

Minutes of Meeting
(October 5, 2004)

Project: S.R. 322, Section 100
Delaware County
Project Advisory Committee Meeting #4
benesch Project No. 7855.02

Date: September 16, 2004 (7:00 P.M.)

Place: Upper Chichester Township Municipal Building

Attendees: See attached sign-in sheet

A regularly scheduled Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting was held to review selected issues identified in the attached agenda. The major discussion points of the meeting include:

General

1. Mr. Keller introduced Joseph Capella as the Department's new project manager replacing John Laughner who recently retired.
2. Mr. Eagan reviewed the previously distributed July 15, 2004 meeting minutes and asked for comments. There were no comments and the PAC approved the meeting minutes.
3. Mr. Eagan noted the previous meeting minutes were posted on the District's web site. Additional copies of the directions to find the web site were made available.
4. Mr. Keller reviewed the revised PAC meeting rules distributed July 26, 2004, noting the intent behind the modifications is to keep the meeting focused on the PAC members and the topics on the agenda. He also explained these modifications are the result of feedback from several PAC members after the previous meeting and this meeting would serve as a "trial run" for the format changes.
5. Mr. Keller acknowledged Representative Barrar held a meeting on August 31, 2004 with several concerned citizens and PENNDOT to discuss the Mattson/Featherbed jug-handle. The follow-up to this meeting is still on-going and would not be addressed or commented on as part of this meeting.

S.R. 322 Section 101 Draft Traffic Noise Monitoring Work Plan

6. Mr. Weinstock displayed the equipment to be used to monitor the noise, noting the 24-hour tests will require the equipment be placed at the proposed monitoring site unattended overnight. Mr. Eagan noted the police agencies for each of the Townships were notified of tonight's meeting, but were unable to attend due to other commitments. It was agreed pictures of the equipment would be forwarded to the police contacts in an attempt to avoid any questions directed to the police by the public. Mr. Keller reported on past occasion, the police have been contacted by uninformed residents of an unidentified "black box" being "abandoned" on private or public property.

PAC Issues:

- Ms. Zenuk questioned if the Department would be issuing a press release in advance of the field work. Mr. Keller noted the District's normal press release process would be followed and that intent-to-enter property letters would be sent to each property where the monitoring process would take place. A specific schedule of monitoring cannot be provided at this time as it is impacted by variables such as weather, etc...
7. Mr. Weinstock distributed a map listing the proposed monitoring locations by street address/property owner with the anticipated testing type (i.e. short term or 24-hour). He also explained the area that will be represented by each site, emphasizing existing/future build/no build noise levels at historic sites must be identified (via either modeling or direct monitoring) per federal regulation. He also explained Monday mornings and Friday afternoons could experience atypical traffic conditions and monitoring will not be provided during this time frame. Additionally, although there are minor seasonal variations in noise levels in some parts of the country, this is not usually significant in the northeast and will not be considered as part of this analysis. Noise monitoring for Section 101 will begin shortly.

PAC Issues:

- Mr. Groer questioned the overall duration of the noise monitoring program. Mr. Weinstock indicated the monitoring will take approximately 2 – 3 weeks.
- Ms. DeNenno questioned why monitoring of the historic site in the vicinity of short-term monitoring site #19 is not proposed. Mr. Weinstock indicated monitoring of this site will be added.
- Ms. Lizza questioned why the area on the north side of S.R. 322 in the vicinity of the proposed Mattson jug-handle does not have a monitoring site for model calibration. Mr. Weinstock indicated monitoring of this site will be added.

- Ms. Hannum suggested the monitoring at the eastern limit of Section 101 be sufficient to cover the over-lap areas with Section 102 to avoid re-work as part of that section of construction. Mr. Weinstock indicated monitoring of this area will be sufficient for computer noise model calibration.
- Ms. Zenuk questioned why Section 102 monitoring was not being proposed concurrent with Section 101 as an overlap of the two construction projects is anticipated. Mr. Weinstock indicated the proposed monitoring locations for Section 102 will be summarized at the next PAC meeting.
- Ms. Lizza noted NSA1 is a commercial property with a heavy volume of trucks and questioned if the monitoring site should be moved to the adjacent hotel. Mr. Weinstock indicated they will move NSA1 to the "hotel-side" of the property to avoid the influence on the readings from truck-activity on that site. Although the parcel does have commercial usage, tax records and a "windshield" field view indicate that there is a residence on-site as well.
- Mr. George questioned if a noise wall will be feasible considering the presence of numerous driveways along the corridor. Mr. Keller clarified the Department has not yet committed to building noise walls along the corridor noting the warranted/reasonable/feasible criteria reviewed at the previous PAC meeting must be satisfied. However, in accordance with Federal law the Department is committed to evaluating their need in accordance with mitigation requirements outlined in PENNDOT Publication 24 – Project Level Highway Traffic Noise Handbook. Mr. Keller acknowledged the presence of numerous driveways will be a consideration in the final recommendations. However, the noise analysis may assist the Townships in addressing future land development opportunities.
- Mr. Heyburn questioned if short-term monitoring site #19 would sufficiently cover the Cambridge Downs Development. Mr. Weinstock indicated the addition of a short-term monitoring site to address the historic site would provide sufficient data to calibrate the computer noise model within this area.

General Questions from the PAC Members

7. **Revised PAC Meeting Rules** – Ms. Lizza questioned if non-agenda questions can be raised by a PAC member at the conclusion of the scheduled topics. Mr. Keller suggested if time remains before the schedule adjournment at 8:30, this time could be dedicated to a PAC Q/A period. Noting this meeting is intended to be for the benefit of the PAC, should the PAC decide additional format changes are required, they can be implemented at future meetings. Mr. Zenuk suggested the formal PAC meeting last 1 hour with an additional 30 minutes be allotted for PAC Q/A period.

8. **Sequence of Sections 101, 102, and 103 Construction** – Ms. Trivedi questioned why Sections 101 and 102 are proposed for construction in advance of Section 103. It is her opinion the proposed construction sequence should be reversed. Mr. Eagan noted this topic was discussed at a previous (March 18, 2004) PAC meeting, but summarized it will take more time to resolve issues in Section 103 and also with consideration given to the intent of advancing four lanes through the entire corridor as the first priority.
9. **PAC Agenda Topics** – Ms. Trivedi questioned why the PAC is concentrating on specific details such as Section 101 noise analysis when overall concept issues such as the Mattson/Featherbed jug-handle is still not resolved. Mr. Eagan noted the project development process requires numerous concurrences throughout the design of a project and some have longer “critical paths” than others. The noise analysis process is one of the more lengthy processes. As such, to maintain the proposed construction schedule the noise evaluation process is being addressed at this time. It was requested non-noise related design issues in Sections 101 thru 103 (such as Construction Staging, Garnet Mine Road Intersection Closure, Pedestrian Access, etc...) be the primary agenda topics at the next PAC meeting.
10. **Driveway Access to S.R. 322** – Ms. DeNenno indicated she has received comments on potential access issues to residences along S.R. 322 in the vicinity of Partridge Road (short-term monitoring site #7). Mr. Hummel stated driveway adjustments will be required as a result of the mainline widening, but all driveways will be reviewed in accordance with PENNDOT Publication 282 (Highway Occupancy Permit Handbook) and township ordinances. Should access not meet these standards, the parcel will need to be acquired as part of the normal right-of-way clearance process.
11. **Roadway Typical Section** – Mr. Racz questioned why the widening will predominantly take place to the south of the existing roadway and not symmetric about the existing centerline. Mr. Eagan noted the design utilizes the existing (60 foot) right-of-way south of the existing road. This right-of-way was originally acquired for this purpose as discussed at a previous (March 18, 2004) PAC meeting. Ms. DeNenno produced an “old” Cambridge Downs plan consistent with Mr. Eagan’s explanation. Mr. Racz questioned why the alignment is shifted to the north side at Clayton Park. Mr. Keller responded the Federal Highway Administration’s Section 4(f) policy paper provides special consideration be given to public parks.
12. **Context Sensitive Solutions** – Noting S.R. 322 was dedicated to the 28th Infantry Division, Ms. Lizza provided a handout on the “History of the 28th Infantry Division.” It was suggested this theme be incorporated into any potential mitigation measure where possible, such as on any potential noise barrier or signing.

13. **Driveway Acceleration/Deceleration (A/D) Lanes** – Noting acceleration/deceleration lanes are proposed at the non-signalized intersections only (i.e. not at driveways), Ms. Zenuk expressed concerns that the potential increased speeds resulting from the project may make access to and from the residences along the corridor more difficult. Mr. Keller noted it is not the intent of the project to create a limited access roadway and eliminate all driveway accesses to S.R. 322. Mr. Hummel also added the design intent of a deceleration lane is to improve traffic capacity.
14. **Cambridge Downs Subdivision** – Ms. DeNenno indicated a petition has been generated by the residences of this community. Mr. Keller informed Ms. DeNenno the PAC Meeting is not the mechanism by which a petition is to be officially submitted. Any petition should be submitted directly to the District 6-0 Executive (Mr. Andrew Warren).
15. **Traffic Signal Criteria** – Mr. Heyburn questioned how PENNDOT establishes if a traffic signal is required. Mr. Eagan noted the warrants listed in Publication 201 establish the need for a traffic signal.

The next meeting has been scheduled for November 18, 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.
S.R. 322-100 P.A.C. Facilitator

Michael S. Hummel, P.E.
Project Manager

JFE

cc: All Attendees

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

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

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #4

September 16, 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	X
Bob Little	Concord Township	
Judy Lizza	Bethel Township	X
Wayne Martin	Upper Chichester Township	
Robert McLarnon	Bethel Township	
Jon Peri	Bethel Township	
John Pickett	Delaware County Planning Commission	
Dominic A. Pileggi	Concord Township Supervisor	
Norwan Powell	Bethel Township	
James Racz	Concord Township	X
Jim Stewart	Upper Chichester Township	
George Swayngim	Upper Chichester Township	X

Frank Toth	Upper Chichester Township	
Sirita Trivedi	Concord Township Supervisor	X
Beth Zenuk	Upper Chichester Township	X

DESIGN TEAM MEMBER	REPRESENTING	INITIAL (if present)
Joe Capella	PENNDOT District 6-0	X
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

ALTERNATE PAC MEMBER	REPRESENTING	INITIAL (if present)
John Atkinson	Bethel Township	
Sheridan Eriksen	Upper Chichester Township	
Michael Kirilin	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
Kathy Clarke	
Linda Smith	
Joseph Perkovaki	
Victor B. Starr	
Kathleen Mack	Clayton Park
Jeffrey Kiehl	

