

Appendix A

Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Tuesday, May 10, 2016
9:00 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on May 10, 2016 at 9:00 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager

Sara Pandl, Township Planner

Annie McGeary, TIFAC

Brent McNabb, TIFAC

Jack Tibbets, TIFAC

Dale Dries, TIFAC

Mike Seislove, TIFAC

Don Denberg, TIFAC

Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor

Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers, Township Engineer

Adam Supplee, KMS Design Group

Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering

Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Doug Brown, President of the Board of Commissioners

Ron Beitler, Township Commissioner

Not present: John Hayes, TIFAC

Bruce Fosselman opened the meeting, expressing gratitude to the Committee members for their service. Attendees introduced themselves. Bruce suggested that a committee chairperson be selected. Don Denberg, who served in that capacity during the previous Act 209 study, was nominated and elected. Bruce mentioned that the TIFAC should meet annually or biannually to evaluate the allocation of collected Act 209 fees.

Meeting Minutes

May 10, 2016

Page 2

Joe Fiocco provided an overview of Act 209 legislation as well as an outline of steps to be taken to complete the new study. These include identification of transportation service areas (TSA). In the previous study, two service areas were identified, and were noted as the east and west TSAs. The TIFAC will have to determine if any changes will be made regarding the scope of intersections and the limits of the TSAs.

Joe explained that the committee will identify a peak hour to be studied. Typically, the weekday evening peak hour is selected. Traffic data collection will be done to determine existing levels of congestion. Then, background growth will be added to the volumes, along with volumes from approved developments within Lower Macungie Township as well as from adjacent municipalities. Joe noted that the township cannot assess new developers with costs of improvements that become necessary because of previous development and/or background growth.

Joe stated that the committee will need to identify a reasonable level of service goal. Joe indicated that Adam Supplee would be working to identify and predict development that may occur over the next ten years. By adding anticipated traffic from that development to area roadway traffic volumes, the team will identify required improvements and costs associated with those improvements. These costs and the number of anticipated additional trips will be used to determine a fair share cost contribution to be assessed to new development within the Township (based on the cost per peak hour trip.)

Joe explained that the money collected in the one TSA must be spent in that TSA, at the identified intersections. The improvements do not need to be the same as what was identified in the previous study, but there are constraints on the spending. It must be done within the required timeframe, or developers may request that their contributions be returned.

Don asked if we could identify new intersections in the study; Joe responded that yes, we can. Joe suggested that we keep the study areas the same to make the tracking of funds simpler, but we can identify new intersections within each TSA.

Meeting Minutes

May 10, 2016

Page 3

Ann asked if monies collected under the previous Act 209 study could be used on new intersections within an area; Joe stated that they cannot be used this way.

Sara asked if we needed separate “pots of money” for each area for the previous study and the new one. Joe indicated that yes, separating the money is necessary if we create new study areas.

Bruce asked about the timeframe for spending funds collected under the previous study. Joe explained that the Township has 13 years in which to spend the money. Since the original study was started in 2007, the monies must be spent by 2020.

Joe pointed out that the funds may be used to convince PennDOT to do larger improvements. The money can be contributed as matching funds for projects.

Dale asked Bruce how much money has been collected to date. Bruce said he will have that information available at the next meeting.

Don stated that the assessment of the fee is currently used as a bargaining tool; it is not always assessed. Joe responded that a developer can sometimes accomplish the work more quickly and more cost effectively than a government agency, so this is sometimes reasonable.

Sara pointed out that several improvements along the Route 100 and Hamilton Boulevard corridors have been done by developers.

Jack asked Bruce if any of the money collected under the previous study had been spent. Bruce said he didn't think so.

Jack asked if any of the improvements from the previous study had been implemented, and if there were any other changes.

Adam indicated that the team will identify what new development has taken place since the 2007 study, and that will determine how accurate the previous predictions were.

Meeting Minutes

May 10, 2016

Page 4

Alan explained that there were two large developments that were not foreseen in the previous study: Spring Creek Properties and Hamilton Crossings. These were not factored into the study.

Sara asked if frontage improvements (shoulder, sidewalk) could be included in the Act 209 improvements. Joe responded that all improvements must be capacity driven.

Adam asked if road widening would be included. Joe said if a lane is added to increase capacity, that could be included.

Don asked if giving right of way would be included. Joe responded that if additional right of way permits the implementation of a capacity improvement, then it could be included.

Sara pointed out that as we moving forward, we want to try to have a balance, to potentially limit development. We need to consider this in establishing the level of service criteria.

Joe mentioned that a safety improvement may be incorporated by the committee, along with a capacity improvement. The money must be spent on capacity, but these improvements may have the effect of improving safety as well.

Sara asked how heavy vehicles (i.e., trucks) are incorporated into the analysis. Joe responded, stating that SAFE will count the heavy vehicles separately, and include this in our analysis.

Don pointed out that the Act 209 fee per trip is the same for cars and trucks. Joe agreed, stating that all trips are not created equal. Joe will consider this and research it.

Don said that the order and priority of projects to be completed is determined by the Township. Bruce said that they are working on the 5 year Capital Plan, and it is likely that the Township will begin to spend funds next year; the intersection of Indian Creek Road and Brookside Road would be the first to be looked at.

Joe mentioned that SAFE has begun data collection at the 28 intersections previously included in the study. Eight intersection counts are left to be counted. All data collection should be done during the school year. The SAFE proposal was written as a time and materials contract with a not to exceed limit. SAFE anticipates that there will be opportunities for savings to the Township, which would allow for more flexibility in studying additional intersections. The existing conditions analysis can be utilized to determine where improvements are most needed today and can be used to help the Township prioritize spending.

Bruce asked Alan to discuss the new signal programming along Hamilton Boulevard. Alan mentioned that Hamilton Boulevard has been having problems since the bypass opened. Alan described the adaptive signal control that will be established along the Hamilton Boulevard corridor. The Insync program is intended to resolve these problems. Joe and Alan discussed the characteristics of the system, including an increased cycle length which sacrifices some side street capacity in order to make the major street movements more efficient.

Adam asked Alan when the system would be fully functional. Alan said it was to be in the middle of August, but this schedule had assumed a full roll-out of the center at one time. The anticipated roll-out has been modified and may take up to 6 months.

Adam asked if the system would provide real time count data. Alan explained that yes, it has a capacity to store 30 days of data.

Mike asked if, in terms of the Township's Board of Commissioners deciding how to spend the money, they can consider new intersections only, or can the previously studied intersections be revisited. Joe said the committee can make recommendations for the study intersections and the money can be spent on those.

Jack asked if any of the planned improvements from the previous study had been implemented so far. Sara said she and Alan would identify completed improvements for the next meeting.

Meeting Minutes

May 10, 2016

Page 6

Sara said that Brookside Road would be getting adaptive signal timing as well, but there is currently not any development funding those improvements.

Joe said that the next meeting would be the time to look at the “nuts and bolts” of the study. We will plan to discuss intersections, and determine if other study data is available. Sara said that in the eastern portion, Hamilton Boulevard from I-78 to the bypass is included in the TIP, and Keystone did some modeling for that. Alan said that the purpose for the modeling was to identify long term improvements that are developer driven. Alan said Keystone will provide SAFE with graphics showing traffic count data used in the modeling.

Don asked if the three reports done last time would be done in the same sequential order. He asked if there were any big zoning changes since the last study. Sara said that the Comprehensive Plan is ongoing, and there is a lot of “development pressure”. Specifically, she mentioned that it is difficult to know how the Jaindl property will be used. Alan explained that this property has a cap on the number of weekday evening peak hour trips that can be generated. Nothing is open yet. Don described this decision as a result of a unique complicated process that included lots of discussion about how this was to be managed. Alan explained that the Township decided to require that the ultimate improvements be done ahead of the opening to limit the disruptions to traffic as the volumes grow.

Joe asked if there was a list of planned improvements. Alan said there was. Joe asked for a copy of the list including planned improvements (driven by PennDOT and development) for the next ten years.

Adam said his next step is to meet with Sara to identify new developments approved. He commented that there is a great deal of GIS data.

Joe mentioned that Adam can develop a website to include information and documents for the Committee, including meeting minutes. Bruce noted that Renae Flexer from Lower Macungie may be able to setup a website within the Township system. They will look into this.

Meeting Minutes

May 10, 2016

Page 7

There was discussion regarding the scheduling of the next meeting. It was agreed that the next meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 11:00 AM. Bruce said he will advise John Hayes (who was absent) of the next meeting.

Joe recommended that the TIFAC refer to "Transportation Impact Fees, A Handbook for Pennsylvania's Municipalities" found at the following link:
<http://www.dot.state.pa.us/public/Bureaus/Cpdm/ImpactFees.pdf>

Bruce said he would copy this document for the Committee members.

These minutes are being sent to the meeting attendees via email. If any attendees notice omissions or needed corrections to the above, please send them to my attention within one week and I will modify and resend to attendees. If I do not receive comments, it will be assumed that the above is an accurate representation of the items discussed.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus

SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Tuesday, May 24, 2016
11:00 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on May 24, 2016 at 11:00 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager

Sara Pandl, Township Planner

Don Denberg, TIFAC Chairman

Annie McGeary, TIFAC

Brent McNabb, TIFAC

Jack Tibbets, TIFAC

Mick Seislove, TIFAC

Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor

Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers, Township Engineer

Adam Supplee, KMS Design Group

Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Doug Brown, President of the Board of Commissioners

Ron Beitler, Township Commissioner

Not present: John Hayes, TIFAC

Dale Dries, TIFAC

Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering

Don Denberg called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.

The meeting minutes from the previous meeting were distributed by email. Don asked for further corrections from the committee; there were none. Jack Tibbetts motioned for the approval of the minutes, Annie McGeary seconded the motion.

Meeting Minutes

May 24, 2016

Page 2

Don requested that an agenda be provided prior to the meeting to the TIFAC. He and Janet Stankus will coordinate agendas prior to future meetings.

Don would like to see something on the Township website providing information about the TIFAC. He would prefer not to have KMS establish a website, to be accessed through a link from the Township site. Bruce Fosselman indicated that the Township can provide the information on their website. Renae Flexer, who was in the room at the time, commented that it is possible, but she will need to approach the web hoster about this. Adam Supplee offered to collaborate to provide information as needed.

Adam asked if there was a need to create a "behind the scenes" website for the TIFAC's use. KMS can create an internal website that the committee can use to comment on draft reports, and to share information.

Don wanted to clarify that the meetings are being advertised, as outlined in the legislation. Bruce said that all meetings need to be advertised for this project and that today's meeting was advertised in the Free Press. He stated that he and Catherine Curcio, the Township solicitor, are handling the advertising. Don reiterated that there is a need to be meticulous with this.

Bruce asked Adam to explain the agenda for today's meeting. Adam would like to discuss the following:

- Identification of intersections to be studied
- What development is pending (approved)

Adam met with Sara Pandl last week to discuss any upcoming development, and they "roughed out" a list of planned developments.

Bruce provided an account of the Developers' Impact Fee Accounts as of December 31, 2015. This indicates that the following amounts have been collected since the previous Act 209 Study:

East \$259,262.96

West \$ 75,171.20

Total \$334,434.16

Don clarified that all improvements done thus far have not used the funds collected.

Meeting Minutes

May 24, 2016

Page 3

Bruce acknowledged that Don had requested a copy of the Transportation Impact Fee Handbook, which Bruce provided to all of the committee members. Don pointed out that the Act 209 legislation is also available online.

Adam referred to the handbook, which recommends gathering existing data, and looking at what has happened since the last report was conducted. Adam wanted to advise the committee of potential development, to ensure that all involved parties have the same information.

Adam met with Sara to establish a list of development that is not currently visible on maps and aerials we have. Sara said that she will review the list with Alan, and will refine the list to provide square footage, and list improvements associated with each project. Alan provided a spreadsheet he developed, entitled "Act 209 Discussion Points Improvements Made or In Progress". This lists the developers and improvements associated with their developments. It is not in its final form, as it will be refined to include identified improvements that were recommended as part of the previous Act 209 Study. Sara and Alan will populate more columns in the spreadsheets to estimate fees coming in and improvements. Adam said it would be helpful to merge the data on the two spreadsheets (the one listing development and the one listing improvements) into one document.

Adam clarified that until the new resolution is adopted, the Township can continue to impose the existing fee, and do not need to revert to the \$1000 per peak hour trip fee, which was applicable when the first study was conducted. Proposed developments that are approved between now and the approval of the new resolution are still subject to the previous Act 209 fee.

Sara, using an aerial photo image projected on a screen, listed proposed development and provided the status of each.

Grandview: This is a mixed use development at the corner of Route 100 and Gehman Road. This will consist of a Weis, two pad stores and 204 apartments. This development has been approved. Alan described improvements identified as #37-45 on his spreadsheet.

Stonehill Meadows: Sara described this as an approved "cluster project" with 106 single family homes with approximately 8,000 s.f. lots. This is unique in that 70%

Meeting Minutes

May 24, 2016

Page 4

of the land will remain open space. A trail connection will be provided. Alan indicated that this development will require an impact fee, and the developer is also paying for frontage improvements.

CVS: A sketch plan for the development at Willow Lane and Route 100 has been submitted to the Planning Commission. Alan indicated that they are adding a right turn lane. This is not listed on his spreadsheet because they have not yet submitted a preliminary plan.

Brent asked how the fee is calculated. Adam reviewed the steps involved. Brent asked about frontage improvements paid for by developers. Adam indicated that if an improvement is along the site frontage, it is considered to be an on-site improvement. This is not included in the calculation of the impact fee, and the developer will still be subject to that fee.

Sara pointed out that Hamilton Crossings development is implementing some of the improvements that were identified in the previous Act 209 study.

Don mentioned that for some projects, a larger study area needs to be included. Sara explained that PennDOT establishes the scope of study when a state highway is involved and can require that a larger area be analyzed beyond what the township may require.

Adam pointed out that this is not a multi-municipality study.

Don recalled that there was some discussion during the time of the previous study regarding the disparity between the impact fees of Lower and Upper Macungie Townships.

Adam said we must strike a balance moving forward. The Township doesn't want to scare developers away with an impact fee that is too large, but doesn't want to shortchange the Township, either.

Jack asked who coordinates the improvements. Alan responded, saying typically, one entity is on the "frontlines." If the Township collects funds, then it can spearhead the improvement. If a state road is involved, PennDOT can provide a permit to implement the improvement. A developer may spearhead an improvement as well.

The discussion returned to the list of approved developments.

Mack Truck: Sara indicated this is a small/minor expansion. Alan said there is a reduction in peak hour truck traffic, but they need to evaluate employee traffic as well. Sara asked about the distribution facility at Alburty Crossing. Alan indicated that along Schoeneck Road, utility poles are currently being relocated.

Lehigh Road Expansion: Alan described proposed expansion of Lehigh Road.

School District has a property which was purchased for a new school, but the school district is not likely to build a school there now. Jaindl sold the lot to the school district with right of first refusal. Sauerkraut Road will be extended through to Spring Creek development.

Sara identified some preserved farm land. Adam said we will look at all of this information to determine:

- What was built since the last study
- What is approved
- Where is development likely to occur
- What is preserved

Every township parcel will be classified in our study.

Sara said there is a lot of pressure to change agriculture zoning. The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission has a goal to save 25% of land for agriculture.

Adam noted that the Spring Creek parcels are listed individually on the spreadsheet. Alan indicated that there are improvements associated with the Spring Creek development along Spring Creek Road.

Brent asked what will happen to the farms beyond the Spring Creek properties. Sara said some have been preserved, including Hunsicker Farm.

Mick asked about the parcel next to Lutron, on Spring Creek Road. Sara said there are 70+ acres set aside for a future park.

In the east, Hamilton Crossing is under construction. Associated developments are shown on Alan's spreadsheet on page 3, #56-76. Alan reviewed the

Meeting Minutes

May 24, 2016

Page 6

improvements. Ethan Allen will have a new driveway with a signal. There are seven intersections that will be part of the new adaptive signal control system. There will be a collector/distributor road, known as "Hamilton Crossings Way" to provide access. This road is almost done.

Sara said that Liberty at Mill Creek/Uline contributed for adaptive signal control at four intersections, and one more is being considered. This is located mostly in Upper Macungie, between the bypass and Hamilton Boulevard, next to Mill Creek.

Bruce asked about the Audi dealership, which is paying a fee. Alan said this will not have a significant impact during the peak hour.

Anthony Property: is initiating a point of access study.

Sara pointed out that there is a potential for state funding for signal improvements at the "triangle" formed by I-476, US 222 and Hamilton Boulevard. Upper Macungie Township supports the improvements, and it is on the TIP.

Bieber Transportation: Sara said it is ideal to have a park and ride facility. Adam said we should definitely consider this. Alan said the property owner used to have access to Hamilton Boulevard.

Alan mentioned that the intersection of Route 222 and Mill Creek in Upper Macungie will experience some changes, but Bruce stated that all of Upper Macungie is outside of the scope of this study.

Sara proceeded to describe upcoming development:

Mill Creek: at Firestone, north of Lower Macungie Road, there will be up to four medical offices.

There is a church property (previously a roller skating rink) that may be developed as a Signature Senior care center on Lower Macungie Road.

Newton is a limited commercial development located next to the Masonic Lodge on Route 100.

Meeting Minutes

May 24, 2016

Page 7

At Cedar Crest and Lower Macungie Roads, there are 80 single family homes proposed. This property is owned by the hospital and is referred to as the Farr Tract.

Some Dorney Estate properties may be sold soon. The hospital was named as a trustee for these properties. Sara indicated that there are significant access and storm management issues along Cedar Crest Boulevard. Alan indicated that if PennDOT were to take on a corridor study, it would be for Cedar Crest Boulevard.

Indian Creek Development: Allen Street will have a signal.

Faith Evangelical/Italian Delight : may consolidate – Adam confirmed that this is separate from the Faith Evangelical Church Expansion listed on his spreadsheet.

Weiner Tract: Located at Lower Macungie and Brookside Roads, this 204 acre parcel is currently zoned residential.

Air Products owns a property behind Panera Bread on Hamilton Blvd that is currently undeveloped.

Sara said they are in the discussion phase to transfer development rights for use to another parcel. The Township hopes to preserve the Lichtenwold Farm, and is looking into obtaining development rights. The Township would like to create a list of parcels and map the locations to show parcels the Township is interested in acquiring. This includes golf courses.

Don recalled that Shepherd Hills was an issue last time. Sara said it was not approved; they took the Township to court, and narrowly lost.

The Township would like to identify “vulnerable properties”, which the Township is interested in preserving, but are currently zoned for development.

Annie asked about other land uses for these parcels, other than for recreation.

Bruce asked to set up a date for the next TIFAC meeting. Adam will work on developing the draft Land Use Assumptions Report in the meantime. He

Meeting Minutes

May 24, 2016

Page 8

indicated it will take 45-60 days to do so. The tentative date for the next meeting is set for Tuesday, July 19, 2016.

Adam asked about the Jaindl residential development off Mertztown Road. Sara said this is zoned, not yet planned. Alan said it was included in the previous Act 209 assumptions, with no access to Mertztown Road. Sara said the developer is paying an overall fee.

Sara discussed the Smooth-On worker housing project. Smooth-On took over the Daytimer Building. It may be developed as 20 twin residential units, to be leased by the workers of Smooth-On. Bruce pointed out that this is a good business for the Township.

Biet Simka: Sara said this development is anticipated relatively soon. It will consist of a synagogue with housing for a Rabbi and six families.

Adam reminded the TIFAC that it is very important to count all of the projects, even the small ones, as they cumulatively may have a significant impact.

Sara discussed the Air Products property on the east side of Mill Creek. It is zoned commercial and is owned by Liberty Property Trust.

A mosque is planned off Alburdis Road, near Schoeneck Road. This will involve two properties. They are expected to bring plans before the Zoning Board next month.

At the southwest corner of Alburdis Rd and Schoeneck Road, Jaindl owns a property that has yet to be developed.

At Alburdis Road and Orchard Road, David Jaindl owns a property that is zoned industrial.

Adam said he will need to filter the unknowns for various parcels with Sara and Alan. Then, input from the TIFAC will be required to determine where the Township is headed in the next ten years. It is anticipated that, eventually, development will slow down.

Meeting Minutes

May 24, 2016

Page 9

Mick asked how redevelopment is accounted for in the analysis. Adam said we will need to consider redevelopment potential within the Township. Alan pointed out that there are significant redevelopment opportunities along Hamilton Boulevard.

Brent said there is a lot of talk about property values increasing along Hamilton Boulevard as a result of development.

Bruce said that the Turnpike is expanding a bridge to double the existing width. Alan indicated that the staging of the project has not been established yet. Bruce's understanding is that the Turnpike will widen the bridges first, and then widen the roadways. The Township Planning Commission has expressed the need to keep one lane open during construction.

Annie mentioned the bottleneck created at the Cedar Crest Boulevard Bridge. Sara said it has the effect of limiting development in the area. Bruce agreed it is a long term problem. Alan said PennDOT is likely to say that the physical bridge is in good condition at this point, and they would therefore not consider modifications. Sara said they have spoken to PennDOT about Indian Creek Road, and it is not considered a safety issue, as there have been few crashes.

Bruce asked the consultants to identify tasks to be completed prior to the next meeting.

Adam said that KMS will set up a website for use by the TIFAC. The development spreadsheets will be posted, and the committee will be able to comment and provide input online. Adam will start the draft Land Use Assumptions Report. This will document assumptions regarding the level of development. At the next meeting, the assumptions will be defined and available for review by the committee.

Janet indicated that if the entire scope of intersections cannot be determined prior the end of the school year, seasonal adjustment factors may be applied to summer traffic count data to adjust volumes for use in the study.

Alan indicated that he has a list of intersections that he would recommend be removed or added to the list of intersections included in the previous Act 209 Study. Alan will email the list to Bruce, to be distributed to attendees.

Meeting Minutes

May 24, 2016

Page 10

Janet will provide Bruce with a schedule and list of anticipated meetings.

Don asked if the committee members had any further thoughts or input. Jack requested a map of the Township. Bruce will provide one.

The motion to adjourn was made by Jack, and was seconded by Annie. The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 PM.

These minutes are being sent to the meeting attendees via email. If any attendees notice omissions or needed corrections to the above, please send them to my attention within one week and I will modify and resend to attendees. If I do not receive comments, it will be assumed that the above is an accurate representation of the items discussed.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus

SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Tuesday, July 19, 2016
9:00 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on July 19, 2016 at 9:00 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager

Sara Pandl, Township Planner

Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman

Annie McGeary, TIFAC

Brent McNabb, TIFAC

Dale Dries, TIFAC

Mike Seislove, TIFAC

John Hayes, TIFAC

Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor

Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers, Township Engineer

Adam Supplee, KMS Design Group

Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Jack Tibbets, TIFAC

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. Annie McGeary made a motion to approve the minutes from the previous TIFAC meeting. Mick Seislove seconded the motion.

Meeting discussions began with Joe Fiocco discussing the current state of intersection improvements with the TIFAC and Alan Fornwalt. The discussion continued to determine which intersections will be included in the new study.

It was agreed that the proposed agenda for each future meeting would be added to the TIFAC website one week prior to the meeting date.

Meeting Minutes

July 19, 2016

Page 2

The main focus of the meeting was to review properties that are potentially vulnerable to land development or redevelopment in the next 10 years. The TIFAC reviewed a list of properties provided by KMS Design Group and viewed the sites on a map projected on the screen. The following list is the result of the detailed review of the list.

Description: Property Owner and Acreage	Determination by TIFAC: Is this likely to be developed in the next 10 years?
Behmer Property, 5.07 AC	Yes
DBS Holdings, 33.6 AC	Yes
RB Grange, 4.27 AC	Already approved for development, however no fees were collected for the site which was intended for a Home Depot; therefore, fees will be collected under the new study for this site.
Jones, 6.27 AC	Yes. Commercial or Industrial Development.
Air Products, 9.44 AC	Yes. Commercial or Industrial Development.
Air Products, 43.08 AC	Yes. Commercial or Industrial Development
Shepherd Hills Golf Course Community, 70+ acres	Undecided. This may potentially be developed into 100 new homes plus a 9-hole golf course. The TIFAC and staff will need to review this further.
Gorton, 4.6 AC	No. This will likely be protected or preserved from land development.
Deihl, 3.32 AC	Yes. Commercial Development
Housing along the north side of Church Lane	Yes. Will be developed/ redeveloped as residential/ mixed use
Ravenold Trust, 5.17 AC	Yes. Residential development.
Smith, 2 AC	No.
Gerkin, 3.56 AC	Yes. Likely developed as industrial.
Jaindl .57 AC	Yes. Likely developed as industrial.
Karma Ventures, 12.02 AC	No.

Meeting Minutes

July 19, 2016

Page 3

Double D Lehigh, 4.82 AC	Yes. Likely developed as residential.
Muse Properties, 8.5 AC	No. Likely will be preserved
SJC, 51.1 AC	No.
Dixon, 10.9	No. Likely will be preserved.
Jaindl properties, 11.9 AC, 52 AC, & 26.6 AC	No "vertical" development. This will likely be stormwater management, causing no trip generation.
Meldrum, 11.41 AC	No. This will likely be preserved.
Danweber Trust Properties, 100+ AC	Not within 10 years, but will likely be developed in the long term future.
Kline, 7.6 AC	No.
LoPresti, 10.5 AC	No.
Kernechel, 11.2 AC	No.
Jaindl, 36.6 AC (north of Hills at Lockridge)	Yes. Likely to be developed industrial along Alburdis Borough and developed residential to the south.
Jaindl, 13.6 AC (SW corner of Schoeneck Rd & Alburdis Rd)	Yes. Likely to be developed as industrial/warehouse.
Kirby Grace, 16.2 AC	Undetermined. Changes likely in the next 2 months.
Danweber Trust, 120+ AC	Not within 10 years, but will likely be developed in the long term future.
Geist, 17.8 AC & 25 AC	No.
Schenkel, 17.98AC & 85 AC	No.
East Penn School District, 107 AC (14 AC will revert to Jaindl)	Yes, but this parcel is grandfathered from traffic impact fees and therefore any potential new trips will need to be assumed as background trips.
Dries, 7.68 AC	Yes. Potential for redevelopment, likely commercial.
Buckeye Pipeline Property, 50.7 AC	Yes, likely tank farm expansion.
3135 Brookside Rd, 120.6 AC	Likely 50% of this will be developed as residential.
Lichtenwalner Farm, 133 AC	Likely 50% developed as residential.
Ashbrook, 21.36 AC	Yes. Likely developed as residential.

Meeting Minutes

July 19, 2016

Page 4

Bollinger (south of Indian Creek Rd, between I-476 and Cedarcrest Blvd)	Mostly outside Lower Macungie, already approved for 239 homes. Alan Fornwalt to give traffic study to TIFAC.
Tantaros Konstantinos, 13.06 AC	Yes. Likely will be developed as residential.
Reichard Trust, 12.4 AC	Yes. Likely will be developed as residential.
Dorney parcels, 107 AC	50% of this area will likely be developed as residential.
H.E. Holding Co, 68.7 AC	Yes, but if the hospital has control of the property, it will likely be developed as medical use.
Hamill, 15.23 AC	No. This will likely be preserved.
2050 Brookside Rd, LP, 16.4 AC	Yes. Likely cluster/mixed use development. A sketch plan exists for this project.
Faith Evangelical, 38.27 AC	Yes. Likely residential.
Browoski, Deibert, Gaumer parcels, 72.25 AC	Yes. Likely residential development.
<u>Small Properties along Hamilton Blvd</u>	
Jost, 0.91 AC	No.
Bear, 1.79 AC	No.
Hamilton Blvd & Schantz Rd intersection	Maybe 25-30% of these properties will be redeveloped.
Hamilton Blvd & Cedarbrook Rd intersection	25%-30% of these properties, Taylor Rental and vicinity, will likely be redeveloped in the next 10 years.
North of Brookside and Hamilton Blvd	Two small homes east of Wescosville Park possibly will be developed into a small retail shop.
Bear medical site (SE of N. Krocks and Hamilton Blvd)	Likely a new medical office.
3 parcels NE corner of N. Krocks and Hamilton Blvd	Yes. Potentially redeveloped into commercial/ retail.
NW corner of Hamilton and N. Krocks	Yes. This will likely double the size of the

	current retail shopping center.
Mobile home park NW of N. Krocks and Hamilton Blvd	Yes. This will likely be redeveloped as commercial.
All parcels surrounded by New Street, Quince Street, Broad Street	Yes. Will likely be redeveloped as mixed use, commercial, residential.

Other discussion:

The TIFAC committee members requested that the project team upload a high resolution map of the Township with street names and parcel lines to the internal use website for further review.

The TIFAC agreed that we should password protect the internal use website for password only access. Access should be granted only to the TIFAC, LMT staff members and the consultant project team, and any others specifically identified by the TIFAC for access.

Discussion regarding intersections which should be included and excluded from the study continued. It was decided that Joe Fiocco will produce an analysis with his recommendations as to which intersections should be included in the new study.

Next Meetings:

- Tuesday, August 30th, 9:00 AM
- Tuesday, September 27th, 9:00 AM
- Tuesday October 18th, present LUAR recommendations at the Planning Commission workshop
- Thursday October 20th, 7:00 PM, Present LUAR Recommendations at the Board of Commissioners Meeting

These minutes are being sent to the meeting attendees via the TIFAC website, with notification of the posting provided via email. If any attendees notice omissions or needed corrections to the above, please send them to the attention of Janet Stankus within one week and we will modify and resend to attendees. If

Meeting Minutes

July 19, 2016

Page 6

we do not receive comments, it will be assumed that the above is an accurate representation of the items discussed.

Respectfully prepared by:

Adam Supplee

KMS Design Group LLC



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Tuesday, August 30, 2016
9:00 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on August 30, 2016 at 9:00 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Sara Pandl, Township Planner

Don Denberg, TIFAC Chairman

Annie McGeary, TIFAC

Brent McNabb, TIFAC

Mick Seislove, TIFAC

John Hayes, TIFAC

Dale Dries, TIFAC

Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor

Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers, Township Engineer

Adam Supplee, KMS Design Group

Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering

Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager

Jack Tibbets, TIFAC

Don Denberg called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. Don asked if there were any modifications proposed for the agenda. Don distributed copies of the "Township of Lower Macungie Traffic Impact Fee Advisory Committee Rules and Regulations for the Conduct of Public Meetings Pursuant to the Sunshine Act", adopted May 19, 2009 for review by the TIFAC members. He suggested that the attendees review the document prior to the next meeting. He asked that public comment be added to the agenda for subsequent meetings. John Hayes made the motion, which was seconded by Brent McNabb.

Meeting Minutes

August 30, 2016

Page 2

Adam Supplee presented the draft findings of the Land Use Assumptions Report (LUAR). He explained how the population projections were developed, and noted that while KMS and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission projections are based on different sets of data, the projections are generally consistent among the two. Adam reviewed the proposed developments, and provided a breakdown of how much development is anticipated for residential and various non-residential uses, including medical, commercial, industrial, office, etc.

The draft LUAR will be posted to the TIFAC internal website. The TIFAC members can review and provide comment via email or the website. There was some discussion regarding whether or not to include predictions from the previous study in the current LUAR. Adam will include the previous LUAR in the appendix of the current study.

Adam presented a map with projected development, noting that there is more growth anticipated in the East Transportation Service Area (TSA) than in the West TSA. This is due to growth that has already occurred in the West TSA.

There are several parcels that are still under review by the TIFAC, which are highlighted on the spreadsheet with a parcel by parcel description. Sara Pandl will provide additional information about these sites at the next meeting, if not earlier. Joe Fiocco recommended taking a conservative approach to the land uses that are in question.

Specific school district properties were discussed. These will be shown on the map that will be provided on the TIFAC website for review and comment by committee members.

Adam anticipates finalizing the report within two weeks. He noted that there is a 30 day comment period, and it must be advertised twice within this period.

Joe Fiocco presented aerial images of intersections that were included in the previous study, as well as those recommended to be added to or excluded from the study. The TIFAC members provided comment and discussed the addition of other intersections. The TIFAC agreed upon the following intersections to be included in the study:

Meeting Minutes

August 30, 2016

Page 3

1	Spring Creek Road (S.R. 3001) and Trexlertown Road
2	Route 100 and Sauerkraut Road
3	Route 100 and Mill Creek Road
4	Route 100 and Donegal Road
5	Route 100 and Gehman Road
6	Route 100 and Willow Lane (S.R. 3003)
7	Brookside Road (S.R. 2017) and Buckeye Road (S.R. 2018)
8	Brookside Road (S.R. 2017) and Indian Creek Road (S.R. 2018)
9	Sauerkraut Road and Brookside Road (S.R. 2017)
10	Sauerkraut Road and Willow Lane (S.R. 3003)
11	Sauerkraut Road and Mill Creek Road
12	Lower Macungie Road (SR 2012) and Mill Creek Road
13	Lower Macungie Road (SR 2012) and South Krocks Road
14	Lower Macungie Road (SR 2012) and Brookside Road (SR 2017)
15	Brookside Road (SR 2017) and East Texas Road
16	Minesite Road (SR 2015) and East Texas Road
17	Cedar Crest Boulevard (SR 0029) and Minesite Road (SR 2015)
18	Cedar Crest Boulevard (SR 0029) and Riverbend Road (SR 2042)
19a	Cedar Crest Boulevard (SR 0029) and Lower Macungie Road (SR 2012)
19b	Cedar Crest Boulevard (SR 0029) and Farr Road
20	Hamilton Boulevard (SR 6222) and South Krocks Road
21	Hamilton Boulevard (SR 6222) and North Krocks Road
22	Hamilton Boulevard (SR 6222) and Brookside Road (SR 2017)
23	Hamilton Boulevard (SR 6222) and Schantz Road/Minesite Road (SR 2015)
24	Route 100 and Aster Road
25	Route 100 and Wisteria Road
26	Route 100 and Foxglove Road
27	Route 100 and Columbine Road
28	Orchard Road and Alburtis Road
29	SR 222 and Cedarbrook/Kressler Roads
30	SR 222 and Eastbound I-78 Ramps
31	SR 222 and North Krocks Road
32	Hamilton Boulevard (SR 6222) and Kressler Road
33	Hamilton Boulevard (SR 6222) and Mill Creek Road
34	Brookside Road (SR 2017) and Liberty Lane

Meeting Minutes

August 30, 2016

Page 4

There was a discussion regarding the schedule of upcoming meetings. There will be a TIFAC meeting on September 27, 2016, at which time Adam Supplee will present the final LUAR, assuming additional information and comments have been received. The following tentative dates were discussed, to be determined via comment on the website, or a Doodle poll.

- Advertise, send notification to East Penn School District and adjacent municipalities in October, 2016
- November 2, 2016: Present LUAR to Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting (4:30 PM)
- Schedule Public Hearing between November 2nd and 17th, 2016 (possibly November 9th or 10th?)
- November 17th, 2016: Present LUAR recommendations at the Board of Commissioners Meeting (7:00 PM)

Sara Pandl will confirm meeting room availability.

The motion to adjourn was made by Don, and was seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.

These minutes are being sent to the meeting attendees via email. If any attendees notice omissions or needed corrections to the above, please send them to my attention within one week and I will modify and resend to attendees. If I do not receive comments, it will be assumed that the above is an accurate representation of the items discussed.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus

SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Wednesday, November 9, 2016
7:30 PM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on November 9, 2016 at 7:30PM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman
Brent McNabb, TIFAC
Mick Seislove, TIFAC (by phone)
John Hayes, TIFAC
Dale Dries, TIFAC (by phone)
Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor
Adam Supplee, KMS Design Group
Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering
Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM. The first order of business was to establish the number of TIFAC members that constitute a quorum to conduct business. Motion made by John Hayes, seconded by Brent McNabb to require three members for a quorum. Passed 5 to 0. A quorum was present for the remainder of the meeting.

There were no modifications proposed for the agenda, which was then approved. The minutes of the September 27, 2016 meeting were approved.

Don Denburg opened the advertised public hearing to gather public comment on the draft *Land Use Assumptions Report* (LUAR), dated October 3, 2016, that the committee had approved at its meeting on September 27, 2016. The report had been circulated for review to surrounding municipalities, the East Penn School District and the Lehigh County Planning Commission (LVPC). At the conclusion of the 30-day review period, the only responses were a letter from the LVPC that was dated October 31, 2016; and electronic correspondence from LMT Planning Commission chair Maury Robert.

The LVPC letter discussed trends in population and future housing growth, and was not relevant to the LUAR, as the methodology and calculations used by KMS to form the basis of the LUAR were appropriate for the mix of housing anticipated based upon the actual existing conditions in the Township. Growth predictions were not changed.

Our land use consultant, Adam Supplee of KMS Design, LLC gave a review of the contents of the October 3 LUAR.

There was one comment relevant to the LUAR received from the audience present at the meeting. Harold "Bud" Newton of The Newton Engineering, Group, LLC, 6325 Hamilton Boulevard, #212, Allentown, Pennsylvania, 18106, questioned the designation assigned to the Air Products Foundation property located on Mill Creek Road in the East Transportation Service Area, and its imminent potential for an alternate use. Based on the information provided by Mr. Newton, the Committee opted to allow Mr. Newton to continue his review of the LUAR beyond the November 9, 2016 public hearing and outline any additional comments by way of correspondence provided directly to the Board of Commissioners, should he deem same appropriate upon further review.

A motion was made by John Hayes and seconded by Brent McNabb that the *Land Use Assumptions Report*, dated October 3, 2016, presented at this meeting, be approved and sent to the Board of Commissioners, along with the public comments. The motion was unanimously passed. Don Denburg requested that the Township Solicitor draft the LUAR transmission letter to be sent to the commissioners, along with our recommendation that they approve the LUAR at their next meeting. The TIFAC public meeting was then adjourned.

The next meeting of the TIFAC will be held Monday, January 16, 2017 at 9:00 am.

A motion was made by John Hayes and seconded by Brent McNabb to adjourn the meeting. It passed unanimously.



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Monday, January 16, 2017
9:00 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on January 16, 2017 at 9:00 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager

Sara Pandl, Township Planner

Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman

Annie McGeary, TIFAC

Mick Seislove, TIFAC

John Hayes, TIFAC

Jack Tibbets, TIFAC

Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor

Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers, Township Engineer

Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering

Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Brent McNabb, TIFAC

Dale Dries, TIFAC

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. Don asked if there were any modifications proposed for the agenda. He noted that the minutes from the previous meeting were not yet completed, and he anticipates that they will be ready for distribution prior to the next TIFAC meeting. Don noted that two letters were received regarding the Land Use Assumptions Report (LUAR). Bruce Fosselman indicated that Renea Flexer has the letters. They will be included with the meeting minutes for approval at the next meeting.

The agenda for today's meeting was approved.

Don noted that the LUAR was successfully approved, and now the study moves to the second phase.

Joe Fiocco provided handouts to the TIFAC members, and explained the information provided. The intersections are now numbered differently than in the previous Act 209 study. Joe explained the definitions of levels of service at signalized and unsignalized intersections, and the respective measures of delay.

Bruce Fosselman identified planned roadway improvements at several intersections, including intersections #9 (Route 100 and Gehman Road), 10 (Route 100 and Willow Lane), 27 (Cedar Crest Boulevard and Minesite Road), and 31 (Willow Lane and Sauerkraut Road).

Joe explained the results presented in Table 1, which are preliminary results that compare the existing level of service with the previously identified preferred level of service from the Act 209 Study completed in 2009. The committee members were asked to review the data and provide input comparing the results with their personal experience at these locations. The following issues were discussed:

- Willow and Route 100 – experience significant delays of two to three minutes. It was pointed out that the worse delays are during school peak hours.
- Hamilton Boulevard and Brookside Road – Sara Pandl indicated that the Township has recently received several complaints about the delays at the intersections. The eastbound Hamilton Boulevard and northbound Brookside Road approaches experience significant delays.

Joe indicated that the next step is to add traffic from already approved developments. John Hayes asked if there was a need to revisit the LUAR because of the preservation of the golf course. Sara confirmed that 100 residential units had been assumed in the LUAR report.

There was a discussion about Hamilton Crossings, and whether the traffic counts were conducted before or after the opening of the majority of the shopping center. Bruce stated that the shopping center is now almost entirely built out. Jack Tibbets indicated that the impact of Hamilton Crossings is significant, with some intersections becoming “practically impassable.”

Joe said the “typical commuter peak” is what is being analyzed. We will assume trip generation for Hamilton Crossings and all future development. We will reevaluate

Meeting Minutes

January 16, 2017

Page 3

later and can recount if needed to ensure that the analysis is accurately representing the traffic conditions around Hamilton Crossings.

The committee provided input for each intersection, relating the analysis result to their personal experiences. SAFE will investigate the analysis of the intersections where discrepancies were identified.

There was some discussion about the physical constraints at the intersection of Cedar Crest Boulevard with Lower Macungie Road. Various ideas were discussed, but it was generally agreed that because it involves the intersection of two state highways, it was an issue for PennDOT to resolve.

Sara pointed out that Cedar Crest Boulevard was identified as a high crash corridor. Joe noted that while we can only consider capacity improvements in this study, a safety improvement may also result from the implementation of a capacity improvement.

The question was raised of how to account for trucks in the analysis. Joe explained that all vehicles are counted, and heavy vehicles are classified as such. The heavy vehicle percentage is determined and included as part of the analysis.

John mentioned that the traffic from the proposed warehouses north of Alburty should be added, assuming trucks from the warehouses, not just passenger vehicles.

Joe indicated that based on what we see, the previously identified level of service may be appropriate to continue with, but it is up to the TIFAC to decide at the next meeting. During the next meeting, it is anticipated that SAFE will present the findings of future conditions with currently proposed developments.

The next meetings were tentatively scheduled for Monday, March 6, 2017 at 9:30 AM, and Monday, April 10, 2017 at 9:30 AM. *(Please note that the March 6th meeting date has been changed to Wednesday, March 8, 2017 at 9:30 AM.)*

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 AM.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus
SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Monday, March 8, 2017
9:30 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on March 8, 2017 at 9:30 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager

Sara Pandl, Township Planner

Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman

Annie McGeary, TIFAC

John Hayes, TIFAC

Jack Tibbets, TIFAC

Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor

Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers, Township Engineer

Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering

Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Brent McNabb, TIFAC

Dale Dries, TIFAC

Mick Seislove, TIFAC

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM. Don asked if there were any modifications proposed for the agenda. There were no changes, and the agenda was approved. He noted that there were two sets of meeting minutes to be considered for approval, for the November 9, 2016 Public Hearing on the Land Use Assumptions Report (LUAR) and for the most recent TIFAC meeting on January 16, 2017. Don noted that two letters were received regarding the Land Use Assumptions Report (LUAR), and he would like them posted with the minutes from the November 9, 2016 hearing. The motion for approval of the meeting minutes from November 9, 2016 and January 16, 2017 was approved.

Joe Fiocco provided handouts to the TIFAC members. He explained that after the last meeting, SAFE staff took the comments provided by the TIFAC and revised the existing analysis based on those comments. The existing analysis was also modified to reflect the incremental development at Hamilton Crossing that had occurred at the time of the traffic counts. John Hayes asked if the analysis accounted for the adaptive traffic signal system that had been installed, and Joe indicated that there is not a means to do so with available software.

Joe explained the methodology of developing pass-through traffic volumes and assumptions for known improvements that are currently planned. He explained that it will be the responsibility of the Township and PennDOT to finance improvements required to achieve the preferred level of service (to be determined by the TIFAC).

The next step will be to add in traffic in the east and west TSAs identified in the full build out scenario (as documented in the LUAR). The incremental cost of improvements required to achieve the preferred level of service (between the pass-through and full build out scenarios) will be used to calculate the per trip cost to be assessed to developers.

There was a discussion regarding the fair share of the cost. Don indicated that the fair share portion is documented as 50% of the total project cost. Therefore, the developers are responsible for 50% of the mitigation costs, and the balance of the funding must come from other sources.

Alan Fornwalt pointed out that the future pass-through analysis did not include the planned signal at Willow Lane and Sauerkraut Road, which is going in now. Alan expressed concern regarding the extreme delays shown in the analysis. Specifically, he discussed the intersection of Brookside Road and Sauerkraut Road, which he said he would not expect to have a significant increase in traffic in the future pass through conditions. He indicated that most traffic would take Route 100 instead of Sauerkraut Road.

John asked if the program could be used to funnel traffic to another place. Joe indicated that the program is not set up to account for traffic diverting to alternate routes because of localized congestion.

Alan indicated that from Sauerkraut Road west to Route 100 is built out. Joe said that SAFE staff would look at this in the analysis.

Sara Pandl stated that due to physical constraints, some of the proposed improvements will not be feasible. Joe said that, yes, we must confirm that the elements of the Capital Improvement Program are realistic.

Sara asked if the preferred level of service can vary by roadway. Joe said we can't "cherry-pick" an area to have more restrictive levels of service. However, it may be possible to establish a preferred level of service by class of roadway (local, state, etc.)

Don asked what we are looking to mitigate: the worst case overall level of service, or the movement with the highest delay. Joe indicated that in the previous study, a desirable goal was established for the overall intersection delay as well as the highest delay for an individual movement. Don said that his recollection is that the previously chosen thresholds were one level of service worse than those identified in Township documents. Sara said these don't have to be consistent.

Sara indicated that there is a movement to reduce speed limits on certain roads. She asked if a reduction would affect the assumptions. Joe said a change in speed limits would not necessarily produce a change in driver speeds and further pointed out that maximum capacity is achieved at lower speeds (30 to 35 mph).

There was a discussion regarding the assessment fees, and whether they would be the same moving forward. Joe explained that it is anticipated that the fees will change, based on the calculation of the incremental cost of improvements between future pass-through conditions and future build out conditions.

Joe reminded the committee that, while there are valid concerns regarding the impacts of trucks on the roadways, the Act 209 fees can only be applied for capacity improvements, not for maintenance or other purposes.

Alan requested to see the spreadsheet with the traffic projections that was developed by SAFE. He also indicated that tractor trailers are now prohibited on Trexlertown Road. Bruce Fosselman said there have been major changes in truck traffic restrictions within the Township. He said that Alan would have the information to compile a list of locations where trucks are restricted, which would be provided to SAFE to be incorporated in the analysis.

Don stated that for the next meeting, the goal will be to reevaluate the pass-through conditions after SAFE receives input and conducts reanalysis based on these comments.

There was a discussion about the identification of the preferred level of service. Don mentioned that he had developed a “tutorial” on levels of service that was presented during the previous Act 209 Study meetings. It is available on the Township website. Joe reviewed the preferred levels of service established during the previous Act 209 Study:

<u>Intersection</u>	<u>West TSA</u>	<u>East TSA</u>
Signalized	LOS E all movements LOS D overall	LOS E all movements LOS D overall
Unsignalized	LOS D all movements	LOS E all movements

Joe reminded the TIFAC that they could consider taking an approach that applies preferred levels of service based on roadway classification. Don asked if there was any reason not to continue with these thresholds. John asked if the TIFAC may want to make the preferred levels of service stricter than previously established. Joe explained that it would be more expensive all around to do so, as the improvements for the pass-through condition would be more extensive as well as for the future build out conditions, but the increment between them would still provide information to establish the per trip cost to be assessed to developers.

There was a discussion about being careful to not overbuild intersections, and remembering that the study reflects operations during the evening peak hour only.

There was some discussion about Cedar Crest Boulevard at Minesite Road. Jack indicated that the traffic on Cedar Crest is overwhelming, but it is “self-regulating” due to the two adjacent signals at Fish Hatchery and Riverbend Roads. Annie McGearry indicated that safety is a concern here, and accidents are due to people going around northbound left-turning vehicles. Joe indicated that a signal may not be warranted at this location.

Don asked for guidance regarding the preferred level of service. Joe said that if there is a change to the previously established preferred level of service, the onus will be on the committee to defend that change.

Meeting Minutes

March 8, 2017

Page 5

SAFE will provide documentation of trip generation and distribution to Alan Fornwalt for review and comment. Alan will complete a review within one to two weeks. SAFE will provide tables representing the revised findings on the TIFAC website prior to the next meeting, to provide the TIFAC with the opportunity for review.

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 10, 2017 at 9:30 AM.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus
SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Monday, April 10, 2017
9:30 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on April 10, 2017 at 9:30 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager
Sara Pandl, Township Planner
Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman
John Hayes, TIFAC
Jack Tibbets, TIFAC
Brent McNabb, TIFAC
Mick Seislove, TIFAC
Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor
Jonathan Rogers, Keystone Consulting Engineers
Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering
Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Annie McGeary, TIFAC
Dale Dries, TIFAC

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM. Don asked if there were any modifications proposed for the agenda. There were no changes, and the agenda was approved. Don asked for comments regarding the meeting minutes from the previous TIFAC meeting on March 8, 2017. There were no comments, and the motion for approval of the meeting minutes from March 8, 2017 was approved.

Joe Fiocco provided handouts to the TIFAC members. He explained that after the last meeting, SAFE staff took the comments provided by the TIFAC and revised the existing

Meeting Minutes

April 10, 2017

Page 2

and pass-through analysis based on those comments. Joe reviewed the overall level of service and highest movement delay for each intersection.

John Hayes commented that at Intersection 14 (Route 222 and N. Krocks Road), a significant delay that is modeled in the analysis is not occurring. The lefts are showing more delay than is actually experienced. Joe pointed out that we can't account for the adaptive system in the traffic model, and that may be the reason for the discrepancy. The major concern is the eastbound and westbound left turn movements on Route 222. Sara Pandl asked if there was a way to find out when the improvements were completed in this area. Jon Rogers said he would find out.

Bruce Fosselman commented on the delay at Cedar Crest Boulevard and Lower Macungie Road. John indicated that he is not surprised by the delays represented here.

At Intersection 23 (Lower Macungie Road and S. Krocks Road), there was a discussion regarding how the intersection operates. The discussion continued regarding whether the driveway opposite S. Krocks Road has its own signal heads, and its own phase. There is no volume shown in the figures from the driveway; SAFE will confirm this with the traffic counts.

At Intersection 27, Cedar Crest Boulevard and Minesite Road, the need for a signal is currently being investigated. Jack Tibbets reiterated his opinion that a signal would exacerbate the situation at this location. He indicated that traffic piles up at Riverbend Road, and it "self-regulates" the traffic on Cedar Crest Boulevard.

At Hamilton Boulevard and Brookside Road, Brent McNabb indicated that the biggest problem is the left turn from the bypass to Hamilton (i.e., the southbound left turn from Brookside Road). Currently, there is no left turn arrow for this movement. Bruce indicated that Keystone is looking into the option of installing a left turn arrow. It was commented that the delay for the westbound left seems reasonable.

Joe explained that the pass through conditions include currently planned improvements. He reviewed the intersections and projected delays. Joe led a discussion regarding improvements to be considered, and the Committee provided input on constraints at the locations. Janet Stankus indicated that some intersections may require signal timing modifications; the required improvements may not be physical. Joe explained that due to time constraints, SAFE has not yet evaluated potential improvements that may be required to satisfy the preferred level of service.

There was a discussion about Intersection 29a, Cedar Crest Boulevard and Lower Macungie Road. The adjacent intersection at Cedar Crest and Farr Road was also discussed. The physical constraints at this location are significant. It was noted that vehicles are currently creating two lanes on the northbound approach, with through vehicles getting by the left-turning vehicles by passing on the right. There are issues with a relatively significant grade/embankment on the northwest corner of the intersection. Also, the southbound Cedar Crest Boulevard right-turn movement, which is currently controlled by a yield sign, has an impact on operations at the intersection. It was suggested that a separate southbound right turn lane could be considered, but the issues with the embankment on the northwest corner may be an issue.

At Intersection 17, Hamilton Boulevard and Brookside Road, there are significant physical constraints with the buildings on the corners at the intersection.

At Intersection 27, Cedar Crest Boulevard and Minesite Road, it was noted that people are avoiding this intersection by using Riverbend and Fish Hatchery Roads.

At Intersection 28, Riverbend Road and Cedar Crest Boulevard, it was suggested that the shoulders could be repurposed. Currently, shoulders are being used by vehicles to bypass left-turning vehicles. Opposing left-turn lanes on Cedar Crest Boulevard may be an option.

At Intersection 1, Trexlertown Road and Spring Creek Road, eastbound Spring Creek Road is not a problem now, and the majority of traffic uses the bypass instead of turning left here. Timing changes will be considered to mitigate the deficiencies.

At Wisteria Road and Route 100, a level of service 'f' is shown for the left-turn from Wisteria Road to Route 100. Joe pointed out that a left-turn restriction could be considered during the evening peak hour. The discussion continued regarding options for left-turning vehicles. It was noted that the left-turning vehicles could work their way over to the signal at Sauerkraut Road if needed. This is something that could be included in the discussion in the study; if drivers experience significant delay and have another option available to them, they may consider taking the longer route to the signal at Sauerkraut Road.

At intersection 8, Route 100 and Alburtis/Donnegal Road, it was noted that signal timing adjustments may be sufficient to alleviate the delays.

There was a discussion regarding the truck traffic in the vicinity of Schoeneck Road, which is currently closed and will be until June, 2017. This roadway, when reopened, is anticipated to take some of the truck traffic from Alburdis Road, resulting in a lower truck volume turning left from Alburdis to Route 100. It has been observed that cars traveling through to Donegal Road are sneaking around the left-turning vehicles. Joe said that SAFE can model this in the analysis, by including a very short left-turn lane on this approach.

At Intersection 9, Gehman Road and Route 100, there was a question about the alignment of the driveway opposite Gehman Road. SAFE will confirm if the intersection was modeled with the north and south approaches running concurrently or with separate phases.

At Intersection 10, Willow Lane and Route 100, it was suggested that the signal timings be modified. There was a discussion regarding the access to Weis from the apartments planned for the Grandview development. Sara indicated that there is a connection available, but it is not a direct route.

At Intersection 13, Hamilton Boulevard and Krocks Road, there are three properties on the northeast corner that will be developed. Bruce indicated that this is not a big problem area; traffic is ok.

At Intersection 14, Route 222 and North Krocks Road, there was some concern expressed regarding the people using the service road to avoid the signal. Also, the westbound left turns operate with two lanes. The delay is substantial for this movement. Joe pointed out that the time required to clear the intersection is significant, and takes from the green time available for this movement. When the apartments open, it is anticipated that there will be more traffic at this intersection.

At Intersection 15, Hamilton Boulevard and N. Krocks Road, it was mentioned that there will be a Baird Medical facility on the southeast corner. There will be a driveway coming north to the intersection. Sara will send site plans to SAFE for the proposed developments at this location.

At Intersection 17, Hamilton Boulevard and Brookside Road, there are currently significant backups for vehicles exiting the Costco.

Meeting Minutes

April 10, 2017

Page 5

At Intersection 16, Brookside Road and Liberty Lane, John mentioned that the only existing delays occur during school hours. Nothing can be built to the west, and anything from the east would be behind the school, and there are no plans for development there. Bruce indicated that the intersection operates without too much delay.

South of Intersection 17 (Hamilton Boulevard and Brookside Road), Brent indicated that there is a problem with vehicles making a left in and out of Oplinger Road (which has access to Wawa.) These turning vehicles must cross two lanes of traffic to reach their destination. Bruce pointed out that there is now a left turn arrow from Brookside Road to Hamilton Boulevard, which has helped to alleviate the backups in the area. He also indicated that the Township is putting a park in with a bus shelter and sidewalks on the southeast corner of the intersection of Hamilton and Brookside.

At Intersection 18 (Hamilton Boulevard and Minesite Road/Schantz Road), the worst movement is considered to be the left turn from Minesite Road. Some people are finding alternate routes to avoid the signal. The general feeling is that there is not much we can do. The Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission will be widening the bridge in the future. Consideration should be given to adding left-turn arrows and phases for Minesite and Schantz Roads. The timeframe for the Turnpike bridge widening is not known, but it is possible it will be completed within ten years.

Intersection 19 (Route 222 and Kressler Road/Cedarbrook Road) is an intersection on the TIP. Sara will provide SAFE with the conceptual plan for this improvement. Keystone did a study for this; SAFE can incorporate this into the study.

At Intersection 20 (Hamilton Boulevard and Kressler Road), the delays may be alleviated by adjustments to signal timings.

Intersection 21 (Hamilton Boulevard and I-78 Ramps) is also part of the improvements associated with the TIP.

At Intersection 24 (Lower Macungie Road and Brookside Road), it was recommended that a southbound through/right-turn be considered.

At Intersection 30 (Mill Creek Road and Sauerkraut Lane), which operates as an all way stop controlled intersection, it was generally agreed that there is not much future

Meeting Minutes

April 10, 2017

Page 6

development anticipated here and the Township has not received complaints about the intersection.

At Intersection 31 (Willow Lane and Sauerkraut Road), there is a significant amount of traffic. The traffic signal proposed for this location will improve operations.

At Intersection 32 (Brookside Road and Sauerkraut Road), the left turn lane was added to westbound Sauerkraut recently, and while there is no left turn phase, the lane has improved the operations at the intersection.

At Intersection 33 (Brookside Road and Indian Creek Road), it was noted that a signal was recommended under existing conditions in the previous Act 209 Study.

At Intersection 34 (Brookside Road and Buckeye Road), the addition of a southbound right lane might be a good option in the future.

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 8, 2017 at 9:30 AM. *(Please note that this meeting date was changed to June 8, 2017.)*

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 AM.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus
SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Thursday, June 8, 2017
9:30 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on June 8, 2017 at 9:30 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager
Sara Pandl, Township Planner
Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman
John Hayes, TIFAC
Jack Tibbets, TIFAC
Mick Seislove, TIFAC
Julie Macomb, Township Solicitor
Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers
Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering
Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Annie McGeary, TIFAC
Brent McNabb, TIFAC
Dale Dries, TIFAC

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM. Don asked if there were any modifications proposed for the agenda. There were no changes, and the agenda was approved. Don asked for comments regarding the meeting minutes from the previous TIFAC meeting on April 10, 2017. There were no comments, and the motion for approval of the meeting minutes from April 10, 2017 was approved.

Joe Fiocco provided handouts to the TIFAC members, which included tables and figures illustrating the improvements required for the future pass-through and future

with development scenarios. Joe led a discussion regarding the proposed improvements, and the following comments were made:

- Intersection 1 (Trexlerstown and Spring Creek Roads): The flood plain and existing bridge may be an issue for the proposed improvements.
- Intersections 2 through 6 (Route 100 at Aster, Wisteria, Foxglove, Columbine, and Sauerkraut): A four-lane cross-section is proposed on Route 100. An alternative was discussed. SAFE will analyze future operations assuming a traffic signal at Route 100 and Foxglove Lane, with left turns restricted to and from (providing a right in/right out access) at Aster, Wisteria and Columbine Lanes.
- Intersection 7 (Route 100 and Mill Creek Road): no improvements required.
- Intersection 8 - 9 (Route 100 at Alburtis/Donegal and Gehman Road): Alan indicated that this issue came up previously, and PennDOT requested that an additional lane on Route 100 extend beyond Gehman through Willow Lane.
- Intersection 10 (Route 100 and Willow Lane): It was noted that a right turn to NB Route 100 was added by others (CVS)
- Intersection 11 (Alburtis Road and Orchard Road): It was noted that operations at this intersection may change, as an application for a warehouse was recently received.

There was a discussion regarding the preferred level of service (LOS). This can be revised (i.e., does not have to be consistent with the previously defined preferred LOS) if the Township doesn't want to have all of the widening that is currently projected with the current preferred LOS constraints. The Township may decide to accept an increase in delay during the evening peak hour instead of these widening improvements. It was noted that the Township may identify an overall LOS as the preferred threshold without identifying a preferred LOS by individual movement.

Sara asked if the Township can have different levels of service based on the roadway type. Joe indicated that the TIFAC may choose to have a different LOS threshold for a designated district. Hamilton Boulevard has been identified as a "complete streets" corridor. The Township has made a request to PennDOT to reduce the speed limit to 35 MPH, and is looking at changing zoning to eliminate high traffic generators such as fast food restaurants. The goal is to encourage use of the bypass. Hamilton Boulevard may be designated as a "Core Commercial District Corridor".

Jack Tibbets asked if Hamilton Crossings was expanding. Township staff indicated that the shopping center is continuing with the current build out, but has an option to build on the north side of the bypass. Currently, there are no retailers for that area.

- Intersection 14 (Route 222 and N. Krocks Road): There is significant widening proposed here to satisfy the current preferred LOS criteria, including triple lefts on all approaches in the future with development scenario. It was agreed that there is not sufficient room to widen to that degree. Alan indicated that the only option is a grade separated interchange. This was also analyzed by SAFE, and satisfies the LOS criteria. Joe pointed out that the Township can dictate what is acceptable in terms of improvements, and can specify that the requirement for triple lefts can be waived if documented. There was some concern expressed over the increase in the per trip fee that would result from the requirement of a grade separated interchange. Bruce indicated that the Township would prefer to use waivers than have the significant improvements required at this intersection. Alan said he does not believe the triple lefts would be built, and he questions whether an additional through would be built here as well.
- It was noted that there is a project on the TIP on the eastern end of Hamilton Boulevard, near intersections 19 and 20 (Route 222 at Kressler Road/Cedarbrook Road and Hamilton Boulevard at Kressler Road). Alan indicated that it is his impression that PennDOT won't commit to further improvements here until the Route 22 project is finished.
- SAFE will investigate the potential increase in the per trip fee with the inclusion of a grade separated interchange. Bruce indicated that he believes that the interchange is not going to happen and the Township would also accept waivers for this location. It was recommended that the limit be double lefts and three through lanes eastbound.
- Intersection 15 (Hamilton Boulevard and N. Krocks Road): It was noted that there is a Taco Bell going in here, on the site of the existing Baird Medical facility. This plan was provided to SAFE since the last meeting, and has been incorporated into the study.
- Intersection 16 (Brookside Road and Liberty Lane): A roundabout was considered at this location, but does not satisfy the preferred LOS criteria. There is a signal warrant for locations in proximity to schools. Alan indicated that this location may satisfy this signal warrant. Joe pointed out that the signal is required in pass-through conditions.
- Intersection 17 (Hamilton Boulevard and Brookside Road): additional left turn lanes and through lanes are required. There is no physical widening possible

here, given the historic building and proximity of buildings to the roadway. Joe indicated that in the report, we can document these constraints.

- Intersection 18 (Hamilton Boulevard and Schantz/Minesite Road): Alan said Ciocca is adding a right-turn lane on the southbound Schantz Road approach. It was noted that the shoulder is currently operating as a defacto right turn lane. It was noted that the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission will be widening the bridge at this location.
- Intersections 19 and 20 (Route 222 at Kressler/Cedarbrook and Hamilton Boulevard at Kressler Road.) Keystone has developed a concept sketch to SAFE, some of which was incorporated into a plan submitted by Anthony Properties. Alan indicated that PennDOT has bought into the concept plan, but wanted another westbound through lane. This would require obtaining right of way.
- Intersection 23 (Lower Macungie and S. Krocks Road): signal retiming and addition of a westbound through lane would be required.
- Intersection 24 (Lower Macungie and Brookside Road): addition of lanes as proposed may be an issue with right of way, since only one corner is not built out.
- Intersection 25 (Brookside Road and E. Texas Road): Alan indicated that there is no room here for widening. It would be best to try to encourage drivers to take alternate routes.
- Intersection 26 (Minesite and E. Texas Road): Bruce indicated that a signal will not happen here.
- Intersection 27 (Cedar Crest Boulevard and Minesite Road): The Township is currently evaluating whether a signal is warranted here.
- Intersection 28 (Cedar Crest Boulevard and Riverbend Road)
- Intersection 29a (Cedar Crest Boulevard and Lower Macungie Road): There are physical constraints with the bridge south of the intersection.
- Intersection 30 (Mill Creek Road and Sauerkraut Lane): SAFE evaluated a roundabout for this location but the TIFAC and Township indicated a signal was the better choice because of the proximity to a school.
- Intersection 31 (Willow Lane and Sauerkraut Lane): This will be signalized by others.
- Intersection 32 (Brookside Road and Sauerkraut Lane): This was agreed to be acceptable as proposed.
- Intersection 33 (Brookside Road and Indian Creek Lane): This will be signalized in the future condition with development.
- Intersection 34 (Brookside Road and Buckeye Road): This was agreed to be acceptable as proposed.

Meeting Minutes

June 8, 2017

Page 5

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for September, but the consultants will keep the TIFAC informed of developments via email.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus

SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC



Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Thursday, September 14, 2017
9:30 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on September 14, 2017 at 9:30 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager
Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman
Jack Tibbetts, TIFAC
Mick Seislove, TIFAC
Brent McNabb, TIFAC
Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor
Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers
Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering
Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Annie McGeary, TIFAC
Dale Dries, TIFAC
John Hayes, TIFAC
Sara Pandl, Township Planner

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM. Don asked if there were any modifications proposed for the agenda. He suggested the addition of Item #6, "New Business." The revised agenda was approved. Don asked for comments regarding the meeting minutes from the previous TIFAC meeting on June 8, 2017. There were no comments, and the motion for approval of the meeting minutes from June 8, 2017 was seconded, and therefore approved. Brent McNabb abstained from the voting regarding the previous meeting minutes, as he was not in attendance at that meeting.

Joe Fiocco provided handouts to the TIFAC members, including updated decision papers and figures. The decision papers list the improvements required to satisfy two

preferred level of service scenarios for the future pass-through and build scenarios, and the figures illustrate these improvements with SAFE's recommended level of service criteria for each transportation service area (TSA). Joe explained that the information had been sent to the TIFAC over the summer, but little input was received, so SAFE proceeded with the development of recommendations for the preferred level of service criteria, which is reflected in the tables and figures that were distributed. Joe led a discussion regarding the required improvements for each intersection. The preferred level of service criteria for TSA West is level of service 'E' by movement at signalized intersections, and level of service 'e' by movement at unsignalized intersections. In TSA East, the recommended preferred level of service criteria is an overall level of service 'E' at signalized intersections, and level of service 'e' by movement at unsignalized intersections. The following comments were raised in the discussion:

- Intersection 9 (Route 100 and Gehman Road): This signal is anticipated to be turned on when work at Route 100 and Willow Road is complete.
- There was a discussion regarding the proposed widening of Hamilton Boulevard to include a five-lane cross-section. Bruce Fosselman and Alan Fornwalt expressed the Township's position that no additional through lanes are desired or feasible. The only possible widening for an additional through lane would be in the westbound direction at Kressler Road, which will drop in front of the Ciocca Subaru property. It was agreed that turn lanes at intersections would be considered, but not additional through lanes beyond the identified WB lane at Kressler Road.
- At Intersection 17, Alan indicated that a left turn lane from Brookside Road is feasible, but the dual lefts and rights are not feasible, due to right of way issues.
- At Intersection 21, the southbound Route 222 through lane is a topic of discussion with PennDOT as part of the improvements at Intersections 20/20a. Note that Intersection 20a is a new intersection that will be created with the improvements associated with the adjacent intersections.
- Intersection 27 (Cedar Crest Boulevard and Minesite Road): Bruce indicated that the traffic signal is planned at this location, and funds have been budgeted for this improvement. A traffic study was done, and the traffic signal warrants were satisfied. Jack Tibbetts expressed that it is his observation and experience that there are adequate gaps provided for side street traffic because of the adjacent signals on Cedar Crest Boulevard. Bruce said the timings of the signals will be coordinated in the future to improve the flow of traffic.
- Intersection 28 (Cedar Crest Boulevard and Riverbend Road): Don Denburg asked if the Township had any reluctance to widening Cedar Crest Boulevard. Alan indicated that it will probably have to be widened to include a center left

turn lane. Joe reminded the attendees that right of way costs are included in the TCIP cost estimates.

- The Act 209 legislation provides a means for the Township to waive a level of service requirement if the roadway improvements are not possible due to the following: geometric design limitations, topographic limitations or the unavailability of necessary right-of-way.
- The only location being considered for the waiving of the preferred level of service criteria is along Hamilton Boulevard.
- A question was raised regarding the improvements along Cedar Crest Boulevard at Farr and Lower Macungie Roads (Intersections 29a and 29b). The addition of a southbound Cedar Crest Boulevard through lane at Farr Road is required because there is not adequate area to taper from two lanes to one lane between the intersections. As a result, a new bridge may be required on Cedar Crest Boulevard.
- Intersection 30 (Mill Creek Road and Sauerkraut Road): a roundabout or a signal may be considered here. Joe noted that PennDOT requires that a roundabout be considered before a new traffic signal. A roundabout will be assumed in the RSA.
- Don asked how the mechanism for the waivers would work. Joe said in the reports, SAFE will document what is required to satisfy the preferred level of service criteria, explain what the Township and TIFAC are willing to accept, and then identify the waiver locations.

Don made a motion to authorize SAFE to proceed with the Roadway Sufficiency Analysis report. The motion was seconded.

Jack expressed that he wanted to be sure that the report reflects the opinion of the TIFAC about their vision for the Township, in particular as it relates to the waivers. This documentation is to be included in the introduction of the RSA. The process will provide the TIFAC with an opportunity to review and comment on the RSA prior to its adoption, to ensure that the document accurately reflects their opinions. Janet Stankus will send the draft RSA to Bruce Fosselman by late October or early November. Bruce will distribute the document to the TIFAC. After that, the next meeting will be scheduled.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 AM.



Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Tuesday, January 16, 2018
9:30 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on January 16, 2018 at 9:30 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager
Sara Pandl, Township Planner
Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman
Mick Seislove, TIFAC
Annie McGeary, TIFAC
Brent McNabb, TIFAC
Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers
Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering
Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Jack Tibbetts, TIFAC
Dale Dries, TIFAC
John Hayes, TIFAC
Catherine Curcio, Township Solicitor

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM. Don asked if there were any modifications proposed for the agenda. A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. Don asked for comments regarding the meeting minutes from the previous TIFAC meeting on September 14, 2017. There were no comments, and the motion for approval of the meeting minutes from September 14, 2017 was seconded, and therefore approved.

Joe Fiocco provided a list of errata that documented changes made to the draft Roadway Sufficiency Analysis, based on input from the TIFAC and other minor changes made. Joe reviewed the list of items. During the meeting, one additional

change was identified relative to the table of proposed developments. The Anthony Property was incorrectly listed as being located on the south side, but it is actually on the north side. Janet Stankus will make the change to the document and forward the text and figures to Sara Pandl. SAFE Highway Engineering prepared a technical appendix for the Roadway Sufficiency Analysis report, and left that with Township staff. The additional correction will not impact the documents in the technical appendix.

Don asked for a vote from the TIFAC members to recommend the Roadway Sufficiency Analysis report to the Board of Commissioners and the Planning Commission. Brent McNabb made a motion to vote to make the recommendation, and Mick Seislove seconded the motion. All TIFAC members in attendance voted to make the recommendation.

Joe Fiocco reviewed the initial draft findings of the Transportation Capital Improvements Program, and described the funding sources. It was noted that SAFE has not finalized the cost estimates, so the numbers that were presented may change somewhat, but the order of magnitude of the fee is not anticipated to change. The most expensive improvements included in the program are to implement a grade separated interchange and widen Route 100. If it is assumed that PennDOT would fund only 25% of the cost of the interchange and 50% of the cost of the Route 100 widening, the impact fee costs would be significantly increased from the existing impact fee to an estimate of \$5,000 per trip. For these major improvements, in particular at the interchange, where it is assumed that PennDOT will have ownership and maintenance responsibilities, Joe indicated that it would be reasonable to consider assuming an increased proportional contribution from PennDOT. With this assumption, the estimated fee for the two TSA's becomes somewhat consistent, and will be in the range of \$2,500 to \$2,600. Township staff and the TIFAC agreed that this was the appropriate approach to take when estimating funding contributions.

Moving forward, SAFE will finalize their draft report for the Transportation Capital Improvements Program (TCIP) in the next couple of weeks. Janet Stankus will send the draft TCIP documents to the TIFAC members via email providing them with an opportunity to review and comment on the TCIP.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 13, 2018 at 9:30 AM. Janet will contact the TIFAC members via email to determine if this date is acceptable.

Meeting Minutes

January 16, 2018

Page 3

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 AM.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus

SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC



SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC

36 Trevoise Road
Trevoise, PA 19053
215-355-2089

Meeting Minutes
Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC)
Tuesday, March 13, 2018
9:30 AM
Lower Macungie Township Building

This correspondence is intended to document the discussions that took place at the Lower Macungie Township Building in Conference Room B on March 13, 2018 at 9:30 AM. The following individuals were in attendance:

Name

Bruce Fosselman, Township Manager
Sara Pandl, Township Planner (arrived at 10:10 AM)
Rich Somach, Township Solicitor
Don Denburg, TIFAC Chairman
Annie McGeary, TIFAC
Brent McNabb, TIFAC
Jack Tibbetts, TIFAC
John Hayes, TIFAC (via telephone)
Jon Rogers, Keystone Consulting Engineers
Joe Fiocco, SAFE Highway Engineering
Janet Stankus, SAFE Highway Engineering

Not present: Dale Dries, TIFAC
Mick Seislove, TIFAC

Don Denburg called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM. Don asked if there were any modifications proposed for the agenda. A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. Don asked for comments regarding the meeting minutes from the previous TIFAC meeting on January 16, 2018. There were no comments, and the motion for approval of the meeting minutes from January 16, 2018 was seconded, and therefore approved.

Bruce Fosselman stated that the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission is currently reviewing the draft Roadway Sufficiency Analysis (RSA), and that no comments had yet been received. The Lower Macungie Township Planning Commission will discuss

the RSA at their first meeting in April. Then, it will be presented to the Board of Commissioners on April 19th, 2018.

Don Denburg asked if the TIFAC could approve the draft Transportation Capital Improvement Program (TCIP) report and send it for review together with the RSA. Bruce Fosselman and Joe Fiocco stated that both could be presented at the same meeting.

Jack Tibbets expressed his concerns regarding the installation of a traffic signal at Cedar Crest Boulevard and Minesite Road. He is concerned that the signal will make conditions worse, requiring through traffic to stop another time on Cedar Crest Boulevard. Rich Somach and Joe Fiocco explained that, if the timing is correctly coordinated with adjacent signals, traffic will be able to move through efficiently. Jon Rogers confirmed that the signal will be coordinated with two existing systems, as the adjacent signals are in two municipalities. It is not currently anticipated that an adaptive system will be implemented. Bruce indicated that the traffic signal warrants were satisfied for this location, and the approval has already gone through the budget process.

Joe Fiocco indicated that, moving forward, it would be advisable for the TIFAC to provide input to the Township every two years. Although the TIFAC did not meet between the previous approval of the Act 209 study and the current efforts, it is recommended that the committee be more active moving forward.

Don Denburg asked about the comparison of the most recent findings with those of the 2009 study. The transportation impact fees based on the findings of the previous study were in the range of \$1,800 per trip for each Transportation Service Area (TSA). The updated fees will be in the range of \$2,500 per trip. There are fewer trips projected in TSA East, yet the cost is higher in that TSA. Joe Fiocco explained that this area is nearer capacity already; therefore, the threshold for the required improvements is closer. In addition, the proposed interchange at Route 222 and Krocks Road will have a significant impact on the fee for this area.

Don requested that the 2009 study be referenced in the current TCIP report to better quantify and explain why the cost has changed over time. A paragraph will be added to the report, and submitted to the TIFAC for review. The TIFAC had no additional comments.

Meeting Minutes

March 13, 2018

Page 3

The next steps require that the draft TCIP be on display at the Township for ten business days prior to a public hearing. Bruce Fosselman proposed to have the public hearing on the same night as the Board of Commissioners meeting. It was noted that Don had previously prepared a PowerPoint presentation for the 2009 study, and the presentation is available on the Township website.

Don made a motion to approve the TCIP draft report with the additional paragraph to be added. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The tentative schedule moving forward will be as follows:

- April 3, 2018: Planning Commission Meeting
- April 4, 2018: Zoning Commission Meeting
- April 19, 2018: Public Hearing followed by Board of Commissioners Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 AM.

Respectfully prepared by:

Janet Stankus

SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC