



Lardner/Klein Landscape Architects, P.C.

Memorandum:

To: Brad Zearfoss, Anna Breinich
Consultant Team
Advisory Committee
From: Jim Klein
Date: 1 December 2006
Subject: Meeting Notes: Flight 93 National Memorial Corridor Study
Advisory Committee #2: 11/15/06

The second advisory committee meeting of the Flight 93 National Memorial Corridor Study was held on November 15, 2006 from 3:00-5:00 PM at the Somerset County office building.

The agenda for the meeting included:

1. Introductions
2. Update on Memorial Project (Jeff Reinbold, NPS)
3. Discussion of Draft Corridor Vision and Corridor Definition (Jim Klein, LKLA)
4. Presentation/Discussion on existing conditions (Todd Stell, SEE)
Presentation/Discussion of Simulations of Anticipated Land Use Changes in the Corridor (Jim Klein, LKLA)
5. Review of Proposed Property Owner Survey (Anna Breinich, PEC)
6. Next Steps/ Schedule

Jeff Reinbold provided an update to the committee on the status of the Flight 93 Memorial Project. Mr. Reinbold noted that visitation is up for this year, and that the projected visitation for the permanent memorial (+/- 230,000 per year) is probably conservative. He also noted that there is an increase in visitors coming from the east (most typically come from Pittsburgh, Cleveland and points west on their way to somewhere else). It was noted that the re-opening of the Bedford Springs resort might also bring more travelers from the east.

Jim Klein reviewed the results of the vision and goal exercise from the first meeting including discussion of the draft vision and draft corridor definition provided in the advance materials. Comments include the following:

- Concerns were noted about the broad width of the corridor, especially in the Stoystown vicinity. Mr. Klein indicated that the boundary shows the primary ridgeline that is visible from the route. An adjustment to the boundary will be made to reflect a narrower corridor, and the distant ridgelines will be shown differently.
- It was noted that this is just the beginning of the project, that the corridor character area mapping delineations are just the areas of study, and that the map does not imply that lands within the corridor will be zoned. Mr. Klein indicated that there are a lot of tools available, such as conservation easements or purchase of development rights from willing property owners that can be used to maintain the rural character of the area that do not involve zoning. The corridor boundary needs to include these areas so that the public benefit and conservation interest in the property can be noted for tax purposes, should a willing property owner wish to donate a conservation easement.
- A question was asked about whether or not the corridor can include the Stonycreek Watershed areas. Mr. Klein indicated that linkages to other regional projects should be noted in the corridor definition.
- A suggestion was made to extend the corridor route to the Bedford County line, rather than Reel's Corner.

Todd Stell presented the project mapping to date showing the existing conditions in the corridor including existing land use, existing legal limitations for development (wetlands, streams, floodplains), steep slopes and other constrained lands, and natural and cultural resources.

- A suggestion was made to show the areas with existing zoning (interchange areas, Somerset Borough)
- The recent donation of land to the State Game Commission should be shown on the maps (approx. 100 acres across from the Memorial entrance)
- Agricultural Security Areas and any preserved farmlands (voluntarily protected by easement) should be shown on the resource map
- It was noted that the Stonycreek Watershed area should be shown on the resource map
- Suggestions made to verify trail designations shown on map and add remaining identifiable cultural and recreational resources, per the draft Southern Alleghenies Open Space and Greenways Plan.
- The entire memorial boundary will be shown along with the location of the new entrance
- Road names will be checked for accuracy prior to the public meeting.

Jim Klein presented computer simulations from five areas along the corridor (PA 281/US 219 interchange, US 219 just south of the Jennerstown Interchange (US 30/US 219), US 30 just east of the Jennerstown interchange, US 30 near the Stonebridge entrance, and US 30 just east of the proposed memorial entrance) to illustrate how typical development practices might change the character of the corridor. Committee comments provided as follows:

- The billboards shown in the distance on the US 30 near Stonebridge illustration are unlikely to be installed and should be removed from the simulation (and moved to another location if an additional site can be found), but all others were reasonable.
- The foreground vendors should be moved off Camp Allegheny property on the US 30 east of the proposed memorial entrance simulation.
- It was noted that the simulations showing signs illustrated how important size and scale are in the degree of change that results. Examples are needed to show positive ways to make development better
- It was recommended and all agreed to incorporate a workshop by Shelley Mastran on "Better Models for Development" as it might be applied to the corridor as part of a public or property owner workshop.
- A suggestion was also made to incorporate basic information about planning and conservation, including definitions of key terms, into any public meetings, web sites, and other public information distributed, so that concepts under consideration, such as conservation easements, can be better understood.

Anna Breinich discussed the property owner survey that will be conducted sometime in early January. The survey will be done through face-to-face interviews, preferably, or otherwise in a manner convenient to the property owners. Approximately 50 out of the 520 property owners representative of the proportion of different types of property owners as per the assessments (e.g. residential, agriculture, etc.) has been made using a random sampling selection process.

- A concern was expressed about absentee landowners filling out the survey, and it was pointed out that some of those owning property for development are important to talk to, as they are the ones likely to change the use of the property at some point.

General discussion followed including the following comments:

- The economics of development is very important, especially in expanding the tax base in Somerset County where opportunities are somewhat limited. It was

- noted that one of the purposes of the study is to identify development opportunities, especially those that fulfill the needs and interests of the community. It was also noted that not all economic development is a net gain for the community when you consider the cost of providing services (schools, infrastructure, etc.)
- It was noted by several committee members that the route (PA Turnpike to PA 281, to US 219 to US 30 east) is good, but the corridor should be extended past Reel's Corner to the county line. One concern raised is that the route as proposed does not go through Shanksville, which is the referenced municipal name for the crash site. It was also pointed out that the proposed designated travel route would be the general route for travelers unfamiliar with the area, including tour buses. The more rural, narrower roads (PA 31 and PA 281) would not have as much capacity or be as safe. Those familiar with the area will probably still take routes through Shanksville.
 - It was noted that there appears to be more and stronger pressure for billboards along Route 30 with higher prices being offered.
 - The area around Hoffman's nursery (west of the proposed memorial entry) was identified as an area that is likely to develop and could benefit from simulations.
 - It was pointed out that the County has strong credibility on similar projects, such as the successful Great Allegheny Passage trail, where concerns were initially raised about property rights issues, but have since dissipated.
 - Mr. Klein indicated that the end result of the study will be a list of actions or strategies to achieve the vision for the corridor that will be implemented in a wide variety of ways. There are a lot of tools available and a range of options will be proposed. Recommendations will be based on the interests of local officials and property owners. By defining the corridor as a series of character areas, the plan's recommendations will be tailored to the specific interests and character for each area.

Jim Klein concluded with a discussion of the next steps:

- A landowner workshop was recommended prior to conducting a full public meeting, with a redrafted informational flyer/meeting notice mailed to every property owner. Using exercises similar to what was done at the first committee meeting would be a good way to ensure that those not wanting to speak out in public would be able to express their opinions. Using color-coded dots to place on a map showing where people live would be a good way to get a sense of who came to the meeting.
- Consideration should be given to using an open house format with a more informal setting and stations – allowing for more 1 on 1 contact
- 7pm was the recommended time for a meeting.
- The original date of the meeting will need to be changed from Wednesday January 24, 2007 to Tuesday, January 23, 2007 to avoid conflicts with Wednesday night church activities. These dates and a location still need to be confirmed. The advisory committee and the Municipal officials will meet the day before.
- A snow date will be incorporated into the public information sent out about the meeting for 1-week afterwards (e.g. "if schools are closed, then the meeting will take place on January 30, 2007).
- Follow-up information will be sent out about the public meeting and include some kind of "frequently asked questions" sheet in a simple format for use by Advisory Committee members when talking to their friends, neighbors, and colleagues about the study, and to send out as part of the public information package.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:00 pm.