

**Minutes**  
**Borough Public Meeting – 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Dam**  
**October 13, 2011**

A special public meeting was held at 7 PM in the Borough Council chambers on the above date regarding the design of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Bridge and Dam. The meeting was requested by the Friends of Glen Providence Park (FGP) at the August 23, 2011, Special Meeting. All members of Media Borough Council were present, as well as Borough Manager Jeff Smith, and Borough Engineer Robert Johnston.

Also in attendance were: John Harrison and Lisa Ciampitti (Schnabel Engineering); Paul Cavanaugh (Broomall's Lake Swim Club); and Karen Holm (Delaware County Planning Department).

Council President Peter Alyanakian (PA) started the meeting with an invitation for general comments and concerns, with the direction that specific design-related questions be held until Schnabel Engineering (John Harrison) has presented the history and overview of the project.

Media Resident Paul Indorf had several questions regarding the status of the project:

1. What has happened since the last meeting, with regard to previous questions and concerns?
2. What has been discussed to move the project forward regarding the aesthetics and traffic concerns?
3. What will be the process moving forward from this meeting?

Council President answered by noting that the Borough has had an unprecedented number of public meetings for this project. In addition, the Third Street Dam Committee was created to focus on the repair of the dam and roadway.

John Harrison (JH) presented slides showing simulations of the proposed rehabilitated dam and roadway as a result of the proposed construction. Mr. Harrison noted that form liners would be acceptable to PennDOT and could be used on the proposed concrete structures. In addition, PennDOT would be open to a more aesthetically pleasing fence; however, if the price of the alternate fence is in excess of replacement in kind, the Borough may be required to share in the extra cost.

Following Mr. Harrison's presentation, the Council opened the floor to the public:

1. What is the timing for submitting the Dam Permit Application? (Stephanie Gabriault)

*JH: Mid 2012*

2. Petition was prepared proposing the creation of a greenway across the dam instead of a roadway. The petition signed by 500+ Media residents (800 people total) was presented to Council. Question was posed to Council if they would endorse a citizens advisory committee for the Third Street Dam Project? (Terry Rumsey)

*Council: Several council members said they would support the creation of such a committee, others said they would support the committee, but would defer to legal advice regarding the dam and roadway. At the conclusion of the meeting, Council determined they would accept citizen applications for the committee for review at their next working meeting.*

3. FGP noted that they have done a lot of research regarding what has been done and what is still required. They understand that the Borough is the project sponsor and request that the Borough have an independent peer review done for the project. (Shannon Davidson)

*JH: PennDOT and DEP have been reviewing and approving the design to date and will have final approval of the project. Peer reviews do occur in design projects; however, the additional expense of a peer review would be the responsibility of the Borough, and may cost around \$30,000-\$40,000.*

4. How would peer review proceed? (Peter Alyanakian)

*Jeff Smith (JS): Borough would prepare an RFP, with input from PennDOT, stating the project requirements. The RFP would be put out to bid. Once the bids are received, they would be reviewed for both price and qualifications.*

5. Can the use and width of the roadway change? (posed by several citizens and council members)

*JH: The width of the roadway will be determined based on the final roadway use decision. One of the current roadway alternatives includes a parking lane and sidewalk; removal of one or both of these items will reduce the top of dam width, and subsequently, the dam footprint.*

*Council: Configuration of the roadway would need to be in compliance with the legal agreement. In addition, Upper Providence Township must be in agreement with the creation of a one-way roadway, if the project were to move in that direction. Council will consider the use of stop signs, one-way and speed bumps.*

6. FGP and other attendees requested the creation of a greenway as opposed to a roadway at the dam for several reasons:

- a. Things have changed at the bridge since it was originally closed.
- b. A greenway is best for the park.
- c. A greenway is the "Media way."
- d. A greenway is legal. According to conversations between PennDOT and FGP, funding does not require replacement of the roadway.
- e. Concerns relative to traffic, safety and noise.

FGP requested a poll of Council to see who would support a greenway. (Robin Lasersohn)

*Robert Johnston (RJ): Roadway may be required for funding to remain in place.*

*Peter Williamson (PW): The assumptions have always been that the roadway was required. However, to the best of his knowledge the legal agreement did not specify which alternative was chosen for design and that there is opportunity for the greenway. There should be a public referendum to decide if there is vehicular traffic or not.*

*JS: Legal counsel has advised the Borough that replacement of the road is required. In addition, the agreement with Broomall's Lake Swim Club and Delaware County states a vehicular thoroughfare is*

*required. JS cited the applicable portions of the legal agreement which note that a roadway shall be reconstructed over the dam. JS also noted that any design modifications may have to be clarified with PennDOT.*

7. Will Borough Council allow variations to design? (Paul Indorf)

*JH: Variations have been considered in the 1998 Alternatives Report, which is posted on the Borough website. The concept with the new spillway and roadway were approved by the Borough, PADEP and PennDOT. The roadway (top of dam) width is variable depending on the selected options.*

8. What is the anticipated traffic with the roadway re-opening?

*PA: Small informal studies have been performed in other locations; however, they are not considered reliable. The closed road has increased traffic in other areas of Media, and reopening the roadway will alleviate traffic in those affected areas.*

*RJ: In general, anticipated traffic at a site could be estimated by extrapolation from a previous study. However, the Borough/Engineer has looked for records of a previous study at this location, but was unable to find any.*

9. What percentage complete is the project? What is Council's basis of design? (Brett Muster)

*JH: Project is estimated to be at 65% complete. The 1998 Alternatives Report is the basis of design, with the recommended alternative chosen by the Borough.*

10. What is the Council's goal/basis of design for the project? (Robin Lasersohn)

*PA: Public safety and protection of habitat and park land.*

11. Can there be trees on the dam? (Patty Cooper)

*JH: Trees are not allowed on dams, per dam safety regulations and standard dam design practice, for stability and inspection purposes.*

12. What are the maintenance requirements for the project? (Megan Moore)

*PA: After rehabilitation of the dam/bridge, the responsibility for maintenance of the dam is on the County and Broomall's Lake Swim Club.*

13. Do the funding grants require a two-lane road?

*PA: PA's understanding is that the grant requires two-lane roadway; not sure if there is flexibility with regard to roadway usage.*

14. Has an Environmental Assessment been prepared?

*JH: Schnabel is currently preparing the EA.*

15. Are the wetlands at the toe to be impacted? What is the impact area and what is the required mitigation?

*JH: Yes, 0.16 AC (7,000 SF) of wetlands are going to be impacted. There will be a 1:1 mitigation. A possible mitigation site is at the small pond in the park.*

16. Where is the anticipated staging area and how long will construction last?

*JH: Staging area will be determined by the contractor; it will likely be on the roadway to either side of the dam. Construction of the dam and roadway will be approximately one year.*

17. Is a waterfall still possible? (Susan Garrison)

*JH: The drop at the outlet structure as designed is approximately 10'.*

18. Who decides the wetland mitigation site? (Lisa Johnson)

*PA: PADEP. Council understands that Ridley Creek is an exceptional value waterway.*

*JH: Wetland mitigation will be designed in accordance with PADEP standards.*

*RJ: The PADEP, USACE, design engineers, township and responsible parties will confer on wetland mitigation. The USACE and PADEP will make the final decision on location of mitigation.*

Mr. Paul Cavanaugh of the Broomall's Lake Swim Club noted that the Club is in favor of opening the road. If the design of the road/dam is altered significantly, the legal agreement which has previously been arranged would have to be renegotiated.

Several citizens voiced their support of re-opening 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to vehicular traffic. One citizen noted that the opposition to re-opening the roadway comes from citizens that live adjacent to the dam/roadway and are being exclusionary in their attempts to block the roadway from the design.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 9 PM.