

RTCS Joint Study Committee Meeting #2
October 12, 2010
1:00 p.m.
Commuter Services of PA Offices – York, PA

Anna Lynn Smith reviewed the meeting agenda and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to update the JSC on work accomplished on three major tasks as defined in the project scope.

Mapping

Anna Lynn first reviewed the mapping efforts that had been underway. There were several maps displayed around the room. These maps were:

- Current and projected population density
- Current jobs density
- Origin-destination by county
- Percent driving alone
- Land use – current and future developed areas

The population and job density maps looked very similar, as both showed clustering of population and employment centers around the major cities and towns in the study area, surrounded by considerable undeveloped land.

Through the use of charts and maps, Anna Lynn demonstrated that population growth for the region varied from 4.7% to 32.4%, and the team had computed an overall regional population growth rate of 21.4% between 2000 and 2030. As shown most clearly on the Population Change map, the southern and eastern counties are projected to experience the most population growth between 2010 and 2040. Employment projections were not done.

Before explaining the Origin –Destination map shown on the wall, which summarized journey to work data by county, Anna Lynn showed a progression of maps on power point slides. The maps showed a clear decrease in the number of trips between two points as the number of people making it increased. Anna Lynn then pointed out the Origin Destination map by county, which showed the number of residents commuting outside of their boundaries for work as well as the number of employee residents who stay within their own county. Anna Lynn characterized three counties as “destination or employment” counties and the remainder as bedroom communities. The three destination counties are Dauphin, York and Cumberland. Discussion followed on what an appropriate threshold would be for running bus service, and Anna Lynn would work with the project team and other MPOs such as DVRPC and SPC to obtain an appropriate range.

While the percent of people driving alone varies by census tract, most of the map indicated a percentage of 81% and higher driving alone. Interestingly, parts of Perry, Dauphin, and Lancaster counties had the lowest percent driving alone, not due to the use of mass transit, but more so carpooling and agriculture.

The last map to be reviewed was the current and projected land use. Like the origin and destination data, this map needed some massaging before it got to its current form. Steve Deck explained some of the issues associated with compiling this map. First, all the county land use classifications were different, so establishing a common nomenclature and framework was difficult. Second, three of the counties had no projected land use, and those that did had different horizon years. This led to a simplified map showing developed and undeveloped land, both today and projected into the future. Instead of using the individual counties growth rates where available, the State Data Center's growth rates were used for consistency sake.

Steve pointed out that the projected development outpaced the population growth and attributed it to declining household size, which results in more houses being built for the same number of people. Dick Schmoyer said there were several trends mitigating the decline in household size. Because of the economic downturn, some households were growing as new college graduates and other family members can't find employment, and retirees can't afford to live independently. This situation would be acknowledged in the summary report for the existing conditions and trends task. All agreed that we are planning in a most dynamic time, and that the approach taken for the land use map was correct.

Public Outreach

Discussion then turned to the public outreach tasks. Maggie Mund briefly explained the purpose of the Public Involvement Plan in terms of the 4 Rs of Public Involvement: Research, Relationships, Resources, and Results. The public involvement plan explains how these 4 components are organized to achieve the goals of the plan.

Anna Lynn Smith reported the status of the stakeholder interviews. So far, 29 of 45 interviews have been conducted. Interviewees represent chambers of commerce, tourism bureaus, economic development agencies, and some employers. Most had never thought about the need for regional transit coordination, and 27 corridors of interest were identified to-date. Many of the interviewees expressed interest in participating in the transit roundtable.

Anna Lynn explained that several stakeholders identified on the original list were not interested in participating in the interviews. They had not responded to requests for interviews. She asked that members of the committee notify the consultant with additional names for interviews and/or the first Transit Roundtable.

Maggie Mund explained preliminary plans for the transit roundtable, which is conceived as an opportunity to engage the larger stakeholder community in the transit coordination discussion. Possible additions to the JSC members and interested interviewees are representatives of employers, politicians (county commissioners/clerks) and intercity bus providers that serve the region. The JSC also identified large developers, ULI--Harrisburg Chapter, realtors and chambers of commerce representatives as potential invitees. PB will send out a notice to the JSC members for their recommendations. JSC members will send out the invitations, which will be designed and provided electronically to them by PB.

Two possible venues for the roundtable were suggested: HACC and the Central Penn Business College. Steve Deck will look into scheduling the facility. The target week was set as December 6-10.

Information to be presented at the transit roundtable includes:

- Study purpose and goals
- Stakeholder interview results
- Demographic and transportation trends
- Transit Service Gap Analysis

Following the presentations, participants will work in small groups to develop a draft list of regional corridors/routes of interest. Dennis Louwerse emphasized the importance of the roundtables as a part of an educational process for stakeholders and it was agreed that a one-page summary of activities would be prepared for the attendees to review in advance of the event.

Finally, Maggie said the team would update the project website to post the completed maps, a brief summary of the stakeholder interviews, and announce the transit roundtable.

Next Steps

- Conclude stakeholder interviews and share findings with JSC
- Prepare for first Transit Roundtable
- Share 'corridors of interest' with JSC for review
- Reach out to transit agencies to identify potential routes for coordination
- Update project website

NEXT MEETING --November 17 at 10:30 AM at Commuter Services to prepare for Transit Roundtable.**JSC Attendees October 12, 2010:**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>
Brandy Heilman	URS
Sean Saffle	URS
Sherri Clayton	Franklin County Planning (RPO)
Jeff Glisson	RRTA
Harriet Parcels	LCPC
Dennis Louwerse	BARTA
Teri Giurintano	COLT
Tim Reardon	TCRPC
Michael Golembiewski	BCPC
Bill Parkins	CAT
Richard Schmoyer	ACOPD
Beth Nidam	YCPC
Rich Farr	YCTA
Dave Kilmer	RRTA
Andrew Smart	geographIT
Anna Lynn Smith	PB
Steve Deck	PB
Maggie Mund	PB
Ryan Furgerson	Michael Baker