

Memorandum

TO: Meeting Attendees
FROM: Amy Sokalski
DATE: March 21, 2005
SUBJECT: Northerly Crossings Corridor
Congestion Mitigation Study
Northerly Crossings Forum (NCF)
Meeting #3

DATE AND TIME: Wednesday, March 9, 2005
7:00 PM – 9:00 PM

LOCATION: Clarion Hotel
1220 W. Main Street
Stroudsburg, PA

PURPOSE: Northerly Crossings Corridor Congestion Mitigation Study Northerly Crossings
Forum Meeting #3

IN ATTENDANCE (19 TOTAL):

Michael Cane	Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission – Project Manager
Roger Sager	Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission
Bryan Hill	Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission
Jeanne Pomager	Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission
Michael Meeker	Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission
James Yeager	Michael Baker Jr., Inc. – Project Manager
Mark Alisesky	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Amy Sokalski	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Tom Drabic	Sussex County Planning Division
Tanya Emam	FHWA
Keith Utter	Sandyston Township
Robert Philips	Monroe County
Roger Smith	Pennsylvania State Police
Dennis Collette	Sussex Cty Chamber of Commerce Transportation Integration Effort
Deena Cybulski	Morris County
Ann Pilcher	Pocono Mountains Vacation Bureau, Inc.
Bill Mineo	Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor
Marc Lipshultz	McCormick Taylor
John Mullen	McCormick Taylor

Below is a summary of key issues discussed during Northerly Crossings Forum Meeting #3 for the Northerly Crossings Corridor Congestion Mitigation Study.

Welcome/Introductory Remarks: *DRJTBC*

Meeting Agenda/Study Purpose: *James Yeager*

Forecasting Future Travel Demand: *James Yeager*

- It was asked if vehicle trips during the peak hour would be reduced if the Lackawanna Cut-Off line was used for freight. Mr. Yeager responded that this scenario was not evaluated. However, there may not be a large benefit because the truck percentage is lower during the peak commuter hours, which are the critical periods for traffic operating on the DWG Bridge.

Future No Build Analyses and Concept Development: *James Yeager, Amy Sokalski*

- Tom Drabic asked where Bus Only lanes would be located on I-80. Mr. Yeager responded that this would have to be evaluated further but may include the bridge and I-80 mainline as well as access ramps. Mr. Yeager cautioned that this may not be feasible without bridge widening because there are no shoulders on the DWB Bridge and anticipated bus volumes would not justify dedicating one of the existing two lanes for bus only use.
- Bill Mineo asked if the existing pedestrian facilities on the Portland-Columbia Pedestrian Bridge and Milford-Montague Bridge (sidewalk) will be maintained since no improvements are proposed as part of this study. Mr. Mineo stated that trails connecting to these facilities are currently being planned, and that it is important for tourism to maintain bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Mr. Yeager stated that these facilities will be maintained and that upgrades to Milford-Montague may be considered during the System Preservation Project.
- Ann Pilcher asked if the study team looked at the differences in mileage and travel time for the ITS Concept. Mr. Yeager responded that these differences were not evaluated. Mr. Yeager stated that the mileage is comparable; however, motorists would probably not use the Portland-Columbia Bridge unless there was severe congestion on I-80.
- Mr. Drabic asked who will pay for the proposed six-lane improvements. Mr. Yeager responded that this is not decided yet and will be discussed in Technical Memorandum #4.
- It was asked if the improvement concepts will impact the DWG National Recreation Area (NRA). Mr. Yeager stated that there will be impacts to the NRA. However, the study team will investigate ways to minimize impacts.
- Deena Cybulski asked why there are gates on the E-ZPass lanes at the existing DWG toll plaza. Mr. Cane stated that the gates are there as a safety measure for DRJTBC employees. The DRJTBC is investigating toll plaza operations and may investigate eliminating the gates in the future.
- Mr. Yeager and Ms. Sokalski presented the range of conceptual improvements for the I-80 DWG Bridge. These concepts include the following:
 - 4-lane Concept – Add inside and outside shoulders to I-80
 - 5-lane Concept – Widen I-80 to provide one reversible lane
 - 6-lane Concept – Widen I-80 to six lanes
 - 6-lane Concept – Construct a double-deck structure to accommodate six lanes
 - 6-lane Concept – Provide six lanes on I-80 by constructing a new I-80 eastbound bridge (3 lanes) and keeping I-80 westbound on existing alignment (3 lanes).

- 6-lane Concept – Provide six lanes on I-80 by constructing a new I-80 westbound tunnel and bridge (3 lanes) and keeping I-80 eastbound on existing alignment (3 lanes).
- I-80 Alternate Alignment – Construct a new roadway alignment to the south of existing Delaware Water Gap Bridge running parallel to I-80
- I-80 Alternate Alignment – Construct a new roadway to the north beginning with a newly constructed parallel bridge at the Delaware Water Gap Bridge and ending west of Stroudsburg.
- It was asked if the existing I-80 DWG Bridge structure can support a double deck structure. Mr. Yeager stated that the existing bridge cannot support a double deck structure.
- Ms. Cybulski asked if the LOS results for the DWG Bridge were for both directions. Mr. Yeager responded that I-80 westbound LOS are based on Friday PM and Saturday afternoon volumes, and I-80 eastbound LOS are based on Monday morning and Sunday afternoon volumes. Traffic volumes are higher during the AM Peak Hour, which is mostly commuter traffic. During the PM Peak Hour, there is a combination of both commuter and recreational trips.

Evaluation Criteria: *Mark Alisesky*.

Mr. Alisesky presented the evaluation criteria and the process that the study team anticipates using to evaluate the conceptual improvements. Categories of criteria include: Mission Statement, Congestion/Mobility, Feasibility, Environmental and Public/Community Impact.

- Tanya Emam asked if safety is being considered as one of the evaluation criteria. Mr. Alisesky stated it would be difficult to compare concepts in terms of safety, especially since I-80 is not a high accident area. Ms. Emam stated that she will provide the study team with information about performance measures dealing with safety.
- Ms. Pilcher asked if there will be impacts to the Appalachian Trail. Mr. Yeager responded that there is a trail representative on the NCF. One of the main concerns will be maintaining the trail during construction.

Action Items

- ◆ Finalize Technical Memorandum #3 and post on the project website.

Next Steps

- ◆ Complete Draft Technical Memorandum #4.
- ◆ IAC Meeting #4 – May 2005
- ◆ NCF Meeting #4 – May 2005