



MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

DATE: June 27, 2003

MEETING DATE: June 10, 2003

PLACE: Leola Family Restaurant

TIME: 6:30 pm

SUBJECT: PA 23 EIS Community Advisory Committee, Meeting No. 5
KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

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

BOARDS ON DISPLAY: PENNDOT's 10-Step Transportation Process Alternatives Composite Map

HANDOUTS: Visioning Conference #2 Agenda
Email Response from Dick Fulcher (May 29, 2003)
Letter from Russell Pugh (June 5, 2003)

ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| John Bare, Member | Neil Kinsey, Member |
| Henry Bieler, Member | Larry Knepper, Member |
| Herman Bontrager, Member | Frank Ludwig, Member |
| Frank Christoffel, Member | Michael Middleton, Member |
| William Ebel, Member | John Shiver, Member |
| Steve Gabriel, Alternate | Karen Weibel, Alternate |
| Katie Glick, Member | Fred Wissler, Member |
| Lisa Greaves, Member | Adam Zimmerman, Alternate |
| Bill Hoffman, Alternate | |

Mark Malhenzie, Project Manager, PENNDOT, District 8-0
Deborah Scherkoske, Project Manager, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Stacey Hostetler, Acting Facilitator, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Dave Royer, Lancaster County Planning Commission
Matt Bennett, McCormick Taylor and Associates

The purpose of this meeting was to review the alternatives recommended for continued study, provide an overview of the upcoming Visioning Conference, 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 that the

attendees 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 Steve Gabriel (for Mary Clinton) and Adam Zimmerman (for David Zimmerman, Member and Clyde Martin, Alternate). MM stated that previous newsletters were available. Several newsletters were passed out.

2. PA 23 Alternatives Recommended for Continued Study - Deborah Scherkoske (DS) provided an overview of all the alternatives previously under study and gave a presentation on which alternatives were recommended for further study and those alternatives recommended for dismissal. DS explained that the project is still in Step 5 of the PENNDOT 10-Step Process and that this step is the most time consuming.

DS presentation reviewed the project needs, discussed each of the eight build alternatives and the transportation needs, environmental impacts and stakeholder input associated with each alternative and the recommendation. DS presentation closed with a summary of the alternatives recommended for no further study and the alternatives recommended to be carried forward, a review of what the public is telling the project team about the alternatives, and a review of current project team activities.

3. CAC Participation at the Visioning Conference – Matt Bennett (MB) gave a brief overview of the activities at the first Visioning Conference held last year. MB then spoke about the upcoming Visioning Conference and the importance of the CAC members/alternates attendance. MB passed out and reviewed the agenda for the two-day Visioning Conference scheduled for June 19 and 20, 2003. After reviewing the agenda, MB explained that a packet would be mailed out this week for attendees to review that will help them to better understand and participate in land use discussions. MB explained that the second Visioning Conference is to develop future land use scenarios based on the alternatives carried forward for further study and begin to develop a growth management strategy that is favorable to the community. MB opened the floor for questions.

A CAC member questioned if the attendees would have resources in regards to the legal aspect of land use so as to make sure what could be implemented. MB explained that planning staff will attend to help guide and answer questions. MB further stated that attendees will be taking part in a planning exercise to show what we would like to see happen in our communities as far as growth and land use. MB stated that later in the process, once a preferred alternative is identified specifics regarding the land use strategies paired with that transportation alternative could be finalized. The CAC and Project Team held some more discussion around this topic. DS explained that the toolbox of strategies the attendees would be looking at and working with have been implemented in the region, Lancaster County and/or the study area.

Dave Royer (DR) explained that a draft ELCLUS plan would be circulated this summer and that, ultimately the EIS and ELCLUS plan would be combined into one plan for implementation.

A CAC member brought up the possibility of having a person from the Lancaster Farmland Trust become a member of the CAC. MM indicated that this relates directly to the next agenda topic.

4. CAC Membership Issues – Stacey Hostetler (SH) explained that we do have a representative from the Lancaster Farmland Trust (LFT). SH stated that Mr. Dan Sweigart who is an alternative for Tom Baldrige is a member of LFT. The CAC held some discussion about Mr. Sweigart's position with the LFT and the possibility of still adding an additional member from LFT. Henry Beiler made a recommendation that the project team extended an invitation to the Trust for membership on the CAC. The recommendation was seconded. Lisa Brozey (LB) asked if there was anyone opposed to extending an invitation to LFT. One member indicated that he was concerned with LFT's agenda because the CAC didn't need another representative with an agenda like LAND. Several CAC members with connection to LFT stated that they did not feel LAND and LFT had related agendas. SH stated the Project Team would extend an invitation of membership to Heidi Schellenger of the LFT.

During the conversation, a member expressed concern over Mr. Sweigart not receiving meeting materials. SH stated that she would speak with Mr. Sweigart and confirm his mailing address to assure that Mr. Sweigart received future materials.

The CAC had some discussions over the letters being sent out by another CAC alternate. LB explained that everyone is entitled to his or her opinion but that the project will continue to move forward through PENNDOT's process.

SH stated the next membership issue that needs addressed is the vacancy left by Randy Harris's departure from the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County (HPTLC). SH stated that based on the operating and organization principles Randy's alternate Mike Middleton has the opportunity to fill the vacancy. Mike stated his willingness to become a member. SH welcomed Mike to the CAC as a member. SH stated that again according to the operating and organization principles, Mike is responsible for appointing his alternate. SH explained that HPTLC expressed an interest of having Carol Hickey replace Randy Harris as a member of the study group and asked that Mike consider her as his alternate. Mike stated that Carol would be his alternate. SH stated that Carol would be notified and materials on the CAC would be sent to her.

SH explained that Adam Zimmerman was attending tonight in place of David Zimmerman and Clyde Martin. SH further explained that both David and Clyde had a Supervisor's meeting tonight. Joe Shiver stated that Adam was his alternate as well.

SH distributed two additional correspondences that had been sent to the project team since the CAC mailing and opened the floor for discussion.

5. Open Discussion/Conclusion – Hearing no further discussion, SH indicated that the meeting would conclude and the next meeting date would be included with the meeting summary, or announced in a separate mailing. DS indicated that the next CAC meeting would be held prior to the public meeting, tentatively schedule for late summer 2003, and that the agenda would focus on design details of the alternatives carried forward, and the draft public meeting materials.

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