

IV. Comments and Coordination



IV. Comments and Coordination

A. Introduction

The original engineering and environmental studies on the SR 0202 Section 700 project were initiated in December 1990. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared and released in 1997 and included an analysis of a range of alternatives to meet the identified needs of the project. The EIS recommended a four lane, limited access expressway from PA 63 (Welsh Road) to PA 611 in Bucks County. This 8.4 mile project was estimated at \$465 million. In 2004, PennDOT identified Section 700 as one of several projects throughout the Commonwealth to be re-evaluated as a result of long-term financial limitations facing PennDOT regarding Transportation Projects in Pennsylvania.

PennDOT has worked with local officials (Task Force), environmental review agencies (SACM) and the public to refine this project to make it more affordable. An ongoing agency and public coordination program is being maintained throughout the process to provide for public input and to ensure all environmental and socioeconomic concerns were adequately addressed.

B. Summary of Coordination Activities

1. Community Task Force Meetings

In early 2005, PennDOT established a Community Task Force made up of representatives of the 11 affected municipalities, County Planning Commissions, state representatives, the MPO (DVRPC), and also including the principal permitting agencies, PA Department of Environmental Resources and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

An intensive 3-day workshop was held in June 2005 with the Task Force to review the full length of the entire 8.4 mile corridor and lay out a conceptual alignment of a context-sensitive parkway intended to be largely at-grade. Key elements of the Parkway Concept were developed from the Task Force sessions and are included in the in the Parkway Alternative described earlier in this document.

The Task Force meets monthly to assist in the advancement of the Route 202 Section 700 project. The dates are listed below:

04/14/05	Initial Task Force Meeting
05/03/05	Technical Review Meeting
05/10/05	Group 1 Interview (Lower/Upper Gwynedd and Montgomery Townships)
05/10/05	Group 2 Interview (Montgomery and Warrington Townships)
05/11/05	Group 4 Interview (New Britain Township, New Britain and Chalfont Boroughs)
05/12/05	Group 3 Interview (Warrington and Doylestown Townships, Doylestown Borough)
05/12/05	Group 5 Interview (Buckingham and Solebury Townships, NBCP and DRKN)
06/28-30/05	3-day Task Force Workshop
09/13/05	Task Force Meeting to present Parkway Concept
10/19/05	Informational Session on Roundabouts
11/16/05	Monthly Task Force Meeting at Montgomery Township
01/10/06	Task Force Meeting at Montgomery Township
02/15/06	Task Force Meeting at Montgomery Township
03/15/06	Task Force Meeting at Montgomery Township
04/19/06	Task Force Meeting at Montgomery Township
05/17/06	Task Force Meeting at Montgomery Township
07/18/06	Task Force Meeting at District 6-0
08/16/06	Task Force Meeting at Montgomery Township
09/20/06	Task Force Meeting at Montgomery Township

2. Individual Municipal Meetings

In addition to the Task Force Meetings, PennDOT met with Townships on an as needed basis to work out details of site specific issues related to the project. These meetings included:

- 11/22/05 Meeting with Lower/Upper Gwynedd and Montgomery Townships
- 11/30/05 Meeting with Doylestown Township
- 03/31/06 Meeting with Doylestown Township
- 04/10/06 Meeting with Warrington Township
- 05/02/06 Meeting with Doylestown Township
- 05/15/06 Meeting with Lower Gwynedd Township
- 05/30/06 Meeting with Montgomery Township
- 06/14/06 Meeting with Montgomery Township
- 07/07/06 Meeting with New Britain Township
- 07/12/06 Meeting with Warrington Township
- 07/12/06 Meeting with Solebury Township
- 07/13/06 Meeting with Doylestown Township
- 07/25/06 Meeting with Buckingham and Solebury Township
- 08/16/06 Meeting with Montgomery Township
- 09/27/06 Meeting with Buckingham Township

3. Environmental Review Agency Meetings

Several federal and state regulatory agencies have been directly involved in the original project and environmental studies associated with the EIS development through a series of agency coordination meetings and work sessions.

With the recent redefinition of the project purpose and funding as 100% state, the project development and environmental clearance studies must also comply with the PennDOT Project Development Process pursuant to PA Act 120. A new series of agency coordination meetings and work sessions have been developed through the PennDOT Special Agency Coordination Meeting (SACM). For this project, this forum has been expanded to include a number of additional state agencies.

The agencies include:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Philadelphia District

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Environmental Programs
Region III, 3ES30

U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental
Protection
Southeast Regional Office

Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission
Division of Environmental Services
Watershed Analysis Section

Pennsylvania Game Commission
Bureau of Land Management

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission
Bureau for Historic Preservation
Division of Archaeology and Protection

Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture
Bureau of Farmland Preservation

Pennsylvania Department of Community and
Economic Development
Governor's Center for Local Government Services

Pennsylvania Department of Health
Office of Policy

Below is a summary of the meetings held to date for the redefined Section 700 project.

- 03/21/05 Meeting with Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) at ACOE Philadelphia Office
- 04/11/05 Meeting with ACOE
- 06/21/05 Special Agency Coordination Meeting (SACM) in Avondale
- 10/03/05 Meeting with ACOE
- 11/15/05 SACM at Montgomery Township Building (Scoping and Purpose and Need)
- 03/21/06 SACM at District 6-0 (Purpose and Need and Preliminary Alternatives)
- 04/06/06 Agency Field View
- 04/24/06 Meeting with ACOE at ACOE Philadelphia Office
- 05/16/06 SACM at District 6-0 (Alternatives Screening and Mitigation Discussions)
- 06/05/06 Agency Field View
- 09/07/06 SACM at District 6-0 (Alternatives and Recommendation of a Preferred Alternative)

4. DVRPC Meetings

PennDOT met with DVRPC regularly to coordinate the data collection, traffic forecasting and traffic analysis for this project. Below are the meeting dates related to traffic coordination:

- 11/06/05 Traffic at DVRPC Office
- 12/08/05 Traffic at DVRPC Office
- 03/22/06 Traffic at DVRPC Office
- 06/16/06 Traffic at District 6-0 Office
- 08/16/06 Traffic at Montgomery Township Building

5. Other Organizations Meetings

- 06/02/06 Meeting with Delaware River Keepers Network at District 6-0
- 09/27/06 Meeting with Philadelphia Archdiocese Cemetery Office in Philadelphia
- 10/17/06 Meeting with Delaware River Keepers Network at Buckingham Township

6. Community Group Meetings

- 07/17/06 Meeting with Home Owners Association from Terrace of Montgomery at Montgomery Township
- 09/19/06 Montgomery Township Citizen Advisory Committee (Businesses) at Montgomery Township Building
- 09/19/06 Montgomery Township Citizen Advisory Committee (Residents) at Montgomery Township Building
- 10/17/06 Montgomery Township Citizen Advisory Committee (Businesses) at Montgomery Township Building
- 10/17/06 Montgomery Township Citizen Advisory Committee (Residents) at Montgomery Township Building

7. Business Group Meetings

- 05/30/06 Meeting with COSTCO, General Hancock Partnership and Joseph Ambler Inn at Montgomery Township
- 10/11/06 Meeting with General Hancock Partnership and Joseph Ambler Inn at Montgomery Township

8. Other Meetings

- 07/10/06 PA 611 Signing Coordination Meeting at District 6-0

9. Public Meetings / Events

a) 2005 Public Meetings

The public participation program to date has included numerous meetings with government officials and interested members of the communities throughout the course of the study.

The Preliminary Alternatives Analysis was prepared in consultation with organizations and individuals with county wide, as well as local interest.

A brief summary of the public coordination completed to date is provided below. Three meetings were held in the project area in October and November of 2005 to present the status of the project and identify the issues facing the Department

Public Meeting #1 was held on October 25, 2005 at the Montgomery Township Building, Montgomery County. Meeting #2 was held on November 1, 2005 at Central Bucks High School South, Warrington, PA. The third meeting was on November 2, 2005 at the Lenape Middle School in Doylestown. All three meetings included plans displays from 5:00 pm – 9:00 pm with presentations and Questions & Answers (Q&A) at 6:00 pm and 8:00 pm.

All three open houses were well attended, each by about 120-160 people. While a few attendees appeared to come for only a short time to view the displays, most stayed for at least one of the formal presentations. Representatives from various newspapers attended including the Doylestown Intelligencer, the Lansdale Reporter, and the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The Q & A during the formal presentation gave people an opportunity to express their concerns and questions. About 35 written comments have been received to date. Comment forms show more support for trail, bike lanes, roundabouts, and the updated project, which may not have been fully accounted for in public forum.

A few of the top issues identified by the meeting attendees included:

- Two lane parkway vs. four lane expressway – Almost everyone who voiced an opinion still wants 4 lanes. Many thought that the Parkway Alternative (2 lane portion) would be obsolete before it is ever built. Some have decided that building something is better than nothing. The Project team repeatedly explained that the expressway was unaffordable even with federal money. Some asked how designers would avoid clogging of traffic in the transition area from 4 to 2 lanes. Traffic operation simulation analyses will be performed as part of the EER Process to address the impacts of the proposed facilities.
- Shared Use Path (SUP)–Some supported the addition to existing trail networks while others were wary of it. Some of questions/comments identified: trail maintenance, fencing and lighting. In general, the trail will not be lit. Lighting will be provided for the roadway and trail at the intersections with side roads. The Department’s response focused on how the trail is an element of the original bypass design that the Task Force agreed should be

included in the Parkway concept. All the municipalities on the Task Force viewed the addition of the trail as an asset to their communities. In addition, PennDOT policy now requires the consideration of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in all projects.

- Roundabouts – Most individuals at the Open House apparently did not understand how roundabouts work, why they are being considered and how they differ from New Jersey traffic circles. Videos and display were provided to educate attendees on the details of roundabouts. It is still a very new concept for most folks that have not seen or experienced a modern roundabout. Additional education and exposure will be necessary if they are pursued and supported by one or more of the municipalities.
- Environmental Concerns - Most of the attendees were concerned about traffic or their specific home location with respect to the new road; very few people voiced concern about environmental features or how they would be protected. Several comments about woodlands, streams or historic resources had more to do with why the road avoided or minimized impacts to those features at the cost of shifting closer to their residence.
- Operating and Design Speed –Residents were skeptical that the Parkway would operate at 40 mph. It was felt that trucks, in particular, would not use the road at such a speed. A few attendees asked whether design and posted speeds have to be different. Others asked if the Parkway will restrict commercial vehicles/trucks use the Parkway.
- Noise Walls – Residents asked if a noise study did warrant sound barriers, where will they fit in the \$200 million budget.

These issues were evaluated and addressed in the EER.

Other public involvement activities included:

09/24/05 Warrington Day

10/01-02/05 Doylestown Octoberfest

b) Consulting Parties Meeting

PennDOT, on behalf of the USACE, identified potential Section 106 consulting parties and sent invitation letters and response forms to each individual and organization that was identified on April 1, 2006. A Section 106 consulting party meeting was held on April 27, 2006, at the Montgomery Township Building in Montgomery County. Invitations were sent to all potential consulting parties, and approximately 14 individuals attended the meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Section 106 coordination process, the role of consulting parties, and the efforts initiated by PennDOT on behalf of the USACE. Presentation boards were displayed for the attendees' review, handouts were provided (including comment forms and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Protecting Historic Properties: A Citizen's Guide to Section 106 Review), and project staff were available to answer questions. Once the materials were reviewed by the consulting parties, detailed presentations were made by individual project staff members, including summaries of the cultural resources investigations completed to date. A question-and-answer session followed. The results of the historic resources survey and preliminary eligibility recommendations as well as the findings of the archaeological surveys were presented at the meeting. Comments regarding historic resources were requested.

PennDOT compiled and provided copies of response forms to the USACE on June 1, 2006, listing the invited parties, detailing the responses received, and requesting that USACE review and consider the responses for consulting party status in consultation with the PHMC-BHP. PennDOT sent out acceptance letters, on

behalf of the USACE, to the approved Section 106 consulting parties on August 9, 2006.

A public open house was held on September 28, 2006, at Central Bucks High School South, Warrington, Bucks County. All consulting parties were mailed invitations to attend this meeting. Approximately 200 individuals attended the meeting, including a number of the recognized consulting parties. The purpose of this open house was to present plan displays for the Preferred Alternative (the Parkway Alternative) to the public. The open house featured a number of stations that focused on the impacts that the Preferred Alternative would have on the surrounding area. These included Traffic Studies, Environmental Review Process, Noise Studies, Right-of-Way Acquisition, and Section 106 Resources and Environmental Resources. Comment stations were also available for feedback, comments, and suggestions. A project Community Newsletter was also distributed to the public. With regards to historic resources, the Section 106 Resources station featured preliminary effect data for the Parkway Alternative. The information was presented to the public in the form of mapping, cross sections, and tables with effect assessment information for each historic property in the APE.

Following the public open house, PennDOT submitted the Determination of Effects Report to PHMC. PHMC concurred with the Effects determination in a letter dated October 26, 2006. Copies of the Eligibility Report and Determination of Effects Report were mailed to all consulting parties inviting them to provide their views related to findings and determinations made during the project development and Section 106 process. A consulting parties meeting was held on November 16, 2006, to discuss the effects of the proposed project and discuss mitigation opportunities.

c) 2006 Public Meeting

A Public Open House was held on September 28, 2006 at Central Bucks South High School. Approximately 200 people attended the public meeting and had an opportunity to review more detailed plans of the proposed Parkway and the related project studies. Information was available regarding the EER Process, traffic data, noise studies, right-of-way and rendered cross sections to help visualize the proposed Parkway.

Representatives from various newspapers attended including the Doylestown Intelligencer, the Lansdale Reporter, and the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Residents attending the meeting were given the opportunity to express their concerns and questions through comments forms available at the meeting. Residents were also given the opportunity to submit their comments via the project website.

Key comments received including concerns, questions and issues from the Public Open House, website and comments forwarded to PennDOT can be found in Table IV-1 on the following pages, along with PennDOT's responses.

A public hearing is also scheduled for early 2007.

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
You mentioned that building a limited access roadway has a high price tag. My question is since route US202 is a federal roadway are there funds from the US Dept of Transportation to help finance this new construction? Thank you for your time and consideration.	5/30/2006	Plans for the nine-mile, \$465 million expressway had progressed considerably with the support and 80% funding from the Federal Highway Administration. In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues, including state and federal funds, fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.	11/30/2006
This site hasn't been updated recently. Looks like most info posted is from 2005. What is the current status (June, 2006), what is the projected time for a definite decision and then a projected start time for the project. For a citizen who sits on Rt. 202 (Chalfont) traffic everyday, the length of time on this debate is becoming unacceptable.	6/7/2006	The website was recently updated to include additional frequently asked questions. The Project Overview on the website includes a timeline for the project which is updated on a regular basis. The project map was also revised to incorporate proposed improvements along Limekiln Pike and Bristol Road in the vicinity of the proposed Parkway and Upper State Road.	11/30/2006

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>I am aware of all that went into this decision - I remain of the opinion that this is not the correct solution and that a full expressway should be built. Our business operates heavy trucks throughout all of Bucks and Montgomery counties and a local two lane road is not the answer. We need the expressway to get heavy traffic off the local streets so they can move through the community efficiently. I would very much like to see this whole plan reconsidered before it becomes even more costly to do so.</p>	<p>6/18/2006</p>	<p>In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.</p> <p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>So our traffic in Chalfont is getting worse. Are you doing anything about it or still wasting money on beaurocratic BS?</p>	<p>6/22/2006</p>	<p>The Parkway is just one of several projects proposed to help reduce congestion in the area, including Chalfont.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>Dear Ms. Fausto: 4 points A. I did the neighborhood survey for the proposed noise barrier. What barrier are you proposing with the new plan? What is the proposed decibel increase. B. If the proposed decibel increase is based on 40 mph traffic, that is to say the least, a joke. C. The area is becoming increasingly built up. As the lowest point of land, I am very concerned about run off. Whoever built the storm water detention basin failed to follow plans. It is not supposed to drain in my direction. Is this your problem?</p>	<p>6/26/2006</p>	<p>The following is in response to the four identified points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. PennDOT is currently evaluating the potential sound impacts of the project according to the approved Department policy. In an effort to reduce or eliminate possible noise impacts and based on input from our public involvement process, we have been proactively applying a combination of context sensitive design solutions to address potential sound impacts. Some of these solutions include moving the roadway away from homes, depressing the roadway, maintain existing trees and placing landscaped earth berms adjacent to the roadway. The results of the noise analysis will be present in the project's environmental document. This document is scheduled to be available for public review in December 2006. Based on the preliminary noise analysis the project does not meet PennDOT noise abatement criteria in accordance with PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). While there will be increases in the noise levels in many neighborhoods, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. The projected noise level at 133 Gwynmont Farms is 51 decibels. B. The proposed design speed and projected operating speed is 40 mph and was the operating speed used in the noise analyses for this project. C. PennDOT will prepare a Stormwater Management Plan in consultation with the Municipalities, Counties and Environmental Review Agencies to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Parkway. Existing drainage problems within residential development areas which are not directly impacted by the proposed action are not the responsibility of the Department. 	<p>11/30/2006</p>

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>I have a question pertaining to the designated line of the bike trail right near Horsham Rd. - I live at 158 Filly Dr which is right behind Joseph Ambler Inn - Why does the bike path move away from the proposed road and closer to the top of the ridge - this is located in the area right after the Joseph Ambler property? In essence the bike trail moves very close to the properties of Montgomery Greene townhouses - instead of staying adjacent to the road! please advise thank you.</p>	<p>6/26/2006</p>	<p>Input from several trail advocates, including the Montgomery County Planning Commission (MCPC) have indicated that it is desirable to create the greatest separation possible between the proposed parkway and the Shared Use Path (SUP) to improve the user experience of the proposed trail. The Department is also working with Montgomery Township and the Joseph Ambler Inn to consider trail access from the Joseph Ambler Inn property.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>I see a line going down meadow lane pass my house can you tell me what is it that the line represents.</p>	<p>6/29/2006</p>	<p>The line represents a potential trail access from Meadow Lane. It is desirable to encourage the use of the trail and promote access where possible in consultation with the Townships and the adjacent neighborhoods. The final decision on this particular location will be between the residents of Meadow Lane and Warrington Township.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>A Two-lane Parkway will not be a cost effective use of highway funds. Section 700 should be at least four lanes, if not six. The funds were available until they were diverted to a failing rail system by an egotistical politician. Put the money in the bank until additional funds can be raised to do the job right. Better yet, build a toll road like the one that runs from Greensburg to Delmont in western PA.</p>	<p>6/29/2006</p>	<p>In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.</p> <p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>We live on the north side of the 611 bypass and were told by politicians that noise created by additional traffic would be taken care of. Were any studies done on this issue?</p>	<p>6/29/2006</p>	<p>PennDOT is currently evaluating the potential sound impacts of the project according to the approved Department policy. In an effort to reduce or eliminate possible noise impacts and based on input from our public involvement process, we have been proactively applying a combination of context sensitive design solutions to address potential sound impacts. Some of these solutions include moving the roadway away from homes, depressing the roadway, maintain existing trees and placing landscaped earth berms adjacent to the roadway. The results of the noise analysis will be present in the project's environmental document. This document is scheduled to be available for public review in December 2006.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>It has taken a long time to come to the understanding that something needs to be done to alleviate traffic congestion in this area. And, I guess that the parkway is the way to go. But, this roundabout idea is totally ridiculous. They just do not work! I can not believe that they would even be considered. New Jersey has been doing away with this circle/roundabout idea as totally unworkable and the state of Pennsylvania is going back decades, in designing these. We must look to the future, far into the future!</p>	<p>7/1/2006</p>	<p>PennDOT, in coordination with the affected municipalities, evaluated the feasibility of incorporating roundabouts into the design of the Route 202 Parkway. Based on technical analysis and the requirement for community support of the concept, roundabouts at this time are not included in the Parkway design. PennDOT continues to support roundabouts as a potential option for an intersection improvement project when there is community support.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
I hope that they build this two lane parkway with future expansion in mind. Example would be to allow enough buffer between the road and the Shared Use Path incase they go from two lanes to four lanes that the path would not have to be rebuilt. I hope they build this two lane parkway with the chance that one day it may be a four lane parkway in there minds.	7/10/2006	PennDOT is not planning for, nor precluding a future expansion of the proposed Parkway. A future widening of the Parkway would require a separate environmental assessment before construction of an expanded facility can begin.	11/30/2006
I believe constructing a parkway instead of a limited access road is a waste of tax payer money. The current and most certainly future traffic volume requires the limited access expressway. Building a two lane road and an un-needed bike path wastes tax dollars and will not improve the conditions along the existing US202 to any great extent.	7/12/2006	<p>In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.</p> <p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations.</p>	11/30/2006

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
Picture Main Street in Doylestown without the 611 bypass! This is reason enough to hurry with help for route 202. Steal money from somewhere quickly.	7/16/2006	PennDOT anticipates starting construction of the proposed Parkway in late 2007 and complete the project in 2010.	11/30/2006
I recently received a postcard in the mail. As I haven't read anything in a while on 202-700, I decided to take a peak at the website to see the latest. The latest seems to be from September 2005 (so why did I recently receive a postcard?). No new news here!! Enough Already! I can recall moving into this area in 1994. I recall purposely working with my realtor to identify areas around the bypass and AVOID buying anything too close. I can further recall attending public hearings at CB West HS in/around 1996. It's ten years later; and still nothing but studies and protests. Since that time MANY housing developments have been built near the proposed bypass. I suspect some of these residents are part of the NBCP. I know another faction is likely the well-to-doers living north of the bypass (Doylestown/Buckingham). I recall reading the Philly Inquirer articles and the complaints. The ones that stick out are words to the effect of "...ruin the nature of Bucks County..." and "...based on a traffic study that was now x years old...". Well this irks me to no end. Does anyone really believe that the current 202/611 bypasses around Doylestown have ruined Bucks County. Hardly!! As for traffic studies, since we are moving at a snails pace, obviously no traffic study is ever going to be "current enough" for the complainers. So let's get on with it and do what needs to be done. What needs to be done is the full project as originally envisioned, not this Parkway nonsense. We have 3 roads serving parallel to 202 from the Montgomeryville area, Upper State, Stump, ~Lower	7/16/2006	<p>The website was recently updated to include additional frequently asked questions and the project map was revised to incorporate recent improvements proposed along Limekiln Pike and Bristol Road in the vicinity of the proposed Parkway and Upper State Road.</p> <p>Plans for the nine-mile, \$465 million expressway had progressed considerably with the support and 80% funding from the Federal Highway Administration. In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues, including state and federal funds, fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.</p> <p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding</p>	11/30/2006

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>State. Try driving on any of these in evening rush. From Stump heading north, you can't even make a left onto County Line Road (CLR) since CLR is backed up from Upper State to Stump. The same is typically true along Horsham road. So this Parkway concept adds another road running parallel between Stump and Upper State, and therefore an additional traffic light on the cross streets (463 and CLR). What a joke!! Your just creating a huge mess east/west in trying to relieve north south, AND ACCOMPLISHING NEITHER!! It takes me a minimum of two traffic light cycles to travel south on 202 when crossing CLR every morning rush. It takes me 10 minutes to travel 1 mile from Skyline Drive to Route 152N in Chalfont during evening rush trying to get to the local soccer/baseball fields. It takes 10 minutes to travel that same mile most Saturday mornings. 202 bogs down both direction at CLR every Saturday (while CLR is not doing nearly the traffic it does during the weekdays, ie the timing needs a weekend and weekday plan!! I also read in the newspaper that by rolling the project back to a Parkway lowers the bill (\$), because it changes the Federal dollar "kick-in" it actually costs PA residents MORE than the original project (limited access 4 lanes). Your response to the above is appreciated. I am so tired of the voices of the few complainers talking for the thousands who desire and need this project to proceed. Compromise for the sake of compromise yields nothing. Giving consideration to complainers who don't even live in the communities the bypass will actually run through is ridiculous. Giving credence to those that bought new homes in the last decade when the bypass plans were clearly available and in progress is also ridiculous. Lets get on with it!!</p>		<p>limitations.</p> <p>The comments regarding existing congestion within the corridor are noted and are consistent with the existing congestion documented through traffic volume data collection and field observations of the peak congestion periods. The Parkway Alternative provides the best opportunity to meet these congestion issues.</p> <p>While this particular project will be constructed with 100% State transportation funds, the amount of state and federal money available for transportation improvements statewide remains unchanged.</p>	

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>This project is the supreme example of over analysis of a problem! The area needs better roadways to move an ever increasing volume of traffic through the Bucks/Montgomeryville area. A limited access highway to the river is the only practical way to do it. The right of way has been on planning maps for 50 years but still the area suffers with the same roads that served the area over 100 years ago. If politics and selfish interest were removed from this project we would have the roads we need.... bottom line.</p>	<p>7/24/2006</p>	<p>In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.</p> <p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>What is the status of the wall between Hancock Rd. and Gwynedd View Rd.?</p>	<p>8/22/2006</p>	<p>The proposed improvements to Welsh Road are now part of the adjacent existing Route 202 widening project.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
We love the convenience of the roadway...it runs behind our home...is there purposed sound barriers for residents close to the highway...	9/14/2006	PennDOT is currently evaluating the potential sound impacts of the project according to the approved Department policy. In an effort to reduce or eliminate possible noise impacts and based on input from our public involvement process, we have been proactively applying a combination of context sensitive design solutions to address potential sound impacts. Some of these solutions include moving the roadway away from homes, depressing the roadway, maintain existing trees and placing landscaped earth berms adjacent to the roadway. The results of the noise analysis will be present in the project's environmental document. This document is scheduled to be available for public review in December 2006.	11/30/2006
Where will the access points be to the Shared Use Path? I'm referring specifically to the Section 700 area between Horsham and County Line Roads. Thanks. -	9/15/2006	Currently proposed access for the Shared Use Path between Horsham and County Line Roads is only proposed via at-grade crossings of Horsham and County Line Roads. PennDOT and Montgomery Township are also working with the property owner to provide an additional point of access from the rear of the Joseph Ambler Inn.	11/30/2006

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>Why do the plans for the bypass include a dramatic swerve toward residential housing located in the Springville Farm neighborhood (which refers to the Baker Place cul de sac located between Horsham and County Line Roads in Montgomery Township)? It seems like an unnatural course for the road to take at that point, especially since it does not in any way follow the existing grading. Rather, it cuts through a hill, places the nature trail well outside the plentiful wooded area, and then disrupts a run-off basin. It does not seem to make any sense, and it suggests to me that this is influenced by political, as opposed to fiscal or sound logistical, considerations. I would like to know as I am one of the few unfortunate residents at which this anomaly is specifically directed. Thank you.</p>	<p>9/15/2006</p>	<p>The concept of the proposed Parkway includes a curvilinear alignment to control the operating speed of the facility. Roadway alignment is also designed to minimize noise level increases with the use of cuts into existing ground and placement of berms to minimize visual and noise impacts. The placement of the Shared Use Path was developed in consultation with the environmental review agencies and is planned to avoid wooded areas, where possible, to minimize impacts to natural resources.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>A complete network of local roads and/or NBCP are much better options from the point of view of the investment of funds as well as from the utilitarian approach. The new 0.5 billion dollar 700 section will not resolve the conjection problem: the parallel Upper State and Stump roads allow 35 ml/hour speed at any time of the day. The lack of both: a decent local commuting and left-turn-lanes make this area impassable.</p>	<p>9/16/2006</p>	<p>PennDOT currently has several projects on the Transportation Improvement Projects (TIP) to improve existing roads in the project study area. Additional capacity is needed to address the 30% traffic volume increase in the Design Year 2020. The Parkway Alternative provides the best opportunity to meet these goals.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>My business is located at 1282 welsh Road. I have a couple of questions. First, will I loose any part of the front of my property? Second, will the construction disrupt my daily operations?</p>	<p>9/19/2006</p>	<p>The proposed improvements to Welsh Road will be done as part of the adjacent Route 202 widening project. At this time, Welsh Road is proposed to be a 5-lane section from north of Stump Road to north of Dekalb Pike. PennDOT will contact you in the near future about the extent of impact to your property.</p> <p>Temporary impacts to operations will occur during construction. PennDOT will develop a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) during Final Design and would coordinate the plan with the appropriate local municipalities.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>Since I was on the original CAC committee, everyone comes to me with questions. We would like to know the impact of our street with this project, and how much property will be effected. And we are hoping for noise suppresson walls and berms. We are all in the dark here, because the maps do not tell us anything.</p>	<p>9/21/2006</p>	<p>A Public Meeting was held on 09/28/06 to present the details of the proposed Parkway design. PennDOT will work through the Townships to update Citizens Advisory Committees (CAC's) as the project studies progress.</p> <p>PennDOT is currently evaluating the potential sound impacts of the project according to the approved Department policy. In an effort to reduce or eliminate possible noise impacts and based on input from our public involvement process, we have been proactively applying a combination of context sensitive design solutions to address potential sound impacts. Some of these solutions include moving the roadway away from homes, depressing the roadway, maintain existing trees and placing landscaped earth berms adjacent to the roadway. The results of the noise analysis will be present in the project's environmental document. This document is scheduled to be available for public review in December 2006.</p> <p>During final design, the limits of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
With the new design of the parkway published in the paper yesterday, why is that not posted here. The project area map still has the expressway design. Thanks.	9/27/2006	The schematic layout of the Parkway, as shown in the newspaper, was not presented in detail. The placement for the proposed Parkway generally follows the alignment of the original four lane expressway New Alignment Alternative.	11/30/2006
I just sent in a comment about the fact that the project area map appears to still have the expressway layout. I looked at it again and realize it does appear to have the parkway layout. My specific concern is related to the map published in the Intelligencer yesterday. Thaty map showed a connector road, parallel to and east of 309 -- between 309 and Horsham Road. The connector connects the new parkway with Upper State Road to the north and Stump Road to the south. Where does this connector actually run? Thanks	9/27/2006	The connector road that you are referring to is actually just a public access drive (Township owned) from the Parkway to the adjacent shopping area to the north as well as General Hancock Boulevard to the south. The details of this access are being refined in coordination with the property owners, the township and the residents of General Hancock Boulevard.	11/30/2006
There is a certain home I am really considering on purchasing right off of wells road in Doylestown, how close in miles is the proposed bypass from wells road?	9/27/2006	The Parkway will pass under Wells Road approximately 0.3 mile east of Lower State Road.	11/30/2006

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>The two-lane portion of the "bypass" is a waste of money and also increases the congestion on the at-grade cross streets, such as County Line and Horsham roads. It would be, in effect, just another local road rather than a bypass.</p>	<p>9/27/2006</p>	<p>In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.</p> <p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>I see from the information that Knapp Road will be one of the access points. I live in Gwynedd Pointe and Knapp Road is already over congested. Sometimes you can barely get out of the development. Are there any enhancements planned for Knapp Road?</p>	<p>9/29/2006</p>	<p>Improvements are anticipated on Knapp Road only in the vicinity of the intersection with the new Parkway. The current plans include the conversion of a portion of Knapp Road from the Parkway to Route 309 (currently a Township Road) into a State owned/maintained roadway.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

<p align="center">SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses</p>			
<p align="center">Key Concerns Identified</p>	<p align="center">Date Concern Identified</p>	<p align="center">How Concern was Addressed</p>	<p align="center">Date Concern Addressed</p>
<p>I just wonder why in excess of \$280 million will be spent on a road that will just clog up other roads. In just watching the first 10 minutes of the nightly news I see residents houses in Bucks Co. that have flooded many times still not getting funding. Then I see kids who are in class rooms with 55 other students. These students do not have enough desks to sit in or books to study. And we wonder why murders are up. The kids do not have a chance. Yet we are wasting precious money on a roadway, that will not help traffic. It may help lessen 202 traffic, but increase many other road's traffic...examples- Horsham, Countyline, Limekiln Pike, Bristol etc. I went to the open house and no one can answer these questions. Except for more money being spent on those roads to help deal with the new traffic problems. I am not happy about where my tax money is going. Ken Tumas</p>	<p align="center">9/29/2006</p>	<p>Route 202, Section 700 was previously identified for a limited access expressway. Plans for the new nine-mile, \$465 million facility had progressed considerably. In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.</p> <p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations.</p> <p>The Parkway is just one of several road improvement projects proposed in the area, including the widening of Horsham and County Line Roads. In addition, Limekiln Pike and Bristol Road will be widened between Upper State and the Parkway as part of this project.</p>	<p align="center">11/30/2006</p>

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>In talking with neighbors, we are wondering why widening Upper State Rd is not an option. It is a mirror image of the 202 project. Why not save a ton a money for the state?</p>	<p>9/30/2006</p>	<p>Upon review of the identified project needs, the Parkway project best meets these needs including the provision of alternate routes via increased network connections, maintaining transportation efficiency by limiting access points along the proposed improvement and this project is consistent with local and regional land use goals and policies. For these reasons, the proposed parkway is the preferred alternative.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>Following is a comment, following up on the Open House/Plans Display on 9/28/06: I believe that the plans should include allocated space and a conceptual idea to allow for expansion for the 2-lane section to 4-lanes in the future. I am not talking about any actual construction or structures (overpasses, bridges, culverts, etc.) or anything which would add cost (except that any underpass, where the parkway passes under anotehr road, should be sized to allow additional lanes to pass under in the future). I am merely talking about design throught and "on-paper" space allocation for the added lanes. I am also not talking about environmental planning or mitigation (that, plus actual 4-lane design would only be needed if the actual need for 4-lanes arises). While the current parkway will likely solve the problem (and 4-lanes may never be necessary), it seems prudent to at least allow for the possibility in the future. The current design should not become restrictive to make 4-lanes impossible (or prohibitively expensive) in the future. Change will always happen, and should be anticipated, if only by a footnote on the drawings.</p>	<p>10/3/2006</p>	<p>PennDOT is not planning for, nor precluding a future expansion of the proposed Parkway. A future widening of the Parkway would require a separate environmental assesment before construction of an expanded facility can begin.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
I hope that the environmental mitigation areas (wetlands replacement; the West Branch Neshaminy Creek and Kansas Road locations) can be preserved as open space and would allow for passive (undeveloped) recreational use, whether the areas are actually needed for mitigation purposes or not. The only development I would hope to see (other than wetland construction as part of mitigation) would be to provide access for undeveloped recreation.	10/3/2006	PennDOT is working with the Environmental Review Agencies and the Municipalities (New Britain Township, Chalfont Borough and Warrington Township) to determine the appropriate level of public access (if any) at these sites.	11/30/2006
My family and I are looking to move into the Warrington Oaks development, after reviewing your website, I believe the bypass, once complete does not directly back up to this development, as the home is on Bristol Road. It looks as though it is 1 to 2 miles down Bristol Road. The entrance to the development is Pin Oak Rd, can you shed some light on this??	10/3/2006	The intersection of Bristol Road and the proposed parkway are approximately ½ mile from Pin Oak Road.	11/30/2006
Will there be a public comment period for this project. During the last public comment period I posed a question regarding the threat of flooding as a result of removing the trees, bushes, etc... I also posed many other questions. When the final EIS was released all questions were addressed with the exception of the flooding issue. I still work about this issue even with the downsizing of the project and I am also concerned that our homes were not built with the blasting grade concrete that the homes more near to the quarry were built with, as I fear that blasting may be needed to complete the project in spite of assertions to the contrary. Thank you.	10/4/2006	A public hearing is scheduled for early 2007. PennDOT will be developing a stormwater management plan during final design to mitigate the impacts of the proposed parkway alternative. A vibration analysis would be performed during final design if blasting were required in areas where shallow depth to rock is encountered.	11/30/2006

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>My only concern is the parking lot planned for Bristol Road. It has the potential to be a location for vandals or other misconduct. Has thought been given to surveillance and lighting for that location – is it necessary at all? I look forward to future presentations.</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>Currently, there are no plans to light or provide surveillance cameras in the parking area. Law enforcement at the parking area would be provided by local police. The details for the lot have not yet been determined and PennDOT will continue to coordinate with Warrington Township during final design of the Parkway and related features.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>I would like to see the berm planned south of Cedarcrest farms development near Bristol and Upper States Roads to be extended as far as possible east and west along the north side of the road.</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>During final design, the limits of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>I am disappointed that a strip for light rail is not provided even though it might never be utilized. Also make right and left turn lanes longer (300' – 500')</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>Capital investment for a light rail line in the corridor would not be within the \$200 million budget for this project. In coordination with SEPTA, detailed studies to justify maintenance and operation costs of new transit service would be required to advance a light rail transit option.</p> <p>For purposes of advancing the preliminary design of the project, standard minimum length (150') left and right turn lanes were included at the major signalized intersections along the proposed Parkway. During final design, the turn lanes will be designed, as required, to optimize the operations of the intersections.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>For one there will need to be more access for emergencies (major accidents). Also to be able to travel from Mont. County to points north (New Hope, Solebury, New Jersey) without playing favorites.</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>The proposed Parkway will provide more travel options for emergency service providers within the roadway network. The Parkway will reduce congestion in the AM/PM peak periods when compared to No Action, which should improve emergency response times in the study area.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>The only thing positive of the whole project is that the rights of way are preserved. It is a shame that some municipalities are held "hostage" by two influential townships. The traffic problem is caused by these two townships that have doubled their size in the last decade. How do you have these people get back and forth to Philadelphia without going through the areas that are burdened by traffic. What are we to do barricade ourselves off from these other townships? Maybe these other townships (Buckingham) should help defer the cost of maintaining these roads.</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>There should be more over and under passes and fewer traffic lights. That will move the traffic faster. The former concept of interchanges rather than lights would keep the traffic moving. I foresee just another road with packed up traffic.</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>Route 202, Section 700 was previously identified for a limited access expressway. Plans for the new nine-mile, \$465 million facility had progressed considerably. In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.</p> <p>PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
1) Narrow lanes and narrow shoulders are hazardous. 2) 33% saving in travel time is a dream. 3) I believe the current parkway plan is totally inadequate for today's traffic volume. By the time it's completed it will be even far more inadequate. Considering projected population growth.	9/28/2006	The proposed 11' wide travel lanes and shoulder widths are within PennDOT minimum standards for design of this facility. Based on travel simulation analyses, the Department has determined that substantial time savings would occur when comparing the Parkway Alternative to No Action in the AM/PM peak periods in the Design Year 2020 traveling from Welsh Road to PA 611 in the north/south corridor.	11/30/2006
As you schedule work, you should consider improving the intersection of Upper State and Bristol Road early in the cycle. There are major traffic problems here in the morning and evening rush hour.	9/28/2006	During final design, PennDOT will determine which phases of construction will be advanced in the early stages of the construction schedule. PennDOT frequently completes intersection improvements adjacent to major roadway improvements to help maintain traffic during construction.	11/30/2006
The overpass for New Britain Road was ongoing to my knowledge to be built wide enough for bike/pedestrian passage to the park. "Sketches" don't show that. A) Was it dropped? B) If yes, how do I get it reconsidered?	9/28/2006	The shared-use path (SUP) will end at New Britain Road. Access to/from the SUP will be provided at Wells Road as a way to get to Central Park. We continue to work with Doylestown Township to enhance the connections to their local trail network.	11/30/2006

<p align="center">SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses</p>			
<p align="center">Key Concerns Identified</p>	<p align="center">Date Concern Identified</p>	<p align="center">How Concern was Addressed</p>	<p align="center">Date Concern Addressed</p>
<p>1) Considering that the proposed speed limit is 40 mph, in today's world how will that be enforced? 2) How much will it be necessary to expand local municipal police departments to cover responsibility for the parkway?</p>	<p align="center">9/28/2006</p>	<p>Speed enforcement will be provided by state and local police. The additional cost to the local police departments in Montgomery, Warrington and Doylestown Townships is not expected to be substantial.</p>	<p align="center">11/30/2006</p>
<p>I noticed that there were no berms on the Sunrise Drive side of the parkway... Please seriously consider adding visual and auditory blockage to that side of the road. I am very concerned that the existing plan will not be sufficient, especially when there are no leaves on the trees currently growing in the section. A berm next to the roadway with evergreens would be a good solution.</p>	<p align="center">9/28/2006</p>	<p>During final design, the limits of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features.</p>	<p align="center">11/30/2006</p>

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Section 21 – I'd think you want to include fencing to keep the kids out of the traffic in the residential areas. 2) Include schedule info. On web-site. 3) More frequent updates would be nice. 4) Continue the berm from Wells to proposed berm running into New Britain Road. 5) Make it illegal to Jake brake at underpass of Wells Rd. and at light at Lower State Road. Please! 	9/28/2006	<p>Right-of-way fencing in areas where residences are adjacent to the proposed roadway is being considered. A project schedule has been added to the 202 700 website in the project overview section of the site. The Department is working to keep the public informed of the progress of the project. As the final design process advances, the Department will be working with the Township and Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC's) to keep the public informed of project activities</p> <p>During final design, the limits of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features.</p> <p>Jake Brake restrictions require municipal ordinances for enforcement.</p>	11/30/2006
<p>Please consider noise walls and/or noise berms along the following locations, Limekiln Pike section between Stump Road and Upper State Road, Winding Lane, Sunrise Drive side of the parkway, and south of Cedarcrest farms development near Bristol and Upper States Roads. Also the addition of dense evergreens would serve as a slight improvement. Thank you.</p>	9/28/2006	<p>PennDOT is currently evaluating the potential sound impacts of the project according to the approved Department policy. In an effort to reduce or eliminate possible noise impacts and based on input from our public involvement process, we have been proactively applying a combination of context sensitive design solutions to address potential sound impacts. Some of these solutions include moving the roadway away from homes, depressing the roadway, maintain existing trees and placing landscaped earth berms adjacent to the roadway. The results of the noise analysis will be present in the project's environmental document. This document is scheduled to be available for public review in December 2006. Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the</p>	11/30/2006

**SR 0202 Section 700
Montgomery and Bucks Counties
Table IV-1
Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses**

Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
		equivalent noise level (Leq) increases below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). While there will be increases in the Leq in many neighborhoods, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. During final design, the limits of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features.	
<p>Please provide information/report on the environmental studies/impacts and potential mitigation. Report should include SHPO, THPO, wetlands, floodplains, fish and wildlife. I would also like notification of all public meetings regarding this issue. The parking area off of Sage Lane – We have serious concerns of people accessing our development via this outlet. I want a better understanding of how you will ensure no traffic will go through our development.</p> <p>Berms/Noise Issues – the noise increase, 8 dBA, just shy of the limit for a wall, we would like to see a taller berm in this area. Also, will landscaping be put in before construction or after? What height will the trees be on top of the berm and of what variety?</p>	9/28/2006	<p>The Environmental Evaluation Report (EER) will be available for public review in December 2006 and a public hearing is scheduled for early 2007.</p> <p>The details for the lot have not yet been determined and PennDOT will continue to coordinate with Warrington Township and adjacent residents during final design.</p> <p>During final design, the limits of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features including construction staging of the berms and the selection of the plantings in the project area.</p>	11/30/2006
<p>The elevation drawings should be identified on the glossy parkway image.</p>	9/28/2006	<p>Roadway profiles were prepared and are included in the technical support documentation for the project. They will be available for review by the public as part of the Environmental Evaluation Report (EER) documentation.</p>	11/30/2006

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
What is the current and projected traffic volume at Limekiln (152 N) North of Railroad and Park Avenues?	9/28/2006	DVRPC did not provide Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes for Limekiln Pike north of Railroad Ave. and Park Ave. Just south of Railroad Ave on PA 152, the current Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume is 15,800 vehicles per day. If No Action is taken, the AADT will increase to 18,600/day. If the Parkway is constructed, DVRPC project and AADT of 18,500/day at this location.	11/30/2006
I am the director of Capital Planning and Construction at Delaware Valley College and would like to know if I could obtain a copy of the Environmental Constraints aerial that captures the Doylestown and Upper Gwynedd property owned by the college. This would be a very useful tool for future project planning.	9/28/2006	A plan was transmitted on or about October 17, 2006 in response to the request for the plan.	11/30/2006
Item – trail access to Quail Dr.- do not recommend as it will cause excess traffic and parking along Quail- the neighbors do not want it. Item – bridge over Almshouse will create excess noise and sight problems from Quail Drive – No berm or noise protection planned. As you go up sound carries more. It is now projected +8 – I believe it will be over +10. Please prove me wrong.	9/28/2006	Trail access will be further evaluated during final design in coordination with the municipalities and local residents. PennDOT is currently evaluating the potential sound impacts of the project according to the approved Department policy. In an effort to reduce or eliminate possible noise impacts and based on input from our public involvement process, we have been proactively applying a combination of context sensitive design solutions to address potential sound impacts. Some of these solutions include moving the roadway away from homes, depressing the roadway, maintain existing trees and placing landscaped earth berms adjacent to the roadway. The results of the noise analysis will be present in the project's environmental document. This document is scheduled to be available for public review in December	11/30/2006

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
		<p>2006. Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the equivalent noise level (Leq) increases are below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). While there will be increases in the Leq in many neighborhoods, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls.</p> <p>During final design, the limits of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features.</p>	

<p align="center">SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses</p>			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>Our property backs up to the proposed roadway. There is a berm that appears to be only five feet high. We request that the berm be made higher than five feet and extended further than it shows in the drawings. The noise levels indicated in the information presented do not appear to adequately depict the noise we will hear.</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>PennDOT is currently evaluating the potential sound impacts of the project according to the approved Department policy. In an effort to reduce or eliminate possible noise impacts and based on input from our public involvement process, we have been proactively applying a combination of context sensitive design solutions to address potential sound impacts. Some of these solutions include moving the roadway away from homes, depressing the roadway, maintain existing trees and placing landscaped earth berms adjacent to the roadway. The results of the noise analysis will be present in the project's environmental document. This document is scheduled to be available for public review in December 2006.</p> <p>During final design, the limits of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>
<p>I own the property located at 133 Wells Road. How far from my property line will the right of way be and will the parkway be on the same grade as my property or will it be below my property?</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>The Parkway will pass under Wells Road. As the roadway continues north of your property, the road will still be below grade and will be approximately 40 feet from the rear property line.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>

SR 0202 Section 700 Montgomery and Bucks Counties Table IV-1 Summary of Identified Concerns and Responses			
Key Concerns Identified	Date Concern Identified	How Concern was Addressed	Date Concern Addressed
<p>Warrington township would like to arrange for a private presentation (no public) of the traffic simulation models. Also we would like to see expanded counts (to Bristol/611) (County Line/611) intersections. I discussed this with Mary. Eric and Jack Smyth of Boles. Smyth Assoc.</p>	<p>9/28/2006</p>	<p>A meeting was held on November 3, 2006 with Warrington Township to present the results of the traffic simulation analysis for the No Action and Parkway Alternatives.</p> <p>The Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes as provided by DVRPC (Figure 4 dated April 2006) indicate that the daily volumes on Bristol Road between Lower State Road and Folly Road for No Build and the Parkway are within 100 vehicles per day (14,200/day and 14,300/day respectively). Since the increase of the proposed action over No Action on this roadway link is less than 1% additional intersection traffic counts for intersections east of this location are not necessary to determine traffic impacts related to Route 202 Section 700.</p>	<p>11/30/2006</p>