



---

PUBLIC  
COMMENT



## PUBLIC COMMENTS

### October 8, 2021

The draft final report was issued to Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, Dauphin County, and the five municipalities (Susquehanna Township, Lower Paxton Township, West Hanover Township, South Hanover Township and East Hanover Township) for staff and elected official review. Comments received were incorporated into the draft final report for submission to the public.

### January 12, 2022 to February 28, 2022

The draft final report was submitted to the public for comment. Comments received are generally summarized as follows:

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Number of Comments</b>
Support for additional investment in bicycle and pedestrian mobility enhancements	3
Concern with additional development, especially warehousing and associated truck traffic, near the Rt 39/I-81 Exit 77 Interchange	3
Concern with providing additional access to residents and businesses along Orchard Rd	2
Support for intersection improvements at Rt 39/Orchard Rd	2
Concerns over environmental impacts of more pavement and vehicular traffic	2
Support for safety improvements along Sand Beach Rd, particularly near Meadow Ln	1

Original comments are provided below; for privacy purposes, the names and other personal information have been omitted from the comments below.

### Received January 20, 2022

Good afternoon. I am a resident of East Hanover Township since 2010, with my house sitting along S. Meadow Ln. near Sand Beach Rd. I was pleased to see that traffic along Sand Beach Rd. was addressed in the study, particularly the intersection of Sand Beach Rd. and S. Meadow Lane.

As noted, traffic on Sand Beach Rd. between Rt. 22 and Hersheypark Drive has increased significantly over the past decade. Part of this may be due to many navigation apps routing people from 81/743 onto Sand Beach Rd. for travel to Hershey. As someone who has traveled Sand Beach Rd. thousands of times in the past decade I can say with certainty that it is absolutely not suitable for the level of through traffic it receives, much of which is from out-of-state drivers simply following their navigation apps who are unfamiliar with the road and traveling too fast on their way to and from Hersheypark. Sand Beach Rd. between Rt. 22 and Hersheypark Drive is full of sharp turns, hills and narrow sections with no shoulder and no room for error. I would suspect that most visiting drivers, understandably, are not anticipating those rural road conditions on the route their navigation apps are telling them to take from a major interstate to a major tourist attraction. I would hope that many of the improvements that are proposed for Rt. 39 and 743, which are the most direct and sensible routes between 81 and Hersheypark Drive, would improve through traffic conditions on those roads, making them safe, preferred routes.

Because of where I live, the intersection of Sand Beach Rd. and S. Meadow Lane is of particular concern for me. I use this intersection almost daily, sometimes multiple times a day, whether to turn onto Sand Beach Rd. or cross over it. The combination of limited sight distance and speeding drivers on Sand Beach Rd. mean that I never feel confident or safe at that intersection. In a fraction of a second, a vehicle traveling too fast can appear from around a bend or over a hill, forcing the driver on S. Meadow Lane who may have started to proceed across the intersection to either slam on their brakes or floor it and pray. I have seen the aftermath of crashes and the occasional car with NY or NJ plates sideways in a ditch at this intersection on several occasions. The fact that there are not more frequent crashes at this intersection is pretty miraculous. I realize the challenges with improving visibility at this intersection and controlling driver speeds in the most hazardous sections of Sand Beach Rd. Unfortunately, I believe if measures are not taken to improve safety and reduce the use of Sand Beach Rd. as a through route between 81 and Hersheypark Drive, more crashes are inevitable. I pray every day that none of my family or neighbors become the victims.

Thank you for your thorough assessment of the 39/743 corridor and suggestions for sensible improvements.

**Received January 30, 2022**

Thank you for compiling a comprehensive report. My only comment is in regards to Appendix P Improvement Sketches.

I understand we are only in the study phase of the report, although as recommendations within the existing report I would like to voice my concern over them. Within Appendix P the sketches indicate a dedicated bike lane which is great.

Moving forward there is no doubt a bike corridor will be needed to reach Harrisburg and its associated Greenbelt. I anticipate when completed, because Rt 39 serves a multitude of residential neighborhoods (of which are only going to increase) and has the potential to serve as an main artery to the Greenbelt (connecting at the Wildwood Lake) and surrounding neighborhoods, the bike traffic will be substantial on RT 39.

Due to the inevitable increase of family residences in the area, not only will experienced bicyclists be utilizing this corridor, but younger, more inexperienced ones will be as well. As such, I propose modifying the dedicated bike lane and sidewalk into a shared use path, or at the very least provide some sort of physical divider between the bike lane and the conventional vehicle lane traffic.

I propose to have this modification to be addressed or annotated within the Appendix P Recommended Improvement Sketches.

**Received February 9, 2022**

I'm so excited to see the improvement sketches! The added focus toward bike and pedestrian safety is so very important and welcome. Especially seeing that there will be segments of separated bike lanes in parts, and more sidewalks near Thomas Holtzman Elementary School!

I do hope these changes can be implemented - especially improving access to places like Giant and Weis. There are many of us who would cycle or walk given the opportunity, but hesitate to do so on the shoulder of a fast, busy road.

Will the bike lanes have soft-hit posts separating the bikes from car traffic?

**Received February 11, 2022**

Always have wide bike and walking paths and as many shrubs and trees as space allows.

**Received February 15, 2022**

Comment via phone:

- Seeking clarification of how the future “existing” and “proposed” zoning/land uses were determined.
- Specifically concerned about “Hot Spot” #1 (at 39/Fargreen), which building(s) may be razed.

**Received February 16, 2022**

While I don't live in the corridor area that is the subject of the study, I want to make sure that the land uses and transportation modes HRG propose start from the goal of reducing carbon emissions and promoting a clean, sustainable environment. Simply focusing on making more roads for more cars is not the answer! Consider more public transportation, park and ride sections, creating incentives for electric and low emissions vehicles, etc. Also expanding the use of solar powered roadway snow cleaning and traffic lights. Whatever you propose, please always go back to making sure your proposals are promoting a clean, sustainable future that will counter climate change.

**Received February 22, 2022**

1. Pedestrians use Orchard Road daily, and bicyclists use it frequently. However, the lack of shoulders poses a safety issue. In lieu of a sidewalk, the roadway should be widened 6' to 8' to accommodate a multiuse path (pedestrians and bicyclists) along one side of Orchard Road (from SR39 to Smoke House Lane). The terrain suggests that the widening could be along the north side in some locations and along the south in others. Therefore, the right-of-way could be obtained from different sides of the street at different locations to minimize property impacts as well as cutting/filling. The roadway could then be restriped and locally realigned to establish the new multi-use path wholly along one side of the street. The Orchard Road multiuse path should be connected to a multiuse path on SR39 and tie into the existing paths near Shetland Drive. In addition to greatly improving safety, this would provide connectivity to established multiuse paths in neighboring communities.
2. Orchard Road is not a through-street. It serves approximately 28 homes and two small businesses. A redundant outlet is not warranted for Orchard Road. Our community greatly benefits from the fact that Orchard Road does not receive through-traffic. In fact, the seclusion is precisely what attracted us to our community. If Orchard was connected to neighboring roads, traffic would increase dramatically. Increased traffic volume would negatively impact the community and lead to the following:
  - Exacerbation of the existing safety concerns to non-motorized users (through increased traffic volumes and speeds)
  - Increased noise
  - Increased pollution (from vehicle emissions and discarded waste)
  - Diminished community cohesion
  - Negative impacts to the context of the community
  - Impacts to the environment (the proposed roadway connection option cross waterways and wetlands)
3. Beyond the negative impacts discussed above, there is no need or justification to increase access to our community. Orchard Road does not parallel a waterway or significant features. In the extremely unlikely event of a road blockage, it would be easy to get around the problem area. There is no bridge that could “wash out”, the roadway and embankments are stable and relatively flat, there are no large trees that pose an issue, and the many pedestrians would

notice potential issues before they occurred. Some residents have lived here their whole lives, many of the others, for decades (32 years for us), and we have never had an issue. The chances are infinitesimal that anything would block the roadway for any significant duration. Increasing the pavement width by adding a multiuse path would also reduce the likelihood of the whole roadway ever being blocked.

4. Sight Distance at Orchard Road and SR39 is obviously substandard and presents a safety issue. However, the remedy is straightforward via regrading and locally realigning the intersection (right-of-way impacts are unavoidable). Correcting the intersection sight distance deficiency and adding a shoulder (multiuse path) along Orchard Road would correct the only existing Orchard Road safety issues while preserving the existing context of our community. Conversely, if Orchard Road was made into a through-street, safety and the quality of life would diminish for our community.
5. SR743 should be designated as an official corridor to/from Hershey Park. Currently, SR39 seems to carry the majority of traffic between I-81 and the Park. This causes the LOS on SR39 and all the intersections to drop tremendously. It also makes it very difficult to exit Orchard Road during peak volumes. If the volume was distributed evenly between SR743 and SR39, these problems could be greatly alleviated, which would benefit both the Park patrons and the local communities. It may prove to be more prudent to direct the majority of Park traffic away from SR39 and toward SR743, because the non-Park volumes are much higher on SR39. The signing on I-81 (and around the Park) is largely absent in terms of directing traffic to either SR39 or SR743. Signing should be established to direct traffic to both roadways.

#### **Received February 28, 2022**

Enclosed is a copy of a letter of my concerns re the Prologis Warehouse development plan. I submitted this letter to West Hanover Twp Board of Supervisors at the November 2021 meeting. Please take into consideration my concerns.

From the November 13, 2021 letter pertaining to the Prologis Warehouse in West Hanover Twp:

*I would like to ask how many of you live in the vicinity of the proposed warehouse and how will it affect you?*

*For almost 30 years my husband Larry and myself have lived near the I-81 Exit 77. We will directly be affected by the location of the proposed warehouse.*

*We moved in February 1992 to the township from Lower Paxton Township at the Linglestown/Paxtonia Exit of I-81 where we lived for 20 years. At the time of our move from Lower Paxton Twp., the tractor trailer traffic was already causing much noise pollution that in order to sleep at night it was necessary to move our bedroom to the front of the house away from the interstate. The congestion on I-81, and change in air quality was noticeable then in the 90's as well as the effect on our teenage sons who suffered from asthma. This was our reasoning to leave LP Township where I grew to the peaceful scenic environment of WH Township. For me, WH Township was as LP Township was when I grew up there 65 years ago.*

*I have numerous concerns with the change in zoning taking place in our township to allow the building of the Prologis warehouse. It is important to me to submit to you in writing those concerns so they become part of the permanent record.*

*As you are aware there is a group of WH Township residents on Facebook who have been outspoken about their concerns and are informing residents so we have an arena to voice our concerns. I hope and pray you, our elected officials, are taking our concerns as seriously and hearing us as you have Prologis. I am part of that FB group and agree with most of their concerns but I wish to personally add mine to the Board:*

- *This is my home township where I am a resident, Prologis, their tenants, and many of the employees, truckers, possibly hundreds will come from outside our township. They will heavily use*

our township and state roads now and in the future to conduct their business. Will they be responsible for maintaining them? Or will it be township residents?

- We residents have no retail or grocery stores in the township and need to take our business outside the township. Could this be a better use for this property which would better serve township residents? How will we in the township benefit from the warehouse which will destroy our land.

- Have you the Board or Commission, for our own township purposes, conducted an environmental impact study, environmental justice study, on the area to determine the concerns for the future of this area? Has PennDOT conducted a traffic study to determine the impact of the additional truck traffic on their roads: Route 39, Route 22, or Interstate 81, or the township on their roads? I would think this would be a necessity. We are also in the runoff area that directly affects the Susquehanna River that drains into the Chesapeake Bay. How will the 100 acres of green space covered by concrete and macadam affect the water runoff?

- When we leave our home on N Fairville Ave to drive East or West on Route 39 or pass through or onto I-81 at Exit 77 the area is already heavily congested with truck traffic. At the McDonalds Perkins area it is very difficult to exit or enter these restaurants due to trucks from I-81 going to or leaving the truck plazas. The Interstate truck traffic is already causing congestion and stoppage North or South bound from Grantville Exit through Linglestown Exit making it very difficult to use I-81. How many more warehouses will be allowed along I-81 further causing congestion? How are the PennDOT truck restriction signs posted now on Route 39 to be enforced or will they?

- Once the land is covered over with concrete and macadam it no longer is available to the natural environment of: bees, deer, insects, and other nature who share the land with us. Can we afford to lose the natural environment for this use of our township land? You, the Board of Supervisors and we the township residents living here now are responsible for the future impact on our community by your decisions made here today. I for one, take this matter very seriously. When we who are here now have passed on, how will this change the environmental impact for the future residents of which may very well be our own children and grandchildren. This is the very reason for my concerns, "speak now or forever hold your peace."

- I also have a concern that our own shopping habits have necessitated the need for these warehouses by internet purchasing and not supporting our local businesses and seeing the demise of our local establishments, ie, Colonial Park Mall, East Mall.

These some concerns I found from the WH Township Warehouse FB Group: (please excuse and address any incorrect information):

- The proposed Mega Warehouse on Linglestown Rd. would have 200 loading docks.
- And 480 parking spaces for cars.
- And 297 parking spaces for tractor trailer storage.
- And spaces for 125 truckers to PARK OVERNIGHT in their 18-wheelers.
- Yes, it will also be a MEGA TRUCK STOP.
- Right next to Twin Brooks Horseshow grounds, and the kids and families in all of the beautiful new homes in Winslet.
- NOISE from back-up alerts
- AIR POLLUTION from up to 125 diesel engines idling overnight.
- HEAVY TRUCK TRAFFIC past the existing truck stops at Exit 77. HUNDREDS OF 18-WHEELERS, PLUS 500 employee vehicles EVERY DAY going further down Linglestown Rd., down Fairville Ave. to Rt. 22, and through the Linglestown Circle, when I-81 is backed up.

Thank you for your consideration in hearing one of the residents you represent. In no way do I have any disregard for our tractor trailer drivers and the countless hours they put into their jobs.

**Received February 28, 2022**

1. The study relied on an outdated Zoning Map for West Hanover Township. There are likely a number of changes that have been made since this map was produced and posted to the Township website. I am aware of two large properties along Rt. 39 in our Township that have been recently (February 2021) been re-zoned, from Flexible Rural to Industrial Enterprise. The addresses for these properties are 7600 and 7464 Linglestown Rd. I have added a white circle to the Township's zoning map above to show the location of these two parcels, which are still depicted in dark brown on the zoning map, although an updated map would show the entirety of these two parcels in bright pink.)
2. I do not believe it is possible to accurately assess and plan for future needs of Rt. 39 in West Hanover Township without considering that these two properties (just over 100 acres, total) are zoned INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE, and NOT Flexible Rural Agriculture. In fact, these properties were the site proposed for a 1.2 million sq. ft. logistics facility to be built by Prologis, LP. Although the Board of Supervisors voted on February 17, 2022, to deny approval of that Land Development Plan: a) Prologis might challenge that decision in court, and might win; b) Prologis might submit new land development plans for a different warehouse footprint/configuration on that property; and c) even if Prologis does not pursue development of this site, the zoning will remain Industrial Enterprise, and some other developer will purchase and develop those large parcels, almost certainly resulting in substantial increase in both automotive and tractor trailer truck traffic from those parcels East to Exit 77 of I-81. The result all along that mile or so, and through those four existing red lights will be a mess unless changes are made to Rt. 39 in terms of an additional light (or two); additional signage; new turning lanes; and some provision for pedestrian and bicycle safety.
3. Although you did traffic counts at many intersections along Rt. 39, the study apparently did not include a traffic count at the intersection of Rt. 39 and N. Fairville Ave. (where the traffic signal is located). This is a very important intersection in the West Hanover portion of Rt. 39, as it is the intersection at which much residential traffic crosses and merges with much truck traffic. Both of these will increase in the near future, as more homes are built north of Rt. 39, and more commercial development occurs along Rt. 39 both east and west of this intersection.
4. Even at this time, there are significant and concerning traffic safety issues with the truck traffic between that N. Fairville traffic signal, all the way through the next three signals for tractor trailers entering or exiting I-81 at Exit 77. The timing of the four traffic signals is very poor. Trucks frequently run red lights and block automobiles, especially those attempting to make turns onto or off of Rt. 39 the N. Fairville Avenue traffic signal.
5. The intersection of Rt. 39 and N. Fairville Avenue (on the South side of Rt. 39) also presents traffic safety issues for vehicles approaching on N. Fairville from the south, and attempting to turn either right or left. I do not know the technical parameters for measuring "sight distance." However, I am frequently at that intersection and can attest that it is virtually impossible to see traffic on Rt. 39 that is approaching that intersection from the West until the approaching vehicle is nearly on top of you. This is especially a problem because of the speed that vehicles on Rt. 39 are travelling on that section of Rt. 39 as they are headed East.

And finally, it concerns me that there was no meeting held with the Supervisors of West Hanover Township to discuss this study. I do not know if that was a decision made by HRG or by the Township. In either case, I believe it was unfortunate that no such meeting took place.

**Received February 28, 2022**

I don't think that Orchard Road needs to have another access road to it. We don't need anymore traffic on it that's why we live here to be away from all the noise of cars the peacefulness, and to be able to take walks without the traffic. I also don't think it's right that you could make plans to put a road in and take away people's land that is their livelihood and that they had in their family for generations. I think before you make plans for a road I think that you should approach those land owners and get their input before you draw up plans and take their land. I know that there is another alternative to it. All you would have to do is to put the bridge back in that was washed out years ago by Agnes instead of trying to take land from my property and other neighbors of mine. Property owner of land that you would be affecting..

**Received February 28, 2022**

Someone evidently feels that there should be a second access/exit to/from our area since Orchard Road currently has no outlet. The report simply says, "proper design guidance suggests having more than one access to large developments for purposes of emergency access in the event of a road closure." Two options are proposed:

1. Extend Orchard Road past the last property on Orchard Road, construct a new bridge across the Manada, and connect Orchard to 743. (This would restore the road to the way it was before the Agnes flood destroyed the original bridge in 1972).
2. Build a new road that would extend from Orchard Road to then follow the base of the hill between Orchard Road and Shetland Drive and finally connect to Shetland Drive near Cassel Vineyard.

The report also mentions improving the sight distance where Orchard turns into 39.

I see zero need to provide a second access/exit to our area. The chances of Orchard being blocked are extremely remote, and the road doesn't parallel a cliff, mountain, waterway, or any major physical obstruction so even if it were blocked, we could easily get around any blockage. If we were many miles from civilization, I could perhaps see the point, but it's only one mile from Smoke House to rt. 39. Worst case scenario: we drive to the obstruction, we walk around it, and we get into the "rescue vehicle."

I don't see our area as a "large development" as stated in the report.

If Orchard was a through-street, traffic would increase significantly.

The fact that Orchard is NOT a through-street is one of the main features that attracted us to the area. We love being secluded, and through-traffic would greatly subtract from one of the best features of our great community.

Many of us enjoy walking on Apple Tree, Smoke House, and Orchard. The last thing that walkers need is more traffic. And a through-street would undoubtedly result in higher speeds as well as increased traffic, noise, and litter.

If Orchard was extended to 743, it would have to be widened from Smoke House to the current cul-de-sac near the last home on Orchard Road, and it would require taking property from many of the neighbors whose property adjoin the area considered. Please let's not even think about doing that.

If Orchard was connected to Shetland, that would require taking property from many of the neighbors whose property adjoin that area considered. Please let's not even think about that either.

So in summary, As a resident who has lived on Orchard for sometime now, the only advantage I see to this whole project is the sight distance improvement where Orchard turns into 39. Improving the sight distance where Orchard turns into rt 39 is straightforward and could be done easily by removing one of the



homes at the current intersection and removing the embankment across from the barn. The homes would probably need to be removed anyway to make room for the widened 39. Orchard could also be connected to Red Top via a roundabout or signal. There are several easy options.

I am VERY MUCH opposed to any other additional construction of a road to or from Orchard Road.