

ITEM 3

LANCASTER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TTAC) MINUTES

DATE: February 13, 2017

TIME: 12:00 p.m.

PLACE: 150 North Queen Street, 1st Floor LCPC Meeting Rooms, Lancaster, PA 17603

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leo Lutz (Chairperson)	Lancaster County Planning Commission
Ralph Hutchison (Vice-Chairperson)	Lancaster County Planning Commission
James Cowhey (Alternate)	Lancaster County Planning Commission
Jeff Glisson (Alternate)	South Central Transit Authority
Alice Yoder	Lancaster County Planning Commission
Bill Swiernik	Bike/Ped. Advisory Committee
Cindy McCormick	City of Lancaster
Maureen Westscott	Advocate for Persons with Disabilities
Kate Gonick	Environmental Community
Lisa Riggs	Business and Finance Community
Heather Valudes	Chamber of Commerce
Beth Raves	PennDOT Central Office
Tony Berger	PennDOT District 8-0

GUESTS:

Commissioner Dennis Stuckey	Board of County Commissioners
Nate Walker	PennDOT District 8-0
Cindy Schweitzel	East Hempfield Township
Robert Krimmel	East Hempfield Township
Jon E. Beck	East Hempfield Township
David Aichele	Lancaster City Alliance
Quentin Rissler	Larson Design Group
Samuel Sulkosky	Mount Joy Borough
Amy Crystle	Citizen

STAFF:

Robert Bini	Director for Transportation
Lauri Ahlskog	Senior Transportation Planner
Harriet Parcels	Senior Transportation Planner
Gary Jones	Transportation Planner
Christie Jolly	Office Manager
Kyle Salage	Administrative Secretary

ITEM 3

1. **Call to Order** – Chairperson Lutz called the meeting to order at 12:01 PM.
2. **Membership** – Mr. Bini provided an update regarding the legislative representation on the MPO and TTAC. He announced that Representative Michael Sturla will continue to serve as the legislative representative for TTAC, along with his designated alternate Gregory Paulson. He also announced that Rep. Dave Hickernell will no longer serve as the State House representative for the MPO. Filling his seat on the committee will be Rep. Mindy Fee. In addition, Senator Ryan Aument will fill the State Senate vacancy on the MPO.
3. **Election of Officers (Action)** – Ms. Yoder spoke on behalf of the Ad-Hoc Nominating Committee. A handout listing the committee’s recommendations was given to members, a copy of which is attached. First, the committee proposed that the MPO nominate Leo Lutz to serve another term as Chairperson of TTAC and for Ralph Hutchison be nominated to serve another term as Vice-Chairperson. She opened the floor to other nominations for Chair and Vice Chair, but there were none.

Ms. Yoder made a motion to accept Leo Lutz as TTAC Chair, and it passed unanimously. She then made a motion to accept Ralph Hutchison as TTAC Vice-Chairperson, and it also passed unanimously.

Second, Ms. Yoder added that the committee determined the bylaws are in need of a review and revision, particularly in regard to specification of officer duties and term limits. She noted that it has been a significant period of time since they were last updated. The committee raised the question of whether the current composition of TTAC is best, and asked if there are established best practices among TTAC bodies. Mr. Cowhey said that federal law provides flexible guidelines on how TTAC should be composed, which leaves it open to change if the committee deems it necessary. Vice-Chairperson Hutchison expressed opposition to the idea of changing the committee’s composition, as it has been changed before and doing so led to a very tedious process. Mr. Cowhey suggested that instead of forming a Bylaws Subcommittee, that TTAC as a whole serve in this role and bring all suggested changes to the MPO. The committee agreed that the bylaws will be addressed going forward.

4. **Updates and Announcements:**
 - a. **Major Projects** – Mr. Berger had no major project announcements to make on behalf of PennDOT District 8-0. However, Mr. Bini pointed out that updates regarding the state road project would be provided later on in the agenda.
 - b. **Transit** – Mr. Glisson provided those in attendance with a copy of the RRTA Red Rose Access guide, which includes details on the SCTA services offered to seniors. He reported that the access guide will be updated sometime this summer. Additionally, the SCTA annual report was completed and released, and the “Ten Ride Reward Program” will begin in March. Copies of both the RRTA Ride Guide and the SCTA Annual Report were distributed to members of the committee. After announcements were completed, Chairperson Lutz commended the SCTA on its schedule change notification system.

ITEM 3

- c. **Federal Highway Administration** – No representative present.
 - d. **Bike/Pedestrian Advisory Committee** – Mr. Swiernik informed the committee that BPAC held a meeting on January 26th. At that meeting, the committee agreed upon the goal of increasing its membership and expanding its diversity, with the particular aim of bringing in members who represent the pedestrian perspective. The committee's next meeting will be March 23rd at 5 PM. Mr. Swiernik also reminded members that the public meeting for the Active Transportation Plan will be held at the Farm and Home Center on March 2nd. The official event flyer has been released, and a copy was distributed to those in attendance. The ATP consultants will be conducting field work in the county in the near future. Mr. Swiernik also announced that the bike share program is in the works but ultimately still in the in the early stages of development. Chairperson Lutz asked Mr. Swiernik for clarification as to whether BPAC has prospective new members at the moment, and when we might expect new members to be presented for approval. Mr. Swiernik said that the committee is still in the search process, but he hopes that the public meeting for the ATP can produce interest in BPAC and some potential new members. Mr. Bini assured the committee that several people are already under consideration and reaffirmed that BPAC will be aiming to add pedestrian representatives.
 - e. **Transportation Authority** – Nothing to report.
 - f. **Commuter Services of PA** – No representative present.
5. **Minutes of January 9, 2017 Meeting (Action)** – Ms. Crystle noted that Item 2 of the minutes states that Mr. Bini provided a copy of the draft TTAC membership listing to members at this meeting, but a copy of this document was not provided in the packet. Ms. Ahlskog said that because the draft was only a handout given to voting members at the TTAC meeting, it was not included along with the meeting packet. Mr. Bini proposed that a copy of the final, approved membership list be made available. Chairperson Lutz asked for clarification regarding how the membership list would be made available. Ms. Ahlskog said that the membership list would be added as an attachment to the final copy of the January 9th meeting minutes. Vice-Chairperson Hutchison then made note of the fact that his last name was spelled wrong several times, and asked that this be corrected.

Ms. Valudes made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, and this motion was seconded by Ms. Riggs. The motion passed unanimously, and therefore the minutes were approved as amended.

6. **State Road Project Update** – Mr. Bini provided an update on the state road project. A progress report from the PennDOT District 8-0 project manager was provided as a handout for those in attendance, in light of the committee's concern that the timeline goals be met in order to ensure a let date of February 2018. Mr. Bini noted that the report reflects the action being taken and plans being reviewed for the project in January. Spring of 2017 will mark the deadline for updated plans, and separate construction agreements will still need to be met in September and October. A February 2018 let date is achievable if this timeline is kept intact. Mr. Bini said that he has discussed the project's progress with both Mike Kaiser and Mr. Berger of PennDOT, and from these discussions

ITEM 3

it is apparent that there is ongoing activity in negotiations and improvements have been made as the project closes in on the final stages of preparation. Mr. Berger then provided additional updates on the project on behalf of PennDOT District 8-0. Mr. Berger said that the issue holding up negotiations is that of indemnification, and this is what they are attempting to work through with Amtrak. PennDOT will be presenting another proposal to Amtrak in the near future, and they are confident that this proposal will be accepted. Mr. Bini asked when the new set of proposals will be given to Amtrak. Mr. Berger said that the proposals will be given to Amtrak during its set of meetings over the course of next month, and updates will be provided to TTAC as they become available. Vice-Chairperson Hutchison asked for clarification as to what Amtrak wants in regard to the issue of indemnification, to which Mr. Berger said that Amtrak wants PennDOT to be fully responsible for any damages to tracks after the completion of the bridge construction. Ms. Valudes asked whether Amtrak has a standard procedure for how to handle indemnification in construction agreements, to which Mr. Berger said that as of recently their new standard is to receive indemnification when possible. Ms. Valudes expressed concern that Amtrak does not have a consistent procedure for addressing indemnification, noting that this could prove to be a problem since this will not be the last project that presents a similar issue. Mr. Berger noted that PennDOT worked through similar negotiations for the Eby Chiques bridge project, as well the Holland Street project. Mr. Swiernik interjected and asked if PennDOT granted indemnification to Amtrak for the Eby Chiques bridge project, to which Mr. Berger said he believes indemnification was granted. Ms. Riggs then asked whether the proposal is being done singularly. Mr. Berger said that yes, Amtrak only reviews and discusses one project at a time based on prioritization. Mr. Swiernik asked whether there is anything unusual about the design of the intersection. To this, Mr. Berger said that the design is not particularly unusual, but because the project involves the construction of two bridges it results in more complicated negotiations. Chairperson Lutz asked for clarification regarding the target let date for the project. Mr. Berger said that February 2018 will remain the target let date, but added that PennDOT is committed to moving the project forward even if the let date has to be moved past 2018.

- 7. Rohrerstown Road and Good Drive Traffic Study (Action)** – Mr. Bini provided an update and summary of the now-completed Rohrerstown Road and Good Drive traffic study led by the LCTA. In addition to Item 7A, which included a copy of the executive summary and text portion of the report, Mr. Bini provided a handout to members that depicted a map showing all intersections included in the study. The study was originally focused on the Good Drive-Columbia Avenue and Rohrerstown Road-Columbia Avenue intersections, but ultimately expanded to include all sections included on the map once it was determined that repairs on those two intersections would have no impact. Mr. Bini said that in the study's conclusion, it was determined that there are four different courses of action that can be pursued in order to address the problems facing the intersections surveyed in the study. The first option is a "No Build" scenario that would entail only select spot improvements at these intersections. The second and third options are to add lanes to either Good Drive or Rohrerstown Road. The fourth option is to expand and make localized improvements to both roads. Mr. Bini said that the completed study concluded that only Option 4 will produce acceptable Level of Service, and now it must

ITEM 3

be determined what to do going forward. Chairperson Lutz asked whether Options 2 and 3 were a part of Option 4, to which Mr. Bini said that it is indeed a combination of the previous two options. Chairperson Lutz then asked whether it would be possible to pursue one of the sets of improvements and pursue the others at a later point. Mr. Bini said that yes, this is possible, and the project would likely be spread out into smaller projects given the cost associated with the needed improvements. Vice-Chairperson Hutchison asked whether this study had any overlap with the previously-conducted Centerville Road study. Mr. Bini said that yes, that study was considered to some degree when analyzing the congestion at these intersections. Chairperson Lutz asked whether, given that all three of these roads have the same problem of deterioration and congestion, they should be considered together as part of a larger, regional fix. Mr. Bini said that the TIP already includes funding for work on Centerville Road, so these surveyed roads will have to be dealt with separately. Vice-Chairperson Hutchison asked whether Running Pump Road would be part of the improvements proposed by this study. Mr. Bini said that no, Running Pump Road is not within the scope of this study. Chairperson Lutz asked whether a regional study may be necessary, given the scope of the problem. Mr. Krimmel noted that a regional study was conducted previously, and improvements along the corridor will be made over the next several years. These improvements will include linking Rohrerstown Road to Running Pump Road, linking Centerville Road to Running Pump Road, and the addition of a roundabout. However, Mr. Krimmel added, these improvements alone will be insufficient to fix the intersections focused on in this study. Ms. Ahlskog added that east-west connectors such as Knoll Drive will be looked at in order to counter the north-south traffic flow of the region. Ms. Gonick inquired as to whether it was known if the railroad track was considered or analyzed in this study. Mr. Bini said that this was likely addressed in the Centerville study, but does not appear to have been analyzed in this one. Ms. Riggs inquired as to whether there was a particular rationale for the intersections selected, and what exactly the committee was being asked to take action on. Mr. Bini said that the rationale was based on the initial finding that the two primary intersections were part of a larger problem, which led to the LCTA's decision to use remaining funds to expand the scope of the study. In regard to the second question, Mr. Bini said that he was asking the committee to decide whether to accept the findings of the study and send the report to East Hempfield Township for review. At that point, the township would have the option of coming back to the MPO if they so choose. Ms. Riggs interjected and asked whether the LCTA has coordinated with East Hempfield on the study. Mr. Cowhey said no, but the consultants have coordinated with the township. Chairperson Lutz asked Mr. Bini for clarification again on the motion he wanted to make for this item. Mr. Bini said that the motion would be to accept the findings and forward it to the MPO, who would then pass it to the township. Mr. Swiernik pointed out that issues could arise from these projects, because adding additional lanes for certain portions could create a bottleneck at their respective ends. Mr. Bini responded by saying that he would have to review the report more thoroughly in order to determine whether that was considered. Ms. McCormick said that she believes the staff and committees should have a larger role in this process, rather than putting the burden and pressure solely on the townships. Ms. Ahlskog commented that this is not meant to put the pressure on the township, but they are the first step in the process of potentially adding this project to the long-range plan. Chairperson Lutz pointed out that

ITEM 3

this project would impact Manor Township as well. Ms. Riggs suggested that the motion involve more than passing the study to East Hempfield Township. Vice-Chairperson Hutchison asked whether transit, bicycle, and pedestrian issues were considered in the study. Mr. Bini said that these issues were likely not considered in depth, but they could be incorporated into the solutions.

Ms. Riggs made a motion to approve the study, provide the study to East Hempfield Township for their consideration and appropriate action, and return comments to the MPO with the understanding that it will consider study options on a more regional basis in the future. This motion was seconded by Ms. Gonick. The motion passed unanimously.

8. **Open Question Time for Voting Members** – Ms. Ahlskog invited voting members of the committee to ask any questions they may have, whether about an item on the agenda or otherwise. Ms. McCormick asked who the Federal Highways Association representative for the committee is, to which Ms. Ahlskog replied that Dan Walston is the new FHWA representative on TTAC. The committee can expect more engagement from the FHWA going forward. Ms. Valudes asked about financial capacity issues for the projects being discussed, referencing the prior reconstruction of US-30 E and the potential Rohrerstown Road project. She expressed concern that there will need to be a conscious effort to prioritize projects due to cost. Ms. Ahlskog said that there are plans at the staff level to use a prioritization mechanism, and there will be an effort to do more analysis when making decisions as to what problems to address and how to do so. Mr. Bini added that some of these projects are not in the long-range plan or the TIP, and will need to be added. The TIP prioritization algorithm will be a big part of addressing this. Chairperson Lutz expressed concern about pursuing only major projects, as doing so may result in many other areas degrading further. Mr. Cowhey expressed agreement with this concern and said that over-incrementalization generally fails to produce long term results, because there needs to be a balance between minor projects and major projects. He also added that in the past many of the county's capacity projects were not realistic. Vice-Chairperson Hutchison said that he believes that cost needs to be considered and discussed more when weighing road project options, and that there should be more effort put into looking at revenue-enhancing measures. Ms. Ahlskog expressed agreement with this and added that there will also be efforts to promote alternative means of transportation. This will entail aiding Commuter Services of PA, bicycle accessibility, transit systems, and the like. As evidence of the need to do this, Ms. Ahlskog cited an article in the day's news which reported that Lancaster County residents are driving alone and driving longer distances than years prior in order to get to work. Though not asking a direct question, Ms. Westcott followed this up by commenting that she appreciates the discussions of the committee and the learning opportunity that it affords her. She said that as someone who takes the "user" perspective on transportation issues, the committee provides insightful information. She also added that people with disabilities are attempting to get into the job market, but many of them cannot drive. This means it will be important for the county to be able to help those who cannot drive on their own and must rely on other means of transportation so that they are able to start careers. Ms. Ahlskog confirmed that aiding the ability of disabled persons to access transportation is a

ITEM 3

concern and a priority. Ms. Parcels noted that the Human Services Transportation Plan, which could address these concerns, will be updated in the near future. Chairperson Lutz pointed out that many of these disabled persons who use transit are confined to a particular route to reach their place of employment, and road projects could potentially affect these routes and the ability of these individuals to get where they need to.

9. **TIP Project Prioritization Process Update** – Ms. Parcels provided an update on the TIP prioritization process review and reported that the TIPUS recently met. A revised flow chart with minor changes made was provided in the meeting packet. She said that the chart is close to being finalized, but is still only a draft. Ms. Yoder asked if this will be the final version, and where it will go once it is finished. Mr. Bini answered that this will not be the final version of the chart, and it will be reviewed by the subcommittee for further revision. Ms. Parcels commented that this chart should help citizens get a better understanding of how decisions are made. Ms. Yoder suggested that there be a public outreach program so that this chart can be made known to and understood by the public. Ms. Parcels then referred to the handout titled “Summary of Responses to Date”. The committee is still working on this TIP criteria rating survey, and about half of the task force has provided input so far.
10. **Other Business and Participation** – None
11. **Next Meeting:** March 13, 2017, 12:00 PM
12. **Adjournment** – Chairperson Lutz adjourned the meeting at 1:31 PM.