



McCormick, Taylor & Associates, Inc.
Engineers and Planners



MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

DATE: July 22, 2003

MEETING DATE: June 19-20, 2003

PLACE: Leola Family Restaurant

SUBJECT: PA 23 EIS
Land Use Visioning Conference #2

ATTENDEES: See Attached

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss potential land use scenarios linked to the PA 23 EIS study transportation alternatives. Lancaster County forecasts of population and employment growth show that the municipalities in the study area will see continued growth and can expect increased development pressure regardless of whether a transportation improvement is constructed. In response to the strong interest from Lancaster County and local communities, Land Use Planning continues to be an important component of the EIS study, and was the focus of the second Visioning Conference. Municipal officials, community advisory committee members and representatives from state and federal regulatory agencies were invited to review the latest work of the land use studies and to provide the EIS study team with their perspectives about how to manage the future growth forecast for the study area.

Local land use decisions are ultimately the responsibility of municipal officials and the communities they serve. However, the EIS study provides a great opportunity to discuss how future development might change study area communities and explore strategies to manage future growth in the PA 23 EIS study area. Conference participants were asked to provide feedback and recommendations about what future development patterns are more or less acceptable, and what strategies need to be put in place to manage future growth. These recommendations will be considered as the study team refines the land use scenarios.

Day One

1. Opening & Introductions – Mark Malhenzie (MM), the PENNDOT Project Manager opened the conference and welcomed the group. MM emphasized the importance of the land use component of the PA 23 EIS study, describing it as the most extensive integration to date of land use planning within a PENNDOT transportation study's scope of work. He noted that the study team had narrowed the list of transportation improvement alternatives. The purpose of the conference was to discuss the land

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 2 of 9

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

June 18 & 20, 2003

use implications of these alternatives and to consider planning strategies that would help maintain the quality of life for these communities.

Lancaster County Commissioner Pete Shaub (PS) also welcomed the participants and thanked them for contributing their time. He stated that the land use planning initiatives that are part of the EIS study and the Eastern Lancaster County Land Use Study (ELCLUS) are vitally important to maintaining quality of life in Eastern Lancaster County. PS stated that Lancaster County wants to have land use planning measures in place before construction begins, should a transportation improvement alternative be selected. He also reminded the group that the MPO will be looking for municipal buy-in to the land use strategies as this study progresses.

L. Bert Cossaboon, MTA (LC) described the anticipated outcome of the conference. He invited conference participants to look at the potential future development scenarios related to the No-Build and three build alternatives. LC asked participants to share their perspectives regarding the pros and cons of future development patterns, how development must be managed, and what growth management strategies must be in place to shape future growth in a positive way. He stated that the conference feedback and recommendations would be reported at the next public meeting and would be considered by the team as the study moves forward.

2. Land Use Update – Dave Royer, Lancaster County Planning Commission (DR) provided an update regarding the ELCLUS project. Through close coordination with its stakeholders, the ELCLUS team has identified four goals for its study area, that include Agricultural Preservation, Livable Communities, Natural and Cultural Resource Conservation and Transportation Safety and Efficiency. To help implement these goals, the study team has developed a toolbox of growth management strategies, and is working on an action plan to implement the goals. In addition, they are working with the County to identify municipal training courses that can be held to help build the skills that local officials need to manage growth.

Matt Bennett (MB) provided a brief review of what was presented and the results of the first Visioning Conference, and discussed the feedback that was received at the August 2002 public meeting. Conference participants were concerned about maintaining an agrarian landscape and stated their interest in planning measures that would keep future development out of farmland. Members of the public were interested in maintaining their quality of life and worried that local planning measures could be overturned by subsequent elected officials.

3. Transportation Alternatives Update – Deborah Scherkoske, KCI (DS) reported on the transportation alternatives. She reviewed the project needs and showed how PENNDOT determined that the Widening Option 1 Alternative, the Bareville Connector Alternative, and the Southern Alternative would be studied in more detail. This presentation included details about engineering design and the environmental impacts of each alternative.

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 3 of 9

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

June 18 & 20, 2003

4. Future Development Scenarios – Joseph Bucovetsky, MTA (JB) related how Lancaster County’s population and employment forecasts for the EIS design year of 2030 were translated into how much acreage would be required to house and provide job locations for this projected increase in residents and workers. Regardless of whether a transportation alternative is selected for the PA 23 EIS study area, the communities will continue to see new growth and development.

JB described how the team constructed future development scenarios to compare the impacts of each transportation improvement alternative as it relates to land use issues. The No-Build and Widening Option 1 were examined together since Widening Option 1 does not introduce a new roadway and does not increase the through capacity of PA 23. All of the scenarios represented the same population and employment increase. The differences between the Trend and the Growth Management Scenarios result from the location and density of new development.

For both the Trend and the Growth Management Scenarios, potential future development was depicted using colored chips representing ten acres of residential (yellow), commercial (red) and industrial (purple) uses. We also used some 2.5-acre residential and commercial chips to represent subdivisions of farm parcels.

The Trend Development Scenarios show a potential future development pattern that could occur based on current trends, and in light of the characteristics of each transportation alternative. It places half of all new residential development outside designated (ELANCO North and South) and pending (Conestoga Valley) growth areas, and at a lower density than inside the growth areas. This development pattern could consume the following acreage:

New Residential Development Inside Growth Areas (Acres)	386
New Residential Development Outside Growth Areas (Acres)	798
New Commercial & Industrial Development (Acres)	569
Total Acreage for New Development	1753

The Growth Management Development Scenarios attempt to show a future growth pattern that is more in line with what the communities have said they want, and with Lancaster County’s Comprehensive Plan. This includes a linear pattern of development along existing PA 23, a sentiment recorded at the first Visioning Conference and the Public Meeting. The Growth Management Scenarios also achieve the location of eighty percent of new development inside the growth areas and at a higher density than in the Trend Development Scenario. This development pattern could consume the following acreage:

New Residential Development Inside Growth Areas (Acres)	470
New Residential Development Outside Growth Areas (Acres)	320
New Commercial & Industrial Development (Acres)	569
Total Acreage for New Development	1359

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 4 of 9

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

June 18 & 20, 2003

Jeff Greene, ORA, (JG) described the assumptions that were used in his qualitative sketch analysis of the traffic implications for the Trend Development Scenarios and the Growth Management Development Scenarios. The analysis was done using industry guidelines (ITE Trip Generation Manual) of how many vehicle trips are generated by different land uses. JG related that the increases in trips that result from development are not always bad, especially if they occur as part of an adopted land use strategy. The difference between good and bad traffic is that good traffic occurs based on planning but bad traffic is traffic that has not been planned.

MB and JG described the highlights of the Trend Development Scenarios and Growth Management Development Scenarios for each of the transportation alternatives. MB described the potential future development patterns shown on the mapping. Generally, the growth management approach moved more of the potential future development into the Growth Areas and out of the farmland. This move was also accompanied by an increase in residential density (dwelling units per acre). The overall effect was to reduce the impact of future development on the agricultural landscape. JG reviewed the potential traffic implications of those development patterns, including the traffic that could potentially be generated in the vicinity of the new development. It was explained that by locating future development within or adjacent to urbanized areas, the Growth Management Scenarios could result in fewer trips along stretches of side roads in agricultural areas than if a Trend Scenario pattern of development occurred. This would mean that more trips would be concentrated near existing population and employment centers, which are generally more appropriate locations for these trips, than out in the agricultural areas where they are more likely to conflict with non-motorized and farm-related vehicles.

5. Growth Management Strategies – JB introduced a set of growth management tools that are a sub-set of the strategies that the ELCLUS team has prepared as its toolbox. The strategies range from strong agricultural zoning, which is prevalent in the EIS study area, to transfer of development rights, which exists in Lancaster County, but not within the study area. It will be through these strategies that local communities will control and maintain an acceptable future development pattern.

Day 2

6. Breakout Sessions – After opening comments, the conference participants were divided into three breakout groups to discuss the land use scenarios linked to the PA 23 EIS study transportation alternatives. These scenarios allocated future residential, commercial and industrial growth that could result from Lancaster County's projected increases in population and jobs in the study area. Participants were asked to move paper chips that corresponded to future residential, commercial and industrial growth to locations that they thought would be appropriate for that kind of development. In addition, participants discussed and recommended design changes for the transportation alternatives and the growth management strategies

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 5 of 9

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

June 18 & 20, 2003

that could help local officials direct growth in ways that maintain their communities' quality of life.

7. Group Reporting and Consensus – Each group presented the results of its discussions, including recommendations. A composite set of recommendations is included in Appendix A. Following the conference, the EIS land use team produced a revised Growth Management Scenario for each of the transportation alternatives that reflects the changes recommended by participants. Copies of these maps have been included with this summary. Please refer to these graphics as you read Appendix A.
8. Next Steps – The project team will consider the group's input as it moves forward with the land use studies. At the upcoming public meeting, the team will display the work done by the Visioning Conference participants and ask for additional feedback from the public.

We believe that the above accurately reflects a summary of the key points of discussion that transpired at this conference. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding, or further explanation pertinent to the purpose of the land use component of this discussion is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Matt Bennett mbennett@mta.biz within ten (10) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this transcript.

CC: CAC Members
Project Team
Steering Committee

Appendix A: Results from Breakout Sessions

The following material represents a compilation of stakeholder feedback gathered from the breakout sessions. It has been organized under the categories: location of potential future development; highway design elements; and growth management strategies: (Make sure the point is made that these are the opinions of the participants and not the project team)

A. Location of Potential Future Development

1. Potential future development was moved out of farmland and into Urban Growth Areas, clustered in or near existing town and village centers.
2. If a new road is built, commercial or industrial development should not occur at its interchanges, or along the roads that would connect it to existing PA 23. Future development should be located along existing PA 23 for the use of local residents.
3. Residential "chips" moved into the Urban Growth Areas from outside its boundaries were clustered to form denser residential areas north of existing PA 23 in New Holland, Leola, and in pockets on the east and west sides of Manheim. Most groups favored overt clustering of anticipated residential development in some form of Traditional Neighborhood Development, often with accompanying neighborhood retail.
4. Some commercial chips were placed amongst residential chips to serve the commercial needs and create walkable communities, thereby potentially reducing the number of vehicle trips along PA 23.
5. Several commercial chips were placed in generally industrial areas, to reflect the trend of business parks opening to draw some of the larger farm-based businesses out of the agricultural land.
6. A few commercial chips were split into 2.5-acre chips and placed in the agricultural areas representing anticipated and continued growth of farm-based industries.
7. Industrial development was clustered in current industrial areas south of existing PA 23 in Leola and New Holland, as well as around the current industrial area of East Lampeter.

B. Highway Design Elements

No-Build/Widening Option 1 Alternative

1. Concerns about the safety of this alternative, including getting on, off and across the widened highway.
2. Support for maintaining on-street parking in villages. Seen as important for local businesses to survive. It could be lost in some places for left turn lanes, which would be helpful.
3. Connect parallel roads and, if possible, acquire new rights of way for new parallel local roads to get trips off of existing PA 23; improve lateral circulation; and possibly remove the need for a bypass or new roadway.
4. Incorporate traffic calming in village areas to make existing PA 23 safer.

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 7 of 9

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

June 18 & 20, 2003

Bareville and Southern Alternatives

5. Support for a narrower median.
6. The arterial version better preserves the visual character of the landscape. Freeway option will create a much greater visual impact.
7. The Bareville Connector will only address the western half of the corridor. A real solution will address traffic problems in New Holland and should be extended east past Shady Maple to meet PA 625 or end west of Blue Ball.
8. Concern that alternatives will encourage additional traffic into the study area from the south.
9. A new road could encourage development between existing and a newly constructed PA 23.
10. Good land use management will lessen traffic issues and possibly eliminate the need for a new road.
11. Perceive that using PA 322 and US 222 to bypass PA 23 takes about the same amount of time as traveling PA 23.

Intersections/Interchanges

12. Less interchanges will reduce development pressure.
13. Signalized intersections at grade are a better idea because of the preponderance of local trips throughout the corridor.
14. Consider north only exits at interchanges to funnel traffic toward existing PA 23.
15. Use the existing infrastructure e.g. Goat Path and PA 772 interchange rather than new interchanges
16. A Ranck Road interchange should allow east/west access only.
17. Concerned about impact of interchange at PA 772 on Monterey, Intercourse and farmland in the area.
18. Prefer PA 772 interchange to an interchange at Horseshoe Road because the infrastructure and grading already exists there.
19. Investigate building an access road between Farmland and Maple to handle existing truck traffic and discourage development at new PA 23/PA 772 intersection
20. A Willow Road interchange is not necessary, since it is so close to US 30 and could overwhelm the school along Horseshoe Road.

C. Growth Management Strategies

Access Management and Roadway Issues

1. Use access management techniques to consolidate and direct driveways that result from new development to side roads rather than along existing PA 23.
2. Consider consolidating existing driveways along PA 23 into clustered driveways with access to side roads.

Farmland Preservation

3. Make Agricultural Security Areas available in all study area municipalities since it is a required first step toward joining the County's farmland preservation easement program.

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 8 of 9

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

June 18 & 20, 2003

4. Allow farmland preservation easements adjacent to the Urban Growth Areas, (which is not currently encouraged by preservation advocates), in order to forever protect important farms and view sheds that are right next to the growth areas and that could be impacted if it is determined that the UGB should be expanded.

Farm-Related Businesses

5. Continue to allow farm subdivisions for farm-based businesses only, not for additional residential or other forms of commercial development.
6. Amend zoning to allow farm-based businesses as they are needed to keep area farms in business and thereby preserve farmland and open space.
7. Establish thresholds regarding the size and impact of these farm-based businesses and upon crossing the threshold, condition permitting and other government interaction on the business locating in specially developed, located and planned farm-business industrial parks.

Zoning

8. Zone out development at new interchanges if new roadway(s) are built.
9. Prohibit, through zoning and in conjunction with access management strategies, new development along connector roads between existing Rt. 23 and new alternatives.
10. Allow and encourage mixing of uses through zoning codes in village centers and along existing Rt. 23 in order to support urban growth areas and to encourage walkable communities, mass transit and to preserve farms and open space.
11. Encourage traditional neighborhood development (TND) through model zoning ordinance identical in various townships throughout the study area and county.
12. Write new study-area wide commercial zoning ordinances that limit the amount of square feet per establishment to zone out large "category-killers" and their attendant traffic impacts and parking demands.

Urban Growth Areas

13. Coordinate the assemblage of areas suitable for redevelopment and revitalization within the growth areas as part of efforts to prevent development of green fields.
14. Earmark holding areas within the Urban Growth Areas for certain time periods or uses in order to optimize its use, provide buffering between incompatible uses located within it as well as stagger development pressure throughout the growth area.
15. Place all future non-agricultural uses within the UGB but remember the need for a loophole related to farm-based businesses.

Better Inter-Municipal Cooperation and Support

16. Share information about effective zoning ordinances.
17. Coordinate Capital Budgets to comprehensively plan public works and optimize corridor-wide public spending, including coordinating impact fees to pay for water, sewer and road infrastructure.
18. Develop a fund to defend against developer-originated lawsuits over denied development that will have negative impacts within and across township borders.

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 9 of 9

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

June 18 & 20, 2003

-
19. Attend zoning hearing board and permitting meetings to demonstrate public and civil support for “good” projects and support the denial of permits for projects that are not in the public’s interest.
 20. Lobby for additional changes to the Municipal Planning Code to support more regional and multi-municipal controls and funding opportunities.

Official Map

21. Develop Official Maps to set priorities, articulate the intended location of new roads, prioritize development areas and support the growth areas.

Transfer of Development Rights

22. Create a regional Transfer’s of Development Rights (TDR) mechanism to focus the location of new development where the community desires it, and to increase density in village centers and other desired places. This program would also provide a source for compensation to individual landowners without developing their land.

Federal/State Agencies Attendees

Mike Dombroskie, US Army Corp of
Engineers

Deborah Suciu-Smith, Federal Highway
Administration

Neil Kinsey, PA Department of Community
and Economic Development

John Blacksmith, PA Department of
Environmental Protection

Colleen Brown, PENNDOT Bureau of
Design

Mark Lombard, PENNDOT Environmental
Quality Assurance Division

Ralph Zampogna, PENNDOT Environmental
Quality Assurance Division

Mark Lombard, PENNDOT Environmental
Quality Assurance Division

Rob Linn, PENNDOT Environmental Quality
Assurance Division

Todd Lutte, PENNDOT Environmental
Quality Assurance Division

Lisa Wassel, PENNDOT Program Center

Lancaster County Attendees

Commissioner Pete Shaub

Chris Neuman

Glenn Taggart

Dave Royer

Trish Lang

Carole Wilson

Randy Heilman

Mary Frey

Municipal Attendees

John Bare, East Lampeter

Sylvan Fisher, West Earl

Richard Fulcher, New Holland

Stephen Gabriel, Upper Leacock

Lisa Greaves, Manheim

Clyde Martin, East Earl

Joe Shriver, East Earl

Fred Wissler, Earl

Gloria Hollinger, Earl

Charles Benner, Upper Leacock

Jim Dum, Upper Leacock

Richard Stover, West Earl

Dale Schmitz, East Lampeter
Bob Terry, New Holland

Community Advisory Committee

John Bare
Henry Bieler
Herman Bontrager
Mary Clinton
William Ebel
Sylvan Fisher
Richard Fulcher
Stephen Gabriel
Lisa Greaves
Neil Kinsey
Frank Ludwig
Clyde Martin
Michael Middleton
Heidi Shellenger
Joe Shriver
Karen Weibel
Fred Wissler

Project Team Attendees

Mark Malhenzie, PENNDOT Project Manager
Deb Scherkoske, Consultant Project Manager
Todd Baylson
Matt Bennett, AICP
Matt Best, PE
Joseph Bucovetsky, AICP
L. Bert Cossaboon, AICP
John Derr, PE
Gus Drizos, AICP
Jeff Greene, PE
Deb Hoover
Stacey Hostetler
Sharon Maclean
Rob Nuss, PE
Eileen Pauletta
Christie Perry, PENNDOT
Nancy Zobl - ELCLUS
David Rouse - ELCLUS