

MINUTES OF MEETING
(August 26, 2004)

Project: S.R. 322, Section 100
Delaware County
Project Advisory Committee Meeting #3
benesch Project No. 7855.02

Date: July 15, 2004 (7:00 P.M.)

Place: Upper Chichester Township Municipal Building

Attendees: See attached sign-in sheet

Based on the input received at the May 20, 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 major discussion points of the meeting include:

General

1. John Eagan reviewed the previously distributed May 20, 2004 meeting minutes and asked for comments. Mr. Eagan and Tom Shaffer reviewed changes submitted and incorporated into the minutes. Mr. Shaffer stated that the Townships adopted the Chester Creek Storm Water Management Plan for the watersheds within the Townships. The PAC approved the meeting minutes.
2. For the benefit of the non-PAC members in the room, Bob Keller briefly reviewed the purpose of the PAC and discussed the ground rules for the question and answer period. Public (non-PAC member) questions and comments should be directed to their local PAC member representative. The intent of a PAC meeting is different than that of a Public Meeting and is not intended as a bi-monthly open public forum. Sharon Hannum requested people with questions should state their name and municipal address so that the appropriate PAC member could report back to the individual separately as relevant information becomes available.
3. The next meeting is scheduled for September 16th at 7:00 P.M. at the Upper Chichester Township building.

Section 105/404 permit process

4. Paul DeAngelo reviewed the federal and state wetland permitting requirements as well as the wetland and stream impact mitigation requirements. Mr. DeAngelo distributed a handout on identifying the Evolution of Potential Wetland Mitigation Sites evaluated up to this point in the project process. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regulates the stream and water resources through the Section 404 permit process. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection also regulates wetlands through the Chapter 105 permit process. The Joint Permit application process simplifies coordination between these two agencies in Pennsylvania as well as the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the Pennsylvania Game Commission.

For impacted resources, the permitting process requires three steps - avoidance, minimization, and compensation. The S.R. 322 project will impact 1000 feet of streams and 1.5 acres of wetlands. Stream impacts result from widening from two lanes to four lanes at existing stream crossings. The wetland impacts result when the roadway improvements cross existing wetland boundaries.

The avoidance and minimization steps were investigated during the preliminary design process while investigating different alternatives. The compensation step requires the creation of new wetlands in current upland areas. A wetland replacement ratio of 1:1 is used for impacts to emergent wetlands; 2:1 is used for forested wetlands; and 1½:1 replacement is used for scrub shrub wetlands. A net 2.4 acres of wetland replacements are required.

Sites for wetland replacements are chosen through a 6 part strategy - screening, feasibility, conceptual design, final design, construction, and monitoring. The Department is completing the screening process and is advancing to the preliminary design of the wetlands. The monitoring part requires monitoring the new wetlands to assure vegetation and hydrology for a five year period. Mr. DeAngelo reviewed the 11 sites that have been identified as potential wetland replacement areas. Sites 6 and 11 are progressing while the other sites have been rejected due to development, insufficient hydrology or other reasons. The rejected sites could be re-visited if deemed necessary by the Department.

Stream Site A has been identified for stream mitigation from a local watershed group. The 1000 feet of stream mitigation can be performed on the site upon agency approvals.

PAC Issues:

- The PAC questioned how they find a wetland replacement site. Mr. DeAngelo indicated they search for open sites near the project initially. Preferred sites are on-site and in-kind. The screening process includes contacting property owners, Townships and following leads from the conservation district and watershed groups. Replacement wetlands can be taken from areas outside the municipality of the impacted wetland.
- Dom A. Pileggi indicated that Concord Township was previously agreeable to establishing wetlands on Township property for a private developer. If necessary, a property easement could be acquired by PENNDOT to construct and maintain an S.R. 322 project replacement wetland on this site.
- Currently sites 6 and 11 have enough uplands area available to develop 2.4 acres of new wetlands.

Traffic Noise Impact Assessment Process

5. Mr. Nat Weinstock reviewed the noise impact assessment process. Traffic noise mitigation has a legal basis and is a federal requirement administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and PENNDOT. The noise analysis and mitigation requirements are outlined in PENNDOT Publication 24 – Project Level Highway Traffic Noise Handbook. A short video was shown to inform PAC members on noise issues and to emphasize PENNDOT's commitment to noise mitigation.

The equivalent sound level (Leq) is a term referring to sound pressure levels over a designated time period, and is used in the analysis as the metric describing the loudest hour of the day. The Leq(h) (one-hour Leq) is recorded at front-line receptors for existing conditions. Future Leq(h) is predicted using a noise model.

PENNDOT policy is to build a noise barrier if it's warranted, feasible, and reasonable. A noise barrier is warranted if the model indicates that the project will increase future noise levels to above 66 decibels, or if the net increase is 10 decibels above existing conditions. The barrier is feasible if it's possible to build from an engineering standpoint and it's also effective in reducing the noise levels. The barrier must be accessible for maintenance, cannot interfere with drainage or utilities, and cannot create adverse safety or access issues. PENNDOT considers a noise barrier reasonable if it costs less than \$50,000 per benefited residence based on a standard \$25 per square foot (s.f.) of barrier. Based on actual bid results, the cost of a barrier traditionally exceeds the \$25/s.f. programming amount.

PAC Issues:

The following are answers to PAC noise related questions and concerns.

- PENNDOT noise barrier criterion is applied uniformly across the State.
- State statutes do not regulate truck usage of “jake” breaks, however municipalities can regulate this.
- Highway design criteria cannot be ignored when locating a noise barrier. As an example, it was noted that noise barriers cannot be constructed that would block the site distance of side roads (a highway design safety element).
- Preliminary noise study results are documented in the Environmental Assessment (EA). Copies of the EA are available from each municipality. The EA documents a total of approximately 3410’ (over a total of 4 locations) of noise barriers for the S.R. 322, Section 101 project. Due to land use changes, new receptors, etc., the noise analysis will be re-done during final design. The results could differ from the EA stage preliminary noise study results.
- The custom artwork on the noise barriers shown in the video were paid for by the community. The Department has several standard finishes that the impacted community can choose from for the community side of the barrier. The cost for “custom” textures will not be paid by PENNDOT. Judy Lizza asked PENNDOT to provide information on what a municipality would need to do to initiate an agreement to pay for custom textures.
- All noise barrier decisions are final. Should a community choose to not construct a warranted/reasonable/feasible barrier, PENNDOT will not pay to construct a barrier at a later date or pay to remove one should the community decide it no longer wants it. Similarly, if post-construction noise monitoring indicates noise levels higher than anticipated by the computer model, a noise barrier will not be constructed.
- It was stressed noise barriers mitigate noise, not eliminate it.
- A separate noise barrier public involvement and comment process will be performed. The impacted residential community will make the final decision with regard to building a noise barrier.
- Residential development approved by a municipality subsequent to the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will not be evaluated for noise impacts. The FONSI for this project is dated July 16, 2002 (see attached).
- Additional copies of the noise pamphlets can be provided to the Townships should extras be required.
- Mr. Keller noted the topic of the next PAC meeting will be the proposed ambient noise monitoring program. The presentation will specifically address exactly where the tests will be done by address and location on the parcel and explain the exact area that the results from that site will cover. The black

boxes will be shown to the Townships and Chief of Police or State Police to avoid any homeland security issues.

General PAC Member Issues

6. Roadside development and project “landscaping” treatments can be reviewed at a future PAC meeting.
7. In response to a question from Ginny DeNenno, Mr. Eagan noted PENNDOT will officially respond to her April 17, 2004 letter concerning the addition of a Smithbridge interchange to the project at some point in the near future. Mr. Keller reiterated the project is in final design. Although minor design changes are still feasible, new alternatives cannot be incorporated without delays to the project. Besides delays, these requests could result in the need to return to the regional Transportation Improvement Programming stage.
8. Mr. Shaffer requested that pedestrian facilities and alternate transportation measures be discussed at a future PAC meeting.
9. Mrs. Lizza requested the Garnett Mine Road access to S.R. 322 disconnection topic be addressed at a future PAC meeting.
10. Mr. Eagan noted the project schedule remains unchanged from the March 18, 2004 meeting. Schedule updates will be reviewed at all future PAC meetings.
11. Mrs. Lizza asked if the Folk Road Bridge will be replaced. Michael Hummel responded the bridge will be replaced as part of the Section 102 contract.
12. Based on comments received from many of the general public in attendance, Mr. Pileggi indicated minutes from all PAC meetings will be posted on the Concord Township web site (www.twp.concord.pa.us). To keep each individual Township Board of Supervisors/Commissioners apprised of the PAC meetings, it was agreed a PAC member should summarize the PAC meeting discussions at the subsequent monthly Township meeting. Mr. Keller also indicated the Department will look into posting the minutes on a separate S.R. 322 web site maintained by District 6-0. (See attached instructions to access this web page under the www.dot.state.pa.us web site.)
13. Mrs. Lizza noted as per previous discussions with the District, a separate meeting may be necessary to discuss potential commercial development in the southeast quadrant of the Market Street intersection.

14. Mr. Racz requested the design team provide him with the approximate dimension of the existing eastbound S.R. 322 pavement edge to the right-of-way line east of Merion Drive.

Questions from the Public

15. Ed Nolan, Concord Township (near Clayton Park) – Questioned whether noise barriers will be built to block headlights at adjacent homes? **Response:** No, noise barriers will not be built to screen headlights but the Department may consider landscape screening for headlight abatement via the project's Roadside Development Plans.
16. Ed Solon (?), Concord Township - Questioned whether future casino traffic to Chester County has been considered in the traffic model? **Response:** Traffic projections have been made to 2026 for existing land uses by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC). **benesch** will check with DVRPC on this issue and report back to the PAC.
17. Dave Miller, Concord Township – Questioned why it takes so long to complete a PENNDOT project? **Response:** Mr. Keller gave a brief overview of the PENNDOT Highway Development Process.
18. Kathy Clark, Upper Chichester Township – Questioned when will S.R. 322 near Cherry Tree be constructed? **Response:** The Cherry Tree intersection is located in Section 102. The current schedule has Section 102 scheduled to begin in 2008.
19. John Stolley, Concord Township (Cambridge Downs) – Questioned whether screening will be installed in the Cambridge Downs area and across from the Featherbed Lane jug handle? **Response:** As previously noted, Roadside Development Plans will be developed for the entire corridor. Mr. Keller also noted an additional public meeting will be held to address public concerns such as these. The PAC meeting is not intended to serve as a forum to discuss these specific homeowner property questions. Specific property questions should be directed to the PAC members in the Township. It was also noted the preliminary design plans are on display at State Senator Dominic F. Pileggi's and State Representative Stephen Barrer's offices. A review of these plans may answer some specific questions such as these.
20. Ed Sullivan, Concord Township – Mr. Sullivan noted S.R. 322 carries mostly through traffic. He questioned why there are so many signals and why a road similar to the Blue Route could not be built? **Response:** Mr. Eagan noted S.R. 322 is not a limited access highway, and therefore, at-grade intersections are to be expected. Project

funding has been attained (and preliminary design completed) for the project based on maintaining the existing roadway classification. As for the traffic signals, they are required to attain intersection volume capacity and to maintain safety. Mr. Keller added the transportation funding process is very competitive. Attempting drastic modifications from the preliminary designs (such as making S.R. 322 a limited access highway or adding a new interchange at Smithbridge Road) would require starting the planning process all over again which could jeopardize project funding. Addressing planning type issues such as these is done during the planning process, not during final design.

21. Rose Canuso, Concord Township – Questioned 1) What alternatives were considered at the Mattson Road ramp? 2) Why were they rejected? 3) When can I get answers regarding this jug handle? 4) Is the ramp layout and typical section minimized for safety reasons? 5) Does the ramp accommodate future land use within the loop? 6) What is the noise impact? 7) What are the traffic projections on Mattson Road? 8) How does PENNDOT abandon properties? **Response:** Mr. Keller indicated 1) the intersection alternatives evaluated are presented in the Environmental Assessment (EA) document which is a public document on file with Concord Township. A detailed explanation of the alternatives studied for this and other intersections is contained in the EA. 2) A discussion of this intersection was part of the March 18, 2003 PAC meeting at which Mrs. Canuso was in attendance. 3) Specific questions that Mrs. Canuso has should be directed to Concord PAC members. 4) The jug handle requires the taking of the parcels identified in the preliminary plans. The layout of the ramp is based on the resulting available property size. 5) Mr. Pileggi re-stated his position the Township does not intend to change zoning “within the loops” to accommodate a commercial establishment. He stated this issue was previously explored by the Township Supervisors but subsequently rejected. They do not want to re-zone the parcel. 6) Noise impacts to specific properties will be discussed at a future meeting. 7) The traffic projections are in the EA. 8) Mr. Keller reviewed the PENNDOT excess land disposition process. This process will not start until after construction is completed and it will take several years to complete. At this stage of the project’s development, the Department does not know if this process will be utilized for this project.

Mr. Keller reiterated it is not the intent of the PAC meetings to re-visit individual property owner concerns on a bi-monthly basis, Mr. Keller directed **benesch** to document in the minutes a summary of the design concepts evaluated at this intersection (*see below*).

(Featherbed Lane/Mattson Road Intersection “Evolution” – The September 2001 Environmental Assessment (EA) documents the impacts associated with the subject intersection. The EA included a jug-handle for S.R. 322 westbound to Featherbed

Minutes of Meeting
Project Advisory Committee Meeting #2
July 15, 2004
Page 8

Lane movement in addition to a westbound S.R. 322 left-turn lane at Cambridge Drive for the Cambridge Downs subdivision. As part of the Federal Highway Administration's review of the EA, it was suggested the Cambridge Drive left turn lane be eliminated as it was the only location within the improved roadway between Creek Parkway and U.S. Route 1 where a left turn is permitted. Through coordination with Concord Township, it was agreed that the left turn lane at Cambridge Drive would be eliminated and access to the subdivision would be provided through an extension of the westbound jug handle to align with Merion Drive. These preliminary layout refinements were incorporated into the Design Field View plans which were approved by the Federal Highway Administration on December 19, 2003. A compilation of these plans are available as noted in Item 19 above.)

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.
S.R. 322-100 P.A.C. Facilitator

Michael S. Hummel, P.E.
Project Manager

MSH

Attachments

cc: All Attendees
Tim O'Brien, PENNDOT District 6-0
Joseph Capella, PENNDOT District 6-0

MM.PAC 071504

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

**S.R. 0322, SECTION 100
DELAWARE COUNTY**

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #3

July 15, 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	X
Robert McLarnon	Bethel Township	
Jon Peri	Bethel Township	
John Pickett	Delaware County Planning Commission	
Dominic A. Pileggi	Concord Township Supervisor	X
Norwan Powell	Bethel Township	
James Racz	Concord Township	X
Jim Stewart	Upper Chichester Township	X
George Swayngim	Upper Chichester Township	
Frank Toth	Upper Chichester Township	X
Sirita Trivedi	Concord Township Supervisor	
Beth Zenuk	Upper Chichester Township	

DESIGN TEAM MEMBER	REPRESENTING	INITIAL (if present)
John Laughner	PENNDOT District 6-0	
Robert Keller	PENNDOT District 6-0	X
Tim O'Brien	PENNDOT District 6-0	
Michael Hummel	alfred benesch & company	X
Mark Roth	alfred benesch & company	
John Eagan	alfred benesch & company	X
Nat Weinstock	Skelly & Loy	X
Paul DeAngelo	Skelly & Loy	X

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	
Tom Shaffer	Delaware County Planning Commission	X
Richard Slater	Upper Chichester Township / Excelsior Village	

NAME (Please Print)	REPRESENTING
Harold Robinson	Upper Chichester Twp.
Blair Mahoney	
Ernest Lopoli	
Fred Schollenberger	
Jackie Schollenberger	
Jonathan Stolley	
Chris Stolley	
Justin Soss	

NAME (Please Print)	REPRESENTING
Jim Holt	
Doni Grimes	
Jim Strohman	
Sue Strohman	
Diane MacBeth	Concerned Citizens of Garnet Mine, Kirk, & Shavertown Roads
Kathy Clarke	
Doris Clarke	
R.S. Nolan	Green Creek Lane ? (Clayton Park)
Chuck Greenleaf	