

**SR 0202, SECTION 700
MONTGOMERY AND BUCKS COUNTIES**

*Response to Comments
on
Environmental Evaluation Report (EER)
Section VII*

G. Website Comments (W)

April 10, 2007

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Andrea Marino/ Resident of Doylestown Crossing	3/15/2007	As a resident of Radcliff Drive, I have closely followed the redesign of the Parkway project. The design work did not take into account the already unsafe alignment of Wells Road and the potential negative impact the parkway will have on the residents of this area. Wells Road is plagued with dips and valleys that make visualization of oncoming vehicles almost impossible. Turning right or left onto Wells Road from Radcliff is risky even for the most experienced driver. Improvements for Wells Road were never part of the project despite requests that this road be given consideration for improvement because of its hilly nature. The design of the Parkway has changed over the years and even with its roller coaster concept, Wells Road will remain unsafe. Now it will remain difficult to navigate along with having pedestrians walking to access Central Park. This is a deadly combination that was never addressed by the PennDOT design team. This concern needs to be looked at since the concept of the multiuse trail was integrated into the parkway design thus adding more risk to an already unsafe road.	Wells Road is a Doylestown Township owned roadway. The only impact to Wells Road is the construction of a bridge to allow the parkway to pass under Wells Road and the elimination of the Vale View Drive intersection. The extension of a bituminous walking trail between the parkway and Radcliff Drive was included at the request of Doylestown Township. The Wells Road profile will not be altered with the construction of the parkway. Any pre-existing safety concerns should be discussed with Doylestown Township.
Richard and Andrea Marino/ Resident of Doylestown Crossing	3/15/2007	The proposed Rt:202-700 Parkway The proposed solution to the traffic problems along existing Rt. 202 have been long studied and documented. The suggestions made 10 years ago by the same individuals who oppose the Rt. 202 bypass are now being implemented as separate projects along with the proposed parkway. A valid research study has only one variable that is being studied. Multiple variables never let you know what intervention was most effective. That is what we have here. If all the proposed traffic improvements are to be done at the same time, you will never know, which one, if any, was the real answer. For \$200 million dollars, we would like to know if our money was wisely spent. This answer will remain elusive. As for the traffic congestion on existing Rt. 202 and the implied safety hazards for fire, police and emergency vehicles, we challenge every public official, present and former, who stood up at the public hearing touting their laurels, yet were remiss all these years in being public advocates for road improvements. It is amazing that the road is only unsafe when we talk bypass or parkway. We will not dispute the fact that traffic exists on existing 202.	PennDOT currently has several projects on the Transportation Improvement Projects (TIP) to improve existing roads in the project study area. However, additional capacity is needed to address the 30% traffic volume increase in the Design Year 2020. The Screening of Preliminary Alternatives in the EER evaluated a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative, which included localized intersection improvements to increase capacity and efficiency of the existing roadway network. As a result of this initial screening, the TSM alternative did not meet the defined purpose and need of the project.

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
		<p>Richard and Andrea Marino (continued) However, this is not the only pocket of traffic. The same problems exist all over the Central Bucks and Montgomery County regions primarily because of unabated commercial development resulting in multiple non-synchronous traffic lights. It is commonplace to travel Rt. 611 southbound and encounter 4-5 traffic lights within a 1 mile stretch. This man-made traffic nightmare is endured daily by motorists yet no effort is made to improve this situation. There is still no access between the PA Turnpike and Rt. 95 yet as our transportation guardian, you will spend \$200 million on a small pocket of traffic because the residents and elected officials are unwilling to see their small community altered by road improvements. The parkway will be another feeder road to Rt. 309, which has already been turned into a mini King of Prussia. After 10 long years of debating the merits and disadvantages of building another road, we are afraid that the time has past for such monumental monetary expenditures. Existing roads desperately need to be brought into the 21st century. Adequate turning lanes, dedicated turning signals, and realignment of existing roads would go a long way for the future of the counties. Population growth for revitalization of communities is essential. Along with this comes the obligation to repair and improve transportation. The answer is not to build new roads leaving present road problems behind.</p>	<p>The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p>
Madeleine Sturm/ Resident	3/15/2007	<p>I have seen, and have some pictures, of unique waterfowl in the wetlands around the 202 Parkway right of way. They appear to be herons (blue heron or great blue heron) and/or egrets (snowy egret or great egret). These birds were not mentioned in the Environmental Evaluation Report. I will be happy to share the photos that I have. The environmental evaluation should address these birds.</p>	<p>Great blue heron are common residents in our area. Snow and Great egrets are considered transient - meaning we see them as they pass through on migration. These represent a few of the wildlife species that inhabit the project study area. Existing wildlife and habitat are addressed in the EER in Part II Section 6 Vegetation and wildlife.</p>

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Elaine Crooks/ Neighbors for Bucks County Preservation	3/15/2007	<p>The Neighbors for Bucks County Preservation (NBCP) commends you and PennDOT for the straightforward, analytical approach you have taken on the issue of traffic congestion relief on Section 700 of U.S. Route 202. The proposed Parkway Solution should bring substantial relief. We know that the roundabouts that were proposed in the original design were eliminated because of political pressure from township officials who lack understanding of the power of roundabouts. We know that roundabouts would be more effective than what is now being shown in the final design. We know this because PennDOT would not have proposed them if they were not the most effective designs for the intersections where they were planned, and because members of the Project Team at the public meeting in Doylestown told us that local political pressure caused PennDOT to give in. It is NBCP's judgment that roundabouts vs. what is now planned would improve LOS for the intersections in question, with the result that the entire corridor would work more efficiently. We want to be on record that more effort should have been made to educate the local officials about the efficiency and effectiveness of roundabouts. In addition, roundabouts have been proven to be more safe for both drivers and pedestrians than signaled intersections. Should you find resistance to roundabouts in other locations, we hope your posture will be more aggressive. One of our Board members has made regular visits over the past dozen years to England where he has done much driving. He compares the intersection efficiency of a roundabout to our signalized intersections and wonders why "we don't get it". Are there studies of roundabouts vs. signalized intersections with regard to fuel consumption? If roundabouts save fuel, as we suspect they do, it would be a major argument in their favor. In addition, we feel that the replacement of some roundabouts with over- or underpasses has reduced the opportunity for drivers to access the Parkway effectively because some of the traffic linkages in the original design have been eliminated. Again, our thanks to you and PennDOT for your vision and courage.</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 assessment before construction of an expanded facility can begin. The need for environmental re-evaluations would include widening of the two lane portion of the Parkway and any proposed grade separations/interchanges along the Parkway as well as proposed Parkway corridor.</p> <p>There have been no project specific analyses regarding potential fuel consumption in signalized intersection vs. roundabouts along the Parkway.</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>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
<p>L. Theodore Clemmer/ Home Owner</p>	<p>3/15/2007</p>	<p>The proposed parkway impacts our lifestyle and quality of life in many ways. 1) Air pollution: At a projected 11,000 cars per day in very close proximity to our home, I can only imagine that the quality of the air (many more particulates) we are exposed to will be significantly impacted. Who is going to pay for the related health issues that we will incur? What about the consent settling of the particulates on our property? How do you clean up? 2) Noise Pollution: At 11,000 cars per day passing in very close proximity to our home, how will we be able to enjoy our current life style? Will the noise and vibration slowly affect our hearing? Will the noise and vibration rattle our windows, separate our drywall seams, etc. Who pays for that? Can earth berms with trees be planted or sound walls be erected to further help mitigate the sound? 3) Esthetics: I am very much concerned about the lack of attention to the esthetics of this project as it relates to our property. Mention has been made that a chain link fence may be placed on the ROW line, the ROW runs on two sides of my property and would look terrible. This would greatly affect the value of my property. Please use of earth berms with trees or decorative sound walls instead. 4) PennDOT Property Is Not Maintained: When viewing my property, please note the property owned by PennDOT beyond the proposed ROW line next to my property. Note the line that runs from the side of my property to the proposed cul-de-sac, there is a small piece of property that is almost triangular in shape. I am concerned that maintenance will not be kept up/forgotten and that this area will become a detracting eye sore. Whatever grows or gets thrown onto this PennDOT property blows onto mine and causes a constant maintenance difficulty for me. I propose that PennDOT sell this unusable property to me and I will landscape and maintain the property. Please advise back on these comments, as I am very concerned. Please email these comments back to me for my record. Respectfully, Ted Clemmer 26 Vale View Drive Doylestown, PA. 18901.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The air quality analysis documented in the EER was conducted at two levels a regional analysis and a project level impact analysis for several potential air pollutants including carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter, which are constituents of concern associated with motor vehicles. The forecasted emissions do not exceed regional air quality budgets or baseline and the project was included in both the DVRPC's Transportation Conformity and the Destiny 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan TIP. Because the project is included in the approved and conformity plan, no mitigation is necessary for regional standards. At the project level, the air quality receptor concentrations of pollutants for carbon monoxide and particulate matter were well below the applicable standards, the particulate matter analyses do not indicate any impacts, and the evaluation of air toxics do not indicate a worse condition over existing. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted. 2&3. While there will be increases in the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) in this community, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Landscaped earth berms are proposed along the Parkway corridor to mitigate visual impacts to adjacent communities. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. As design progresses, PennDOT will finalize the details (i.e. location, length, height, and plantings) of the proposed berms, and will continue to coordinate with residents as PennDOT refines these design features. 4. PennDOT will maintain the proposed Parkway on their regularly scheduled maintenance program. 5. PennDOT plans to retain ownership and maintain all property acquired to date for the Route 202 Section 700 Project.

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Bill Stieg and Jennifer Lin/ Home Owners	3/14/2007	<p>We live in the Samuel Shutt House at 3655 Bristol Rd. It's a historic property that despite PennDOT's finding will be affected by the parkway. We'll hear it loud and clear, we'll see the traffic and the backups at the stoplights, and we'll have trouble getting out of our driveway. The gorgeous, peaceful stretch of the Neshaminy Creek near our house will be forever ruined by a roaring bridge and vast expanses of concrete. The effect on the pond on our property is yet to be seen but we're not optimistic. In the bigger picture, you'll be doing future generations the dubious favor of paving over the last untouched, extensive stretch of farmland in central Bucks County, land which, if left natural or in crops, would in half a century be viewed as a treasure, a breathtaking swath of parkland, an invaluable asset in the crowded suburban landscape, the envy of every other suburban area in the region. Its preservation would have been seen as a stunning piece of forward thinking. But no. You're going to pave it over. Because county and township planners never planned properly, because they saw subdivisions as dollar signs and never had the foresight to push for open-space preservation, and because PennDOT and local road-builders were equally dim-witted. We've lived in many places around the country, and nowhere have we seen such poorly designed intersections. Many of the traffic problems that PennDOT and township officials see as dire could be alleviated with a few simple fixes at intersections on existing roads. It's as if they never heard of a turning lane and a green arrow. Install a dozen of those in trouble spots and the allegedly horrible backups would have eased, and demand for a highway would have faded. But no. You're highway builders, so you'll build your highway. Relax, we're not going to go on like this. We know the parkway will be built. We hope it will be delayed, and that those delays will be used to design the most beautiful, unobtrusive parkway in the country. A few points that need to be stressed: 1. The intersections at all secondary roads MUST be upgraded before the highway is built, or at least before it is opened. This should have been done 10 or 20 years ago. Case in point: Upper State and Bristol. Despite the two homes close to the roadway, there has been plenty of room for a creative improvement; left-turn lanes and green arrows, for starters. Do this before your beloved parkway starts dumping cars onto Bristol. 2. Whenever there is a chance to mound up earth between the highway and our house, DO SO! We know we're not getting any sound barriers or formal berms, but we insist that every chance you get, you try to hide the road from us. The road is in a 6- to 8-foot cut for much of its path past our house; take that earth and pile it up on our side. I will personally follow up on this as the design process continues, and will appeal directly to the on-site bosses to see that it's done. 3. Soften the edges wherever possible with as many trees as possible. We are in the process of buying 100 trees for our ground. Try to match that on PennDOT ground.</p>	<p>The effect evaluation for the Samuel Shutt House determined that although the Parkway may be visible from the house it would not alter the architectural characteristics that make the property eligible for the National Register. Noise levels are anticipated to increase from the existing 49 dBA to 51 dBA with the construction of the Parkway. The PHMC concurred with the determination of no effect to this historic property. The proposed Parkway Project does not directly impact the driveway to the Samuel Shutt House.</p> <p>PennDOT will preserve, where possible, existing vegetation, including trees and shrubs, particularly in areas in proximity to listed or eligible historic properties. If vegetation cannot be preserved, replanting of vegetation to produce a visual screen will be carried out in consultation with the SHPO and the property owner. Coordination with Section 106 consulting parties will continue through final design.</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>The Screening of Preliminary Alternatives in the EER evaluated a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative, which included localized intersection improvements to increase capacity and efficiency of the existing roadway network. As a result of this initial screening, the TSM alternative did not meet the defined purpose and need of the project for the Design Year 2020.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
		<p>4. Please do NOT put a fence along the border of PennDOT ground and our lot. We'd prefer an open look. There, we've just saved you thousands of dollars. You're welcome. IF YOU CAN'T DO THIS for whatever reason, you MUST contact us. We don't want any rude surprises. 5. Be very careful working around the source of the stream that feeds our pond. If you mess with this, we'll have an environmental lawyer on your case faster than you can say spotted owl. The stream begins at the edge of a farm field not far from the roadway; it's clearly explained in the environmental documents. The stream was not deemed important by the state; we beg to differ and will fight to protect it. 6. Bridge design. We hope the bridge over the Neshaminy has some sense of style, and we're not just being picky. If you're honest about wanting to maintain and reflect the nature of Bucks County, you'll face it in stone or do something creative, so we're not stuck with another ugly, conventional, oh-so-practical (and cheap) bridge. Put in the time now and people (drivers, bikers, and people walking below, along the creek) will be marveling for decades. Do it right. 7. We want PennDOT to pay if we have to relocate our driveway. Your plans now show Bristol Road widened at the spot where our driveway hits it. That means we'd have to cross two lanes of traffic to turn left. This is unacceptable. If we can shift the driveway to the other side of our property, where the road just begins to widen, that would be better. We're not sure of this, but we want your engineers to look at the situation closely, give us a recommendation, and we want the state to pay for it. It's the least you could do. 8. Construction: We want to meet the foremen of the crews before anything starts. We want the phone numbers of any designers or work crew foremen (or women) who will be working on the parkway where it passes our house. That's all for now. Thanks for listening. Bill Stieg Jennifer Lin 3655 Bristol Rd. Doylestown, PA 18901 215-343-8065</p>	<p>As part of the overall Parkway project, additional intersection improvements beyond those intersections with the parkway will be improved. In particular, Upper State / Limekiln Pike, Upper State / Bristol, Bristol / Stump and Lower State / Wells will be upgraded. These intersection improvements will be constructed at the same time as the parkway but will be open to traffic upon completion, whereas the parkway will not be open to traffic until the entire parkway is completed between Welsh Road and Route 611. Landscape berms are an integral part of the parkway and will be designed in coordination with local communities.</p> <p>Right-of-way fencing is not required for this project and will only be installed if requested by the adjacent property owner(s). Aesthetic treatments (e.g., form liners) will be evaluated for all bridges, culverts, retaining walls and roadway barriers. Selection of types and colors will be determined in coordination with the local municipalities.</p> <p>Currently no driveway adjustments are required to the Samuel Shutt House construct the proposed Parkway.</p>
Dennis R. Winters/ Sierra Club	3/14/2007	<p>While the Sierra Club supports full accommodation of bicycles and pedestrians in the US202 corridor, we oppose any expansion in motor vehicle capacity.</p>	<p>The comments in support of the Shared Use Path (SUP) for bicycles and pedestrians are noted. The comments in opposition to any expansion of motor vehicle capacity are also noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p>

**Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from
December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)**

Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
<p>Mustafa B. Igdelioglu, PE/ O'Brien and Gere Engineers, Inc.</p>	<p>3/14/2007</p>	<p>Dear Sir or Madam, I am Civil/Structural Engineer and one of the residents at Terrace at Montgomery development. I had a chance to attend to the public hearing on Feb. 28th at Lenape Middle School. There have been significant changes from an expressway to a divided roadway due to funding issues. However when these changes made some of the key elements, which will affect areas along the road, were left behind. As a resident at Terrace at Montgomery, which is only couple of hundred feet away from the proposed roadway, I have some concerns about the revised design such as replacement of sound barrier with berms. I do not think berms will be sufficient enough for our children's' safety as well as their health due to increased emission form the vehicles. My other concern is trash that will be brought by the proposed road to our community. There are two intersections proposed from the new roadway to our private road "General Hancock Blvd.", which will increase the public access to our community. This will increase the traffic as because most likely General Hancock Blvd. will be least resistant alternative due to reduction of proposed roadway from 4 lanes to two lanes after Horsham Rd. junction. Additional repairs and maintenance of "General Hancock Blvd." will be overburdening the residents of Terrace at Montgomery due to increased vehicle load from the proposed roadway. We would like our community to have same standards before and after the construction of the proposed roadway. There is number of improvements that is feasible to make this proposed roadway community friendly as well as commuter friendly. Regards, Mustafa B. Igdelioglu, PE Project Engineer O'Brien & Gere Engineers, Inc. Resident @ Terrace at Montgomery 405 Anthony Ct. North Wales, PA 19454 P: 215-412 2668</p>	<p>Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to proactively design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). The criteria are defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10 dBA increase over the existing condition. A summary of the noise analysis for this project is included in the EER starting on Page III-67 of the document</p> <p>While there will be increases in the Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Berms are proposed along General Hancock Boulevard to mitigate visual impacts. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. During final design, the location, length and height of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features. Based on the current design, a full signalized intersection will be provided at the southern access point to Costco and General Hancock Boulevard. The northern (existing) access roadway will be designed as right-in/right-out for both Costco and General Hancock Boulevard.</p> <p>Direct access to Horsham Road will be provided via right-in/right-out based on comments from the residents at the Customer Advisory Committee (CAC) Meetings. PennDOT proposed a cul de sac at the end of General Hancock Boulevard to eliminate cut through traffic in the community, but the residents preferred the right-in/right-out condition at Horsham Road. PennDOT will continue to work with the residents of the Terrace at Montgomery to minimize impacts to the related to traffic operations, visual and acoustic conditions as a result of the proposed Parkway. As requested by the residents of the community, PennDOT will consider options that include a gate along General Hancock Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Candace Snyder/ Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission	3/14/2007	The Regional Citizens Committee of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Committee met on March 13, 2007 and took action opposing highway capacity increases on Section 700 of US 202. If you wish to have a copy of the committee minutes, please notify me. Thank you.	The motion of the Regional Citizens Committee (RCC) of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission stating that it does not support highway capacity expansion on the US 202 Section 700 Corridor is noted.
Chief Frank Campbell/ Chalfont Borough Police	3/14/2007	I was unable to make the last public meeting in regards to the parkway project but did wish to share my thoughts with you. Dealing with the traffic situation in Chalfont on a daily basis I feel that any relief from the gridlock that we experience especially during rush hour would be a welcome improvement. I believe that PennDOT must follow through with their plans for the Parkway in order for this area to return to some type of traffic normalcy. Thank you	The comments in support of the proposed Parkway are noted.
Joseph Fisher/ Resident	3/12/2007	To Whom It May Concern: How do I obtain a formal definition of the wetland boundaries that are present on my property (Parcel 46-00-03084-36-2)? 136 Preston Drive North Wales, PA 19454 Thank you, Joseph Fisher	The subject property is outside the limits of the wetlands identification effort for the proposed Parkway project.
Miranda/ homeowner in Doylestown	3/12/2007	THANK GOODNESS we are getting this done!!! We really need to complete this. I would rather spend our tax dollars on the bypass than new light posts any day.	The comments in support of the proposed Parkway in lieu of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Stephanie Brigidi/ Resident	3/12/2007	<p>After reviewing the current plans for the proposed 202 parkway, I am adamantly opposed to this project. As a resident in this community, I do not feel that such a roadway would relieve much of the congestion on the local roadways. Further, the idea of the broadening bike-trial is of great concern for our family. Our home would be one of those directly up against this trial. Historically, these trials are underutilized for the intent in which they were constructed, but rather, provide an easy access for evil-doers, and unfortunately child predators. This trial would directly effect hundreds of families whose homes rest on its' boarder. Additionally, we already have several public parks within walking distance from our community. It is a sad reality that we live in a world that does not always put the protection of our children as a first priority. It is my plea that you reconsider building such a trial along the proposed parkway.</p>	<p>The comments in opposition to the proposed 202 Parkway and Shared Use Path (SUP) are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project. DVRPC has identified the Route 202 corridor as a priority bike route in the Delaware Valley Region. The SUP is consistent with the regional and local planning efforts for providing opportunities for alternate modes of transportation in the Route 202 Corridor</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Edwin Lua/ The Terrace At Montgomery	3/11/2007	<p>I am a concerned citizen living in the Terrace at Montgomery community located at Horsham Road and General Hancock road. I wanted to make known some of the concerns that I, along with many of my neighbors, have about the new route 202 - section 701 roadway project that is being proposed to run along side our homes. Currently, PennDOT has no plans for a sound wall or barrier for this road. A major four lane highway will create serious noise that will have a detrimental effect on our local quality of life. The amount of traffic that our community already serves is growing every day. With the plans for the highway, our neighborhood will turn into an access road for the highway, increasing both noise and traffic. There are no plans for a wall or fence to keep out trash and pollution. Many of our homeowners have young children or pets. I am very concerned about the possible dangers and security issues associated with an open roadway. PennDOT has yet to adequately address this issue. I am concerned that this roadway will have a negative effect on my homes value. Construction issues - PennDOT estimates that the highway will take 2 years to complete. There are no plans to spare our community the disruption caused by work vehicles, noise or dirt.</p>	<p>Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to proactively design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). The criteria are defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10 dBA increase over the existing condition. A summary of the noise analysis for this project is included in the EER starting on Page III-67 of the document</p> <p>While there will be increases in the Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Berms are proposed along General Hancock Boulevard to mitigate visual impacts. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. During final design, the location, length and height 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>Market conditions and extraneous factors affect property values. Proximity to a roadway can increase or decrease the value of individual properties. The access improvements afforded by the SR 0202 Section 700 Project will provide area residents with improved travel time to employers, recreational activities, health facilities and major education centers. All landowners directly impacted by the project will be compensated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and PennDOT's Relocation Assistance Bulletin No. 47. PennDOT is committed to design the Proposed Parkway so that it meets the Department's design/safety standards for a 40 mph posted speed.</p>

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Joseph Mehr/ Montgomery Twp. CAC	3/9/2007	I recently attended the public hearing at Lenape Middle School in Doylestown. There was tremendous support for the parkway from a wide variety of citizen and local government groups. However, when I studied the exhibits, I was disappointed to learn that the \$200M we were proposing to spend would only manage to hold the traffic levels in New Britain and Chalfont AT their current levels which, by all testimony, are unacceptable! It seems to me that the FIRST priority for spending this money should be to alleviate the main street traffic for these two boroughs. I heard proposals for separate improvements that showed significantly more promise like extending Bristol Road over the SEPTA tracks or extending Rt 152. Any parallel path to the current Rt 152 choke point in New Britain would help tremendously! Why can't we make these improvements FIRST and then re-evaluate the need for an expensive road parallel to Upper State Road? While I like the current Parkway plan, I am not sure it is the best use for the money. I get the feeling that the local supervisors have been told that they can have the money for the parkway or they don't get it at all! I think the worst problems should be addressed first with the most cost effective solutions. Are we locked in to the Parkway as the only possible solution for our traffic problems? It certainly seems as if this road is at the center of every proposed solution to the area's traffic woes even when the data doesn't show any improvement!	In addition to the proposed Route 202 Parkway Project, the Bristol Road Extension Project near Bristol Road and US 202 is being pursued as a separate project in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The comments related to the proposed Parkway are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
Joseph DiMarco Montgomery Greene Townhouse Resident	3/8/2007	Very Frustrated Because I feel as though no matter what I say, Penndot will do what they want to do. Why build MORE of something that is already not working in the area, AN ADDITIONAL 2 Lane Road. If money is tight that the project had to be scaled down. ILLIMINATE THE NON ESSENTIAL WALKING TRAIL!!!!!! or better yet, EXPAND ALL THE EXISTING ROADS TO 4 LANES (Stump Rd, Upper State Rd, 202, County Line, Horsham) Expand all of these roads and then see if additional roads are needed! DONT BUILD ANOTHER 2 LANE ROAD. Of course I'm sure this will go unheard, cause the powers to be, only want to pretend like they are concerned and listening to the public. In the end they will justify why they have to do what they wanted to do all along. But I felt i had to at least have my voice heard. thank you Joseph DiMarco	The comments in opposition to the proposed 202 Parkway and Shared Use Path (SUP) are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project. DVRPC has identified the Route 202 corridor as a priority bike route in the Delaware Valley Region. The SUP is consistent with the regional and local planning efforts for providing opportunities for alternate modes of transportation in the Route 202 Corridor.

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Hal Kodikian Rental World	3/8/2007	The By Pass must be built!! The limited access proposal makes the most sense eliminating the cross traffic on heavily traveled roads such as Horsham and County Line roads. The Parkway proposal just adds traffic lights and delays on those roads. Why build a road at half the cost that will not solve the traffic problem. I realize the 800 section is not in question but it should be so the traffic can move to NJ and eliminate the traffic problems along 202 in Buckingham and Solebury. With all the house being built, 202 will be parking lot during rush hour. Please build the By Pass as originally proposed before Warren and Rendell killed it.	The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
Michelle Stober Doylestown Crossing	3/8/2007	I am concerned b/c I have been told that no improvements are planned for Wells Road. The intersection of Wells Road and Radcliff Drive is a disaster. When pulling out of the development it is a nightmare to pull out b/c you cannot see traffic coming up the hill. This situation needs to be addressed and corrected. It is also difficult pulling out of Valley View coming up the hill on Wells Road as well. Please consider leveling the road in your plans for the 202 Project. Thank you.	Wells Road is a Doylestown Township owned roadway. The only impact to Wells Road is the construction of a bridge to allow the parkway to pass under Wells Road and the elimination of the Vale View Drive intersection. The extension of a bituminous walking trail between the parkway and Radcliff Drive was included at the request of Doylestown Township. The Wells Road profile will not be altered with the construction of the parkway. Any pre-existing safety concerns should be discussed with Doylestown Township
Craig Kennard Gilmore & Associates	3/5/2007	As a local resident, a vice president of a business located directly on Route 202 in the New Britain/Chalfont area, and as an engineer that works for several municipalities in the local area, I am very familiar with the current traffic problems along Route 202 and the surrounding roadways. I fully support the proposed parkway project, including the proposed improvements to the connecting roadways that are essential to the local residents, businesses and emergency services in the community.	The comments in support of the proposed parkway are noted.
Mary Ann Welsh Doylestown Lea Homeowner	3/4/2007	I share the concern as many of the homeowners in Doylestown Lea regarding the poor visibility at the intersection of Radcliff & Wells Rd. Something must be done to correct the dangerous intersection.	Wells Road is a Doylestown Township owned roadway. The only impact to Wells Road is the construction of a bridge to allow the parkway to pass under Wells Road and the elimination of the Vale View Drive intersection. The extension of a bituminous walking trail between the parkway and Radcliff Drive was included at the request of Doylestown Township. The Wells Road profile will not be altered with the construction of the parkway. Any pre-existing safety concerns should be discussed with Doylestown Township.

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Gayle Wartko Doylestown Crossing	3/2/2007	In addition to the building of the Route 202 Roadway, I would like to see improvements done on Wells Road to level it out for much better visibility. When we are exiting from Radcliff Drive you are unable to see traffic coming from Wells Road. Also when you are on Wells road trying to make a left onto Radcliff you cannot see the traffic coming from the opposite direction on Wells Road. There have been many accidents because of this.	Wells Road is a Doylestown Township owned roadway. The only impact to Wells Road is the construction of a bridge to allow the parkway to pass under Wells Road and the elimination of the Vale View Drive intersection. The extension of a bituminous walking trail between the parkway and Radcliff Drive was included at the request of Doylestown Township. The Wells Road profile will not be altered with the construction of the parkway. Any pre-existing safety concerns should be discussed with Doylestown Township

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Phil Altomare	3/1/2007	<p>202 Parkway - possible Traffic Flow Improvements to Consider / Study After reviewing your plan for the 202 Parkway, I must say that it is a dramatic improvement over the "By-pass" plan, and very nicely done. I am, however, compelled to make some comments and recommendations. These comments and recommendations are designed to be only constructive in nature (and not to detract from the considerable and thoughtful work performed so far), and to address what I believe will be very serious impacts, to the cross-traffic patterns that all of the new at-grade intersections will impose. Let me state emphatically that I realize that we cannot eliminate all of the at-grade intersections. But, I believe that we can eliminate / improve many of them (and hopefully at an acceptable cost) to provide a very real and large, positive impact for the traffic flow in ALL directions, not just from Doylestown through Montgomeryville. Many good people (residents) will sacrifice much, in the way of quality of life, all day, every day - for the "intermittent" traffic relief benefits that this project is being billed to offer both them, and out-of-towners alike, so we must do our absolute best to balance the impacts with benefits. And, while not totally exhaustive, and certainly requiring much additional consideration, analysis and refinement by talented engineers to validate (or not) my gut feel and instinctual "solutions" to this problem, I believe that the following, ideas, can / will go a long way to improve that balance, and make this one a model project for which others to aspire. Thank you for your attention and consideration.</p> <p>1. Consider elimination of the Welsh Road Intersection with a fly-over. Rationale – Already have an entrance / exit point in close proximity (at the "head-waters") where high volumes can be handled with proper design. Secondly, it removes the "additional" significant obstacle to flow on Welsh Road, that the new intersection would impose. Additionally, the Dekalb+Welsh Road intersection would need to be reworked and "beefed-up" to handle additional left turns from the south / east. 2. I am in favor of the at-grade intersections in the Knapp Road "shopping destinations" as these will add accessibility and keep speeds down in these areas. 3. Install a full clover-leaf at 309 – the reasons should be obvious. 4. Consider elimination of the Horsham Road Intersection with a fly-over. Rationale – Force "pass-through" traffic to seek 309, County-line or Limekiln Pike Entrance / exit options (as I will outline later) as well as the "Costco destination" intersection. This would remove the "additional" significant obstacle to flow on Horsham Road that the new intersection would impose. 5. Consider elimination of the County Line Road Intersection with an under-pass and when Traveling south on County Line Road, provide entry to the Parkway southbound via a simple ramp, and traveling northbound on the Parkway provide exit onto County Line northbound by a "partial clover-leaf like" ramp. Rationale – Commuters traveling down County Line Road from the north have viable options to head north on the 202 corridor via 202 and Upper State / Shady Retreat Roads, but not south, due to the increasing congestion as you get closer to 309. And, eliminating the at-grade intersection, will not add to the already appalling backups on County Line Road, regardless if it will eventually be two lanes or the future four. 6. Consider elimination of the Limekiln Pike Intersection with a fly-over and when Traveling north on Limekiln Pike, provide entry to the Parkway northbound via a simple ramp, and traveling southbound on the Parkway provide exit onto Limekiln southbound by a "partial clover-leaf like" ramp. Rationale – Commuters traveling up Limekiln Pike from the south or County line from the east have viable options to head south on the 202 corridor via Limekiln Pike to Horsham Road and County Line to Kenas / Hartman or Stump Roads. Again, this would remove the "additional" significant obstacle to flow on Limekiln Pike that the new intersection would impose. The rest of the plan seems reasonable to me... Additional Idea; Eliminate Multi-Use Trails to save money to apply to the increased cost of the above improvements, to better traffic flow. Rationale – Who really wants to walk or bike right next to a road? Answer: No-one. But, many people still do, and those people already have the opportunity to do-so on the hundreds of miles of existing roads, sidewalks and paths. There is no need to add more, at great cost. If the Multi-Use Trail is an absolute requirement by law, then consider moving these new trails elsewhere, where they can actually used and enjoyed (in a better environment) by everyone (instead of no-one), like connecting all of the Parks in the townships or something like that. Let's get creative on this one. Thank you again for your attention and consideration and if you have any questions or wish to respond or discuss, please do not hesitate to contact me. Best regards, J. Philip Altomare, Jr. 114 Gordon Lane North Wales, PA 19454 (215)872-8055 (cell) jpaltoamare@hotmail.com</p>	Please See the Detailed Response to these comments on Page VII-181.

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Robert Weed/ homeowner	3/1/2007	Who within the contractors PennDOT hired is responsible for noise monitoring and noise abatement at the intersection of Dekalb Pike and the new parkway (just south of Rt 63 and the parkway)? What is the noise impact at that intersection and the rt 63 and parkway intersection? During the public meeting Feb 28 the noise and traffic engineers repeatedly said that area was not their responsibility and it was covered in section 600. However, the 202 web site shows section 600 as going to Hancock Road and I could not find up to date information on the section from Hancock to Rt 63. How can I be informed of and confirm the verbal assurances I received about intersection operation, lights, and expected noise abatement.	As noted in your comment, the area south of and including Welsh Road is part of the Route 202, Section 600 widening project. Any questions or comments on that section can be directed to Madeleine Fausto, PennDOT Project Manager, 610-205-6848.
Michael Reilly/ Montgomery Ridge	3/1/2007	Dear PENNDOT; I have previously commented on the lack of berms that are currently shown on the proposed plans for US 202-700 on the Montgomery Ridge Development side of the roadway. I would like to again reiterate my request for the inclusion of berms between our residences and the road to act as both a visual and auditory barrier. Thank You, Michael Reilly	Currently no berms are proposed along the proposed Parkway that abuts Montgomery Ridge Development. As design progresses, PennDOT will finalize the details (i.e. location, length, height, and plantings) of the proposed berms, and will continue to coordinate with residents as PennDOT refines these design features.
Judy Snyder/ Bucks County resident	3/1/2007	As a 39 year resident of Warrington, I have seen many changes in population but little in road accommodations in central Bucks County. Where is your foresight? This was originally talked about years and years ago and even today is not reality. It does NOT meet the needs of this area as planned today and certainly NOT for tomorrow. Another 2 lane highway is NOT needed; use of state tax money has been less than frugal for state highways and in this high population area a 4 lane highway is needed...not a 2 lane parkway! By the time it is built it will be obsolete as it is even today! Our state legislators and PENNDOT care NOT for the huge traffic problems of this area nor the people they serve with the present plan!	The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
steve cinoski	2/28/2007	<p>We are writing to let you know of our dissatisfaction regarding the proposed 202 bypass. This bypass would pass through our neighborhood (Terrace at Montgomery) and bring a lot of noise and safety issues into our community. We also worry about its potential negative effect on our home's value. We have heard that a mesh-wire fence will be the barrier of choice used on this bypass. We can only imagine the amount of trash and debris that will get caught in this. Also, the existing traffic light will be removed at 463 & General Hancock Blvd, and in its place an access road will be installed in the middle of our neighborhood? We envision this causing a lot of extra traffic through General Hancock Blvd - the upkeep of which is paid by our association fees. Is it true that an overpass of Horsham Road has been denied due to cost? We have heard that our township offered to assist in the cost - if so, why was that turned down? We can appreciate the need for a solution to ease traffic congestion in our area, but under the assumed current plan, it will result in many, many unhappy residents. Are there definitive reasons that an elevated bypass and true sound barriers are no longer being pursued? It seems like this would solve a lot of the problems. We hope that you will take this complaint into consideration, as well as any others that you receive regarding our disappointment on the progression (or, more appropriately, regression) of the plans. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Best Regards, Steve and Kathy Cinoski</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PennDOT Response</p> <p>Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to proactively design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). The criteria are defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10 dBA increase over the existing condition. A summary of the noise analysis for this project is included in the EER starting on Page III-67 of the document. While there will be increases in the Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Berms are proposed along General Hancock Boulevard to mitigate visual impacts. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. During final design, the location, length and height 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>Market conditions and extraneous factors affect property values. Proximity to a roadway can increase or decrease the value of individual properties. The access improvements afforded by the SR 0202 Section 700 Project will provide area residents with improved travel time to employers, recreational activities, health facilities and major education centers. All landowners directly impacted by the project will be compensated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and PennDOT's Relocation Assistance Bulletin No. 47. PennDOT is committed to design the Proposed Parkway so that it meets the Department's design/safety standards for a 40 mph posted speed.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PennDOT Response (continued)</p> <p>Horsham Road (PA 463) is an integral element in the project area roadway network and a state highway. Increasing network connectivity and providing alternate routes for local trips are also identified needs for this project. Providing direct access to/from Horsham Road, and other state highways in the area, is vital to the proposed Parkway Alternative concept. The elimination of access at Horsham Road would divert those trips that would otherwise use Horsham Road to either Route 309 or County Line Road via Upper State Road or Stump Road, further reducing the effectiveness of the Parkway.</p> <p>As described in the September 2005 Community Task Force Report, the Parkway concept includes a four-lane roadway south of Horsham Road and an at-grade signalized intersection at Horsham Road and the Parkway. This concept also includes an at-grade signalized intersection with the Parkway at Costco Drive/General Hancock Blvd. PennDOT will reevaluate the need for the signalized intersection at the Parkway/Costco Drive based on the comments from the community in consultation with Montgomery Township.</p> <p>Direct access to Horsham Road will be provided via right-in/right-out based on comments from the residents at the Customer Advisory Committee (CAC) Meetings. PennDOT proposed a cul de sac at the end of General Hancock Boulevard to eliminate cut through traffic in the community, but the residents preferred the right-in/right-out condition at Horsham Road. PennDOT will continue to work with the residents of the Terrace at Montgomery to minimize impacts related to traffic operations, visual and acoustic conditions as a result of the proposed Parkway. As requested by the residents of the community, PennDOT will consider options that include a gate along General Hancock Boulevard to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.</p>

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Leanne Landis/ Nightwatch Kennel	2/28/2007	I would like to take this opportunity to express my concerns in regards to the proposed 202 Pkwy. I live on 11.4 acres that encompasses road frontage on Limekiln Pike and Stump roads in Warrington Twp. This is a historical property and have lived here for thirty years. My business Nightwatch Kennel is located on this property and is my only means of income. I have two main concerns: 1. How the 202 Pkwy will affect my property and business? 2. When the building begins will the roads around me be effected? -My concerns are that my clients will not be able to get to my facility, and therefore effect my ability to make a living. Any info you can give me will be greatly appreciated. Sincerely, Leanne Landis 2/28/2007	<p>Market conditions and extraneous factors affect property values. Proximity to a roadway can increase or decrease the value of individual properties. The access improvements afforded by the SR 0202 Section 700 Project will provide area residents with improved travel time to employers, recreational activities, health facilities and major education centers. All landowners directly impacted by the project will be compensated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and PennDOT's Relocation Assistance Bulletin No. 47.</p> <p>PennDOT will maintain access to local residents and businesses during the construction phase. PennDOT will continue to coordinate schedules for construction activities with the Townships and the public to keep people informed of any change in traffic patterns during construction.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

<p align="center">Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)</p>			
<p>Name/ Organization</p>	<p>Date</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>PennDOT Response</p>
<p>Chris Corridoni/ Terrace at Montgomery</p>	<p>2/28/2007</p>	<p>My name is Chris and I am a concerned citizen living in the Terrace at Montgomery community located at Horsham Road and General Hancock road. I am not able to attend tonight's meeting, but I wanted to make known some of the concerns that I, along with many of my neighbors, have about the new route 202 - section 701 roadway project that is being proposed to run along side our homes. Currently, PennDot has no plans for a sound wall or barrier for this road. A major four lane highway will create serious noise that will have a detrimental effect on our local quality of life. The amount of traffic that our community already serves is growing every day. With the plans for the highway, our neighborhood will turn into an access road for the highway, increasing both noise and traffic. There are no plans for a wall or fence to keep out trash and pollution. Many of our homeowners have young children or pets. I am very concerned about the possible dangers and security issues associated with an open roadway. PennDot has yet to adequately address this issue. I am concerned that this roadway will have a negative effect on my homes value. Construction issues - PennDot estimates that the highway will take 2 years to complete. There are no plans to spare our community the disruption caused by work vehicles, noise or dirt. These issues should seem to be repeated tonight at the meeting, since many of my neighbors feel the same way. Thanks you. Chris Corridoni</p>	<p>Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to proactively design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). The criteria are defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10 dBA increase over the existing condition. A summary of the noise analysis for this project is included in the EER starting on Page III-67 of the document</p> <p>While there will be increases in the Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Berms are proposed along General Hancock Boulevard to mitigate visual impacts. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. During final design, the location, length and height 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>Market conditions and extraneous factors affect property values. Proximity to a roadway can increase or decrease the value of individual properties. The access improvements afforded by the SR 0202 Section 700 Project will provide area residents with improved travel time to employers, recreational activities, health facilities and major education centers. All landowners directly impacted by the project will be compensated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and PennDOT's Relocation Assistance Bulletin No. 47. As indicated in the EER, PennDOT is designing the proposed Parkway to meet the safety standards for a 40 mile per hour (mph) posted speed limit as outlined in PennDOT's Design Manual.</p> <p>During construction, construction vehicles will be limited to state roads in order to gain access to construction areas, in this case Horsham Road and Route 309. The use of General Hancock Boulevard will not be permitted unless agreed to by the Terrace of Montgomery Home Owners Association. Additionally, provisions will be made to minimize dust and debris during construction from impacting adjacent properties.</p>

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Ray Harrison	2/28/2007	Since this area seems to be very unfriendly to bicycle riders, I was wondering if there were any plans for a bike lane or a wide shoulder on the new parkway	The proposed Parkway includes a 5 foot wide paved shoulder (bike lane) on each side of the Parkway. A 12foot wide Shared Use Path (SUP) is also proposed within the highway right-of-way for the project..
Jeanne and Gordon Plate	2/28/2007	The bypass idea has always been the best option - we have previously expressed our disgust at the wastefulness of securing the land and right-of-ways, and then only building one lane in each direction. The area is still growing, and the expressway would be obsolete before it was even finished. Build the full by-pass!	The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
Thomas Fagan	2/28/2007	After canceling the bypass and giving us a two lane road, why is construction not starting to 2010? I've heard all the excuses you politicians give we don't need more studies about the environment or what signals we need at intersections etc. etc. we need someone to take the bull by the horns and build the road. if I took this long to come up with a solution I would be looking for a new job. Build the road now not three years from now!	Construction is scheduled to begin in early 2008 with an anticipated construction completion in late 2010.
Kim Murphy/ Resident at Cedar Crest	2/28/2007	I am concerned about the aesthetics of the fence- versus adding additional landscaping shrubbery for noise reduction. Where does the fence exactly run- close to the road or close to the right-of-way lines on the map? The berm does not seem to extend far enough north behind the property lines at Cedar Crest. The map on the website shows the pathway on the northbound side of 202. Is this correct?	<p>Landscaped earth berms are proposed along the Parkway corridor to mitigate visual impacts to adjacent communities. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. As design progresses, PennDOT will finalize the details (i.e. location, length, height, and plantings) of the proposed berms, and will continue to coordinate with residents as PennDOT refines these design features. PennDOT will consider fencing adjacent to the Parkway/SUP and will work with the adjacent community to determine the location of fencing along the Parkway corridor.</p> <p>The Shared Use Path (SUP) is proposed to shift from the south side of the Parkway to the north side (along the southbound lanes) between Bristol Road and Lower State Road. Currently there are no plans to provide trail access from the Cedarcrest Development to the Parkway SUP.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
James Pye/ Home Owner	2/28/2007	I am strongly oppose to the projects construction. As a homeowner and daily motorist on the roads, I believe road widening and intersection redesign would remedy most of the congestion. There is a reason this project has been postponed for more than 50 years. It is a costly and disruptive plan that is generally not needed or wanted. I intend to work with community and township leaders to oppose the construction.	The comments in opposition to the Parkway are noted. PennDOT did consider several alternatives that considered widening/upgrades to existing roadways. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
Jonathan Adomsky	2/27/2007	Although I now live in Doylestown, I previously lived in The Terrace at Montgomery in Montgomery Twp where you are planning to put the bypass. I don't even live there anymore and I am still greatly disappointed in PennDOTs new plans for this intersection! As it stands now there is too much traffic from Costo going through that community- I cannot imagine what your plans will do to this neighborhood! Please reconsider and stay true to your initial promises to the residents of the Terrace at Montgomery!	Based on the current design, a full signalized intersection will be provided at the southern access point to Costco and General Hancock Boulevard. The northern (existing) access roadway will be designed as right-in/right-out for both Costco and General Hancock Boulevard. Direct access to Horsham Road will be provided via right-in/right-out based on comments from the residents at the Customer Advisory Committee (CAC) Meetings. PennDOT proposed a cul de sac at the end of General Hancock Boulevard to eliminate cut through traffic in the community, but the residents preferred the right-in/right-out condition at Horsham Road. PennDOT will continue to work with the residents of the Terrace at Montgomery to minimize impacts to the related to traffic operations, visual and acoustic conditions as a result of the proposed Parkway. As requested by the residents of the community, PennDOT will consider options that include a gate along General Hancock Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.
Kristin Rubia Adomsky/ Homeowner	2/27/2007	I am outraged at the plans to put the bypass in our backyard without adhering to the initial promises made to us in the disclosure we received from you when we purchased in this neighborhood!	The comments in opposition to the proposed 202 Parkway as currently design are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
			efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project. DVRPC has identified the Route 202 corridor as a priority bike route in the Delaware Valley Region. The SUP is consistent with the regional and local planning efforts for providing opportunities for alternate modes of transportation in the Route 202 Corridor.
Robert Weed/ owner in Lower Gwynedd	2/27/2007	My question is regarding the southern end of the parkway near the existing 202 and 63. Why are you building an intersection with light to enable northbound 202 traffic to turn left onto the old portion of 202 between Swedesford Rd and rt 63. If you forced all traffic to make their turns at the new 202 parkway and 63 intersection, you could eliminate that southerly intersection. You could maintain the existing 2 lane road between 63 and 202 as a "202 Southbound only" ad business access road. The southerly light at the parkway could be eliminated and any traffic could merge onto 202 south when there is a break in traffic. Trucks could use the rt 63 intersection if they needed more room or time. Any northbound traffic that wants to return to DeKalb Pike could go 200 yards further and turn left onto 63 west. It seems to me that my design would eliminate a traffic light (i.e. truck noise and traffic movement) without significantly impacting the northerly intersection or inconveniencing northbound traffic.	While the left turn movement from the northbound Parkway to westbound Welsh Road may be redundant, DVRPC projects 250 vehicles in the am peak period and 290 vehicles in the am peak period will be making left turns from the southbound Parkway onto eastbound Welsh Road. Maintaining full access at the Parkway and Welsh Road helps maintain the network connectivity as outlined in the project needs. The project is currently in final design for this the area south of and including Welsh Road is part of the Route 202, Section 600 widening project. Any questions or comments on that section can be directed to Madeleine Fausto, PennDOT Project Manager, 610-205-6848.
Alice Berendzen	2/27/2007	My concern with the proposed bypass is the displacement of wildlife, the deer, skunks, raccoons, turkeys and other birds. There are so few pockets of open space and small woodlands presently existing, and further reduction of these could have a detrimental effect on wildlife in this region. Alice Berendzen	Impacts to wildlife were evaluated and are described in the EER Part III (f) Vegetation and Wildlife.
Robert Weed/ owner in Lower Gwynedd	2/26/2007	1 - What action will be taken to coordinate the two new traffic lights now added to the southern most section where the old route 202 meets the parkway and route 63 meets the parkway? 2- What is the calculated increase in noise due to forcing traffic to now stop, (truck braking and truck acceleration) where there was no forced stopping except 200 yards away at the old 202 AND 63?. 3 - Will noise abatement walls be erected between the parkway and the new road (basically along the stretch of the old Swedesford road from 202 to rt 63).	Detailed traffic analysis for the southern connection of the Parkway is being coordinated closely between the two sections and the signals will be coordinated in this area. A sound barrier wall is proposed for this community as part of the US 202 Section 600 project. The project is currently in final design for this the area south of and including Welsh Road is part of the Route 202, Section 600 widening project. Any questions or comments on that section can be directed to Madeleine Fausto, PennDOT Project Manager, 610-205-6848.

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Lane Sattler	2/26/2007	I believe that the best solution for the region is a limited access highway as previously planned, ideally extending to NJ. In light of funding restrictions, progress on the parkway option is preferred over no option. However, since the parkway will still be restricted by 8 intersections, which themselves add restrictions to several major overburdened cross-roads, the plan should provide for future upgrade to a limited access highway. Specifically, the location of the roadbed in the right of way should allow for additional lanes to be easily added later. Bridges should be built wider to accommodate the extra lanes, and the intersections should allow for overpass/underpass upgrades with adequate ramp space. The area has already experienced significant growth without the addition of roads, and will continue to do so. Blocking roads will not slow development, building them will not increase it. The proliferation of signaled intersections slows traffic (increases time on road), increases accident rates, and disproportionately increases emissions. A limited access solution avoids these challenges, and improves our life situation. Local communities can limit traffic from limited access highways by simply routing the highway through with no intersections.	<p>The comments in support of the proposed Parkway in lieu of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p> <p>The original right-of-way will be purchased as limited access with no access to private properties. Purchased right-of-way that is not used (if any) can be utilized for transportation purposes, not private development. 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. The need for environmental re-evaluations would include widening of the two lane portion of the Parkway and any proposed grade separations/interchanges along the Parkway</p>
John Trusky/ The Terrace at Montgomery	2/26/2007	I have lived in Montgomery Township for almost 13 years and have been aware of the 202 project for just as long. I think the current plans for the road, which have changed extensively over these years, are completely unacceptable. While I truly believe we could use the 202 Bypass, the current plans are going to harm the area more than help it. What happened to the overpass over Horsham Rd? Where did the sound walls go? What became of the multi-use trail along side the road? I believe that the road should be built the right way or NOT AT ALL. Thank you for your consideration.	<p>The comments in opposition to the Parkway in its current design are noted.</p> <p>Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to proactively design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). The criteria are defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10 dBA increase over the existing condition. A summary of the noise analysis for this project is included</p>

<p align="center">Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)</p>			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
			<p>in the EER starting on Page III-67 of the document</p> <p>While there will be increases in the Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Berms are proposed along General Hancock Boulevard to mitigate visual impacts. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. During final design, the location, length and height 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>Analysis of the proposed Parkway intersection with Horsham Road revealed that the projected daily volumes (approximately 24,000 vpd on Horsham Road) could be accommodated with an at grade intersection. An overpass would be more costly and environmentally impacting than the at-grade intersection concept. Potential additional impacts include greater encroachments into the historic Joseph Ambler Inn, natural resources, and the Terrace at Montgomery community.</p>
Kellie Richardson	2/26/2007	<p>I have reviewed a lot of the material available on the website and am quite impressed and overwhelmed with all the information. Can you tell me if an assessment was completed on the impact of the wildlife and of the cross traffic patterns at 309, Horsham and Stump Roads? This information may be available on the website and I just need some guidance finding it. The amount of beautiful wildlife (fox, deer, red-tailed hawks, wild turkeys, blue herons and numerous other birds) in the area behind my residence is phenomenal and I am very interested in knowing to what degree this has been considered. I also am having a difficult time wondering how this project will not cause additional problems for the traffic crossing at the intersections mentioned above. The cross-traffic at these intersections at rush hour is already a problem and to add an additional traffic light at each intersection seems like it will only make the problem worse. I would like read any information available about this prior to the hearing on February 28th. My husband and I will be attending the hearing and look forward to hearing from you so we can be more informed of these two issues as they pertain to this project. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Kellie Richardson 113 Baker Place</p>	<p>Impacts to wildlife were evaluated and are described in the EER Part III (f) Vegetation and Wildlife.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Jeff Sowers/ Homeowner, Taxpayer	2/26/2007	In my opinion, the taxpayer's money spent to construct a 2 lane parkway from Doylestown to Montgomeryville would benefit only those who live in the immediate area. A better use of the funds would be to fill the numerous potholes which exist on roads throughout the state. Why construct yet another road when the State does not have the funds to properly maintain the current roadways. One need only drive the 309 expressway from Montgomeryville to Phila. to view evidence of my claim.	The comments in support of improvements to the existing roadways are noted. PennDOT did consider several alternatives that considered widening/upgrades to existing roadways. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
JACK DIAMOND/ Bucks County commuter	2/26/2007	Gentlemen: The need is to facilitate the flow of through traffic and relieve local road congestion. There can be no substitute for the above ground bypass that was originally planned. If Governor Rendell had not stolen the money necessary for the project and diverted it to SEPTA you could construct what is really needed. The proposed parkway alternate is all but a waste of money since it is intended to be an at grade roadway with intersections. The whole purpose of the original plan was to "BYPASS" local traffic. All that the parkway will do is construct another very expensive local road parallel to two already existing local roads. It is pointless. I believe that you should hold out for construction of a "BYPASS" that will be functional rather than spend money on a sorry excuse for a solution. Rendell will not be Governor forever! Keep the existing land and obtain whatever additional land that is required to build a proper bypass when you can get the money. They found the money to connect 309 to the Northeast Turnpike Extension. I agree that connection is a badly need resource. BUT; so too is a 700 bypass. Sincerely, Jack Diamond 299 Kent Road Warminster, PA 18974.	The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.

**Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from
December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)**

Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Susan Frasch	2/25/2007	I have lived in Chalfont for thirty years. Route 202 has been inadequate for all of these years. We have been promised a "bypass" and are now being given a two lane parkway - which will begin construction in 2010. In the paper it was stated that few people are showing interest. We are tired. I can't afford to move. I'll be here no matter what is done or not done. However, we really need alternate roads. Put Bristol Road through; build the parkway - it will later be made into 4 lanes - widen the existing 202 through Chalfont. Just do something.	The comments in support of the proposed Parkway in lieu of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project. In addition to the proposed Route 202 Parkway Project, the Bristol Road Extension Project near Bristol Road and US 202 is being pursued as a separate project in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Rob & Cindy Seaner	2/25/2007	<p>We live in Doylestown Crossing, a development that will be directly affected by the construction of the parkway. We are against the construction of the bypass, especially when some sensible alternatives have been suggested, such as the round-about solution on existing 202. But, we have accepted the fact that the bypass will eventually be built. The problem that I know have has to do with the multi-purpose trail. What is the privacy going to be like? It's bad enough that a parkway will be about 120 feet from my \$600k house, but we are now more concerned with the privacy of our property. Furthermore, what is the berm going to look like? Currently, we have a beautiful view of the woods. Will we have any say in how the berm will appear? What about during the construction phase, how long will there be loud vehicles, pollution (both noise and dust) behind our property during construction? How secure will our property be with all of the construction workers? How will our property value be affected? Has there been any study on that? A good portion of this project will cut through developments with homes well over \$500k and it can't be good for the property values in the area. We are extremely unhappy that this project is moving forward as it doesn't seem to address the problem of the existing 202. Studies have been done that indicate that 5 to 10 years after the completion of the bypass the traffic problem on existing 202 will be worse. There have also been studies that stated that 90% of the drivers on 202 between Chalfont and Montgomeryville are local and would not benefit from a limited access parkway, which would only benefit transients trying to get from Chalfont to Montgomeryville and beyond. It seems to us that the \$200M price could be better spent on other road improvements in the area. A bypass does not solve a problem, it goes around it. There will always be a high volume of traffic on 202 and building a bypass will just waste the taxpayers hard-earned money for the sake of building something after almost 40 years of debate. Look at the 611 bypass, this road is rarely used past Doylestown and it is 4 lanes and is almost always empty, no matter what time of day. We believe that a 202 bypass in the same area will be just as under utilized. We would appreciate answers to all of our questions and concerns. We realize that we are a little voice and probably have little to no impact on the overall course of this project. We would like to thank PennDOT and the state of Pennsylvania for destroying the rural lifestyle that our family currently enjoys, as well as the rest of Doylestown.</p>	<p>The comments in opposition to the to the current design of the proposed 202 Parkway and Shared Use Path (SUP) are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p> <p>DVRPC has identified the Route 202 corridor as a priority bike route in the Delaware Valley Region. The SUP is consistent with the regional and local planning efforts for providing opportunities for alternate modes of transportation in the Route 202 Corridor.</p> <p>Construction of the Parkway should be completed between 2008 and 2010. The construction activities near Doylestown Crossing will not be ongoing for the entire construction phase.</p> <p>As noted in the EER, delay lengths were substantially reduced or eliminated at the following locations due to the incorporation of the Parkway: Route 202 and Upper State Road intersection; Stump Road and Horsham Road intersection; along PA 152 West; along Pickertown Road; along Bristol Road; and along Upper State/Shady Retreat Road in both directions between Schoolhouse Road and Route 202 in Bucks County. Minor reductions or similar levels of congestion were observed at only three locations: the Five Points intersection (Route 202, PA 309 and PA 463); PA 309 and Stump Road intersection; and Route 202 South and PA 152 West in Chalfont.</p> <p>PennDOT did consider several alternatives that considered widening/upgrades to existing roadways. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p>

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
<p>Lee Raguz</p>	<p>2/25/2007</p>	<p>I am opposed to any changes to the 202 plan that would limit the roadway from the original plans of a 4 lane unencumbered highway. I have lived in South Jersey for over 33 years before moving here 13 years. I moved here to get away from the roadway insanity of South Jersey. The concept of a traffic circle or "rotary" does not work and will not work for this project. If you build this project with traffic circles you will end up widening the road to the intended 4 lanes and eliminating the traffic circles in the near future. By the time you complete this project the highways in the area will have transformed themselves into strip mall hell with traffic lights at every corner. There will be gridlock. Rt. 73 from the Betsey Ross Bridge to Berlin, NJ" where a bypass was planned was shot down by short sighted and allegedly well meaning citizens. That area today is what I have termed a strip mall hell and a gridlock of traffic lights. All the communities on Rt. 202 have this same situation to look forward to in the near future. I will have moved on by then and I pity those who are left to deal with the short sighted plans for the new road.</p>	<p>The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</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>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
<p>ROBERT BENDER/ CHALFONT EMS</p>	<p>2/25/2007</p>	<p>ROBERT C. BENDER 80 CREEK ROAD CHALFONT, PA. 18914 (215) 822-7949 RCB9000@HOTMAIL.COM TO: Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Re: Route 202 – Parkway/Bypass Project - Section 700 Date: February 28, 2007 Please allow these comments to be entered for the record in absolute SUPPORT of the proposed Route 202 Parkway Project. I reside within New Britain Township, and formerly served as the New Britain Township manager and Emergency Management Coordinator from 1980-1998. I now serve as a member of the Board of Directors of the Chalfont Emergency Medical Services Corp. For over twenty five years, I have been involved in public service and public safety issues within our community, and have actively participated in numerous meetings, discussions and hearings related to the Route 202 traffic problem, and its potential solutions. I strongly support the completion of the proposed Route 202 Parkway project, and all currently proposed roadway improvements which will help alleviate traffic congestion in the Chalfont-New Britain area.</p> <p>The fact is that we have long passed the point of local traffic congestion being a simple inconvenience. The current level of daily traffic congestion has risen to the point where essential public safety services; including Police, Fire, Ambulance and Highway services, are regularly delayed and adversely impacted. There is no perfect solution to this problem, and any action we take, including the “do nothing” option, will have both benefits and detriments. We need to realize that if we continue to wait for unanimous consent, we will never, ever, build another roadway. We must do what is right for the majority, while at the same time fairly compensating any landowner adversely impacted by the project, but we must move forward. Lives are being put at risk every day due to the levels of traffic congestion in the Chalfont area. This situation will only continue to worsen while we debate and await this long needed traffic relief. We have likely allowed the bypass project to get away from us due to repetitive debate of the issues, all while costs to the taxpayers increased. In fact, we are now considering a Parkway at a greater cost than the bypass would have cost to complete when it was initially proposed. And we are still debating the same issues as we did 30 years ago. Let’s not be foolish and allow this opportunity to pass while we again seek the “perfect” solution. Completion of this project, with the resultant traffic relief, regardless of how much or how little, is essential to the public safety of the residents, businesses, and visitors to the Chalfont-New Britain area. This project should proceed immediately, and continue with urgency, until completed. Respectfully, Robert C. Bender</p>	<p>The comments in support of the proposed Parkway are noted.</p> <p>The proposed Parkway will improve traffic operations on the project area roadway network and improve emergency response time in the US 202 corridor.</p>

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Edward Bilger/ Area Resident	2/24/2007	<p>Three brief comments: 1- Energy: Our nation is focused on reduced energy consumption. Accelerating an automobile consumes far more energy than operating at constant speed. The proposed bypass design is energy inefficient. 2- Pollution: An automobile operating at constant speed produces less pollution than an accelerating vehicle. A stopped vehicle is the worst source of pollution. The bypass will increase pollution. 3-Safety: Intersections and rotaries result in far more accidents than limited access, divided highways. There will be many accidents on the bypass. While a limited access road is more expensive it will address these issues and solve the roadway problem. Thank you: Edward Bilger - Registered Engineer and Safety Professional</p>	<p>The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Limited Access Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p> <p>The air quality analysis documented in the EER was conducted at two levels a regional analysis and a project level impact analysis for several potential air pollutants including carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter, which are constituents of concern associated with motor vehicles. The forecasted emissions do not exceed regional air quality budgets or baseline and the project was included in both the DVRPC's Transportation Conformity and the Destiny 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan TIP. Because the project is included in the approved and conformity plan, no mitigation is necessary for regional standards. At the project level, the air quality receptor concentrations of pollutants for carbon monoxide and particulate matter were well below the applicable standards, the particulate matter analyses do not indicate any impacts, and the evaluation of air toxics do not indicate a worse condition over existing. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.</p> <p>PennDOT is committed to design the Proposed Parkway so that it meets the Department's design/safety standards for a 40 mph posted speed.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
walter mcnair/ Home Owner	2/24/2007	I'm a new resident of Cedar Crest Farms in Doylestown pa. When I saw the original plans for the Bypass there was a greater distance from my home. Now it looks like it will be in my back yard!!! If that's the case I believe that the 12' sound barrier is a must What is my option? When you look out my side yard there is at least 1400 feet of open area that could be used why would this be so close to a development? Thank you Wally McNair	PennDOT will reevaluate the area behind the property at Burke Circle to determine if any horizontal adjustments can be made to the alignment. As stated at the plans display at the Public Hearing on February 28, 2007 at the Lenape Middle School, there are two engineering constraints in the area behind Burke Circle that prohibit relocating SR 202 approximately 160' east to the opposite side of the existing tree line as requested. These constraints are the existing wetlands that run through the tree line and the historic property (Samuel Shutt House - #186) located on the other side of the tree line. Relocating SR 202 would have an adverse impact on both resources. While there will be increases in the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) in this community, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Also, SR 202 will be below existing grade behind Burke Circle and a 10' high earth berm will be constructed behind in this area to mitigate the visual impact of the Parkway. Landscaping plans are currently being developed to give residents a better idea of what they will see behind their property. These plans will be displayed at the next Customer Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting for the Parkway Project PennDOT has added you to the email distribution list for that meeting.
John Ciavola/ Resident	2/23/2007	Please reconsider your decision not to include a traffic light at the intersection of Belmont Ave. and Limekiln Pike in your road widening plans. This intersection is currently difficult to manage as it currently exists, and with the increased volume anticipated with the added 202parkway and the widening of Limekiln Pike, the intersection will be that much more difficult. All the residents I have spoken to who live here in the neighborhood are in agreement that they too would like penndot to provide a traffic light at this intersection. Please reconsider your decision and take another look at this intersection. Thank you.	Unfortunately, PennDOT cannot install a signal at this intersection. State and federal guidelines mandate that certain minimum conditions ("warrants") be met before installation of a signal can even be considered. Based on the estimated volumes there is not enough traffic turning in and out of Belmont Ave to warrant installation of a signal.

**Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from
December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)**

Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
michelle eves/ Terrace at Montgomery	2/22/2007	I am concerned that the noise level without barriers will be quite loud - when we bought our houses that told us there would be a sound wall and now I read that there is not - is there a petition to sign to encourage that the wall be put up? Also eliminating the one access road into our development will cause more back up - why is this being considered?	<p>Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to proactively design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). The criteria are defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10 dBA increase over the existing condition. A summary of the noise analysis for this project is included in the EER starting on Page III-67 of the document</p> <p>While there will be increases in the dBA Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Berms are proposed along General Hancock Boulevard to mitigate visual impacts. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. During final design, the location, length and height of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features. PennDOT did receive a petition from the Terrace at Montgomery Homeowners Association which included comments related to each of the issues listed in these comments.</p> <p>Direct access to Horsham Road will be provided via right-in/right-out based on comments from the residents at the Customer Advisory Committee (CAC) Meetings. PennDOT proposed a cul de sac at the end of General Hancock Boulevard to eliminate cut through traffic in the community, but the residents preferred the right-in/right-out condition at Horsham Road. PennDOT will continue to work with the residents of the Terrace at Montgomery to minimize impacts related to traffic operations, visual and acoustic conditions as a result of the proposed Parkway. As requested by the residents of the community, PennDOT will consider options that include a gate along General Hancock Boulevard to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Joel	2/22/2007	What is the difference between expressway and parkway, from a motorist perspective?	Both facilities in this case are limited access roadways. The previous bypass further restricted access by excluding connections with Horsham Road, Limekiln Pike (PA 152), and Lower State Road. Increasing network connectivity and providing alternate routes for local trips are also identified needs for this project. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: four lanes of Added Roadway Capacity between Welsh Road and Horsham Road, two lanes of added roadway capacity between Horsham Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, creates 9 miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, better incident management options and emergency response times
Hank Miller Sr/ Retired Chalfonteer	2/21/2007	Ever since WW2 this project was going to happen any day now. That was when 202 was the main road from the South and West to NYC. All the BIG roads changed that situation. Upon returning to downtown Chalfont last year I thought all the BIG roads must have been shut down! Anything to help relieve the situation will be greatly appreciated; even by us former Chalfonteers. Sincerely, Hank Miller Sr.	The comments in support of proposed capacity adding roadway improvements are noted.
Rosalie Hoffman	2/20/2007	Am trying to understand the proposed 202 bypass parkway. Will there be exits and entrances on this parkway going to Doylestown from 309? And if so will that not create more local traffic?	A grade separated interchange is proposed at the Parkway and PA 309. There will also be at-grade intersections on the way to Doylestown along the Parkway at Horsham Road, County Line Road, Limekiln Pike (PA 152), Bristol Road and Lower State Road. The proposed Parkway will not "create" new traffic. It will divert the trips based on the new available roadway capacity within the project area.
LEE SCHWARZ	2/18/2007	While I have been receiving info over the years in my name about this project, the last notice to my address came in as "BILL AND ELLEN CONNOLLY". Please correct your records	The project mailing list has been revised as requested.
Christopher Erb	2/18/2007	Why is the speed limit pegged at 40? With all this design work it can't be raised to 50, and a few more traffic lights eliminated?	The Parkway concept includes efforts to restrict speed on the facility. Roadway splits, as well as the introduction of horizontal and vertical curves along the alignment, are proposed at several locations along the Parkway to enhance the appearance of the Parkway and control operating speeds.

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
			<p>Increasing network connectivity and providing alternate routes for local trips are also identified needs for this project. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: four lanes of Added Roadway Capacity between Welsh Road and Horsham Road, two lanes of added roadway capacity between Horsham Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, creates 9 miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, better incident management options and emergency response times.</p> <p>PennDOT is committed to design the Proposed Parkway so that it meets the Department's design/safety standards for a 40 mph posted speed.</p>
Paul Taylor	2/17/2007	<p>I and many other voters / taxpayers in this area feel that building this parkway is a mistake. We already have too many narrow 19th century roads in this area (only 309 is not), and you are just adding to them with a narrow at-grade parkway. We need a bypass, as originally proposed. We need to do this RIGHT, not put in another dinky road that will NOT alleviate traffic woes in this area. BUILD THE BYPASS, I say.</p>	<p>The comments in support of the proposed Parkway in lieu of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p>
Bruce R Taylor/ homeowner	2/16/2007	<p>I've lived in this area for just over 20 years now and have seen the steady growth and the figures indicating more growth in the future. From what I think I understand about the plans to "improve" the 202 corridor I don't believe the plans offered will improve much of anything along this busy road. Penndot and the two counties need to rethink their current plans and provide the necessary roadway to have any kind of relief. There are other sections of the state that have significant highway improvements, namely, getting to and from State College and the Pittsburgh area just to mention a couple. Surely we deserve the kind of planning and commitment that has been shown in these other locations. BRT</p>	<p>The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Michael S Gross/ Warrington	2/16/2007	you should incorporate as many overpasses as possible. By saving money now in not making the road the way it was planned as a bypass, it will cost HUNDREDS of TIMES more, when it has to be redone, This will happen very shortly as the land is developing quickly. Build the BYPASS not a parkway. At least build some overpasses more than planned. County line, rt 152, and Bristol should not be AT GRADE. You are wasting taxpayer funds.	<p>The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p> <p>The original right-of-way will be purchased as limited access with no access to private properties. Purchased right-of-way that is not used (if any) can be utilized for transportation purposes, not private development. 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. The need for environmental re-evaluations would include widening of the two lane portion of the Parkway and any proposed grade separations/interchanges along the Parkway (i.e. Parkway and County Line Road and Limekiln Pike [PA 152]).</p>
Bob Massaro/ retired home owner	2/16/2007	what is in the future say five years or so down the road ,with population growing the way it is? I believe you will have two inadequate roads to move traffic in the area .you are building this new road for cars only at a reduced speed .how is this gona move traffic ? BUSH can send all this money oversea . why cant we improve our living conditions here at home.	<p>The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p>

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Michael Kazimer	2/16/2007	February 16, 2007 When the Blue Route (Interstate 476) was proposed, people/municipalities on the southern end of the proposed location of the highway were opposed to it. When it was determined that the highway was going to be built, the final plans called for a six-lane highway between the Pennsylvania Turnpike Mid-County Toll Plaza and Route 3 and a four-lane highway from Route 3 to Interstate 95. The reason for the change from a six-lane highway to a four-lane highway was because of the great opposition to the highway by the people/municipalities on the southern end. On the southern end of the Blue Route traffic now gets so congested that people often have a hard time getting onto the Blue Route (particularly at rush hour) and traffic even backs down the on ramps onto local roads. Approximately five years ago - just ten years after its completion in December 1991 - people that use the road and the municipalities on the southern end said they want the highway widened one lane in each direction. Large highway projects must be voted on in Harrisburg. Since the Blue Route is a new highway, it was felt that the Legislature would not approve the widening. When voted on, the widening project was approved; however, PennDOT does not know where the money will come from. PennDOT is now looking to the Federal Government to fund the project. This is the same exact scenario with the 202 Bypass. People in Bucks County are opposed to the four-lane Bypass, so now a two-lane Parkway (country road) is proposed. All of the studies for thirty years have said build a four-lane bypass, and all of the land preserved was for a four-lane bypass. People in Bucks County say that building a bypass will only push development east. Buck County is already a developing county, and it is just going to continue. If the Parkway is built instead of the Bypass, it will be another big PennDOT mistake just like the Blue Route and I will guarantee that ten years after the Parkway is built, people will be saying PennDOT should have built a four-lane bypass. Sincerely, Michael Kazimer	The comments in opposition to the Parkway in its current design are noted. The comments in support of the previous bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
Cherie Noble/ Terrace at Montgomery Assoc	2/6/2007	Why does the proposed 700 section on the web show a two lane highway, while PennDOT is telling us it will be 4 lanes?	The Parkway concept includes a four-lane roadway south of Horsham Road and two lanes from Horsham Road to PA 611 with primarily at-grade intersections.
john and carol Honingford	2/5/2007	in this map, there are 2 houses that do not appear. Have these homes been purchased by the state? Are any homes on Quail drive or in the vicinity of Quail drive being removed or purchased?	PennDOT has not demolished any homes in the last six months.
John Honingford	2/5/2007	What is the date for a decision AND completion of the project? Our property values are significantly impacted due to the uncertainty associated with this project.	PennDOT plans to begin construction for the proposed Parkway in early 2008 and is scheduled to complete construction in late 2010.
Robert G. Koenig/ Brittany Pointe Estates	2/3/2007	The project is important to the economic health of the communities that it will serve. It is a disservice to the same communities to delay the project, and constantly run up the costs. Gridlock already exists during certain periods, and demands relief, sooner than immediately.	The comments in support of the proposed improvements are noted.

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Steven Fairlie	2/3/2007	It is my humble opinion that they 202 "parkway" will do more to contribute to gridlock than it will to alleviate it. Years of construction and expense to give us more of what we already have - choked traffic, stoplights at nearly every intersection, etc. The construction delays may be more trouble than they will be worth in the long-run. I would rather wait for a bypass. It is a disgrace that the state has not done anything meaningful to address the congestion in this area, and that everyone is rallying around the parkway as a solution instead of calling it what it is - a stopgap measure without a backup plan. What do we do when you've used up the available money and the corridor and the parkway is jammed?	The comments in opposition to the current design of the Proposed Parkway are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
Kevin Clausz	2/3/2007	The Parkway is extremely disappointing, and I thought PennDOT would have done much better than this idea in attempting to rectify the traffic problems occurring mainly in the Montgomery County area. At this point, the project sounds as if it's a done deal, and I wonder what brilliant idea PennDOT will come up with after the Parkway proves ineffective and frustrating to motorists.	The comments in opposition to the current design of the Proposed Parkway are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
John Schoell/ Home Owner - Stone Ridge	2/2/2007	20 years living and working in this area, this project is long overdue. Please make it happen. I am tired of the unnecessary long commute times and congestion within a relatively short distance.	The comments in support of capacity adding improvements are noted.

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Walter Weber/ North Wales Lions	2/1/2007	The idea of a 35MPH Parkway is a ridiculous compromise. Again a small group of dissidents is holding the motoring public hostage for their own selfish reasons. Look back to I476 and the reductions from 3 to 2 lanes. A natural bottleneck. Building a Parkway style 2 lane road is like building another cowpath road. When will we recognize the need for a comprehensive plan to resolve traffic issues, not another short term fix that will be outmoded when it opens (ie. I-76)	<p>The comments in opposition to the current design of the Proposed Parkway are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p> <p>PennDOT is committed to design the Proposed Parkway so that it meets the Department's design/safety standards for a 40 mph posted speed.</p>
Ken Boice/ Home owner	2/1/2007	I live in Montgomery township. I would like to see the bypass built. With today's traffic on 202 corridor the parkway concept is a nightmare. People say it will dump unwanted traffic in these areas. If someone gets off an exit they will more than likely live there. And to have stoplights or roundabouts at intersections on a major highway is crazy.	<p>The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p>
Tim McAteer	1/31/2007	The parkway needs to remain 4 lanes, even past 463. Don't let the gripes of a few disgruntled neighbors doom us all to continued hell in traffic. This plan has been in place for a long time, and anyone with that great of a concern should have raised it 20 years ago. This whole project should have been a major expressway, but we now have to tolerate it as a "parkway." Just give me my four lanes.	<p>The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
MCWEENEY FAMILY/ HOMEOWNER	1/30/2007	OUR FAMILY FULLY SUPPORT THE BYPASS CONSTRUCTION PLAN AS IS. PLEASE BUILD IT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. THERE ARE NO NEGATIVES IN THIS PLAN. THANK YOU	The comments in support of the current Parkway Project are noted.

**Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from
December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)**

Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Jennifer Borra/ Resident	1/25/2007	<p>The proposed bypass will interfere with a private access road to a residential community located off of Horsham Road and General Hancock Blvd. I am a resident of one of the townhomes that uses General Hancock road to access my house. The proposed plans show eliminating the stop light at Gen. Hancock and Horsham and making it an entrance only coming from West 463 and you can only enter going West onto 463. This is severe hardship to all of us who live in the townhomes that are accessible only from General Hancock blvd. We would have to enter onto the bypass and try to make a left turn across two lanes of traffic onto the service road entrance behind Costco just to enter into our development. That is a ridiculous hardship and burden for residents of our street to bear. Already, we were informed that Gen. Hancock Blvd. is a private road. The state cannot just alter the traffic pattern to suit its needs depriving us of ingress and egress to our homes. Furthermore, there are deer and other wetlands in the proposed bypass route right alongside General Hancock Blvd. building the bypass here would disrupt these animals and the lush vegetation along with bringing more noise, pollution, congestion, and accidents to an already busy area. The benefits of the bypass fall short once its reaches this area as it appears the same number of lights will be used to reach 63 (welsh road) as if someone were to use Upper State or Stump Road. I propose the bypass be stopped somewhere prior and then the extension be made from the West side of 309 down to 63. In the alternative, as a resident whose home value, air quality, noise quality, would all be reduced with the construction of the bypass in this particular area (alongside General Hancock blvd.) I would request that an overpass be created instead which would not disrupt the current access roads and also provide noise barriers to reduce the impact on this otherwise calm area of Montgomery Township. I understand the need for the bypass but in my particular section of it, it is fraught with more problems and will not make traffic any better in this particular area the way it is currently designed. Thank you for your time.</p> <p align="center">PennDOT Response</p> <p>Based on the current design, a full signalized intersection will be provided at the southern access point to Costco and General Hancock Boulevard. The northern (existing) access roadway will be designed as right-in/right-out for both Costco and General Hancock Boulevard.</p> <p>Direct access to Horsham Road will be provided via right-in/right-out based on comments from the residents at the Customer Advisory Committee (CAC) Meetings.</p>	<p align="center">PennDOT Response (continued)</p> <p>PennDOT proposed a cul de sac at the end of General Hancock Boulevard to eliminate cut through traffic in the community, but the residents preferred the right-in/right-out condition at Horsham Road. PennDOT will continue to work with the residents of the Terrace at Montgomery to minimize impacts to the related to traffic operations, visual and acoustic conditions as a result of the proposed Parkway. As requested by the residents of the community, PennDOT will consider options that include a gate along General Hancock Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.</p> <p>Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to proactively design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). The criteria are defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10 dBA increase over the existing condition. A summary of the noise analysis for this project is included in the EER starting on Page III-67 of the document While there will be increases in the Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Berms are proposed along General Hancock Boulevard to mitigate visual impacts. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. During final design, the location, length and height of the proposed berms will be finalized. PennDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent residents as the Department is refining these design features. Analysis of the proposed Parkway intersection with Horsham Road revealed that the projected daily volumes (approximately 24,000 vpd on Horsham Road) could be accommodated with an at grade intersection. An overpass would be more costly and environmentally impacting that the at-grade intersection concept. Potential additional impacts include greater encroachments into the historic Joseph Ambler Inn, natural resources, and the Terrace at Montgomery community.</p>

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Barbara Stechert/ Homeowner	1/24/2007	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to submit my comments for the February 28th meeting. My husband and I purchased a townhome in the Terrace at Montgomery, 4 doors from general Hancock Boulevard in October 2006. We were not informed of the potential bypass. (Other new buyers also did not have this information disclosed to them). We moved off of busy Welsh Road to find some peace and quiet in a small community setting. You can imagine the sense of sadness and betrayal we feel since finding out about this. We don't know if our sellers or the other sellers broke the law by not disclosing this potential highway just a few hundred feet from our door, but they did us a moral injustice. How many other unsuspecting homeowners are there who will now discover this project that has been dormant all these years? Also leaving at a busy intersection on Welsh Road for more than 20 years, I know how bad it will be on this stretch that is proposed. the stop light will make for a traffic jam, pollution, noise and major inconvenience for our access to our homes. It will also be adjacent to a day care center making that inhospitable. would you want your kids there? I feel deeply troubled by this. I understand that you are trying to work with our community to make this the most palatable for us but I fear nothing will. If this must go through, I beg you to reduce it to a two lane highway with an overpass over Horsham Road. If there is an intersection at Horsham Road, the traffic nightmare that currently exists will be far worse. Please allow us to continue to make a left turn into our community from Horsham Road and put up the promise sound barriers and landscaping. Our homes are all elevated and we will see all of this from our front and back yards. How sad and how ugly. Please reconsider all of this for the sake of communities like ours and the wildlife and wetlands that will be lost. Thank you. Barbara Stechert</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PennDOT Response</p> <p>Based on the current design, a full signalized intersection will be provided at the southern access point to Costco and General Hancock Boulevard. The northern (existing) access roadway will be designed as right-in/right-out for both Costco and General Hancock Boulevard.</p> <p>Direct access to Horsham Road will be provided via right-in/right-out based on comments from the residents at the Customer Advisory Committee (CAC) Meetings. PennDOT proposed a cul de sac at the end of General Hancock Boulevard to eliminate cut through traffic in the community, but the residents preferred the right-in/right-out condition at Horsham Road.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PennDOT Response (continued)</p> <p>PennDOT will continue to work with the residents of the Terrace at Montgomery to minimize impacts to the related to traffic operations, visual and acoustic conditions as a result of the proposed Parkway. As requested by the residents of the community, PennDOT will consider options that include a gate along General Hancock Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.</p> <p>Based on a preliminary noise analysis for the Parkway Alternative, the Department has been able to proactively design the proposed Parkway Alignment to keep the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) below the Department's impact criteria as outlined in PennDOT's Publication 24 (Noise Handbook). The criteria are defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10 dBA increase over the existing condition. A summary of the noise analysis for this project is included in the EER starting on Page III-67 of the document</p> <p>While there will be increases in the Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Berms are proposed along General Hancock Boulevard to mitigate visual impacts. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. During final design, the location, length and height 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>Analysis of the proposed Parkway intersection with Horsham Road revealed that the projected daily volumes (approximately 24,000 vpd on Horsham Road) could be accommodated with an at grade intersection. An overpass would be more costly and environmentally impacting than the at-grade intersection concept. Potential additional impacts include greater encroachments into the historic Joseph Ambler Inn, natural resources, and the Terrace at Montgomery community.</p>

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Cynthia Bradley/ Taxpayer	1/17/2007	I'm all for a new road in our area since every single intersection is gridlock in the area but please...do not put a roundabout at 152 and 202. There will be too much traffic for that situation. I know I've made this comment before but we're moving if something isn't done about the roads soon. Stop wasting tax payer money for all these public hearings and just build the thing before its outdated like the Blue Route.	The comments in support of the current Parkway Project are noted. There is no longer a roundabout proposed for the intersection at US 202 and PA 152.
Sharon Young	1/16/2007	Comment: I am adamantly opposed to the 202 Parkway. If a true "bypass" cannot be built, then build nothing. The idea of a parkway is ludicrous and a waste of my hard earned tax dollars. Thank you.	The comments in support of the previously planned Bypass are noted. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.
Yoon Kim/ Owner	1/2/2007	Hey. Please contact me regarding this project. Apparently the construction is going to take up a considerable portion of my backyard. I was not aware of this. I can be contacted through email or my cell. Thank you.	PennDOT will follow up with the property owner as part of the right of way process. All landowners directly impacted by the project will be compensated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and PennDOT's Relocation Assistance Bulletin No. 47.
Jim Evans/ Mastertech Auto Service	1/2/2007	How will the 202 parkway construction affect the operation of my business? Since I am also the property owner, what are the plans for the front of the property?	PennDOT will follow up with the property owner as part of the right of way process. All landowners directly impacted by the project will be compensated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and PennDOT's Relocation Assistance Bulletin No. 47.

G. Website Comments (W)

Response to Comments Posted on 202 Website from December 22, 2006 to March 15, 2007 (Descending Chronological Order)			
Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	PennDOT Response
Joseph DiMarco/ J & E Homeowners	12/29/06	Why are you building something that already is NOT WORKING in Montgomery Township (ANOTHER 2 Lane Roadway) - You are just building more of the same problem! WIDEN ALL OF THE EXISTING ROADS (Stump, Horsham, Lower & Upper State Roads, Township Line)- to 4 lanes. AFTER that has been done, then do another evaluation and see what additional is needed! Also WHY have the sound walls been removed from the plans (to save money)? YOU WANT TO SAVE MONEY? - REMOVE THE WALKING TRAIL and put back the sound wall!! The walking trail is going to bring strangers right into my backyard - check my address - My property backs-up right to the walking trail! To make matters worse I noticed on the revised plans of the walking trail that it does not stay close to the proposed road, it moves right near our property line - it moves CLOSER to the Montgomery Greene Development (the TOP of the Berm - right in our backyards. I am extremely discouraged by the decision makers of this whole thing. I realize that it is impossible to please everyone but this is crazy to build MORE (a 2 lane road) of what is NOT WORKING in the area! I hope you will listen and take this as a legitimate concern. Thank You Joseph DiMarco	<p>The comments in opposition to the Parkway are noted. PennDOT did consider several alternatives that considered widening/upgrades to existing roadways. The Proposed Parkway Alternative best met the identified needs for the project. The transportation benefits of the Proposed Parkway include: added roadway capacity between Welsh Road and PA 611, ten new links in local roadway network and creates more routing options/alternate routes, more efficient use of existing network, nine miles of new bicycling/pedestrian trails, as well as better incident management options and emergency response times. The Parkway Alternative has been recommended as the preferred alternative for this project.</p> <p>The comments in opposition to the proposed Shared Use Path (SUP) are noted. DVRPC has identified the Route 202 corridor as a priority bike route in the Delaware Valley Region. The SUP is consistent with the regional and local planning efforts for providing opportunities for alternate modes of transportation in the Route 202 Corridor.</p> <p>While there will be increases in the peak hour decibel levels (dBA Leq) in this community, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Landscaped earth berms are proposed along the Parkway corridor to mitigate visual impacts to adjacent communities. As a secondary gain, these earth berms provide an acoustical reduction for many residences in the community. As design progresses, PennDOT will finalize the details (i.e. location, length, height, and plantings) of the proposed berms, and will continue to coordinate with residents as PennDOT refines these design features.</p>
Earl Sullivan	12/26/06	where will the new design be located with respect to st. john neuman cemetery?	As shown on Page U-9 of the EER Update, the Proposed Parkway alignment goes through the eastern third of the cemetery property (closer to Stump Road for the first half of the property and then shifts to the west into the central area of the future expansion area as it approaches Detweiler Road, This northern shift was recently employed in consultation with the Archdiocese of Philadelphia and federal/state regulatory review agencies.