

**S.R. 0926 IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ENGINEERING DISTRICT 6-0
PUBLIC MEETING
MINUTES OF MEETING
MEETING DATE: MAY 7, 2014**

DATE: May 20, 2014

LOCATION: Pocopson Elementary School, Gymnasium
Pocopson Township, Chester County, PA

ATTENDEES:

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) District 6-0

Chuck Davies	Velega Narayana
LeAnne Fullard	Monica Harrower

Gannett Fleming, Inc. (GF)

Frank Eells	Robert O'Neill
Megan Fallon	Kristin Civitella
Anthony Constantini	Steve Wittig
Kayla Holcomb	Deborah Fretz
Jason Beecher	

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) held a Public Meeting on May 7, 2014 at 5:30 PM in the gymnasium of Pocopson Elementary School, located in West Chester, Pennsylvania, with approximately 125 individuals in attendance. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity to the public to learn more about the proposed design of the State Route (S.R.) 0926 Improvement Project, ask questions, and provide comments regarding the project.

Overall the meeting was separated into three parts. The first part was an Open House where members of the public and public officials could engage the project team at the various display board stations. The second part was a formal presentation providing an overview of the project that explained the results of the recent studies. The third part consisted of a question and answer session where residents could ask questions about the project to PennDOT and the project team. The attending public was provided with a Questions/Comments Sheet.

A) Open House and Display Board Stations

The Open House part of the evening began at 5:30 PM and lasted until 8:00 PM. Eleven presentation boards were displayed depicting key project elements for public review during the Open House part of the Public Meeting. The project team answered questions during this time

regarding the presented material on the display boards and about the project in general. Comments were recorded by the various personnel at the display board stations. Like the written comments, some of the comments from the display board stations were directly addressed by the GF project team at the display board stations or as part of the question and answer session part of the Public Meeting. These comments will be reviewed by the project team and addressed. The majority of the questions and comments during the Open House part of the evening were related to traffic and the detour. Additional topics included questions and concerns regarding flooding issues, construction, aesthetics, recreation, how to obtain further information regarding the project, and environmental issues. Questions and comments from the public during this time included the following:

1. Traffic/Detour:

- a. A traffic backup at PA 52 and Pocopson Rd will be created when the road is closed for construction.
- b. Access to the meadows on the southwest side of the Brandywine Creek after the profile is raised.
- c. Detour routes will be clogged with traffic and blocked by tractor trailers that cannot navigate the narrow roadways and bridges.
- d. The PA 52 bridge is a mess and a resident asked how will it accommodate additional traffic.
- e. Concern was raised over the traffic issues associated with PA 52. This was the general feeling that traffic is bad with PA 52 closed for the detour and even though PA 52 will be open during our project, they feel that traffic will be worse than it is during this construction.
- f. Many people in attendance noted their concern about the bridge on Pocopson Road, the impacts to the Brandywine Park, and the PA 52 Resurfacing project.
- g. Concern was noted over right turn lane on Pocopson Rd to S.R. 0926 (south) and if we could look at possibly adding a right turn lane at Pocopson Rd to go south on S.R. 0926.
- h. The public was concerned with bus detours and the weight loads of buses going over the PA 52 bridge.
- i. Traffic signaling was a large concern with the public.
- j. The public was curious if traffic studies have been completed for PA 52.
- k. A resident suggested having Rt. 842 be the detour instead of the proposed detour.
- l. A resident expressed concern regarding congestion of Pocopson Road and Rt. 926. She had suggested incorporating a right turn lane into the project to avoid the congestion.

- m. A resident asked if a sign can be posted to limit truck traffic.
 - n. The school district was unsure of the school boundary lines and wondering where buses would have to go to and how this project would affect bus routes.
2. Flooding:
- a. The new S.R. 0926 profile will create a dam effect upstream of the bridge, meaning the new bridge openings will not provide enough flow.
 - b. Several residents referenced the profile board: the area bound by the original S.R. 0926 profile and the flood event lines do not appear to match the new area provided by the bridge openings.
 - c. Concern that all water of a major flood event will pass below the new bridges.
 - d. One resident mentioned that the new bridge will create a dam. A question was asked if the bridge opening will be wide enough to accommodate flood flows.
 - e. Will the area under the bridge to the east be dredged to allow for extra stream flow?
 - f. Radley Run floods before the Brandywine Creek.
3. Construction:
- a. Many questions were asked regarding the schedule.
 - b. One resident was concerned about access into field for mowing.
 - c. The property owner for the veterinary clinic has a septic tank that is believed to be located in the temporary construction easement (TCE). He was also concerned if the business would still be open during construction. If so, he would like an "Open for Business" sign near the entrance and also further up the street. It was mentioned to him that the TCE will be adjusted so as to not impact the septic system. Also, the business can and will remain open for business and the contractor must maintain access to it at all times.
 - d. Residents were concerned about the PA 52 Roundabout Project and if it would be completed before the S.R. 0926 Improvement Project begins. It was mentioned that the PA 52 Roundabout Project would be complete and fully functioning prior to commencing the S.R. 0926 Improvement Project.
4. Aesthetics:
- a. The architectural treatment being used on the new structures are of concern.
 - b. Raising the profile will impact the view from the home on a piece of property located at the southeast corner of the project area.

5. Recreation:

- a. One resident expressed their desire to have dedicated bike lanes provided on the bridge as opposed to the 5 foot shoulders that are shown, even though these shoulders are able to accommodate bicycles.

6. Obtaining further information:

- a. Residents want access to the study documents to check on the progress of the project.
- b. A suggestion was to put the PowerPoint on the township websites.

7. Environmental:

- a. What kinds of environmental impacts occur due to project?
- b. Will impacts to wetlands and historic resources be minimized?

B) Formal Presentation

The formal presentation began at approximately 6:40 PM and lasted approximately one half hour. Ms. Fullard introduced herself as the PennDOT project manager and explained the purpose of the Public Meeting. Mr. Eells presented the PowerPoint presentation to the public.

C) Question and Answer Period

The Question and Answer part of the evening began during Mr. Eells presentation and continued until approximately 7:30 PM.

1. Q) Can you please explain what site distance means.

A) Mr. Eells explained it was the ability to see conflicting traffic when making a turn.

2. Q) How many 25-year storms has there been in recent years?

A) Mr. Eells explained that there have been 3 storms that exceeded the 25 year storm since 1992: Hurricane Floyd in 1999, Hurricane Irene in 2011, and a recent storm event on April 30/May 1, 2014.

3. Q) One resident was concerned about her property, located at corner of S.R. 0926 and S.R. 0100 (Creek Road), after viewing the general plans during the Open House. She expressed her frustration and asked what she is supposed to do if the elevation of the road was raised 9 feet in relation to her property.

A) Although the elevation will be raised, the project will tie into existing driveways. Mr. Eells asked if the conversation could be continued separately after the formal presentation. Mr. Eells met with the property owner and she located the driveway. Any impacts to her driveway will be addressed.

4. Q) Will the project reduce flooding upstream or downstream?

A) The project will reduce the flooding of S.R. 0926 and also the road closures that are associated with the flooding.

5. Q) One resident asked Mr. Eells to explain the model he mentioned during the presentation.

A) The model, called HEC-RAS, is the model required by PADEP and FEMA. It was run on both Brandywine Creek and Radley Run. The Brandywine Creek model showed no flood raise associated with the proposed design. The Radley Run model showed a flood raise upstream or east of SR 0926.

6. Q) Why can't you raise the elevation so that the road will not flood at all?

A) It was explained that the nursery property is higher in elevation than the road and putting a culvert in to allow water to pass under roadway would not work. It was also mentioned that the bridge was designed for the 25-year storm per PennDOT criteria, which would not completely eliminate the flooding.

7. Q) If you have a 100-year flood, would cars be able to pass on the road?

A) No. There would still be one foot of water on the road which would not be passable.

8. Q) Why not raise the road to the 100-year storm level to get the bridge out of flood waters?

A) If water cannot flow over the road the Radley Run structure would need to be made bigger. Additionally PennDOT is only required to design to the 25-year storm for this road.

9. Q) Will there be a sloped wall at corner of S.R. 0926 and Creek Road?

A) A grass slope will be constructed, not a wall at this location.

10. Q) What is the cost of the project?

A) 8 million dollars

11. Q) Is there a way to speed up the project?

A) There is a timing restriction for the construction of the bridge over the Brandywine Creek because of the high tension line. A crane needs to access the area to remove existing bridge and transport beams for the new bridge. This would need to occur during low energy months in order to not disrupt power to customers as the power in the high tension lines would need to be deenergized. It was clarified that no one would be without power and that the distribution of power would come from elsewhere to serve customers. It is anticipated that construction will take place from 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM Monday through Friday.

12. Q) Why can't construction be 24 hours to speed up the time?

A) This is due to cost. Also as mentioned previously, there are construction time limits due to high tension lines west of the Brandywine Creek.

13. Q) Is PennDOT aware of the pedestrian/bicyclist needs? Are sidewalks proposed?

A) The County and PennDOT are aware and accept that there will be 5 foot shoulders, which will accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

14. Q) Have traffic studies been completed for PA 52?

A) No traffic studies have been completed for this project.

15. Q) A concern was raised about the detour. It was mentioned that local people will go on Parkerville Road, which intersects with Rt. 1, and it will become gridlocked. It was advised to put a "No Left Turn" sign at the intersection of Parkerville Road and Rt. 1.

A) The comment was acknowledged.

16. Q) A question was asked if signs could be posted to not allow tractor trailers to use the detour.

A) PA 52 is a state road and PennDOT cannot post signage that would restrict tractor trailers to use a road that can accommodate truck traffic. Therefore tractor trailers would be allowed to use the detoured roads.

17. Q) A resident mentioned that the nursery property that was discussed was sold and is no longer nursery property. The resident suggested that the project team determine what the property will become. Another resident asked if the new property owners are putting a retail store on property or know of the work that is proposed for the bridge.

A) If the new owners are doing anything to the property, they will have to complete studies and mitigate for impacts.

18. Q) Tractor trailers are prohibited from using S.R. 0926 bridge currently. Why not the same in the future?

A) The existing bridge is posted with a weight limit due to poor condition of structure. The tractor trailers are therefore restricted from using the bridge. However, when the proposed bridge is constructed, tractor trailers would not be restricted from its use.

19. Q) The state route designation was lifted from Creek Road, why can't PennDOT do the same to PA 52?

A) Mr. Davies mentioned that Creek Road is still a state road and can therefore accommodate the traveling public. PA 52 is not restricted because it can handle truck traffic loads.

20. Q) Concerns were mentioned about the PA 52 bridge. If tractor trailers are trying to negotiate turns, traffic backs up. This will be a major traffic issue if they are allowed on detour. Due to the storms that occurred the previous week that flooded and closed S.R. 0926, the traveling public used the roads proposed for the detour. Traffic is a great concern and can back up as far back as Lenape Pizza during rush hour. There was and will be much frustration with traffic and the detour.

A) Mr. Davies mentioned that the detours will be posted and anyone can use them. If temporary signals are needed, PennDOT can be flexible during construction. It is difficult to predict traffic issues and PennDOT will work with the public and townships to address traffic concerns.

21. Q) How do I get an official copy of the presentations and the models presented?

A) The reports have not been officially submitted, but once they are approved by the associated agencies, they are available for public review.

22. Q) How flexible is PennDOT with detours and/or signals? Why are they not with PA 52?

A) PennDOT will adapt when they see an issue.

23. Q) It was mentioned that there were only 3 storms in the last 25 years? Is that correct?

A) The 3 recorded floods are greater than 25-year storms. Hurricane Floyd was actually greater than the 100-year storm. Therefore, even if the bridge were to be built to the 100-year storm, the road still would have flooded.

Mr. Davies mentioned that the project is not very simple and that is why it has taken so long, many years, to finish this project. PennDOT is trying to get as many improvements as possible with this project.

24. Q) The look of this bridge appears that it should be going to the airport. It needs to be "softened".

A) The aesthetics of the bridge are not final and the look can be "softened".

25. Q) It was just asked that PennDOT be sensitive to the people living in area of construction.

A) This comment was acknowledged.

26. Q) How will the public know what has been looked at in terms of traffic options and where to look specifically to verify all options have been studied?

A) Coordination with the townships is ongoing and construction adjustments will be made if necessary.

27. Q) Can you reassure residents that the water will flow through the structures and will not dam?

A) The outcome of the model showed the same water surface elevation.

28. Q) When you raise the elevation of S.R. 0926, would water back up?

A) A lot of the water at the corner of S.R. 0926 and Creek Road just sits there. The project will not reduce flooding at this location.

29. Q) Is dredging Brandywine Creek an option?

A) No. This is not an option since downstream is higher in elevation and also if it were to be dredged, the sediment would simply fill back into the stream bed.

30. Q) Is the bridge over the Brandywine Creek in imminent trouble structurally or will it last through the next decade?

A) Mr. Eells mentioned that he was not positive what the bridge was posted at, but knew that there is a weight restriction. He added that the bridge is inspected after all flooding events. With the frequent flooding, this bridge gets inspected more than most. It is in poor shape.
Note: The bridge is posted for a limit of 26 tons and 33 tons for combinations. This information was obtained after the meeting.

31. Q) A resident confirmed the need for a new bridge. He mentioned that he canoes down the Brandywine Creek and there is concern that pieces of the bridge may fall down and hit canoers as they paddle the waterway.

A) Comment was acknowledged.

32. Q) A question was raised if the traffic light timing can be adjusted for Pocopson Road and S.R. 0926.

A) Contractor can adjust the timing of the lights if they see the need.

33. Q) Is there a way to see all questions asked during this meeting? Is there a website for the project? The resident was concerned about accountability and would like answers.

A) The project does not have a specific website, but coordination with the townships is ongoing. Discussion with the townships will occur about the possibility of posting information about the project to its website so the public can be updated.

34. Q) A resident expressed her concern about health, safety, and welfare of the people in this community, the living things in Brandywine Creek and the creek itself. Will buses be made to use the detour?

A) Comment was acknowledged and it was mentioned that the school bus routes will be laid out by the Unionville School District.

35. Q) Monica Harrower, PennDOT District 6-0, suggested that the project team can email the minutes and the comment/response forms from the Public Meeting to the public in attendance.

36. Q) A resident asked if it was normal to not post projects to websites.

A) Yes, this is common. Larger projects have websites, most do not.

37. Q) Some of the roads proposed for the detours are in poor shape. Are any improvements to these roads proposed? Are any plans to resurface PA 52 due to potholes?

A) Mr. Davies mentioned that there were some Surface Treatment Improvement Projects coming out this summer. However, he was not aware which roads were being improved in the area.

38. Q) How will we know if there is a website?

A) Provide us your information and we will most likely use the townships website to upload project information.

The Question and Answer period was completed at approximately 7:30 PM and the public was offered the opportunity to review the display boards and ask the project team questions.

The Public Meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 PM.

D) Written Comments

Twenty-eight Comment Sheets were collected from the comment station at the Public Meeting or were mailed to the project team. As of the date of these minutes, four emails have been received by the project team. The Comment Sheets were designed so that the public could write any question or concern they had as opposed to answering specific questions asked by the project team. Main topics of concern as per the Comment Sheets were traffic and detour route, construction, flooding, aesthetics, how to obtain further information regarding the project, historic preservation, recreation, and environmental concerns.

1. Traffic and Detour:

- a. The traffic traveling south on Old 100 backs up when 18 wheelers attempt to turn right on PA 52 bridge then cannot complete the turn (radius too small). The traffic backs up both directions on PA 52. Emergency equipment is then stuck.

- b. Since the S.R. 0926 bridge has a 15 ton limit, why is there not signage on S.R. 0926 and other roads instructing tractor trailers and dump trucks not to take the roads? Signs should be posted up to 202.
- c. Concern is the need for access for farm equipment into meadow on west side of Brandywine and south side of S.R. 0926. PECO and gas line also need access.
- d. The detours will be a traffic nightmare as evidenced by the minor detour today with PA 52 N being closed in Pocopson. Improvement should include a traffic light at Street and Creek Road intersection. What are the detour options when Rt. 1 is closed?
- e. Has a traffic study been completed? Will there be additional traffic lights and stop signs installed? (i.e. S.R. 0926 and Creek Road, Creek Road and Country Club Road, PA 52 and Creek Road). Can traffic be restricted in residential neighborhoods, such as Radley Run?
- f. What will be done at the Lenape bridge where PA 52 and Creek Road meet about traffic flow? There are stop signs there and with increased traffic during detour, a large bottleneck may occur here.
- g. When will the road surface of the PA 52 bridge over the Brandywine be repaired? When construction begins on the S.R. 0926 bridge, will PA 52 be shut down for local traffic only? If not, how will traffic be controlled at the PA 52/Pocopson Road? I understand a traffic light has been approved for this intersection, but I haven't seen a schedule for installation.
- h. With the closure of PA 52 at Pocopson, we the residents of the surrounding area have gotten a taste of what traffic patterns look like when one of our primary roads is closed. Traffic has been very bad, with an average of 15 minutes added to rush hour commute times. And this is with two bridges open. My primary concerns about traffic during the 926 bridge project area: 1) The Lenape Bridge at PA 52 and Rt. 100 needs to be repaired and widened, if possible. Currently it is riddled with pot holes and traffic crawls across creating a backup in three directions. 2) The cross traffic at the intersection of Pocopson Road/ PA 52/West Creek Road needs a traffic light if Lenape Bridge is going to be the primary detour for the 926 bridge. Currently the wait for a break in traffic during rush hour in order to turn onto or cross PA 52 from Pocopson Road or W. Creek Rd. is 3-5 minutes. Doubling the traffic will make it impossible to turn onto or cross over PA 52 from Pocopson Rd. or West Creek Road.
- i. Will school buses be able to navigate the detour? I do not want to be redistricted.
- j. It sounds to me like you have not addressed the impact of the "unofficial" detour routes, especially on the Lenape/Creek Road intersection, PA 52, Brintons Bridge Road (Pennsbury Township), Parkerville Road, Denton Hollow, etc.

- k. Crucial to study traffic issues related to light at Pocopson Road and make improvements during construction.
- l. Traffic pattern analysis needs to be done. Traffic light at Pocopson and PA 52. Limit trucks off PA 52 bridge and Picnic Park Bridge.
- m. Add no left turn sign at Parkerville Road and Rt. 1. Traffic light at Pocopson Road and PA 52.
- n. Detour signage for roundabout construction has been a disaster. Traffic has been funneled onto local, one lane roads (i.e. Parkerville and Denton Hollow).
- o. The alternate routes must be maintained (Pocopson Road/52/Creek Road). The comments about a light at PA 52 and Pocopson Road are premature. Traffic flows just fine through there currently. The delay is caused by the closure of PA 52 and the use of Pocopson as an alternate. This rerouting is causing traffic backups on S.R. 0926, mainly westbound, because the light at S.R. 0926 and Pocopson is constantly tripped. Only 5-6 cars westbound get through the light at any time.
- p. Traffic is delayed by the use of S.R. 0926 by tractor trailers that cannot make the grade of the hills. It is not uncommon to see 20 cars following a tractor trailer both ways on S.R. 0926. Trucks should be banned on this road.
- q. There is no schedule for the trains on the railroad. However, the trains constantly backing up and moving forward cause horrific delays. School buses are delayed at least once a week due to this. If PennDOT could somehow reroute the tracks or put the new road over the tracks, that would help.
- r. The “marked” Detour and the “reality” of where traffic will flow are vastly different. A majority of the S.R. 0926 traffic is bound for Rt. 202 corridor and West Chester.
- s. The recent closure of S.R. 0926 and the round-a-bout construction on PA 52 points to many deficiencies in the detour plans during construction.
- t. Traffic backups on these rural routes are affecting the SAFETY and SECURITY of the residents, businesses, and schools. The planned vs. actual detours during the bridge closure will cause significant delays and backups for an extended period were the project’s original plans and detours put into effect. Ambulance or Fire vehicles will have significant delays getting through the traffic backups during peak travel times were than emergency at the school, residences, or businesses.
- u. S.R. 0926 Street Road has daily traffic counts per the latest PennDOT data of 14,000 vehicles. The vast majority of these vehicles are heading to Rt. 202 and West Chester. The detour sends them to the already overloaded Painters Crossroads intersection of Rt. 1 and Rt. 202. Traffic count on Rt. 1 exceeds 26,000. The left turn lane onto Rt. 202 is far undersized to handle this car load.

- v. Many vehicles will seek to cross the Brandywine at the PA 52 Lenape Bridge. That will require retiming of the light at Pocopson Road and S.R. 0926 and the installation of a new traffic light at Pocopson Road and PA 52.
 - w. The geometry of the "T" at the end of the Lenape Bridge will need to be studied and those radii be reconstructed prior to this project to allow for school busses and truck traffic. It is imperative that the Lenape bridge access points be improved prior to the beginning of the bridge project.
 - x. Should an unforeseen emergency occur that would require extended road closure in either the area of the Lenape Bridge or Painters Crossroads, a county wide traffic debacle would occur and the access of fire and ambulance would be greatly impaired.
 - y. A traffic impact study be completed regarding the PA 52 and S.R. 0926 corridors as well as the proposed Painter Crossroads detour.
 - z. Traffic backups would drastically impact access to local businesses and impact delivery schedule which add costs to delivery and labor productivity.
 - aa. If traffic flows are not improved during detour, this cost will be greatly exacerbated during an 18 month bridge shutdown.
2. Construction:
- a. Trucks hit stone wall of PA 52 bridge.
 - b. Construction timeline seems really lengthy for a small bridge.
 - c. Is the bridge being widened to accommodate 18 wheelers? Bad for the area. The 18 wheelers should be encouraged to use Rt. 1 and not 926. Too much traffic on 926.
 - d. Shorten the time from 18 months – Incentives! Work 24 hours/day to shorten the 18 months.
 - e. What is the status of the PA 52 bridge? I.e. structural integrity? Is there a size and weight restriction? I am especially concerned about creek disturbance during construction and runoff of contaminants which will be harmful to the streams health.
 - f. Lenape bridge approach angles must be addressed before construction.
 - g. Thought and serious consideration should be given to determine if at any cost, to keep a portion of the old bridge, an adjacent staged construction of the new bridge, a temporary bridge, or shifting of bridge location be considered in order to keep at least single lane of traffic on SR 0926 over the Brandywine. A queuing light could be incorporated to route a single alternating lane of traffic over the bridge during construction.

- h. It is imperative that the construction be managed on two shifts into the evening in order that the project can be completed in under a year. The project timetable would be shortened and the net labor outlay should be a relative wash.
 - i. What assumptions are being made regarding work days and overtime to make up lost days due to weather conditions?
 - j. Are there any incentives built into the plan to entice the contractors to finish ahead of schedule.
 - k. During the construction period, what thought has been given to safe staging of materials, equipment, and construction management trailers? You would almost have to plan for a 25year storm during construction. In this most recent storm, there were no areas near the bridge that could allow for such staging.
3. Flooding:
- a. Radley Run creek back up. Are there any plans to investigate water rise off from 926 in neighborhoods?
 - b. Project is under-engineered. If there is still going to be flooding and closures several times a year, why spend all this money on something that is not truly fixing the situation?
 - c. According to your numbers, we have had 3 “25-year” storms since 1992. This is 22 years/3 storms = 7-year storm. Will the new bridge be adequate?
 - d. I had not realized Radley Run was a problem.
 - e. How high of an elevation will 926 and 100 have? I have concern of flooding to my property.
 - f. The lines of land elevations and the lines of major flood events show significant overflow cross section area west and east of the bridge. These are, of course, the areas that presently flood. The added cross section at the left and right ends up the proposed bridge does not appear to adequately restore flow area. Thus the new embankments at either end approaches to the bridge will function as dams. While the design will likely decrease flooding of 926 somewhat, it will come at the expense of increased flooding upstream of the bridge. The bridge should be widened by adding a fourth span to total 420 feet.
 - g. Do your best to eliminate flooding near nursery on Rt. 926.
 - h. Why are you planning on spending \$8MM on a bridge that will continue to flood? The 3 times in 22 years is incorrect.
4. Aesthetics:
- a. I would recommend either stone or MFSD stone facing to cover cement bridge. Also consider some type of wood railing across bridge.

- b. Please look into making the bridge more architecturally appropriate to the area rather than so industrial looking.
 - c. You need to pay more attention to the aesthetics of the bridge design to have it be compatible with the surroundings.
 - d. I do appreciate continued work you can do to “soften” the bridge so it better fits into the surroundings. The example of the new bridge aesthetics at Longwood and PA 52 was a great example of the softening we would like to see.
 - e. Please make the bridge so it has some architectural interest and looks as if it fits the area. The one you have on the sketch looks as if it could be at a shopping mall.
 - f. As much as possible, the bridges should have a good Chester County appearance – like PA 52 bridge south of S.R. 0926 and north of Rt. 1, But it is nice to be able to see the water as you cross.
 - g. Ensure bridge facings are stone-like.
5. Obtaining Further Information:
- a. More public meetings! More information given to owners of property directly impacted.
 - b. How will we be able to get info on who will be monitoring the Brandywine? Where will the information on the creek be posted?
 - c. Post info on website? Notify residents? Poorly advertised for attending.
6. Historic Preservation:
- a. Please ensure historic marker on existing bridge is preserved.
 - b. Historical bridge abutments must be preserved. They are a township historical resource.
7. Recreation:
- a. I see no “bicycle lane” in the well done diagrams and drawings. As a bicyclist the increase in auto traffic over the years has been quite significant. Also, the number of bicyclists and organized rides has increased also. To help us all coexist, provisions for both should be part of the plan for improved facilities. State and federal funds support improvement for bicycle travel and safety.
8. Environmental:
- a. There is a bald eagle nest near the S.R. 0926 bridge. The bald eagle pair perch for most of the day on the tall overhead power lines right next to the bridge (north side) and have been doing so for at least a year.

These minutes represent our best interpretation of the proceedings of the Public Meeting held on May 7, 2014 for the S.R. 0926 Improvement Project. If you have any questions or require any information please contact Robert P. O'Neill at 610-650-8101.

Meeting notes prepared by: Deborah Fretz