

Lancaster County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: May 25, 2017

PLACE: 150 N. Queen Street, Conference Room 102

Members: Bill Hoffman, Cyndie Fuhrer, Bill Swiernik

Staff: Lauri Ahlskog, Robert Bini, Kyle Salage

Guests: Michael Domin, Brenda Buescher, George Tobler, Greg Paulson, Mohammed Badri

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

1 **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 5:04 PM.

2 **Call to Audience – Public Comment**

Any person who wishes to speak about any item NOT on the agenda

There were no comments offered by the members of the public in attendance.

3 **Minutes of March 23, 2017 (Action)**

There were no comments or suggested changes to the draft minutes.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, and this motion was seconded by Ms. Fuhrer. The motion passed unanimously, thereby approving the minutes.

4 **Active Transportation Plan Update** – Mr. Domin provided the committee and those in attendance with an update on the county’s Active Transportation Plan. Progress continues to be made on the plan. Currently, consultants are in the process of incorporating public input acquired from the meetings held in April. The first draft of the plan will be presented to county staff during the week of May 29th, at which point LCPC staff and the ATP Visioning and Technical Committees will have three weeks to review the document and provide comments that they may have. In addition, Mr. Domin noted that ideas have been presented to the consultants regarding map and concept designs. More detailed information regarding the draft plan will be presented to the public in approximately six to seven weeks, meaning that a full draft should be complete within two months. Mr. Domin added that he hopes BPAC will have the opportunity to provide comments and feedback regarding the draft plan. Mr. Hoffman asked whether the draft plan will be accessible online, to which Mr. Domin said that it will indeed be posted online. Furthermore, it will be possible to submit comments both directly in the document and electronically. He added that consideration is being given to the possibility of taking the plan “on the road” and giving residents of different municipalities throughout the county the opportunity to gain a better understanding of the plan, ask questions, and voice concerns. In total, the second public comment phase will last for a minimum of sixty

days. From there, a final draft is projected to be available approximately two to three months after the completion of public comment.

- 5 **BPAC Membership (Action)** – Mr. Bini reported that the issue of committee membership has been discussed with BPAC, TTAC, and the MPO at previous meetings, and LCPC staff would like to present nominations to the TTAC for approval as the first phase of the membership process. In addition to filling the two existing vacancies, it is hoped that ATP consultants can provide suggestions regarding committee structure and function. The two recommended candidates are Brenda Buescher and George Tobler. These individuals would provide some needed pedestrian representation. Mr. Swiernik asked for confirmation that both Mr. Tobler and Ms. Buescher have been informed that the committee is an advisory body, rather than an advocacy body, and that its purpose is to provide comments and suggestions. He stated that in the past there has been misunderstanding regarding this distinction, and that false expectations can be created if one believes BPAC is to serve as a channel for advocacy. Mr. Bini stated that both Mr. Tobler and Ms. Buescher will bring technical expertise and relevant pedestrian activities that will make them valuable members who can provide diversity to the committee. They would be added before any potential expansion after this year. Ms. Buescher said that she does currently serve in various advocacy roles, but believes that it is best to operate with a distinct function. Ms. Ahlskog assured the committee that both Mr. Tobler and Ms. Buescher have a clear understanding of the role of BPAC. Mr. Swiernik noted that, though the committee is an advocacy body, one’s passions in regard to bicycle and pedestrian issues do not need to be completely ignored. Mr. Tobler stated that he never thought that BPAC is advocacy body, and he added that from the outset it appears to be a support function more than anything else. He said he has no desire to use it as a channel for advocacy, though he does advocate at the state and federal level. Mr. Hoffman said that the line between “advocacy” and “advisory” is a bit blurry. Mr. Domin added that the committee does, in a sense, advocate for good planning. Many people simply don’t understand the channels for facilitating change in regard to bicycle and pedestrian matters. Ms. Ahlskog recommended that if a committee member wishes to make a motion regarding the action item at hand, that a motion be made to recommend that Mr. Tobler and Ms. Buescher be appointed at the June 26th MPO meeting.

Mr. Swiernik made a motion to recommend that the MPO appoint Mr. Tobler and Ms. Buescher to BPAC at its June 26, 2017 meeting. Ms. Fuhrer seconded this motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- 6 **Tar and Chip Roadway Concerns** – Mr. Swiernik asked for clarification regarding the term that describes when PennDOT tars and covers streets with stone. The debris created by this process endangers cyclists and produces unsafe road conditions. Mr. Hoffman stated that the stone is round and granular, and PennDOT does not generally sweep up the loose chips. During standard resurfacings, there will be a sweeping of loose stone. Mr. Swiernik stated that these resurfacings create dangerous, slippery roadways. Ms. Ahlskog stated that the PennDOT Maintenance Office was contacted, and they claimed that this type is not new. Mr. Bini noted that this issue may have to be brought up with PennDOT in discussions regarding the ATP, as it would be desired to avoid this method in bicycle

and pedestrian projects. Mr. Hoffman stated that the natural migration of chips takes months. Ms. Buescher asked whether the bicycle and pedestrian manager at PennDOT (Roy) is sympathetic towards these kinds of concerns. Ms. Ahlskog said that she will bring this issue up with PennDOT at the next state bicycle and pedestrian meeting, as well as at the June 12th TTAC meeting. Mr. Swiernik asked whether providing an image of this kind of sealing would be a helpful resource to use during these discussions, to which Ms. Ahlskog said that a visual would be appreciated. This would provide context for those not as familiar with bicycle and pedestrian issues. Mr. Hoffman noted that most municipalities do not have road sweepers. Mr. Swiernik said that the matter will be brought up with TTAC and PPAC.

- 7 **Resurfacing and Bikes** – The first discussion with PennDOT regarding the resurfacings and the TIP recently took place. As announced at the May TTAC meeting, a list of the 2018 resurfacings will likely be released in either the Summer or Fall, due to the fact that PennDOT is busy right now with TIP development. Mr. Swiernik stated that it would be desirable to see where we can “diet” roads during resurfacings when possible. Shorter road widths can make for safer pedestrian crossing, added bike lane striping, and other improvements. Mr. Hoffman stated that the scope of resurfacings is generally narrow, meaning that they would not include or consider such improvements. Mr. Swiernik asked whether there is a movement towards radar detection on traffic lights. Mr. Paulson stated that radars are being mounted on new traffic signals, and these signals are able to detect bicycles. Mr. Hoffman noted that different radar designs will work differently and more or less effectively. Mr. Paulson said that the main concern is that you would only have eleven seconds to cross the intersection, and Mr. Hoffman added that most pedestrians fail to press the crossing button and thereby extend the light cycle. Mr. Swiernik suggested that there should be consideration given to replacing and/or upgrading traffic light cameras. Mr. Hoffman noted that these cameras are more expensive, but they require less maintenance and are more reliable. Ms. Ahlskog suggested that this could be incorporated into the ATP, and she noted that East Lampeter Township made these upgrades on their own. In order to make such upgrades county-wide, an inventory of all traffic lights would be needed. Mr. Swiernik suggested prioritizing upgrades to take place where there is a high volume of pedestrian activity. Ms. Ahlskog stated that the hope is that BPAC will receive the list of resurfacings in time to provide comments. Mr. Paulson noted that he attended PennDOT’s briefing for the state legislature in April, and suggested that the LCPC should ask to be invited to these briefings. Ms. Ahlskog said that LCPC staff generally is invited, so PennDOT must have forgotten to extend the invitation this year. Mr. Domin added that it is unfortunate that PA-743 will be resurfaced without any additional improvements because PennDOT did not inform Elizabethtown Borough in time. This corridor stretches from Marietta to Elizabethtown. Ms. Ahlskog stated that resurfacings are supposed to go through PennDOT Connects, meaning it should be possible to get this kind of information sooner. Mr. Hoffman suggested that the legislative briefing take place earlier in the year. Ms. Ahlskog noted that resurfacings will now be eligible for TIP funds. Mr. Swiernik pointed out that municipal budgets need to be passed in September or October. Ms. Ahlskog suggested that it should be looked into whether a widening is need, and Mr. Swiernik pointed out that widenings do not need to be symmetrical. Ms. Buescher asked whether there could be follow-up on this at the

August 24th BPAC meeting, to which Mr. Bini said that staff can reach out to PennDOT. Ms. Ahlskog noted that the resurfacing list is also needed for TIP prioritization. Mr. Swiernik asked whether there is a bridge reconstruction plan. Ms. Ahlskog said that there is no master list of bridge projects, as each municipality would need to be contacted individually. PennDOT does, however, want more information on bridges. The committee would not be limited to reviewing the resurfacing projects forward to BPAC by PennDOT.

- 8 **Other Business & Public Participation** – Ms. Ahlskog reported that the STAP cycle will begin at the end of the summer. This will be brought up with the MPO at its June 26th meeting. Mr. Badri asked what the Safe Harbor Trestle Bridge cost to construct. Ms. Ahlskog said it is unclear how much the bridge initially cost, because it is a historic structure. Mr. Domin noted that it was built in 1905. Ms. Ahlskog also reported that the Bicycle Occupancy Permit is no longer a requirement from PennDOT. This requirement was a deterrent to municipalities. It has been replaced with a request and approval letter. Many municipalities did not even know that the requirement was in place, but they will be informed of this change in law. The DVRPC has been involved in facilitating this change, and the LCPC intends to share some of the information that it has produced on the issue. Mr. Badri asked whether the government will move towards requiring the registration of bicycles. Mr. Paulson stated that Lancaster City has an ordinance requiring the registration of bicycles, and a fine is in place for those who fail to comply. This is the only municipality in the county with such an ordinance. Mr. Swiernik noted that some states have a “Pay to Ride” program, because cyclists can generally use the road without paying taxes or a registration fee. There are also some groups that require you to pay an annual fee to use the road. Mr. Hoffman stated that in Pennsylvania, general funds cannot be used for highways, though some states do use revenue from sales tax to pay for highway improvements. He also noted that there are some rail trails. Mr. Badri noted that China uses a bike share program incorporating barcodes. Ms. Buescher stated that Lancaster City will have an agreement in place next week with sponsors next week to help fund a bike share program, to be launched in September. Mr. Swiernik said that the fee charged for bike use in this program would not be substantial. Ms. Buescher suggested finding more information regarding the program at zagster.com.

- 9 **Next Meeting: August 24, 2017 at 5:00 p.m.**

- 10 **Adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at 6:16 p.m.