

Third Street Dam Citizens Advisory Committee

Purpose and Scope of Activities

January 17, 2011

Purpose

The Citizens Advisory Committee for the Third Street Dam and Roadway is established to advise the Borough Council on the three main options identified for the redesign of the dam. These options are:

- 1) Rebuilding the existing dam to include a two lane road and a bike path/pedestrian walkway on the perimeter;
- 2) Rebuilding the existing dam with some form of non-motorized pathway; i.e., a greenway for just pedestrians and bicyclists;
- 3) Removing (breaching) the dam:
 - a. With no bridge or roadway
 - b. With a bridge and roadway¹

It will produce a report of its activities that will be shared with the public and with Council.

Definitions

For the purposes of this document, the following definitions are used:

- Dam: a barrier constructed to hold back water and raise its level.
- Road: a surface that allows vehicles to move from one point to another.
- Bridge: a structure spanning and providing passage over a gap or barrier such as a river.

Scope of Activities

The Committee is charged with investigating the environmental and community preferences and impacts of each design option. It shall, in all its work, seek to address the broad, common concerns of Borough residents, and avoid technical details, which are the responsibility of design and building professionals working on the project. To the extent that technical expertise is needed for decision making, it will flag the need for such information with the Borough Manager and the sub-committee.

¹ It is unclear as of this writing whether PADOT would pay for a bridge over a breached dam.

It shall work with the Borough Manager, who will assist in setting up public hearings and stakeholder interviews with borough staff and other professional service firms that assist the borough (e.g., the Borough Engineer). It may interview members of surrounding municipalities. It may utilize the Borough's public records and reports on the engineering of the dam. It should not contact the parties that are so-signers of the current agreement or make any representations with regard to the project.

It shall also reach out to a broad cross-section of the community representing interest in each of the design alternatives. It is encouraged to collect data from residents and businesses to support its work.

It should inform the public of its activities and findings, and seek the opinions of Borough citizens using simple, recognized techniques of dissemination and surveying. It will hold regularly scheduled meetings, advertised and open to the public, and will keep Council apprised of its work by regular reports to the Council sub-committee on the project. Council members may attend meetings of the citizens group from time to time.

The report of its findings shall be concise, document the process undertaken, and the rationale that led to the Committee's final work.

Borough Council will receive the report and will use the document in its deliberations on the issue. The role of the committee is advisory only and the final decision is the responsibility of Borough Council, which must weigh this information along with inputs from several sources.

Committee Structure

The Committee will be composed of 9 citizens that reside in the Borough of Media, selected by Council, with a range of skills and experience suitable to the task, and from all precincts. It shall complete its charge by April 1, 2011. A chair may be recommended by Council but it is otherwise free to organize itself as it sees fit.

Committee Deliverables

The Committee will deliver the following document to Council (or its sub-committee).

1. Stakeholders

Identify all the stakeholders who could potentially be impacted by this decision. Describe in depth their characteristics and interest in the outcome.

Table 1.0

| # | Stakeholder | Description |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | Etc. | |

2. Options

The options are:

- 1) rebuilding the structure to include a two lane road and a bike path/pedestrian walkway on the perimeter;
- 2) rebuilding the dam with some form of non-motorized pathway; i.e., a greenway for just pedestrians and bicyclists;
- 3) removing (breaching) the dam with or without a bridge and roadway.²

Review each of these options. Provide a 1/2 page or more design description of each of these options; ie., what is a citizen's vision for each option if it is chosen? In other words, if you had to design the two-lane roadway option, what would it look like? A greenway?

Provide any information that could be useful in the design stage such as aesthetic considerations, size, landscaping, etc..

Table 2.0

| # | Option | Vision (Design) for Each Option |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 2-lane highway | |
| 2 | Greenway | |
| 3 | Breach -with no bridge -with a bridge/roadway | |

² It is unclear at this time whether PaDOT will fund the construction of a bridge if the dam is breached.

3. Stakeholder Preferences

Collect data from a sample of each stakeholder group as to their preferences for the three options. Show as a distribution across the three options (note: you may include sampling data in separate tables or charts).

Example: Stakeholder Group A: 60% in favor of 2 lane road (option 1), 20% in favor of Greenway (option 2); 11% in favor of a breach (options 3); 9% undecided.

Table 3.0

| # | Stakeholder | Preferences |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |

4. Stakeholder Impacts

Indicate the likely impacts (positive and negative) to each stakeholder group of each option. You may collect data from a sample of each stakeholder group to determine impacts for the three options.

Table 4.0

| # | Stakeholder/Option | Roadway (+/-) | Greenway (+/-) | Breach (+/-) |
|---|--------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1 | Stakeholder 1 | | | |
| 2 | Stakeholder 2 | | | |
| 3 | Stakeholder 3 | | | |
| 4 | Stakeholder 4 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| 5 | Stakeholder 5 | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|--|

5. Criteria for Evaluation

Review the following criteria for evaluation of the options. Review what these criteria mean to citizens; i.e., interpret the criteria listed below. Indicate how much relative weight citizens would place on these criteria (note: all criteria weights must add up to 100%). Note: You should collect data to support the weights from a sample of citizens.

If you wish to add additional criteria (or modify the existing ones) you may do so, but construct another table with the revised criteria in addition to this one. If you will use the modified table, please let the sub-committee chair know as soon as possible to allow for some standardization.

Table 5.0

| # | Criteria | Weight | Description of Each Criteria (interpret and expand on) |
|---|---|--------|---|
| 1 | Value of Access | | The value to residents and businesses based on ability to drive motorized vehicles across the dam . |
| 2 | Environmental Improvement | | The degree to which the option improves the local natural environment in the vicinity of the dam. |
| 3 | Improved Safety (immediate area of dam) | | The degree to which the option improves safety for current and future generations of residents. Potential hazards include unplanned breach of the dam, auto accidents, pedestrian accidents, etc. |
| 4 | Decreases Financial Liability to Borough | | The degree to which the option limits financial liability to the Borough such as maintenance, repairs, etc. |
| 5 | Recreational value | | The recreational value to residents of each option. |
| | TOTAL | 100% | |

6. Other Issues

What key questions or issues should the Council consider in its deliberations? Please provide a list of key concerns and issues, and any other information that the Council should consider.

7. Due Date

Given the constraints imposed by PennDot, Council needs to receive the completed report by April 1, 2012.

8. Contacts

The report may be delivered to Borough Manager Jeff Smith at jasmith@dca.net and the Council sub-committee on the 3rd Street Dam project:

- Paul Robinson (chair) - mediaman55@aol.com
- Monika Rehoric - kennysflowers1@verizon.net
- Eric Stein - estein@councilmanstein.com