

Grand History Trail Feasibility Study in Adams County

Study Committee Meeting #4

Meeting Date & Time: Tuesday, April 30, 2019; 5:30-7:20 p.m.

Next Meeting Date: To be decided

1. See the attached meeting agenda. The topics and headings below are taken from the agenda. The bullets describe what was discussed or took place.
2. Prior to the start of the meeting, Douglas Maisey, with Campbell Thomas & Co. (CTC), distributed the following documents for each participant:
 - a. A meeting agenda
 - b. An updated, 11x17 inch topo map in green and white, showing most of the roads that they analyzed in the study area.
 - c. An 11x17 inch road map showing “Alternative Alignments” with alignments in yellow
 - d. An 11x17 inch road map labeled “Alternative Segment Map” which shows other features like Land Conservancy easements and Preserved Farms.
 - e. An 11x17 inch road map labeled “Base Map” without the alternative alignments, but adding railroads
 - f. An 11x17 inch spreadsheet labeled “Segment Analysis,” showing characteristics of 56 different segments of roads
3. Douglas also posted on the wall, 24x36 inch printouts of the maps listed above.
4. A list of people attending is the third attachment.

I. MEETING UPDATE

- a. Bob Thomas, CTC, discussed the follow-up meeting we conducted with staff from Gettysburg National Military Park (GNMP) and Eisenhower Historic Site. He thanked Dafna Reiner, Park Biologist, for arranging the meeting. He used his laser pointer on the large map to show where consideration is being given to allow the trail to use the roads on the Eisenhower property to get over to Red Rock Road. He also showed where the park staff thought that the trail could cross park property near Sachs Covered Bridge.
- b. Bob talked about the discussion several of us had with land owner Tim Shields and asked Jim Paddock, who arranged a meeting, to explain how Mr. Shields feels about the trail. Jim provided some background information and made it

clear that Mr. Shields is supportive of the trail. Minutes of this meeting were distributed to Study Committee members following the meeting.

II. RESIDENT CONCERNS ALONG GORDON ROAD

Bob showed a proposed route along Gordon Road, crossing a stream ford. He said that this alternative route would not be pursued any further due to concerns that residents had expressed to their Township Commissioner, Paul Kellett, and to Cumberland Township Commissioner Jim Paddock. Paul expressed concern about showing this at all and requested that the words “SHOULD THIS ROUTE BE SELECTED” on the green and white map be removed prior to the public meetings. This will be done, but Bob said it was important to show all the possible routes being analyzed or someone would likely ask, “Why didn’t you consider Gordon Road?” Dennis stressed that any work being done under the contract for the study needs to be cited in the final study so the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) knows how the money was spent.

III. UPDATES TO ALIGNMENT MAPPING

- a. Bob discussed the updates to the green and white topo map with additions like Shorb’s Mill Road, Stultz Road, and Boyle Road. Doug also pointed out some of the changes.
- b. Bob and Doug discussed the additions as they related to the “Alternative Alignments” map, showing roadway segments in yellow
- c. Bob explained, with comments from Doug, the “Alternative Segment Map” and the accompanying spreadsheet which analyzed all the segments. Committee members asked how they determined whether a segment was a “Bucolic Trail Experience” since a couple members did not agree with the assessment. Bob and Doug stressed that this was a starting point and changes may need to be made before the analysis is final.

IV. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS CHART

Bob talked about a chart that would compare the alternative routes, using characteristics requested by DCNR. He emailed Dennis, the Project Officer, a sample chart but other committee members have not seen that yet.

V. PUBLIC MEETING #1 (SCHEDULED FOR MAY 14TH AT 5:00 P.M.)

- a. The meeting room will be organized in table groups. There will be 5 or 6 groups of two tables, with 8 chairs around each group of tables. One or two large maps will be on each set of tables and posted on the walls. As members of the public arrive at the meeting, Bob wants Study Committee members to greet

and welcome people and answer questions until it's time for the meeting to start. Then Bob will provide a brief presentation about the project, using PowerPoint slides. He showed draft slides for the presentation. After the introductory material, he had slides showing what an "Advisory Bike Lane" would look like, using different colored pavement. Dennis suggested he reverse the order of the two slides as the second more clearly shows the concept. Following the explanation, there was a slide showing the roads to be used for Route 1. The following slides had photos of what the roadways looked like along this route. Committee members suggested changing "Route" to something else like "Option" since "Route" seemed too definitive. Bob repeated this process with four different routes/options. Dennis said he liked the way the routes/options were presented, and others seemed to agree.

- b. Following the PowerPoint presentation, members of the public would be asked to examine the maps, evaluate the proposed routes, and suggest other routes or ways to connect the various route segments. Members of Bob's consulting team would circulate and facilitate discussions in the table groups. Members of the Study Committee should also participate, sitting at different tables.
- c. After an hour or so of discussion, each table group would report out to sum up their discussion.

VI. ADDITIONAL PROJECT MEETINGS

After the public meeting, another Study Committee meeting will be held to discuss the public meeting. After the draft trail study is complete, another Study Committee meeting will be held to discuss the document. Then there will be a final public meeting to present the final, printed study.

VII. NEXT STEPS/OPEN DISCUSSION

- a. Bob and Doug will be meeting with PennDOT to learn if there are any road projects which could impact a possible route. As Bob, pointed out, if we plan a trail along a road that may have major rehab work, some work on the trail could be performed at the same time, and at lower cost.
- b. Bob is open to more meetings with key property owners, to further advance the project (although not required by his contract).
- c. Selecting a preferred alternative alignment will not happen until the study is complete, and the selection could change months after selection, because changing events may make a different route more feasible.

These minutes were prepared and submitted by Dennis Hickethier, Project Officer, with input from CT&C.

