COMMENT #1: Will trout stockings be stopped during construction?

**RESPONSE #1:** Trout stockings will not be stopped during construction. In-stream restrictions from March 1 to June 15 will apply to this project preventing contractors from working in the stream during this time period.

COMMENT #2: Will alternative 6 allow traffic to continue during construction?

**RESPONSE #2:** For alternative 6 and 7, traffic will be maintained during construction, if the bridge has not been closed due to inspection findings. Since the bridge is nearing the end of its useful life, replacement may be the only option to reopen the structure to vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

COMMENT #3: This might seem counterintuitive, but the existing bridge actually improves the safety of the road. The problem is that the only physical impediment to slowing speeding vehicular traffic is the bridge- it’s physically impossible to speed through the bridge without damaging the vehicle. The 25 MPH speed is exceeded constantly and jumping of the stop signs occurs every day. The section of the road from the Pike to and over the bridge is used every day by runners, walkers and bicycles seeking to access the Green Ribbon Trail.

A larger bridge will encourage more speeding and allow larger traffic which is not in-keeping with the road size, and that faster larger traffic on the same small road along with runners, walkers and bikes is an accident waiting to happen!

Has a recent traffic study been conducted (2013 is a long time ago)? Will West Valley Green Road and the bridge be considered collectively as a system? Will trucks be prohibited from crossing the new bridge in keeping with the width and usage of the road?

**RESPONSE #3:** The bridge will be designed to carry all legal loads (40-ton capacity). To prohibit larger vehicles from travelling on West Valley Green Road, Whitemarsh Township could study the road and have a professional engineer complete Form TE-109, Engineering and Traffic Study for Restrictions as to Weight, Size, Kind or Class, or Type of Load Based on Highway, Bridge or Traffic Conditions and submit it to PennDOT for concurrence on the findings. This would allow the Township to post the road with restrictions.

COMMENT #4: How long would construction for alternative 4 be? Would there be a detour in place for that duration?
**RESPONSE #4:** A detour will be in place during construction. Construction would start in the spring or summer of 2027. It is anticipated to be completed at the end of the construction season, fall of 2028. The detour would likely be in place from spring/summer 2027 to the end of construction in 2028.

**COMMENT #5:** In regards to alternative 4, will a sidewalk be added on West Valley Green Road (between Beth Pike and Creek)?

**RESPONSE #5:** Since there are no sidewalks on either approach to the bridge, sidewalks cannot be provided on the bridge as they have nothing to connect to. To accommodate pedestrians, the County has provided 6-foot shoulders in addition to the two travel lanes.

**COMMENT #6:** Alternative #4 appearing the best possible choice, what would be the "minor right of way impacts to adjacent properties"? And what would be the height difference of the new bridge at the road level and overall? Thanks!

**RESPONSE #6:** The right-of-way impacts to the properties are as follows:
- Southeast quadrant – No take would be necessary
- Northeast quadrant – Sliver take would be necessary
- Southwest quadrant – Sliver take would be necessary
- Northwest quadrant – No take would be necessary

Temporary Construction Easements may be needed from all property owners to allow the contractor to access the construction site. Any impacts within these areas will be returned to their original conditions after construction. As the design is advanced, more information will be provided. Each property owner impacted by either a permanent or temporary easement will be reached out to once the impacts have been thoroughly vetted.

The new bridge is at the same elevation of the proposed bridge. The west approach to the bridge will be raised to prevent flooding while the eastern approach will stay at the same elevation.

**COMMENT #7:** Can the general public request this recent traffic study? If so how would one go about that? Would we have to submit it as an Act 3 of 2008 (RTKL) request?

**RESPONSE #7:** The right to know request would go to the Montgomery County rights to know office. Further information can be found on the County website. The most recent traffic count (not a study) would not be published for public viewing, but can be a part of a submitted rights to know request.

**COMMENT #8:** Has any thought been given to moving the bridge south to where the old railroad bridge was? Or where the Planet fitness is?
RESPONSE #8: We did not look at an alternative with that drastic of an alignment shift.

COMMENT #9: We were told that the rumble strips in front of our house, between Hunt and Creek, would be removed once the bridge is replaced - can you confirm this. These are a major noise nuisance.

RESPONSE #9: The rumble strips were placed to provide a warning notice to the traveling public about the overhead height restriction at the bridge. Since it is a mitigation measure for the overhead height restriction, which will be removed during construction, the rumble strips would no longer serve a purpose. So, they will be removed and the limits of paving will make it so there will be a smooth road surface at the end of the project.

COMMENT #10: I own the property directly southeast of the bridge, if option 4 is selected would it be possible to bump the roadway out away from my house roughly 5-10 feet so it's not directly abutting the house?

RESPONSE #10: If Alternative 4 is selected, the design team will evaluate the feasibility of shifting the roadway to the north while maintaining an alignment that meets the current design standards.

COMMENT #11: Although I do appreciate the potential decrease in response times for emergency vehicles, I'm concerned with the goals of inducing more demand of vehicle traffic through this corridor.

The trail crossing just south of the bridge is a very important asset to the area.

Additionally, the bridge is along a major route for cyclists coming through Montgomery and Bucks County. (Strava Heat Maps can assist with visualizing the routes)

The bridge as it stands works well as a traffic calming device to slow traffic down for the multitude of vulnerable users in the area. The occasional broken sideview mirror with sub 10mph speeds is well preferred to a much more dangerous crash at higher speed.

What sort of traffic calming would be installed on West Valley Green with the bridge replacement to ensure the trail crossing, the bridge, and ultimately the entire corridor is safe for all road and trail users?

RESPONSE #11: There has been some discussion in regards to traffic calming. The County did look at moving the trail crossing beneath the bridge, however due to constraints within the project area, we were not able to provide the clearance to allow a bicyclist to travel underneath the bridge due to height requirements. The County is responsible for the bridge itself with the roadway being owned and maintained by the Township, any traffic calming measures along the roadway are the responsibility of the Township.
COMMENT #12: Alternatives 4-6 will significantly adversely affect the character of the community and negatively impact the neighborhood and the environment, along with eliminating the historic nature of the area. It will generate significant truck cut through traffic increasing noise and volume to the local community. Can you please indicate what governmental agencies will be involved in the approval process so that the affected residents in the area can properly voice their opposition the Alternative 4 proposal.

RESPONSE #12: There are several agencies involved that you can express your concerns to. The US Army Corps of Engineers and Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) will be involved during permitting, PA State Historic Preservation office reviews the cultural resources within the project area. Due to the federal and state funding, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation has oversight of all design approvals.

COMMENT #13: Will walking on the bridge be allowed in any of these possible project scenarios?

RESPONSE #13: The 6-foot shoulders on each side of the bridge are being provided for pedestrian access.

COMMENT #14: What is the expected increase to traffic on West Valley Green Road?

RESPONSE #14: No additional lanes are being added to the bridge; therefore, no capacity is being added to the structure. Only the width of the bridge is being increased to allow two lanes of traffic to safely cross the bridge at the same time. The County will perform a traffic count on the bridge once it has been replaced to identify the classification of vehicles that are utilizing the bridge. Roadway restrictions could be implemented depending on the results of the study by the Township to minimize the truck traffic on the roadway (refer to response #3).

COMMENT #15: Are the alternatives plans available online if so where?

RESPONSE #15: The alternative plans have been posted on the Montgomery County website, as well as the recording of this meeting. The project information can be found on the Roads and Bridges section of the County’s website.

COMMENT #16: What are the estimated costs of these alternatives?

RESPONSE #16: As documented in the Preliminary Alternative Analysis Report the preliminary cost estimates are as follows:
- Alternative #1 – N/A
- Alternative #2 - $3,900,000
- Alternative #3 - $2,316,000
- Alternative #4 - $2,396,000
Alternative #5 - $6,793,000
Alternative #6 - $3,082,000
Alternative #7 - $3,142,000

COMMENT #17: I would also recommend that sidewalks be installed on at least one side of West Valley Green Road from Bethlehem Pike to the Bridge. Anyone walking or riding a bike on that roadway takes a great risk of getting hit by vehicular traffic.

RESPONSE #17: Refer to response #5 for answer.

COMMENT #18: Do you anticipate any efforts to shore up or stabilize the banks of the creek approaching the bridge? And do you plan to remove the current headache bars or adjust them prohibit certain larger vehicles like 18-wheel trucks?

RESPONSE #18: The project will provide rock protection mainly for scour at the abutments and around the pier. If there are bank stabilization issues beyond the project limits, it would not be improved. Regarding the headache bars, they will be removed at the start of construction and not replaced as the bridge will not be weight restricted.

COMMENT #19: Will the (very) large headache bars be removed?

RESPONSE #19: Yes.

COMMENT #20: Who makes the decision on which alternative is selected?

RESPONSE #20: The decision is made by Montgomery County taking into account the concerns of the residents.

COMMENT #21: Is the traffic study only regarding the number of cars or also the speed?

RESPONSE #21: The traffic count completed in 2013 only collected information on the number of cars crossing the bridge. Speed data was not collected.

COMMENT #22: How likely is failure of the old bridge during the construction?

RESPONSE #22: That is an open-ended question as it is dependent on a number of circumstances (weather, flood events, etc.). The steel of the structure is old and deteriorating, the last inspection resulted in mitigation measures to keep the bridge open. The bridge is getting closer and closer to its potential closure, however the timeline of that is unknown.

COMMENT #23: I would also suggest looking into having just one lane for pedestrians that has a barrier wall to protect the pedestrians from vehicular traffic (similar to the Germantown Avenue Bridge in Chestnut Hill). The reduction in the cartway width would more than pay for the cost of this barrier wall & the sidewalks.
RESPONSE #23: This is something that can be evaluated in preliminary design. The criteria would need to be reviewed to determine the impact on safety for both pedestrian and vehicular traffic across the bridge.

COMMENT #24: Speed is a major issue, as well as anyone stopping at the Hunt Lane stop sign - cars rarely stop here - what will be done to enforce this especially given the expected increase in traffic?

RESPONSE #24: Enforcement is the responsibility of the Whitemarsh Township Police Department.

COMMENT #25: Will there be a "Response to Comments" provided to the meeting participants, or provided in the final decision document?

RESPONSE #25: We will be preparing meeting minutes to this meeting where we will respond to all the questions. The document will be published on the Montgomery County website. If you RSVP’d to Jason Vendetti, he will email out the meeting minutes and comment forms.

COMMENT #26: Will we receive the environmental impact study?

RESPONSE #26: The study is a public document, once it is approved by Federal Highway Administration and PennDOT, it will be available for public viewing.

COMMENT #27: What other projects have A.D. Marble completed in the surrounding area?

RESPONSE #27: Unsure of the correct number of projects, but A.D. Marble has been involved with many projects within Montgomery County and for PennDOT. A.D. Marble has been in the business for over 30 years.

COMMENT #28: Is A.D. Marble a public or privately held company?

RESPONSE #28: A.D. Marble is a private company.

COMMENT #29: If EMS vehicles will be allowed on the bridge, will there be restriction on use of the sirens? Will school bus size be restricted also?

RESPONSE #29: EMS vehicles will be allowed on the bridge. Per Title 75, Section 3105 of the Pennsylvania Statues, emergency vehicles are allowed to utilize their sirens and lights in route or in pursuit of someone. School bus sizes will not be restricted on the bridge.

COMMENT #30: Who decided that EMS and school buses needed to use the West Valley Green Road Bridge?

RESPONSE #30: The project team reached out to local school districts, EMS and fire companies including the Colonial School District, Wissahickon School District, Barren Hill
Volunteer Fire Company, Flourtown Fire Department, Whitemarsh Police Department and Whitemarsh Ambulance Association to discuss response times and route options. The local emergency responders and school district that utilize the bridge expressed interest in using the bridge as a part of their routes. Related issues for maintaining the bridge crossing include alleviating congestion in the project vicinity and providing an alternative route for the Creek Lane residents that may be landlocked during flood events.

COMMENT #31: If a vehicular traffic study hasn't been completed for a long time, and you aren't able to account for the future increase in vehicular traffic, how do you propose to effectively complete the studies mentioned? And how do we account for the impact on the road? Is this something Whitemarsh Township will partner with you on?

RESPONSE #31: A vehicular traffic study, i.e. traffic counts, has not been completed in years due to the weight restriction as true counts would not be obtained as passenger cars are the only class of vehicle able to utilize the bridge. The count in 2013 was completed to determine the amount of traffic utilizing the bridge for design purposes. To account for future increases in vehicular traffic, PennDOT publishes Pennsylvania Traffic Data on an annual basis which aids in predicting how traffic will change given the current trends. Refer to Response 3 regarding roadway restrictions.

COMMENT #32: Will any of these project alternatives change the Township boundary lines between Springfield Township and Whitemarsh Township?

RESPONSE #32: The project will not have an impact on the Township boundary.

COMMENT #33: What coordination efforts would be implemented with other agencies to minimize additional construction sites in the vicinity of this location during the construction-year?

RESPONSE #33: We will be coordinating with both PennDOT and the Township to obtain an approved detour route. As the project gets closer to construction, we will once again coordinate with both entities to ensure that construction projects are coordinated.

COMMENT #34: We are worried about the safety of our children and increased traffic/traffic speeds on West Valley Green Road. Can the township and county collaborate to provide a holistic solution and address impacted residents' concerns?

RESPONSE #34: Comment noted as we are in regular correspondence with the Township.

COMMENT #35: Can you clarify whether, with Alt 4-7, the level/height of West Valley Green Road would be raised approaching the bridge?

RESPONSE #35: The elevation of West Valley Green Road on the west side will be raised to alleviate flooding. The east side is at grade and will not be changed.

COMMENT #36: Won't allowing EMS and school buses invite the truck traffic to come in too? How will you keep them out/off?
COMMENT #37: Will the new bridge be able to have pipes to carry wastewater from west side (Creek Lane) to the sewer main in Bethlehem Pike?

RESPONSE #37: No utility coordination has been initiated yet, but if there is a need for utility improvements and a utility company requests to be accommodated, their facilities would need to be evaluated to determine if they could be accommodated as size and weight impact the design of the structure.

COMMENT #38: What type of bridge is contemplated? Will it have the appearance of the bridge nearby on Stenton Ave. and the other on Germantown Ave.?

RESPONSE #38: We anticipate it will be two-span structure with either concrete beams or steel girders. Both will be studied in the next design phase. Architectural treatments will be considered and implemented due to the setting of the project site.

COMMENT #39: How will you accommodate those residents surrounding the bridge who have safety impacts and not being able to get to/from their homes with flooding when the road will close due to bridge construction?

RESPONSE #39: The design team will look into this concern during the next design phase to determine the extent of the problem and what measures, if any, can be taken. The County in coordination with the Township will discuss these findings and determine their feasibility.

COMMENT #40: Does the local community have a say in what option is selected?

RESPONSE #40: Yes, the objective of this meeting is to listen to the local community and gain a better understanding of your needs, so the County is well informed in all positions regarding which alternative is selected.

COMMENT #41: Have you evaluated applying for a Grant from PA DCNR to fund any off-site improvements such as sidewalks. The enhanced recreational benefit to the community provided by a pedestrian friendly bridge combined with a multi-government agency participating in the Grant request would certainly allow this modification to score highly for funding.

RESPONSE #41: I can’t speak for the planning department, but if there are better options through DCNR, I trust the planning commission has looked at those options. With the ownership of the roadway being that of the Township, the County would provide a letter of support to enhance their application for a grant.

COMMENT #42: Will the stop signs be removed after new bridge is installed?

RESPONSE #42: During the next design phase of the project, the County will coordinate with the Township to decide whether the signs will be removed.
COMMENT #43: At some point there was discussion of trying to move the historic bridge to a new location. Is that still under consideration to mitigate the "adverse effect" on the bridge itself?

RESPONSE #43: This will be covered during the Section 106 consulting party discussions, once that meeting is held. Relocation has been pursued, however a site has not been found at this time.

COMMENT #44: Vehicle traffic is low at the trail crossing due to the bridge restrictions, if the goal is to increase traffic, why is a separate traffic study required after the fact instead of considering the impact of the change at the time of replacement? That question was regarding traffic calming at the trail crossing.

RESPONSE #44: The goal of this project is not to increase traffic volumes. Since the bridge is not a trip generating facility, there is no traffic data that would provide realistic traffic patterns within the project area. If a development was being constructed, there would be historical data to generate future volumes. Since this is the case, a traffic count after construction will provide information needed on who is utilizing the bridge.

COMMENT #45: Alternatives #5 and 6 would significantly route the road into my property on the Southwest side of the bridge and place the roadway practically up against the home itself. The designers appear to give that substantial weight in not recommending those designs and design #7 which goes through the other home. How much weight does the effect upon adjacent residential properties carry in the FINAL decision on which design to use?

RESPONSE #45: It has a significant weight, as the County’s goal is to minimize impacts on all properties surrounding the bridge.

COMMENT #46: Can you elaborate further on how the decision on the alternative will be made? What county committee or other entities are involved, and what steps will be taken to engage the public prior to this decision?

RESPONSE #46: At this point, there is a recommended alternative which is not final. But based on the information that our consultant has provided, it appears the most feasible option. Our goal here is to get feedback from everyone in this meeting, prior to making the final decision. Once all feedback is received the County will digest the feedback to make an informed decision. The purpose of this meeting is for public engagement.

COMMENT #47: I missed the beginning, but I have yet to see any data to define what the problem is: What is the need driving this project?

RESPONSE #47: It comes down to having a crossing over the creek which provides safe access for the traveling public. The existing bridge is deteriorating and will eventually need to be closed. There is a need to have a crossing here at West Valley Green Road.

COMMENT #48: Todd, appreciate you trying to answer questions even though many are not Erdman Anthony’s responsibility. There was a detailed report written which expands on these
alternatives. That report was only issued to a very select group of nearby "interested parties." Will this detailed report be made available?

**RESPONSE #48:** The Preliminary Alternative Analysis Report will be sent to the meeting participants and posted on the County’s website.

**COMMENT #49:** What is the legal standing of this proceeding? What legal standing do these comments or questions have?

**RESPONSE #49:** This meeting is a part of the NEPA (environmental) process.

**COMMENT #50:** If the West side roadway is raised, how does that impact access to the path into the park on the North side - will this also be raised or a ramp implemented?

**RESPONSE #50:** Because the profile is being adjusted to the west side, there will be a potential trail relocation.

**COMMENT #51:** Has this project received an Infrastructure Fund grant or something similar?

**RESPONSE #51:** This project does not have any grant monies involved. The project; however, is on the Pennsylvania Transportation Improvement Plan and has received funding from both the federal and state government.

**COMMENT #52:** This whole thing seems like putting the cart before the horse. From what I have heard so far tonight, this "project" is out of control. No traffic study, relying on township to manage/restrict traffic type/size... that is a farce. This project needs to be shelved and put back on the drawing board... starting with defining what the problem is and budget and then potential answers. How can you claim to know "all positions" when there is in fact been very limited solicitation for public input? For what it's worth, I am adamantly opposed to this "project" as I still have yet to see data defining a problem. It seems this is being foisted and the resulting traffic disaster will be ours to figure out after it's irreversible. What is the basis for this project?

**RESPONSE #52:** Thank you for your input, your comment will be taken into consideration. The basis of this project is to provide a safe crossing over the creek for vehicles and pedestrians since the existing bridge is deteriorating.

**COMMENT #53:** Will you provide contact details for all the members who are responsible for this project at Whitemarsh Township, the county and PennDOT?

**RESPONSE #53:** Project contacts for Montgomery County and PennDOT have been provided in the meeting minutes. The Whitemarsh Township Supervisor or Manager are the correct representatives to contact at the Township.

**COMMENT #54:** Please detail the process for the community to follow so that they may submit which alternative they support?
**RESPONSE #54:** Resources can be found on the Montgomery County website.

**COMMENT #55:** As a business on WVG Rd, has PCC been contacted about the potential change to the bridge and the potential for major traffic changes?

**RESPONSE #55:** A representative from the Philadelphia Cricket Club was invited to this meeting.

**COMMENT #56:** Please include this slide presentation in the meeting minutes. Please also include a link to the place on the county website where this and future documents regarding this project will be made available.

**RESPONSE #56:** A copy of the presentation and a link to the meeting video was sent to all meeting attendees. They can also be found on the Montgomery County website.

**COMMENT #57:** Option 1 do nothing please.

**RESPONSE #57:** Thank you for your input, your comment will be taken into consideration.

**COMMENT #58:** In the absence of advice on a formal process to follow, I would like to make record that I select Option 1

**RESPONSE #58:** Thank you for your input, your comment will be taken into consideration.

**COMMENT #59:** I don’t think we can make an informed decision about the options without all the data and information such as up to date traffic studies and up to date environmental impacts. Will another meeting be held with this information? Or will it be sent everyone?

**RESPONSE #59:** We will decide based on the comments from this meeting. It is all based on need, since there is nothing preventing us from having another meeting.

**COMMENT #60:** Proposal #4 appears to be the best option. Benefits the neighborhood re current flooding issue, least impact on neighbors, improves sight lines and angles, provides pedestrian and bike lanes. We would prefer to continue restrictions on the largest vehicles, though it sounds like that is a county/Township issue to address, Thank you for all of your efforts.

**RESPONSE #60:** Thank you for your input, your comment will be taken into consideration.

**COMMENT #61:** Will there be a press conference and or press release occur for this project?

**RESPONSE #61:** That is to be determined. The County Road and Bridges Department has taken an active role in coordinating with the County’s communications department to give the public as much transparency as they can. Whether or not this will have press coverage is up to the communications department within Montgomery County.
COMMENT #62: I argue there has been inadequate public input on this "project." Once the horse is out of the barn it's got a life of its own.

RESPONSE #62: Thank you for your input, your comment will be taken into consideration.

COMMENT #63: What is the time window for submitting comments? What is the expected timing of a decision on the alternative that the county wants to pursue?

RESPONSE #63: We did not establish a date to have comments due by. The time window will be two weeks from the day of the meeting. July 26th is when submissions close.

COMMENT #64: Do you know if Whitemarsh Township and the County will be required to hold meetings to assess the road impact and inform the public?

RESPONSE #64: The Township is not required to hold a public meeting since the County owns the bridge and is responsible for the project. This meeting is being held by the County to inform the public of the project and solicit input.

COMMENT #65: When will the meeting minutes be expected to be released? Will the meeting minutes have to be approved by the Montgomery County Board of Commissioners?

RESPONSE #65: We will wait until July 26th after all comments have been collected. Approximately one month until the meeting minutes are released.

COMMENT #66: Again "safety problems" listed as a cause. What data show safety problems? Where is the DATA?

RESPONSE #66: The primary safety problems that exist are the following:

- Deterioration of the bridge to the point that it will need to be closed. With closure comes land locking residents during flooding events.
- Width of the roadway is too narrow to allow two vehicles and pedestrians to safely cross the bridge at the same time.
- Limited existing site distance at the bridge crossing.

COMMENT #67: I live on W. Valley Green and I would like to select option 1.

RESPONSE #67: Thank you for your input, your comment will be taken into consideration.

COMMENT #68: appreciate your tone, however, the bike lane/pedestrian lane will only get across the bridge into the bushes the other side of the bridge. Thereafter, you will be faced with increased traffic and larger traffic and be unsafe.

RESPONSE #68: Thank you for your input, your comment will be taken into consideration.
COMMENT #69: What would be the next preferred alternative if number four is not selected?

RESPONSE #69: We always look at minimizing impacts when deciding an alternative. Alternative 4 has the most pros and less impacts. Alternative 3 where we would replace on the existing alignments has less right-of-way impacts, and minimizes the footprints of the construction. However, does not include safety improvements such as sight distances. If I had to rank them, I would rank Alternative 3 as second.

COMMENT #70: Can the meeting minutes, or follow-up communication, include the results of the 106 deliberations in which not all attendees here will participate?

RESPONSE #70: Refer to response #48.

COMMENT #71: Have the friends of Wissahickon or the Wissahickon trail org, local groups which care for the trail system, been contacted for their input on the project?

RESPONSE #71: These organizations have not been contacted yet but will be during the next phase of the project.

COMMENT #72: What is unsafe?? Where is data?? Traffic accidents? Injuries?? Seems made up…

RESPONSE #72: Thank you for your input, your comment will be taken into consideration.

COMMENT #73: I asked the question about enabling sewer pipes under the bridge. Can you tell me who I can contact to discuss this in the future?

RESPONSE #73: If the utility is within the vicinity of the bridge, the design team will reach out to each utility company to determine the impacts to their facility and whether or not they would want to connect to the structure.