

**RTCS Joint Study Committee Meeting #3**  
**November 17, 2010**  
**10:30 a.m.**  
**Commuter Services of PA Offices – York, PA**

Steve Deck reviewed the meeting agenda and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to review study progress made to date, focusing on updated mapping, transit corridor identification and methodology, and public outreach tasks, emphasizing the relationship to the upcoming Transit Roundtable, to be held Tuesday, December 14.

**Inter-County Travel**

Steve reviewed a series of slides that showed the top 3 inter-county travel destinations for each of the 9 counties in the study area.

Originating County	Inter-county travel destination #1	Inter-county travel destination #2	Inter-county travel destination #3
Adams	74% to York		
Berks	55% to Lancaster	29% to Lebanon	
Cumberland	72% to Dauphin		
Dauphin	66% to Cumberland		
Franklin	62% to Cumberland		
Lancaster	38% to Dauphin	22% to Berks	22% to York
Lebanon	61% to Dauphin		
Perry	50% to Cumberland	45% to Dauphin	
York	36% to Cumberland	30% to Dauphin	

These statistics are based on 2000 Journey to Work data, the latest available. It was felt that all of the counties had grown, but that the trends probably remained the same—just more so.

Ryan Furgerson presented 9 corridors that had been identified by the project team that potentially would be recommended for transit service. Corridor identification was based upon:

- DEMAND--General understanding of cross-county travel movements
- DESIREABILITY--Access to higher-speed highway network
- STRATEGIC PURPOSE--Study committee input

Additional questions that were considered in the identification include:

- How to best capture existing informal park-and-ride locations?
- What defines a secondary hub, and what areas meet those criteria?
- Should travel outside the study area also be considered?
- Where can corridors be connected, to provide different options for one-seat/through services?

The corridors were identified by color since they have not been fully analyzed and prioritized:

- Blue—I-81 corridor through Berks, Lebanon and Dauphin; serving primarily Fort Indiantown Gap and park and rides in the I-78/I-81 corridor. This was identified as express service with near term priority.
- Orange—US -30 and PA -462 between York and Lancaster; serving primarily Columbia and many informal Park and Rides along US -30. This was identified as interline service with a near term priority. Rabbittransit and Red Rose **already provide service, but a transfer is required. A one seat ride would be preferable.** This was identified as express service (city center to city center) with a near term priority—**possibly the pilot project.**
- Red—US- 222 between Reading and Lancaster; would serve numerous informal Park and Rides along US- 222.

- Brown—US-422 between Berks and Lebanon; would serve numerous informal Park and Rides along US- 422. This route would provide local service and was identified as a mid- term priority.
- Gold—I-83/PA 581 from Cumberland to York; would serve the business/industrial parks in Mechanicsburg. This would be express service identified as intermediate term priority.
- Yellow—I-81 from Franklin through Cumberland to Dauphin; would primarily service I-81 Park and Rides. Identified as express service with long term priority.
- Purple—I-76 from Lancaster through Lebanon to Dauphin; would primarily serve northern Lancaster County communities. This was identified as express service with long term priority. The participants felt this service should be reoriented to the I-283 corridor.
- Pink—US-11/15 between Perry and Dauphin; would serve primarily Duncannon and Marysville. This was identified as express service with long term priority. There was discussion that it should end on the west shore of Harrisburg.
- Green—US-15/PA 74 from Adams through York to Cumberland; would serve primarily Gettysburg and Route 15 Park and Rides. This was identified as express service with long term priority.

There was considerable discussion of the corridors, but in the end everyone agreed these were good corridors to present. Several comments were received on potential adjustments to the start and end points of each corridor which would be incorporated. There was also a suggestion from Dick Schmoyer about a potential new corridor connecting Adams and York Counties on US 30, which would be investigated and shared with the JSC for potential discussion at the transit roundtable. At the transit roundtable, the presentation should also include brief descriptions of the types of service that are possible, since not everyone will be familiar with express, local, vanpool, carpool, etc.

Specific comments on the maps were to remove the large employers shown, and also to identify emerging hot spots, such as the hospital west of Lancaster. Beth asked that PB prepare a table of all the corridors for ease of comparison.

Maggie Mund then discussed outreach activities, focusing on the upcoming transit roundtable, to be held December 14 at HACC. Beth Nidam distributed the draft invitation and final comments were received. The consultant agreed to revise and resubmit to the JSC for their distribution. Bill Parkin expressed concern that he needed to invite 9 county commissioners, which he feared would be too many. It was agreed that JSC members should invite business leaders, politicians, government staff and social service representatives in their area, even if they were not on the “list”—if they felt it prudent. HACC does not have any conflicting events, so space will not be an issue, and the consultant team can pull in facilitators as needed. Because several commissioners are asking about the study, it was also agreed to have a WEB briefing on January 6.

The agenda was presented and no changes were made to the agenda. Dennis Louwerse said the introductory presentation should clearly state the focus of the study is to **examine regional connections between transit systems and commuter services** within the 9 county study area. We are not concerned with individual transit agencies’ service planning needs.

- **8:30 a.m. Registration and Continental Breakfast**
- **9:00 a.m. Welcome and Introductory Remarks**
  - *Transportation and demographic trends*
  - *Stakeholder interview results*
  - *Gap analysis – where is transit coordination needed?*
- **9:45 a.m. Break**
- **10:00 a.m. Small Group Discussion**
  - *Review the draft purpose statement and goals and objectives*
  - *Validate opportunities for regional transit service coordination*
  - *Identify potential challenges and constraints*
- **11:00 a.m. Report Back to Larger Group**
- **11:30 a.m. Wrap Up and Next Steps**

Maggie explained the room layout and said that the small groups would be pre-determined, in order to ensure each group had representatives from throughout the study area. This will help ensure the participants all hear the transit needs of the entire region, reinforcing the purpose of the roundtable as both educational and data gathering.

For the transit roundtable, the consultant team will prepare the presentation materials, maps, name tags and agendas.

**JSC Meeting #3 Attendees November 17, 2010:**

<b><u>NAME</u></b>	<b><u>AGENCY</u></b>
Brandy Heilman	URS
Laura Lutz	URS
Sean Saffle	URS
Amy Klinedinst	URS
Jeff Glisson	RRTA
Dennis Louwerse	BARTA
Michael Golembiewski	BCPC
Bill Parkin	CAT
Richard Schmoyer	ACOPD
Beth Nidam	YCPC
Rich Farr	YCTA
Steve Deck	PB
Maggie Mund	PB
Ryan Furgerson	Michael Baker