

**LANCASTER MPO
TRANSPORTATION IMPLEMENTATION AND ENGAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE (TIES)
MINUTES**

DATE: January 6, 2022
TIME: 1:30 P.M.
PLACE: 150 N. Queen St., Conference Room 102, Lancaster, PA 17603

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ray D’Agostino	Lancaster County Commissioner
Bonnie Glover (virtual)	South Central Transit Authority Board Member
Ralph Hutchison	Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC)
Rebecca Denlinger (virtual)	Elizabethtown Borough Manager
Scott Russell	East Hempfield Township Supervisor
Tom Kifolo	Rohrer’s Quarry
Cindy McCormick	Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC)
Dan Zimmerman (virtual)	At-Large
Mark Hansen	At-Large

GUESTS:

Ronique Bishop (virtual)	Federal Highway Administration
Adriana Atencio (virtual)	Active Transportation Advisory Committee

STAFF:

Scott Standish	Executive Director
Kristiana Barr	Senior Land Use and Transportation Planner
Faith Gaddie (virtual)	Senior Administrative Secretary

Order of Business:

1. **Call to Order** – Commissioner D’Agostino called the meeting to order at 1:32pm.
2. **LCPD Executive Director Update** – Mr. Standish provided a brief update on the Planning Department activities and operations, including the status of the vacant Director for Land Use and Transportation position. He announced that pending Salary Board approval, the new Director will be starting in February 2022. Mr. Russell asked about their professional background. Mr. Standish responded that their background is very similar to the previous Director for Land Use and Transportation, Bob Bini.
3. **Minutes of the December 2, 2021 Meeting** – Mr. Russell moved to approve, and Mr. Kifolo seconded. Minutes were approved unanimously.
4. **Prioritization Process for Transportation Projects** – Commissioner D’Agostino noted the “homework” members had, which was to review several materials to discuss today.
 - a. **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Project Evaluation Tool**

Commissioner D’Agostino noted the information provided in the meeting packet was presented at the last meeting. It also includes a spreadsheet that staff

distributed after the last meeting. He shared that Dave Hogle (from County Engineer, RETTEW Associates) was not able to attend the meeting, but he provided some comments via email. He requested they be included for the record (see attached). Commissioner D'Agostino reviewed Mr. Hogle's feedback, which included the consideration of a new technology in the criteria. There was a brief discussion of how to best incorporate it. Commissioner D'Agostino stated that technology can be considered in categories, it does not need to be a separate new category.

Ms. McCormick remarked that most criteria seem to be based on the location of the improvements, not the quality of the improvements. She acknowledged that can be subject or not based on data; however, some metrics may get at the idea.

Mr. Hutchison wondered if some sort of cost-benefit metric may help evaluate projects against each other. Mr. Russell expressed caution over the use of "cost benefit analysis". He explained that many of the categories could be supported by measurable criteria. For example, it is possible to measure congestion reduction using data on data and traffic counts.

Ms. McCormick said it is also important from a safety perspective to look at crash modification factors. She expressed concern that a lot of projects are not vetted before being considered for the TIP.

Mr. Hansen asked if the congestion management category and the safety and security category could be combined to make a category that is the highest priority. Mr. Standish asked if funding is broken out based on similar categories, like congestion management. Ms. Barr responded that yes, there is a program called Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ).

Mr. Russell remarked that congestion management is probably the easiest of all these criteria to measure. Safety is harder to measure because there is a lot of information to consider, such as crash reports and road design. For example, roundabouts are a known safety benefit for intersections with frequent, severe angle crashes. He suggested that there be a study of some sort to provide objective criteria to support a project.

Commissioner D'Agostino asked if the environmental category is necessary, and if it was best for those points to be distributed to other categories. Mr. Russell responded that he thinks congestion management has an environmental component and other components. He believes many of these categories interrelate and so there is overlap. With limited funding, and most projects being congestion management or safety, that all the other categories or considerations serve a supporting role that help to prioritize the projects.

Mr. Hansen explained that he thinks some categories could be combined – environmental, social equity, public support, and public health as well as congestion management, safety and security, and economic benefit. Mr. Russell noted that there are different funding streams with different sets of criteria for funding projects determined by the federal government. Keeping in mind the requirements, he suggested the group consider rankings for different types of funding sources because they will have different requirements. The project

ranking would change or vary by funding source because project selection will depend on available funding sources.

Commissioner D'Agostino explained that this is a tool to figure out what funding sources can be applied to projects. There are certain required considerations, like environmental justice. Mr. Hutchison remarked that projects may have multiple benefits. The initial motivation for a project may be one thing like safety, but it will have other benefits or improvements included in it. Ms. McCormick cautioned that safety be considered outside of congestion. For example, a project that improves the safety of bicyclists may increase vehicle congestion. She expressed the desire for keeping congestion management and safety as separate categories. The other categories are things that help enhance the quality of a project and improve its ranking.

There was a brief discussion of the "public support" category. Mr. Standish stated that projects should be consistent with County and regional plans, which go through a public process of adoption. He expressed a desire to see projects look beyond boundaries to consider benefits and burdens – projects cannot be done in isolation.

Commissioner D'Agostino summarized that "value add" points such as public support or having a project studied and vetted help bring the project closer to being shovel ready. Mr. Russell agreed with the idea of the projects being vetted by a study to demonstrate the need and make the case for the use of public funds. Mr. Hutchison noted an additional benefit of a study is being less likely to run into public opposition later in the project development process. Ms. Denlinger asked what kind of study or additional effort is needed beyond a project being identified in plans. She expressed concern about municipalities spending money on engineering studies. Commissioner D'Agostino responded that a municipality would get extra points if a project has been studied. Mr. Russell noted he does not think a municipality needs to hire an engineer because there is lots of data publicly available.

Mr. Zimmerman remarked that he did not see anything in the materials about rewarding municipalities for being creative with funding projects by leveraging other funding sources. He suggested rewarding projects that bring in other money. Other members expressed agreement.

Mr. Hutchison share that when the tool was originally developed, there was a dry run of projects. There was dissatisfaction with the result. He suggested doing another dry run to see if the results make sense to members.

Commissioner D'Agostino noted that staff were taking notes and requested that updated information based on the discussion be provided.

b. Smart Growth Transportation (SGT) program Guidelines

Commissioner D'Agostino noted the information provided in the meeting packet was presented at the last meeting. He invited members to provide feedback.

Mr. Hansen asked if notifying applicants of awards in December was too late in relation to the municipal budget process. Ms. Barr responded that staff noted that concern and they plan on modifying the timeline in recognition of that issue.

Mr. Hutchison recommended the places2040 be incorporated in the program criteria. Mr. Standish confirmed that places2040 and other County plans will be.

Mr. Hutchison expressed concern over applicants participating on the evaluation panel. He admitted he did not have a solution to this problem. Commissioner D'Agostino responded that it is a known issue but unavoidable.

Commissioner D'Agostino stated the next staff is staff putting together an updated timeline. Ms. Barr shared that staff began drafting a proposed timeline. The application process would be this summer with award notifications in September. A couple suggestions to save time are not holding site visits or interviews. She explained that in the past there was poor participation at site visits for the effort County staff and applicants went to in order to hold them. Group members agreed that site views are not necessary because members can view the project area on Google Earth. Commissioner D'Agostino stressed the importance of holding interviews. Mr. Hutchison suggested the interviews could be virtual, which may be easier to schedule and result in better participation. There was consensus from municipal representatives that award notification in September is good timing for their budget process. Ms. Barr noted it also aligns with the start of Federal Fiscal Year 2023, which is when project funds may be expended.

5. Other Business & Public Participation – Ms. Denlinger noted that final rules for the American Rescue Plan Act funding were issued during this meeting. No other comments.

6. Next Meeting: February 3, 2022 @ 2:33pm

7. Adjournment – Chairman D'Agostino adjourned the meeting at 2:55pm.