

**Adams County Transportation Planning Organization (ACTPO)  
Minutes for the Committee Meeting on July 29, 2020**

**Attendance:**

**Voting Members**

Bob Gordon	Hamiltonban Township, (Chair)
David Scotty Bolton	Abbottstown Borough, ACBA (Vice-Chair)
Jim Martin	Adams County Commissioner
Skip Strayer	Adams county Planning Commission
Bob Jackson	Liberty Township
Beth Nidam	CPTA - Rabbittransit
Robin Fitzpatrick	Adams County IDA
Anne Geiger	East Berlin Borough
David Laughman	Arendtsville Borough
Anthony Sansone	PennDOT Central Office
Nathan Walker	PennDOT District 8-0

**Legislative Representatives**

Bev Frey	Senator Mastriano's Office
----------	----------------------------

**Adams County Office of Planning and Development**

Sherri Clayton-Williams  
Andrew Merkel  
Harlan Lawson  
Laura Neiderer

**Others**

Will Cameron	Adams County Bridge Engineer
Michelle Tarquino	PennDOT District 8-0
Jeff Puher	PennDOT District 8-0
Jonathan Owens	PennDOT District 8-0
Ray Green	PennDOT Central Office
Judie Butterfield	Gettysburg Borough
Matt Boyer	Commuter Services
Susan Naugle	HABPI
Jen Becker	York County Citizen

**Media**

None

## **1. Introductory Comments**

Mr. Gordon called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm. He explained that the meeting was being recorded. Mr. Gordon turned the opening comments over to Mr. Merkel, whom asked that participants remain muted unless speaking. Mr. Merkel explained that the same meeting rules apply as they did last meeting and asked participants to identify themselves in order to obtain an attendance list. It was determined that a quorum of voting members was in attendance.

## **2. Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Martin motioned to approve the June 8, 2020 minutes as drafted, and Mr. Bolton seconded. Mr. Strayer did not vote, as he was not able to participate in the last meeting. The minutes were passed unanimously by roll-call vote.

## **3. Transit Update**

- a. Mr. Boyer provided an update from Commuter Services. He explained that business is being conducted virtually using various web-based platforms. He mentioned that 34 people signed up for the program over the last month. He noted that 90 percent of participants are teleworking.
- b. Ms. Nidam provided an update from CPTA. She explained that CPTA services are 95 percent back to normal, however, ridership is low, down by about 50 percent.

## **4. 2021-2024 TIP Update**

- a. Mr. Merkel provided a staff presentation of the draft 2021-2024 TIP update.
- b. Mr. Merkel reviewed the public comment period documentation with the board. He explained that the Public Comment Period was open from June 15, 2020 through July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2020, and the Public Comment Meeting presentation and recording are posted on the county website. He explained that six tribes were notified by letter of the draft TIP, and the office did not receive any correspondence in return. Mr. Merkel noted that legal notices were placed in both the Gettysburg Times and the Evening Sun. The draft 2021-2024 TIP was presented at the Planning Commission Meeting. Three comments were received during the Public Comment Period:
  - Art Becker regarding the Eisenhower Extension Project
  - Nancy Bennett regarding a bridge design over Rock Creek, and
  - Cumberland Township regarding the intersection of RT30 and Herr's Ridge Rd.

Mr. Merkel explained that the staff had received comments regarding the Eisenhower Extension Project prior to the formal Public Comment Period that, because of current events related to COVID-19, were carried forth into the Public Comment Period. Mr. Merkel explained that all public comments must be addressed by the board. Responses from the staff were provided to both Nancy Bennett and Cumberland Township. Mr. Merkel explained that in preparation for the board to address the public comments regarding the Eisenhower Extension Project, the staff prepared a project summary including, background information, history of funding projects that cross MPO lines, an update of where the project stands currently and the alternatives being considered, current policy positions of municipalities based on letters and resolutions that have been adopted, and staff recommendations for the board to consider to move forward. A draft resolution has also been prepared for the board to consider as a potential response to the comments received regarding the Eisenhower Extension Project.

- i. Mr. Gordon explained that the Draft Resolution 2020-1, which the board had a chance to review as part of the meeting packet prior to the meeting, is a resolution dealing with the Eisenhower Extension Project. He explained that the draft resolution reflects closely to the context of resolutions that have been passed by both Hanover Borough and Penn Township in York County. He noted that the draft resolution states opposition to the TSM Alternative and the No Build Option. Mr. Gordon went on to explain that, after being presented with the project summary information, the board requested that the staff prepare a draft resolution for consideration at today's meeting. Mr. Laughman made a motion to approve Resolution 2020-1 and Mr. Strayer seconded. Mr. Gordon opened the meeting up for discussion and questions regarding the resolution. Mr. Merkel clarified to the board and the meeting participants that the No Build Option means no improvements are made as part of the project, and reiterated that the York MPO has passed a resolution against the TSM Alternative as currently designed, meaning that they are not going to fund the portion of the project in their area, about 65 percent of the project. Mr. Martin asked for clarification that the resolution opposes the No Build Alternative, and Mr. Merkel confirmed affirmative. Mr. Laughman asked if the 5C Alternative is the only other alternative, as it is not discussed in the resolution. Mr. Merkel explained that currently, the TSM, No Build, and the 5C Alternatives are the only options on the table. He mentioned that there could be other alternatives identified, however, that would impact the timing and cost of the project. He went on to say that there will likely be additional outreach regarding the alternatives performed by PennDOT. Mr. Bolton thanked the staff for providing recommendations. Mr. Gordon put Draft Resolution 2020-1 up for a roll-call vote. PennDOT Central Office and PennDOT District 8-0 abstained from the vote. The remaining votes were approvals and Resolution 2020-1 was adopted.
- c. Mr. Merkel explained that Adams County was impacted by court determinations that changed the standards by which air quality conformity is determined, and so the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report is not as detailed as it was for previous TIPs. He explained that action is required to approve the Air Quality Conformity Report prior to approval of the Air Quality Resolution, which states that the TIP update maintains air quality standards and conformity as provided in federal regulation. Mr. Martin made a motion to approve to the report and Mr. Walker seconded. The Air Quality Conformity Report was approved unanimously by roll-call vote.
- d. Mr. Gordon entertained a motion to approve the Air Quality Resolution for signature by the chair and vice-chair of the board. The motion was moved by Mr. Strayer and seconded by Mr. Martin. The Air Quality Resolution was approved for signature unanimously by roll-call vote.
- e. Mr. Merkel explained that the Self-Certification Resolution is another document that has been included with the past several TIP updates and it states that the TIP update has been developed in accordance with transportation planning guidelines outlined by federal law. Action is required by the board to approve the resolution for the chair and vice-chair to sign. Ms. Nidam motioned to approve the Self-Certification Resolution, and Mr. Laughman seconded. A roll-call vote was taken, and the Self-Certification Resolution was approved for signatures.
- f. Mr. Merkel explained that the Procedures for 2021-2024 TIP/STIP Modification are the technical guidelines that must be followed if the TIP requires changes. He explained that

the board has long set a \$1 million threshold distinguishing an amendment, which requires action and a formal vote by the board, from an administrative modification, which does not require board action. Mr. Gordon also noted that the signature of Larry Shifflet, the Deputy Secretary of Planning for PennDOT, is also included on the document if approved. Ms. Nidam made a motion to approve, and Mr. Bolton seconded. The document Procedures for 2021-2024 TIP/STIP Modification was approved for signature by a unanimous roll-call vote

- g. Mr. Merkel explained that the complete 2021-2024 TIP document requires action from the board to formally approve and submit to PennDOT Central Office, given that the separate components requiring action have been approved. Mr. Bolton motioned to approve, and Mr. Strayer seconded. The 2021-2024 TIP was approved unanimously by roll-call vote.
5. Mr. Merkel stated that the next priority for the board and staff will be the Long-Range Transportation Plan. He noted that the original document was adopted in 2012 and was later amended in 2017. He went on to say that this next update is required by July 26, 2022 and it will be an entirely new plan and document, with most of the work being handled in-house by staff. He explained that the staff discussed the possibility of creating a sub-committee within ACTPO, which the bylaws do allow, in order to coordinate with the board and keeping them involved through the entire process. He noted that ideally the sub-committee will consist of four to six members and be a mix of representatives from the Borough Association, Township Association, Transit Authority, and private sector. Mr. Gordon entertained a motion to approve the formation of a sub-committee. Mr. Bolton motioned, and Ms. Nidam seconded. The action was approved unanimously by roll-call vote. Several board members expressed interest in participating in the sub-committee. Mr. Merkel explained that the entire board will still be involved and remain informed during the LRTP update process.
6. Mr. Sansone summarized the modifications, taking the form of Administrative Modifications, updating the 2019-2022 TIP. The Administrative Modifications involve five bridge projects, the Eisenhower Extension Project, RT94 & RT234 Intersection Improvements Project, US15 Pipe Replacement Project, and US15 Improvements Project.
7. Mr. Walker provided an update from PennDOT District 8-0. He noted that legislative briefings will soon be posted to the district website. He also said the District is working to identify candidate safety projects to be included on the 2021-2024 TIP for use of HSIP funds. He noted the HSIP funds are very specific and can only be used toward safety improvements. Mr. Walker also noted that the Green-Light-Go Program has been modified due to funding shortages related to COVID-19. Also, MTF awards were announced, however, District 8-0 was not awarded any multi-modal funding this round.
8. FHWA was not represented.
9. Ms. Naugle, representing the Gettysburg Interloop Project and Healthy Adams Bicycle Pedestrian Incorporated provided updates. The group is attempting to complete Gettysburg Interloop phase B2 on Racehorse Alley. She explained that the phase cost is about \$1.22 million and they have secured about \$170,000 this year in local funding. They have an application pending with DCNR and are exploring other avenues of funding including DCED, the Adams County Greenspace Grant, and the Wellspan Partnership Program. She explained that all the funding sources they are seeking, if granted, would leave the project about \$140,000 short of the \$1.22 million. She explained that if, and when, a PennDOT multimodal funding grant round opens, they will likely seek funding from that source, which would in turn increase the cost of the project. If funding is secured as planned, the phase is anticipated to be completed in the Spring 2023. Ms. Naugle also provided an update on the Grand History Trail, which connects

Gettysburg to Emmitsburg. HABPI has completed a feasibility study on the project and the report is pending final review and approval with DCNR.

10. Mr. Martin explained that because the No Build Option was opposed, he would like to see action to move forward improvements to RT116, from Brushtown through McSherrystown, and including Elm Ave. Mr. Merkel explained that the board can take whatever action they see fit, however, improvements through that area would have to consider the input from the York MPO. He explained that a request can be made to the department to explore other alternatives, but whether PennDOT can design an alternative can gain support from both sides is the question. Mr. Gordon explained that PennDOT has made some intersection improvements in McSherrystown. Mr. Martin went on to say the he would like to see another alternative, as the project has come this far. Mr. Strayer mentioned that since both the TSM Alternative and the No Build were opposed, that leaves the 5C Alternative as the remaining option to follow through on. Mr. Gordon also mentioned that the project is on the 2021-2024 TIP, which the board just approved, so PennDOT is going to continue work on the project. Mr. Merkel went on to reiterate that the TSM Alternative was opposed by resolution from a funding perspective, as the York MPO took a position against it and were not willing to fund the portion in York County. The No Build Option was opposed by resolution from a practical perspective, because something needs to be done, as problems have been identified in the area. Mr. Merkel explained that does leave the 5C Alternative, however, other alternatives could be brought to the table, but those alternatives would have to be coordinated with all municipalities. Mr. Merkel explained that if there are specific improvements that the affected municipalities want to see done in the area, he would encourage they be directed to PennDOT, ACTPO, and the York MPO, keeping in mind that all entities would have to coordinate and agree on such improvements. Mr. Strayer said the 5C Option is beneficial not only to the immediate area, but to the greater communities in the area. Mr. Gordon also said the project impacts the larger community, as many people travel across the county to the Hanover Area for various reasons, and it is very important to keep the project moving. Mr. Martin said there is strong opposition to the 5C Alternative, and the board needs to be practical to have an alternative to the 5C Alternative. Ms. Clayton-Williams said that from a planning perspective, the work that has already been done needs to be considered. Mr. Merkel reiterated that each MPO must consider the impacts on the entire urbanized area, which crosses county lines. He explained that the TIP is currently based on the identified alternatives and would have to be adjusted accordingly based the chosen alternative. Ms. Geiger asked when the next step happens, and who takes the step. Mr. Merkel answered that an alternative will have to be selected and the project will move into the final design phase. He explained that there is still some additional outreach that needs to be done, based on federal requirements, and the Resolution 2020-1 will go into the project record. Mr. Bolton thanked everybody on the board for attending and he addressed the 5C Alternative. He explained that there are potential revisions to the design in order to avoid condemning already developed land and to utilize undeveloped land in the area.
11. The next ACTPO Board Meeting will be held October 28, 2020 at 1:00pm. The meeting was adjourned at 2:35pm.