

YAMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

June 2, 2011 - Meeting Summary

1. **Call to Order**: In Mr. Reilly's absence, Ms. Dell opened the meeting at 9:00 am.
2. **Public Comment**: There was no public comment.
3. **Introductions**: A self-introduction was conducted.
4. **Minutes of the April 7, 2011 Technical Committee Meeting**: Mr. Sloand mentioned a change to item 5.a. The comment should be that we made revisions to the 2011 TIP, not the 2014 TIP.

*With that correction and no other comments or changes, Mr. Farr made a **motion to approve the April 7, 2011 Technical Committee minutes**. Mr. Sloand seconded the motion. It was voted on and passed as presented.*

5. **2011 TIP Modifications**: Mr. Archer briefly reviewed the modifications. No action required, this is for your Information only. Mr. Clark reminded past members and informed new members that anything under \$2 million is considered an action, not an amendment, and requires no action.
6. **Transportation Enhancements - Project Updates**:

- a. **Northern Extension of the Heritage Rail Trail Park** - Mr. Knoch explained the history of the northern extension of the Heritage Rail Trail. Mr. Shue, noted that in late-April they received approval of Phase 2. They now have a PennDOT schedule for Part A of Phase 2. They hope to begin construction 1/12 and to be completed by 10/12. They are seeking additional funding to complete this phase.

Part B, Phase 2 is to build trail from Emig Mill Road to Route 30. They have an agreement with the Army Corp, but have no money to build it. Right-of-way is currently the only issue. Mr. Sloand noted that they are waiting for right-of-way to clear before they can obligate the funds.

Mr. Clark asked what the funding shortfall is currently? Ms. Loose noted that the PennDOT award was \$1,160,500 and they received \$316,500 from DCNR = \$1.477 total. The DCNR funds were for bridges and ramps, so some will be reserved for Part B of Phase 2 to meet their requirements. They do have Capital Campaign funds as well. The shortfall is currently a couple hundred thousand for Phase A.

- b. **Susquehanna Heritage Park** - Mr. Pinkerton noted that this project has been in the works since 2005. He gave background on the project. It is uniquely situated near the river. The scope of work has been narrowed. They were considering 2 phases. They have since decided to apply all the funding to the Zimmerman Center phase of the project. There was an environmental scoping meeting last week. They are still processing the specifics of that meeting. They will hold additional investigation of the archeology of the area. The Center is on the national register of historic places.

The funding is in place to complete the design. Mr. Dittenhafer described modifications to the original plan so the project will be ADA compliant. The attic will be finished and a stair/elevator is part of this project. These changes will be done in a proper way as to not take away from the historic feel of the building.

Ms. Dell inquired if the project is financially whole? Mr. Pinkerton noted that with private campaign of \$50,000, the project is fully funded. Mr. Sloand mentioned that Jessica Clark is in charge of Enhancement Projects at PennDOT, so it makes sense for you to contact her. They are hoping for a November/December start, with completion in June 2012. Mr. Panko noted that there may be no TE funds in next re-authorization. If there are no TE funds available, will MPO be willing to designate highway funds for the completion of TE projects? Ms. Dell noted that it all depends on what the bill says. If the project sticks to its schedule, funding shouldn't be an issue.

- c. Wrightsville Borough Safe Routes to School - Mr. Baltzer explained the project. It is for the Eastern York School District for improvements around the elementary school. They applied and were granted Federal Safe Routes to School funds in 2009. The design is complete and was forwarded to PennDOT for ADA approval. The environmental has been done and they should be receiving utility clearance soon. The plan is to let the project this fall for construct next summer. Right-of-way won't be an issue. Mr. Sloand stated he has an 8/16/11 let date. Mr. Baltzer stated that is accurate.

Mr. Clark noted that we should keep in mind, if we would run into a funding issue, the commitment should still be there from the MPO. We made a commitment and should stand by it. These funds are awarded on a first-come, first-serve basis. In the future, prospective projects may have to delay construction until a year that we can give-up funding for construction.

7. Candidate Projects - Will Clark, YCPC

- a. Project Tracking Sheet - Mr. Clark reviewed the tracking form, Level 1 - We are attempting to identify problem issues in the beginning instead of throughout the project approval process. This will be included in every Technical Committee packet from this point forward. The Level 2 form identifies how to deal with the issues.

To date, the Route 15 mile marker project was the first project to go through this process. This process/form will be changing as we learn how this will work. It could become part of an electronic format that all MPO members could then view. We are not sure how that will all work yet, but it should make it simple to track all projects and their status.

A brief discussion ensued regarding having a subcommittee that would meet to review these on a regular basis instead of bringing to every MPO.

- b. Market Street (City of York) Resurfacing (Level 1) - Mr. Clark briefly reviewed the Level 2 form for this project. Approval from Level 1 to Level 2 is not a commitment for funding. This project includes the entire length of the corridor, through York City. Level 2 may or may not break that into phases. It will take a few years to get to construction and the road condition will be very poor.

*There being no additional questions/comments, Mr. Farr **made a motion to approve** the project at Level 2. Representative Miller seconded the motion. It was voted on and passed as presented with one abstention.*

- c. Stewartstown Railroad (Level 1) - Mr. Clark described that the project encompasses 7.4 miles of rail. There is a lien against it and it is involved in an estate issue. On June 10 they will get ruling on abandonment. That will allow this project to continue. The project is to preserve the corridor. The corridor could be dissolved based on the ruling.

Mr. Knoch noted that he has been following this since 2009. He has talked to the attorney and the executor of the estate. There was a deal between the estate and the historical society to make payments to the estate over time. The estate ran out of patience getting those payments. He would like to see this corridor preserved.

The STB can "bank" the corridor, which preserves the rail status so that it could possibly be used for rail again in the future. In the meantime, it could be used for recreation and/or transportation.

Representative Miller believes this project should be moved into Level 2 to further review the issues. Mr. Clark inquired if the MPO wants to commit? This means we support looking further into options for this project. Level 2 is cumbersome and staff could spend a lot of time going through that process. A letter of support to the entity that may or may not apply for the STB "banking".

*Mr. Riebling made **a motion to recommend** to the Coordinating Committee to show the support of the MPO, without commitment to fund it. The Level 1 approval is contingent on rail banking and a letter of support. Representative Miller seconded the motion. It was voted on and passed as discussed. PennDOT abstained.*

- d. I-83 Exit 4 (Level 1) - Mr. Clark noted that this was received a day before the packets were sent. There are new proposals to deal with un-safe conditions at this interchange. Representative Miller wanted to clarify, that he is not the applicant for this project. Ronald Miller is also the name of the Township engineer.

Mr. Clark recommended that this be discussed at the next meeting, as staff has not had time to review the options/details of the project.

*Mr. Farr made **a motion to defer** discussion on this project to the August meetings. Mr. Gross seconded the motion. It was voted on and passed as discussed.*

- 8. **Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)**: Ms. Bitner explained that in the past, staff presented a list of the top 25 crash locations in York County. Staff took a look and selected a few of the 25 to perform a field scope. Some were addressed by projects already programmed on TIP. Others were dealt with from other funding sources. These are the ones that had not been addressed.

Two weeks ago, they performed an initial field scope of these projects:

- a. Route 425 (Woodbine Road) - The field scope determined that some trees need to be removed. This will enable them to widen the lane to 11'. They also recommend the addition of guide rails. This \$1.2 million project will address crash issues.
- b. Bull Road/Poplars Road - The majority of crashes here were during the daylight hours. The field scope determined that sight distance is the primary issue. This \$1.3 million project will address crash issues here. This was originally part of a larger Bull Road project, but was scratched for budget issues.
- c. Mt. Zion (Route 24)/Concord/Whiteford Road - This location had higher crash rates, but with less injuries. The field scope determined that the left turn lane/bay should be lengthened. This \$843,000 project would definitely address the crash issues.
- d. Queen Street - Rathton Road to before Boundary Avenue - The field scope determined that traffic signals should be replaced and should be synchronized. The addition of a left turn bay would be helpful as well. The biggest problem is angles of the side streets. The real fix would be to take away parking. There are no good options for removing parking in this area. This \$1.1 million project will not fully address the crash statistics, but should be completed.

Mr. Clark noted that we want to recommend that PennDOT place these four projects on York County's Interstate TIP. We need a recommendation today to do that. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the specifics and timing of these projects.

There being no additional comments, Ms. Shermeyer made a motion to recommend to the Coordinating Committee that these projects be placed on our TIP by PennDOT. Mr. Sloand seconded the motion. It was voted on and passed as discussed.

9. **YAMPO Meeting Schedule:** Mr. Marczyk, YCPC, reviewed the proposed meeting schedule for the 2011-2012 FFY for YAMPO. *There being no comments, Mr. Sloand made a motion to approve the meeting schedule as presented. Mr. Farr seconded the motion. It was voted on and passed as presented.*

10. **Other Business:**

- a. Watertank Road Bridge - Ms. Bitner briefly noted that FHWA can only do this project at a 80/20 split. Both municipalities are discussing this match at their June meetings. There will be more information for the August meetings.
- b. Electric Vehicle Charging Stations - Mr. Clark noted that Lancaster is looking for a grant for this type of project. We currently don't feel it's a priority with all the other projects/issues we are dealing with. Each municipality would also need to revise their SLDO and Zoning Ordinances to address location, regulations, etc.
- c. Mr. Mark Hilson has moved from the area. We need to fill his position in Region 4. Staff will be sending requests for a rep for that region.

11. **Upcoming Meetings:**

- a. Coordinating Committee - June 28, 2011
- b. Technical Committee - TBA

12. **Adjournment:**

There being no additional comments/business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50.

**Attendance
York Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Committee Meeting
June 2, 2011**

<u>Voting Members (# of Votes)</u>		<u>Attended</u>
PennDOT (2)		
Central Office:	Walt Panko	x
District 8-0 Office:	Dennis Sloand	x
Alternates:	John Kennedy	
	Mike Gillespie	
	Justin Batiuk	
York County (2)		
York Planning Commission:	Felicia Dell, Secretary	x
Alternates:	Joe Heffner	
	Jeph Rebert	
	Beth Nidam	
	Heather Bitner	
YCPC Transportation:	Will Clark	x
Alternates:	Heather Bitner	
	Jeph Rebert	
	Beth Nidam	
	Joe Heffner	
York County Transportation Authority (1)		
Transportation Authority:	Richard Farr, Chair	x
Alternate:	Jenna Reedy	
Legislative Appointments (2)		
Legislator:	Representative Ron Miller	x
Alternate:	Missy Werner	
Appointee:	Congressman Todd Platts	
Alternate:	Bob Reilly, Chairman	
Planning Region Representatives (7)		
Region 1 - South Central York	Jason Snyder	
Alternate:	Tom Wolfe	x
Region 2 - Greater York East	Elizabeth Heathcote	
Alternate:	Mark Henise	
Region 3 - Greater York West	Kelly Palmer	
Alternate:	Madelyn Shermeyer	x
Region 4 - Northern York	Vacant	
Alternate:	Leon Zeiders	x
Region 5 - South Western York	Ron Orndorff	
Alternate:	Loren Riebling	x
Region 6 - City of York	Kim Bracey	
Alternates:	James Gross	x
Region 7 - South Eastern York	Vacant	
Alternate:	Vacant	

Attendance (Continued)
Technical Committee Meeting - June 2, 2011

Advisory Members (0)

Federal Highway Administration:	Jon Crum	x
FAA-Airport District Office:	Lori Ledeborn	
Federal Transit Admin:	Deborah Purnell-Butler	
PennDOT Bureau of Aviation	Edie Letherby	
PennDOT Bureau of Public Transportation	Brandon Eshenour	

Other Planning Partners (0)

Adams County Planning	Richard Schmoyer	
Bicycle Access Council	Joe Stafford	
Capital City Airport:	David Spaulding	
Commuter Services of PA	Brandy Heilman	x
Genessee & Wyoming, Inc.	Kim Smith	
Lancaster Co Planning Commission	Dave Royer	
Maryland Midland Railway	Jonathan Rudman	
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	James Szymborski	

Other Persons Attending (0)

PennDOT Central Office	Beth Raves	x
C.S. Davidson	Jeff Shue	x
	Ben Baltzer	x
York County Rail Trail Authority	Gwen Loose	x
	Carl Knock	x
PennDOT Central Office	Michael Archer	x
Heritage Area	Jonathan Pinkerton	x
M&D Architects	Frank Dittenhaffer IV	x
York County Planning Commission	Joe Heffner	x
	Jeph Rebert	x
	Heather Bitner	x
	Beth Nidam	x
	Joe Marczyk	x
	Mike Pritchard	x
	Kelly Hildebrecht, Recording Secretary	x