

**NORFOLK SOUTHERN DILLERVILLE YARD
CONSOLIDATION PROJECT- PHASE II
PUBLIC MEETING
MINUTES OF MEETING
MEETING DATE: JUNE 19, 2008**

DATE: August 28, 2008

LOCATION: Franklin and Marshall College, Alumni Sports and Fitness Center
City of Lancaster, Lancaster County, PA

ATTENDEES:

Moderator

Ronald Bailey

Franklin and Marshall College (F&M)

John Fry
Keith Orris
Michael Davis (Barley Snyder)
Dulcey Antonucci
Wendy Gentile

**Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
District 8-0 (PennDOT)**

Sharon Okin
Diana Zawatski
Greg Vaughn

**Pennsylvania Department of Environmental
Protection (PADEP)**

Kathy Horvath
Ryan Carr

Gannett Fleming, Inc (GF)

Richard Cross
John Legath
Ahmed El-Aassar
Rich Pugh
Robert O'Neill
Paula Loht
Kristin Civitella
Steven Wittig

Norfolk Southern (NS)

Mark Sawyer
Rudy Husband
Joel Bolstein
Rick Crawford
Terry Albright
Mike Fresen

Lancaster General Hospital (LG)

Jan Bergen
Joe Donaldson
John Lines
Mike Horst

ARM Group, Inc (ARM)

Ned Wehler
Keith Lupfer
Dan Dalton

Gannett Fleming Cont'd

John Macdonald
Holly Reynolds
Danielle Baker

A public meeting was held on June 19, 2008 at 6PM on the Franklin and Marshall College Campus in the Alumni Sports and Fitness Center, located in Lancaster, PA, with approximately 250 individuals in attendance. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for members of the public and elected officials to see the proposed layout of the Dillerville Yard Consolidation Project, review the results of technical studies, ask questions about the project, and provide comments or suggest ideas about the project. A significant portion of the meeting materials and discussion were dedicated to the noise, air, and vibration studies. In addition, PADEP and ARM were present to address questions on the PADEP Act 2 cleanup process associated with the remediation of the Lancaster County Solid Waste Management Authority (LCSWMA) parcel. This public meeting provided an opportunity to review and comment on the project in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. In addition, this public meeting also satisfies the PADEP public involvement requirements under the Act 2 cleanup process.

Overall the meeting was separated into three portions. The first portion was an Open House where members of the public and public officials could engage the experts at the various display areas. The second portion was a formal presentation providing an overview of the project that explained the results of the recent studies. The third portion consisted of a question and answer session where residents could ask questions about the project to the project team.

As attendees entered the Open House, they were requested to locate their home on the project vicinity board. Based on the number of pins present on the board, the largest concentrations of attendees at the public meeting live in the Barrcrest and the Old School Lane Hills neighborhoods.

A) Formal Presentation

1. The formal presentation began at 7:12 PM and lasted approximately one half hour. Mr. Fry explained that the public meeting was part of 3 years of study and design work, and was a continuation of the dialog with the public throughout the progression of this project. He stressed that F&M wants to thoroughly address questions that the public may have and that F&M is committed to public dialog. Furthermore, he thanked the public and neighbors for their involvement with the process. He noted that a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) brochure was mailed to the community, a project website with responses to issues was developed, 10 neighborhood meetings were held, public officials were briefed, and responses to emails and questions were provided. He explained that the College engaged a several hundred individuals about the project. [*N.B. The most recent neighborhood meeting was held on June 11, 2008*] Mr. Fry explained that the purpose of the meeting was to share the results of the recently completed vibration, noise, and air quality studies, and also share information on the project including rail operations, site remediation, and various project aspects.
2. Mr. Fry then proceeded to explain why the project is important to the local community and region. He noted that the project is critical for the future of the local economy because it increases rail yard capacity and allows NS to respond to customer demands. Furthermore,

the project will allow for the reconnection of several streets in northwest Lancaster, providing better access to the Amtrak station and new commercial and residential development sites. Second, he noted that the project will facilitate the long term growth and development of LG and F&M. Both these institutions need places to grow and develop in the future. Third, he noted that the site for the new rail yard is the LCSWMA parcel, which will be remediated as part of the project. He stressed that the remediation of the LCSWMA parcel will improve the overall project and benefits the community. He noted that the project will reduce truck trips, resulting in a reduction in air pollution and road maintenance. Furthermore, once the consolidated rail yard is operational, the former rail yard site can be redeveloped to commercial and residential land uses in the future. Mr. Fry explained the project team will work to minimize adverse impacts and address concerns. Furthermore, the project will comply with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations. Mr. Fry stressed that he wanted this to be a model project for other cities, and that the public present should listen to the facts and data, and then draw their own conclusions.

3. Mr. Orris explained that he has spoken to several hundred people over the past one-and-a half years and there were some good questions and ideas expressed. He noted that some of those ideas were put into practice and some were still being considered. He explained that the environmental studies that took place regarding noise, vibration, and air quality were not required by Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria, but were undertaken as the result of suggestions by neighbors. In addition, he noted these data and assumptions used in the studies were more conservative than necessary. Finally he noted that the results of the studies are being shared with the community in order to address public comments.
4. Mr. Orris explained that he and Mr. Cross met with The Railroad Action and Advisory Committee (TRRAAC), a concerned citizen action group, regarding alternative sites. Mr. Orris noted that the project team has studied TRRAAC's alternatives early on in the design process as part of finding the best site that balances needs and impacts. Mr. Orris noted that all the TRRAAC alternatives were rejected due to various hurdles that were not able to be overcome. One of the hurdles noted was that the southern bridge opening under Dillerville Road has room for only 6 tracks, whereas the existing yard is 14 tracks. [This bridge opening would restrict the capacity and flexibility of the consolidated yard by causing a significant bottleneck in the center of TRRAAC's proposed yard layout.] In addition, the TRAAC alternative did not include the tail track in its design. [Furthermore, a tail track (drill track) shorter than the existing tail track would not be suitable for NS operations.] Mr. Orris noted that the TRRAAC alternative was not efficient with regard to the tail track being located in the southeastern portion of the exiting yard at the southern bridge opening under Dillerville Road. This design would still require locomotives to double handle cars in the western portion of the yard proximal to Little Conestoga Creek. Furthermore, Mr. Orris noted that the existing yard was developed in the 1800's and the existing tracks do not comply with current design standards for safety due to the curvature of the tracks and the tight track centers. He noted that the stub yard depicted on the TRAAC alternative was also not efficient and resulted in an increased handling of cars. [*N.B. Clarifying information was added from the Alternative Site Evaluation letter to Mr. Orris from Mr. Cross dated June 12, 2008 and available for public review on the project website.*] Mr. Orris noted that the second

TRRAAC alternative on the Armstrong Property, which is currently under development, was not acceptable due to the stormwater management requirements and the need to provide large retention basins. Furthermore he noted that locating the new yard at this site did not provide the needed rail capacity and was actually closer to residential neighborhoods. Mr. Orris noted that R.R Donnelly and Sons Company (Donnelly) was also contacted to see if they would be willing to sell land to F&M for the project. He noted that Donnelly senior management explained that they were not willing to sell their land for this project. Finally, Mr. Orris reiterated that an evaluation was performed to balance railroad operations and safety in deciding suitable alternatives for the site location and layout. He also noted that a response letter from GF regarding TRRAAC's alternatives is posted on the project website.

5. Mr. Orris then proceeded to explain that the LCSWMA parcel remediation was going to be performed in compliance with PADEP's Act 2 requirements, that the cleanup was going to be "done by the book" according to all applicable regulations, and noted the good relationship F&M has with PADEP. Mr. Orris also discussed the misconceptions about Norfolk Southern operations and explained that while they are exempt from local land development and zoning procedures, they must comply with various environmental, transportation, safety, and emergency management regulations. Mr. Orris briefly explained the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is necessary to obtain federal funding and that the NEPA documentation will be submitted in the near future. He also noted that the final reports associated with air, noise, and vibration studies will be part of the NEPA documentation and shared with TRRAAC and be made available to the public.
6. Mr. Pugh provided a general summary of the environmental review process and results of the noise, air, and vibration studies. He explained that the NEPA process is necessary to obtain federal funding, and that oversight is provided by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and PennDOT District 8. Furthermore, he noted that Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act provided a comment period for historic resources, of which this meeting was a part. Mr. Pugh noted that the vibration and air studies were based on FTA guidelines for assessing impacts, and began with a 650 foot screening distance. The FTA screening distance for noise assessment is 1000 feet. The FTA screening distance for vibration was 200 feet. Based on the screening criteria per FTA guidelines, no detailed noise or vibration studies were necessary, although detailed studies were conducted as a result of public concerns.
7. Mr. Pugh explained that the noise study used the FTA model for future conditions and that a slight increase of 3-4 dBA, which is barely perceptible to the human ear, was observed. However he noted that all predicted noise levels were below FTA's levels for impact assessment. He explained that the noise models were based on a worst case scenario of approximately 120 trains over 24 hours, and emphasized that this scenario would not occur in the new yard. Mr. Pugh noted that the vibrations associated with the rail yard do not extend beyond 200 feet and that the vibration outside of this area was due to local vehicular traffic.
8. Mr. Pugh noted that the methods and models used to assess the air quality impacts is approved and recommended by the United States Environmental Protection Agency

(USEPA) and also used in California. Mr. Pugh explained that the air quality parameters for both the existing and future conditions are below the NAAQS (National Ambient Air Quality Standards) as established by USEPA. Mr. Pugh noted that PM₁₀ was used as a diesel emissions indicator, and that the modeling indicated a slight increase as a result of the project, but that levels were still below the NAAQS for PM₁₀. The study was performed using the USEPA methodology and not the California Air Resources Board methodology. Based on FTA guidance, an air quality study was not required, although one was performed as a result of resident's concerns.

9. Overall, Mr. Pugh emphasized that based on federal criteria, no impacts for noise, vibration, or air quality are anticipated for the project. Furthermore, Mr. Pugh explained that a human health risk assessment using the air quality data was performed as a result of the comments by residents. Mr. Pugh explained that the project team followed the California Air Resources Board Approach, which is not required to be used in Pennsylvania. Mr. Pugh also noted that this approach is very conservative in calculating cancer risk because it assumes, for instance, that a lifetime resident would be outside 24 hours per day. Mr. Pugh also noted that the risk assessors spoke with California officials during the evaluation of the human risk health assessment. Officials from the California Air Resources Board indicated that a project in California similar to the one proposed for Dillerville Yard would not be a candidate for California Air Resources Board Approach for human health risk assessment. Mr. Pugh then explained that the lifetime cancer risk does not increase as a result of the project, but that a slight decrease in risk was indicated. This decrease is attributed to the increase in distance from the source of emissions to residential receptors once the yard has been consolidated. Mr. Pugh also noted that the emission sources taken into account included both locomotives as well as stationary sources such as generators. Mr. Pugh concluded by explaining that the risk results are within the USEPA range of acceptable targeted risk.

B) Question and Answer Period

1. The Question and Answer portion of the evening began at approximately 8:30 PM and lasted approximately one-and-one-half hours. Ronald Bailey, the moderator, introduced himself and explained the rules of the session. He noted that the meeting was not a public hearing but rather a community conversation where questions could be asked.
2. Q) How much and what form of taxpayer money will be used to fund the project?

A) Mr. Orris explained that the project overall would cost approximately \$40-42 million with Lancaster General and F&M contributing \$6 million each and NS contributing \$2 million. The remainder of the funding would be from various government grants for economic development, environmental cleanup, transportation, and air quality improvements.
3. Q) If the project team wants to eliminate noise and air impacts then the rail lines should be re-electrified. With the increase in the cost of fuel, electric operations should be more interesting. The individual is concerned that with the expansion of the rail yard, the frequency and length of the trains would increase.

A) Mr. Husband responded that due to geographic limitations, train length would not increase beyond 115 cars and that no increase above the existing two trains per day will be realized as part of the project.

4. Q) What direct economic benefit do you expect in the next 5 years, and what is the benefit to the bottom line?

A) Mr. Fry responded that the property F&M is acquiring as the result of the relocated yard will allow the F&M to connect to the Armstrong Property. In addition, the acquisition of property will also connect College Avenue to Liberty Street, as well as increase parking and connecting of the existing playing fields. Mr. Fry also indicated that the connection of east and west Lancaster would result in overall city connectivity as well as future development sites for commercial and residential development.

Ms. Bergen responded that LG would get 10 acres near Harrisburg Pike, and that this land would be held for future use, with no immediate value besides the value of the land itself. LG is now examining use options for the land when it becomes available in three plus years.

Mr. Husband responded that NS would gain a safer operating yard, with more efficient operations for its customers, and benefits in reductions of noise levels for the community.

5. Q) Is there anything that supporters can do to help facilitate the project?

A) Mr. Orris responded that the goal would be more education on the benefits of the project to the citizens of Lancaster City and the surrounding townships. Writing letters to public officials would be one way of helping to promote the benefits. Mr. Orris reiterated some of the benefits including 55,000 truck trip diversions, an increase in air quality, the remediation of the LCSWMA parcel, and the undergirding of the local economy.

6. Q) Impulse fast response noise levels related to rail yard car shunting was not provided. In addition, noise mitigation berms are not planned but are mentioned on the website.

A) Mr. Orris responded that the previously stated agreement was to share final written reports for noise, air, and vibration and that the final reports will be due in a month's time. Furthermore, Mr. Orris noted that F&M and LG are sensitive to the concerns of the neighborhood regarding noise levels and would implement noise abatement mechanisms (i.e. noise walls or earthen berms). However, at the time of the meeting, Mr. Orris was unsure if noise walls were the best mitigation approach and was waiting on GF for the recommended sound abatement method (possibly earthen berms with conifers).

Mr. El-Aassar also commented that measurements were taken within the radii of the impulse and the model does account for impulse noise events. *[Mr. El-Aassar further explained that there is no single way to address impulse noise level {i.e. coupling/uncoupling} and compare these levels to the FTA noise impact criteria].* Mr. El-Aassar stressed that detailed analysis

was not needed because no residents were present within 1,000 ft but that detailed studies were still performed. However, information impulse on noise levels would be included in the final written report.

A) If the information is provided later that is ok, but the individual was still concerned about the lack of a restriction on rail cars being pushed together.

7. Q) What kinds of materials are going through the yard? Will the yard accept shipments of chlorine, radiation, and other toxic materials? If the yard does/will accept these materials, why does the Health Risk Assessment only include air quality related to diesel emissions and does not include rail incidents such as explosions, train wrecks, or fires?

A) Mr. Husband responded that by law NS must operationally carry hazardous materials that customers order. Mr. Husband stated that the project will not introduce new types of hazardous materials that are not already carried currently. In addition, for the public's safety, NS cannot discuss the actual materials shipped but NS works closely with Lancaster County EMA and 911 for training needs.

Ms. Loht explained that the risk assessors followed the California Risk Assessment process developed by the California Air Resources Board. She noted that the PM₁₀ concentrations were considered to be all carcinogenic risk and that the California slope factor for carcinogenic risk was also used. An EPA non-cancer hazard index was also used.

A) Does the California model include minimal emitters or type of engines used?

A) Mr. El-Aassar responded by stating that the numbers for the engines used are specific to the current models they are currently being used in the yard.

A) The individual was dissatisfied with answer and asked why more information is not being provided.

A) Mr. Bailey explained that specific information on types of materials that go through the yard are difficult to speak about due to Homeland Security concerns.

8. Q) The 55,000 truck trip removal number should not be used. Will the proposed yard be used for storage of empty cars, and in turn store incoming freight? The LCSWMA parcel is on both sides of the creek, but the plans only to remediate one side. Why isn't the other side being remediated? Why should we trust your statements?

A) Mr. Husband explained that based on earlier statements, the number was based on trucks going to Enola to pick up materials and then bring it back to Lancaster.

Mr. Orris added that the truck trip diversions were defined to be the annual number of truck trips that would not occur once the project is completed based in the increased capacity of the yard. The increased capacity of the yard and ability of NS to ship products more efficiently

would reduce the customer demand for truck trips. These calculations were required for the air quality grants and were based on current and future NS demand.

Mr. Orris also noted that the installation of the nearby Cork Line has already seen additional business as projected during the development phase of that project.

Mr. Wehler explained that the conditions on the opposite side of the creek were not investigated.

A) This area was part of the LCSWMA parcel and you are not carrying the “good deed” of remediating the LCSWMA parcel through to completion.

Mr. Orris explained that the vast majority of the trash was confined within the 11 acres that will be remediated, but that no remediation will take place within the wetland area. He explained that they are unsure of the extent of the trash on the other side of the creek but are dealing with the trash in the area impacted by the project.

9. Q) TRACC is supportive of the project and is here to obtain a compromise so that their members would not be negatively impacted. The relocation of the yard is consistent with the Lancaster County Long Term Transportation Plan, and the yard currently lacks capacity. Does the relocated yard have sufficient capacity and benefits?

A) Mr. Husband responded that having a fluid rail system benefits everyone. He noted that NS is currently delaying shipments due to a lack of capacity. Mr. Husband noted that benefits to the shipping community include being tied into the national transit network and an increase in jobs and the tax base. Furthermore he noted that the new yard will enhance the safety of NS employees. He explained that a locomotive emits only 1/3 the emissions of what trucks do. Finally, he noted that the shippers win and NS wins, resulting in growth in the tax base and further regional business development.

10. Q) Individual lives within 1,100 ft of the existing yard and doesn't really know that the yard is nearby, but instead hears Route 30. The individual stated that it is very important to revamp the old yard for the benefit of the community. How can he support the effort if he is in favor?

A) Mr. Fry explained that LG is very important to the community and needs a site to expand in the future. Furthermore although F&M is a private institution, it is in public service and provides free, accessible events to the public on its campus and also needs to increase its capacity.

A) Moving the yard is not a problem, but supporters do not know who to talk to or where to express support.

A) Mr. Orris suggested that tonight the supporters comment on the various studies and applications to DEP, and that they should write letters of support for the NEPA application, letters to elected officials, and letters of support as part of obtaining federal grants.

11. Q) Individual thanked panel for the obvious benefits. What are the plans for mixed use walkable community on College Avenue?

A) Mr. Orris responded that College Avenue will connect to Liberty Street in addition to two other streets near Clipper Stadium. The connection of the streets near Clipper Stadium will amplify the community gathering point of the stadium, and provide an opportunity for mixed use design. Pedestrian awareness is a key factor in stabilizing the neighborhood and creating the “economic buzz” of the neighborhood.

Mr. Fry also responded that a walking trail will be present on the Armstrong property when that project is completed, and will also provide a pedestrian friendly environment.

12. Q) Individual questioned the long term accountability of the stakeholders with regard to the project. The individual commented that the project studies were paid for by F&M and LG on land not owned by the college. What assurances can F&M and LG provide if the results of the studies are not true? Will F&M remain accountable to issues that come up (i.e. if sound walls are needed is the college willing to put more money in?)

A) Mr. Fry responded by stating that F&M will be accountable and will take responsibility for issues that may come up. He also commented that F&M has 100 acres across from the proposed rail yard and will continue to develop that site in the future. Mr. Fry explained that a terrific group of experts were hired and that the regulators would not approve the site if the data is wrong. Mr. Fry emphasized that F&M will not walk away from issues associated with the project.

A) Would the college hold money in escrow to see if long term impacts are correct?

A) Mr. Fry responded that the \$42 million for the project includes a lot of items, and that the project provides significant increases in long term economic development and environmental quality. Mr. Fry also indicated they would be willing to talk in the future regarding issues that may arise.

Ms. Bergen responded by stating that LG is part of the community and that the reputation and integrity of LG is based on its projects. She also noted that the board wants public comment, and stressed that the project is important to the community.

Mr. Orris responded that the best method of sound abatement was not yet determined.

13. Q) The individual asked Mr. Bailey’s opinion of the project.

A) Mr. Bailey indicated that the project has significant benefits but was initially concerned that the project would impact neighborhoods.

14. Q) Individual questioned why there was no air or vibration data on properties to the north of the proposed rail yard.

A) Mr. El-Aassar responded that the focus of the study was on residential sound levels and that the commercial requirements are less stringent than residential requirements. The outer noise contour line on the residential side was shown as an area of concern, and that the noise contours on the other side could be shown in the final report. He also indicated that the nearest noise contour does not show levels above the noise abatement criteria. This information will be added for the report, but stressed that there was no impact. [*N.B. The requested information was added to the final reports and associated maps.*]

A) The individual is concerned that the background noise levels plus the railroad would cause impacts.

A) Mr. El-Aassar responded that the background noise levels are below the threshold noise criteria levels. He also commented that the absolute levels of the increase are below the threshold noise criteria levels.

15. Q) The individual indicated that he has greater concern with the 100 acre site that F&M owns because they do not know what it will be used for. The individual also mentioned Section 106, and that the information related to Section 106 and historical resources have not been provided.

A) Mr. Fry responded by saying that the Baker campus will not be sold, and that Wilson drive will not be extended. The 50 acres known as the Brickyard will be used for conservation and preservation and the 50 acres known as Baker Campus could be developed to recreational or residential uses in the future. Mr. Fry stressed that the college needed land to expand in the future.

Mr. Pugh responded by stating the Section 106 information was provided at the exhibit at Station 7, which shows both existing and eligible resources. This exhibit also includes the railroad itself as one of the potentially eligible historic resources.

16. Q) The individual wanted to get a second opinion on the engineering drawings, but their consultant was not given access to drawings tonight. How did F&M and LG conclude that property values were not affected by the project?

A) Mr. Orris responded that he encourages TRAACC to communicate with F&M and he had not heard that a new consultant was hired. Mr. Orris also noted that the display boards will be placed on the website.

Mr. Husband responded that the request for information did not come through him and that NS does not have any of its own drawings.

Mr. Fry responded that it is acceptable if TRAACC is requesting to switch consultants and have a meeting with the new consultant, but that requesting information on the fly is not respectful of the process.

Mr. Orris responded that he has spoken with real estate agents with many years of experience who indicated that there is no specific process to determine if real estate values will go up or down from any one project. Mr. Orris also responded that real estate agents that he spoke with noted that property values are affected by zoning and use. He also noted that the existing development has grown up around industrial land and that the value of an individual property was affected by the upkeep of adjoining properties. Mr. Orris reiterated that there is no definitive reliable way to predict property value growth and that there is no change in land use of the area. Mr. Orris also noted that F&M and LG would not be undertaking the project if property values would decline, particularly because F&M's property is adjacent to the rail yard.

A) The individual further commented that if the changes in the type of zoning occur, many people would not be able to leave the area.

A) Mr. Fry responded by indicating that replacing the 11 acre LCSWMA parcel with a rail yard is a fair trade.

Mr. Orris responded that additional project features include improvements to the Brickyard, the remediation of the LCSWMA parcel, and a walking trail. Mr. Orris indicated that these environmental improvements that are going to take place could be argued to increase property values.

17. Q) The individual requested a breakdown of the budget and what amounts taxpayers would pay.

A) Mr. Orris responded that there is currently a nonspecific "sources and uses" budget. The project will be out to bid this summer, at which time there will be more specifics available. Mr. Orris also indicated that approximately \$4 million was added to the conceptual budget for removing the waste. In addition, Mr. Orris also reiterated that the overall budget is \$40-\$42 million, and that \$14 million would be from F&M, LG and NS, with the remainder being provided by various governmental grants for environmental, transportation, or waste removal projects.

18. Q) The individual supports the project and doesn't understand why people aren't more concerned with the shopping center, but still doesn't understand the rail yard relocation project.

A) Mr. Bailey responded that if people are concerned now about the rail yard project that they should have their questions addressed and get more information. Mr. Bailey also reiterated that the meeting tonight was educational and to address people's concerns.

19. Q) The individual is concerned about traffic flow. Current traffic flows onto Prince Street with future traffic flowing through the northwest neighborhoods once the College Avenue and Liberty Streets are reconnected. Individual wants to know about the plans to mitigate this impact and wants this issue to be a point of conversation.

A) Mr. Orris responded that conceptual plans drawn up by RTKL who performed planning tasks as part of the Armstrong Property development were consistent with other plans for northwest Lancaster that were developed over the past 25 years. Mr. Orris noted that the next step would be to retain a civil engineer and explore how the streets do connect and engage in conversations with the city administration about integration.

Pat Brogan, representing the City of Lancaster Mayor's office, indicated that they could control truck traffic on non-state roads, but not on state-owned roads.

Mr. Bailey indicated that the City is involved in the creation of new public streets, and as part of the process, environmental review and City planning would take place. Mr. Bailey indicated that during this process that the City will make sure that there are no adverse impacts on the city streets.

20. Q) The individual is skeptical of engineering plans designed with the best intentions but are invalid in their assumptions. Would F&M be willing to have a written binding document for the development of the site that will revert if site assumptions change or if the actual use is not as proposed? The individual suggested that this document be legally binding in each of the townships and have steps within the document to address issues if the project does not function as proposed.

A) Mr. Fry commented that the suggestion was taken seriously with NS, but that no current NS rail yards currently have a legally binding document regarding operation, and that F&M couldn't force NS to have such a document. Mr. Fry also reassured the individual that NS will use BMP's in disaster planning. F&M has also engaged top senior management at NS with this issue.

A) The individual further commented that if there is a change in the use or operation, then the assumptions used in various parts of the project studies are not correct.

A) Mr. Husband responded that the yard is designed for maximum efficiency and NS is committed to talking about issues and how to resolve them. Furthermore Mr. Husband noted that he tries to be candid, understands the impacts on the community, and wants to have a dialogue with the community. Mr. Husband also indicated that he would be willing to talk about issues if they come up in the future.

Mr. Fry added that NS has done a lot of good for the community and that they have been very helpful, told the truth, and have been very engaging throughout the project. Mr. Fry indicated that there is a lot of good will but that there is no legally binding agreement, and will follow up on standard operating procedures to try to obtain some sort of agreement.

21. Q) The individual is disappointed in the noise studies because they are an average 24-hour study and she is concerned that she will be awakened at night, which is not "average levels". The individual also wanted to know about the decibel levels of cars coupling and not the 24-hour average, and reiterated that she is disappointed that this information was not provided at this meeting.

A) Mr. El-Aassar responded that the evaluation was based on the FTA 1,000 ft screening criteria and that no residents are located within 1,000 ft, but that they went ahead and did an evaluation anyway. Mr. El-Aassar also explained that sound levels are based on a logarithmic scale, and major influence is placed on high sound levels in the noise abatement criteria developed by the agencies. Mr. El-Aassar also reiterated that although an increase in noise levels is present that it is not significant and that it is below the FTA criteria for impact. He also explained that he assessed at every instance what an individual will hear and that the model used to determine the proposed conditions is based on how humans hear. Mr. El-Aassar also explained the observed activity is typical to NS operations and that both peak and off peak noise levels were measured.

A) Individual wants to know the number of couplings.

A) Mr. El-Aassar indicated that he assumed train activity over the entire day.

Mr. Bailey asked if the information on the boards would be on the website for further study.

Mr. Orris also responded that the boards will be uploaded with the written report given to Gary Brown (TRAACC's consultant) with the specifics on the website.

A) Estimate the number of times the train coupled.

Mr. Orris indicated that there will continue to be a dialogue on this issue and referred the individual to the website.

22. Q) Individual was concerned about having trains pass by her backyard and wanted to know the distance from her home to the trains.

A) Mr. Orris responded that the individual who asked the question is the closest home in Barrcrest to the project, which is 1,200 feet from the center of the western point of the new yard.

A) The individual is still not sure of the distance and concerned about trains in her backyard.

A) Mr. Orris and Mr. Cross indicated that no trains would be parked on the west side of the creek.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:20 PM.

C) Written Comments

1. Thirteen Comment Sheets were collected from the comment station at the Public Meeting. As of the date of these minutes, no comment sheets have been returned via mail or email. Three comments were in support of the project, six comments critical of the proposed project, and four comments were questions to be addressed. The three positive comment sheets consisted of comments revolving around the idea that the proposed project is good for the city and region. One of the comments applauded the rigor of the noise, air, and vibration studies and explained that the individual's concerns about noise and air impacts have been addressed.
2. The six comments critical of the proposed project overall revolved around issues and concerns about project-related impacts to the adjoining residential communities. Most of the comments included a statement regarding benefits for F&M, LG and NS at the expense of surrounding residential neighborhoods. One comment additionally requested a 5% contingency be factored into the project budget. One comment implied that the public had only been informed in the past year even though NS and F&M had been discussing the project for 5 years. The comment suggested that a compromise (i.e. a win-win situation) could have been developed if the affected residents were informed earlier. One comment suggested that the 200-foot vibration screening distance was too small and that testing should radiate approximately 2,000 ft from the rail yard to address the impacts felt by residents. One comment stated that the rail yard belongs in the city, the noise levels will increase, wildlife will be displaced, rat populations will increase, and house values will go down as a result of the project. The same comment also indicated that the results of the studies can be manipulated. One comment suggested that F&M and LG should not be tax exempt.
3. The remaining four comments were questions that can receive individual responses. Two of the four questions were directly addressed in the Question and Answer session, with two remaining question that can be addressed by the GF project team. One question asked about the consequences for the stakeholders (F&M, LG, and NS) and their accountability if the study results, particularly noise and pollution, prove to be incorrect. The question also asked about a contingency plan and whether it is included in the project budget. This question was specifically addressed by the project team during the Question and Answer Session. One question asked about the traffic impacts and mitigation plans in the northwestern corner of the city once the College Ave and Liberty St are reconnected. This question was specifically addressed by the project team during the Question and Answer session. One question asked about the tax implications of the project on the School Lane Hills residential neighborhood and rhetorically asked if the neighborhood was losing out as a result of Manheim Township's industrial zoning. This question was not directly addressed at the meeting. The last comment addressed the project display boards. The individual suggested that all displays be

posted on the F&M website. Furthermore, the individual suggested that written narratives be prepared for all the displays, and particularly referenced the air quality displays. This question was not directly addressed at the meeting.

D) Comments from Technical Information Stations

1. Comments were recorded by the various personnel at the display stations. Like the written comments, some of the comments from the display board stations were directly addressed as part of the question and answer session. Some of the comments should be addressed by the GF project team. Comments from the solid waste remediation station compiled by Ned Wehler of ARM Group, Inc, have been attached to these meeting minutes.
2. Comments and questions from the project display stations were generally technical in nature, although some comments stated that the individual did not believe or trust F&M, the other stakeholders, or the presenters. Some of the comments and questions at the various display areas that were addressed in the question and answer portion of the meeting included discussions of alternatives, funding, site location in relation to residential neighborhoods, contingency plans if the studies are incorrect and impacts are not as stated, project scheduling, project effects on the tax base in the surrounding municipalities, the building of trains on the west side of Little Conestoga Creek, the remediation of only half of the LCSWMA parcel, and concerns that the project will destroy property values of the neighborhood.
3. Comments and questions from the project display stations that were not addressed as part of the question and answer session were all technical in nature. Questions and comments included why the bridges are not being built wider, why can't development take place on top of the existing site like "in a big city", the relation of the Act 2 process to the NEPA process, the fate of the LCSWMA parcel if the project does not go forward, what the extents National Register boundaries include and why is it changing, why NS will not contribute more if the project benefits them so much, how the NEPA and technical documents will be made easily available to the public, how the "Crossings" project fits with the proposed project, and how will the "Crossings" project affect Harrisburg Pike. These comments should be examined by the project team.

E) Commitments

The following items are commitments that F&M made during the public meeting on June 19, 2008.

- F&M will post the boards displayed at the public meeting on the project website. [*N.B. these boards have been posted*].
- F&M will post the environmental studies when accepted by all reviewing agencies on the project website. [*N.B. The environmental reports need to be approved by PennDOT and FHWA before they can be posted.*]

- In response to a request to consider removing the trash that remained on LCSWMA's property across Little Conestoga Creek, F&M will evaluate this proposal and also will contact Jim Warner at LCSWMA regarding their plans to address the trash. [*N.B. F&M's letter to Jim Warner is posted on the website. A reply is expected.*]
- In response to a request to consider giving neighbors assurances that the yard would be used as described by NS and the project partners, F&M will coordinate with NS regarding their willingness to commit to certain operational topics. [*N.B. F&M is currently in communication with NS on this issue.*]
- F&M will expand the air quality testing results to show results for the area to the North of the tracks. [*N.B. This information is included on the final air quality reports.*]
- F&M will continue to update the project website with more information as it becomes available.

These minutes represent our best interpretation of the proceedings of this Project Public meeting. If you have any questions or require any information please contact Robert P. O'Neill at 610-650-8101.

Steven J Wittig

ARM Project #05303

**QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE PUBLIC ON
THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 2008
CONCERNING THE PROPOSED DILLERVILE YARD
RELOCATION TO THE LCSWMA PARCEL CONCERNING
THE REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION AND PROPOSED CLEAN UP PLAN
PROJECT #05303**

1. What is the impact on the Chesapeake Bay and what agency will address the Bay impact?
RESPONSE: *This Project will have no adverse impact on the Chesapeake Bay. If anything, this project will benefit the Chesapeake Bay by eliminating and reducing discharges of degraded groundwater to the watershed. PADEP will address the Bay impact.*
2. Was this site considered as a Superfund site? Was it rejected as the same? RESPONSE:
We have no information that indicates that this site was ever seriously considered for Superfund designation.
3. Word of mouth says this dump contains a lot of Armstrong waste—what is the asbestos impact if the dump stays as is? What is the asbestos impact if the dump is excavated?
RESPONSE: *Asbestos content within the waste is indicated as being limited to waste floor tile (linoleum and vinyl flooring). Samples of the floor tile indicate that the asbestos content is non-friable, as the laboratory tests indicate it to be non-friable, organically-bound (NOB). If the dump is removed, then the ACM materials will be removed from the site and have no future environmental consequences at this site. If the dump is not removed, there could be future environmental consequences associated with the ACMs.*

4. What methods of dust control will be used to contain airborne asbestos associated with removal of waste from the former Brickyard site? RESPONSE: *Perimeter and work zone mister and soaker systems will be employed, as necessary, to control and eliminate work zone dust exposures and to prevent off-site migration of dust originating from the excavation, backfilling, compaction, and waste hauling activities.*
5. How will flooding affect the waste removal project? RESPONSE: *No waste removal activities will occur within the 100-year FEMA floodplain. As a result, flooding will have no effect on the project.*
6. What will happen to the wildlife that inhabits this part of the property? How is that considered in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process? RESPONSE: *Wildlife that inhabits the site (birds, deer) is transient in general, and will be dispersed onto existing and substantial abutting, adjacent land areas, including those owned by the College and the LCSWMA.*
7. How will earth disturbance and waste removal activities affect the creek and fish? RESPONSE: *Pursuant to applicable best management practices and the authorization of an NPDES permit, areas of earth disturbance and existing drainageways will be fitted with all necessary erosion control devices, according to the approved permit.*
8. The F&M website concerning this project should be mentioned in the Public Involvement Plan. RESPONSE: *The F&M website is cited in the Public Involvement Plan.*
9. Why not remediate both sides of the Little Conestoga Creek to remove the former dump sites? RESPONSE: *This Project is situated in Manheim Township and does not include lands opposite the Little Conestoga Creek within East Hempfield Township.*
10. Is there seepage of contaminated groundwater from the site? Does it affect stream quality? RESPONSE: *Yes, there is some seepage of contaminated groundwater from the site. Surface water quality modeling (SWLOAD5B and PENTOXSD) for Little Conestoga Creek (which forms the western boundary of the site) indicates no adverse water quality effect on the Little Conestoga Creek and the UNT from the discharge of groundwater originating from the Site.*
11. Because stormwater infiltration will not be permitted, how will Norfolk Southern prevent mosquito infestation of its proposed storm water basins and thereby diminish or eliminate any risk of the West Nile Virus? RESPONSE: *The storm water basins are not "wet" basins; they are designed to drain quite quickly following a storm event. Routine*

maintenance by Norfolk Southern should preclude the development of a significant risk of mosquitoes bearing the West Nile virus.

12. How long will we conduct environmental monitoring after project completion?

RESPONSE: *No environmental monitoring is proposed after project completion.*

13. What different types of waste are present on the site? How much waste is present? How much waste will be removed? What are the different percentages of different categories of waste materials? RESPONSE: *The predominant waste materials present on the site consist of flooring tile stacked in layers of up to 2 feet thick with no intervening soil.*

Brick and cement block fragments were also fairly ubiquitous throughout the subsurface at the site. Other commonly encountered materials encountered included: glass and plastic fragments, glass bottles, tires, wood chips, foundry sand, newspaper, fibrous/fabric material, cloth, metal sheeting, metal pipe, cans, leather scraps, lumber, wire, steel wool, venetian blinds, rubber, ashes, cinders, macadam, and demolition debris. Typically, the non-media solids are placed in layers, covered with and often mixed with earth materials that typically consist of silty clay loam, or mixtures of sand, loam, gravel and brick fragments. Approximately 60,000 to 80,000 cubic yards of waste materials are present on the site. All of the waste materials are proposed for removal from the site.

14. Is there asbestos present within the waste? What part of the waste contains asbestos?

RESPONSE: *Samples of suspect ACM material were collected from floor tile samples taken from test pit excavation made on April 3, 2008. Twelve samples (IDs ASB-1 through ASB-12) were submitted to the analytical laboratory on April 3. Results of the laboratory analyses, performed by EMSL Analytical, Inc. revealed that ten of the twelve samples of linoleum and vinyl flooring samples did not contain asbestos; two of the samples (ASB-3 and ASB-11) contained asbestos at a concentration of 15% (ASB-3) and 20% (ASB-11). For sample ASB-3, the asbestos content was described as fibrous and heterogeneous, consisting of 8% cellulose, 77% non-fibrous (other) and 15% chrysotile. For sample ASB-11, the asbestos content was described as fibrous and heterogeneous, consisting of 10% cellulose, 70% non-fibrous (other) and 20% chrysotile.*

15. What methods will be employed to protect site workers and the neighbors from asbestos?

RESPONSE: *Perimeter and work zone mister and soaker systems will be employed, as necessary, to control and eliminate work zone dust exposures and to prevent off-site migration of dust originating from the excavation, backfilling, compaction, and waste hauling activities. Workers will not be permitted to have access to the excavations; moreover, this project will involve no confined space entries. Potential dermal contact exposures that may arise with respect to the commissioning and decommissioning of various control measures and equipment will be prevented and avoided by the use of personnel wearing dermal gloves and splash suits, pursuant to the requirements of the*

site-specific HASP. Upwind and down-wind (non-stationary) monitoring stations will be established for each set of waste excavation cells. These will be established, in general to the northwest (upwind) and the southeast (down-wind) to monitor for and ensure compliance with applicable air quality regulations. As the planned excavations progress from west to east, the air quality monitoring stations will move to the east to maintain the same type of monitoring program as established for the initial cells. For site workers, air quality exposure assessments for asbestos, lead and dust will be conducted initially and maintained until adequate documentation exists to support a negative exposure assessment conclusion. In addition, site monitoring will include the use of a fiber analysis meter (FAM) to detect the presence of asbestos fibers in worker breathing zones.

16. Are there dust control standards that apply to this project? RESPONSE: *Yes; Dust/particulate matter – 15 milligrams per cubic meter (mg/m³) of air (29 CFR 1926.55); asbestos – 0.10 fibers per cubic centimeter (on-site); and 0.01 fibers per cubic centimeter (off-site) (29 CFR 1926.1101); and, lead – 0.05 milligrams per cubic meter (mg/m³) of air (29 CFR 1926.62).*
17. Explain the proposed haul routes including travel routes to the landfill. RESPONSE: *Wastes will be hauled and transferred to FFLF in waste trucks, fitted with fully-deployed tarp covers. The haul route will be established as follows: outbound truck traffic will be directed to the east on Harrisburg Pike, north onto Dillerville Road, west onto Manheim Pike, and finally west onto U.S. Route 30 West, traveling to Columbia and then south on Route 441 and River Road to the Frey Farm Landfill. In-bound trucks (returning from FFLF) will exist U S Route 30 at Harrisburg Pike and travel in-bound to a right-hand turn onto Vermont Avenue, continuing to the site with backhauled clean earth for backfill and compaction.*
18. Over what period of time will the waste removal project be conducted? When will the project begin and when will it end? RESPONSE: *Plans call for the start of waste removal operations as soon as October 2008, ending no later than May 31, 2009.*
19. How many truck loads of waste material will leave the site each day and how many trucks/truckloads will be involved with the total waste removal project? RESPONSE: *Plans provide for approximately 70 trucks leaving the site and 70 trucks returning to the site each work day. Over the life of the project, plans provide for approximately 6,500 truckloads of waste being removed from the site.*
20. What are the anticipated hours of operation for the waste removal project? RESPONSE: *Access will be limited to the hours of approximately 6:30 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. on Monday through Saturday, with no construction-type work permitted on Sundays.*

21. What is the DEP approval timeline for approval of the proposed clean up plan?
RESPONSE: *DEP has up to 90 days to review and approve the proposed cleanup plan after it is submitted to DEP for review and approval.*
22. After the project is complete, please describe any environmental monitoring that will be conducted. What environmental monitoring will be conducted by Norfolk Southern?
RESPONSE: *No environmental monitoring is proposed after project completion.*
23. When DEP gets questions and comments from the public concerning this project, how do they deal with those questions and will they require the applicant to provide any additional information? RESPONSE: *DEP examines the information that they have at their disposal and responds directly with responses to questions raised by specific inquirers. Often, DEP requires an applicant to provide additional information.*
24. How and when will we respond to questions that are provided to us? RESPONSE: *We have responded to these questions and comments by providing responses in this format, within this publicly-accessible document. Future questions will be answered or responded to directly by the project's point of contact, Mr. Keith Orris of F&M College.*
25. How will floods affect storm basins proposed by Norfolk Southern? RESPONSE: *No storm basins will be placed within the 100-year FEMA floodplain. As a result, flooding will have no effect on the proposed storm basins.*
26. There was a nearby Superfund site known as the Lancaster Battery Site. Did you find any battery casings in the waste materials indicative of disposal by Lancaster Battery?
RESPONSE: *No, we did not find any battery casings in the waste materials indicative of disposal by Lancaster Battery.*