

Comments from Adjacent Planning Commissions, Municipalities and School Districts  
and LCPC Responses  
Prior to Adoption of the LRTP as part of the Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan  
September 2016

Comments from Pam Shellenberger and Anne Walko, York County Planning Commission:

Comment 1: The Lancaster County's LRTP guiding principles, goals and strategies are consistent with the goals and objectives of the York County Comprehensive Plan.

RESPONSE: No response required.

Comment 2: YCPC stated that the LRTP does not address Airport Hazard Zoning (AHZ) as a potential impact on land use and raised a question about the eastern approach to Capital City Airport in northern York County and if it has implications for AHZ by Lancaster County municipalities.

RESPONSE: Municipalities in Lancaster County that surround airports in Lancaster County have incorporated AHZ into their zoning code, with the exception of two municipalities with whom LCPC is working. The Capital City Airport is located in York County, north of the Lancaster County border across the Susquehanna River. LCPC staff has reviewed FAA Part 77 and has determined that since the airport is located 39 miles north of Lancaster County, none of Lancaster County's northwestern or other municipalities fall within FAA Part 77.

Comment 3: YCPC inquired whether the recommendations of the RabbitTransit/RRTA Route 12 Connection Study have been implemented.

RESPONSE: RRTA informed LCPC staff that recommendations of the study, which was initiated by RabbitTransit and conducted several years ago, have not been implemented due to the low projected ridership for an express route.

Comment 4: YCPC has suggested that Lancaster County add three bridges that cross the Susquehanna River to the LRTP's list of outyear funding projects in Appendix A. The bridges are: US 30 bridge; the Veterans Memorial Bridge (on PA 462) and Norman Woods Bridge (on PA 372).

RESPONSE: Lancaster County looks to PennDOT for guidance on the prioritization and funding of bridges that need repair, restoration or replacement. This is based on PennDOT's Asset Management System and bridge inspections. Regarding the bridges mentioned by YCPC:

1. The U.S. 30 bridge over the Susquehanna River underwent a major restoration project several years ago. PennDOT has not recommended the need for further work or funding at this time.
2. The Veterans Memorial Bridge is on the FY 2017-2020 TIP (MPMS# 79020) for \$3.5 million for Final Design for a rehabilitation project on the bridge. Future phases of the project will be funded on future TIPs.

3. Norman Woods Bridge was on a list of state bridges that Lancaster County received from PennDOT but the SD rating at the time was 51.8 (2013 listing). PennDOT has not recommended funding for this bridge on the Lancaster County TIP.

Comment 5: YCPC inquired whether Lancaster County considered working with other municipalities to reactivate the South Central Pennsylvania Goods Movement Study.

RESPONSE: Lancaster County worked cooperatively with other counties on the South Central Pennsylvania Goods Movement Study through its completion. More recently, the county provided input to the state's Comprehensive Freight Movement Plan and Pennsylvania on Track mobility plan and participated in PennDOT-sponsored freight movement webinars. We will continue to work cooperatively with other counties and MPOs on freight mobility issues

Comments of Lee C. Olsen, AIA, Chairman Berks County Planning Commission

Comment 1: Correct the name of Commuter Services of South Central PA in Chapter 3.

RESPONSE/EDIT: On page 3-15, Commuter Services of South Central PA should be "Commuter Services of Pennsylvania, a program of the non-profit Susquehanna Regional Transportation Partnership."

Comment 2: Correct the names, Berks County Regional Transit Authority and South Central Pennsylvania Transit Authority.

RESPONSE/EDIT: On page 3-28, Berks County Regional Transit Authority should be "Berks Area Regional Transportation Authority" and South Central Pennsylvania Transit Authority should be "South Central Transit Authority."

Comment 3: The terms in Chapter 4 concerning the Growth Management Framework and those in the key of Map 8, Growth Management Framework, are not the same.

RESPONSE/EDIT: On pages 4-11 and 4-12, change the third to last sentence at the bottom of the second column to read: "Lancaster County's Growth Management Plan (GMP) has evolved into a tailored approach to land development and preservation with an Urban Strategy and Designated Natural Resource Areas. On Map 8 in Appendix B, change CMP Urban Strategy to "GMP Urban Strategy."

Comment 4: The future land use designations on Map 8, along Lancaster County's border with Berks County are generally consistent with those shown on the future and use plan for Berks County.

RESPONSE: No response is required.

Comment 5: The Commission noted that there were no transportation projects planned on roadways that enter Berks County from Lancaster County (US 222 in Brecknock Township and PA 23 in Caernarvon Township) and stated that it hoped that, if projects were planned on these roads in the future either on the Lancaster County or Berks County side of the dividing line between them, the MPOs would communicate with one another concerning the project(s).

RESPONSE: Lancaster County agrees that this would be a good practice.

Comments of Wes Bruckno, AICP, Senior Planner, Chester County Planning Commission

Comment 1: Chester County Planning Commission commented that *Connections 2040, 2016 Update*, addresses important contemporary and future transportation planning issues, includes a section on transportation and public and contains well-considered policies that will help Lancaster County address its transportation plans during the Plan's time frame.

RESPONSE: No response required.

Comment 2: Chester County Planning Commission suggested that Lancaster County coordinate with Chester County on issues of mutual importance, particularly policies and plans related to US 30 and US 322 and that both counties should coordinate policies related to extension of the Chester Valley Trail to connect with the Enola Low Grade Trail in Lancaster County.

RESPONSE: Lancaster County agrees that on issues of mutual importance to both Lancaster County and Chester County, coordination would be helpful to both counties, especially on projects located on sections of US 30 and US 322 close to the border between the two counties. Lancaster County has been working with Chester County staff on extending the Enola Low Grade Trail in Lancaster County into Chester County at Atglen. An extension of the Chester Valley Trail by Chester County to connect to the Enola Low Grade Trail would extend the benefits of both trails to pedestrians, bicyclists and others who use them.

Comments of Thomas K. Edinger, AICP, Transportation Planner, Dauphin County Planning Commission

Comment 1: Page 3-25 refers to Roadway Safety as part of Chapter 3, Transportation Conditions, Trends and Issues. Dauphin County noted that Lancaster County may want to include a reference to PennDOT's 2012 Strategic Highway Safety Plan that serves as a guide for improving traffic safety statewide. PennDOT is working on an updated Strategic Highway Safety Plan and Lancaster County may want to contact PennDOT to see how it can participate.

RESPONSE: In Chapter 2, Introduction, on page 2-3, the LRTP states that the plan was developed within the context of various documents and policies including "Consistency with the state's Highway Safety Plan." Lancaster County appreciates Dauphin County's suggestion that

the County may want to provide input to the state's update of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Comment 2: Page 3-33 of the LRTP states that freight movement is not confined to the borders of a single MPO. Dauphin County commented that the Harrisburg Area Transportation Study is facilitating development of a three-county (Cumberland, Dauphin and Perry) regional freight plan that will be completed in 2017. Lancaster County may want to incorporate the recommendations of the freight plan into its future work.

RESPONSE: Lancaster County would be interested in receiving a copy of the three-county (Cumberland, Dauphin and Perry) regional freight plan when it is completed in order to review the recommendations and their implications for Lancaster County.