

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

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

*C. Public Hearing
Testimony (Transcript) [T]*

April 10, 2007

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

PennDOT Testimony

1

1
2 PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
3 MONTGOMERY AND BUCKS COUNTIES
4 PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY
5 - - -
6
7 Wednesday, February 28, 2007
8 Doylestown, Pennsylvania
9 - - -
10 HELD AT: Lenape Middle School
11 Doylestown, Pennsylvania
12
13 COMMENCING AT: 5:45 p.m.
14
15 BEFORE: Madeleine Fausto
16 Michael Boles
17 Bob Kehler
18 - - -
19
20
21
22
23 CLASS ACT REPORTING AGENCY, LLC
24 Registered Professional Reporters
1420 Walnut Street 133H Gaither Drive
25 Suite 1212 Mt. Laurel, NJ 08054
Philadelphia, PA 19103 (856) 235-5108
(215) 928-9760

PennDOT Testimony

2

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 MS. FAUSTO: Good evening,
3 ladies and gentlemen. My name is Madeleine
4 Fausto, project manager for PennDOT District 6.
5 To my right is Bob Kehler. He's our environmental
6 manager for District 6. To my left is Mike Boles.
7 He works for Boles Associates, one of the
8 consultants assisting the District in putting
9 together environmental and preliminary plans on
10 the project.
11 On behalf of the
12 Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, we
13 welcome you to tonight's hearing for the proposed
14 SR 202 Section 700 Parkway project in Montgomery
15 and Bucks County.
16 During the course of the
17 evening, feel free to go to the cafeteria to
18 review plans of the proposed improvements. There
19 are members of our design team available to answer
20 your questions that you may have regarding the
21 proposed parkway project.
22 The parkway alternative is
23 recommended to relieve traffic congestion and
24 improve capacity and safety on Route 202 from PA
25 63 in Upper Gwynedd Township, Montgomery County,

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

PennDOT Testimony

3

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 to PA 611 bypass in Doylestown, Bucks County. The
3 project will address current and future
4 transportation needs of this corridor.
5 PennDOT, in compliance with
6 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Act 120 of 1970,
7 has prepared an environmental evaluation report,
8 which I will be referring to as the EER.
9 The purpose of this hearing
10 tonight is for the Department of Transportation to
11 collect written and verbal testimony regarding the
12 EER. The public hearing is being held to provide
13 interested persons an opportunity to testify of
14 the effects of the project, including its social,
15 economic and environmental effects of the proposed
16 action as described in the EER.
17 Copies of the EER have been
18 made available for public review since December
19 22, 2006. It's available at various locations
20 throughout the study area and project web site,
21 which is www.us202-700.com.
22 Official project testimony
23 may be given by any of the following means; oral
24 testimony at to tonight's public hearing, written
25 testimony presented at tonight's hearing, written

PennDOT Testimony

4

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 testimony that you can send to the PennDOT
3 District Office during the common period, and
4 e-mail testimony via the project website.
5 All comments will become
6 part of the formal record of the hearing. Oral
7 comments will be limited to five minutes or less.
8 Written comments may be submitted in support of
9 the oral testimony tonight or it can be sent to
10 the district to my attention, Madeleine Fausto,
11 Project Manager, Engineering District 6-0, 7000
12 Geerdes Boulevard, King of Prussia, PA 19406.
13 The procedure for tonight
14 allows anybody who cares to offer his or her
15 opinion about the project to provide testimony
16 with the court stenographer. PennDOT has been
17 taking reservations to speak since December 22,
18 2006.
19 Reservations are schedule
20 every five minutes between now around 11 o'clock
21 tonight to provide everyone an opportunity who
22 wishes to provide a statement to testify.
23 If you were unable to obtain
24 a convenient five-minute time period and you want
25 to have your opinion expressed as part of the

PennDOT Testimony

5

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 public record, you can write it and provide it to
3 PennDOT by March 15, 2007. Whether you give your
4 testimony here or whether you offer written
5 testimony, it will be incorporated into the record
6 and given the same consideration as part of the
7 project record.
8 If you have a comment or
9 after being here tonight something occurs that you
10 may want to make a point on the public record,
11 please send it to the address that I just stated
12 above or previously and mail it by March 15, 2007.
13 Written comments postmarked
14 after March 15, 2007 will be included in the
15 overall project record, but will not be included
16 in the EER testimony.
17 The procedure for this
18 evening will be those people who have an assigned
19 time will have a maximum of five minutes to
20 present their opinion. There will be periodic
21 breaks for PennDOT's staff, but we will be
22 available until all testimony is received.
23 A brief description of the
24 project is as follows: The study limits for
25 Section 700 are from Welsh Road, PA 63, Montgomery

PennDOT Testimony

6

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 County, to the existing PA 611 Bypass in Bucks
3 County and extend from the existing Route 202 to
4 Stump or Lower State Roads. Municipalities within
5 the study area in Montgomery County include Lower
6 Gwynedd, Upper Gwynedd and Montgomery Townships.
7 In Bucks County, the municipalities include
8 Chalfont, New Britain and Doylestown Boroughs,
9 along with Warrington, New Britain and Doylestown
10 Townships.
11 DVRPC has also identified
12 Route 202 as a priority in the region. Therefore,
13 all project alternatives considered as part of
14 this process included bicycle and pedestrian
15 facilities to be consistent with the regional
16 planning initiatives in the project area.
17 The Department's vision of
18 proposed improvements includes the following
19 elements: Four additional traffic lanes will be
20 provided between PA 63, Welsh Road, and PA 463,
21 Horsham Road; two additional travel lanes would be
22 provided between Horsham Road and PA 611; the
23 project will consist of 11-foot wide travel lanes
24 and a 5-foot paved shoulder on each side; bridges
25 in the two-lane section will be 32 feet wide

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

PennDOT Testimony

7

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 inside of parapets; the specific design of
3 individual intersections will be determined in
4 consultation with the local municipalities as we
5 proceed; a 12-foot shared-use path will be
6 provided with the right-of-way; operating speed of
7 the roadway will be 40 miles per hour; and the
8 budget for the project will be 200 million.
9 Within this funding limit, the project will be
10 designed to minimize delay and maximize mobility
11 and level of service along the corridor.
12 PennDOT has consulted with
13 appropriate officials as designated by the chief
14 administrative officer of the Department of
15 Agriculture, the Department of Environmental
16 Resources, Department of Community Affairs,
17 Department of Health, the Historical and Museum
18 Commission and the Fish Commission regarding the
19 environmental hazards and the agricultural,
20 conservation, sanitary, recreation and social
21 considerations that may arise by reason of the
22 location, design, construction or reconstruction
23 of any part of this transportation facility.
24 PennDOT received letters
25 from the Department of Agriculture, Fish and Boat

PennDOT Testimony

8

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 Commission and Department of Conservation and
3 Natural Resources after review of the EER. None
4 of the Act 120 agencies have outstanding
5 objections to the selection of the proposed
6 parkway as the preferred alternative.
7 The agencies expressed
8 interest in continued minimization and mitigation
9 of impacts to resources in the final design phase
10 of the project. PennDOT will continue to work
11 with the agencies to reduce impacts, where
12 possible, and finalize mitigation commitments for
13 the project.
14 Since this project is 100
15 percent state funded, it will be completed in
16 accordance with Section 2002 of Pennsylvania's
17 Act 120 of 1970. This regulation requires that
18 special efforts be made to protect publicly owned
19 parks and recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl
20 refuges, and historic sites. A Section 2002
21 Evaluation was prepared in conjunction with the
22 EER and it's also available for public review
23 through March 15, 2007.
24 Again, as required by the
25 Pennsylvania Act 120 of 1970, PennDOT prepared an

PennDOT Testimony

9

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 Environmental Evaluation Report and the following
3 subject areas were evaluated and impacts of the
4 project were reported in the EER.
5 These subject areas are
6 residential and neighborhood character and
7 location; conservation including air, erosion,
8 sedimentation, wildlife and general ecology of the
9 area; noise, air and water pollution; multiple use
10 of space; replacement housing; displacement of
11 families and businesses; recreation and parks;
12 aesthetics; public health and safety; fast, safe
13 and efficient transportation; civil defense;
14 economic activity; employment; fire protection;
15 public utilities; religious institutions; conduct
16 and financing of government including the effect
17 on the local tax base and social service costs;
18 natural and historic landmarks; property values;
19 education, including the disruption of school
20 district operations; engineering, right-of-way and
21 construction costs of the project and related
22 facilities; maintenance and operating costs of the
23 project and related facilities; and operations and
24 use of existing transportation routes and programs
25 during construction and after completion.

PennDOT Testimony

10

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 I am submitting as part of
3 the written testimony the full version of the
4 write-up for each individual subject area. Pretty
5 much this concludes PennDOT's formal testimony for
6 tonight's hearing.
7 Again, all oral and written
8 testimony that you provide today as well as
9 written statements postmarked no later than March
10 15, 2007 will be part of the public hearing
11 record.
12 Before we start the
13 testimony from the people who made reservations, I
14 would like to take this opportunity to thank
15 Central Bucks School District for affording us the
16 opportunity of using their facilities for
17 tonight's hearing.
18 Bob will go over the
19 procedures and how we can carry out the testimony.
20 MR. KEHLER: For tonight's
21 testimony, our procedure will be as follows. We
22 will call three names at the time they requested
23 be available to testify in the auditorium. Again,
24 we are running a little behind schedule, but it
25 shouldn't be a problem.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

PennDOT Testimony

11

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 When you begin to testify,
3 please state your name, spell your name and give
4 your address and any organization you are
5 representing.

6 You will have a five-minute
7 time limit to present your testimony. We have a
8 coach here that will let you know the time
9 element. When you start, He'll start the timer at
10 five minutes. When it's down to one minute, he'll
11 give you a yellow card. When it's over, you get a
12 red card and you are out of here.

13 MS. FAUSTO: We will give
14 you 30 seconds to then kind of wrap up your
15 testimony once we raise the red card.

16 MR. KEHLER: We'd just ask
17 your cooperation. We have a pretty full agenda.
18 We will get started. The first three we have is
19 Bob Cotton, Peggy Smith and Henry Rowan. Are all
20 three of you are here? Is Henry, Henry Rowan?
21 All right. The next one is Jack Atar. Elaine
22 Vanpars? Marilyn Jacobson? Okay. We will start
23 with Bob Cotton.

Testimony of Mr. Bob Cotton

24 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
25 My name is Bob Cotton. I have resided in New

12

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 Britain Township for the past 47 years. I spent
3 38 years in service to New Britain Township
4 including the planning commission and 32 years as
5 a supervisor. As such, I am representing the
6 Board of Supervisors this evening.

7 New Britain Township
8 supervisors have past a resolution in favor of the
9 proposed 202 Parkway design. I am submitting that
10 resolution for the record.

11 In 1969, many of the local
12 municipalities and planning commissions past
13 resolutions recommending that PennDOT build a
14 four-lane bypass extending from Montgomery
15 Township to connect directly to the bridge in New
16 Jersey, State of New Jersey.

17 About 11 years ago, a public
18 hearing similar to this one tonight was held where
19 the majority of the testimony favored building the
20 202 bypass. A few months later, the secretary of
21 transportation approved of the Route 202 Section
22 700 bypass project costing about \$224 25 million.

Testimony of Mr. Bob Cotton

12

23 The project was subsequently approved by the
24 Federal Highway Administration in 1998.
25 Until three years ago, the

Testimony of Mr. Bob Cotton

13

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 bypass was tied up in various legal actions. The
3 new Governor Rendell, after reviewing
4 high-priority transportation projects throughout
5 the Commonwealth, announced that the Route 202
6 bypass, now estimated to cost about 450 million,
7 along with several other state projects could not
8 be built due to the high cost. He did indicate
9 there was a need to provide some traffic relief in
10 the Route 202 Section 700 corridor and that the
11 proposed right-of-way could be preserved.
12 Secretary of Transportation Alan Feeler convened a
13 meeting of all of the effected communities,
14 municipalities, county planning commission and
15 legislators, to a meeting in Harrisburg exactly
16 two years ago this month.
17 An alternate proposal to
18 build a parkway was suggested which would have two
19 lanes instead of four. The secretary said the
20 300-foot right-of-way would be preserved. The
21 project cost would be about \$200 million funded
22 entirely by PennDOT.
23 During the past two years,
24 PennDOT's planners, engineers, consultants and
25 members of all the effected municipalities, county

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Bob Cotton

14

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 planners and legislators have been meeting monthly
3 to develop a parkway concept and preliminary
4 design which everyone could support. Many
5 compromises were made by all the participants.
6 There are several reasons
7 why New Britain Township supports this plan. The
8 existing traffic congestion on Route 202 running
9 through New Britain Township, Chalfont Borough and
10 New Britain Borough continues to adversely effect
11 the public safety and health of our residents.
12 This congestion has resulted
13 in twice-daily long lines of vehicles stacked up
14 in all directions. Around here, fire fighters,
15 ambulance attendants and police using the Route
16 202 Section 700 corridor are delayed in responding
17 to life-threatening emergencies. These delays are
18 encountered every day.
19 School busses, trash trucks,
20 delivery trucks and tractor trailers during rush
21 hours further add to the delays. One of the
22 consequences of the stacked, idling vehicles
23 greatly affects the quality of the residents who
24 live in the corridor and as well as the drivers
25 and passenger who must breathe the exhaust

Testimony of Mr. Bob Cotton

15

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 emissions from the jam up. It is expected that
3 the proposed two-lane limited access 202 parkway
4 will notably help to decrease the amount of
5 congestion and associated problems mentioned
6 previously.
7 There are several related
8 off-site improvements which will enhance traffic
9 flow besides the parkway. One is County Line Road
10 will be increased to five lanes starting from Wawa
11 on Route 202 in New Britain Township and ending
12 just past Stump Road in Montgomery County. These
13 current improvements are being designed and built
14 by two separate PennDOT contractors.
15 In addition, improvements to
16 the following intersections which are included in
17 the parkway design should further reduce local
18 tie-ups and decrease vehicle accidents and
19 injuries.
20 The improvements include
21 additional turn lanes, crosswalks, sidewalks,
22 improved traffic signalling and greater
23 visibility. The intersections are Upper State and
24 Bristol Road, Upper State and 152, Upper State
25 Road and County Line Road.

Testimony of Mr. Bob Cotton

16

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 It should be noted that New
3 Britain Township and Chalfont Borough are
4 providing significant lane for mitigation of some
5 of the wetlands associated with the new parkway as
6 planned in the original design.

7 If the quality of the above
8 plan and improvements are completed, this should
9 be a much better flow of traffic and less
10 congestion along the 202 corridor. I would thank
11 you very much.

12 MR. KEHLER: Peggy Schmidt.

13

Response to Bob Cotton

1. The comments regarding the history of the project and recent coordination activities are consistent with the information presented in the EER.
2. The statements in the New Britain Township support portion of the testimony are consistent with the traffic delays in existing condition as identified in the project traffic simulation analysis. The anticipated traffic operations benefits of the Proposed Parkway are included in the EER and Traffic Technical Support Data.
3. As noted in the Testimony, the Proposed Parkway Project is just one of several projects (including the independent County Line Road Improvement) to provide traffic relief in the study area in the Design Year 2020.
4. The improvements to Upper State Rd. and Bristol Rd., Upper State Rd. and Route 152, and Upper State Rd. and County Line Rd. are part of the Proposed Parkway project to provide adequate traffic operations at the key intersections with the Parkway in the Project area.
5. PennDOT will prepare a Section 404 Permit Application for the Route 202 Section 700 Project for submission to the US Army Corps of Engineers. An integral component of the permit application is the preparation of the project wetland mitigation proposal. Final plans will be prepared for the wetland mitigation plan during the permitting process.
6. The Resolution in support for the Proposed Parkway alternative is included in the formal project record.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Peggy Schmidt

16

13 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
14 I'm Peggy Schmidt, the executive director of the
15 Partnership Transportation Management Association
16 of Montgomery County, or PTMA. We are a nonprofit
17 organization in existence in since 1993 and are
18 located in the heart of the Route 202 Section 700
19 County, 434 North Main Street, North Wales.
20 The PTMA works with
21 municipalities, organizations and private partners
22 to increase mobility for a variety of ways with
23 all individuals. On behalf of the board of
24 directors of our organization, I'm here to voice
25 their support for the Route 202 Section 700

Testimony of Ms. Peggy Schmidt

17

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 parkway alternative.
3 A popular Beatles' song in
4 the 1960s was entitled The Long and Winding Road.
5 Is it just a coincidence that planning for Route
6 202 began back then.
7 As we move into 2007, our
8 long and winding road has become a very congested
9 one, one in the need of a parkway alternative that
10 is being presented here today.
11 The new alternative while
12 not a fantasia, will provide additional local and
13 regional capacity. The limited access highway
14 with proposed maximum speeds of 40 miles per hour
15 will enable traffic to move efficiently along the
16 roadway.
17 It's an affordable option
18 with a debt being funded and, maybe the most
19 important item for many of the residents that
20 travel this congested roadway, it can be
21 implemented in the immediate future.
22 Over the past several years
23 our member municipalities along with PennDOT, the
24 county planning agencies, the Delaware Valley
25 Regional Planning Commission and elected officials

Testimony of Ms. Peggy Schmidt

18

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 in other municipalities that are located along and
3 east of Route 202 Section 700 work diligently
4 through project design technique to create a
5 balance between moving traffic and a livable local
6 community. We commend them for all their hard
7 work, persistence and dedication to this project.

8 The parkway, a new roadway
9 created within the same right-of-way as the
10 original Section 700 bypass, is their consensus
11 choice and we support them on this decision.

12 This new roadway will
13 preserve the right-of-way set thoughtfully aside
14 by local municipalities for many years. This
15 retention of this right-of-way is imperative in
16 our communities because we are one of the fastest
17 growing areas in the state. The recommendation
18 that any remaining right-of-way not used for the
19 parkway can only be utilized for public purposes
20 is the right one.

21 The parkway alternative will
22 significantly reduce operational delays and
23 increase the response time for emergency
24 responders. The safety of the residents in this
25 Route 202 parkway corridor should be and is the

Testimony of Ms. Peggy Schmidt

19

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 most important concern of local elected officials.

3 In addition, the provision
4 to dedicate a pedestrian and bicycle facility will
5 help improve safety for non-motorized vehicles.
6 Pedestrians and bicycle facilities will also help
7 to address the growing concerns and efforts to
8 have individuals participate in more healthy
9 lifestyle activities.

10 Environmental impact such as
11 wetlands, surface water and the water quality of
12 streams have been reviewed and mitigation measures
13 proposed. The parkway alternative is also
14 consistent with the long-range land use planning
15 efforts of the municipalities in the region.

16 Based on these facts plus
17 review of the Environmental Evaluation Report for
18 State 202 Section 700 we respectfully request and
19 support this alternative. The parkway alternative
20 can help us change the last line of that Beatle's
21 song, don't keep me waiting here. Thank you.

22 MR. KEHLER: Marilyn
23 Jacobson? Is Henry Rowan here? Jack Atar?
24 Eileen Vanpars. After Marilyn will be Rebecca
25 Kiefer.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Peggy Schmidt

1. The comment in support of the Proposed Parkway is noted and is consistent with the information presented in the EER.

Testimony of Ms. Marilyn Jacobsen

20

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.

3 I'm Marilyn Jacobson from Chalfont Borough. I've
4 lived in the Chalfont area for 26 years. I am a
5 member of the Chalfont Borough Council. I'm the
6 appointed representative for Chalfont to the task
7 force and have been working with my fellow task
8 force members for the last two years on developing
9 the parkway concept.

10 Chalfont Borough has passed
11 a resolution in support of the Section 700, 202
12 parkway. We feel that this parkway has been
13 identified as a preferred alternative to meet the
14 defined goals of the project and help manage
15 traffic congestion problems along the 202
16 corridor.

17 Currently, we feel that we
18 have a public safety hazard that exists along the
19 existing 202 corridor. The residents of Chalfont
20 are affected daily, out quality of life through
21 increased traffic times increased congestion on
22 our local roadways and delay in emergency response
23 times and increased pollution.

24 We have hundreds of
25 preschool and school-aged children that travel

Testimony of Ms. Marilyn Jacobsen

21

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 daily by bus and private vehicle along the
3 existing corridor subject to long commute times
4 and unhealthy air pollution.

5 The 202 parkway would help
6 channel the local and pass-through traffic in a
7 more efficient and effective manner while taking
8 significant amounts of traffic off our local roads
9 and allow for a safer, more liveable community
10 with improved air quality.

11 We are at the point where we
12 have the capacity of what -- we're at capacity
13 with our roads. It only takes one little problem
14 to create gridlock. We really feel that the
15 parkway is the best alternative to help improve
16 the environment, the quality of life in our little
17 borough. Thank you.

18 MR. KEHLER: Rebecca Kiefer.
19 Frazier Wall?

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Marilyn Jacobsen

1. The comment in support of the Proposed Parkway is noted and is consistent with the information presented in the EER.

Testimony of Ms. Rebecca Kiefer

21

20 THE SPEAKER: My name is
21 Rebecca Kiefer. I'm a township supervisor in
22 Warrington. I have lived in Warrington for over
23 30 years. I spent ten years on the zoning board
24 and have been involved in a number of local things
25 and seen changes that have happened in Warrington.

Testimony of Ms. Rebecca Kiefer

22

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 Some of the things that I
3 wanted to mention is that during that time we've
4 seen a huge increase in traffic. We have watched
5 it. We helplessly stood by while the increased
6 traffic has changed the quality of our lives and
7 been detrimental for us.
8 Many years ago the studies
9 were done. As a matter of fact 20 years ago I was
10 talking to Ben Wilson. I'm a novice. I'm a youth
11 compared to Bob. I've only been working on this
12 for 20 years. I feel that I can look up to
13 someone who has more information on it.
14 However, the thing I wanted
15 to state is that the traffic that we're having a
16 problem with mostly in Warrington is pass-through
17 traffic. It's not the local traffic. The people
18 that live their, quality of their lives have been
19 harmed by the fact that they can't even get out of
20 their driveways. During the rush hours or times
21 when people want to pass through to get to the
22 shopping centers and otherwise Montgomeryville,
23 they use the local roads because traffic will seek
24 the area of least resistance. If they have to
25 wait in a traffic jam in Chalfont, New Britain,

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Rebecca Kiefer

23

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 they're going to find a local road to get where
3 they want to go. I do want to state that I think
4 it's going to cause some consternations, the fact
5 that it was very clearly defined that the 202
6 expressway was the solution. It was the
7 recommended solution for the traffic that we have.
8 However, we don't have that
9 option anymore because the fact is that there is
10 not enough money to put the 202 expressway and
11 there's a certain amount of money obligated to
12 which we can use to improve traffic movement
13 throughout the township, throughout this whole
14 corridor.
15 The thing that we have to do
16 is take advantage of the opportunity to look at
17 this and ensure that our 300-foot corridor is
18 acquired and preserved and that it's used for
19 transportation purposes; that the two-lane parkway
20 that we're putting in there is a safe road to
21 ensure that we have emergency vehicle access to
22 it; to ensure that we have a pedestrian walkway
23 that is safely protected with lights underneath
24 the road where it passes under the road at
25 Pickertown Road and continues along; to ensure

Testimony of Ms. Rebecca Kiefer

24

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 that the residents where this is traveling through
3 their backyards are protected and their way of
4 life is preserved by having berms and plantings
5 and whatever division that we can provide there
6 for them to continue the quality of life that they
7 have currently.
8 There are changes in between
9 the four-lane expressway and the two-lane parkway
10 which will eliminate some of the higher density
11 traffic. What this will do is it will provide
12 immediate relief for some of the local roads that
13 are currently being over burdened.
14 The issues that we have to
15 concern ourselves with in addition to that are the
16 environmental issues of which we're discussing
17 tonight. One of them is the relocation of
18 wetlands which is going to be placed into two
19 areas, one in New Britain and one along Kansas
20 Road in Warrington. We must ensure that we have
21 that.
22 I'm going to make a plea to
23 the environmental and the Army Corps. of Engineers
24 that I would also like to see a trail that passes
25 along or through that area so that people can have

Testimony of Ms. Rebecca Kiefer

25

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 a true learning experience about the use of
3 wetlands and the use of providing these areas to
4 help recharge the water table.

5 Again, another issue that we
6 have in the area is problems with the
7 environmental issues for recharging the water
8 table. There are many things we can do here.

9 I think one of the most
10 important things about this study that we've done
11 and the proposal is the attention that would be
12 placed on all of the network of roads in the
13 surrounding area to ensure that all of these
14 sections, and Bob mentioned some and there are
15 numerous intersections and I know other speakers
16 are going to talk about that, that all these
17 intersections must be addressed because if you're
18 going to have a two-lane parkway that goes through
19 this area and have attended intersections where
20 traffic is going to be congested coming to and
21 from the parkway, then all of those intersections
22 must be addressed to make sure that we not only do
23 not exacerbate it, but that we also eliminate the
24 area of contention where we have some true
25 problems with line of sight. I thank you very

26

Testimony of Ms. Rebecca Kiefer

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 much for your time. I would implore you to move
3 ahead with this project.

4 MR. KEHLER: Frazier Wall.
5 Jeff Lamaron?

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Rebecca Kiefer

1. The statements regarding the increase in traffic congestion in the project study area are consistent with the information provided in the EER.
2. The statements in support of the previous bypass option 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.
3. 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.
4. The proposed parkway project includes intersection improvement at Bristol Road and Upper State Road as well as Limekiln Pike (PA 152) and Upper State Road. These intersection improvements, in conjunction with the proposed parkway, substantially relieve traffic congestion in these areas in the design year 2020.
5. PennDOT will prepare a Section 404 Permit Application for the Route 202 Section 700 Project for submission to the US Army Corps of Engineers. An integral component of the permit application is the preparation of the project wetland mitigation proposal. Final plans will be prepared for the wetland mitigation plan during the permitting process. The comment in support of trails through the wetland mitigation sites for educational purposes is noted.
6. In response to concerns regarding recharging the water table, the parkway design will include a large number of smaller sized infiltration sites located throughout the corridor. This design will reduce the disturbance in any one area and shorten the required travel distance for water to reach an infiltration site.

Testimony of Mr. Frazier Wall

26

6 THE SPEAKER: My name is
7 Frazier Wall, W-A-L-L. I'm a 37-year resident of
8 Warrington Township and I've spent 25 years on the
9 planning commission as a chairman and vice
10 chairman of Pembroke.

11 I'm going to echo probably a
12 lot of what Becky mentions because generally I
13 think we're on the same page as representing not
14 only our own views, but the views of many people
15 in Warrington. I'm going to be a little bit more
16 from the summary point in my discussion.

17 I think we all have of to
18 realize that 202 is a highway. It's not a dream.
19 It's not a play thing. It is something we must
20 have. It's not something that you can play around
21 with and play around with peoples' motions.

22 Doylestown has an effective
23 bypass. Newtown has an effective bypass. The
24 rhetorical question is: Why can't Chalfont and
25 New Britain have an effective bypass? There's no

Testimony of Mr. Frazier Wall

27

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 reason why. Warrington has preserved a 300-foot
3 right-of-way in negotiations with property owners
4 and developers and considerable sacrifice in time
5 and money. I can tell you it hasn't been easy.

6 With 97 percent of Bucks
7 County citizens driving to work, shouldn't the
8 emphasis be on the cartways and the lanes of the
9 bypass? The bike paths in the environmental
10 studies are nice features, but they're auxiliary
11 to the main purposes of the road.

12 Please explain, and I'm sure
13 that you should have the concept, how the present
14 parkway arrangement can be expanded in the future
15 to a four-lane expressway. This is a must for the
16 effective traffic plans for the Montgomeryville,
17 Doylestown corridor.

18 The last thing, and I don't
19 want to start any animosities, shouldn't there be
20 somebody from Norristown and Lower Gwynedd here as
21 well as the people from Buckingham and Solbury
22 since they're the same distance in the other
23 direction? You would think they would have the
24 same interests. Thank you all. ?

25 MR. KEHLER: Jeff? James

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Frazier Wall

1. The statements in support of the previous bypass option 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.
2. The comments regarding the proposed (SUP) as auxiliary to the main purpose of the road are noted.
3. 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]).
4. The EER was provided to Lower Gwynedd Township for review and comment. They are also part of the Task Force. The EER was also made available through the project website. Copies of the EER were not forwarded to Norristown Borough for the project.

Testimony of Mr. Jeff L'Amoreaux

28

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 Miller?

3 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.

4 My name is Jeff Lamaro, 367 Stoney Hill Drive in

5 New Britain Township. I've been a traffic

6 engineer for 20 years and I have some very

7 difficult acts to follow here.

8 As I've been sitting back

9 there, I've decided that I am not going to chicken

10 out and I am going to say some of the ideas that I

11 have in my head about this thing, so here we go.

12 It's a common thought

13 that -- first of all let's just put it to bed. I

14 think we ought to build this thing as soon as

15 possible. It's a common thought that

16 intersections along this roadway will hold the

17 great deal capacity.

18 A lot of the capacity is

19 really not so much in the two lanes. It's what

20 happens at the intersections. Let's think about

21 this for a minute. We have a 100, 200, \$300

22 million highway and we're going to take the

23 capacity that's on that roadway and make it the

24 responsibility of the local municipalities who in

25 Pennsylvania must maintain the traffic signals.

Testimony of Mr. Jeff L'Amoreaux

29

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 I don't think that that's a

3 really good method of public policy. It seems as

4 though you can get animosity from one town to the

5 next. I don't like to see that being set up that

6 way.

7 What I would like to see,

8 especially on a national highway system, there

9 should be a different way to control it. Those

10 who know me will know what I'm about to say and

11 that is that I don't think that we should take the

12 concept of the roundabout and deep six it yet.

13 For example, New Jersey DOT

14 is proposing four roundabouts on the South Branch

15 Parkway east of Flemington, New Jersey. This

16 connects Route 202 and 31. They're also proposing

17 to rip out Route 29 in front of Trenton along the

18 waterfront and replace that with roundabouts along

19 the boulevard. They're dead serious about

20 replacing the Flemington circle with a roundabout.

21 Pretty soon there's going to

22 be roundabouts all over the place within 20 miles

23 and we are not even thinking about this here.

24 I've heard it mentioned earlier that while in

25 order to get the capacity we need we would have to

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Jeff L'Amoreaux

30

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 have two-lane roundabouts and PennDOT wasn't ready
3 for that yet. Well, they just proposed one on
4 North Baltimore Pike and PA 41 down near Avondale.
5 That's a real thing now. We should really
6 consider that. Being uneasy about roundabouts is
7 entirely 100 normal. It's expected before people
8 going and get used to these things.

9 The time is right to do it
10 because tomorrow PennDOT's own staff is attending
11 roundabout training at Delaware Valley Regional
12 Planning Commission. It's being taught by a
13 fellow that I know named Howard McCullick, who is
14 fantastic. He works for the New York State
15 Department of Transportation. In New York State,
16 before they'll install a traffic signal, they have
17 to be dead sure that a roundabout won't work.
18 It's their policy now. Very interesting little
19 point there.

20 I would suggest that if
21 people are uneasy about roundabouts let's take a
22 local intersection and do a demonstration project.
23 I would suggest that we look at 152 and Upper
24 State Road as an example where you could take a
25 traffic signal down very easily and fit one in

Testimony of Mr. Jeff L'Amoreaux

31

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 with a minimum amount of paving. Give it a try.
3 Give it a try.
4 A couple of other points.
5 First is I'm very concerned about -- well, if
6 anybody remembers the way that Route 15 used to be
7 around Gettysburg before they went and dualized
8 it, it was a one-lane each way. It used to neck
9 down to one lane each way from a four-lane
10 section.

11 The trouble is that at night
12 you often had people thinking that it was two
13 lanes each way and they just weren't seeing the
14 other half of the four lanes. You had a horrible
15 head-on collision problem there. Please take due
16 care and pay attention to that when we're doing
17 this.

18 Also, aesthetics are very
19 important on this roadway. These people have
20 waited a very long time. This thing needs to look
21 top notch like the Baltimore Washington Parkway.
22 That kind of level of detail with stonework, care
23 and craftsmanship.

24 Bucks County and Montgomery
25 County deserve it. I look forward to what other

Testimony of Mr. Jeff L'Amoreaux

32

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 people have to say this evening. I thank everyone
3 for your time.

4 MR. KEHLER: James Miller.

5 Henry Rowan? You'll be after James.

Response to Jeff L'Amoreaux

1. The comments in support of the Proposed Parkway are noted.
2. The comments in support of roundabouts are noted. 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.
3. PennDOT has designed the transition area for four lanes to two lanes at Horsham Road to meet current safety standards as outlined in PennDOT's design manual.

As noted in the EER, transportation projects no longer have the sole purpose of moving traffic, but of supporting the communities in which they are located. There is a nationwide transportation initiative, called Context Sensitive Design or Context Sensitive Solutions, which requires a balance between moving traffic and benefiting the surrounding communities.

4. PennDOT has embraced this new way of approaching transportation investments and has identified this project as a pilot project to demonstrate the principals of Context Sensitivity.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. James Miller

32

6 THE SPEAKER: Ladies and
7 gentlemen, good evening. My name is James Miller.
8 I'm the chief of police of Warrington Township,
9 852 Easton Road, Warrington, PA. I've been a
10 policeman for 30 years.

11 My intent tonight is to
12 emphasize the importance of the upgrades to the
13 roadways and to the intersections continues to the
14 parkway. Heavy traffic already exists on the
15 state roads in Warrington Township, which is
16 County Line Road, Limekiln Pike and Bristol Road.

17 In my capacity, I deal with
18 traffic congestion issues throughout Warrington
19 Township on a daily basis. I have seen a steady
20 increase in the volume of traffic and all of these
21 free state highways and also the township roads.
22 I would hope that the Pennsylvania Department of
23 Transportation has fully evaluated the impact of
24 the parkway construction on all of the roadways
25 within the township that will potentially be

Testimony of Mr. James Miller

33

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 affected to ensure that the project will include
3 current conditions. I understand that the
4 department of transportation has indicated they
5 are going to improve a number of these
6 intersections and also roadways leading to the
7 parkway.

8 I would like to go on record
9 with concerns of the following road and also
10 intersections with emphasis that they need to be
11 improved. Without these improvements, the affect
12 on traffic conditions will become more severe.

13 Some of these roads are
14 already on your list but again I need to mention
15 for emphasis: The intersection of Upper State
16 Road and Bristol Road; intersection of Upper State
17 Road and Limekiln Pike; intersection of County
18 Line Road and Upper State Road; intersection of
19 County Line Road and Stump Road; intersection of
20 Bristol Road and Stump Road; intersection of
21 Bristol Road and Lower State Road; and
22 construction of the roadways that are also
23 adjacent to the parkway between those
24 intersections; the length of Upper State Road with
25 particular attention to the curve approaching the

Testimony of Mr. James Miller

34

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 northbound direction to Bristol Road. There's a
3 line of sight problem there and traffic backs up
4 there on a frequent basis. With the parkway, that
5 needs to be addressed.

6 The following road and
7 intersections will be affected indirectly due to
8 the traffic to and from the parkway: County Line
9 Road and Titus, County Line Road intersection with
10 Lower State Road and Limekiln Pike. I understand
11 that the County Line Road project will probably
12 address most of these intersections. However, I'm
13 also concerned that that project may be postponed
14 or removed when we go forward for some reason.

15 Thank you for your time and consideration.

16 MR. KEHLER: Henry Rowan.

17 Then Jim Clements.

Response to James Miller

1. The comments in support of improvements to the existing intersection in Warrington Township are noted.
2. The proposed parkway project includes intersection improvement at Bristol Road and Upper State Road, Bristol Road and Stump Road as well as Limekiln Pike (PA 152) and Upper State Road. These intersection improvements, in conjunction with the proposed parkway, substantially relieve traffic congestion in these areas in the design year 2020.
3. The intersections at County Line Road and Upper State Road and County Line Road and Stump Road are also being improved as part of the independent County Line Road Improvement Project. Currently there are no plans to improve the other existing intersections and roadway segments in Warrington Township as part of any programmed project.
4. As noted in the EER the proposed parkway improvement provides substantial relief to the traffic congestion at the major signalized intersection within the project area in the Design Year 2020.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Henry Rowan

34

18 THE SPEAKER: I'm running a
19 little late. It just took me a little bit better
20 than two hours to get here from Philadelphia.
21 Fortunately, I wasn't on the Schuylkill because
22 that would have been worse. Even worse would have
23 been on the Blue Route.
24 A lot of people will be late
25 because they're stuck on 611. Some will be late

Testimony of Mr. Henry Rowan

35

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 because they're on Route 13 and of course some
3 will be late because they're on Route 202. The
4 point I'm trying to make is that there is no magic
5 bullet. There is no magic solution for our
6 transportation problems. A four-lane road won't
7 necessarily make a whole lot of difference. Doing
8 nothing won't make a whole lot of difference.
9 What we have here is a
10 situation where some people would like to see
11 nothing done, some people would like to see an
12 expressway. I don't think that either of those
13 are viable alternatives at this point.
14 I think we need to
15 appreciate the change that has occurred in this
16 process. For that, I'd like to start by thanking
17 the secretary of transportation, Al Feeler, who
18 actually has led what amounts to a revolution in
19 transportation in Pennsylvania.
20 The process that this road
21 has undergone in this process has been nothing
22 short of miraculous. Over the past couple of
23 years, we have come to appreciate the wisdom and
24 the input of Bradley Jackson, who has acted as
25 consultant to the project, but more impressive has

Testimony of Mr. Henry Rowan

36

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 been the change in the PennDOT staff. I've got to
3 say that the PennDOT staff has really stepped up
4 to the challenge of what amounts to a very
5 fundamental institution of change.

6 They're looking at building
7 roads differently now than they did under previous
8 administration. A lot of people said build it.
9 The reality was that when the road got its
10 approval, in quotes, it was a \$225 million
11 project. Nobody objected when it went to \$465
12 million.

13 We're blowing our estimates
14 by a 100 percent. It wasn't just on 202. It was
15 on virtually every project in District 6. They
16 were blowing their estimates by 100 percent.
17 That's the story. That's where we need to be
18 looking.

19 How does a state agency miss
20 by 100 percent every time. That's where I'd like
21 people to start looking at, if we're going to go
22 into the past. As we go to the future, I looked
23 forward to working with PennDOT.

24 They've done a magnificent
25 job. Five years ago nobody in Buckingham would

Testimony of Mr. Henry Rowan

37

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 talk to anybody in PennDOT. Andy Warren said,
3 we're going to dump all of our snow in Buckingham.
4 That's changed. We have a great relationship now
5 with PennDOT and it's to everybody's benefit. I
6 would like to see that continue. I would like to
7 see this road built as soon as possible. There's
8 still issues out there I think that can be
9 resolved.

10 I also would like to thank
11 everybody that's been part of the task force
12 process. Whether we agree or disagree on all of
13 the issues, the reality is everybody worked on
14 them with a lot of effort.

15 The disagreements can go
16 aside and I think everybody can be reasonably well
17 satisfied there's a project that's going to serve
18 this community for many years into the future.

19 MR. KEHLER: Thank you. Jim
20 Clements and then Representative Rick Taylor.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Henry Rowan

1. The comments in support of PennDOT's new policies and initiatives for transportation planning as proposed by the Secretary of Transportation are noted.
2. Project costs typically increases over time in final design as a function of time, value of money, and project scope creep. The duration of the process for 1998 to 2004, plus the inclusion of items not anticipated in the previous FEIS resulted in the increase in project cost.
3. The comments in support of the Task Force coordination as part of this project and future projects are noted.

Testimony of Mr. James Clements

37

21 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
22 My name is James Clements. I've been a resident
23 of Chalfont for 53 years and I was last in this
24 room 47 years ago. I am the current president and
25 retired fire chief of Chalfont Chemical Fire

Testimony of Mr. James Clements

38

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 Company No. 1. Many years ago I testified on the
3 importance of the Route 202 bypass. Today I'm
4 testifying on behalf of the Route 202 parkway.
5 The past ten years the
6 traffic congestion in Chalfont has increased
7 exponentially as every municipality to our east
8 and north have had their open grounds developed.
9 Hundreds of homes have been built and hundreds
10 more are about to be built.
11 As these homes are being
12 planned and built, there's been little thought to
13 increasing the infrastructure necessary to support
14 these new homes who are now suffering the effects
15 of lack of regional planning.
16 Secondary roads such as
17 Upper State Road and Stump Road and Ferry Road are
18 now gridlocked with the overflow of 202. It's no
19 longer unusual to see traffic backed up on Ferry
20 Road or Upper State Road for over a half mile
21 during the morning and afternoon rush.
22 It is now the norm for
23 traffic to be backed up for a mile or more in both
24 directions out from the center of Chalfont. Route
25 152 traffic then becomes backed up both southbound

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. James Clements

39

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 and especially northbound. Chalfont is in total
3 gridlock for periods of time during the high
4 volume rush hours of the morning and the
5 afternoon. As time passes, these periods of
6 maximum congestion continue to grow longer and
7 longer.
8 The effect of this
9 congestion is a double-edged sword that severely
10 impacts fire company response times. Volunteers
11 have great difficulty in getting to the fire house
12 and then fire apparatus has to fight its way to
13 the scene of the emergency.
14 There are now times when we
15 have great difficulty in even getting out of the
16 firehouse onto Route 152. These delays increase
17 the risk to the residents of our community and
18 they continue to grow more severe as each he day
19 passes.
20 As a fire apparatus driver
21 for over 30 years, I have watched the problem grow
22 more serious with each passing year. Fire
23 apparatus becomes bogged down in this congestion.
24 It is not because drivers intentionally block the
25 apparatus. It is simply because they have no

Testimony of Mr. James Clements

40

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 place to go. With the narrow confines of the
3 Route 202 corridor, traffic has a great deal of
4 difficulty in granting the right-of-way to
5 responding fire apparatus and the volunteers as
6 well.
7 Today we are discussing the
8 importance of the new two-lane highway and sadly
9 not the bypass. Without this new highway, traffic
10 conditions will continue to deteriorate at a
11 dramatic rate. Traffic must be given an
12 alternative route to go around Chalfont. We must
13 be able to route the large amount of truck traffic
14 around our town.
15 Most of our traffic is
16 transient, not originating from Chalfont and
17 Chalfont is not its destination. If you give
18 these drivers a choice of driving through the
19 gridlock or driving around the gridlock, what
20 choice do you think they'll take?
21 Additional improvements are
22 now being discussed such as the Bristol Road
23 extension, addition of a turn lane on 202 south
24 onto 152 north and the coordination of traffic
25 signals on Route 202 at the intersections of 152

Testimony of Mr. James Clements

41

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 north and 152 south. This will have a dramatic
3 impact on the congestion. These improvements
4 coupled with a new parkway will go a long way in
5 reducing the congestion.

6 Shortly we will be faced
7 with the replacement of bridge on 202 between 152
8 north and 152 south. The effects of this
9 replacement will surely increase the congestion.

10 Even with the careful
11 planning that PennDOT has done and the planning
12 stage of construction, there will still be major
13 disruptions to the flow of traffic in this heavily
14 used corridor of less than a mile.

15 We have studied this
16 situation to death. We have had hearing after
17 hearing. Studies have been ongoing for 30 years.
18 Now is the time to take the necessary action to
19 alleviate the problem. Each day that you delay in
20 building this roadway you are endangering our
21 residents.

22 PennDOT needs to now take a
23 proactive stand, forge ahead, get this project off
24 the drawing board and start moving dirt. Our
25 community is in desperate need. Fire emergency

Testimony of Mr. James Clements

42

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 times are being directly impacted. All emergency
3 services response times have been impacted. Our
4 community is at risk and that risk continues to
5 grow. We fully support the construction of the
6 202 parkway. Thank you.

7 MR. KEHLER: State
8 Representative Rick Taylor. Sherry Noble?

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to James Clements

1. The comments regarding increased development and related traffic congestion over the last 10 years are consistent with the information presented in the EER.
2. The proposed Parkway will improve traffic operations on the project area roadway network and improve emergency response time in the US 202 corridor.
3. PennDOT will work with the emergency service providers to maintain access for emergency vehicles during the independent bridge replacement project.
4. The comments in support of the proposed Parkway alternative are noted.

Testimony of State Representative Rick Taylor

42

9 THE SPEAKER: Thank you for
10 providing me this opportunity to speak at this
11 meeting. I'm here to testify for my support for
12 Route 202 700 project.

13 While I think most of us
14 will agree that this is a far from perfect project
15 and radically different from the one originally
16 envisioned, given the two choices of building or
17 not doing anything I believe building is the best
18 alternative.

19 I recognize that the bypass
20 has been pared down from a \$465 million project to
21 a project to a \$200 million project and has gone
22 from an expressway to a parkway and many design
23 elements that satisfied most such as sound
24 barriers are no longer part of this current plan.

25 We can discuss what ought to

Testimony of State Representative Rick Taylor

43

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 be all we want, but it comes down to this: We
3 need action now. We need to build it before costs
4 escalate and then even this project becomes cost
5 prohibitive.

6 The project is important to
7 justify from the standpoint of continued economic
8 development and livability for the whole region in
9 the legislative district that I represent.

10 At present, too many roads
11 are congested. The problem will only be
12 exacerbated by continued inaction. It is vital to
13 have good transportation and infrastructure to
14 continue attracting and maintaining businesses,
15 spurring economic development and prosperity for
16 the region and, as you heard, for emergency
17 traffic.

18 I know few of us really
19 enjoy sitting in a traffic jam. The time spent in
20 the car is time away from our family, time away
21 from doing business and all the other components
22 that go into an already hectic life.

23 I've been an advocate about
24 providing us with other options than driving cars.
25 One of the particular aspects I especially liked

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of State Representative Rick Taylor

44

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 in this project is that it incorporates trails and
3 alternative means of moving people around.
4 Additionally, this falls with Montgomery County's
5 comprehensive plan to build a network of trails.
6 Too often we think our first
7 method from Point A to B is getting into our
8 vehicles. This parkway and plan offers an
9 opportunity to safely ride a bicycle or take a
10 child for a walk in a stroller. The point is that
11 this parkway, a car is not the only option.
12 I also appreciate the
13 integration of landscaping as a key part of the
14 design and the environment being considered.
15 Additionally, maintaining the right-of-way from
16 development will offer space between the road and
17 the nearby dwellings, which I consider crucial.
18 While I recognize that this
19 is important and this project needs to go ahead, I
20 also want to be sensitive and advocate on behalf
21 of the citizens that live adjacent to the parkway.
22 I understand the issue of
23 increased noise and safety for young children
24 because I live on Bethlehem Pike, which as
25 everyone can imagine is a pretty busy road.

Testimony of State Representative Rick Taylor

45

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 Specifically, I want to talk about the specifics
3 of the citizens of Terrace development in
4 Montgomery Township such as Mr. Howard Auerbach.
5 I ask that you consider the
6 parkway noise and make measures that are
7 economically feasible for this project. Further,
8 I understand the concern that as congestion builds
9 driving may cut through General Hancock Boulevard,
10 a private drive. Like it was said, it's a path of
11 least resistance.
12 To be sure, most drivers are
13 not aware that they're using a private road. The
14 wear and tear will be coming out of the pockets of
15 the homeowners. They may not be aware of it, but
16 they will. This is not the driver's fault, nor is
17 it the community's. They should not have to bear
18 the cost of repairing and resurfacing.
19 In closing, I think these
20 concerns are legitimate and important. They're
21 important to me. Ultimately, I think that 202 700
22 parkway must be built. It will offer relief from
23 congestion and offer more choices to promote
24 alternative methods of moving people from one
25 destination to another. Thank you for your time.

Testimony of State Representative Rick Taylor

46

- 1 PUBLIC HEARING
- 2 Please do not hesitate to call my office if you
- 3 require any clarifications of my testimony.
- 4 Please submit my testimony as part of the written
- 5 record. Thank you.
- 6 MR. KEHLER: Sherry. Corine
- 7 Cody?

Response to State Representative Rick Taylor

- 1. The comments in support of the Proposed Parkway alternative are noted.
- 2. The comments related to current traffic conditions in the project area and the No Action alternative are consistent with the information presented in the EER.
- 3. The comments in support of the Shared Use Path (SUP) are noted.
- 4. The comments made on behalf of adjacent property owners are noted. PennDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners to address concerns regarding specific design details that are part of the Proposed Parkway design and minimize impacts to the natural, community and cultural resources in the project area. PennDOT has received several comments from the residents of the Terrace at Montgomery residential development that have clearly articulated the concerns of the community.
- 5. PennDOT completed project noise studies in accordance with PennDOT Publication 24 (Project Level Highway Traffic Noise Handbook). Based on the 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 Publication 24 (Noise Handbook).

The criteria is defined as a predicted design year sound level of 66 dBA for these residences and/or a 10dBA 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 dBA Leq in this community as noted above, these increases do not warrant the construction of sound barrier walls. Landscaped earth 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. 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 adjacent residents as PennDOT refines these design features.

- 6. 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.
- 7. 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 Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Cherie Noble

46

8 THE SPEAKER: Hi. My name
9 is Sherry Noble. I'm here to represent Terrace of
10 Montgomery Homeowner's Association that
11 Representative Taylor so kindly did mention some
12 of your hassles we are worried about.
13 The community members of
14 Terrace at Montgomery along with the homeowners
15 Devon Court are vehemently opposed to the design
16 of the proposed 202 700 bypass parkway. We are
17 going to submit our petition of 162 signatures to
18 that effect.
19 The reason for our lack of
20 support by our community members include quality
21 of life issues, future home values, safety issues
22 and access to our community and private road by
23 bypass parkway motorists.
24 The current plan includes a
25 traffic light behind Costco to provide access to

Testimony of Ms. Cherie Noble

47

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 our community for residents as well as
3 northbound-only access to Amy Court. This access
4 to our community is also provided to any motorist
5 stuck in heavy traffic due to congestion caused by
6 the narrowing of the highway from four lanes to
7 two lanes of Horsham Road.
8 General Hancock Boulevard is
9 a private road maintained by community members.
10 Not surprisingly, our community members don't wish
11 to have use of our community roads by motorists
12 using the bypass parkway. PennDOT's plan has
13 ignored this problem.
14 Adding to the issue of
15 community access is the lack of a turning lane
16 into our community at the Costco light. The
17 two-lane 202 proposal included a turning lane
18 while the current four-lane plan does not. Will
19 there at least be a left arrow light to facilitate
20 turning into your our community?
21 Bypass plans also limit our
22 community access to Horsham Road and General
23 Hancock Boulevard and our traffic light and
24 turning lane would be removed. This will limit
25 our acces to both Horsham Road and our community.

Testimony of Ms. Cherie Noble

48

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 There are solutions available to these problems.
3 If there were an overpass at Horsham Road, there
4 would be no need for a traffic light at Costco and
5 we could maintain access to our community with the
6 current traffic light at General Hancock Boulevard
7 and Horsham Road. Eliminating the traffic light
8 at Costco and closing the access to Amy Court
9 would remove the problem without traffic to our
10 community.

11 These changes would also
12 take away access to the bypass parkway by our
13 residents, which we view as unimportant compared
14 to the problems that would be involved. Surely
15 motorists using the bypass parkway would not miss
16 the traffic light at Costco or Horsham Road.

17 Since overpasses cost much
18 more money than traffic lights, PennDOT could go
19 back to the two-lane version of the road as is
20 presently currently on the 202-700 website. Is it
21 ethical to inform the public that the road will be
22 a two-lane parkway when the final plan is for a
23 four-lane highway with traffic lights? The
24 two-lane version of the road would eliminate the
25 congestion and pollution resulting from the road

Testimony of Ms. Cherie Noble

49

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 narrowing to two lanes that is proposed to occur
3 literally in the view of within significant
4 distance of our homes.

5 The new reverse -- of no
6 sound barriers is appalling and a safety concern
7 as well. With no barriers on the ground level of
8 the highway, which is in 50 feet of our
9 communities, we consider it hazardous to our young
10 children and pets who are capable of inappropriate
11 and inadmissible behavior.

12 The lack of sound barriers
13 is an issue that will affect our daily quality of
14 life and our home values, especially those on
15 elevated ground.

16 Additionally, there are
17 issues connected to living in the construction
18 zone for two years. Construction equipment will
19 chew up and General Hancock Boulevard after
20 putting up with daily traffic and truck hassles as
21 well as noise and dirt we will be rewarded with a
22 roadway that most of us don't want, motorists
23 invading our private streets. This was not our
24 understanding when we purchased our homes. We
25 have been frustrated by the lack of problem

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Cherie Noble

50

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 solving while communicating with PennDOT
3 representatives. Our issues need to be addressed
4 rather than ignored.
5 In closing, with the
6 Pennsylvania educated in our historical tradition,
7 I'm sickened the Joseph Ambler Inn, 200 year-old
8 historical property will be negatively impacted
9 with the bypass parkway. Since when does a
10 roadway for shoppers and commuters trump a
11 historical property in Pennsylvania.
12 We have this petition, which
13 we, the homeowners of Terrace at Montgomery,
14 believe that the proposed 202 parkway shouldn't be
15 built without an overpass at Horsham Road and
16 appropriate sound barrier.
17 The traffic light at 202
18 bypass and Horsham Road plus another light at
19 Costco would be detrimental to our quality of life
20 and cause increased traffic congestion, noise and
21 pollution and severely limits access to our homes
22 and threaten home value. We do not feel our needs
23 of the community have been met by the current
24 design. We invest our aims to prevent PennDOT's
25 planning and we command that PennDOT do the right

Testimony of Ms. Cherie Noble

51

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 thing for all.
3 MR. KEHLER: If anyone has
4 written testimony after they get done reading they
5 want to turn into the stenographer, give it to us.
6 We will make sure it gets incorporated. Mitchel
7 Myerson or Reyerson. Lynn Bush will be after
8 Mitchell.

Response to Cherie Noble

1. The comments in opposition to the Parkway in its current design are noted. The petition from The Terrace at Montgomery Homeowners Association is included in the project record on Page VII- 222.
2. Route 202, section 700 was previously programmed as a limited access expressway. The expressway project had an estimated construction cost of \$465 million. In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.

PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations. PennDOT worked the Task Force in the preliminary design of the parkway option during the preparation of the environmental document.

An Environmental Evaluation Report (EER) was made available for public review on December 22, 2006 and a Public Hearing was held on February 28, 2007. PennDOT considered all comments received during the public review period and determined that the Parkway Concept as presented in the EER is the preferred alternative with revisions in response to public commentary. This concept includes a four-lane roadway south of Horsham Road and an at-grade signalized intersection at Horsham Road and the Parkway.

The Parkway 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 and a protected left turn lane at the Parkway/Costco Drive based on the comments from the community in consultation with Montgomery Township.

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 Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.

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

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Cherie Noble (continued)

There is only one grade separated interchange proposed for this project at PA 309. An at-grade intersection at PA 309 and the Parkway was not feasible to accommodate the Design Year 2020 daily volumes of 40,000+ vehicles per day (vpd) on PA 309. PennDOT's 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 at Horsham Road. A grade separated interchange would be more costly and environmentally impacting than the at-grade intersection concept. Placing a grade separated interchange at the Parkway between Upper State Road and General Hancock Boulevard would also restrict needed space for the limited access ramps to/from the Parkway and Horsham Road. Potential additional impacts include greater encroachments into the historic Joseph Ambler Inn, natural resources and the Terrace at Montgomery community. Therefore, PennDOT will pursue the current design with an at-grade intersection at the Parkway and Horsham Road.

3. 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.

4. 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

Currently, the sound levels in this area range from the low 50s dBA in the southern end of the development farthest away from Horsham Road, to the mid/upper 50s closer to Horsham Road, and in the low 60s dBA for those sites immediately abutting Horsham Road. Proposed sound level increases at the residences will vary based on their proximity to Horsham Road, the Parkway, access points for the Terrace at Montgomery, and the location/dimensions of the berms. For example, some residential units on Anthony Court in the southern part of the development will have predicted sound levels that change from 50 (currently) to 54 dBA with the Parkway. Some residential units on Amy Court (closer to Horsham Road) will have predicted sound levels that change from 53 (currently) to 56 dBA with the Parkway. And finally, some residential units on Devon Court (closest to Horsham Road) will have predicted sound levels that change from 62 (currently) to 63 dBA with the Parkway.

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.

Response to Cherie Noble (continued)

5. PennDOT's objectives for this project include improving capacity for the roadway network in the Design Year 2020. Again, increasing network connectivity and providing alternate routes for local trips are also identified needs for this project. Horsham Road is an integral State Route (SR 0463) in the project area roadway network. Providing direct access to/from Horsham Road at the Parkway is vital to the Parkway alternative concept.

In order for these alternate routes and improved capacity to be met, PennDOT will construct four lanes in this area with six signalized intersections in the first 1.6 miles of the proposed Parkway. This will provide access to this largely commercialized zone (PA 309 Corridor) within the study area. PennDOT has eliminated one signal at the previously planned Connector B in the vicinity of the Terrace at Montgomery to minimize impacts to resources in the area without adversely affecting the traffic operations in the vicinity of PA 309 and the Parkway.

The remaining traffic signals south of Horsham Road along the Parkway are necessary to maintain the traffic operations along the four-lane segment of roadway. North of Horsham Road, there are four signalized intersections in the remaining seven miles of roadway to PA 611.

6. 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.
7. 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.

8. As part of the Section 106 consultation process PennDOT has conducted with the property owner and Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission (PHMC) regularly potential impacts to the historic Joseph Ambler Farmstead. The PHMC concurred that the proposed Parkway project will have No Effect on the Joseph Ambler Farmstead.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Corine Cody

51

9 THE SPEAKER: My name is
10 Corine Cody. I'm a resident of Doylestown
11 Borough. Our community citizens have been called
12 complacent in the recent newspaper article. I
13 maintain it's not complacency. It's exhaustion.
14 We are tired of explaining
15 why we need a four-lane expressway and having our
16 facts ignored. We are tired of restating the
17 wastefulness of building only two lanes. We are
18 tired of pointing out the congestion and traffic
19 hazards that will continue with the proposed
20 roadway construction.
21 We're tired of giving input
22 that is negated by officials who don't live here.
23 We're tired of being told that while a four-lane
24 202 expressway is needed in Montgomery County up
25 to Horsham Road magically the traffic evaporates

Testimony of Ms. Corine Cody

52

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 so that only two lanes are needed for 202 in Bucks
3 County. We are tired of being asked for ten years
4 what is right for this area and then being told,
5 this is what you're going to get.
6 No it's not complacency.
7 It's exhaustion. The environmental impact report
8 is well done and it's hoped that the 300-foot
9 width is retained for the length of the road.
10 The task force from our
11 communities has given time and energy to do the
12 best they could given the edith that they had no
13 choice but to work with two lanes. However, the
14 fact remains what this community needs is what was
15 originally planned 30 years ago, a four-lane
16 expressway that would realistically relieve the
17 congestion of traffic in Central Bucks. No, it's
18 not complacency. It's exhaustion.
19 MR. KEHLER: Mitchel.

Response to Corrine Cody

1. The statements in support of the previous bypass option are noted.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Mitch Meyerson

52

20 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
21 My name is Mitch Meyerson. I have some random
22 notes. Bear with me. I'm not much a speech
23 maker. I come tonight as a resident and as
24 borough councilman in Chalfont. Brief history,
25 I've only lived here for less than three years.

Testimony of Mr. Mitch Meyerson

53

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 After one year of living here, I was elected to
3 borough councilman. I think that speaks a lot of
4 the representation that we have had in the past
5 and what we still continue with to this date.
6 I think people have been
7 disgusted with how projects like this have gone.
8 The waste is enormous. Let me get back to my
9 notes. I'm disgusted and just appalled at the
10 notion that just taking what you're offered or
11 you'll get nothing at all.
12 I'm a child of the '60s.
13 When I grew up, we were able to land a man on the
14 moon. Why we wouldn't get this four-lane highway
15 done, which everyone admits is clearly needed, is
16 beyond me.
17 Someone mentioned in the
18 hall tonight that it's all politics. It was all
19 politics, one group fights another and people just
20 not getting the job done. We all agree we need
21 the four-lane highway. The two-lane parkway is a
22 local road.
23 To use PennDOT's own words
24 against them, when they came to Chalfont with
25 their ideas to help Chalfont with existing 202 in

Testimony of Mr. Mitch Meyerson

54

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 conjunction with what they're doing, one of the
3 comments they made when they came to study the
4 roundabout -- which they wasted thousands of
5 dollars on where they wanted to put a roundabout
6 where the car wash is where 152 connects to 202,
7 it was a stone's throw away from another
8 intersection, it made no sense, infeasible, but
9 spent they spent thousands of dollars on that.

10 I'm sorry. I'm so angry at
11 how everything's going. To have this local
12 road -- what they said was, if you build it they
13 will come. They were talking about some of these
14 other local roads. If you build it, they will
15 come and what they will do is dump more local
16 traffic to more local roads, bring in more
17 development, more opportunities for builders to
18 come. They'll see another local road available
19 for their new townhouse community. It's going to
20 increase existing local traffic.

21 If you had a road that got
22 you from Point A to Point B overflying Points B
23 and C, that would solve the problem. Then go on
24 from there. I don't understand why we have to
25 settle for what we're settling for. We all pay

Testimony of Mr. Mitch Meyerson

55

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 our fair share of taxes. I don't think we're
3 getting what we're paying for.

4 As a councilman, I deal with
5 PennDOT all the time. I could tell you right now,
6 now that I'm sitting on that side of the table,
7 the amount of money wasted is fantastic, not just
8 for PennDOT, but for all phases of government.
9 There's so much waste. You could build a 30-lane
10 highway with the amount of money that they wasted.
11 Our taxpayer dollars are being thrown away every
12 single day.

13 I have no doubt they will
14 probably get it built. I am one of two councilman
15 in Chalfont to vote against approval of this
16 parkway local road. I just don't have the
17 confidence that PennDOT's going to get half of
18 what they say is going to be built done correctly.

19 I can't even get them to fix
20 the hole in front of borough hall, which is on
21 their own roadway, in the right manner. In fact,
22 they were supposed -- they announced they would
23 repave 152 this year. Then all of the sudden,
24 they lost it off the schedule by a
25 misunderstanding, they said. It's that kind of

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Mitch Meyerson

56

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 stuff that's driven us crazy. I have no
3 confidence PennDOT. I don't see why we are
4 settling for second. We are just as equal as the
5 rest of the state.
6 The money is actually there.
7 You have to cut the waste out and put it where it
8 belongs. This is just another local road. I
9 think we need to just keep up the pressure and get
10 what we've asked for, what we deserve and what we
11 need. Thank you.

Response to Mitch Meyerson

1. The statements in support of the previous bypass option 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.

Testimony of Ms. Lynn Bush

56

12 THE SPEAKER: My name is
13 Linda Bush. I'm executive director of Bucks
14 County Planning Commission. I'm here to speak on
15 the behalf of both the Bucks County Planning
16 Commission and the Bucks County Board of
17 Commissioners.
18 Both boards have passed
19 resolutions in support of the parkway alternative
20 as the best available option to add new capacity
21 to our roadway network. For many of the county
22 residents and for county officials, this was not
23 their first choice. However, it is now our best
24 choice to improve mobility in the 202 corridor.
25 The Bucks County Planning Commission adopted a

Testimony of Ms. Lynn Bush

57

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 resolution supporting the parkway on February 7,
3 2007. They county commissioners adopted a similar
4 resolution on February 21, 2007.
5 Both boards in adopting the
6 resolution recognize the very sincere commitment
7 of our community members who care deeply about
8 their community and who have fought hard for
9 roadway improvement and who have come together in
10 the past year to develop a feasible project.
11 The resolution reads that
12 the Bucks County Board of Commissioners supports
13 the Section 700 Route 202 parkway alternative and
14 original agency charged with the duty of providing
15 a safe and efficient system of highway in your
16 region to expedite their efforts to complete this
17 highway to provide the Bucks County community with
18 the new road to improve mobility and ease
19 congestion. Both boards adopted that.
20 Finally, I would like to
21 urge on behalf of the county commissioners that
22 PennDOT complete its right-of-way acquisition and
23 deliberations of the Delaware Valley College and
24 other properties along the way. Thank you.
25 MR. KEHLER: Bob Meyers.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Ms. Lynn Bush

1. The two resolutions in support of the proposed Parkway are included in the Project Record. The Resolution from the Board of Commissioners is shown on Page VII-21. The Resolution from the Planning Commission is not shown in this document.
2. Upon completion of the environmental clearance process, PennDOT will continue the right-of-way acquisition process for the project.

Testimony of Mr. Bob Beyers

58

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 Robert Harley?

3 THE SPEAKER: I'm Bob

4 Beyers, Chase Limited located on County Line Road.

5 I thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak

6 this evening. I hope you folks are getting

7 hazardous duty pay because you deserve it.

8 We have invested millions of

9 dollars to bring people from all over the country

10 to our area, not only for our business, but to

11 help our neighbors to help build their businesses

12 and help the tourism of this area.

13 One of the things that

14 happened when some of these 80,000 people come to

15 visit us is they love our facility. They love

16 what we have done, but the people who come through

17 Chalfont or down 252 absolutely tell horror

18 stories depending on times of day. They do not go

19 home happy and they do not go home encouraging

20 people to come back.

21 It's the exact opposite of

22 what we have tried to accomplish. We tried to

23 build a facility that will benefit our neighbors,

24 benefit our communities and our obviously help

25 ourselves. We have 108 employees who work for us.

Testimony of Mr. Bob Beyers

59

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 I have watched employees, new hires who once they

3 had problems getting through Chalfont, said I'm

4 going to work somewhere else. We have had

5 problems with the deliveries. When a delivery

6 hasn't come in, we know it's -- we are not able to

7 complete our projects, get them out on time.

8 We got problems with

9 ambulances not getting there to deal with people

10 who have fallen in the visitor's center or

11 employees that have had problems. We desperately,

12 desperately need to get a road built. Now,

13 anybody with any common sense knows we need a

14 four-lane road. We are not going to get it.

15 This state is looking for

16 every single excuse it can possibly find not to

17 build this road. Look at the history. We finally

18 got a chance to get a two-lane road. For heaven's

19 sake, please take that. Let's get this thing

20 built. It's 20 years too late. Let's get

21 something. That's all I have to say.

22 I hope for heaven's sake I

23 live to see -- a good friend of mine who worked

24 with me to try to get this road built for about

25 ten years has passed away. I hope I'm not dead by

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Bob Beyers

60

- 1 PUBLIC HEARING
- 2 the time the road gets built, but that's a good
- 3 possibility.
- 4 MR. KEHLER: State
- 5 Representative Kathy Watson?

Response to Bob Beyers

1. The comments regarding increased development and related traffic congestion are consistent with the information presented in the EER.
2. 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.
3. The proposed Parkway will improve traffic operations on the project area roadway network and improve emergency response time in the US 202 corridor.

Testimony of Mr. Bob Harley

60

6 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
7 My name is Bob Harley. I'm the president of the
8 New Britain Township Republican Club. I was asked
9 by one of our members to read his letter of Robert
10 C. Bender to Pennsylvania department of
11 Transportation, concerning Route 202 parkway
12 bypass project Section 700. Please allow these
13 comments to be entered into the record in absolute
14 support of the proposed 202 parkway project.
15 I reside within New Britain
16 Township and formerly served as the New Britain
17 Township manager and emergency management
18 coordinator from 1980 to 1998. I now serve as a
19 member of the board of directors of the Chalfont
20 Emergency Medical Services Corporation.
21 For over 25 years I have
22 been involved a public service and public safety
23 issues within our community and have actively
24 participated in numerous meetings, discussions and
25 hearing related to the 202 traffic problem and is

Testimony of Mr. Bob Harley

61

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 potential solutions. I strongly support the
3 completion of the proposed Route 202 parkway
4 project and alternative currently proposed roadway
5 improvements, which will help alleviate traffic
6 congestion in the Chalfont, New Britain area.
7 The fact is that we have
8 long past the point of local traffic congestion
9 and have suffered inconvenience. The current
10 living of daily traffic congestion has risen to
11 the point where essential public safety services
12 including police, fire, ambulance and highway
13 services are regularly delayed and adversely
14 impacted.
15 There's no perfect solution
16 to this problem. Any action we take including the
17 do-nothing option will have both benefits and
18 detriments. We need to realize if we continue to
19 wait for consent, we will never ever build another
20 roadway. We must do what is right for the
21 majority at the same time fairly compensating any
22 land owner adversely impacted by the project.
23 We must move forward. Lives
24 are being put at risk every day due to the levels
25 of traffic congestion in the Chalfont area. This

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Bob Harley

62

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 situation will only continue to worsen while we
3 debate and await this long-needed traffic relief.
4 We have likely allowed the bypass project to get
5 away from us due to repetitive debate over the
6 issues, all while cost to the taxpayers increased.
7 In fact, we are now
8 considering a parkway at a greater cost than the
9 bypass would have cost to complete when it was
10 initially proposed. We are still debating the
11 same issues as we did 30 years ago. Let's not be
12 foolish and allow this opportunity to pass while
13 we again seek the perfect solution.
14 Completion of this project
15 with the resultant traffic relief regardless of
16 how much or how little is essential to the public
17 safety of the residents, businesses and visitors
18 to the Chalfont, New Britain area. This project
19 should proceed immediately and continue with
20 urgency until completed. Respectfully, Robert C.
21 Bender.
22 MR. KEHLER: Representative
23 Watson. Scott Shinger?

Response to Bob Harley

1. The comments in support of the proposed Parkway are noted.
2. The proposed Parkway will improve traffic operations on the project area roadway network and improve emergency response time in the US 202 corridor.

Testimony of State Representative Katherine Watson

62

24 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
25 My name is Catherine Watson. For the past 28

Testimony of State Representative Katherine Watson

63

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 years, I've lived with my husband and family at
3 1931 Alalusa Road in Warrington Township, Bucks
4 County.
5 Early in 1982 I was made
6 aware of the proposed Route 202 bypass project and
7 after personally researching the issue along with
8 my husband, who is a civil engineer, I became a
9 supporter of the project and its goal of moving
10 traffic efficiently through the area and off local
11 roads.
12 During the 1980s and early
13 '90s, I attended meetings concerning the bypass.
14 On one occasion I testified in favor of it as a
15 private citizen and community resident.
16 Concurrent with the
17 protracted discussions about the proposed Route
18 202 bypass project, Warrington, New Britain and
19 Doylestown Townships exploded with residential
20 development. The accompanying vehicular traffic
21 began to clog the local roads, particularly Route
22 202 through Chalfont and New Britain Boroughs.
23 Therefore, public support
24 for the bypass project increased in the
25 municipalities immediately adjacent to Route 202

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of State Representative Katherine Watson

64

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 in both Bucks and Montgomery County. Opposition
3 to the roadway project in the form of lawsuits
4 came from the municipalities outside of the
5 proposed corridor who held the belief that if you
6 build it they will come. The hard, cold truth is
7 PennDOT didn't build it and they came anyway.
8 Thus, we are in a situation
9 in 2007 where Route 202 is jammed with traffic
10 which spills over to the transgenial roads such
11 as Upper State Road and at certain times of the
12 day Route 202 looks more like a parking lot than a
13 thoroughfare.
14 In 1994, I was elected to
15 serve on the Warrington Township Board of
16 Supervisors. In my capacity as one member of a
17 five-member board, I attended meetings once again
18 on the proposed 202 bypass Section 700.
19 As a board, Warrington
20 Township preserved the land in the corridor and
21 worked with neighboring New Britain and Doylestown
22 and Montgomery Townships to move the project
23 closer to reality for the residents and drivers in
24 the area.
25 Once again I gave oral

Testimony of State Representative Katherine Watson

65

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 testimony as both the township supervisor and a
3 resident in support of the bypass project as part
4 of the environmental impact statement.
5 November of 2000, I was
6 elected to the Pennsylvania House of
7 Representatives representing the townships of
8 Warminster, Warrington, New Britain and Hilltown
9 and the boroughs of Chalfont, New Britain
10 including down in Dublin.
11 It's in this capacity that
12 I'm testifying about the parkway concept plan for
13 State Route 202 Section 700 corridor. While I'm
14 speaking for myself, I'm also representing it's
15 majority of the opinions of my constituents as
16 they have voiced them to me.
17 Succinctly expressed in an
18 e-mail by one of my constituents who lives in
19 Chalfont and commutes daily to her job at
20 Doylestown Hospital a resident wrote -- she wrote
21 the answer to a newspaper assertion I think over
22 the last weekend that residents lost interest in
23 the project.
24 She wrote, we haven't lost
25 interest. We are tired. I'd love to ride my bike

Testimony of State Representative Katherine Watson

66

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 to work, but it's too dangerous. If they really
3 build a parkway, put bike lanes from Chalfont to
4 Doylestown. Just count my letter as we want
5 something. It's not if you build it they will
6 come. We are already here, so build it.
7 The majority of the
8 residents immediately affected by the traffic
9 congestion still would prefer a bypass. They
10 understand that Governor Rendell said no to the
11 bypass project, but the secretary of
12 transportation and deputy secretary have proposed
13 a 200 million two-lane parkway project through
14 700.
15 Faced with right-of-way and
16 purchase for a bypass being returned to infield
17 development if no bypass is built, they're willing
18 to settle for a two-lane parkway . They are weary
19 of the traffic and congestion and the will to
20 settle for a scaled-back relief that the parkway
21 will offer. I agree with the majority of the
22 residents I represent. I still prefer a fully
23 developed bypass. I'm willing to settle for a
24 parkway now with the hope of the expansion of two
25 lanes into four as progress in the future.

Testimony of State Representative Katherine Watson

67

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 Therefore, I recommend that
3 the roadway be built with the possibility of
4 future expansion be included in the design. Of
5 know, I have amended the cap on the transportation
6 budget, for reference House Bill 2468 of 2006, to
7 include \$20 million for the full development of
8 overpass and interchange of the intersection of
9 County Line and the proposed parkway, along with
10 another \$20 million for full development of the
11 152 parkway intersection.
12 It would be up to Governor
13 Rendell to designate funds from the capital
14 transportation budget to be approved for the
15 aforementioned purposes, thus expanding the
16 current \$200 million parkway limit imposed by
17 PennDOT.
18 In closing, I've supported
19 traffic improvement for the Central Bucks,
20 Montgomery County regions for the past 20 years,
21 first as a resident, later as a supervisor and now
22 as a state representative for 144th. I still
23 believe that the completion of the Route 202
24 Section 700 bypass project would be preferable. I
25 accept in the financially constrained times and

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of State Representative Katherine Watson

68

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 with the nos that we received a 200 million
3 parkway project with the full rights-of-way
4 purchased and secured, it's the only choice
5 available.
6 Therefore, I'll support
7 building of 202 Section 700 parkway with the
8 caveat that the roads be designated for future
9 expansion to four lanes through Warrington and
10 Doylestown Township. Thank you for the
11 opportunity to express my views.

Response to Representative Katherine M. Watson

1. The comments regarding development in the project area are consistent with the description of the development patterns over the last decade as presented in the EER.
2. 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.
3. The Proposed Parkway Concept includes 5' wide shoulders/bike lanes and the Shared Use Path (SUP) to allow for expanded access for trail users and will allow for connections of existing and proposed public recreation and open space areas along the Parkway corridor. The Shared Use Path (SUP) is an important part of the proposed parkway concept to provide alternatives to motor vehicle travel within the project area. Proposed trails will intersect with the SUP at five locations along the route. Trailheads are proposed at the following locations to allow users easy access to the Shared Use Path and provide alternatives to: PA 309, County Line Road, Stump Road south of Pickertown Road, Bristol Road, and New Britain Road.
4. 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]).

Testimony of Mr. Craig Sheehan

68

12 THE SPEAKER: Hi. My name
13 is Craig Sheehan. I'm not a traffic engineer.
14 I'm not a state representative. I'm not a council
15 member. I'm a high school student, high school
16 senior. I'll be going probably to Penn State
17 Honor College next year.
18 This roadway is my future.
19 I like this area. I would love to come back here.
20 This is my future. I don't see why we should
21 settle for a two-lane parkway. It's not going to
22 serve the purpose it was originally designed for.
23 It's got a speed limit of
24 only 40 miles per hour, which will just turn the
25 whole parkway into a parking lot. It's got the

Testimony of Mr. Craig Sheehan

69

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 bike/hike path. How do you get to the path if you
3 live a mile away from it? It's not going to serve
4 very much of a purpose except to those of you
5 directly across from the parkway.
6 Why not take the funding for
7 that and make the road larger? Instead of having
8 all the fancy stonework and things, make it nice
9 and simple, not ugly, simple and divert that
10 funding to make the roadway larger.
11 The added lights, I believe
12 added lights were neglected to be mentioned.
13 Although it will increase the traffic on roads
14 like Bristol, 152, County Line, although the
15 parkway may decrease the traffic on 202, it will
16 only increase the traffic on all these other roads
17 which are already as heavily traveled.
18 On Bristol Road at Lower
19 State in rush hour traffic backs up to close a
20 quarter mile in either direction. My friend
21 sometimes can't get out of his neighborhood, which
22 is a quarter mile away from the intersection,
23 because of all the traffic. The two-lane road is
24 just not going to solve anything. Why bother to
25 settle? We should just hold out and stick around

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Craig Sheehan

70

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 for our four-lane highway. That's all.

Response to Craig Sheehan

1. The statements in support of the previous bypass option 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.

Testimony of Mr. Howard Auerbach

70

3 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
4 My name is Howard. I'm a homeowner from Terrace
5 at Montgomery which we have had some other people
6 from there speak. If you don't know where it is,
7 it's Section 701 on this roadway. It's in
8 Montgomery Township basically between Horsham Road
9 and 309. That's the area where the parkway is
10 actually four lanes.
11 A lot of our homeowners are
12 very concerned about specific issues that will
13 impact our community very directly with this
14 roadway. The current plan is for a four-lane
15 highway passing between Costco and General Hancock
16 Boulevard.
17 There will be two exits off
18 the highway and onto our development, one in the
19 vicinity of Costco and our road, Georges Court.
20 The other is Amy Court. One of our major concerns
21 relates to this aspect of the current plan.
22 It seems to many that a
23 light at Horsham Road and the tapering down of the
24 highway to two lanes right on the other side of
25 Horsham Road will cause an extreme highway backup

Testimony of Mr. Howard Auerbach

71

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 adjacent to our community. People and motorists
3 will try to look for the path of least resistance.
4 Unfortunately, that path will lead them directly
5 into our community and onto General Hancock
6 Boulevard avoiding the backup that the light at
7 Horsham Road will have.
8 Basically, by default our
9 community road, General Hancock Boulevard, the
10 upkeep of which is paid for by our association,
11 will become major traffic arteries.
12 The one suggestion to fix
13 this problem is the idea of an overpass at Horsham
14 Road. We feel it's best if you could keep the
15 traffic light at General Hancock and the current
16 access to our home at Horsham Road. Many feel
17 that the highway should not be built without this
18 overpass. PennDOT has deemed it unnecessary.
19 We also have an issue about
20 sound walls. Directly on the side adjacent to our
21 community is going to be a four-lane major
22 highway. Trucks are going to be allowed. There
23 is no sound wall at all. Can you imagine? I'm
24 sort of lucky because I live in the back of the
25 community, but there are many people that live --

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Howard Auerbach

72

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 well you can spit and hit the road. It's just not
3 a very pleasant option for them to be hearing
4 truck noise and things of that nature around the
5 clock.
6 Trash and pollution. Since
7 there is no wall or barrier system in the current
8 plan to deal with trash and pollution that this
9 highway will surely generate, the chain link fence
10 has been suggested by PennDOT as the only option.
11 However, we see that as creating an unsightly mess
12 of tangled coffee cups and fast food wrappers
13 suspended in perpetuity. Certainly not a pretty
14 site and not a good option for the community.
15 It is also a security issue.
16 Many of our own homeowners have young children and
17 are very concerned about the possible dangers
18 associated with the open roadway and just a minor
19 hill to separate the community from that roadway.
20 Let's talk about the
21 two-lane option from Horsham Road into Bucks
22 County. A two-lane road is more than adequate to
23 carry traffic. Yes, it seems like an arbitrary
24 decision to create a four-lane road from 209 to
25 309, to Horsham. A two-lane road might be much

Testimony of Mr. Howard Auerbach

73

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 more palatable and not intrusive to our
3 neighborhood. The issue of home values -- very
4 many of our homeowners are very worried about the
5 value of their investment, their home.
6 The poorly planned highway
7 with very little thought given to how it impacts
8 the surrounding community will not have a positive
9 effect on the home values.
10 We are also a little worried
11 with the construction issues. PennDOT's
12 estimating the road will take two years to build.
13 Let's say three years. I'm personally dreading
14 the thought of monster trucks and huge equipment
15 rolling up and down General Hancock Boulevard,
16 again our community road, not to mention huge
17 piles of dirt and trash that the project will
18 generate. It seems the plans to spare our
19 communities from this onslaught are not existent
20 or sketchy at best. I am not taking a position
21 for or against this road. I would just like
22 PennDOT to pay special attention to our community
23 needs, which seem, up until this point, to have
24 been ignored basically. That's what we have to
25 say. We have a petition of over 162 homeowners.

Response to Howard Auerbach

Testimony of Mr. Howard Auerbach

74

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 I've spoken with at least two-thirds of them and
3 everybody feels the same way as I do. Hopefully,
4 we can work together and create some real
5 significant solutions to this problem. Thank you
6 very much.

1. PennDOT has designed the transition area for four lanes to two lanes at Horsham Road to meet current safety standards as outlined in PennDOT's design manual.
2. The comments in opposition to the Parkway in its current design are noted. The petition from The Terrace at Montgomery Homeowners Association is included in the project record on Page VII- 222.
3. Route 202, section 700 was previously programmed as a limited access expressway. The expressway project had an estimated construction cost of \$465 million. In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.

PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations. PennDOT worked the Task Force in the preliminary design of the parkway option during the preparation of the environmental document.

An Environmental Evaluation Report (EER) was made available for public review on December 22, 2006 and a Public Hearing was held on February 28, 2007. PennDOT considered all comments received during the public review period and determined that the Parkway Concept as presented in the EER is the preferred alternative with revisions in response to public commentary. This concept includes a four-lane roadway south of Horsham Road and an at-grade signalized intersection at Horsham Road and the Parkway.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Howard Auerbach (continued)

The Parkway 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 and a protected left turn lane at the Parkway/Costco Drive based on the comments from the community in consultation with Montgomery Township.

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 Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.

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

4. 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.

5. 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

Currently, the sound levels in this area range from the low 50s dBA in the southern end of the development farthest away from Horsham Road, to the mid/upper 50s closer to Horsham Road, and in the low 60s dBA for those sites immediately abutting Horsham Road. Proposed sound level increases at the residences will vary based on their proximity to Horsham Road, the Parkway, access points for the Terrace at Montgomery, and the location/dimensions of the berms. For example, some residential units on Anthony Court in the southern part of the development will have predicted sound levels that change from 50 (currently) to 54 dBA with the Parkway. Some residential units on Amy Court (closer to Horsham Road) will have predicted sound levels that change from 53 (currently) to 56 dBA with the Parkway. And finally, some residential units on Devon Court (closest to Horsham Road) will have predicted sound levels that change from 62 (currently) to 63 dBA with the Parkway.

Response to Howard Auerbach (continued)

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.

6. 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.
7. The proposed Parkway has five signalized intersections in the first 1.5 miles of this alignment where there is more commercial development in the corridor. There are four signals in the remaining 7 miles of roadway between Horsham Road and PA 611. By focusing on the mid-block capacity along the four lane southern Parkway segment to Horsham Road that contains the higher concentration of signalized intersections; and maximizing the efficiency of the remaining four signals in the middle and northern Parkway segments; operational delays were substantially reduced when compared to the No Action Alternative.
8. 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.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Mary Pat Holewinski

74

7 MR. KEHLER: Good evening my
8 name is Pat. I'm here tonight to speak -- first
9 of all to present a Resolution No. 11-3 that New
10 Britain Borough Council past on the 13th of
11 February recognizing fully that the parkway is the
12 best option that we have and support the section
13 and urges all agencies charged with the duty of
14 providing a safe and efficient system of highways
15 in our region to adjudicate their efforts to
16 complete this. Give our Central Bucks and
17 Montgomery County communities the desperate relief
18 we need in mitigating traffic congestion along its
19 existing 202 corridor. That's on behalf of the
20 borough council.
21 A personal note, as a
22 resident and a member of the 202 task force, no
23 one is going to argue the traffic problems that
24 currently exist along the Route 202 corridor and
25 elsewhere in Bucks and Montgomery Counties caused

Testimony of Ms. Mary Pat Holewinski

75

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 by the backup on the roadway. By building the
3 proposed parkway, an alternate roadway will be
4 provided and more local routing options will be
5 created.
6 The acquisition of the
7 entire right-of-way that was intended for the
8 bypass we will be hand-hand with the open space of
9 our community. As part of that open space, the
10 parkway will provide new biking and hiking trails
11 for the area.
12 I have reviewed the
13 Environmental Evaluation Report Section 700
14 evaluation. It's huge. I've not read every word.
15 I have reviewed it. I feel that the report
16 addresses the critical areas of the project.
17 Finding no major problems, I
18 feel the project should proceed as quickly as
19 possible. We are not going to argue that many of
20 us would still like to see the bypass, but this is
21 our viable option right now. I think it should
22 proceed as quickly as possible. Thank you.

Response to Mary Pat Holewinski

1. The Resolution in support of the Proposed Parkway alternative is noted and is incorporated into the project record.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Beth Taylor

75

23 THE SPEAKER: My name is
24 Beth Taylor. I live in New Britain Township. My
25 family has been there since 1928. I've lived

Testimony of Ms. Beth Taylor

76

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 there my entire life. Our whole family has a
3 great deal invested in these communities and we
4 and our neighbors find the parkway absolutely
5 unacceptable.
6 As a professional social
7 worker, I know that there are always choices. I
8 get very angry when I am told, this is the only
9 alternative. It's not the only alternative. It
10 only becomes that when we as a community accept
11 that there is no other choice.
12 I offered them a whole lot
13 of money. They didn't have to build a bridge in
14 front of my house. They could have taken that
15 money and used it for the bypass.
16 Year after year New Britain
17 Township at the poles we have signed petition
18 after petition after petition in support of the
19 bypass. We were never asked about the parkway.
20 That was an option that was presented to us as if
21 they were there no other options. There are
22 options.
23 I agree with Dr. Cody when
24 she says we are not complacent and we are just
25 tired of struggling for this since I was still in

Testimony of Ms. Beth Taylor

77

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 college almost when I started hearing about this.
3 My family's been here
4 forever. We want to say. We love this community,
5 if we can manage to stay here. It's been eroded
6 year after year ever since I was a child.
7 This is not the Bucks County
8 my grandparents moved to. The farms are gone.
9 The dirt roads are gone. Nobody gets to sled down
10 the hills anymore the way we used to when we were
11 children. The schools are gone. They've closed
12 or torn down or both. There's just not a whole
13 lot left of our community anymore.
14 What there is we want to
15 save it and we don't need the parkway. We need
16 the bypass. We are here not just for the bypass,
17 but to save what remnants are left of our
18 community. Chalfont and New Britain used to be
19 vital places full of connected, caring families.
20 We're increasingly scattered and isolated without
21 any town centers anymore.
22 202 doesn't even let you
23 cross the street to go to the store or to see a
24 friend. In Santa Cruz in California they
25 deliberately built so that people couldn't connect

Testimony of Ms. Beth Taylor

78

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 with each other. I feel that that's what they're
3 trying to do, keep us isolated and a part from our
4 neighbors or our communities.
5 Unless we have a bypass, we
6 will not regain a sense of having community, of
7 having towns or villages around us. As long as we
8 have to tolerate this -- and believe me the
9 parkway not going to change things in Chalfont.
10 We are still going to have tractor trailers coming
11 down the road. We'll still have a huge volume of
12 people coming past and things aren't going to
13 change. It's not going to create levels -- we
14 are being held hostage.
15 It's interesting that one of
16 the people that's held us hostage in Buckingham,
17 they used to have a town. They lost their town to
18 202. It's almost as if they want us to lose our
19 town as well. It's not right. I think that we --
20 if people are getting off the bypass in Buckingham
21 it's because they live there. They built the
22 houses and we have to suffer.
23 I suggest that we continue
24 to fight. We dig in our heels and say to our
25 township supervisors, we don't want it and it's

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Beth Taylor

79

- 1 PUBLIC HEARING
- 2 not an acceptable option, please go back to the
- 3 drawing board and tell the people we want the
- 4 bypass. Thank you.

Response to Beth Taylor

1. The proposed Parkway will improve traffic operations on the project area roadway network and improve emergency response time in the US 202 corridor.
2. The statements in support of the previous bypass option 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.

Testimony of Mr. Paul Plotnick

79

5 THE SPEAKER: My name is
6 Paul Plotnick. I'm the supervisor with Warrington
7 Township -- and former PennDOT employee. I'd just
8 like to make an analogy, an analogy that sort of
9 shows you what this project is. Let me give you a
10 perfect analogy. Central Bucks is a naked man on
11 an iceberg.

12 PennDOT comes along to give
13 him some help. They offer him a hat. People
14 complain, he complains. They add a tie. That's
15 my analogy.

16 Also in my prepared talk I'm
17 not going to mention the word parkway because it's
18 a misnomer for this road. If there's commercial
19 traffic on this road, it is not a parkway.

20 Pennsylvania has one of the
21 highest gasoline taxes in the nation. Its roads
22 are among the worst. Its maintenance is subpar.
23 Its reaction to highway emergency was clearly
24 demonstrated on a recent I-78 fiasco. It is time
25 to investigate ways of improving all these areas

Testimony of Mr. Paul Plotnick

80

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 through bond issues, better management and
3 planning. This state is grasping at straws and
4 has failed to come to grips with the problems.

5 The sale of the state
6 highways and turnpike to the private firms are
7 short-term solution and I firmly believe highways
8 and bridges are two of the key things that we
9 expect from state government. The time is today.

10 In turnaround, years of
11 neglect, short-sights design and inefficient use
12 of taxpayers funds. Building a two-lane road
13 where physical restrictions do not bar
14 economically or otherwise a four-lane road is
15 inexcusable.

16 Connecting a Route 202 that
17 has four lanes in Montgomeryville and four lanes
18 in Doylestown Township with a two-lane road is
19 impractical, dangerous and is a demonstration of
20 inadequate planning that pervade the department of
21 highways and the political directives to
22 reasonably yield.

23 Several points of this
24 project specifically impact Warrington.
25 Warrington has provided the majority of this

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Paul Plotnick

81

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 corridor and east, west roads, namely, County
3 Line, Street and Bristol Roads, which will bear a
4 new burden as future highways. Route 202 in
5 Chalfont might get some minor relief, but a whole
6 new congestion can be expected in Warrington both
7 on the feeder roads and on connecting Warrington
8 Township roads.
9 This planned two0lane county
10 road with an 11-foot wide lanes allowing for
11 tractor trailer traffic while limiting to a
12 12-foot pedestrian pathway is bewildering. The
13 demand of our police to patrol a dangerous road
14 subject to tremendous rush hour delays and
15 occasional inattendant or hazardous drivers and
16 have resultant accidents will be substantial.
17 Our money, our time, our
18 patience waiting this overdue roadway will be
19 wasted if we allow the two-lane roadway to be
20 built along the designated path.
21 I'm sorry that the wise
22 words of engineers for highway planning were not
23 taken to heart over the last two years to adjust
24 the design to take traffic over the next four
25 decades. Thank you.

Response to Paul Plotnick

1. The comments in opposition to the two lane roadway portion between Horsham Road and PA 611 are noted.
2. Route 202, Section 700 was previously programmed as a limited access expressway. The expressway project had an estimated cost of \$465 million. In March 2004, PennDOT examined its long-term financial commitments for transportation improvements across the state and determined that projected revenues fell far short of the funding required to construct all the projects planned. As a result, several projects across the state, including Route 202, Section 700, were identified for re-evaluation.

PennDOT initiated a study in April 2004 to reexamine the transportation needs in this area and seek a more affordable solution. After completion of the study in January 2005 and subsequent coordination and input from project stakeholders, residents and business owners, the results of these efforts were summarized in the September 2005 Route 202, Section 700 Community Task Force Report. This report identified the Parkway concept as the preferred transportation solution to improve travel along the corridor while still meeting PennDOT's funding limitations. PennDOT worked the Task Force in the preliminary design of the parkway option during the preparation of the environmental document.

An Environmental Evaluation Report (EER) was made available for public review on December 22, 2006 and a Public Hearing was held on February 28, 2007. PennDOT considered all comments received during the public review period and determined that the Parkway Concept as presented in the EER is the preferred alternative with revisions in response to public commentary.

Response to Paul Plotnick (continued)

3. As described at the Task Force Meeting in July 2006, presented to Warrington Township in November 2006 and presented in the EER, the additional improvements as part of the project on County Line Road, Limekiln Pike (PA 152) and Bristol Road substantially reduced the traffic congestion during the peak periods on these feeder roads in the Design Year 2020.

4. PennDOT is designing the Proposed Parkway so that it meets the Department's design/safety standards for a 40 mph posted speed. PennDOT will work with the project area emergency service providers to develop an incident management program to adequately provide emergency services to the Proposed Parkway and the SUP. The project objective to provide increased transportation network connectivity allows for additional alternate routes for emergency service providers within the project area.

5. The comments in opposition to the current design of the Proposed Parkway are noted.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Ms. Jordan Winters

82

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 THE SPEAKER: My name is
3 Jordan Winters. I've lived in this area for
4 20-some years. I currently live on Devon Court,
5 which is Montgomery Court. It's adjacent to
6 Terrace at Montgomery for those of you who are or
7 not sure where it's located.
8 You ask can I currently
9 support the current 202 parkway? I can't. The
10 reasons are just like I've heard a lot of people
11 up here tonight saying how it's going to improve
12 their quality of life. Just as it's going to
13 improve yours, it will negatively impact mine.
14 The reason being that all
15 the traffic in your backyard is going to be moving
16 to my backyard. That's not a solution. I feel
17 like you're taking one problem and just putting it
18 somewhere else.
19 The reason being is just
20 like many of my neighbors have had said, we live
21 off General Hancock Boulevard, a private road we
22 maintain and own. 202 is going to dump off a lot
23 of traffic there because people are going to cut
24 through, a shortcut to Horsham Road, which
25 essentially leads to 611. It's going to be a

Testimony of Ms. Jordan Winters

83

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 shortcut, all different reasons for taking it.
3 What's going to happen is we are going to incur
4 the cost for maintaining it, the traffic, the
5 trash just like people have said.
6 What I could support again
7 is something like an overpass on Horsham Road, a
8 gate at Horsham Road and General Hancock so that
9 people can't cut through so we don't up like the
10 people I have heard earlier tonight saying I have
11 this traffic in my backyard. I feel for you, but
12 feel for me.
13 We are a community here.
14 Just as I want it to get better for you, you have
15 to understand it's not fair to everyone that lives
16 over here. We are hearing you, but please hear
17 us.
18 Again, an overpass, a gate.
19 And something else, the berms. The berms on Devon
20 Court is shorter than me about nine inches. That
21 doesn't work. I mean, that's a joke. If I can
22 come outside and look over it, how is that doing
23 anything for noise?
24 I can shout over it. You
25 don't think cars and trucks are going to be heard

Testimony of Ms. Jordan Winters

84

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 over it? That is a laugh. That is pathetic. If
3 anyone doesn't think that, reconsider. I mean,
4 really. In addition to that -- I think that's
5 everything. Just basically don't take the traffic
6 that's in your backyard and put in mine. Thank
7 you.

Response to Jordan Winters

1. The comments in opposition to the Parkway in its current design are noted.
2. 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. Therefore, PennDOT will pursue the current design with an at-grade intersection at the Parkway and Horsham Road.

There is only one grade separated interchange proposed for this project at PA 309. An at-grade intersection at PA 309 and the Parkway was not feasible to accommodate the Design Year 2020 daily volumes of 40,000+ vehicles per day (vpd) on PA 309. PennDOT's 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 at Horsham Road. A grade separated interchange would be more costly and environmentally impacting than the at-grade intersection concept. Placing a grade separated interchange at the Parkway between Upper State Road and General Hancock Boulevard would also restrict needed space for the limited access ramps to/from the Parkway and Horsham Road. Potential additional impacts include greater encroachments into the historic Joseph Ambler Inn, natural resources and the Terrace at Montgomery community. Therefore, PennDOT will pursue the current design with an at-grade intersection at the Parkway and Horsham Road.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to Jordan Winters (continued)

3. 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 Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.
4. 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.

The Devon Court berm mentioned in the comment was initially placed there for aesthetic purposes. The preliminary noise analyses indicated there were no predicted noise impacts according to PennDOT policy. Therefore, mitigation consideration of any type was not warranted for this location. Existing exterior sound level decibels for the Devon Court units closest to both the proposed Parkway and Horsham Road are in the low 60s; 60 and 62 for the two representative sites that were modeled. Preliminary predicted sound levels with the Parkway were 63 and 63 decibels, respectively. The reason for the minimal change over the existing condition is because the Horsham Road traffic noise is a primary contributor to the sound levels. It should be noted that there is also a sound level contribution from local traffic on General Hancock Boulevard.

Nonetheless, as a result of the public involvement process, the final design team has been able to increase (double) the height of the earth berm in response to the comment. Predicted future sound levels were subsequently reduced by about 1 decibel. The reason for the minimal reduction with the increased berm height is because the Horsham Road traffic noise is a primary contributor to the sound levels. Also, there is still a small traffic noise contribution from General Hancock Boulevard. Overall, there is still no predicted noise impact according to PennDOT guidance for mitigation consideration.

Testimony of Mr. Chris Simerik

84

8 THE SPEAKER: Hello. My
9 name is Chris Simerik. I live in Terrace at
10 Montgomery. I'm not a township official. I
11 really don't care how officials and everybody else
12 lives in the community for 30 years.
13 We are dealing with the here
14 and now. It's really frustrating to me to see
15 what we have been offered when we moved into these
16 neighborhoods as far as -- my house, there's no
17 other house at the top. I am the top of the
18 street. Next to my house -- when I moved into the
19 neighborhood they said, hey, you got this nice
20 sound wall, you're going to have a bike path. I
21 said, that's fine, sounds nice, going to cut down
22 on traffic.
23 Well, the proposal that we
24 have been shown within two years of moving in is
25 obsolete already. The parkway's already obsolete.

Testimony of Mr. Chris Simerik

85

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 It's been proven -- the professionals have already
3 said, well, it's not going to do the job, but our
4 own elected officials, council members and
5 everything, have already decided to roll over and
6 just take -- to me it's like a court case where
7 take what you can get. Take whatever you can get,
8 we are not going to fight, we are done, this is
9 what they offered you. We are taking away the
10 sound wall. If you want, we can put up a North
11 Philly chain link fence that will collect trash,
12 Five-foot berms that basically that -- before
13 without even the fences, kids can just walk up to
14 the berm and walk right into traffic.
15 Now given parents -- it
16 happens every day, kids are hit by cars and stuff
17 like that. The traffic at Horsham Road is already
18 ridiculous. Holidays, it's twice as bad.
19 Everybody wants to get to the mall.
20 Now, the representatives up
21 in Buckingham think that is fine. They want
22 better access to the community, the mall, they
23 want to get in and out of their township.
24 Meanwhile, they blocked their own expansion up
25 there. They still got a lot of big community.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Chris Simerik

86

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 Now they want to make it
3 easier to get to the malls around the
4 Montgomeryville area. They're putting two lights
5 within our neighborhood and they're taking our
6 light to get into the community away and putting a
7 not great intersection to get onto the -- not the
8 parkway -- the new street. It's a damn road.
9 It's going to parallel up to State Road and it's
10 right next to it.
11 Nothing in this whole
12 scenario is properly thought out. Nothing in it
13 is -- they said, well, in what I was told by
14 PennDOT, if we don't use it we lose it. Well, at
15 this point I don't care. You know, it's not going
16 to do the job.
17 Horsham Road is going to be
18 twice as backed up because you are going to have
19 people trying to get into the community and people
20 getting out. Another thing they said about the
21 lights, with this many lights in such a short
22 period. They said they're going to be
23 synchronized.
24 Anybody here ever drive down
25 Lincoln Drive? They have synchronized lights

Testimony of Mr. Chris Simerik

87

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 there. What happens with the synchronized lights?
3 Everybody runs them. They get to the end, they
4 run the lights. That doesn't help our community.
5 Then they put a light in just recently. When they
6 put the LA Fitness, they put a light right there
7 at 309 to get into at Baja.
8 It actually hasn't been that
9 bad. Everybody pulls into it. It gets blocked
10 when the light changes. You are sitting there.
11 You have to weave in and out of cars to get
12 through the intersection because they're blocking
13 it. That's going to be the same way. People are
14 going to take advantage of it. They're going to
15 pull up when there's a blockage and they are going
16 to block the intersection.
17 From the beginning, it
18 sounded the nice. Over time it has just become a
19 fiasco. It's become a joke to everybody. You
20 know, either use it or lose it.
21 I am very disappointed in
22 all of the elected officials who instead of
23 deciding to fight for the real expressway and what
24 we were promised, our own elected officials have
25 decided to roll over. It's sad. It's a joke.

Testimony of Mr. Chris Simerik

88

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 That's what I have to say.

Response to Chris Simerick

1. The comments in opposition to the Parkway in its current design are noted.
2. PennDOT's objectives for this project include improving capacity for the roadway network in the Design Year 2020. Again, increasing network connectivity and providing alternate routes for local trips are also identified needs for this project. Horsham Road is an integral State Route (SR 0463) in the project area roadway network. Providing direct access to/from Horsham Road at the Parkway is vital to the Parkway alternative concept. A grade separated interchange at the Parkway and Horsham Road would be more costly and more impacting to the access to the Terrace at Montgomery as well as the historic Joseph Ambler Inn than the proposed signalized intersection.

In order for these alternate routes and improved capacity to be met, PennDOT will construct four lanes in this area with six signalized intersections in the first 1.6 miles of the proposed Parkway. This will provide access to this largely commercialized zone (PA 309 Corridor) within the study area. PennDOT has eliminated one signal at the previously planned Connector B in the vicinity of the Terrace at Montgomery to minimize impacts to resources in the area without adversely affecting the traffic operations in the vicinity of PA 309 and the Parkway.

The remaining traffic signals south of Horsham Road along the Parkway are necessary to maintain the traffic operations along the four-lane segment of roadway. North of Horsham Road, there are four signalized intersections in the remaining seven miles of roadway to PA 611.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Leo Bagley

88

3 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
4 My name is Leo Bagley from Montgomery County
5 Planning Commission. I have a resolution which
6 I'll give the stenographer here after giving my
7 testimony.
8 The resolutions support from
9 the planning commission which they passed. The
10 summary, urgent the expeditious completion of the
11 parkway alternative. Reserving comments for some
12 technical issues which we want to deal with on the
13 record with the court stenographer.
14 The staff review of the
15 environmental evaluation report, which is a very
16 thick document, but I do want to -- I think our
17 staff wanted to compliment PennDOT for its
18 contact-sensitive development of this alternative.
19 We think they've done an
20 outstanding job of being sensitive to the wetland
21 and water impacts, the stream crossing impact and
22 the land uses that are along -- adjacent to the
23 roadway. One of the things, though, that I think
24 the environmental report did not adequately cover,
25 maybe insufficiently covered, is that the bill

Testimony of Mr. Leo Bagley

89

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 versus the no bill alternative talks about the
3 wetland impacts of the corridor. I think the
4 numbers are 34 wetlands, approximately seven and a
5 half acres impacted. I think that what is missing
6 in there is that it assumes that the no bill
7 alternative is going to be -- is not the case.
8 The no bill alternative -- the corridor will be
9 developed for the most part.
10 In Montgomery Township alone
11 there is about 115 acres in a 300-foot wide more
12 or less right-of-way. That 115 acres is going to
13 be under severe pressure to develop. I'll say
14 that the same things would also happen into the
15 Bucks County community.
16 I don't think that it is a
17 bill versus a no bill. I think that the parkway
18 is the subject over land preservation, open space
19 preservation alternative as well because without
20 that PennDOT will sell the right-of-way and
21 a no bill alternative to developers or the owners
22 of the property will have all rights to develop
23 that. The outstanding efforts that the department
24 has made in trying to do wetland and stream
25 mitigation looking at preservation of woodlands,

Testimony of Mr. Leo Bagley

90

- 1 PUBLIC HEARING
- 2 it's entire open space along that corridor would
- 3 be lost because the parkway would be able to
- 4 preserve that in the no bill, it will not be.
- 5 Thank you very much.

Response to Leo Bagley

1. The Resolution in support of the Proposed Parkway alternative is noted and is incorporated into the project record.
2. The comments regarding the impacts to the streams, wetlands, and natural environment in the No Action alternative are consistent with the information as presented in the EER including the likely development of the 300' right of way corridor if the proposed Parkway is not constructed.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

3.

Testimony of Mr. John Nagel

90

6 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
7 I'm John Nagel, township manager in Montgomery
8 Township. I also have a resolution in support
9 passed by the board of supervisors from Montgomery
10 Township last Monday night, which I'll hand over
11 as part of our testimony.
12 Montgomery Township would
13 like to express our support of the construction of
14 US 202 Section 700 known as 202 parkway. 202
15 parkway will enhance mobility and reduce
16 congestion by providing a new nine-mile roadway
17 from Welsh Road in Montgomery Township to Route
18 611 on Doylestown Township.
19 This limited access roadway
20 will provide an alternative route for motorists
21 that would otherwise travel on the already
22 congested adjacent roadway including State Road
23 and Stump Road. The following key design elements
24 will make this new roadway a major asset for
25 Montgomery Township and several regions.

Testimony of Mr. John Nagel

91

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 One, the 300-foot
3 right-of-way required for the 202 parkway will be
4 preserved as a limited access right-of-way. This
5 is clarification will prohibit direct access to
6 the roadway from future developments which
7 effectively eliminate the potential for capacity
8 deterioration along the parkway that is associated
9 with additional intersections and driveway
10 accesses along the corridor.
11 Two, the 300-foot wide strip
12 of right-of-way requires for the construction of
13 the 202 parkway within Montgomery Township equates
14 to over 115 acres of land which would otherwise be
15 available for development that will generate
16 additional traffic added to the already congested
17 roadways adjacent to the parkway.
18 It's time to understand the
19 importance of using this land for its intended use
20 of providing a new roadway to reduce congestion,
21 increase mobility and prepare for future traffic
22 demands.
23 Three, the parkway will
24 include a 12-foot wide shared use path along the
25 entire nine-mile roadway that will provide a safe

Testimony of Mr. John Nagel

92

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 alternate means of travel for pedestrians and
3 bicycles. The trail will be conveniently located
4 adjacent to the parkway within the 300-foot
5 right-of-way.

6 Additionally, a trail-end
7 parking lot will be constructed along Route 309 to
8 provide parking for patrons that wish to use the
9 trail. This will be a much needed asset for
10 residents of the township and region.

11 Four, the township has
12 worked hard for many years to plan for this much
13 needed roadway including the preservation of
14 right-of-way for the sole purpose of construction
15 a roadway.

16 Due to the rapid pace of
17 growth that has occurred and projected in the
18 region, there is undeniable need for the parkway
19 and the associated roadway projects including the
20 scheduled widening of sections of County Line
21 Road, Horsham Road, the intersections of Route
22 309, 202 and 463 commonly notes as Five Points.

23 The 202 parkway coupled with
24 the adjacent roadway widening project will provide
25 much needed enhancement to the roadway network in

Testimony of Mr. John Nagel

93

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 and around Montgomery Township.

3 Five, the parkway will
4 promote improved air quality by reducing vehicle
5 delays that would otherwise exist within the
6 current network of congested roadways.

7 Six, the parkway will
8 enhance incident management operations by
9 providing additional access to the local roadway
10 networking and by reducing vehicle delays which
11 will in turn improve emergency response time.

12 The township has worked with
13 the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and
14 their consultants to enhance many aspects of the
15 proposed 202 parkway since the 202 bypass was
16 downgraded to a parkway in 2004 due to
17 insufficient funding for the bypass.

18 The township officials,
19 staff and consultants will continue to work
20 closely with the department through the final
21 design phase to resolve design elements that the
22 township feels are necessary for the residents and
23 business owners in Montgomery Township.

24 Engineering comments
25 associated with the design phase of the project

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. John Nagel

94

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 will be submitted for the record by March 15,
3 2007.
4 In conclusion, Montgomery
5 Township expresses our support for the
6 construction of the 202 parkway Section 700
7 project. We are in full support of the project's
8 goals, objectives and concur with the finding of
9 the study that the new roadway is the preferred
10 alternative to address the region's traffic needs.
11 Thank you.

Response to John Nagel

1. The Resolution in support of the Proposed Parkway alternative is noted and is incorporated into the project record.
2. The items noted in the attached Testimony are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Proposed Project.
3. PennDOT will continue to work with the Montgomery Township Board of Supervisors, Township staff as well as the residential communities and local businesses to address each of the concerns raised by the Township and its constituents.

Testimony of Mr. Robert Kuhn

94

12 THE SPEAKER: Good evening.
13 My name is Robert Kuhn. I've been a resident of
14 Montgomery Township since 1969. I served on the
15 Montgomery Township Planning Commission from '72
16 until '77 and I've been a township supervisor
17 since 1978.

18 On Monday evening, the board
19 of supervisors by majority vote passed the
20 resolution and the testimony which Mr. Nagel just
21 presented to the assembled crowd here.

22 I was one of two supervisors
23 to abstain from the vote because I had some very
24 serious concerns about the parkway proposal, which
25 I don't think up to this point that PennDOT has

Testimony of Mr. Robert Kuhn

95

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 adequately addressed.

3 First of all, there's Knapp
4 Road. Knapp Road is a township road and with the
5 elimination of the B Loop off of 309, which saves
6 by PennDOT engineers' estimate some \$3 million,
7 the part of Knapp Road that goes from the proposed
8 202 parkway to 309 will become the major access
9 road to 202.

10 The upper end -- I should
11 say that PennDOT has agreed that they will take
12 ownership and maintenance of that part of the
13 road. However, they have not agreed to take over
14 the other part of the road, which goes from the
15 proposed parkway to DeKalb Pike.

16 That 1400-foot of road will
17 become a financial and maintenance albatross and
18 millstone around the township's neck. We have
19 proposed to PennDOT that they take over that road
20 since that will also serve as an accessway to the
21 parkway, but they have yet at this time refused to
22 do so. Instead, offering that we take over an
23 equal amount of another PennDOT road, then they
24 will then take over that road.

25 Montgomery Township is not

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Robert Kuhn

96

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 interested in substituting one liability for
3 another. It was suggested that money be put in
4 escrow to maintain -- the proceeds of which would
5 be used to maintain that road, to plow the snow,
6 to pave it and when the ribbon is cut on the
7 parkway, that will need to be widened from the two
8 lanes to the four lanes. That part of the road,
9 which they agreed to take over, is already four
10 lanes. That's number one issue.
11 Number two issue, which we
12 were just made aware of two Tuesdays ago at the
13 business -- CAC meeting, was that the access to
14 the Giant store and the other stores that are in
15 the area where that was developed will be limited.
16 They will not have a left in and a left out.
17 That means that over 1,000
18 households will have to go down 202, turn right on
19 309, turn right into the development and then move
20 up to get into a right turn into the Giant store,
21 going full circle around where they could have
22 accomplished it in 1,400 feet because it will be
23 no left in.
24 The third issue has been
25 explained by four residents of Terrace at

Testimony of Mr. Robert Kuhn

97

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 Montgomery and also Representative Rick Taylor, so
3 I wouldn't belabor that. I will say that I
4 support their efforts to get a quality of life --
5 those quality of life issues resolved
6 satisfactorily.
7 I would also mention that
8 those three problems that I just reiterated is due
9 to at-grade intersections. If it were not for the
10 at-grade intersections, none of these problems
11 would exist. I implore PennDOT to reexamine that,
12 to come up with a viable alternative and to
13 address these issues. Thank you.

Response to Robert Kuhn

1. As stated in the Department’s letter to Montgomery Township dated January 18, 2007, PennDOT will consider a roadway ownership swap scenario for the remaining portion of Knapp Road between the Proposed Parkway and Dekalb Pike that will result in no net increase in state-owned highway mileage.

Based on the traffic simulation analysis performed for the project using the Design Year 2020 peak period traffic volumes as provided by DVRPC, Knapp Road will not require widening from two to four lanes between the Parkway and DeKalb Pike as part of the proposed improvements for the project.

2. The proximity of the Knapp Road intersection with the Parkway to the driveway to the Giant Store requires the change in access to right-in/right out. PennDOT will continue to work with the property owner and Montgomery Township to further evaluate the change in access at this location.

3. To address the concerns regarding the Terrace at Montgomery community, this concept includes a four-lane roadway south of Horsham Road and an at-grade signalized intersection at Horsham Road and the Parkway.

The Parkway 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 and a protected left turn lane at the Parkway/Costco Drive based on the comments from the community in consultation with Montgomery Township.

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 Blvd to deter cut through traffic through this community on the privately owned roadway in the final design phase of the project.

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

From the on start of this project, PennDOT was cognizant of the concerns, which the local communities had expressed to us throughout the development of this project. PennDOT designed this project to employ context sensitive topographical features, which would provide the adjacent residential communities noise and aesthetic benefits. PennDOT was able to implement this design strategy on this project because there was an opportunity to use all of the reserved 300 foot right of way corridor for highway purposes. As result of this proactive design strategy, none of the existing residential communities, which currently about the Parkway corridor in Montgomery Township will experience a noise impact as described in PennDOT’s Noise Policy Guidelines.

Currently, PennDOT is preparing a final design noise study. The purpose of this study is to verify that the final construction plans for the project are in compliance with the Department’s noise policy. All the municipalities within the three construction sections will receive a copy of the report. These reports are made available to the respective municipalities to assist in the facilitation of their individual comprehensive land use plans.

The implementation of the earth berms as an acoustical mitigation feature with the adjacent residential areas has greater acoustic reduction benefits than a typical concrete noise wall of the same height. This is because the earth berm is deeper (thicker) and has less transmission through it than a typical noise barrier. Also, the berm surface is more absorptive with its grassy surface and will be landscaped with bushes and trees to further enhance their height.

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.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Jason Lexer

97

14 THE SPEAKER: My name is a
15 Jason Lexer. I live at 105 Society Hill, North
16 Wales, which is the De La Sol development. I am
17 the secretary of De La Sol Homeowners'
18 Association. We are probably the 40 homes west of
19 the most effected -- westmost inception of section
20 300.
21 Similar to the concerns
22 raised earlier by the homeowners at Terrace at
23 Montgomery, we have grave concerns of the removal
24 of the sound and safety barriers that we were told
25 were going to be provided to the majority of you.

Testimony of Mr. Jason Lexer

98

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 The park has been reduced to two lanes, but we're
3 still ignoring that two-mile stretch where it
4 still will be a bypass and safety concerns that go
5 along with that.
6 Having those sound barriers
7 are a safety feature especially when you're going
8 to have that path that will be used. It's not
9 entirely impossible to protect everyone 100
10 percent of the time to know that accidents won't
11 happen, that kids won't be on the paths
12 unsupervised.
13 The comparison some somebody
14 earlier here said, was Newtown has a bypass and
15 Doylestown has a bypass, why can't they. If
16 that's the comparison, if that's what we have
17 expect -- I've driven on those roads. Traffic
18 does not go less than 60 miles an hour. I don't
19 want my kids 12 feet from cars that are going to
20 be driving 60 miles an hour.
21 Representative Taylor said
22 these paths will be used for kids and people who
23 ride their bikes and moms pushing their kids on
24 strollers. Well, 12 feet from cars driving 60, 70
25 miles an hour is ridiculous. It might be posted

Testimony of Mr. Jason Lexer

99

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 as a speed limped, but we know what people will

3 drive. They don't drive the speed limits.

4 My issue here is with --

5 it's become a parkway instead of a bypass except

6 for the portion that it is still a bypass. Where

7 has the protection for the bypass gone for that

8 community that goes along Section 701?

Response to Jason Lexer

1. PennDOT is committed to design the Proposed Parkway so that it meets the Department's design/safety standards for a 40 mph posted speed. PennDOT is working to create as much separation as possible between the Parkway and the Shared Use Path (SUP) based on comments provided by Montgomery Township and Montgomery County including the installation of a split rail fence. 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. Similarly, PennDOT will continue to work with the adjacent communities to provide appropriate access points to the SUP from the respective neighborhoods.

2. 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.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Richard Meyers-Furlong

99

9 THE SPEAKER: Richard
10 Meyers-Furlong. I guess the way I look at this
11 is, and I come at this from the perspective of
12 someone who has never felt that an expressway in
13 the heart of Central Bucks County has been a
14 viable solution for anything.
15 The parkway proposal is
16 something that I can live with. I think that part
17 of this whole discussion is is there a compromise
18 that people can live with. I'm not encouraged
19 seeing additional roads built. I don't see the
20 that they generally improve traffic congestion
21 any -- no further than communities that have more
22 roads than we have traffic congestion. It's just
23 as bad. I'm a little bit disappointed in that I
24 think the design of the parkway is going to suffer
25 because the concept of the roundabouts has been

Testimony of Mr. Richard Meyers-Furlong

100

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 removed from consideration altogether. I think
3 the idea of building a parkway that has at-grade
4 crossing with regular signalized traffic
5 intersections is just a recipe for additional
6 congestion in each one of those crossing points.
7 I understand during rush how -- no matter what you
8 do, you're going to have congestion. I look at
9 the overall time period where you're going to use
10 a highway.
11 How many times do you come
12 to an intersection at 10 o'clock at night and sit
13 there for a minute and a half and you're the only
14 car at the intersection? That doesn't make any
15 sense.
16 I think we have an
17 opportunity here not only to try an innovative
18 approach with a two-lane parkway, but also to
19 include something that may work better because
20 certainly signalized intersections don't work.
21 They never reduce the
22 congestion. They make congestion worse because
23 three-quarters of the people who come to
24 signalized intersections stop and sit and wait and
25 they're not moving. It's not an efficient way to

Testimony of Mr. Richard Meyers-Furlong

101

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 move traffic.

3 I think some of the things

4 that do need to be addressed on 202, the existing

5 202 corridor, are things that could have been

6 addressed years ago and weren't addressed. Things

7 were worked years ago and were removed.

8 Just a couple of specific

9 examples; southbound Route 202 as you approach

10 152, the intersection of Chalfont. 10, 15 years

11 ago, there was a right turn lane there so at least

12 people had who wanted to go north on 152 didn't

13 have wait through the entire light circle.

14 At a certain point in time,

15 somebody came in and said the road's 2 feet too

16 narrow, you can't allow that. It was gone. That

17 added to congestion in Chalfont.

18 By the same token,

19 northbound 202 at Bristol Road, for years you

20 could make a right turn that goes south or east or

21 Bristol Road at the traffic light. Well, low and

22 behold they came back, lined the shoulder of the

23 ride, put signs you, said don't trespass on the

24 shoulder. People could no longer make right

25 turns. Everybody that wanted to make a right turn

Testimony of Mr. Richard Meyers-Furlong

102

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 had to go down Bristol Road, had to stack in

3 traffic with everybody else.

4 The intersection of Upper

5 State Road and Route 202. It's simple left turn

6 stacking lane for people waiting to turn to Upper

7 State road. It would make a world of difference

8 at that intersection. That's something that could

9 have been done 20 years ago.

10 And from a historic

11 perspective, one of the things that really

12 contributed to the congestion in Chalfont Borough

13 given the fact that you've already had a real

14 awkwardly configured intersection with 152 through

15 the center of town, was the construction of Lake

16 Helena and the Pine Run Reservoir back in the late

17 '60s.

18 With the construction of

19 those reservoirs, two or three fairly significant

20 north/south connections between 202 and areas to

21 the north were cut off. The people were forced to

22 either go almost to Doylestown to take 152 north

23 through Chalfont.

24 For years we have discussed

25 the Bristol Road extension, at most the half mile,

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Richard Meyers-Furlong

103

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 two lanes macadam road that could create a world
3 of different to the people in the center of
4 Chalfont. That still hasn't been done.
5 I think those things
6 would -- really need to be considered. For years
7 people needlessly suffered additional congestion
8 on Route 202. I know that won't cure the problems
9 that are there, but in conjunction with the
10 parkway and hopefully you'll give some
11 reconsideration to the roundabout concept to that.
12 It would help.
13 Just one final thought is
14 that you have to understand the traffic congestion
15 is a function of population. We can cure traffic
16 congestion tomorrow if we get rid of all the
17 people. Given the fact that they're here, no
18 matter what solution we have, whether two-lane or
19 four-lane expressway, the roadway will be
20 congested.

Response for Richard Meyers-Furlong

1. The comments in support of roundabouts are noted. 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.
2. Based on input from the Task Force in 2005, the signal permit for the US 202/Bristol Road intersection was revised to eliminate the "no turn on red" restriction from northbound US 202 to eastbound Bristol Road. The "keep off shoulder sign" was retained since there was not sufficient room to provide a right turn lane.. It is correct that currently there is no dedicated right turn lane for southbound US 202 to northbound PA 152 (Main Street) and there are no current programmed improvements for the provision of this movement.
3. The Bristol Road Extension (MPMS #12923) is currently programmed and is planned to provide a two-lane extension of Bristol Road (approximately 2,000 feet) from Route 202 to Park Avenue.
4. There is not a currently programmed project for the intersection US 202 and Shady Retreat Road (referred to as Upper State Road). This intersection improvement must be programmed through the normal transportation development process to be added to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Testimony of Mr. John Cunningham

103

21 THE SPEAKER: John
22 Cunningham from Buckingham Township. I can assure
23 you there are a lot of people from Buckingham
24 Township who don't take the official stance that's
25 been taken by Buckingham Township. I think the

Testimony of Mr. John Cunningham

104

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 young lady said we're tired of talking about this
3 after hearing it for years is exactly right. What
4 we should be doing is looking for a bypass that
5 goes from Welsh Road all the way to New Jersey. I
6 don't think that's going to happen very quickly.
7 I suspect we are going to end up with what's been
8 proposed here.
9 I would ask that PennDOT
10 direct its engineer that they make every effort to
11 make sure that after this fiasco over the two
12 lanes has to be corrected to four lanes that they
13 haven't built-in to the planning and design that's
14 going to make it more expensive to do that.
15 I think the design should
16 anticipate at some point in the future it's going
17 to be four lanes and that's what PennDOT's
18 direction to the engineers should be. Thank you.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Response to John Cunningham

1. 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]).

Testimony of Mr. Ed White

104

19 THE SPEAKER: My name Ed
20 white. I grew up in Chalfont. I live in
21 Buckingham. I grew up there seeing small roads,
22 dirt roads with stop signs, some without stop
23 signs, gradually a light was added and every
24 little thing helped a little bit, but it didn't
25 soffit.

Testimony of Mr. Ed White

105

1 PUBLIC HEARING

2 Then I saw roads being
3 widened a little bit. It helped a little bit, but
4 it didn't solve it. 202 through Chalfont got
5 widened again and again and again. It still
6 hasn't helped.

7 I think all they've been
8 doing is putting it off for the last 40 years what
9 should have been done. I think I agree with the
10 man who just spoke that it's foolish not to
11 utilize the right-of-way have now that it can't be
12 expanded later into four lanes.

13 And another point, everybody
14 talks about the builders. I don't understand why
15 the builders aren't asked to contribute something.
16 I mean, from what I read in the paper Mr. Toll
17 could build the road with his own money and a few
18 other builders around.

19 I think it's time that we
20 kept putting off these halfway measures and do it
21 right. Okay? Thank you.

Response to Ed White

1. 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.
2. 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]).

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Andy Warren

105

22 THE SPEAKER: Hours later.
23 I will be mercifully brief. Andy Warren,
24 Middletown Township. I would underscore what may
25 have been said by one or two other speakers.

Testimony of Mr. Andy Warren

106

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 There are property owners who have in all good
3 faith committed to work with the Department of
4 Transportation and sell their property and have
5 been on hold with finalizing that action, Delaware
6 Valley College comes to mind for one. There was
7 at least two other families which I'm aware that
8 have been waiting to be reimbursed by PennDOT for
9 their good faith of selling their property.
10 I would encourage, implore
11 you the first thing to do is meet with these
12 people who some for years have been waiting to be
13 reimbursed. I would hope that would be one of
14 first things that happens now rather than --
15 sooner rather than later. Thank you.

Response to Andy Warren

1. Upon Approval of the Environmental Clearance Document under PA Act 120, PennDOT will continue to pursue the acquisition of the required right-of-way for the construction of the Proposed Parkway Project.

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

Testimony of Mr. Taylor Lonsdale

106

16 THE SPEAKER: My name is
17 Taylor Lonsdale, 57 Chestnut Valley Drive in
18 Doylestown. I'm a 30-year resident. My first
19 comment is I'd like to invite Mr. Roman to come to
20 Chalfont to get his bagel at the 152 intersection
21 every morning.
22 Since the Toll brothers have
23 taken most of our remaining land, perhaps they
24 would alleviate our funding problem. Thirdly, an
25 automobile may be able to transit the parkway, but

Testimony of Mr. Taylor Lonsdale

107

1 PUBLIC HEARING
2 the trucks with the diesel engines that produce
3 soot with every push of their pedal will not be a
4 welcomed occurrence for the residents of Chalfont,
5 or Doylestown for that matter.
6 In closing, remember I have
7 yet to see a heavy truck honor a speed limit.
8 Every time the accelerator is pushed, we get soot.
9 Thank you.

Response to Taylor Lonsdale

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 regional level analysis determined that the Route 202 project has been included in the long range transportation planning conducted by the DVRPC and its projected impacts to air quality were assessed as part of regional conformity analysis.

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 local project area level the primary analyses focus on generation and distribution of Carbon Monoxide (CO) in the immediate project vicinity. In addition, PennDOT requires the analysis of particulate matter and toxic emissions. A very conservative, "worst-case" approach was used where receptor sites were selected to represent publicly accessible areas where concentrations may be expected to be the highest. Such sites are generally along the approach and departure links of the Parkway Alternative and County Line Road to capture both free-flowing and queuing emissions near this intersection. Based on the modeled projections, the air quality receptor concentrations of pollutants for carbon monoxide and particulate matter were well below the applicable standards, the particulate matter analysis do not indicate any impacts, and the evaluation of air toxics do not indicate a worse condition over existing. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

PennDOT Testimony

107

10 MR. KEHLER: We will let the
11 record show that at 8:10 there was no one else in
12 the room that would like to testify tonight. We
13 will conclude the formal part of the hearing.

14 If anyone else would like to
15 present testimony, the stenographer will stay
16 around until about 8:30. If not, that will be it.

17 The written testimony is open until March 15th.

18 Thank you.

19 - - -

20 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:10 p.m.)

21 - - -

22

23

24

25

C. Public Hearing Testimony (Transcript) [T]

	108	14
1	PUBLIC HEARING	15
2	CERTIFICATE	16
3	I hereby certify that this is a true record of	17
4	the hearing taken in this matter.	18
5		19
6		20
7	-----	21
	Sandra J. Worrell, RPR	
8	Date: February 28, 2007	22
9		(The foregoing certification of this transcript
10		23 does not apply to any reproduction of the same by
11		24 any means, unless under the direct control and/or
12		25 supervision of the certifying shorthand reporter.)
13		