

SEDA-COG  
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)  
2019-2023 Strategic Plan



ADOPTED MARCH 22, 2019  
PREPARED BY GANNETT FLEMING, INC.

---

# Contents

Contents .....	1
Purpose and Use.....	1
The MPO in 2019 .....	2
Status of the 2015 Strategic Plan & Priorities .....	3
Trends in the MPO’s Environment .....	4
Regional Population and Employment.....	4
Drivers of Transportation Change: Technology .....	10
Action Plan.....	11
Issue 1: Transportation funding is inadequate and inconsistent.....	12
Issue 2: Asset management and performance measurement must address local needs. ....	14
Issue 3: System improvements must address resiliency to weather events. ....	17
Issue 4: Modern travel patterns and technology have outdated some corridors. ....	18
Issue 5: Operations are essential to systematic traffic incident management.....	20
Issue 6: The regional system must be conveniently multimodal and service-supported.....	21
Localized Priority: Integration of the CSVT with local land use and transportation .....	23
Appendix 1.....	App 1-1
Federal and State Transportation Planning Policy .....	App 1-1
The MPO’s Transportation Planning Program .....	App 1-2
Appendix 2 Annual Implementation Progress Tracker.....	App 2-1
Appendix 3 Quarterly Activity Review.....	App 3-1

## Purpose and Use

The 2019 SEDA-COG MPO Strategic Plan has been developed as a resource to guide Board and staff activity. It identifies issues demanding attention and practical strategies or approaches that can be incorporated into planning activities and products and outreach to various audiences that will support the region's overall community-economic development direction.

It has purposefully been developed with the active involvement of the MPO Board members to provide a strategic focus for their important role as representatives and liaisons between local community and economic development and regional transportation planning, as well as to guide staff efforts. These two important purposes, taken together, can help the MPO to maintain a strategic and committed focus on optimizing the regional transportation system and services.

The primary component of the document is an action plan that aligns with priorities identified by the Board. Each priority includes a range of strategic actions that can be considered for implementation as conditions and resources warrant. It is understood that not every strategic action may be carried out, but instead that those listed provide a meaningful basis for the Board and staff to consider and program their respective activities.

The plan should be maintained as a living document. Reviews should occur on a regular basis – quarterly is suggested – to select actions for emphasis. This review need not be burdensome, i.e., page-by-page, but should highlight issues and opportunities at the time of review. A one-page “directive” with an as-of date should result. Annual reviews should provide an opportunity to make minor updates and document new emerging issues.

Through the planning process, Board members identified other ideas for improving their contribution to the MPO, including:

- ✦ An orientation to what it means to be on the Board
- ✦ Opportunities to champion actions of greatest interest and experience
- ✦ Brief information updates to help them interface with their communities

Additionally, the Board would likely benefit from information about and education on topics, such as:

- ✦ proposed and recent legislation that impacts transportation (system and planning);
- ✦ funding, e.g., changes in programs, best practices in project development and application;
- ✦ freight and its relationship to transportation planning and local land use; and
- ✦ resiliency as a principle for transportation and community planning and development.

These topics could be addressed through in-person presentations by staff or guest speakers, through online webinars from respected sources, or other means. The follow-up discussion should provide an opportunity for questions and discussion of how these topics impact the SEDA-COG MPO region.

The Board is highly committed to the region and to their work on behalf of the SEDA-COG MPO. The Board should continue this focus on improved governance and Board development.

## The MPO in 2019

The SEDA-COG Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the official transportation planning organization for eight (8) Central Pennsylvania Counties (Clinton, Columbia, Juniata, Mifflin, Montour, Northumberland, Snyder, Union), as designated by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

### Voting members of the MPO

Consistent with its bylaws, the MPO's governing body, commonly known as the Board, consists of 17 voting members, complemented by non-voting members. Ten of the 17 members are new to the Board since 2015; indicated by an asterisk (\*) below.

Katie de Silva, Planning Director, Clinton County\*

Eric Stahley, Resiliency Officer, Columbia County\*

Brad Kerstetter, Planning Director, Juniata County

William (Bill) Gomes, Planning Director, Mifflin County

Greg Molter, Planning Director, Montour County\*

Don Alexander, Planning Director, Northumberland County\*

Lincoln Kaufman, Planning Director, Snyder County\*

Shawn McLaughlin, Planning Director, Union County

Vickie Rusnak, PennDOT Engineering District 2-0

Jonathan Ranck, PennDOT Engineering District 3-0

Carey Mullins, PennDOT Central Office

Michele Holman, rabbittransit\*

Stephen Phillips, Multi-modal interests\*

Richard Ridgway, SEDA-COG Board, Columbia County Commissioner\*

Jim Saylor, SEDA-COG Transportation Program

Lauren Martz, Town of Bloomsburg\*

Jack Kyttle, Berwick Borough\*

### Non-voting members

Non-voting members receive MPO reports and agendas and may participate in MPO discussions to inform decision-making and coordinate efforts. Non-voting members include, among others: Lycoming County officials, Centre County officials, Luzerne County officials, Federal Highway Administration officials, Federal Transit Administration officials, SEDA-COG staff, other state and federal resource agencies, and private citizens with an interest in transportation and economic development throughout the region.

### Committees

Consistent with its bylaws, the MPO may establish and abolish subcommittees as needed.

The MPO is the convener and an active member of the Central Pennsylvania Transportation Coalition. The CPTC consists of numerous public and private sector human service and transportation related organizations and transit providers. This group serves as the steering committee for the Coordinated Public Transit - Human Services Transportation Plan for the MPO area.

The MPO is preparing a bicycle and pedestrian network plan with the Susquehanna Greenway Partnership for the counties along the Susquehanna River. Juniata and Mifflin counties may be incorporated in future updates. Staff expect the plan to recommend a bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee to the MPO.

## Status of the 2015 Strategic Plan & Priorities

The 2015 Strategic Plan was the MPO's first and was prepared under the Board membership in place at that time. When asked if these issues had been addressed, current Board members noted the following:

1. **Central Susquehanna Valley Thruway (CSVT)** – Issues/needs included: municipal action to address secondary impacts; the need for public information about the design/construction schedule; and the need to address land use and operations challenges new to the SEDA-COG region.
  - ✦ **Progress since 2015** – The northern section and bridge are under construction; southern section is in design.
  - ✦ **Remaining Challenges** – Municipal planning for land use and transportation impacts has been minimal. Land use demands and operational impacts specific to a new limited-access highway and its interface with the local road network are still expected.
2. **Economic Development Alignment** – Issues/needs included: a comprehensive funding source matrix and approach; a priority network for economic development; and readiness to address other transportation needs, e.g., on US 322, I-99, etc., for economic competitiveness after the CSVT is completed.
  - ✧ No substantial progress or change.
3. **Transportation Funding** – Issues/needs included: a local TAP review process; municipal education about the varied transportation funding programs; the use of public-private partnerships as a local funding source
  - ✦ **Remaining Challenge** – Optimization of alternative and complementary funding sources from all state and federal agencies, not just transportation agencies.
4. **Bridges/Asset Management** – Issues/needs included: bridge bundling within the region; addressing local bridge needs through inspection data, prioritization, and funding
  - ✦ **Progress since 2015** – Structurally deficient bridges have been replaced, but just as quickly others are added to the structurally deficient bridge list.
  - ✦ **Remaining Challenges** – Weight limits on smaller bridges impact rural freight routes, e.g., agriculture and forestry.
5. **Corridor Modernization** – Issues/needs included: maintenance and expansion of operations equipment
  - ✦ **Progress since 2015** – Select corridors have had signal timing updates and/or safety improvements.

- ✦ **Remaining Challenges** – Congestion has increased in small, growing communities.
6. **Freight Movement** – Issues/needs included: limited understanding of freight needs, especially trucking and intermodal (rail-to-truck) freight
    - ✧ No substantial progress or change.
  7. **Other** – Issues/needs included: coordination with municipalities and utilities; transit/shared-ride planning, via feasibility studies and piloting; bicycle and pedestrian mode planning and improvement; retention of Amtrak service and station improvements
    - ✦ **Progress since 2015** – River Valley Transit is providing fixed-route transit service to Clinton County. SEDA-COG has undertaken preparation of a bicycle/pedestrian plan.
    - ✦ **Remaining Challenges** – Amtrak: retention of service, increased frequency, and increased station accessibility.

### Use of the 2015 Plan

Board members indicated that the 2015 plan had value in guiding the staff activities and communications for issues that were active on a daily or regular basis. However, without consistent reference or update, other issues were unaddressed.

Board members expressed interest in more regular reference to the strategic plan to retain a focus on short-term and long-term transportation planning needs, in addition to requirements and procedures.

## Trends in the MPO’s Environment

### Regional Population and Employment

#### Population

The MPO region’s population has grown steadily since 1980. Clinton, Columbia, Juniata, Snyder and Union counties have each added more than 1,000 residents from 2000 to 2010. Mifflin County’s population has been stable since 1980, and Montour County’s growth has slowed since 1990. Northumberland County’s trend of population loss has slowed since 2000.

The U.S. Census Bureau’s estimates of 2017 county populations suggest slight population declines since 2010 for four of the eight counties, including Clinton and Juniata. However, the 2017 estimates are generally higher than the 2015 and 2016 estimates.

Based on figures prepared by the PA State Data Center in 2008, the regional population may exceed 400,000 by 2040.

See Table 1.

#### **Transportation Implication:**

There are more people to serve in the region. The growth in population can improve the regional economy but also contribute to an increase in users of the transportation network. Higher volumes of vehicles driving on the roadways can lead to increased congestion, more frequent maintenance needs, and greater environmental impacts. Identifying the transportation needs based on future growth projections is critical to a quality livable community.

**Table 1. Population Counts and Projections**

Geography	1980	1990	2000	2010	Change 2000 to 2010		2017	Change 2010 to 2017		Projection 2040
Clinton	38,971	37,182	37,914	39,238	1,324	3.5%	39,321	83	0.2%	48,164
Columbia	61,967	63,202	64,151	67,295	3,144	4.9%	66,615	-680	-1.0%	67,091
Juniata	19,188	20,625	22,821	24,636	1,815	8.0%	24,514	-122	-0.5%	25,094
Mifflin	46,908	46,197	46,486	46,682	196	0.4%	46,388	-294	-0.6%	50,709
Montour	16,675	17,735	18,236	18,267	31	0.2%	18,302	35	0.2%	22,807
Northumberland	100,381	96,771	94,556	94,528	-28	0.0%	93,038	-1,490	-1.6%	93,027
Snyder	33,584	36,680	37,546	39,702	2,156	5.7%	40,570	868	2.2%	41,678
Union	32,870	36,176	41,624	44,947	3,323	8.0%	45,056	109	0.2%	51,641
<b>SEDA-COG MPO</b>	<b>350,544</b>	<b>354,568</b>	<b>363,334</b>	<b>375,295</b>	<b>11,961</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>373,804</b>	<b>-1,491</b>	<b>-0.4%</b>	<b>400,211</b>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

### Urban Population

From 2000 to 2010, the region's population concentrated in urban areas. In fact, the majority of residents lived in urban areas in 2010. Those urban areas may be accommodating more people by expanding their urban footprint (with little or no impact on population density) or by absorbing households into existing neighborhoods (increasing population density).

Many people choose to live in urban areas for nearby access to jobs and services. That nearby access increases choice in how people travel from their homes to their daily destinations: to walk, bike, or carpool, as well as bus and ride-hailing where available, are all feasible options in town settings.

See Table 2.

#### ***Transportation Implication:***

Transportation systems in urban areas are experiencing greater use in whatever condition they exist, and more are in demand.

**Table 2. Population Counts and Projections**

Geography	2000	2010	2000 % Urban	2010 % Urban
Clinton	37,914	39,238	49.5	54.3
Columbia	64,151	67,295	55.7	59.1
Juniata	22,821	24,636	15.1	17.7
Mifflin	46,486	46,682	44.1	49.5
Montour	18,236	18,267	45.6	46.2
Northumberland	94,556	94,528	62.6	65.1
Snyder	37,546	39,702	28.9	33.2
Union	41,624	44,947	55.9	57.2
<b>SEDA-COG MPO</b>	<b>363,334</b>	<b>375,295</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>52.6</b>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

## Senior Population

The senior population (age 65 and older) is steadily increasing across all counties. Seniors as a percentage of total population ranged from 16.8% in Union County to 21.5% in Columbia County. Nearly 1 in 5 residents of the region was age 65 or older in 2017.

Six of the eight counties had rate increases near or over 10% for the 2010 to 2017 period. The senior population in Snyder County is estimated to have increased by more than one third from 2010 to 2017.

See Table 3.

### ***Transportation Implication:***

As a population, seniors require more transportation options—specifically transportation services, like shared-ride, as their driving independence declines.

**Table 3. Population, Age 65 and older**

Geography	2000	2010	2017	2000 % 65 and older	2010 % 65 and older	2017 % 65 and older	Change 2010 to 2017	
Clinton	6,363	6,350	6,934	16.8	16.2	20.9	584	9.2
Columbia	10,202	10,811	11,932	15.9	16.1	21.5	1,121	10.4
Juniata	3,471	4,134	4,669	15.2	16.8	19.1	535	12.9
Mifflin	7,907	8,643	9,501	17.0	18.5	20.5	858	9.9
Montour	3,120	3,395	3,684	17.1	18.6	20.1	289	8.5
Northumberland	18,002	17,516	18,640	19.0	18.5	20.0	1,124	6.4
Snyder	5,275	6,144	8,402	14.0	15.5	17.3	2,258	36.8
Union	5,584	6,654	7,571	13.4	14.8	16.8	917	13.8
SEDA-COG MPO	61,924	65,657	73,350	17.0	17.5	19.6	7,693	11.7

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

## Young and Adult Population

By comparing the 2010-2017 change in senior population to total population change, one can determine that adults under age 65 are leaving the region.

See Table 4.

### ***Transportation Implication:***

Young adults—Millennials, in particular—are choosing places to live based on lifestyle and community quality of life factors. They value community character experienced socially in public spaces and accessible on foot, on bicycle or by transit. Some don't and won't ever own a personal vehicle. Successfully retaining and attracting the young adult portion of the population will require more transportation options and services.



**Table 4. Population Change, Under Age 65, 2010 to 2017**

Geography	Change 2010-2017 Total	Change 2010-2017, Age 65 and over	Change 2010-2017 under 65
Clinton	83	584	-501
Columbia	-680	1,121	-1,801
Juniata	-122	535	-657
Mifflin	-294	858	-1,152
Montour	35	289	-254
Northumberland	-1,490	1,124	-2,614
Snyder	868	2,258	-1,390
Union	109	917	-808
SEDA-COG MPO	-1,491	7,693	-9,184

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

### Population Living in Poverty

The percentage of persons living below poverty in 2017 ranged from 10.2% in Union County to 17.2% in Clinton County and reflected decreases in 5 of the eight counties. Increasing rates of poverty in Clinton, Columbia and Juniata counties pushed the regional poverty rate from 14.0% in 2010 to an estimated 15.7% in 2017.

See Table 5.

#### ***Transportation Implication:***

With limited income, persons living in poverty may or may not own a vehicle. It may or may not be in running condition. They may or may not be compliant with automobile insurance requirements. They are typically reliant on walking, biking or on transportation services to reach services for income assistance, job assistance, medical care, etc. to sustain or improve their economic condition and health.

**Table 5. Population Living below Poverty (past 12 months)**

Geography	2000	2010	2017	2000 %	2010 %	2017 %
Clinton	5,057	5,571	6,431	14.2	15.5	17.2
Columbia	7,899	8,533	9,821	13.1	13.7	15.9
Juniata	2,109	2,007	3,155	9.5	8.3	13.1
Mifflin	5,701	6,390	6,133	12.5	13.9	13.5
Montour	1,514	1,951	1,851	8.7	11.0	10.5
Northumberland	10,818	13,498	12,762	11.9	14.9	14.4
Snyder	3,495	4,342	4,310	9.9	11.7	11.3
Union	2,910	4,445	3,639	8.8	12.7	10.2
SEDA-COG MPO	41,503	48,747	50,119	12.2	14.0	15.7

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

## Households with No Vehicle

The percentage of households with no access to a vehicle is estimated to have ranged from 7.2% in Juniata County to 10.4% in Northumberland County in 2017. Trends from 2000 to 2010 to the 2017 estimate vary widely county to county. Overall, one in ten households had no vehicle per the 2017 estimate.

See Table 6.

### ***Transportation Implication:***

Lack of a vehicle limits access to jobs and services—two primary factors in quality of life. These households rely on walking, biking or on transportation services to meet their daily needs.

**Table 6. Households with No Access to Vehicle**

Geography	2000	2010	2017	2000 %	2010 %	2017 %
Clinton	1,457	1,083	1,395	9.9	7.1	9.5
Columbia	1,860	1,758	1,526	7.5	6.8	5.7
Juniata	549	495	676	6.4	5.8	7.2
Mifflin	1,930	2,032	1,829	10.5	10.7	9.7
Montour	590	609	757	8.3	8.3	10.2
Northumberland	4,367	4,103	4,095	11.2	10.5	10.4
Snyder	1,020	815	1,074	7.5	5.7	7.4
Union	1,049	1,175	1,192	8.0	7.9	8.1
<b>SEDA-COG MPO</b>	<b>14,822</b>	<b>14,080</b>	<b>14,561</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>10.0</b>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

## Economy

Manufacturing, Retail, and Educational Services and Health Care and Social Assistance are the top industries by employment, employing at least 40 percent of workers in each county.

Employment declines in these industries are shown in bold in Table 7.

In 2012, the most recent economic census data available, there were 461 manufacturing firms, 1,250 retail establishments, and 956 service/care entities in the SEDA-COG MPO region.

### ***Transportation Implication:***

These industries have historically been labor intensive; however, automation is impacting many areas of manufacturing and ecommerce/online shopping are putting pressure on traditional brick-and-mortar retail stores. From an employment perspective, health care continues to specialize and expand to meet the needs of an aging population.

All three industries have significant freight demands; manufacturing typically makes greater use of rail freight for inbound material and outbound product, while retail and services rely on trucking for product or supply deliveries. A working knowledge of establishment locations and their transportation needs for employees and materials would be useful for decision-making and potential public-private partnerships.

All three industries are commonly located on the edge of urbanized areas in growing regions, like the SEDA-COG MPO.

**Table 7. Employment by Industry**

Geography, Estimate Period		Civilian employed population 16 years and over	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	Construction	Manufacturing	Wholesale trade	Retail trade	Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	Information	Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	Professional, scientific, and administrative and waste management services	Educational services, and health care and social assistance	Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	Other services, except public administration	Public administration
Clinton	2013-2017	17,572	3.2%	6.9%	15.7%	2.1%	12.8%	5.6%	1.3%	3.2%	6.2%	23.6%	9.9%	5.1%	4.3%
	2008-2012	17,104	3.5%	7.6%	17.6%	1.8%	12.7%	5.0%	0.8%	4.0%	5.7%	22.7%	8.8%	4.0%	5.8%
Columbia	2013-2017	<b>30,035</b>	1.9%	5.2%	16.5%	1.7%	12.5%	6.0%	1.7%	3.4%	5.2%	28.2%	9.6%	4.5%	3.6%
	2008-2012	31,398	1.5%	5.4%	17.4%	2.2%	12.1%	5.6%	1.4%	3.6%	6.0%	27.9%	8.6%	4.2%	4.0%
Juniata	2013-2017	<b>11,180</b>	5.9%	9.6%	22.1%	1.9%	<b>11.0%</b>	6.3%	1.0%	4.9%	5.3%	<b>17.3%</b>	4.7%	4.2%	5.9%
	2008-2012	11,217	4.7%	10.0%	20.1%	2.4%	11.2%	6.8%	1.1%	4.7%	4.7%	18.3%	6.1%	3.5%	6.3%
Mifflin	2013-2017	20,884	2.8%	7.5%	22.8%	2.1%	11.8%	5.1%	0.9%	2.5%	4.5%	23.4%	7.6%	5.3%	3.9%
	2008-2012	19,377	3.5%	7.1%	23.4%	1.9%	11.0%	5.6%	1.4%	3.2%	4.9%	23.2%	6.7%	4.6%	3.4%
Montour	2013-2017	8,662	2.6%	4.5%	10.4%	1.9%	12.4%	5.9%	1.0%	4.6%	5.1%	<b>37.7%</b>	6.7%	3.1%	4.1%
	2008-2012	8,308	1.9%	4.9%	11.6%	1.9%	7.0%	4.3%	0.6%	3.9%	5.1%	40.2%	9.4%	4.0%	5.1%
Northumberland	2013-2017	41,505	2.8%	5.4%	15.0%	2.1%	12.1%	6.3%	1.0%	3.2%	5.1%	29.7%	6.7%	4.8%	5.9%
	2008-2012	41,207	2.6%	6.6%	15.5%	2.6%	13.4%	5.9%	1.2%	3.6%	4.5%	26.2%	7.2%	4.2%	6.5%
Snyder	2013-2017	20,054	3.6%	7.7%	17.3%	2.4%	<b>14.3%</b>	4.8%	0.8%	2.8%	6.1%	<b>24.3%</b>	6.7%	4.3%	4.8%
	2008-2012	18,755	3.1%	8.0%	19.1%	2.7%	15.5%	4.5%	0.8%	2.1%	3.0%	24.6%	6.3%	5.4%	4.8%
Union	2013-2017	18,397	3.3%	7.9%	12.6%	2.0%	<b>10.1%</b>	5.2%	0.9%	2.4%	4.9%	33.9%	9.4%	3.5%	3.9%
	2008-2012	17,662	2.9%	6.3%	13.1%	2.4%	12.0%	4.8%	1.3%	3.2%	5.1%	32.0%	7.9%	4.0%	5.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining, and Accommodation/Food Services are other significant industries in all counties with Construction and Management of Companies and Enterprises showing strong employment in select counties.

***Transportation Implication:***

Agriculture, forestry and mining – though small by employment measures – rely on trucking to move vast quantities of raw materials from rural sites to processing facilities, often across miles of the rural road and bridge network.

Construction, also smaller in employment, moves large and heavy equipment and machinery on the road and bridge system.

Accommodation/Food Services has a much smaller impact on the transportation system day-to-day though truck deliveries are necessary.

**Technology: A Driver of Change**

Technology is influencing transportation infrastructure, operations equipment, software, and consumer demand and will continue to do so in rapidly evolving ways in the years ahead.

Innovations in industry and across the marketplace are creating big data platforms, such as TomTom for traffic data and Strava for pedestrian and cycling athletes. Even the public sector is amassing big data, such as the biennial State Transportation Commission’s Public Outreach Comments. Some of this data is available for free; other data sets require membership or purchase. And the time and expertise to analyze big data is an additional cost.

Natural gas and electric “fuels” are now part of the public and consumer fleet. Demand for fueling and charging stations is on the rise as more vehicle owners choose these fuel alternatives. The region’s first private electric charging station is now in operation in Bloomsburg.

Home delivery of retail products, food and beverage and other consumer goods is shifting shopping destinations from downtown and suburban centers to residential areas and taking trucks from warehouses into neighborhoods.

Connected vehicles and autonomous vehicles are not yet common in the region but are being tested in larger urban areas of the state. They are in our future. Likewise, ride-hailing services haven’t adapted to rural regions but are likely to overcome the challenges of distance and driver density with time and creativity.

# Action Plan

The following pages briefly characterize the six selected strategic issues that must be proactively addressed to shape the SEDA-COG MPO’s transportation system in support of the region’s community and economic goals.

- Issue 1: Transportation funding is inadequate and inconsistent.....12
- Issue 2: Asset management and performance measurement must address local needs .....14
- Issue 3: System improvements must address resiliency to weather events .....17
- Issue 4: Modern travel patterns and technology have outdated some corridors.....18
- Issue 5: Operations are essential to systematic traffic incident management.....20
- Issue 6: Our region’s system must be conveniently multimodal and service-supported.....21
- Localized Priority: Integration of the CSVT with local land use and transportation .....23

For each issue, strategic actions describe various ways that the MPO can build knowledge, assemble and analyze data, and apply tools for better decision-making. Actions include items that the MPO staff may handle and report progress or completion to the Board, as well as items that would require or be most effective if conducted jointly by the Board and staff.

Two tools in the appendix can be used or modified to help the Board stay focused on these issues.

Appendix 2 is an Annual Implementation Progress Tracker. It lists all the strategic actions in abbreviated form and indicates either “Ongoing” or “Q# (Quarter#)/Annually” or “Q# (Quarter#)/Year” as a prompt for annual prioritization or selection of actions. Additional space is provided to mark completion of milestones or other activities of note.

Appendix 3 is a Quarterly Activity Review. This two-page document can be used during the MPO’s quarterly meetings to prompt verbal comments on recent Board member and staff activity and/or upcoming opportunities for outreach to stakeholders. Notes on Quarterly Activity Reviews could be compiled as an annual report or used to populate the Appendix 2 Tracker as an annual summary of progress.

**Issue 1: Transportation funding is inadequate and inconsistent.**

**A. Amount of Funding.** There is never enough state and federal funding to address local needs, i.e., get local projects on the TIP. This is true statewide and has been recognized in the Transportation Funding Advisory Commission’s 2011 report, which led to a five-year boost in state funding known as Act 89 of 2013. Still, this is not enough.

From another point of view, addressing this issue may entail a better understanding of the relationship between the types of transportation needs and other funding agencies and programs. Use of economic development funding programs or recreational development sources for projects or project components can streamline demand for traditional state and federal transportation dollars. For example, economic development projects should explore funding from the Appalachian Regional Commission (e.g., local access road program), and bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects, from PA DCED/CFA and/or PA DCNR.

Ultimately, transportation needs must be sorted by type and program eligibility and prioritized for the limited funding available. There are multiple federal and state agency funding grant programs available for transportation projects. However, they are competitive, and funding must be sought strategically (right source, right project or project component) and with local commitment.

Local funding can be used directly for transportation projects or can be used as local match for state and federal funding. An additional \$5 fee (collected with vehicle registration) for local transportation projects was authorized for county participation in 2013. Mifflin and Union are the only counties in the MPO region that have passed an ordinance to implement the \$5 fee for local use.

Partnerships for infrastructure investment are becoming increasingly necessary as public solutions become more constrained. Municipal traffic impact fees were authorized in 1990 (amended in 2000). They are useful in municipalities where development is active or anticipated.

**B. Long-term Inconsistency in Funding.** State and federal programs and requirements keep changing. Indeed, programs are created, revised, merged and eliminated with each federal transportation funding bill, often impacting state programs. Communities in the region lack an understanding of current programs, eligible projects, selection criteria, match requirements, and application periods, as well as the resources to prepare competitive applications. Specifically, the number of municipalities applying for and awarded Multimodal Transportation Fund grants has been declining over the last few years.

STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR FUNDING	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
A1. Be prepared to give a local response. Develop a short script, e.g., elevator speech or “pocket card,” for MPO Board members to use in their home communities and staff to share in general outreach, indicating: “Here’s what we know, how our region is dealing with it, and the options available to us.”	Develop script via staff planning support Share via everyday outreach by Board and staff

STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR FUNDING	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
A2. Ensure that the MPO’s project prioritization criteria identify those projects that align best with the region’s transportation values for community and economic development, including those that represent local projects. Evaluate, strengthen and clarify criteria, if needed.	Evaluate and update, if needed, via Board action, during or in advance of the LRTP update Provide easy public access to current project prioritization process and project list
A3. Continue working internally with economic development, community development and Joint Rail Authority staff to identify projects and match them up with appropriate funding sources. Advocate for and support projects by helping developers to navigate the HOP process, in tandem with other SEDA-COG staff where efficient.	Obtain ED projects via staff (as internal liaison to SEDA-COG ED staff)
A4. Continue to facilitate the sharing of information and best practices between counties who have passed or are considering the fee for local use.	Document via Board input (as liaisons with county commissioners) and staff outreach to counties Share via everyday outreach by staff and Board members (as liaisons to county commissioners)
A5. Guide municipalities in the effective use of state and federal funding programs to keep the transportation system open and operating versus road or bridge closure and the associated community impacts. For example, if a local bridge needs repair but funding availability is many years away, encourage the municipality to take short-term action to stabilize conditions using a multi-modal transportation fund grant or consider a retroactive reimbursement while a major repair or replacement project waits for funding.	Host via LTAP: <a href="#">Pavement Preventative Maintenance</a> and <a href="#">Bridge Maintenance &amp; Inspection</a> , PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance, lunch and learn, municipal outreach, etc.
B1. Prepare a list of current programs with a summary statement or examples of program use. PennDOT’s Program Center and/or the District Planners may be helpful in preparing the program summary. Share with municipalities via online information, workshops, and local meetings.	Prepare via staff planning support Share via everyday outreach by Board and staff
B2. Assist municipalities in developing sound projects, from identification to purpose/need, scope of services, schedule/phasing, cost estimate, and in preparing competitive applications.	Assist via municipal outreach, Board review, and PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance

## Issue 2: Asset management and performance measurement must address local needs.

C. **Performance Measures.** Transportation organizations use performance measures to report the outcomes of changes in infrastructure and operations relative to established goals. The use of performance measures in combination with other management approaches, such as asset management, is unclear.

FHWA has established a number of performance measures and targets that all recipients of federal funding need to work toward. PennDOT complies with this requirement in its pass-through funding.

MPO Board members have several concerns:

1. that performance measures may influence project selection toward those projects that will yield the best scores without regard for the projects that are needed most but may not contribute to the established measures.
2. that performance measurement, particularly in combination with asset management, will focus on current infrastructure without sufficient attention to needed alternative or additional infrastructure.
3. that performance measurement drives funding toward hard infrastructure, making less funding available for operations and transportation services
4. how to develop local measures that will demonstrate that needs are being met

These concerns can be addressed through the MPO's selection of performance measures. Some measures are required by PennDOT and/or FHWA, but others should be determined. If the completion of local projects is a concern, then one or more locally determined performance measures can be used to measure investment in this area.

D. **MPO Asset Management: Freight and Local Bridges.** PennDOT's asset management efforts collect data (location, condition, etc.) on each state-owned transportation facility. This data is then used to inform decision-making, such as prioritization for improvement and "packaging" of similar projects for efficiency, e.g., bridge-bundling.

PennDOT requests assistance from planning partners in assembling similar data on locally owned facilities so that all investment decisions are well-informed. The identification of priority mobility networks by mode (and purpose, i.e., freight/commerce) would be a useful tool for prioritization, alignment with unique funding sources, and coordination (e.g., traffic incidence management).

The region's rail freight system should continue to be marketed to serve existing businesses, especially those with heavy truck volumes that may benefit from some rail use, and to attract new ones.

Locally owned bridges, including those less than 20 feet in length for which inspection is not required per federal regulation, are of particular concern because they are critical to freight transport routes for the region's agricultural and timber products and have no dedicated support. Bridges that become weight restricted while waiting for funding can cause significant detours, adding time and cost to shipping.

Some counties across the state have begun voluntarily inspecting bridges 8 feet to 20 feet in length to gather data and prioritize needs.



Although there has been a recent increase in the number of reconstructed local bridges, many early 19th century local bridges continue to reach the end of their service life in large numbers. The cost to reconstruct and replace these bridges has increased substantially; however, recent funding techniques, e.g., bridge bundling contracts, have helped to reduce the number of structurally deficient bridges. In 2016, the MPO staff assembled [\*Bridge Funding Handbook for Local Governments\*](#). The handbook is available on the SEDA-COG Transportation webpage.

STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR ASSET MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
C1. Remain involved in PennDOT efforts to consider performance measurements and performance-based planning including FHWA requirements.	Remain involved as a Planning Partner (staff) with PennDOT and FHWA
C2. (Continue to) Provide simplified county level TIP/project listings and highlight their impact on performance.	Provide enhanced project listings by county via staff planning support and outreach
C3. Research (periodically) the state of the practice, drawing from online and agency staff resources: other publications and educational opportunities, e.g., seminars, conferences, etc. made available by PennDOT, FHWA, AASHTO and TRB. Specifically consider initial (starter) measures and measures relevant to rural and small urban areas.	Research via staff planning support (or intern)  Share relevant information with Board members
C4. Draft the project prioritization list based on <u>quantifiable</u> criteria relevant to required and locally determined measures. Finalize the prioritization list using <u>qualitative</u> information from project sponsors, host municipalities, and Board members. All Board members should have sufficient information to evaluate the need for the project and make an informed vote.	Draft and finalize via the LRTP update
C5. Enhance analysis and understanding of the list and its performance potential by using a model, such as Decision Lens, which can be customized to local criteria.	Enhance analysis via staff planning support with Board involvement
D1. Identify businesses that generate heavy truck traffic and characterize truck traffic. Assist in examining the feasibility and cost/benefit of using rail freight.	Determine via staff/Board outreach to major employers
D2. Inform municipal officials on goods movement trends and issues as they relate to land use policy and planning.	Inform via municipal outreach, Board review, and PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance
D3. Examine PennDOT’s Rail Freight investment prioritization approach for possible application to improved integration of transportation and economic development.	Examine via staff planning support

STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR ASSET MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
D4. Identify and map freight centers and generators not served by the existing networks (e.g., National Highway System).	Identify via staff planning support and Board approval
D5. Identify and document state and local bridges that are critical to rural industry. This could be performed in conjunction with D6.	Identify via Board members (as liaisons to county planning and municipalities) and outreach to counties the LRTP; document as asset management priorities in the LRTP update
D6. Document which counties are inspecting local bridges and how counties are successfully addressing local bridge needs, e.g., Lycoming County’s use of combined funds and bridge bundling to repair and replace bridges.	Identify and determine via Board members (as liaisons to county planning and municipalities) and outreach to counties
D7. Use available data to show local bridge trends over time.	Quantify via the LRTP using available asset management data
D8. Encourage “introductory inspections” (i.e., a modified NBIS inspection) and municipal capital improvement programs (CIPs) for addressing substandard local bridges. Develop a funding support mechanism.	Encourage via everyday outreach by Board members and staff Explore a mechanism via staff planning support with input from Board and municipalities
D9. Direct municipalities to resources, training, technical assistance in developing capital improvement plans for local bridges, using the MPO’s <i><a href="#">Bridge Funding Handbook for Local Governments</a></i> .	Direct via Bridge Funding Handbook as well as LTAP: <i><a href="#">Bridge Maintenance &amp; Inspection</a></i> , PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance
D10. Sub-allocate a percentage of TIP funds for eligible local bridges.	Sub-allocate via TIP preparation in coordination with PennDOT

### Issue 3: System improvements must address resiliency to weather events.

E. **Resilience.** Extreme weather events and their impacts on infrastructure and operations are becoming more common. Some roadways and bridges experience repeated damage and closure due to repeated flooding. These impacts are a matter of safety first as well as the resilience and reliability upon which our regional economy depends.

Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act calls for improving the resilience and reliability of the transportation system. In cases of repetitive damage, project scoping should consider a design that can withstand the next and likely stronger storm event, e.g., by resizing the bridge, improving the roadway drainage capacity, and stabilizing slides, sinkholes and geotechnical issues. In addition, analysis of weather trends and impacts would help define the scale of improvement needed to withstand future storms over some predictable period.

The identification of natural and man-made hazards, including weather events and impacts, and the planned mitigation approaches are discussed in hazard mitigation plans, prepared by each county in the Commonwealth. They address the vulnerability of the county and critical facilities to specific hazards; identify evacuation routes, as relevant to known hazards; and recommend mitigation approaches to reduce damages, including the loss of life and property.

STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR RESILIENCY	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
<p>E1. Document transportation facilities impacted by storm events and flooding. Analyze for trends or patterns in repetitive damage or road closure, i.e., problem areas. Share with counties for their hazard mitigation plans.</p>	<p>Document via Board and staff planning support immediately following storm events</p> <p>Analyze records over time via staff planning support</p> <p>Share records with counties for hazard mitigation planning</p>
<p>E2. Participate in county hazard mitigation planning regarding critical transportation facilities, including major employers; liaison with PennDOT engineering and maintenance districts to inform short-term response.</p>	<p>Participate via Board and staff planning support</p>
<p>E3. Coordinate internally to manage data collection, analysis (e.g., validation, cumulative impact), and sharing and to support the flooding resiliency program.</p>	<p>Participate in internal agency coordination</p>
<p>E4. Develop a policy to support re-design of facilities and operations (after repetitive damages) to withstand stronger storm events.</p>	<p>Develop policy via staff planning support with Board and PennDOT involvement</p>
<p>E5. Request listing of known missing USGS monuments. Incorporate replacements into bridge projects.</p>	<p>Request via staff to USGS</p> <p>Incorporate via PennDOT Connects</p>
<p>E6. Review hazard mitigation plans for transportation infrastructure and operations-related problems, impacts and approaches; determine if the MPO can provide assistance or direct municipalities to available assistance.</p>	<p>Review via LRTP update</p>

**Issue 4: Modern travel patterns and technology have outdated some regional corridors.**

**F. Modernization for Safety and Efficiency.** Modern travel patterns and technology have outdated the current design and operations of some regional highways. Roundabouts are now commonly considered for intersections that meet certain criteria. Many one-way pairs are being converted to two-way travel in favor of traffic calming and pedestrian safety. Signals can now operate as a system and respond to changes in traffic flow.

Appreciation for the walkability of the region’s historic cities and small towns is growing in an era of concern for inadequate physical activity related to chronic disease. Yet, decades focused on vehicular circulation have overlooked the need for continuous pedestrian networks and created discontinuous sidewalk networks.

In addition, communities and their business areas in the region are growing, generating more traffic. Intersections that are askew and once carried low traffic volumes now carry more vehicles daily and put more travelers at risk.

**G. Emerging technology in our region.** In addition to improvements that would bring our region’s infrastructure and operations up-to-date, additional technology is on the horizon. Electric vehicles are becoming more common and connected and autonomous vehicles are next. Ride-hailing and home delivery will also affect our transportation in the future.

STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR MODERNIZATION/TECHNOLOGY	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
<p>F1. Identify and monitor corridors of interest/concern. Monitor traffic volumes for significant change. When significant change occurs, compile local data and municipal input about the currency of signal timings, safety records (including non-reportable crashes), etc.; share with the PennDOT District and jointly determine if corridor updates or further study are needed.</p>	<p>Identify via Board input and review Monitor via staff planning and Board review for awareness and perspective Meet and determine via staff outreach with relevant Board member involvement</p>
<p>F2. Conduct road safety audits to assess and prioritize needs. Address needs through state and local action.</p>	<p>Conduct via staff/consultant planning support with PennDOT District and municipal participation Assist municipal action via LTAP: <a href="#">Road Safety Audit</a>, <a href="#">Local Road Safety Plans</a>, and <a href="#">Traffic Calming</a></p>
<p>F3. Document potential transportation needs from outreach meetings/sessions. Determine whether studies are warranted to gather and analyze data.  Where corridor study is needed and crosses municipal boundaries, encourage municipalities to work together for study funding, project funding, and municipal implementation (i.e., planning, zoning, etc.)</p>	<p>Document via staff outreach Determine via PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance</p>
<p>F4. Analyze data to identify problem locations for bike/ped improvement and determine how to address problems, i.e., PennDOT Connects, locally-led bike/ped project, local maintenance effort. Data would include but not be</p>	<p>Analyze via bike-ped subcommittee activity</p>

STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR MODERNIZATION/TECHNOLOGY	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
<p>limited to: safety data (crashes), non-reportable incidents (local police data), bike stress, and outreach findings.</p>	
<p>G1. Research best and emerging practices in applied technology in rural regions, e.g., FHWA, Transportation Research Board (TRB), Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), etc. Share relevant practices with municipalities at county municipal events/gatherings. Program time for discussion/questions.</p>	<p>Research via staff planning support (or intern) Share to Board and via outreach</p>
<p>G2. Expand capacity to understand and apply technology through stronger relations with the region’s higher education institutions (those with technology programs, experts, and possible interns) and local technology companies with relevant knowledge. Invite presenters to educate the Board on coming technologies and impacts.</p>	<p>Identify and invite via staff planning support (or intern)</p>
<p>G3. Host educational workshops on modern design and technology to inform municipal acceptance and use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Electric cars, specifically the need for recharging stations; the first in region is Sheetz in Bloomsburg</li> <li>b. Connected Vehicles / Autonomous Vehicles</li> </ul>	<p>Host via LTAP, PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance, lunch and learn, municipal outreach sessions, etc.</p>

**Issue 5: Operations are essential to systematic traffic incident management.**

**H. Operations & Traffic Incident Management (TIM).** As traffic increases, the need for operational controls and the potential for traffic conflicts increase. This need is elevated when weather or other events result in road and bridge closures, further concentrating traffic on the remaining streets and highways.

Some operational needs can be anticipated, and responses can be formalized as protocol due to the repeated nature of the incident. But others require real-time communication and coordination among EMS/EMA, PennDOT and state and local law enforcement during incidents and are valuable for after-action evaluation.

SAMPLE STRATEGIC ACTIONS	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
<p>H1. Identify critical transportation corridors (criteria to include heavy traffic and evacuation routes, high crash corridors). Compare critical corridors for those that span two or more counties. Share critical corridors with municipalities, PennDOT, County EMA, municipal EMA, fire/rescue, towing, and local EMS for efficient response during incidents.</p>	<p>Identify via staff/consultant planning support and outreach                      Compare via staff/consultant planning support                      Share via staff outreach</p>
<p>H2. Review the Regional Operations Plan (ROP) to implement strategies related to this issue. Determine how human actions can inform continuing investment in ROP updates.</p>	<p>Review via staff planning support                      Implement via recommended strategies</p>
<p>H3. Facilitate or participate in regularly scheduled meetings including municipal road owners, fire companies, towing, PennDOT, EMA, law enforcement, and local EMS regarding preparedness, response coordination and after-action evaluation.</p>	<p>Facilitate/participate via staff planning support</p>

**Issue 6: The regional system must be conveniently multimodal and service-supported.**

**I. Multimodal Transportation Services.** Our region comprises small urbanized areas and villages dispersed across large rural counties. Meeting personal and household needs and accessing employment commonly require intercommunity travel by vehicle. For a variety of reasons, not all persons are able to operate or own a vehicle, but their travel needs are no less important. A multimodal system supported by public transportation services should provide equitable travel for all.

Working toward a multimodal system that provides reliable primary and backup transportation for workers will help to grow and attract additional employers. A commitment to reliable system and services may attract financial support from existing employers.

A multimodal system for our region should:

- Market public transportation services.
- Monitor gaps in needed services.
- Monitor gaps filled by private services and evaluate public service, when appropriate.
- Serve the three branch corridors of the Middle Susquehanna region with intercommunity fixed-route transit service, when feasible.
- Maintain and enhance Amtrak service and facilities and improve accessibility at Lewistown.
- Serve urbanized areas (many are multi-municipal) with pedestrian systems.

Accommodate on-road bicycle travel on select streets and highways.

STRATEGIC ACTIONS	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
<b>Public Transit Systems and Shared-ride Services.</b>	
11. Continue to coordinate services and initiatives through the Central PA Transportation Coalition (CPTC).	Coordinate via staff planning support
12. Identify improved marketing and service access approaches, particularly for the service-dependent public. Begin by reviewing the Local Coordinated Transit Plan (LCTP) for relevant recommendations.	Identify via review of LCTP and follow-up implementation.
13. Identify and interview employers and institutions that operate their own bus/shuttle or other service. Compare areas served, and what works and what doesn't. Explore opportunity and interest in coordinated service.	Identify via Board input and review Interview, compare and explore via staff planning support and CPTC involvement
14. Outreach to populations dependent on transportation services. Consider intercept surveys to collect needs as well as integration of questions into external outreach/survey efforts.	Outreach via staff/consultant planning support during and between LCTP updates (annually)

STRATEGIC ACTIONS	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
15. Outreach to and educate employers and destinations about local support and contributions toward ride-share, transit, and bike-pedestrian travel options.	Outreach via staff/consultant planning support during and between LCTP updates (annually)
16. Outreach to and educate public officials. Focus on those that ask questions and that represent gap areas.	Outreach via staff/consultant planning support during and between LCTP updates (annually)
17. Monitor trends in Lewistown boardings and alightings; annual data is available under <a href="#">About Amtrak</a> on its Facts and Services page.	Monitor via staff planning support (or intern)
<b>Bicycle and Pedestrian Systems</b>	
18. Establish a bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee that 1) liaisons with user groups, 2) assists with bike-ped project development, and 3) reviews other modal projects for intermodal continuity.	Establish via Board approval
19. Direct municipalities to resources for bicycle and pedestrian policy and planning/design, such as curb extensions, pedestrian refuges, mid-block crossings (with good signage), signals, quality outdoor lighting.	Direct to PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance and <a href="#">PA WalkWorks</a> webinars and mini-grants



## Localized Priority: Integration of the CSVT with local land use and transportation

J. **The Central Susquehanna Valley Thruway.** This new 10.84-mile limited access highway will connect US 11/15 south of Selinsgrove to PA 147 at Milton with the interchange of Interstate 80 and I-180. It has been designated as part of Corridor P-1 of the Appalachian Development Highway System by the Appalachian Regional Commission, which aims to improve economic development in the region. The corridor will bypass several town centers but more importantly will better connect communities with the National Highway System and the markets it serves.

The corridor is programmed in two segments. The river bridge and northern section through Northumberland and Union counties are currently under construction; completion is scheduled for 2022. The southern section through Snyder and Union counties is still under design; completion of construction is anticipated by 2027. While the project footprint is located in these three counties, impacts are likely to occur throughout the region.

Many municipalities have been slow to recognize the impact the new corridor will have on both downtowns and rural, greenfield areas. Many local officials view the corridor from a local service perspective—as a bypass only. They have not yet prepared for commercial, warehousing/logistics, and other development demand at the new interchanges and surrounding areas. Others will need to consider the challenges and opportunities of lower-volume traffic on land use and operations. Furthermore, park-n-ride lots were added later in the design process; these, too, will affect traffic patterns in ways that locals have not considered.

In many cases, municipalities have neither the funding nor the planning expertise to adequately prepare for the coming changes in development pressure and patterns that will be introduced by the CSVT. The MPO needs to remain active in coordinating planning at the county and municipal levels to address changing patterns through the construction period and perhaps through at least the first years of operation.

SAMPLE STRATEGIC ACTIONS	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
<p>J1. Seek to understand municipal inaction: 1) if no development along the CSVT corridor and interchanges is desired by municipalities, provide guidance/direction to strengthen policy/land use ordinances to that end; 2) if development is desired, provide guidance/direction to strengthen land use policy/ordinances to that end.</p>	<p>Outreach or informal discussions amid meetings by Boards and staff Provide via staff planning support</p>
<p>J2. For municipalities that recognize that transportation and/or land use impacts will occur, provide or direct them resources to help define the impacts and relevant approaches.</p> <p>Study scopes of work can be developed via PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance. Pursue special study funding from PennDOT to address secondary impacts around the new interchanges.</p>	<p>Provide via staff planning support, special studies, and/or PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance</p>

SAMPLE STRATEGIC ACTIONS	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM
<p>J3. Prompt counties to share the nature of development interest in properties along the CSVT corridor and interchanges for regional awareness; share verbally and quarterly, e.g., at MPO meetings or interim information-sharing calls.</p>	<p>Agenda item or sub-item for MPO meetings</p>
<p>J4. Participate in community forums, e.g., the Warrior Run Community Corporation, chambers of commerce, etc., that actively exchange data, perspectives and concerns pertaining to traffic and land use impacts.</p>	<p>Provide via staff planning support and Board participation</p>
<p>J5. Provide technical support to counties on issues related to impacts created by CSVT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Work with PennDOT and its partners at the municipal level to evaluate the operational performance of affected corridors.</li> <li>b. Monitor the need for new or improved access roads and how they can best connect to the network.</li> </ul>	<p>Provide via staff planning support, special studies, and/or PennDOT Connects Technical Assistance</p>

## Appendix 1

### Federal and State Transportation Planning Policy

Transportation planning requirements and federal funding programs are prescribed for discrete periods of time by federal law. These requirements as well as the amount and allocation of funding to various modal and multi-modal programs can change with each federal transportation appropriation. State planning policy complies with the federal framework and supplements funding toward statewide system priorities.

#### Federal Policy, FY2016-FY2020

Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or "FAST Act" appropriated federal funding for surface transportation for fiscal years (FY) 2016 through 2020. Building upon its predecessor, it continues to make the Federal surface transportation programs more streamlined, performance-based, multimodal, and responsive to the infrastructure and operations challenges facing the U.S. transportation system.

According to the [FAST-Act: Summary of Highway Provisions](#), changes impact three key topics:

1. Ease of mobility on America's highways, particularly for freight.
2. Funding for road, bridge, bicycling, and walking improvements toward job creation and economic growth.
3. Innovation for "efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability in the planning, environmental review, design, engineering, construction, and financing of transportation projects."

Under FAST Act, transportation planning requirements emphasize multimodal systems, performance measurement, and resilience and reliability:

The FAST Act continues requirements for a **long-range transportation plan** (LRTP) and a **short-term transportation improvement program (TIP)**, with the long-range statewide and metropolitan plans required to include facilities that support intercity transportation, including intercity buses. The statewide and metropolitan long-range plans must describe the performance measures and targets that States and MPOs use in assessing system performance and progress in achieving the performance targets. Additionally, the FAST Act requires the planning process to consider projects/strategies to: improve the resilience and reliability of the transportation system, stormwater mitigation, and enhance travel and tourism. Public Law 114-94 Section 1201 and 1202.

Finally, FAST Act replaces the Transportation Alternatives Program with a set-aside of surface transportation block grant funding for transportation alternatives giving MPOs, including the SEDA-COG MPO, greater flexibility in the use of set-aside funds for TA projects or highways, as deemed appropriate by the MPO.

FAST Act may be extended by approval of a continuing resolution or replaced by new transportation legislation.

## PennDOT Policy

[PennDOT's Center for Program Development and Management](#) is the locus of planning and program development in the transportation agency. The Program Center prepares the Statewide TIP or STIP, the statewide LRTP and now, in compliance with FAST Act, the state's Comprehensive Freight Movement Plan. These plans focus primarily on the highway, bridge, and related operational systems but also include multimodal transportation encompassing air, rail, ports, public transportation and bicycle-pedestrian modes.

**PennDOT Connects** was established in 2016 as the state's policy for coordinating transportation improvement with community goals. In advance of listing a project on the TIP, District staff are required to discuss the purpose of the project and any project or contextual concerns or community goals with the host municipality. District staff, in coordination with MPO/RPO staff, must consider the municipal input in scoping the project and determine whether to: incorporate (or decline to incorporate) community needs into the design, offer to coordinate with a locally-led project, which may be funded by PennDOT or other agency programs, or refer a minor need to the county maintenance department for action.

To support municipal understanding and engagement with the new state policy, PennDOT has created *PennDOT Connects: Powered by Communities*, a training and technical assistance program for municipalities. Through this program, municipalities can receive free technical assistance for community-wide or site-specific transportation planning. Municipal officials and staff can learn more and request training and technical assistance at <https://paconnects.org>.

PennDOT's Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) can be accessed at <https://www.dot7.state.pa.us/ltap/default.aspx>.

## The MPO's Transportation Planning Program

The MPO uses three overarching planning products in its efforts to provide a balanced, reliable transportation system.

1. The **Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** summarizes the MPO staff's planning activities, as well as those of its partners and other transportation agencies in the region. It authorizes activities and funds studies across a wide range of needs. The UPWP is updated every two years and may be revised in the interim.
2. The **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** is the regionally agreed-upon list of priority projects—submitted as the first four years of PennDOT's Twelve Year Program. The TIP contains multi-modal projects, including traditional highway/bridge and transit projects, along with bicycle/pedestrian projects, aviation, and freight-related improvements. The TIP is renewed every two years in Pennsylvania and is regularly amended to reallocate available funding to active or new projects. Preparation of the TIP occurs primarily in odd-numbered years for approval by PennDOT in even-numbered years.
3. The **Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)**, as its name implies, takes a long-term view of the MPO's planning program. The LRTP forecasts future conditions and establishes a vision for the development of the regional transportation system over the next 20 years. It is updated every five years. The next SEDA-COG MPO LRTP update is due to be completed by June 2021.

The MPO prepares and/or reviews and accepts additional plans at a modal or service level.

1. **Regional Operations Plans** are prepared by PennDOT's Engineering Districts to help move traffic smoothly under varied conditions. Districts 2, 3 and 9 prepared a multi-region plan encompassing the SEDA-COG MPO region in 2018. The Board had an opportunity to review the plan and ask questions prior the vote of acceptance in December 2018.
2. **The Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Transit Plan)**, prepared by the MPO, recommends how existing public transit service providers and human service agencies offering transportation services can better meet the travel needs of people accessing or receiving human services. This population includes low-income individuals, seniors, minorities, and persons with disabilities and/or limited English language skills. The current Coordinated Transit Plan covers both the SEDA-COG and Williamsport MPO regions and is due for update in 2019.
3. Regional bicycle and pedestrian planning is not required; however, community interest and co-sponsorship by the Susquehanna Greenway Partnership are making the development of a regional bicycle and pedestrian plan possible. The plan covers most of the SEDA-COG and Williamsport MPO regions. The effort was initiated in late 2016 and is expected to be completed by June 2019.

## Appendix 2 MPO Strategic Plan: Annual Implementation Progress Tracker – As of March 2019

ACTIONS FOR FUNDING	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
A1. Local leadership response.	Example Q2 2019	<input type="checkbox"/> "Script"			
A2. Project prioritization criteria and process. (+C9)	Q#/Year	<input type="checkbox"/> Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Update	<input type="checkbox"/> Publish	
A3. Work internally to match ED projects to funding sources and to navigate HOP.	Ongoing	Activity of note:			
A4. Share information/ best practices re: the fee for local use.	Q#/Annually				
A5. Guide municipalities to use all programs to keep the transportation system open.	Ongoing	Activity:			
B1. Current programs list; share.	Q#/Year	<input type="checkbox"/> Prepare	<input type="checkbox"/> Publish		
B2. Assist municipalities in project development.	Ongoing	Activity of note:			

ACTIONS FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
C1. Remain involved in PennDOT efforts.	Ongoing	Activity of note:			
C2. County-level TIP w/performance impact.	Ongoing or Biennial (?)				
C3. State of the practice, esp. rural/small urban areas.	Q# Annually				
C4. Project Prioritization (A2+C9)	See A2 above	N/A			
C5. Analyze project list w/ e.g., Decision Lens before approval.	TIP, biennially; LRTP, 5 years				
D1. Identify heavy truck traffic generators; outreach to characterize truck traffic.	Ongoing	Activity of note:			
D2. Inform local officials on goods movement (trends, transportation and land use.	Ongoing Responsively				
D3. Examine PennDOT's Rail Freight investment prioritization approach.	Q#/Year				

## Appendix 2 MPO Strategic Plan: Annual Implementation Progress Tracker – As of March 2019

ACTIONS FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
D4. Identify and map freight centers and generators not served by the existing networks.	Q#/Year				
D5. Identify and document state and local bridges that are critical to rural industry. This could be performed in conjunction with D6.	Q#/Year				
D6. Document/Share how counties are proactively addressing local bridge needs.	Q#/Annually				
D7. Use available data to show local bridge trends over time.	Q#/Annually				
D8. Develop an “introductory” local bridge inspection program.	Q#/Year				
D9. Direct municipalities to training/tech asst. for local bridge improvement funding.	Ongoing	Activity of note:			
D10. Develop policy to sub-allocate a percentage of TIP funds for eligible local bridges.	Q#/Year				
ACTIONS FOR RESILIENCY	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
E1. Document trans. facilities impacted by events and flooding.	Ongoing				
E2. Participate in county haz. mit. planning; liaison with PennDOT.	Ongoing				
E3. Coordinate internally to manage data and support resiliency program.	Ongoing				
E4. Develop policy to support re-design of facilities.	Q#/Year				
E5. Incorporate replacement of USGS monument in bridge projects.	Ongoing				
E6. Review haz. mit. plans for trans-related for MPO or referral assistance.	Q#/Year				

## Appendix 2 MPO Strategic Plan: Annual Implementation Progress Tracker – As of March 2019

ACTIONS FOR <b>MODERNIZATION</b>	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
F1. Identify and monitor key corridors of concern.	Ongoing				
F2. Conduct road safety audits.	Ongoing				
F3. Document local needs heard in outreach. Determine if study is warranted.	Ongoing				
F4. Analyze data for bike/ped problems.	Ongoing via Bike/Ped Committee				
G1. Research applied technology in rural regions.	Ongoing				
G2. Expand capacity to understand and apply technology.	Q#/Year				
G3. Host/Share transportation technology workshops for municipal officials.	Ongoing				

ACTIONS FOR <b>TRAFFIC INCIDENT MANAGEMENT</b>	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
H1. Identify critical transportation corridors.	Q#/Year				
H2. Implement ROP strategies.	Ongoing				
H3. Participate in response coordination and after-action evaluation meetings.	Ongoing				

ACTIONS FOR <b>MULTIMODAL</b>	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
<b>Public Transit Systems and Shared-ride Services.</b>					
I1. Continue participation in CPTC.	Ongoing				
I2. Improve marketing and service access approaches. (coordinate with CPTC)	Ongoing				
I3. Explore/Guide local interest in new service.	Ongoing				
I4. Outreach to populations dependent on transportation services.	Biennially				



## Appendix 2 MPO Strategic Plan: Annual Implementation Progress Tracker – As of March 2019

ACTIONS FOR <b>MULTIMODAL</b>	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
15. Outreach to employers and destinations re support for travel options.	Ongoing Responsively				
16. Outreach to and educate public officials re travel option gaps (vehicle only).	Ongoing Responsively				
17. Monitor trends in Amtrak Lewistown.	Annually				
<b>Bicycle and Pedestrian Systems</b>					
18. Establish a bike/ped advisory committee.	Q#/Year				
19. Direct municipalities to resources.	Ongoing				

ACTIONS FOR <b>CSVT</b>	Prioritization / Estimated Completion	Progress; Completion			Notes/Comments (Optional)
J1. Provide guidance/direction to support municipal land use action.	Ongoing Responsively				
J2. Provide guidance/direction to support municipal transportation action.	Ongoing Responsively				
J3. Monitor development interest in properties along the CSVT corridor and interchanges.	Ongoing				
J4. Participate in existing community forums re impacts.	Ongoing				
J5. Provide technical support, e.g., for operational impacts and access roads.	Ongoing				

END

## Appendix 3 MPO Strategic Plan: Quarterly Activity Review – As of March 2019

ACTIONS TO ADDRESS FUNDING		Activity of note:
A3. Work internally to match ED projects to funding sources and to navigate HOP.	Ongoing	
A5. Guide municipalities to use all programs to keep the transportation system open.	Ongoing	
B2. Current programs list; share.	Ongoing	
ACTIONS TO ADDRESS PERF MEASUREMENT		Activity of note:
C1. Remain involved in PennDOT efforts.	Ongoing	
C2. County-level TIP w/performance impact.	Ongoing or Biennial	
D9. Direct municipalities to training/tech asst. for local bridge improvement/funding.	<b>Ongoing</b>	
STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR RESILIENCY		Activity of note:
E1. Document trans. facilities impacted by events and flooding.	Ongoing	
E2. Participate in county haz. mit. planning; liaison with PennDOT.	Ongoing	
E3. Coordinate internally to manage data and support resiliency program.	Ongoing	
E5. Incorporate replacement of USGS monument in bridge projects.	Ongoing	
STRATEGIC ACTIONS MODERNIZATION		Activity of note:
F1. Identify and monitor key corridors of concern.	Ongoing	
F2. Conduct road safety audits.	Ongoing	
F3. Document local needs heard in outreach. Determine if study is warranted.	Ongoing	
F4. Analyze data for bike/ped problems.	Ongoing via Bike/Ped Committee	
G4. Update on applied technology in rural regions.	Ongoing	

## Appendix 3 MPO Strategic Plan: Quarterly Activity Review – As of March 2019

STRATEGIC ACTIONS MODERNIZATION		Activity of note:
G5. Host/Share workshops for municipal officials on technology topics.	Ongoing	
ACTIONS FOR MULTIMODAL		Activity of note:
I1. Continue participation in CPTC.	Ongoing	
I2. Improve marketing and service access approaches. (coordinate with CPTC)	Ongoing	
I3. Explore/Guide interest in local coordinated service.	Ongoing	
I5. Outreach to employers and destinations re support for travel options.	Ongoing Responsively	
I6. Outreach to and educate public officials re travel option gaps (car only).	Ongoing Responsively	
I8. Establish a bike/ped advisory committee.		
I9. Direct municipalities to resources.	Ongoing	
ACTIONS FOR CSVT		Activity of note:
J6. Provide guidance/direction to support municipal land use action.	Ongoing Responsively	
J7. Provide guidance/direction to support municipal transportation action.	Ongoing Responsively	
J8. Monitor development interest in properties along the CSVT corridor and interchanges.	Ongoing	
J9. Participate in existing community forums re impacts.	Ongoing	
J10. Provide technical support, e.g., for operational impacts and access roads.	Ongoing	

END