APPENDIX I
AGENCY COORDINATION MEETINGS

ACM #8 MEETING MINUTES

JULY 28, 2010

AGENCY COORDINATION MEETING

July 28, 2010
McCormick Taylor, Inc. Harrisburg Office
5 Capital Drive, Suite 400
Harrisburg, PA 17110

MINUTES

PROJECT PRESENTATION

ALLEGHENY TUNNEL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, Gary Graham, Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) and Ed Jones (L.R. Kimball)

Gary Graham provided a brief overview of the history of the Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project, including the fact the project was put on hold in 2000, but currently needs to go forward. He then introduced **Ed Jones** who presented a slideshow with a history of the project, current status, and a proposed plan to move forward with the project.

A. BACKGROUND AND PRESENTATION

Jones gave a powerpoint presentation (handouts of the slideshow were provided) concerning the history of the Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project and the proposed future plan for the project as follows.

Project History Overview
The project was introduced to the public and agencies in a number of meetings in 1996 and 1997. Public and agency coordination was continued in 1997 and 1998 with presentations of the Needs Analysis findings and 12 preliminary alternatives, including the No Build Alternative. Existing conditions of the study area were shown on mapping to orient the agencies in relation to the Turnpike location. This slide was followed by mapping indicating the alignment of the preliminary alternatives. In October of 1998, following agency concurrence, six alternatives and the No Build Alternative were carried forward for detailed study. The alternatives carried forward were the Orange Cut, Yellow Cut, Brown Cut, Yellow Tunnel, and Red Tunnel. The Brown Tunnel Alternative was also carried forward at the request of the USACOE. The detailed alternative corridors were indicated on mapping.

Resource studies were conducted for the project including a wetland delineation and jurisdictional determination in 1998, two Allegheny woodrat surveys in 1998, a survey in the South Penn Railroad Tunnel for the presence of Indiana bats (23 were identified) in 1999, and a PAM HEP study in 1999. A series of meetings were held with the public and agencies in 1999 to present the Detailed Alternatives Analysis findings. During these meetings the USACOE requested the investigation of a Fly Over Alternative. **Jones** explained this alternative and indicated it on mapping. This alternative was not carried into detailed analysis due to difficulties in design, safety, and cost.

In 2000, resource studies continued, including groundwater/hydrology studies, a general safety analysis, wetland functional assessment (New England methodology), further Indiana bat surveys (harp trapping at the South Penn Railroad Tunnel and mist net surveys), a stream survey of the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River, and a timber rattlesnake habitat survey. In the fall of 2000, the Brown Cut was identified as the PTC recommended alternative at the ACM, but there was no concurrence from the agencies at that time. An agency field view was then held in November of 2000 to walk the Brown Cut and Yellow Tunnel alternatives. As a follow-up to the field view, USACOE requested the study of the Bifurcated Tunnel Alternative. **Jones** explained this alternative and indicated it on mapping. This alternative was not carried into detailed analysis due to difficulties in design, cost, safety and impacts. Following the ACM in the fall of 2000 and the November agency field view, the project was put on hold with no concurrence on a preferred alternative.

Project Purpose and Needs

The original project purpose and needs were revaluated when the PTC indicated plans to restart the project in 2009, and they were deemed to be valid. The purpose is to address traffic congestion, reduce accidents, address deficiencies of the roadway and tunnel, and look at the potential for continuous travel for hazardous material haulers. The project needs include transportation demand, existing geometric constraints, accident rates, tunnel conditions, and system linkage and continuity (use by hazardous material carriers). The system linkage and continuity need was not concurred upon by all of the agencies during the original process. It was determined that information concerning this need could be analyzed, but any alternative chosen to be moved forward would not be required to meet this need. In moving forward with the project today, the PTC still feels this to be a valid need as not all hazardous materials haulers can travel through the tunnel. They are required to divert to other roadways that travel through existing communities.

Plan to Move Forward

Prior to the project ending, the agencies and public were requesting additional information on one cut and one tunnel option. The Red Tunnel and Orange Cut Alternatives were not indicated as being favored by the agencies, public or project team at that time. In consideration of where the project was left in 2000, it was felt that the best plan to move forward would be to update the brown and yellow corridors studies, including a cut and tunnel alternative for each corridor. **Jones** made a request to the agencies present to provide concurrence on carrying the Brown and Yellow corridors forward and utilizing the previous data as technical support. Following concurrence, public involvement would be reinitiated. Mapping of the Brown and Yellow Corridors was presented and a brief list of likely studies requiring updates was given, including wetlands, threatened and endangered species, wildlife crossings, habitat fragmentation, wetland and stream mitigation, cultural resources, handling of excess excavation, and hazardous material carrier routes. Before turning the meeting over to the agencies for questions and discussion, **Greg Bednar (PTC)** explained that the lead agency for the project is the USACOE. During the previous studies, this had been managed through the Baltimore District, but has recently been transferred to the Pittsburgh District.

GROUP DISCUSSION/COMMENTS

The agency members had the following comments and questions following the presentation.

1. **Bill Glover [PA Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)]** noted that on another large project the stormwater management considerations had been left out of alternative analysis, and that these considerations would weigh in on alternative considerations and area of investigation. He stated that he felt a tunnel should have less impact on this factor than a cut.

2. **Dave Spotts [PA Fish and Boat Commission (PFBC)]** stated that there had been a lot of information involved with this project and asked how the project was left off in 2000. **Jones** replied that a draft of the Detailed Alternatives Analysis had been prepared but not circulated. **Spotts** questioned if the agencies had wanted another Red Tunnel alignment considered prior to the project being put on hold. **Jones** stated that a modified Red Tunnel alignment was not being considered at the time the project was put on hold. **Spotts** then asked if the comments from the agencies concerning previous studies and meetings could be gathered and sent out to the agencies. **Jones** asked for clarification whether he would like comments from just PGC or all of the agencies and **Spotts** responded that it should be from all of the agencies. **Spotts** asked what was the last document that the agencies would have commented on. **Tammy Sherwin (L.R. Kimball)** offered further clarification, stating that the last document worked on was the draft Detailed Alternatives Analysis, but that it had not been circulated because the project was put on hold. The comments generated prior to that point had been drafted as part of the Detailed Alternatives Analysis. Therefore, they could be reproduced and circulated. **Barbara Okorn [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)]** stated that the comments should be circulated. **Spotts** asked again about a Red Tunnel Alternative. **Sherwin** replied that the comments from the agencies and public dealt primarily with the Yellow Tunnel and the Brown Cut. Additionally, the Red Tunnel Alternative was not an alternative that was being requested for further review when the project was put on hold, and that the last agency field view that was held was specifically for the Yellow Tunnel and Brown Cut.

3. **Bob Anderson [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)]** stated that he had reviewed the previous USFWS files and couldn't find concurrence from the USFWS on any alternative, and did find one that stated that the PGC specifically did not concur with the Brown alternative. He also stated that concerning the Indiana bat, that there is now a lot of new additional information available for the project area. This is in part due to two large wind turbine farms to the north of the project area. Additionally, it has been determined that this area has the second largest hibernaculum in Pennsylvania and there are two maternity colonies in the vicinity as well. The bats are known to leave the hibernaculum and travel across the proposed alternative routes to the Raystown Branch of the Juniata. **Anderson** stated formal consultation would likely be needed, and that a meeting with the USFWS would be needed to determine impacts to the Indiana bats, considering there might be significant impacts. **Sherwin** clarified that at this time they were only looking for concurrence on carrying forward the studies for the two corridors and not for a specific design. **Anderson** stated that it was his understanding that things had been left off previously in asking for more information on the Red Tunnel alignment. **Jones** stated that he did not recall anyone asking for additional studies on the Red Tunnel, but that the files could be checked concerning that information.

4. **Glover** stated that the Susquehanna River Basin Commission should be contacted concerning the NPDES for the project.

5. **Jamie Detweiler (DEP)** stated that DEP would have to make further inquiries into the use of the New England Method versus Wet II for the wetland functional assessment. She also cautioned that any wetlands associated with trout waters would be considered exceptional

value (EV) wetlands. **Bednar** noted that all wetland studies would be updated. **Detweiler** stated that wetland impacts should be avoided if possible.

6. **Glover** asked if there were any details on potential waste/borrow areas. **Jones** replied that at the time of the last studies they had looked at quantities and potential locations, including a reclaimed strip mine, but that detailed environmental studies had not been conducted on the strip mine area. **Glover** asked if the project would be requiring specifics on waste/borrow areas. **Jones** stated that was something under discussion near the end of the previous studies. Typically it is not done, but it was being considered for this project that the contractor may be required to use this area. He stated that it will be a subject that will be looked into.

7. **Detweiler** asked if the quality of the streams was known. **Sherwin and Jones** stated that they believed the Raystown Branch to the Juniata was HQ-CWF, and that they were unsure about the unnamed tributary to Stony Creek, but that they would check on both.

ALLEGHENY TUNNEL MEETING WRAP-UP AND CONCLUSIONS

Following questions and comments, **Fawver** stated that the next step would be for the PTC to provide comments and responses to the agencies, and asked what a likely time frame would be. **Jones** stated that an appropriate time frame would be approximately two weeks. **Virginia Bailey (McCormick Taylor)** agreed to provide the contact information. **Bednar** asked what the next step would be beyond that. **Spotts** said another follow up meeting similar to this one would then be needed. **Fawver** then questioned if the ACM or a separate meeting was appropriate for a follow-up meeting. This will be determined as the project progresses.

ACM # 9 MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 22, 2010

AGENCY COORDINATION MEETING

September 22, 2010
McCormick Taylor, Inc. Harrisburg Office
5 Capital Drive, Suite 400
Harrisburg, PA 17110

MINUTES

PROJECT PRESENTATION

ALLEGHENY TUNNEL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, Dave Willis, Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) and Ed Jones (L.R. Kimball)

Dave Willis provided introductions of the project team and turned the presentation over to **Ed Jones**.

A. BACKGROUND AND PRESENTATION

Jones gave a powerpoint presentation (handouts of the slideshow were provided) that included a summary from the July 28, 2010 ACM; dates the follow up material was provided to the agencies; information concerning the Red Tunnel Alternative; location of the South Penn Railroad Tunnel (Indiana bat hibernaculum and National Register Resource); a tunnel construction typical; bridge plans and profiles for the Yellow Tunnel and Brown Cut Alternatives; and PTC objective.

GROUP DISCUSSION/COMMENTS

1. **Dave Spotts [PA Fish and Boat Commission (PFBC)]** asked (in reference to the tunnel construction typical and the Red Tunnel Alternative) if it would be possible to construct a tunnel to the south prior to constructing anything to the north. **Jones** replied in the affirmative, but impacts increase for forest area, agricultural land, and residential displacements due to the increase in length for each alternative south of the existing tunnel. Alternatives located south of the Allegheny Tunnel were investigated in the Preliminary Alternatives phase of the project and dismissed due to increased impacts and public concern for the Berlin public water supply. **Sherwin** added that in particular the Black Tunnel alternative was dismissed from detailed analysis due to the close proximity to the Red Tunnel Alternative. The Red Tunnel Alternative was carried forward at the request of the pubic and agencies as an alternative close to existing alignment. **Jones** also stated that any variation of the Red Tunnel Alternative would impact the South Penn Railroad Tunnel (Indiana bat hibernaculum). He stated that the center of the entrance to South Penn Railroad Tunnel is approximately 65 feet north of the westbound tube of the Allegheny Tunnel. Construction of a tunnel alternative north of the existing tubes would result in direct impact to the railroad tunnel or would leave a very thin wall between the new tube and existing railroad tunnel. **Jones** indicated that if a thin wall was left between the new tube and railroad tunnel the bats could be impacted by temperature change as there would not be enough insulation between the two tunnels to maintain separate temperatures in each tunnel.

2. **Carol Copeyon [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)]** stated that the alternatives to the north (Brown and Yellow Corridors) would result in an adverse effect on the Indiana bat and

formal consultation would be entered into. She added that recent investigations (from 2007) showed that the bats travel north along the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River valley corridor. **Jones** then indicated that each proposed alternative would be spanning the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River with a bridge ranging from 210 feet to 240 feet high and 1,250 feet to 1,700 feet wide (abutment to abutment) depending on the alternative. He also asked if it would be acceptable to use fencing on the parapets to assist in guiding the bats away from traffic. **Copeyon** replied that this measure has been discussed in previous projects, but never implemented due to various reasons. **Copeyon** then asked if the area under the bridge would be left as undisturbed forest along the riparian corridor. **Jones** indicated that a small amount of disturbance would be required for construction of the abutments and piers, and that disturbed areas could be re-planted. **Copeyon** stated that an alternative to the south may be more desirable. **Tammy Sherwin (L.R. Kimball)** indicated that alternatives to the south would impact larger amounts of forest than those to the north which would also result in impacts to the bats. **Copeyon** indicated that male bats were shown to use the forest area to the south for roosting, but she indicated this was not as critical as where alignment corridors are located to the north, crossing the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River. **Willis** asked if the PTC could receive a copy of the 2007 bat study. USFWS will provide this report to the PTC.

3. **Susan Zacher [PA Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC)]** asked if there were historic resources impacted by other alternatives (other than the Red Tunnel). **Jones** replied in the negative. **Zacher** then asked if anything had been done for archaeology**. Jones** replied that a predictive model was prepared, but that would need updated as the project moves forward.

4. **Jeff Davis (PTC)** indicated that construction of the Red Tunnel Alternative or rehabilitation of the existing tunnel would be difficult with regard to maintenance of traffic during construction. The PTC is only allowed to reduce traffic to single lanes in each direction for a short amount of distance and time. This would occur during non-peak hours. It must provide two lanes of traffic in each direction during peak hours. Having opposing traffic in one tube for any great length of time, let alone greater than one year, is unacceptable and considered a safety issue.

5. **Bill Glover [PA Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP)]** asked if there could be an alternative investigated between the Red Tunnel and Black Tunnel Alternatives. **Jones** indicated that impacts would be very similar to the Red Tunnel and Black Tunnel. Construction of an alternative between the two would result in greater excavation due to the alternative passing through the ridge located east of the eastern portal of the existing tunnel. The Black Tunnel Alternative is designed within the area of a low saddle below the ridge to minimize excavation.

6. **Jones** stated that the PTC would like to update the Brown and Yellow Corridors (each consisting of one cut and one tunnel option). **Greg Bednar (PTC)** indicated that the PTC is only looking to update the environmental studies for each. The Red Tunnel and Orange Cut Alternatives would be discussed in the required document.

7. **Zacher** asked what the benefits would be to pursuing the Red Tunnel Alternative as it would impact the bat hibernaculum and historic resources. **Jamie Detweiler (PA DEP)** indicated that DEP could not concur without all alternatives (looked at during detailed alternatives analysis) being updated for wetland impacts. **Jones** stated that it was common practice to drop alternatives based only on secondary source data and the data on the detailed alternatives, is dated, but is much more representative of actual field conditions than secondary source data. **Jones** asked why the Orange Cut Alternative would be updated due to its increased length and

overlap with Brown and Yellow corridors. **Detweiler** indicated that she may be able to be more flexible with that alternative.

8. **Allen Edris [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Pittsburgh District]** agreed with DEP that wetlands need updated for all detailed alternatives. He suggested conducting a confirmatory field view (not necessarily a detailed delineation) to verify if wetland habitat is still present within the previously delineated areas. He also suggested that the PTC discuss this further with Kevin Gabig at the USACE.

9. **Spotts** asked if PNDI coordination had been updated. **Sherwin** replied that it had not. **Spotts** indicated that a timber rattlesnake den had been identified on the ridge within this area.

10. **Jeff Means (PA DEP)** stated that the agencies should hold a separate meeting to discuss this issue given the concern over the Indiana bat and other resources. **Edris** stated that the USACE Pittsburgh District could coordinate the upcoming meeting with the agencies involved and provide a response to the PTC within a month.

11. **Detweiler** asked if an overburden analysis had been previously conducted. **Jones** stated that an overburden analysis was completed by Casselberry and Associates and a copy can be provided to PA DEP.

ALLEGHENY TUNNEL MEETING WRAP-UP AND CONCLUSIONS

Following questions and comments, **Gary Fawver** stated that the agencies should conduct a separate meeting with the U.S. Army Corps as lead to discuss this further. He suggested doing this within a month.

ACM # 10 MEETING MINUTES

MAY 2, 2013

Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project
Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday, May 2, 2013
Time: 1:00 P.M.
Location: Quality Inn, Somerset, PA

Subject: Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project Update

Attendees:

NAME	AGENCY/COMPANY	PHONE	EMAIL
Tammy Sherwin	L.R. Kimball	(412) 262-5400 Ext. 4253	Tammy.sherwin@lrkimball.com
Steve Crescenzo	L.R. Kimball	(412) 201-4900 Ext. 2305	Steven.crescenzo@lrkimball.com
Ed Jones	L.R. Kimball	(814) 472-7700	Ed.jones@lrkimball.com
Dave Willis	Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC)	(717) 939-9551	dwillis@paturnpike.com
Ann Safley	Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC)	(717) 787-9121	rsafley@pa.gov
Andrew Rohrbaugh	Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (PDCNR)	(717) 705-2823	c-arohrbau@pa.gov
Tracey Librandi Mumma	Pennsylvania Game Commission (PGC)	(717) 787.4250 Ext. 3614	tlibrandi@pa.gov
Bob Anderson	United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) – State College, PA Office	(814) 234-4090 Ext. 223	robert_m_anderson@fws.gov
Tom Shervinskie	Pennsylvania Fish & Boat Commission (PFBC)	(814) 359-5228	tshervinsk@pa.gov
Chuck Colbert	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) – Southwestern Regional Office (SWRO)	(412) 442-4000	chcolbert@pa.gov
Mike Engelhardt	PADEP – SWRO	(412) 442-4304	mengelhard@pa.gov
Greg Bednar	PTC	(724) 755-5182	gbednar@paturnpike.com
Gary Graham	PTC	(717) 920-7109	ggraham@paturnpike.com
Barbara Okorn	United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) – via phone	(215) 814-3330	okorn.barbara@epa.gov
Don Bole	United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) – Pittsburgh District	(412) 395-7576	Donald.R.Bole@usace.army.mil

Bold items noted as action items.

Introductions

David Willis, Environmental Manager for the PTC, opened the meeting by welcoming the attendees to the Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project (Project) update meeting. Mr. Willis requested that the attendees introduce themselves, at which time copies of the presentation were distributed. Mr. Willis then indicated that the presentation contains a great deal of information and requested that all questions be held until the end of the presentation.

Mr. Willis stated that the purpose of today's meeting is to provide the following information to the attendees:

- A brief history of the Project;
- Results of the environmental studies conducted to date;
- An overview of the alternatives that are under consideration and their potential impacts; and
- The next steps for the project.

Project Overview

Mr. Willis provided a brief review of the Project history from 1996 to current date in 2013. To discuss the Project in more detail, as well as the development of the alternatives over the past couple of years, Mr. Willis turned the presentation over to Ed Jones, Engineering Project Manager (L.R. Kimball).

Mr. Jones started with a review of the Project needs, which were developed in 1996 and evaluated again in 2010 when the project was re-initiated. The needs are as follows:

- Transportation demand;
- Existing geometric constraints;
- Accident rates;
- Tunnel conditions; and,
- System linkage and continuity.

Mr. Jones then presented an exhibit of the existing conditions (aerial photo) of the Project study area. He stated the Project is located approximately 12 miles east of Somerset, Pennsylvania (PA) and 19 miles west of Bedford, PA. The Project area contributes to two (2) watersheds: an unnamed tributary (UNT) to the Stonycreek River on the western face of the Allegheny Mountain and the Raystown Branch Juniata River (Raystown Branch) on the eastern face.

The proposed Project Corridors were presented next. Three (3) Project corridors are currently being analyzed each includes a cut and tunnel option. The Yellow and Brown alternatives are located to the north of the Turnpike and the Gray alternative is located south of the Turnpike. Mr. Jones explained that the Yellow and Brown alternatives were included in the previous study from the 1990's; however, the Gray alternative has been added due to agency concerns of

potential impacts to the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) population that is associated with the South Penn Railroad tunnel. Mr. Jones turned the presentation over to Tammy Sherwin, Environmental Project Manager (L.R. Kimball), to review the Project's environmental constraints.

Field Studies

Ms. Sherwin opened with a discussion of the environmental studies that have been completed to-date for the proposed Project. She indicated that the studies have taken place during the field seasons of 2011 and 2012.

Wetland and stream investigations were conducted May through August 2012, resulting in the identification of 71 wetlands and 133 streams within the Project study area. Ms. Sherwin indicated the classifications of the individual resources are available upon request after the conclusion of the meeting. The PTC plans to submit a request for a preliminary JD once the wetland delineation and stream identification report is finalized.

The rare plant survey was conducted in April, May, and September 2012. Five plant species (spp.) of special concern were identified within the Project study area, as follows:

- Appalachian blue violet (*Viola appalachiensis*) – Proposed Tentatively Undetermined (TU)
- Mountain bellwort (*Uvularia pudica*) – Proposed Rare (PR)
- Tick-leaved meadow rue (*Thalictrum coriaceum*) – Proposed Threatened (PT)
- Bog goldenrod (*Solidago uliginosa*) – PT
- Stiff cowbane (*Oxyplis rigidior*) – PT

A Sphagnum bog was also identified within the southwestern portion of the Project study area, which contained sphagnum moss (Sphagnum spp.), sundew (Drosera spp.), and cotton grass (Eriophorum spp.).

A draft of the Report on the Results and Findings of the Botanical Survey PNDI #021520 was submitted to PDCNR on March 19, 2013. A conference call occurred with the PDCNR on April 24, 2013 to discuss the project and the status of plant rankings. The PDCNR provided a formal letter with ranking designations for the Project study area plants on April 26, 2013.

The timber rattlesnake (*Crotalus horridus*) habitat survey was conducted during the months of May, June, August, and September 2012: The timber rattlesnake is a PA Candidate species. Three (3) sites with potential habitat were identified, which included:

- TRHA-1 contains gestation/birthing habitat;
- TRHA-2 contains hibernacula and gestation/birthing habitat; and,
- TRHA-3 contains gestation/birthing habitat.

An upland travel corridor connects TRHA-2 and -3. The draft Timber Rattlesnake Habitat Assessment Report for the Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project was submitted to the PFBC on January 11, 2013, to which the PFBC responded on February 6, 2013 requesting

avoidance of denning site, possible avoidance of gestational sites, and education of construction workers.

The Allegheny woodrat (*Neotoma magister*) habitat survey was conducted in May, August, and September 2012: The Allegheny woodrat is identified as a state-listed threatened species under the jurisdiction of the PGC. The habitat assessment noted six (6) sites within the Project study area that consisted of potential habitat; however, no obvious signs of woodrat usage were noted. Recent evidence of activity by porcupines (*Erethizon dorsatum*) and raccoons (*Procyon lotor*) was noted within most locations. The draft Allegheny Woodrat Habitat Assessment Report for the Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project was submitted to the PGC on January 11, 2013.

The bat summer mist netting survey was conducted from July 6 through 13, 2012: Eleven mist net sites were utilized for the survey, which resulted in the capture of 262 bats, none of which were identified as an Indiana bat. Ms. Sherwin noted that one juvenile small-footed myotis was captured, but was not tracked due to being under weight.

The draft Summer Bat Mist Netting Survey report for the Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project was submitted to PGC on October 23, 2012 which summarized the above-referenced survey effort, to which the PGC responded with comments on December 4, 2012. A revised report was submitted to PGC on February 26, 2013.

Bat Hibernacula Surveys have been conducted by the PGC within the South Penn Railroad tunnel. The most recent survey took place on February 5, 2013 with the following results:

- 21 little brown bats (*Myotis lucifugus*);
- 10 eastern pipistrelle bats (*Perimyotis subflavus*); and,
- 95 Indiana bats (*Myotis soldalis*).

A survey of an additional cave, located east of Raystown Branch, was conducted on February 17, 2012 by the PGC, with the PTC, L.R. Kimball, and Heberling Associates in attendance. The survey identified the following:

- 9 little brown bats;
- 1 northern myotis bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*); and,
- 8 eastern pipistrelle bats.

No Indiana bats were noted at this location. Four (4) little brown bats, two (2) pipistrelle bats and one (1) northern myotis had visible signs of white nose syndrome.

A Preliminary Area Reconnaissance (PAR) was conducted in August 2011: This survey identified areas of potential contamination, such as debris piles, underground storage tanks, and areas of historic fill. Nine areas of concern were identified and were mostly associated with the residential area within the western quadrant of the study area. A PAR Report was submitted to the PTC on December 17, 2012, which recommended additional investigations for these locations if they are to be included within the preferred alternative's footprint.

A historic structure reconnaissance was conducted by Heberling Associates, Inc. July through October 2011: Two (2) properties were identified as being eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, which included the PA Turnpike and the South Penn Railroad Tunnel. The PHMC concurred on June 13, 2012.

An archaeological reconnaissance of the Project study area was conducted during July 2011 and February 2012 by Heberling Associates, Inc. They recommended following the Skelly and Loy predictive model, with the addition of potential sites, which included the following:

- Rock overhangs;
- Rock faces;
- Rock-outcrops;
- Boulder fields;
- Upland flats near water; and,
- Areas near historic foundations and walls.

A report was submitted to PTC in April 2012 summarizing the above-referenced recommendations.

An overburden analysis will be conducted on the Gray Alternative during the Spring/Summer of 2013. This investigation will include analysis of the same parameters that were utilized for investigation of the Brown and Yellow Alternatives during the previous Project investigations.

Mr. Willis then stated that the current wetland delineation yielded essentially the same results as that conducted for the Project in the late 1990's, with the exception of the Gray corridor to the south. He also stated that of the Project streams and wetlands were assessed using the PADEP's Level 1 Rapid Assessment Protocol for streams and wetlands (Draft Version 1.0, May 23, 2012), which the PTC agreed to utilize on a trial basis for this Project.

Alternatives

Mr. Jones continued the presentation with a discussion on the project alternatives.

The Brown Cut Alternative is located north of the existing Turnpike and is approximately 2.8 miles in length, starting east of SR 0160 and terminating east of the previous Turnpike bifurcation area. This alternative includes the following:

- 4.32 acres (Ac) of wetland impact;
- 5,200 linear feet (LF) of stream loss;
- 9 million cubic yards (CY) of excavation; and,
- 2 wildlife crossings.

The Brown Tunnel Alternative consists of the same alignment as the Brown Cut alternative, but includes a 4,300-LF tunnel. This alternative includes the following:

- 3.39 Ac of wetland impact;

- 5,300 LF of stream loss; and,
- 2 million CY of excavation.

Yellow Cut Alternative is approximately 1.6 miles in length, from SR 0160 on the western terminus to the area of the previous Turnpike bifurcation to the east. The required cut for this alternative is the deepest of all of the alternatives, at approximately 400 feet. This alternative includes the following features:

- 3.47 Ac of wetland impact;
- 2,200 LF of stream loss;
- 28 million CY of excavation; and,
- 1 wildlife crossing.

Don Bole of the USACE Pittsburgh District inquired if the stream impacts listed on the slide included both temporary and permanent impacts, to which Mr. Jones replied the quantities include only permanent impacts at this time.

Yellow Tunnel Alternative is slightly south of the Yellow Cut Alternative. The longest tunnel of all three alternatives is represented by this option, consisting of a 4,800-LF tunnel. This alternative includes the following features:

- 3.48 Ac of wetland impact;
- 1,400 LF of stream loss; and,
- 1.6 million CY of excavation.

Gray Cut Alternative is 3.76 miles in length, from SR 160 on the western terminus to the area of the previous Turnpike bifurcation to the east. This alternative includes the following features:

- 0.74 Ac of wetland impact;
- 1,350 LF of stream loss;
- 13 million CY of excavation; and,
- 1 wildlife crossing.

Gray Tunnel Alternative consists of a 3.82-mile long alignment that is north of the Gray cut alternative and south of the existing PTC Allegheny Tunnel. This option includes a 3,040-LF tunnel. This alternative includes the following features:

- 0.82 Ac of wetland impact;
- 1,040 LF of stream loss; and,
- 8 million CY of excavation.

Mr. Jones added that the impacts calculated for each alternative include a 20 foot buffer for drainage, stormwater / erosion and sedimentation control measures. It is the engineer's intent to avoid and minimize impacts to resources during the design of these measures and the actual impact number is expected to be less than identified at this point.

Gary Graham, Assistant Chief Engineer (PTC), stated that all six (6) alternatives have structures over the UNT to Stonycreek River and Raystown Branch. The Gray alternative has a structure proposed for the Raystown Branch that is 1,160 LF at a height of 129 feet (Ft). The Brown Alternative has a structure proposed for the Raystown Branch that is 1,700 LF and 255 Ft in height, while the Yellow Alternative proposes a structure for the Raystown Branch at a length of 1,490 LF and height of 208 Ft.

Avoidance and Minimization measures were then presented by Mr. Jones. This process was utilized for all of the alternatives. The Gray Alternative development was presented for the purpose of illustrating this process. Initially, the simplest alignment that meets the intended desire of each alternative geometrically was selected, which was used in conjunction with conservative values for design criteria for items such as side slopes at 2:1. This version of this alternative had 4.36 Ac of wetland impacts, 12,976 Ft of stream impacts, and substantial impacts to rare, threatened, and endangered (RTE) plant species.

As the refinement process started, evaluation of secondary source information on items like the geologic formations occurred, and cut slopes were able to be adjusted to within the typical range specified for the geologic formations in this location. With this revision, wetland impacts were reduced by 0.05 Ac and impacts to RTE plants were lessened slightly; however, stream impacts were similar to the initial alignment.

As the avoidance / minimization process continued, areas of concentrated resources were evaluated and refinements to the alignment were developed in an effort to eliminate or reduce impacts to the resources. For this version, the wetland impacts were reduced to approximately 0.90 Ac and stream impacts were reduced to 12,789 Ft.

As avoidance and minimization continued, the evaluation of impacts to individual resources occurred, as well as the analysis of the effects of how minor alignment shifts impact those resources. For this version, the wetland impacts were reduced to 0.77 Ac, stream impacts decreased to 11,746 Ft, and RTE plant impacts were substantially reduced.

After additional minimization measures, the current version of this alternative has associated wetland impacts of 0.74 Ac and stream impacts of 7,652 Ft.

Barbara Okorn (USEPA) inquired if indirect impacts to resources have been considered. Mr. Jones replied that they have not been included in the numbers discussed, but will be identified in the future.

Mr. Willis stated that, in previous Project coordination, the USFWS identified the Yellow and Brown Alternatives as potential conflicts with the Indiana bat colony found within the South Penn Railroad Tunnel. Previous radiotelemetry studies indicated that the bats utilized the Raystown Branch corridor as the primary travel route upon leaving the hibernacula in the spring, which prompted the USFWS to have concerns about bridge structures over this river that may result in the potential for bat mortality due to vehicle strikes. As a result of these concerns the Gray Alternatives were developed.

In addition, Mr. Willis stated that the PTC has met with Mountain, Field, and Stream Club (MFSC), the property holder for the majority of land found within the Project study area. In reviewing the proposed Project with MFSC, the option for the installation of a wildlife crossing was discussed for the purpose of preserving upland habitat continuity via a connective travel corridor over the proposed Project alignment.

Mr. Jones then proceeded with a discussion on the calculation of stream impacts. He identified the two main watersheds within the Project area: an UNT to Stonycreek River to the west and the Raystown Branch to the east. Stream impacts/relocations were challenging to calculate due to shallow bedrock with areas of soil and some cobble and other areas with more cobbles and less soil, located primarily on the western face of the Allegheny Mountain. This surface geology results in streams alternating between subsurface and surface flow, as well as classification (perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral).

For the design of stream relocations, every attempt was made to maintain flow to the original receiving waters; however, there were locations where the relocation was significantly longer than the impact. The table presented reflects only direct impacts at this time, although secondary impacts will be calculated in the near future.

Stream relocation lengths were calculated as a straight line distance; however, the actual relocation will be designed with similar stream geometry (cross-section, meander, etc.) to the existing channel and will be designed using natural stream design techniques.

Ms. Okorn inquired how natural stream losses would be accounted for. Mr. Jones stated that this has not been looked at within this preliminary design; however, this will be considered upon the selection of a preferred alternative. Ms. Sherwin indicated that stream function will be assessed prior to the design of any mitigation, which will be designed by L.R. Kimball staff with Rosgen Level IV training. This project is in an alternative analysis stage and this level of detail has not been incorporated for each alternative.

Mr. Bole inquired if the option of a cut at the existing tunnel has been evaluated. Mr. Jones indicated that this option was considered, along with the rehabilitation of the existing Allegheny Tunnel. Gannett Fleming and Paul C. Rizzo (PCR) Associates are part of the project team and have been analyzing the cost and design of the tunnel options. At this point in the evaluation, it appears that a rehabilitation of the existing tunnel does not seem feasible. Mr. Willis added that a large problem associated with tunnel rehabilitation or cut option within the footprint of the existing tunnel is the maintenance of traffic. The Turnpike has to maintain two lanes of traffic at all times.

The next topic included a discussion of potential waste areas. The sites selected to accommodate excess excavation will be included in the permitting process. The PTC has identified previously disturbed areas, such as the reclaimed strip mine located to the north of the project and the abandoned bifurcated area of the Turnpike east of the Allegheny Tunnel, for use as waste areas. Mr. Jones noted that the waste sites will be investigated for environmental concerns. He stated that these areas were of particular interest due to the absence of forest areas and distance to the proposed project. Haul distances of 2 miles or less are the most cost effective for projects.

Mr. Jones presented a general comparison of impacts by resource for all alternatives.

- Wetland impacts range from 0.74 to 4.32 Ac;
- Stream impacts range from 4,600 to 10,700 LF;
- Stream losses ranges from 1,000 to 5,300 LF;
- Forest land use impacts range from 55 to 150 Ac;
- Displacements (residential) range from 0 to 2;

Archaeological resources may be potentially impacted based upon the predictive model prepared in 1999-2000. Archaeological investigation would more than likely occur once the preferred alternative is chosen.

Additionally, rare, threatened, and endangered plants may be impacted by the proposed Project, to varying degrees, as follows:

- Appalachian blue violet (PT) impacts range from 0.00 to 5.00 Ac;
- Bog goldenrod (PT) impacts range from 0.00 to 0.33 Ac;
- Bog goldenrod (PT)/stiff cowbane (PT) impacts range from 0.00 to 0.22 Ac;
- Thick-leaved meadow rue (PT) impacts range from 0.00 to 2.44 Ac;
- Mountain bellwort (PR) impacts range from 0.00 to 1.17 Ac

Excess excavation will be required for all alternatives, and the depth of cut ranging from approximately 100 Ft to 400 Ft.

Construction costs range from $200 to $750 million, with maintenance costs ranging from several $100,000 to over $3 million annually.

Next, Mr. Jones reviewed the approximate locations for wildlife crossings for all three of the cut alternatives. He noted that each alternative contains a crossing of the UNT to Stony Creek and Raystown Branch, providing wildlife a corridor crossing at either end of the alternatives. Additional wildlife crossings were included within each alternative to ensure an adequate number of crossings are available.

The Brown Cut Alternative contains two additional locations, one at each face of the Allegheny Mountain in an effort to preserve wildlife travel corridors throughout the area. The western crossing will be approximately 3,690 LF east of the UNT to Stonycreek River crossing and the eastern crossing would be approximately 2,920 LF west of the Raystown Branch crossing.

The Yellow Cut Alternative contains one (1) wildlife crossing location approximately 3,000 LF east of the UNT to Stonycreek River crossing. The topography and placement of the Raystown Branch bridge limits the location of a wildlife crossing on the eastern face; however, the placement of the bridge will allow for wildlife movement underneath, thereby preserving a wildlife travel corridor in that area.

Gray Cut Alternative contains one (1) wildlife crossing located on the western face of the Allegheny Mountain, approximately 3,950 LF from the UNT to Stonycreek River crossing.

Mr. Jones then discussed the Mountain Field and Stream Club property access. Mountain Field and Stream Club previously expressed concerns regarding access to the remaining portions of their property after project completion. The Brown and Yellow Cut Alternatives would allow for pedestrian and vehicle access via the proposed wildlife crossing areas, pending permission of the federal and state wildlife management agencies. The Gray Cut Alternative would allow for access via an access road under the proposed Raystown Branch structure.

Mr. Jones then reviewed the next steps for the Project:

- Jurisdictional determination with the USACE and PADEP SWRO – Spring 2013;
- Meeting with Mountain Field and Stream Club – Summer 2013;
- Public official/public meeting – Summer 2013; and,
- Selection of a preferred alternative – Winter 2013.

Questions

Mr. Jones opened the session to questions from the participants.

Mr. Bole cited the proposed 1,366 LF of stream loss associated with the Gray Cut that was referenced in the table on slide 20, and inquired what constituted a "loss". Mr. Jones stated that a stream loss was calculated for any physical loss and culvert installation within a stream channel.

Tom Shervinskie (PFBC) inquired as to the status of funding for the proposed Project. Mr. Willis explained that this Project is on the PTC's Ten Year Capital Plan. Mr. Willis explained that the Capital Plan is reviewed quarterly and updated annually. Mr. Graham stated that the Turnpike tolls are approved for 2.5-3% increases for the next 40 years, which will aid in the funding of this Project.

Mr. Bole inquired as to when an application under Section 10/404 may be anticipated? Mr. Willis stated that the Project needs to go through the Biological Assessment / Biological Opinion process, once a preferred alternative is selected.

Bob Anderson (USFWS) inquired which level of the National Environmental Policy Act will be utilized for the Project. Mr. Willis stated that the USACE has identified the project as an Environmental Assessment (EA). This will aid in the determination of whether an Environmental Impact Statement of Finding of No Significant Impact will be necessary. Mr. Bole agreed with Mr. Willis' statement and added that the USACE will publish a public notice for the Project and consider any public comments obtained from that publication; however, Mr. Bole stated that the Project does not qualify for a PA State Programmatic General Permit, and will most likely require an individual USACE permit.

Tracey Librandi Mumma (PGC) inquired why the eastern small-footed bat has not been included within the impact matrix. She stated the federal government is looking at listing this species in September 2013. Ms. Sherwin stated that the PTC proposed to conduct a habitat assessment for the small-footed bat once the preferred alternative is selected during a meeting in March 2012 with the PGC. Ms. Librandi Mumma indicated that since a juvenile small-footed myotis was

captured there is more than likely a maternity colony in the area. She then stated that it would be necessary to have a habitat assessment in order to analyze all alternatives. **Mr. Willis inquired if the PGC could issue a response letter to the February 2013 submission that would include the recommendation for conducting an eastern small-footed bat habitat assessment for the Project.**

Mr. Bole inquired what percentage of Indiana bats from the South Penn Railroad Tunnel colony are flying downstream on the Raystown Branch. Mr. Willis stated that several telemetry studies indicate the majority of bats were flying downstream (northeast) toward Shawnee State Park area.

Mike Engelhardt (PADEP-SWRO) inquired if the total stream impacts include ephemeral streams. Mr. Jones stated that the total stream impacts shown within the presentation includes ephemeral streams.

Mr. Shervinskie inquired if a preferred alternative was selected in the previous Project analysis from 1996-2001. Mr. Willis indicated that the Yellow Tunnel and Brown Cut Alternatives appeared to be viable alternatives and were being further analyzed at that time; however, the process was halted.

Mr. Bole inquired if any impacts will be associated with the waste/borrow sites. Mr. Jones responded that environmental and cultural resource studies still need to be conducted on these locations, but anticipates small impacts.

Mr. Bole inquired if these areas will be reviewed by the PHMC. Mr. Jones stated that these areas would be submitted to the PHMC for review. Mr. Willis stated that the PTC has the PHMC clearance for the abandoned bifurcated area, located east of the Allegheny Tunnel, which is one of the proposed waste areas for this Project.

Mr. Engelhardt inquired if any of the comments from Jamie Detweiler of the PADEP SWRO have been addressed and incorporated within the alternatives analysis. Impacts to headwater streams and stormwater discharge locations are examples of two (2) concerns included within Ms. Detweiler's letter which will require consideration during the analysis of these alternatives. Mr. Jones stated that these and the remaining concerns within Mr. Detweiler's comment letter will be addressed prior to finalizing the analysis of these alternatives.

Mr. Anderson inquired if the Indiana bat and eastern small-footed bat could be included within the Alternatives Matrix. **Mr. Jones agreed that the Indiana bat and eastern small-footed bat will be included within a revised version of the Alternatives Matrix.**

Mr. Engelhardt inquired if the Red Alternative, which was mentioned in Ms. Detweiler's letter, is still under consideration or if it has been eliminated. If this alternative has been removed from the Project alternatives, the PADEP will need documentation to exclude the Red Alternative and associated comments from the review process in the future. Paul C. Rizzo Associates is in the process of evaluating this option; however, based upon the most-current information, maintenance of two (2) lanes of traffic in each tunnel during construction and/or widening will

be very difficult. **Mr. Jones stated that L.R. Kimball can provide documentation of the Red Alternative's exclusion within the PCR report upon completion.**

Mr. Willis inquired if the attendees had any additional questions, to which no further questions were raised. **Mr. Willis stated that L.R. Kimball will prepare meeting minutes and distribute for review and comment by the attendees.**

Mr. Willis identified that the PTC and L.R. Kimball met with the USACE Pittsburgh District in March 2013 for a review of the proposed Project schedule and plans for the remainder of 2013.

Mr. Willis inquired if Ms. Okorn had any additional questions at this time, to which Ms. Okorn replied that she did not.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 P.M.

Action Items:

1. **PGC to issue letter in response to revised bat mist netting report, which was submitted to the PGC on February 25, 2013. –** *The PGC submitted a letter to L.R. Kimball on May 15, 2013.*
2. **L.R. Kimball to include the Indiana bat and eastern small-footed bat within the Alternatives Matrix table –** *This has been added to the impact matrix.*
3. **L.R. Kimball to provide documentation of the Red Alternative's exclusion from consideration to the PADEP SWRO. –** *This has been provided with these meeting minutes.*
4. **L.R. Kimball to prepare and issue draft meeting minutes for review by attendees.**

ALLEGHENY TUNNEL
ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON MATRIX

DESCRIPTION	BROWN CUT	BROWN TUNNEL	YELLOW CUT	YELLOW TUNNEL	GRAY CUT	GRAY TUNNEL
WETLAND IMPACTS: (ACRES)	**4.32**	**3.39**	**3.47**	**3.48**	**0.741**	**0.82**
PALUSTRINE EMERGENT (PEM)	2.46	2.12	2.26	2.14	0.59	0.59
PALUSTRINE SCRUB-SHRUB (PSS)	1.2	1.18	1.12	1.22	0.15	0.23
PALUSTRINE FORESTED (PFO)	0.66	0.09	0.09	0.12	0.001	0.00
TOTAL STREAM IMPACTS: (LINEAR FEET)	**10,311**	**9,953**	**5,811**	**4,662**	**7,662**	**10,719**
TOTAL STREAM LOSS: (LINEAR FEET)	**5,174**	**5,276**	**2,230**	**1,401**	**1,366**	**1,038**
100 YEAR FLOOD PLAIN: (ACRES)	2.407	2.444	2.832	2.791	1.450	1.295
ANDERSON LAND USE: (ACRES)						
RESIDENTIAL:	0.20	0.17	0.19	0.12	1.40	1.83
AGRICULTURAL (ROW CROPS/PASTURE):	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.14
RANGELAND :	15.98	11.88	19.71	17.87	22.03	21.15
FOREST (DECIDUOUS/EVERGREEN/MIXED):	121.21	71.86	148.95	54.62	134.29	110.28
BARREN:	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.58	0.00	0.00
ROADS:	7.17	6.74	9.90	9.86	19.96	18.92
WATER:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AIR QUALITY IMPACT (YES/NO)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
NOISE IMPACT (YES/NO)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
CULTURAL RESOURCES:						
NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBLE:	1	1	1	1	1	1
POTENTIAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL:	0	0	0	0	1	0
DISPLACEMENTS:						
RESIDENTIAL: (NUMBER)	0	0	0	0	2	1
THREATENED OR ENDANGERED PLANT SPECIES:						
APPALACHIAN BLUE VIOLET (VIOLA APPALACHIENSIS) (ACRES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.42	4.91
BOG GOLDENROD (SOLIDAGO ULIGINOSA) (ACRES)	0.29	0.33	0.29	0.28	0.00	0.00
BOG GOLDENROD/STIFF COWBANE (SOLIDAGO ULIGINOSA/OXYPOLIS RIGIDIOR)(ACRES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.19
THICK-LEAVED MEADOW-RUE (THALICTRUM CORIACEUM) (ACRES)	0.73	0.68	2.44	0.71	0.00	0.00
MOUNTAIN BELLWORT (UVULARIA PUDICA) (ACRES)	0.00	0.00	1.17	0.00	0.00	0.00
THREATENED OR ENDANGERED SPECIES:						
TIMBER RATTESNAKE HABITAT IMPACT (ACRES)	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
ALLEGHENY WOODRAT HABITAT IMPACT (ACRES)	0.83	0.83	1.61	1.01	1.36	0.61
SMALL-FOOTED MYOTIS BAT ROCKY HABITAT	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
IMPACT TO INDIANA BAT TRAVEL CORRIDOR	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
AREAS OF CONCERN (HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)	8	8	9	9	9	9
CLASS 1 EXCAVATION (CUBIC YARDS)	9,074,438	2,130,572	28,437,371	1,563,535	13,332,139	7,907,360
EXCESS EXCAVATION (CUBIC YARDS)	7,611,508	1,252,454	27,232,489	756,644	12,434,477	7,552,592
OVERALL ALIGNMENT LENGTH: (LINEAR FEET)	15,057	15,057	13,865	13,837	19,870	20,205
STRUCTURES: (LINEAR FEET)	1950	1784	1740	1725	1543	1282
MAXIMUM VERTICAL GRADE: (PERCENT)	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00
MAXIMUM DEPTH OF CUT (FEET)	212	109	400	123	251	207
ESTIMATED COSTS:						
ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST	$206,600,000	$698,500,000	$295,100,000	$748,800,000	$234,200,000	$577,600,000
ESTIMATED UTILITY COSTS	$400,000	$400,000	$400,000	$400,000	$400,000	$400,000
ESTIMATED RIGHT-OF-WAY COSTS	$1,300,000	$700,000	$2,800,000	$1,200,000	$1,200,000	$1,100,000
ESTIMATED TOTAL PROJECT COST	$208,300,000	$699,600,000	$298,300,000	$750,400,000	$235,800,000	$579,100,000
ESTIMATED OPERATION & MAINTENANCE COSTS / YEAR	$700,000	$3,300,000	$600,000	$3,600,000	$900,000	$3,000,000

Red Tunnel Alternative

Description

The Red Tunnel Alternative is 4.02 miles long (1.0 mile long tunnel and 3.02 mile long approaches). The western terminus of this alternative is at station 1232+87 (MP 121.6) on the existing Turnpike, or approximately 2,900 feet from the existing tunnel's western portal. The alternative begins with a 3.00% downgrade to station 10+65 and passes through a 2°00' horizontal curve to the right. The alignment crosses an unnamed tributary to Stony Creek at station 110+81 with a 100 foot structure. The alternative continues with a 0.60% upgrade for 1,400 feet, where it reaches the existing western tunnel portal. The proposed horizontal alignment closely follows the existing Turnpike alignment. The constructability of utilizing portions of the existing eastbound tunnel will be investigated. If this proves to not be feasible, a new tube will be bored immediately south of the existing tunnel. The westbound tube of the proposed tunnel will be a newly excavated bore through the mountain just north of the existing westbound tunnel. The vertical alignment through the tunnel will closely match the existing tunnel with a 0.80% downgrade. Immediately after exiting the eastern portal, the alternative will cross the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River using an existing culvert. The horizontal alignment will then diverge from the existing Turnpike alignment by continuing along the tangent for 3,670 feet, then turning to the east through a 1°15' curve to the left. The vertical alignment will increase to a 1.00% upgrade 300 feet after the structure and continue on this grade for 3,000 feet, then decreases to a 5.00% downgrade for 8,200 feet. At station 221+00 the alternative bisects Deeter Gap Road in a 210 foot cut. At this point, Deeter Gap Road will have cul-de-sacs on each side of the alternative. In the next 4,500 feet, a 224-foot long structure is required over Wambaugh Hollow Road. The alternative ties into the existing roadway at Turnpike station 1458+41 (MP 125.9). This alternative has a minimum amount of fill and a 310 foot maximum depth of cut.

Impacts

- The South Penn Railroad Tunnel is located approximately 65 feet north of the existing westbound tube of the Allegheny Tunnel. It is a National Register eligible resource and functions as the second largest bat hibernaculum in the state. An effects determination conducted by Skelly and Loy, Inc. (November 2000) indicated the Red Tunnel Alternative would have an adverse effect to the resource. Widening the existing Allegheny Tunnel could result in direct impacts to the South Penn Railroad Tunnel and placing a tube to the north of the existing tunnel would require traffic to cross over the path of the bats upon their emergence from the South Penn Railroad Tunnel as they travel to the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River valley.

- The Pennsylvania Turnpike (Middlesex to Irwin) is a National Register eligible resources. The Allegheny Tunnel and its approaches are considered to be contributing elements as per coordination with PHMC. An effects determination conducted by Skelly and Loy, Inc. (November 2000) indicated the Red Tunnel Alternative would have an adverse effect to the resource.

- The Sarver Farmstead (consisting of 5 contributing and two non-contributing elements) is a National Register eligible resource. An effects determination conducted by Skelly and Loy, Inc. (November 2000) indicated the Red Tunnel Alternative would have an adverse effect to the resource.

- Eight residential displacements

- Four potential waste sites

- 25 acres of statewide important soils

- 23 acres of prime farmland soils
- 1.64 acres of active agricultural land
- 2.42 acres of wetland
- 3,601 feet of total stream crossings
- 6.56 acres of floodplain
- Six private wells
- Nine sensitive noise receptors

The red tunnel alternative was eliminated from further consideration due to the above impacts.

ACM # 11 MEETING MINUTES

October 16, 2019

Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project
Agency Meeting - Meeting Minutes

Date: October 16, 2019
Time: 1:00 PM
Location: Fairfield Inn and Suites – Somerset, PA
Subject: Agency Project Status Meeting

Attendees:

Greg Bednar (PTC)
Gary Graham (PTC)
Matt Burd (PTC)
Andrew Lutz (PTC)
Cassandra Forsyth (USACE)
Scott Hans (USACE)
Jon Coleman (USACE)
Pam Shellenberger (USFWS)
Richard Novak (USFWS)
Todd Lutte (USEPA)
Joy Gillespie (USEPA) - Phone
Barb Rudnick (USEPA) - Phone
Tiffany Landis (PADEP) – Phone
Becky Dunlap (PADEP) - Phone
Amanda Allison (PADEP) - Phone
Kevin White (PADEP) – Phone
Tracy Librandi-Mumma (PGC) - Phone
Clayton Good (PFBC)
Cheryl Nagle (PA SHPO)
Megan Pulver (DCNR)
Ed Jones (L.R. Kimball)
Tammy Sherwin (L.R. Kimball)
Lee Garner (L.R. Kimball)

Mr. Ed Jones (L.R. Kimball) started the meeting, by welcoming everyone who attended in person and who called in via the conference call and each attendee was introduced. The information to be discussed was provided to all attendees via email prior to the meeting and copies of the presentation were given to everyone who attended the meeting in person. Mr. Jones then started the meeting with a comprehensive background information review of the Allegheny Tunnel Transportation Improvement Project. He presented a slide that detailed the Project Overview timeline. He stated that the Project was started in 1996 and the Project needs were established. Between 1996 and 2001, preliminary and detailed alternatives were evaluated that included various tunnel and cut options. He stated that several options were eliminated at that time due to environmental and design concerns. Mr. Jones described how the project was placed on hold in 2001 and then was re-initiated in 2010. He elaborated that between 2011 and 2014, new alternatives were developed, and environmental studies were conducted. In 2013, the Red Alternative was eliminated from study and the Gray Tunnel Alternative and Gray Cut Alternative were added. Input from various state and federal agencies was included in the development of the alternatives – including concerns about threatened and endangered bat species and avoidance of their travel corridor. Mr. Jones stated that in 2013 and 2014, multiple meetings were held with property owners in the area – including PBS Coals and Mountain Field and Stream Club. Additionally, public meetings were held in 2013 and public input was compiled. He continued, in 2015 the Project study area was expanded to the north and south to avoid or reduce impacts and avoid an ancient geotechnical slide location east of the eastern portal. Mr. Jones continued that in 2016 additional environmental studies were conducted on the expanded Project study area including wetland delineations and threatened and endangered species investigations. He then stated that after the environmental studies, a draft environmental document was prepared and is in the process of being quality checked. Currently in 2019, he added that the Project is at the agency, public officials, and public meeting stage.

Mr. Jones then presented the Project Needs slide. These include Transportation Demand, Existing Geometric Constraints, Accident Rates, Tunnel Conditions, and System Linkage and Continuity. Mr. Jones elaborated on each need. Transportation Demand is an ongoing need and by 2025, the Level of Service (LOS) for the Tunnel area will reach Level D. LOS Level E is anticipated by 2035. He added that the LOS degradation will occur prior to meeting the life cycle of the Tunnel. Mr. Jones then discussed Geometric Constraints and noted some geometric features of the tunnel and its approaches do not meet current highway design standards with respect to lane width, termination of truck climbing lane, horizontal curvature, and sight distance – especially the curve to the east of the Tunnel. Mr. Gary Graham (PTC) added information about a fatality that occurred the morning of the meeting (October 16) in the area of the curve. Mr. Jones then discussed Accident Rates and pointed out that the fatal accident rate for the tunnel and its approaches is three to four times higher than the entire turnpike system and PennDOT statewide rates. Additionally, the overall accident rate for the Tunnel is more than two times greater than the statewide average for similar facilities. The interstate crash rate for the Turnpike increases significantly within ½ mile on either side of the tunnels which includes the speed limit decrease from 70 to 55 miles per hour (MPH) at the Tunnel. Mr. Jones then discussed Tunnel Conditions, stating that both the eastbound and westbound tunnels are in need of major rehabilitation. Routine maintenance has occurred, but major rehabilitation is still needed. Mr. Graham added that temporary repairs are upcoming, including lighting. Mr. Jones then discussed System Linkage and Continuity detailing how travel continuity on the turnpike is currently disrupted since certain hazardous materials are not permitted through the Allegheny Tunnel. They are forced to use secondary roads that are not built to handle large truck traffic including hazardous material loads. One of the routes used, State Route (SR) 31, travels through the community of Berlin's Wellhead Protection Zones.

Mr. Jones then presented a slide detailing the Existing Conditions and location information on the Allegheny Tunnel. This included its location in the Stoneycreek Watershed to the west and Raystown Branch of the Juniata Watershed to the east. The closest community is New Baltimore to the northeast, and Somerset is approximately 12 miles to the west and Bedford is approximately 23 miles to the east.

Mr. Jones presented a slide detailing the Project Corridors. He stated three (3) corridors were studied in detail. Within those three (3) corridors, there were six (6) alternatives total – a cut option and a tunnel option for each corridor. The Brown corridor was located to the north, the Yellow corridor was located in the center of the Project area, but to the north of the Turnpike, and the Gray corridor was located to the south. The Yellow and Brown corridors were carried forward from the original study, but the Gray corridor was added after the Project was reinitiated. Mr. Jones continued that the Gray alternatives were formed due to concerns about impacts to a bat travel corridor.

Mr. Jones presented and discussed the Environmental Constraints of the overall Project including various threatened and endangered species habitats, wetlands, streams, and floodplains. Mr. Jones detailed that within the entire Project study area there were 79 acres of wetlands as well as 99,600 linear feet of streams.

Mr. Jones then provided information on the Cultural Resources present within the Project study area. There are two (2) National Register eligible historic resources located within the Project study area – the Pennsylvania Turnpike mainline and the South Penn Railroad Tunnel (located north of the existing Allegheny Tunnel eastern portal). Mr. Jones stated that an archaeologic predictive model was used to determine areas with the most potential to contain archaeologic

resources. Mr. Jones stated Heberling and Associates also conducted a site reconnaissance locating potential archaeologic resources including rock cairns, rock faces and overhangs, and stone walls and foundations.

Mr. Kevin White (PADEP) inquired as to which alternative at this point was the preferred alternative for the Project. Mr. Jones responded that the Gray Cut is the preferred alternative and further discussion would occur later in the presentation about this.

Mr. Jones presented a slide discussing the Environmental Studies that have taken place on the Project study area including: wetland and stream delineations, land use identification, botanical surveys, timber rattlesnake surveys, Allegheny woodrat surveys, bat mist net surveys, bat habitat and acoustic surveys, bat hibernacula surveys, preliminary area reconnaissance for hazardous materials, historic structures evaluations, archaeological predictive models, overburden analysis, and noise analysis.

Ms. Pam Shellenberger (USFWS) inquired if the South Penn Railroad Tunnel was open at both ends. Mr. Andrew Lutz (PTC) responded that the South Penn Railroad Tunnel was not open at both ends and was only open at the eastern end and stated that the tunnel only goes about halfway through the ridge heading west.

Mr. Jones began a more in-depth discussion of the alternatives and their development. He stated widening the existing tunnel was considered and Paul Rizzo was hired to analyze this. Mr. Jones stated that Paul Rizzo found that widening the existing tunnel would not be practical due to disturbance to the South Penn Railroad tunnel, potential construction issues due to ventilation, cost is nearly $500 million, long construction duration up to 20 years, and extended bidirectional traffic in one lane of the tunnel. Mr. Jones states that based on the opinion of an expert, it is not viable to widen the existing Allegheny Tunnel.

Ms. Shellenberger inquired about the timing of a cut versus a tunnel option – what is the estimated time for each option to be constructed. Mr. Jones responded that an open cut alternative would take between two (2) and three (3) years to construct while a tunnel alternative would take five (5) years. Mr. Graham agreed that it would take five (5) years or more for a tunnel alternative to be constructed.

Mr. Jones continued with the in-depth discussion about the Project alternatives. He stated that all alternatives are of a six (6) lane template with a westbound climbing lane. He continued that there would be 1.5:1 cut slopes on the alternatives with a 26ft. median with a concrete barrier.

Mr. Jones presented the Brown Cut alternative on the screen and began a detailed discussion of the alternative. He indicated the Brown Cut alternative is located to the north and is approximately 3.6 miles long. The western terminus is located west of SR 160 and the eastern terminus is just west of the formerly bifurcated section of the Pennsylvania Turnpike. The Brown Cut alternative was moved further north in 2015 to potentially reduce impacts to environmental resources. Mr. Jones stated that the Brown Cut alternative would have approximately 3.84 acres of wetland impacts – combined direct and indirect and approximately 2,700 linear feet of stream impacts – including minimal impact to the Unnamed Tributary (UNT) to Stoneycreek River. He also presented that the Brown Cut alternative would have approximately 10.8 million cubic yards of Class 1 excavation associated with it. He also stated the Brown Cut alternative has two (2) bridges and two (2) wildlife crossings and indicated their locations on the screen.

Mr. Jones took a moment to detail how impacts were calculated. He stated that the cut/fill lines had a buffer of 20 feet placed around them and resources within the buffer and cut/fill lines were considered to be impacted.

Mr. Jones presented the Brown Tunnel alternative on the screen and began a detailed discussion of the alternative. He stated the Brown Tunnel alternative is located to the south of the Brown Cut alternative and is approximately 3.6 miles long. The western terminus is located west of SR 160 and the eastern terminus is just west of the formerly bifurcated section of the Pennsylvania Turnpike. He stated that the Brown Tunnel was an on tangent design. The Brown Tunnel alternative includes an approximately 4,100-foot long tunnel. Mr. Jones indicated the Brown Tunnel alternative would have approximately 0.97 acres of wetland impacts and approximately 2,000 linear feet of stream impacts. He also stated the Brown Tunnel alternative would have approximately 4.1 million cubic yards of Class 1 excavation associated with it. The Brown Tunnel alternative has two (2) bridges and their locations were indicated on the screen.

Ms. Cheryl Nagle (PA SHPO) inquired if the US Army Corps of Engineers would be the lead federal agency for the Project. Mr. Scott Hans (USACE) confirmed that yes, the US Army Corps of Engineers would be the lead agency.

Mr. Jones then presented the Yellow Cut alternative on the screen and began a detailed discussion of the alternative. He indicated the Yellow Cut alternative is located in the center of the Project study area and is approximately 2.7 miles long. The western terminus is located east of SR 160 and the eastern terminus just west of the formerly bifurcated section of the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Mr. Jones stated that the Yellow Cut alternative would have approximately 1.89 acres of wetland impacts and approximately 5,700 linear feet of stream impacts. He also indicated the Yellow Cut alternative would have approximately 26.3 million cubic yards of Class 1 excavation associated with it and would include a 400-foot-deep cut into the ridge. He also stated that Yellow Cut alternative has two (2) bridges and one (1) wildlife crossing and indicated their locations on the screen.

Mr. Jones then presented the Yellow Tunnel alternative on the screen and began a detailed discussion of the alternative. He stated the Yellow Tunnel alternative is located in the center of the Project study area and is approximately 2.7 miles long. The western terminus located east of SR 160 and the eastern terminus just west of the formerly bifurcated section of the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Mr. Jones stated that the Yellow Tunnel alternative would have approximately 2.00 acres of wetland impacts and approximately 5,000 linear feet of stream impacts. He also indicated the Yellow Tunnel alternative would have approximately 1.7 million cubic yards of Class 1 excavation associated with it and the tunnel is the longest tunnel of all the alternatives at 4,805 feet long. He also stated that Yellow Tunnel alternative has two (2) bridges and indicated their locations on the screen.

Mr. Jones then presented the Gray Cut alternative on the screen and began a detailed discussion of the alternative. He stated the Gray Cut alternative was the preferred alternative. He indicated the Gray Cut alternative design was kept close to the existing Pennsylvania Turnpike and was approximately 3.8 miles long. The western terminus is located west of SR 160 and the eastern terminus is located just west of the formerly bifurcated section of the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Mr. Jones stated the Gray Cut alternative would have approximately 0.70 acres of wetland impacts and approximately 8,500 feet of stream impacts. He added that the Gray Cut alternative would have 13.5 million cubic yards of Class 1 excavation – including a large portion coming

from the over-excavation slide area. He added that the Gray Cut alternative has three (3) bridges and one (1) wildlife crossing and indicated their locations on the screen.

Mr. Jones further explained the over-excavation area located to the east of the eastern portal. The area is similar to the area of the New Baltimore slide, with a slip plane of clay stone approximately 50 feet deep that has rock sloping northwest and moving towards the Raystown Branch of the Juniata. He indicated that borings and geotechnical monitoring continue to be conducted in the area and the slide is moving at approximately one (1) inch per year – but could speed up at any time. Mr. Jones added that geotechnical remediation of the area is needed in order to stop the slide. The remediation would include excavating earth to remove the slip plane and stabilize the hillside using a methodology similar to what was used at the New Baltimore slide area.

Mr. Graham confirmed that the Gray Cut alternative is the preferred alternative and discussed the geometry of the alignment – that it appeared to be paralleling the existing turnpike, but it is actually improving the geometry of the curves.

Mr. Hans inquired if there would still be a climbing lane and if the speed limit issue would be eliminated with the Gray Cut alignment. Mr. Graham confirmed that yes, a climbing lane is included, and the speed limit issue would be eliminated.

Mr. Todd Lutte (USEPA) inquired if the eastern portion of the alignment would then in fact be seven (7) lanes. Mr. Graham confirmed that yes, the eastern portion of the alignment would be seven (7) lanes. Mr. Jones agreed that the eastern portion would be seven (7) lanes to include the truck climbing lane, while the western portion would be six (6) lanes.

Ms. Shellenberger inquired as to what the elevation of the Gray Cut alignment would be in relation to the top of the ridge. Mr. Jones replied that the Gray Cut alternative would be in a cut area across the top of the ridge and the alignment would not be above the elevation of the ridge. He added that the wildlife crossing would be placed in an area of approximately 26 feet of cut and would result in the same elevation as the surrounding forestland.

Mr. Clayton Good (PFBC) inquired as to what the linear feature was that crosses the alignment east of the eastern portal. Mr. Jones responded that the linear feature was an overhead powerline alignment.

Mr. Gary Graham provided information on the Mountain Field and Stream Club which is the majority landowner across the preferred alternative while Mr. Jones indicated the club property boundaries on the screen. The Gray Cut alternative would bisect their property, just south of the existing Allegheny Tunnel. Mr. Graham added that the club currently traverses over the Allegheny Tunnel right-of-way above ground on their property.

Ms. Nagle asked what is planned for the existing Allegheny Tunnel if the Gray Cut alignment is built. Mr. Graham stated there were currently no plans for the existing tunnel and that the PTC was looking at potential options.

Mr. Jones then presented the Gray Tunnel alternative on the screen and began a detailed discussion of the alternative. He indicated the Gray Tunnel alternative is located south of the Pennsylvania Turnpike and is approximately 3.9 miles long. The western terminus is located west of SR 160 and the eastern terminus just west of the formerly bifurcated section of the

Pennsylvania Turnpike. He stated the Gray Tunnel was designed on tangent and the tunnel is 3,045 feet long. Mr. Jones indicated the Gray Tunnel alternative would have approximately 0.85 acres of wetland impacts and approximately 11,000 linear feet of stream impacts. He also stated the Gray Tunnel alternative would have approximately 9.4 million cubic yards of Class 1 excavation associated with it – the majority coming from the over-excavation area. He also stated Gray Tunnel alternative has three (3) bridges and indicated their locations on the screen.

Mr. Jones indicated the Gray Cut alternative was recommended as it best balances the environmental, engineering, operational, cost, and safety considerations that are present within for this Project.

Mr. Jones elaborated the Gray Cut alternative was designed to minimize impacts to all resources including wetlands and streams through design elements. He continued that the wildlife crossing was incorporated into the design and the structures on the alignment would act as additional wildlife crossings.

Mr. Good stated the need for avoiding bridge abutments in streams and Mr. Lutte asked if high quality and exceptional value streams had been identified. Mr. Jones responded that the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River is a Naturally Reproducing Trout Stream and the majority of the stream impacts are on the western side of the alignment (in the Stonycreek Watershed) where the rock strata is different – causing streams to appear and disappear underground.

Mr. Jones presented the Alternatives Matrix on the screen which provided an overview of all alternatives and all of their impact calculations. He stated that the largest wetland impacts were on the Brown Cut alternative, smallest wetland impacts were on the Gray Cut alternative, largest stream impacts were on the Gray Tunnel alternative, smallest stream impacts were on the Brown Tunnel alternative, largest forest impacts were on the Gray Cut alternative at approximately 211 acres, and the smallest forest impacts were on the Yellow Tunnel alternative. Mr. Jones added that the forest impact on the Gray Cut alternative is largely due to the over-excavation area impacts.

Ms. Shellenberger inquired as to how much of the slide area is forested. Mr. Jones replied that the slide area is approximately 80 acres of forest.

Mr. Lutte asked about the number of wildlife crossings on the Gray Cut alternative. Mr. Jones responded that there is one (1) wildlife crossing but the three (3) bridges along the alignment would act as additional wildlife crossings under the road in accordance with FHWA guidance.

Ms. Nagle inquired who had done the archaeology work on the Project study area. Mr. Jones replied that Heberling and Associates had done the archeology work and Ms. Tammy Sherwin (L.R. Kimball) added that they had provided the archaeological predictive model as well.

Ms. Nagle asked if recognized tribes had been contacted. Mr. Hans responded that they had not been contacted yet.

Ms. Nagle inquired how the Project would be permitted. Mr. Jones stated there was a slide later in the presentation that addressed this, but it is anticipated that a provisional Section 404 would be obtained prior to the State Chapter 105 permit. He also stated the Turnpike Commission has historically permitted their larger projects following this process. In particular, it was noted, the Commission does this to have a certain buy-in on one alternative giving them confidence moving

forward with more detailed design. Mr. Lutz stated that the Commission does not have the resources to permit serval alternatives or go back to the drawing board to develop alternatives once they are so far into the design process.

Ms. Forsyth inquired if this design includes worst-case scenario impacts – including indirect impacts. Mr. Jones responded yes, all indirect impacts have been included into the impact calculations. Ms. Sherwin stated that a buffer had been added around all cut fill lines to ensure all potential impacts were included. Mr. Jones stated impacts are anticipated to be reduced moving forward in the design as the entire buffer area should not be required.

Mr. Jones continued with the discussion of the Alternatives Matrix table on the screen. He stated that threatened and endangered species impacts varied across the alternatives. He then discussed engineering calculations and impacts including excavation amounts. He stated that Class 1 excavation was considered common/general excavation out of four (4) levels of excavation. He added that the Yellow Cut alternative has the most excavation and the Yellow Tunnel has the least excavation. He added that the deepest cut is on the Yellow Cut alternative at approximately 400 feet while the other cut alternatives are anywhere between 100 and 250 feet.

Mr. Jones stated that the cost of the tunnel options was much higher than the cost of the tunnel options. He elaborated that tunnel options cost approximately 600 to 700 million dollars to construct while cut options cost approximately 300 million dollars to construct. He stated that maintenance costs were also evaluated and the cost to maintain a cut alternative was approximately 1 million dollars a year versus 3 million dollars a year for a tunnel alternative.

Mr. Jones presented a slide about Excess Excavation on the screen and described how it related to the project. He stated excess excavation or waste placement was included as part of the environmental document and permit considerations. He indicated an area on the screen that was reclaimed strip mine area to the north of the Project study area and would serve as the excess excavation placement area for the Project. The area could hold 13.2 million cubic yards of soil and would result in a short haul distance from the Project construction area. He stated the most recent PNDI included the upland sandpiper that appears to prefer reclaimed strip mine habitat. Mr. Jones also stated resource impacts from the excess excavation area were included in the total impacts for each alternative.

Mr. Jones then discussed Wildlife Crossings associated with the Gray Cut alternative. He stated the FHWA and PennDOT manuals on wildlife crossings were consulted and utilized in the design. He added there were two (2) classifications of wildlife crossings – wildlife overpasses and multiuse. He added the crossing on the Gray Cut alternative will most likely be a wildlife overpass that is approximately 100 to 130 feet wide. He stated the Mountain Field and Stream Club will likely want to use the crossing requiring a multiuse facility placing a pedestrian area to the edge of the structure. He stated the location of the wildlife crossing was chosen due to its proximity to contiguous forest areas and proper fencing and vegetation plantings would be utilized to encourage use.

Ms. Shellenberger inquired about the setting elevation for the wildlife crossing in relation to the height needed for bat species. Mr. Jones responded that the tallest point of the ridge is located to the east of the wildlife crossing. Ms. Shellenberger asked if the alignment would be elevated above that level and Mr. Jones responded that it would not. Mr. Greg Bednar (PTC) added that the wildlife crossing would be at an anticipated cut/fill transition location. Mr. Jones elaborated that the wildlife crossing would be about the same elevation as the surrounding forest area and

that it would be planted using native species that would guide species into or towards the wildlife crossing. Ms. Shellenberger stated she had a concern for all flying wildlife in the area, including bats and if there would be interference with the fencing or wildlife crossing. Mr. Jones responded that the taller fencing would only be used to keep wildlife out of certain areas and the crossing is located in a cut mostly surrounded by forest, so there should not be any concerns with height. Mr. Lutz inquired if the costs of the wildlife crossing were included in the total cost estimate. Mr. Jones responded that the wildlife crossing costs were included.

Mr. Jones presented a slide on the access that will be provided for the Mountain Field and Stream Club. He indicated their access point on the screen, to the west of the eastern portal of the Allegheny Tunnel and stated this access point would provide vehicular access for them going under the bridge that would go over the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River on the Gray Cut alternative. He also stated the impact and cost numbers from this access were incorporated into the alternatives. Ms. Shellenberger inquired if this would be a new access for the club and Mr. Jones indicated that yes it would be.

Mr. Hans inquired if the total excess excavation from the Gray cut alternative would be located in the excess excavation area. Mr. Jones replied that all alternative excess excavation amounts would fit within the area identified except for the Yellow Cut alternative which has more excavation than the others. Mr. Hans then inquired if the Gray Alternative excess excavation amount is so large because of the over excavation area and Mr. Jones replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Good inquired if the potential for acid bearing rock in the area had been investigated. Mr. Jones stated that geotechnical borings in the area had been checked, among other things in the Project area.

Mr. Lutte asked if the Mountain Field and Stream Club property had all-terrain-vehicle (ATV) trails on their property and if they utilized them on their property. Mr. Jones responded that they do have trails and they appear to use them on the property. Mr. Lutte continued that he had a concern about the club using ATVs on the wildlife crossings. Mr. Jones replied it was a concern and potentially large rocks could be used to block the entrances to the wildlife crossing but he was unsure how effective it would be at stopping people from accessing the wildlife crossing. Ms. Sherwin agreed that the club utilizes their property heavily during hunting seasons and ATVs are actively used.

Mr. Jones presented a slide detailing what the process and timing is for the Project from this point forward. He stated that a public officials and public meeting has been tentatively scheduled for November 18, 2019. He added that the environmental document is currently in QA/QC procedures and would be available soon. Additionally, the Section 404 permit submittal is anticipated to occur in the spring of 2020 with the biological assessment submitted in summer 2020, and final design advertised in winter 2020.

Ms. Forsyth inquired about how mitigation would be handled for this Project. Ms. Sherwin responded that there were currently a couple of options that included a recently approved wetland and stream mitigation bank site near New Baltimore. She also stated that natural stream channel design would be used on site where possible. Ms. Sherwin stated that bat management was on board and working through various options for bat habitat mitigation and a programmatic agreement (PA) was in place for above ground historic structures.

Ms. Shellenberger inquired about the possibility of converting the existing tunnel into habitat for bat species. Mr. Jones replied that yes, that was a potential option, but would be further discussed by the Turnpike Commission. Mr. Graham indicated there were no plans for the tunnel once abandoned and any proposal for use of the tunnel would have be thoroughly discussed internally. Ms. Shellenberger stated she had a concern about blasting in the area of the hibernacula and if the removal rock around that area would have any impact on the hibernacula micro-climate. Mr. Lutz responded the PGC had installed data loggers in the South Penn Railroad Tunnel within the past three (3) weeks and that information may be available for use as a baseline. Ms. Shellenberger inquired if the timing of the blasting and tree removal would coincide when it is safe for the bats. Mr. Jones stated yes, and tree removal and blasting information would be included in the biological assessment. Mr. Lutz added that landowners may potentially clear the land themselves prior to any acquisitions.

Ms. Forsyth inquired as to when the wetland delineations were done. Ms. Sherwin responded that they were done in sections as the Project progressed. The dates were May through August 2012, April 2013, April and May 2014, November 2015, and May 2016. Ms. Forsyth asked if the wetlands within the preferred alternative would be boundary verified prior to submittal. Ms. Sherwin responded that yes, they would and as areas have been reinvestigated as the alternatives have changed, wetlands and streams have been spot checked. Ms. Forsyth requested a re-delineation of the preferred alternative for permitting purposes. The PTC agreed.

Mr. Hans stated that the revised Clean Water Rule will be going into effect soon and it will change the definition of what resources have federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Lutte inquired if there had been any changes to wetlands and streams on the additional visits to previously delineated areas. Ms. Sherwin responded that no large changes had been found. Mr. Lutz added that one thing that has changed recently is that the South Penn Railroad tunnel has flooded – what was once a dry tunnel now has standing water in areas.

Mr. White inquired as to what the timing would be for the submittals of the Section 404 and Chapter 105 permits and would the Section 404 permit be obtained provisionally prior to submittal of the Chapter 105 permit. Mr. Jones and Mr. Graham responded that the Section 404 permit application would be submitted earlier than the Chapter 105 permit application because the design process is not detailed enough for the Chapter 105 permit. Mr. White inquired as to when the Chapter 105 permit would be submitted. Mr. Jones responded that it would be submitted during the final design phase. Mr. Jones indicated this process was previously used for larger Turnpike projects and allows the PTC to gain the confidence they can, with minimal risk, move forward with design. It also will allow the USACE to start the Section 7 consultation with USFWS earlier. Mr. White asked if Section 401 water quality certification would become an issue with this process. Mr. Hans indicated the 401 Water Quality Certification would be issued with the Chapter 105 permit as it usually is. However, he was open to waiving it. It was decided that further coordination with the USACE and PADEP would take place to discuss the permitting issue. Mr. Hans also noted that the Section 401 Water Quality Certification would have to be issued within 3 years of the Section 404 permit. If that could not occur the Section 404 permit would be withdrawn. Ms. Tiffany Landis (PADEP) inquired if new threatened and endangered species or Section 106 resources were identified if the provisional Section 404 permit would be re-evaluated. Mr. Hans answered in the affirmative and noted that would be the case for any permit.

Mr. Hans inquired as to how this Project fit into the current total reconstruction project. Mr. Graham indicated that this Project was not associated with the total reconstruction project but would fit within that template. This project is to address the tunnel not necessarily the roadway approaches. Mr. Hans asked if the other tunnels and associated areas are being included in the total reconstruction project. Mr. Graham responded that they are part of a larger overall goal but roadway expansion in those areas are not planned in the near future.

Mr. Hans inquired what the likelihood of another one (1), five (5), or ten (10) year pause on this Project would be. Mr. Graham responded completion of the public officials and public meeting are the goal for right now and those meetings will be a good indicator of how fast the project progresses. Mr. Hans stated that with the Section 404 permit, if there is opposition then the project may require a public hearing or another public meeting.

Ms. Forsyth inquired if the excess waste area was included as part of the Project for permitting purposes. Mr. Jones indicated that it was included. Ms. Forsyth stated that in relation to the Section 404 and Chapter 105 permits – would final design be delayed waiting for Section 404 permitting. Mr. Matthew Byrd (PTC) stated that the design process would be continuing to keep the Project moving. Mr. Hans stated that permit modifications are challenging and indicated that Section 404 and Section 401 issues would be discussed at an upcoming meeting on November 5, 2019 between the USACE and PADEP in Harrisburg. Mr. Graham indicated that the PTC would be happy to meet soon regarding the permitting procedure as well.

Ms. Joy Gillespie (USEPA) inquired as to why type of NEPA document would be submitted and when. Mr. Jones responded that an environmental assessment-type document was in QA/QC now and when done would be sent out later this year. Mr. Hans indicated the environmental document would be used as the bulk of the USACE application packet.

Mr. Good inquired as to what would happen with the existing right-of-way for the tunnel and approaches – would it be maintained or remediated. Mr. Lutz responded that the approaches and tunnel would be maintained throughout the Project, but it was unknown what would happen after project completion. Ms. Shellenberger asked if traffic would be continuing through the area while blasting would occur during construction of the new alignment. Mr. Jones stated that yes, traffic would continue but the concern would be noted and addressed depending on location of the blasting.

Ms. Forsyth inquired about stream remediation on site and voiced concerns about replacing equivalent stream function – an exceptional value stream for example is not equal to a ditch. Ms. Sherwin indicated that every effort would be replace equivalent functions of streams.

Ms. Shellenberger asked to be kept updated with how the Project is progressing. Mr. Graham agreed. The agencies will be updated on the results of the public involvement effort.

Ms. Nagle asked if natural resources as well as cultural resources will be discussed at the public officials and public meeting. Ms. Sherwin stated that both items would be presented at the public officials and public meeting.

The meeting was concluded at approximately 3:45 P.M.