

Minutes of Meeting
(July 15, 2004)

Project: SR 322, Section 100
Delaware County
Project Advisory Committee Meeting #2
benesch Project No. 7855.02

Date: May 20, 2004 (7:00 P.M.)

Place: Upper Chichester Township Municipal Building

Attendees: See attached sign-in sheet

Based on the input received at the March 18, 2004, Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting, this PAC meeting was scheduled to review selected issues that have been identified and to solicit input from the PAC as a partner with PENNDOT. The attached agenda was used as a basis for discussion at the meeting. The major discussion points of the meeting include:

General

1. Mr. Eagan questioned if there were any comments on the previously distributed March 18, 2004, meeting minutes and reviewed the agenda items for this meeting. There were no comments on the meeting minutes.

SR 322 General Design Features

2. **NPDES Issues Preview** - Mr. Hummel introduced permitting issues with the intent to collect information and preferences and discuss goals. A National Pollutant Discharge Eliminating System (NPDES) permit is required due to earth disturbance and changes in ground cover (impervious areas). The Delaware County Conservation District and PADEP review Stormwater and Erosion & Sedimentation Pollution Control plans, reports and drainage calculations associated with this permit. Mr. Hummel noted the goals are to reduce stormwater impacts – cumulative impacts as imperviousness increases, reduce flooding, scour and erosion, control runoff pollutants – sediments, nutrients, toxicants, oils and greases.

Stormwater requirements are controlled by Act 167 which requires Counties to develop watershed wide stormwater management plans. These plans become effective within individual municipalities upon adoption of a stormwater management ordinance by the municipalities. When this happens, release rate districts may be defined that allow runoff to be controlled differently in different parts of the

watershed. Delaware County's Chester Creek Act 167 Plan addresses the Chester Creek Watershed. However, for the sake of uniformity, Concord, Bethel and Upper Chichester Townships have adopted the Chester Creek standards municipality-wide.

PENNDOT's policy is to seek compliance with local Act 167 plans and to strive to maintain good relations with local municipalities. At a minimum, PENNDOT is generally required to control runoff rates to equal pre-development conditions.

New NPDES Requirements (December 20, 2002) require a Post Construction Stormwater Management Plan (PCSWM). This plan encourages post construction infiltration to be greater or equal to pre development infiltration (for the 2 year, 24 hour storm event). The specifics of this requirement by PADEP may differ with local and PENNDOT minimum criteria.

Mr. Hummel described the NPDES permitting process where the Delaware County Conservation District is responsible to review the plan and permit application documentation. PADEP also is involved in the approval process. Mr. Hummel requested the townships consider deferring separate review comments in an attempt to streamline the approval process. Plans and permit documentation will be forwarded to each affected township for information and review. **benesch** will contact each township later in this process to further discuss the details.

Mr. Hummel discussed SR 322 infiltration issues including poor soils, depth to rock/groundwater, and differences in infiltration volumes (change in 2-year storm runoff or Runoff Capture Volume). **benesch** has developed preliminary methods to introduce water to the ground including infiltration swales and infiltration basins. Infiltration swales are wider roadside swales with check dams placed to retain water over an extended period. These affect overall highway right-of-way width on both sides throughout the project where placed. Infiltration basins concentrate the water into very large basins and have a much larger impact to localized properties. Each method has restrictions, advantages and disadvantages and requires regular maintenance by PENNDOT. Other best management practices (BMP's) will also be incorporated into the construction plans.

PAC Issues:

The township PAC representatives indicated each township has adopted the Act 167 ordinance to apply Municipality-wide. Concerns of salt entering the ground water and ice in roadside infiltration swales were raised. Mr. Hummel explained the new regulations appear to be more easily applied to new developments, rather than highway widening projects. Restrictions such as location of wells, poor soils, high ground water, and shallow depth to rock may also restrict much of the

infiltration devices to the point where the total infiltration volume may be difficult to achieve. This permitting process may be difficult unless consideration from the townships, the Conservation District and PADEP allow for less than optimum infiltration volumes.

3. **Delaware County Planning Commission/Environmental Assessment Inquiry** - After the March 18, 2004 PAC meeting, Mr. Tom Shaffer, Delaware County Planning Department requested a response to the Delaware County Planning Department's letter on the Environmental Assessment for the project. Mr. Roth sent a letter to Mr. Shaffer with an excerpt from the Public Involvement Report prepared in conjunction with the Environmental Assessment in April 2002. This excerpt includes the Planning Department's letter dated November 21, 2001 and the responses to the comments in that letter. Copies of the letter and the attached excerpt were distributed to the PAC members at the meeting for information.

PAC Issues:
None at this time.

SR 322, Section 101 Design Features

4. **SR 322 / Smithbridge Road & Letter from PAC Member DeNenno regarding old interchange alternative** - Mr. Eagan reviewed the letter from Ms. DeNenno and Mr. Hummel reviewed the original diamond interchange at Smithbridge Road. This option was originally proposed to increase access to Smithbridge Road by adding ramps to the existing grade separated intersection. At the November 24, 1998 meeting with Concord and Bethel Townships, Concord Township expressed their preference to keep the existing condition without ramps due to the effects on schools and residences from ramp construction and the increased traffic. The ramps were removed and the current design was taken through the NEPA review process and approved. It was explained how a change to this intersection now could result in a significant delay due to the changed impacts. It could take an additional two years to make changes to the Environmental Clearance documents and have additional public meetings. Approval of the addition of the ramps would not be guaranteed after this effort.

PAC Issues:
In light of the impacts to the project, PAC members are not sure they wish to pursue the possibility of officially requesting PENNDOT re-visit this issue. The Concord Township PAC members will take the issue back to the Township Supervisors and report at a later PAC meeting.

SR 322, Section 102 Design Features

5. **SR 322/Foulk Road Interchange Previous Alternative Review** - Mr. Roth reviewed previous alternatives for the Foulk Road interchange and compared them to the current proposed improvement. The original design included a loop ramp in the northwest quadrant and had no impact to the PENNDOT maintenance facility, while the current improvement requires this facility to be relocated. In addition, a full diamond interchange alternative was reviewed. This full diamond interchange was dismissed early in the preliminary design phase due to impacts to a historic property. To avoid the historic property, the current design includes a northward shifting in SR 322 and the eastbound exit ramp is located on the east side of the interchange.

PAC Issues:

Bethel Township has recently received preliminary plans for two Industrial Parks that are likely to affect Garnet Mine Road and Foulk Road. It was noted that the developer(s) are still at least 1 – 2 years from construction and that the Township has forwarded the preliminary plans to Mr. Laughner. PAC members requested the project reflect this added traffic. Mr. Keller stated the 2006 and 2026 DVRPC traffic models already incorporate adjacent zoning and percent of undeveloped areas. Mr. Keller requested that early plans be submitted to PENNDOT as part of the Highway Occupancy Permit required for the development to access SR 3038, Garnet Mine Road. Signals on Foulk Road will incorporate this development as information becomes available. PAC members requested PENNDOT upgrade Garnett Mine Road as needed to accommodate increased traffic. This will be coordinated during the HOP process with the developer and coordinated with this project.

6. **Foulk Road Interchange Ramp D Stacking Capacity** - Mr. Roth reviewed Foulk Road Ramp D stacking capacity. Based on the traffic projections for 2026, approximately 200 vehicles per hour are expected to use the eastbound exit ramp during the peak traffic hour. Considering shorter term “peaking factors”, about 12 vehicles are expected to stack on the ramp during the 2026 peak hour condition. At 25 feet per vehicle, the 300 foot long eastbound exit ramp can accommodate the 12 vehicles. In addition, an additional 600 feet deceleration lane could also stack vehicles, but this would be less desirable due to its desired use to accommodate vehicle deceleration. The bridge over Foulk Road will be replaced. Traffic will be maintained with one lane in each direction. Traffic control can be reviewed in more detail at a future PAC meeting.

PAC Issues:

A suggestion was made to shift SR 322 about 50 feet further to the north to allow an eastbound exit ramp to be constructed north of the historic property. Bethel Township PAC members also suggested that Garnett Mine Road could be made a cul-de-sac on the west side of Foulk Road to eliminate two side-by-side accesses to Foulk Road. This section of Garnett Mine road serves about 5 homes. It would be made a township road. The design team will investigate this option and report at a future PAC meeting.

SR 322, Section 103 Design Features

None

Future Meeting Topic Prioritization and Issues

7. **Project Section Schedule** – The PAC discussed Section 103 with respect to it being last to be constructed. They agreed that Section 103 topics should be addressed last.
8. **Aesthetics** – This issue should be discussed early following major issues.
9. **SR 322/ I-95 Interchange improvements** – This is a separate transportation project that is just now being initiated and is independent of the SR 322, Section 100 project. The environmental / preliminary engineering study phase of this project is scheduled to begin in early 2005.
10. **Emergency Vehicle, School Transportation** – These issues during construction can be discussed at a future PAC meeting after the traffic control plans are further developed.

Questions from the Floor

11. **Non-PAC attendees** – Non PAC attendees are encouraged to contact their Township PAC representative for issues the PAC wishes to discuss. There are 7 Township representatives from each Township.
12. **Clayton Park Drive** – Attendees expressed a desire to remove the access to SR 322 and replace it with a connection to Featherbed Lane. The existing connection with SR 322 will not be impacted by this project. The residents concept of providing a new connection to Featherbed Lane is a Township issue.
13. **Ramp A** – An attendee again expressed her concern about potential commercial development inside the Mattson Road jughandle. It was reiterated this is a Concord Township issue.
14. **Bethel Road** – A group of residents on Bethel Road between Cherry Tree Road and Market Street (PA Route 452) expressed their concerns about traffic using Bethel Road to bypass the congestion on SR 322 and to access I-95 southbound via Market

Minutes of Meeting
Project Advisory Committee Meeting #2
May 20, 2004
Page 6

Street. During the discussion after the PAC meeting, it was noted Bethel Road was not designed to carry this volume and type of traffic and the situation will get worse with the project construction in this area. The project team can consider their concerns in the development of the Maintenance and Protection of Traffic Plans.

The next meeting has been scheduled for July 15, 2004 at 7:00 PM at the Upper Chichester Municipal Building. All attendees are requested to review the above minutes for corrections and/or comments. If no comments or corrections are received within ten (10) business days, these minutes will become the basis for all official action.

Respectfully submitted,

alfred benesch & company

John F. Eagan, P.E.,
Facilitator

Mark C. Roth, P.E.,
Senior Project Manager

MSH:sc

cc: All Attendees

MM.draft PAC 052004

**PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ENGINEERING DISTRICT 6-0**

**SR 0322, SECTION 100
DELAWARE COUNTY**

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #2

May 20, 2004

SIGN-IN SHEET

**alfred benesch & company
PROJECT No. 7855.02**

PAC MEMBER	REPRESENTING	INITIAL (if present)
Dom Cappelli	Concord Township	
Virginia DeNenno	Concord Township Planning Commission	X
Michael George	Bethel Township	X
Al Groer	Bethel Township Planning Commission	X
Sharon Hannum	Bethel Township Supervisor	X
John Heyburn	Concord Township	
Bob Little	Concord Township	X
Judy Lizza	Bethel Township	X
Wayne Martin	Upper Chichester Township	
Robert McLarnon	Bethel Township	X
Jon Peri	Bethel Township	
John Pickett	Delaware County Planning Commission	
Dominic A. Pileggi	Concord Township Supervisor	
Norwan Powell	Bethel Township	X
James Racz	Concord Township	
Jim Stewart	Upper Chichester Township	
George Swayngim	Upper Chichester Township	
Frank Toth	Upper Chichester Township	X
Sirita Trivedi	Concord Township Supervisor	
Beth Zenuk	Upper Chichester Township	X

DESIGN TEAM MEMBER	REPRESENTING	INITIAL (if present)
John Laughner	PENNDOT District 6-0	X
Robert Keller	PENNDOT District 6-0	X
Mark Roth	alfred benesch & company	X
John Eagan	alfred benesch & company	X
Michael Hummel	alfred benesch & company	X
Michael Cuddy	A.G. Lichtenstein	
Philip Murphy	GTS Technologies, Inc.	
Rich Wisnosky	Grove Miller Engineering	
Mindy Bower	Skelly & Loy	

ALTERNATE PAC MEMBER	REPRESENTING	INITIAL (if present)
John Atkinson	Bethel Township	
Sheridan Eriksen	Upper Chichester Township	X
Michael Kirlin	Concord Township	X
Frank Lamanna	Concord Township	X
Tom Shaffer	Delaware County Planning Commission	X
Richard Slater	Upper Chichester Township / Excelsior Village	

NAME (Please Print)	REPRESENTING
Kathy Clarke	
Doris Clarke	
Joe Perkowski	
Rose Canuso	
Tom Krueger	
Denise Krueger	
Drew Kirkland	
Eva Krausz	