



**Western Cumberland County Council of Governments:
A Blueprint for Advancing Priority Transportation Improvements**

August 13, 2007

For more information:

Troy D. Truax, AICP
Delta Development Group, Inc.
2000 Technology Parkway, Suite 200
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050-9407
Tel: 717-441-9030
ttruax@deltaone.com
www.deltaone.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1

Transportation Planning, Programming, Funding and Implementation.....3

Priority Improvements4

Funding Opportunities for WCCOG’s Priority Transportation Improvements.....5

Select Improvements and Implementation Strategies.....8

 Yellow Breeches Creek Corridor Bridge Improvements 8

 Challenge 8

 Action 8

 Implementation..... 8

 Shippensburg Park and Ride/Transit Center 9

 Challenge 9

 Action 9

 Implementation..... 10

Flexible Funding for Highway and Transit 10

Recommendations..... 11

Attachment 1 - Flexible Highway and Transit Programs..... 13

Attachment 2 – HATS Project Development Process..... 14

Introduction

The Western Cumberland County Land Use and Transportation planning project inventoried over 94 transportation projects totaling over \$205 million that are considered necessary over the next 20 years to avoid inadequate travel conditions on local and regional roads and transit systems within the 17-municipality study area (Table 1). The planning, construction and maintenance of these projects require funding from multiple sources, but their costs far exceed the region's and Commonwealth's ability to fund their implementation. Funding these improvements obviously presents the greatest obstacle and competition is stiff as available funds fall short of the need. According to the Pennsylvania Transportation Funding and Reform Commission Report¹, "With regard to highways and bridges, the state's dedicated funding sources are not keeping pace with construction cost increases, and the growth in federal funding in recent years has not been as robust for Pennsylvania as it has for most other states."

The region's transportation improvements are indeed capital intensive but essential for both economic development and quality of life. The improvements are far-reaching and integral to local, regional, and interstate commerce. Approximately \$11 million has been programmed in the Harrisburg Area Transportation Study (HATS) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) toward these projects, leaving a funding shortfall of \$194 million. Obviously, this shortfall is likely unattainable; therefore, regional priorities must be established and strategic funding policies implemented to sustain the region's efficient flow of goods and services, and protect the population's health, safety, and welfare.

The purpose of this report is to develop a strategy and funding plan for the Western Cumberland County (WCCOG) transportation projects that leverages existing funding commitments of local jurisdictions. In doing so, the plan develops a funding strategy for the WCCOG's priority transportation improvements and evaluates implementation strategies for other select project opportunities having regional significance and value.

¹ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Transportation Funding and Reform Commission. "Investing in Our Future: Addressing Pennsylvania's Transportation Funding Crisis." November 13, 2006.
<http://www.dot.state.pa.us/Internet/pdCommissCommitt.nsf/TransCommissHomepage?>

Table 1

Western Cumberland County COG Transportation Projects Summary		
Project Type	Number of Projects	Total Costs
Bridges - PennDOT	20	\$25,314,500
Bridges / Flooding Issues (Local)	7	\$13,090,000
Existing Deficiencies / Circulation Improvements - Bypasses	2	\$500,000
Existing Deficiencies / Circulation Improvements – High Crash Rate Segments	10	\$12,100,000
Existing Deficiencies / Circulation Improvements – Hot Spots / Local Issues	32	\$24,950,202
Existing Deficiencies / Circulation Improvements – Incident Management	2	
Capacity Needs for Long Term Growth - Interchange Improvements	2	\$57,950,000
Capacity Needs for Long Term Growth - Regional Improvements	1	
Capacity Needs for Long Term Growth - Roadway Widening / Corridor Improvements	8	\$69,258,000
Transit	3	\$400,000
Transportation Planning - New / Upgraded Facilities	3	\$750,000
Land Use Planning / Zoning / Management	4	\$1,000,000
Totals	94	\$205,312,702

Transportation Planning, Programming, Funding and Implementation

Planning and programming are often used synonymously in the transportation field. Each term, however, carries a distinct meaning and purpose and it is imperative to understand and use them correctly.

Transportation planning consists of a comprehensive evaluation of transportation improvements and formulation of policies and an overall strategy for addressing them. At the local level, transportation plans are often called capital improvements plans, which are supported by the Municipal Capital Improvements provision (Section V-A) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. At the regional level, HATS is required by federal law to prepare a fiscally constrained long-range transportation plan, updated every three years, based on projections of growth and travel demand coupled with financial projections. The plan, known as HATS' Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), lists and prioritizes hundreds of locally and regionally significant transportation projects for which funding should be sought. It ultimately guides HATS' short-term funding decisions made through HATS' TIP. Note that inclusion on the RTP does not represent a funding commitment for a given project.

In contrast, transportation programming is the means of linking long-range planning projects to specific funding sources. Programming is therefore the intermediate stage between planning and implementation. Programming commits funds to projects so that they can proceed to implementation, which includes preliminary design, engineering, right-of-way control, and construction. HATS' programming requirements ensure that proposed projects are fully funded meaning that adequate funds are available to facilitate the project's full implementation.

As recipients of federal transportation funds, the State Transportation Commission (STC) and HATS are required by federal law to develop and adopt a 12-year TIP. HATS's TIP is based on the RTP and only includes projects that are fully-programmed or funded. HATS' TIP is then consolidated with other regional TIPs from throughout the Commonwealth and submitted to the U.S. Department of Transportation for approval. HATS' TIP is prepared every two years and covers a three-year period.

Needless to say, the transportation planning, programming and implementation processes are complex. These processes are further complicated by the fact that transportation projects often require multiple-year funding commitments and relatively few are funded by a single revenue source. To this end, it is imperative for the WCCOG to fully understand the magnitude and totality of its transportation improvements in light of the limited resources available for their programming. Therefore, a comprehensive funding strategy must be developed for a select few priority projects and carried forward to implementation.

Priority Improvements

Table 2 identifies the WCCOG's top priority transportation improvements, which include six RTP projects and five additional priority improvements based on the WCCOG's land use and transportation planning process. In total, the probable costs for these projects, except for the I-81 IMS project, exceed \$61 million. Approximately 90 percent of this total, however, is allocated towards the I-81 Exit 29 Interchange project.

In addition, several other projects, including the Inner Loop Signalization Project in Shippensburg and Shippensburg University's East Drive / On-Campus Perimeter Roadway project, are currently being programmed by other entities for inclusion on HATS' TIP. Ironically, Shippensburg University is taking a lead role on both projects through the implementation of its July 2005 Transportation Study and Campus Master Plan. This demonstrates how instrumental the University is to the region.

Table 2

Western Cumberland County COG Priority Transportation Improvements			
I-81 Exit 29 Interchange	Interchange Improvements	RTP	\$55,450,000
Inner Loop Signalization Project	Signalization Improvements	RTP	\$400,000
East Drive / On-Campus Perimeter Roadway	Circulation Improvements	RTP	\$1,300,000
PA 696 (Shippensburg Road) and East Creek Road	Intersection Safety Improvements	RTP	\$250,000
PA 696 (Shippensburg Road) and West Creek Road	Intersection Safety Improvements	RTP	\$250,000
SR 3017 (Lebo Road) over Yellow Breeches Creek - Penn Township	Bridge Rehabilitation / Replacement - PennDOT	RTP	\$750,000
Bridge Improvement - LR 4007 (Mountain Road) over Conodoguinet Creek	Bridge Rehabilitation / Replacement - PennDOT	COG Planning Priority	\$2,162,000
PA 696 and PA 641 – Truck Traffic and Geometric Constraints (Newburg Borough)	Intersection Geometrics, Safety Improvements	COG Planning Priority	\$500,000
PA 233 and PA 641 – Geometrics (Newville Borough)	Intersection Congestion Improvements	COG Planning Priority	\$250,000
PA 34 and PA 94 – Congestion, delay (Mount Holly Springs Borough)	Intersection Congestion Improvements	COG Planning Priority	\$500,000
I-81 and PA Turnpike Incident Management System	Intelligent Transportation Systems Improvements	COG Planning Priority	
Total			\$61,912,000

Funding Opportunities for WCCOG's Priority Transportation Improvements

Table 3 identifies federal, state, and local funding sources and innovative financing methods that may be applied to each of the WCCOG's priority transportation improvements. It is important to emphasize that no single funding source should be relied on to fund any single improvement. Moreover, multiple-year funding commitments are usually necessary to fully program a project. It is also important to note that rarely is a project completed without some sort of local funding.

Additionally, the WCCOG must evaluate these projects based on their priority, as well as their current planning status as indicated in Table 2. To that end, priority should be placed on programming the projects currently on the RTP and adding the planning priority projects to HATS' RTP.

Table 3

Priority Transportation Improvement Funding Opportunities			
Priority Improvements	Funding Sources		
	Federal	State	Local
I-81 Exit 29 Interchange Improvements	Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment Program (focus on bridge structure to reduce congestion) Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)		Highly dependent on private co-investment to support the TIFIA. Implementing a Traffic Impact Fee program would be a critical step toward securing the necessary private co-investment. Engage Shippensburg University and BPG Properties, Inc., (the developer) for the proposed I-81 Commerce Park.
PA 696 (Shippensburg Road) and East Creek Road AND PA 696 (Shippensburg Road) and West Creek Road	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU) Transportation Improvements Surface Transportation Program Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank Loan	Toll Credit Right-of-way value PennDOT Agility program Liquid fuels Debt financing Private sources negotiated through land development approval process HUD Community Development Block grants
SR 4007 Bridge Improvement (Mountain Road) over Conodoguinet Creek	SAFETEA-LU Transportation Improvements Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment Program (focus on congestion management) Surface Transportation Program Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank Loan	Toll Credit Right-of-way value PennDOT Agility program Liquid fuels Debt financing Private sources negotiated through land development approval process HUD Community Development Block grants
PA 696 and PA 641 – Truck Traffic and Geometric Constraints (Newburg Borough) PA 233 and PA 641 – Geometric Constraints (Newville Borough)	SAFETEA-LU Transportation Improvements Surface Transportation Program Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank Loan Transportation Enhancements Program Safe Routes to School Hometown Streets Program	Toll Credit Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Municipal capital improvements Right-of-way value PennDOT Agility program Liquid fuels Debt financing Private sources negotiated through land development approval process HUD Community Development Block grants

Priority Transportation Improvement Funding Opportunities			
Priority Improvements	Funding Sources		
	Federal	State	Local
PA 34 and PA 94 – Congestion, delay (Mount Holly Springs Borough)	SAFETEA-LU Transportation Improvements Surface Transportation Program Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank Loan Transportation Enhancements Program	Toll Credit Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Municipal capital improvements Right-of-way value PennDOT Agility program Liquid fuels Debt financing Private sources negotiated through land development approval process HUD Community Development Block grants
I-81 and PA Turnpike Incident Management System	Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Research Program SAFETEA-LU Surface Transportation Program Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TFIA) Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment Program (focus on bridge structures within the project scope to reduce congestion)	Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) project funds through PennDOT District 8-0's business plan update process Request federal planning study funds through HATS' annual Unified Planning Work Program	A feasibility study may be necessary to further define the project's purpose, scope and benefits.

Select Improvements and Implementation Strategies

In addition to the implementation strategies discussed above, Delta evaluated other select transportation improvements and identified the following strategies for their respective implementation.

Yellows Breeches Creek Corridor Bridge Improvements

Challenge

The WCCOG study identified a series of bridge improvements along the Yellow Breeches Creek, which is classified by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) as a High Quality Cold Water Fishery within the project study area. As presented in Table 4, the Yellow Breeches Creek corridor includes eight bridge improvements totaling over \$9.5 million. Of these, the SR 3017 (Lebo Road) over Yellow Breeches Creek in Penn Township is currently on the HATS' RTP.

Action

Delta's consultation with the Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank's Program Manager substantiates the recommendation for the WCCOG to consider packaging the Yellow Breeches bridge improvement projects into a "Yellow Breeches Infrastructure Improvement Program". Under this banner these projects should be carefully prioritized and once the priorities have been established each municipality could pursue a Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank Loan and use a portion of its liquid fuel proceeds to repay the debt service. In addition, federal transportation funds secured for these improvements can be used as payment toward the Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank (PIB) loan provided that the improvements meet federal design criteria.

Implementation

Given that SR 3017 (Lebo Road) over Yellow Breeches Creek in Penn Township is currently on the HATS' RTP, the WCCOG should begin to program funding for this project by applying for a PIB loan and submitting a funding request through the next federal appropriations cycle, which will begin in January 2008. The funding request would include preparing communications to convey the project need to Pennsylvania's federal legislative delegation and completing the necessary federal appropriations request forms.

Bridge structure design (including consideration of innovative design under the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment discretionary grant program) should be carefully considered to ensure optimal costs are achieved. The WCCOG should consult with PennDOT District 8-0 to explore appropriate innovative bridge design techniques and those acceptable to FHWA's IBRD program. Moreover, the WCCOG should consider using PennDOT's Agility Program as a method to further reduce costs associated with any bridge replacement and/or rehabilitation.

In addition, the WCCOG should also consider pre-cast modular bridge systems such as CON/SPAN® Bridge Systems (www.con-span.com), which may offer a more feasible alternative to traditional bridge replacement methods. The pre-cast modular system offers set-in-place construction of small bridges through an international network of pre-cast providers.

Table 4

Yellow Breeches Corridor Bridge Improvements	
Projects	Costs
SR 3021 Burnt House Road over Yellow Breeches Creek – Dickinson Township	\$2,137,500
SR 3013 Station Road over Yellow Breeches Creek – Penn Township	\$1,778,000
SR 3019 Montsera Road over Yellow Breeches Creek – Dickinson Township	\$740,000
SR 3017 Lebo Road over Yellow Breeches Creek – Penn Township	\$750,000
SR 3009 Maple Avenue over Yellow Breeches Creek – South Newton Township	\$682,000
SR 3011 Hays Grove Road over Yellow Breeches Creek – Penn Township	\$877,000
SR 3005 Rehobeth Road over Yellow Breeches Creek – South Newton Township	\$682,000
T - 462 Encks Mill Road bridge over Yellow Breeches Creek – Dickinson Township	\$1,870,000
Total	\$9,516,500

Shippensburg Park and Ride/Transit Center

Challenge

Capital Area Transit’s (CAT) “I-81Route” includes a bus stop in Shippensburg Township at the Kmart Plaza, which is approximately one mile south of I-81 Exit 29 along Walnut Bottom Road (PA Route 174). Given the private-ownership of the Kmart Plaza and ever-changing market conditions and retail commercial along the Walnut Bottom corridor, the bus stop may not provide CAT or its patrons with a long-term and permanent transit stop solution to meet the region’s increasing transit demands.

Action

To that end, it is recommended that a comprehensive study be performed to determine the feasibility and economic potential of a designated transit center in Shippensburg. A transit center could provide a centralized location to use either CAT’s “I-81 Route” or Shippensburg

University's "Red Raider" transit system. A transit center could also make a transfer from one system to another further promoting transit oriented development opportunities for the ever-growing Shippensburg area. The feasibility study would evaluate the center's potential as a "transportation hub" with regard to its location in downtown Shippensburg and in proximity to Shippensburg University. As a hub, the transit center could provide short- and long-term parking, a taxi stand, services to accommodate long-range bus, as well as connections to pedestrian/bikeway greenway systems and potential future light rail alternatives. Should market conditions prove favorable; the transit facility could also provide opportunities for economic development through commercial retail and services, as well as office space for professional businesses and other non-governmental organizations. Moreover, the feasibility study could provide Capital Area Transit (CAT) with an opportunity to maximize public transit usage in western Cumberland County and beyond through service improvements that benefit residents, businesses, and the environment.

Implementation

The WCCOG in association with the Cumberland County Planning Commission and Shippensburg University should advance the feasibility concept to the HATS Technical Committee for its consideration and recommendations for advancement to and final approval from the HATS Coordinating Committee. The feasibility study concept should also be considered in conjunction with the recently CAT Board approved proposal by Cumberland County Commissioners to study a possible bus rapid transit (express bus) service to link the West Shore in York County and Harrisburg. The proposal involves creating a dedicated bus-way along a rail line that was identified for the Cumberland County portion of the stalled Corridor One commuter rail system. Buses would pick up riders on feeder routes and proceed onto the bus-way for an unimpeded run into the city.

The following is a list of funding opportunities that may be used to advance this study.

- PA DCED Transportation Improvement District (TRID)
- FHWA & FTA Flexible Funding for Highway and Transit (see discussion below)
 - Statewide planning and research
 - Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program
- FHWA Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Funds
- FHWA Transportation Community and System Preservation Program
- Public Transit Assistance Funds (PTAF)
- Section 5309 Federal Bus/Bus Facilities

Flexible Funding for Highway and Transit

According to the FHWA, many federal-aid highway programs have specific eligible transit activities identified in legislation. In addition, funds from other programs that do not have specific transit eligibility may be transferred by states (under the uniform transferability provisions of 23 USC §126) to other federal-aid highway programs that do have such eligibility. If funds are transferred from one federal-aid highway program to another, those funds then have

the same eligibility as the program that they are transferred to. Attachment 1 shows which federal-aid highway programs have eligible transit activities and those programs that do not, but where funds may be transferred to another program that does have such eligibility. Attachment 2 also lists federal transit programs that may be used for highway related activities. In addition to the project eligibility identified in Attachment 1, there are other projects that support both transit and highway systems, either directly or indirectly (e.g., construction of park and ride lots, carpool/vanpool programs), that are eligible for funding under both Title 23 and Chapter 53 of Title 49, United States Code.

Recommendations

Actions for the WCCOG to consider in expanding the diversity, reliability, size, and effectiveness of its transportation planning, programming and implementation process are listed in the following Table 5.

Table 5

Policy Recommendations			
Recommendation	Lead (Support)	Timeframe	Funding
Actively participate in HATS' new project solicitation and development process (Attachment 2). An initial step should be to communicate this plan to the HATS' Technical Committee and promote the region's priority transportation improvements.	WCCOG (CCPC)	Ongoing – Consider positioning a priority transportation project for funding under the 5-year update to the SAFETEA-LU: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). (SAFETEA-LU) update beginning in 2008/09	Annual operating budget
Manage the region's transportation needs by improving coordination between land use planning and transportation infrastructure. More detailed corridor studies should be performed for U.S. Route 11, PA Routes 174, 233, 641, and 696.	WCCOG (CCPC)	Ongoing	DCED Land Use Planning and Technical Assistance Program DCED Share Municipal Services Program Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program SAFETEA-LU Section: 1117
WCCOG growth municipalities should consider developing and administering a joint municipal transportation impact fee program as authorized by Act 209 of 1990, which amended Act 247 of 1968 (Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code) to include the Municipal Capital Improvements provision (MPC Section V-A). The first step would be to conduct an Act 209 Roadway Sufficiency Analysis. This analysis would also result in a Transportation Capital Improvements Plan in accordance with Act 209.	WCCOG growth municipalities (WCCOG, CCPC)	0 – 3 years	DCED Land Use Planning and Technical Assistance Program
Develop a 5-year transportation capital improvements program (CIP). Prioritizing criteria should be developed to support the CIP's preparation and maintenance.	WCCOG (CCPC)	Year 1; maintain annually	DCED Land Use Planning and Technical Assistance Program DCED Share Municipal Services Program
Consider conducting a countywide goods-movement study to assist with the WCCOG's project prioritization and capital improvements planning efforts. This study should dovetail with the HATS' regional goods movement study.	CCPC (HATS)	0 – 2 years	Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program SAFETEA-LU Section: 1117
Become familiar with FHWA's "Innovative Finance Primer" to increase awareness and better understand innovative transportation finance techniques and applications. http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/innovativeFinance/ifp/ifprimer.pdf	WCCOG (CCPC)	Year 1	N/A
Shippensburg Township and Shippensburg Borough should continue to work with Shippensburg University in implementing the University's July 2005 Transportation Study. The WCCOG should become more involved in the University's growth and development by engaging in the University's current and future campus master planning efforts.	Shippensburg University (Shippensburg Township/Borough, CCPC, HATS, and PennDOT District 8)	Shippensburg University is currently implementing the short-term goals of the study in cooperation with Shippensburg Township and Shippensburg Borough.	\$400,000 SAFETEA-LU earmark is currently being used to fund short-term recommendations Implementation of mid- and long-term recommendations should be considered under the next 5-year update to SAFETEA-LU) Private sector development of the I-81, Exit 29 Interchange should be leveraged

Attachment 2

Revised 4/18/06

FHWA and FTA Funds That May be Used for Either Highway or Transit Purposes

Federal Highway Administration Programs			
Primary Purpose	Eligible Transit Activities	Transfer Among Title 23 Programs	Interagency Transfer Considerations
<i>Metropolitan Planning (PL) (23 U.S.C. 104(f))</i>			
To carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process under 23 U.S.C. 134.	49 U.S.C. 5303 metropolitan transportation planning process	None.	May be transferred to FTA at the request of the State DOT to be combined with 49 U.S.C. 5305(d) metropolitan planning funds as a consolidated planning grant.
<i>Statewide Planning & Research (SPR) (23 U.S.C. 505)</i>			
Highway and transit planning; statewide transportation planning under 23 U.S.C. 135; metropolitan transportation planning under 23 U.S.C. 134.	49 U.S.C. 5305 statewide transportation planning process; public transportation management systems under 23 U.S.C. 303.	None.	SPR funds for planning may be transferred to FTA at the request of the State DOT to be combined with 49 U.S.C. 5305(e) statewide planning funds as a consolidated planning grant. The 25% of SPR funds that can only be used for RD&T may not be transferred.
<i>National Highway System (NHS) (23 U.S.C. 103)</i>			
Improvements to	Transit improvements	Up to 50% of	May be

rural and urban roads that are part of the NHS or that are NHS Intermodal connectors.	within a NHS corridor, subject to statutory conditions set in 23 U.S.C. 103 (b)(6)(C); transportation planning in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134 & 135; fringe and corridor parking facilities; carpool and vanpool projects; public transportation management systems under 23 U.S.C. 303; publicly owned intracity and intercity bus terminals.	funds may be transferred to CMAQ, STP, IM, HSIP, RTP, and/or HBRRP. Up to 100% of NHS funds may be transferred to STP if approved by the Secretary and if sufficient notice and opportunity for public comment is given.	administered by FHWA or may be transferred to FTA for transit projects eligible for NHS funds under 23 U.S.C. 103(b)(6).
Equity Bonus (EB) (23 U.S.C. 105)			
Same as STP.	Same as STP.	None.	Same as STP.
Interstate Maintenance (IM) (23 U.S.C. 119)			
Resurfacing, restoring, rehabilitating, and reconstructing most routes on the Interstate system.	No direct transit uses.	Up to 50% of funds may be transferred to NHS, CMAQ, STP, HSIP, RTP, and/or HBRRP.	Must first be transferred to another 23 U.S.C. program that has transit eligibility before the funds may be transferred to FTA.
Surface Transportation Program (STP) (23 U.S.C. 133)			
Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements for highways and bridges including construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes.	Capital costs of transit projects that are eligible under Ch. 53 of 49 U.S.C., including vehicles and facilities, publicly or privately owned, that are used to provide intercity bus service; carpool projects and fringe & corridor parking facilities; transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs; transit research, development and technology transfer; surface transportation planning programs; public	Up to 50% of the STP funds may be transferred to NHS, CMAQ, HSIP, IM, RTP, and/or HBRRP, except that funds suballocated under 23 U.S.C. 133(d)(3) for use in areas of a State may not be transferred to other 23 U.S.C. programs.	May be administered by FHWA or may be transferred to FTA for transit projects eligible for STP funds under 23 U.S.C. 133(b).

	transportation management systems under 23 U.S.C. 303.		
Surface Transportation Program Transportation Enhancements Set-aside (TE) (23 U.S.C. 133(d)(2))			
12 specific activities included in the definition of Transportation Enhancement Activities in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(35).	Although transit is not specifically mentioned in the list of 12 eligible TE activities, some of the eligible TE activities benefit transit.	Up to 25% of the increase above the FY97 Transportation Enhancements or Safety amount may be transferred to NHS, CMAQ, IM, HSIP, RTP, and/or HBRRP.	May be administered by FHWA or may be transferred to FTA for TE projects that benefit transit.
Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (HBRRP) (23 U.S.C. 144)			
Replace and rehabilitate deficient highway bridges and to seismically retrofit bridges located on any public road.	No direct transit uses.	Up to 50% of funds may be transferred to NHS, CMAQ, STP, IM, HSIP, and/or RTP. Transfer of any HBRRP funds after September 30, 1997, will result in deduction of the amount of the transfer from the total cost of deficient bridges in the State and all States in the succeeding fiscal year. Funds provided for Off-System bridges may not be transferred to other 23 U.S.C. programs without a needs determination (23 U.S.C. 144(g)(3)).	Must first be transferred to another 23 U.S.C. program that has transit eligibility before the funds may be transferred to FTA.

Construction of Ferry Boats & Ferry Terminal Facilities (23 U.S.C. 147)

Construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities in accordance with section 129(c). Priority in the allocation of funds is to be given to those ferry systems, and public entities responsible for developing ferries, that: (1) provide critical access to areas that are not well-served by other modes of surface transportation; (2) carry the greatest number of passengers and vehicles; or (3) carry the greatest number of passengers in passenger only service.	Passenger ferry boats & terminal facilities.	None	May be administered by FHWA or may be transferred to FTA for transit projects eligible under 23 U.S.C. 147.
---	--	------	---

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) (23 U.S.C. 148)

To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on public roads.	No direct transit uses.	Up to 50% of HSIP funds apportioned under 23 U.S.C. 104 may be transferred to NHS, CMAQ, STP, IM, RTP, and/or HBRRP; the annual set-aside for 23 U.S.C. 130, Rail-highway crossings, may not be transferred.	Must first be transferred to another 23 U.S.C. program that has transit eligibility before the funds may be transferred to FTA.
--	-------------------------	--	---

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 U.S.C. 149)

<p>Projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas that reduce transportation related emissions.</p>	<p>Any transit capital projects and operating expenses for new services.</p> <p>Funds may only be used in nonattainment and maintenance areas and projects must demonstrate an air quality benefit.</p> <p>States without nonattainment or maintenance areas may use their minimum apportionment of CMAQ for any project in the State eligible under either CMAQ or STP.</p> <p>Operating assistance is limited to new or expanded transportation services.</p> <p>Operating assistance is limited to three (3) years.</p>	<p>An amount not to exceed 50 percent of the difference between the State's annual apportionment and the amount the State would have received if the CMAQ program was authorized at \$1.35 billion for that year may be transferred to Up to 50% of funds may be transferred to NHS, STP, IM, HSIP, RTP, and/or HBRRP. Funds transferred to other title 23 programs must still be expended within the State's nonattainment or maintenance areas.</p>	<p>May be administered by FHWA or may be transferred to FTA for transit projects eligible for CMAQ funds under 23 U.S.C. 149(b).</p>
--	--	---	--

Federal Lands Highways Program (FLHP) (23 U.S.C. 204)

<p>Coordinated program of public roads and transit facilities serving Federal and Indian lands. Funding is broken into 4 discrete sources: Indian Reservation Roads (IRR); Public Lands Highway - Discretionary & Forest Highways; Parkways & Park Roads; Refuge Roads</p>	<p>May be used for transit facilities within, adjacent, or providing access to public lands, national parks, national forests, refuge roads, and Indian reservations.</p> <p>Refuge roads category funds may not be used for new construction and transit.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>May be administered by FHWA or may be transferred to FTA for transit projects eligible for FLH funds under 23 U.S.C. 204(h).</p>
--	--	--------------	---

Recreational Trails Program (RTP) (23 U.S.C. 206)

<p>Develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both nonmotorized and motorized recreational trail uses.</p>	<p>No direct transit uses.</p>	<p>Up to 50% of funds may be transferred to NHS, CMAQ, STP, IM, HSIP, and/or HBRRP, subject to approval of the State agency administering the RTP.</p>	<p>Cannot be transferred to FTA.</p>
---	--------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (TCSP) (S-LU Sec. 1117, formerly TEA-21 Sec. 1221)

<p>Provides funding for a comprehensive program to facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of strategies to integrate transportation, community, and system preservation plans and practices that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the efficiency of the transportation system of the United States. 2. Reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment. 3. Reduce the need for costly future investments in public infrastructure. 	<p>Transit projects that meet the purpose of the TCSP that are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eligible under Title 49 U.S.C., Ch. 53. 2. Transit activities relating to TCSP that the Secretary determines to be appropriate, including corridor preservation activities that are necessary to implement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Transit-oriented development plans, b. Traffic calming measures, or c. Other coordinated TCSP practices. 	<p>None.</p>	<p>May be administered by FHWA or FTA. Although TCSP funds cannot be transferred, they may be allocated to FTA for eligible transit projects.</p> <p style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">[Revised 4/18/06]</p>
---	--	--------------	---

<p>4. Provide efficient access to jobs, services, and centers of trade.</p> <p>5. Examine community development patterns and identify strategies to encourage private sector development</p>			
--	--	--	--

Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program (CBIP) (S-LU Section 1303)

<p>To improve the safe movement of motor vehicles at or across the border between the United States and Canada and the border between the United States and Mexico.</p>	<p>Improvements to existing transportation and supporting infrastructure that facilitate cross-border vehicle movements (for highway or transit projects).</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Cannot be transferred to FTA.</p>
---	--	--------------	--------------------------------------

Nonmotorized Transportation Pilot Program (S-LU Sec. 1807)

<p>To demonstrate the extent to which bicycling and walking can carry a significant part of the transportation load, and represent a major portion of the transportation solution, within 4 identified communities.</p>	<p>Sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian and bicycle paths that connect directly to transit stations.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Cannot be transferred to FTA.</p>
---	--	--------------	--------------------------------------

Federal Transit Administration Programs

Primary Purpose	Eligible Highway Categories	Transfer Among Title 49 Programs	Interagency Transfer Considerations
-----------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Metropolitan Planning Program (MPP) (49 U.S.C. 5305(d))			
To carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process under 49 U.S.C. 5303.	23 U.S.C. 134 metropolitan transportation planning process	None.	May be transferred to FHWA at the request of the State DOT to be combined with 23 U.S.C. 104(f) metropolitan planning funds as a consolidated planning grant; FHWA matching ratio may be used for MPP funds in a consolidated planning grant (CPG).
Statewide Planning & Research (SPR) (49 U.S.C. 5305(e))			
To carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. sections 5304, 5306, 5315, and 5322.	23 U.S.C. 135 statewide transportation planning process.	None.	SPR funds for state planning may be transferred to FHWA at the request of the State DOT to be combined with 23 U.S.C. 505 statewide planning funds as a consolidated planning grant FHWA matching ratio may be used for SPR funds in a consolidated planning grant (CPG)..
Urbanized Area Formula Grants (Section 5307) Transit capital and planning assistance to urbanized areas with populations over 50,000 and operating assistance to areas with populations of 50,000 - 200,000.	In a Transportation Management Area, the MPO may elect to transfer portions of its FTA Section 5307 (Urbanized Area Formula Grants) funds that cannot be used for operating assistance to FHWA for highway projects subject to the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 5307(b)(2).	Funds apportioned to the Governor under Section 5307 may be transferred to the Nonurbanized Formula Program (Section 5311).	FTA funds must be transferred to FHWA if they are to be used for highway purposes. Only funds in designated TMAs (urbanized areas with population 200,000 and greater) that cannot be used for operating assistance may be made available for highway projects.



HARRISBURG AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

PLANNING STAFF OFFICE: TRI-COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
112 MARKET ST., 2nd FLOOR, HARRISBURG, PA 17101-2015
(717) 234-2639
FAX (717) 234-4058
HATS@TCRPC-PA.ORG

July 6, 2007

**To: Municipal Governments of the
HARRISBURG AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY-
Cumberland, Dauphin and Perry Counties
Palmyra Borough, North & South Londonderry Townships, Lebanon County
and
Regional Transportation Stakeholders**

From: Diane Myers-Krug, AICP
HATS Planning Staff *Diane*

The HATS Coordinating Committee approved changes to its project solicitation and development process at its June 22, 2007 meeting.

Attached is a summary of the current HATS policy. Additional information is also available on our website at <http://www.tcrpc-pa.org/HATS.htm>.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 717-234-2639 or dkrug@tcrpc-pa.org.

Thank you.

HATS Project Development Process

Recent federal and state initiatives have generated the need for HATS to revisit its project development process. The focus is to better define projects at the onset of a project's development to produce more realistic scopes, costs, and schedules. Ultimately, this will prevent unexpected delays and unnecessary cost increases now often encountered during projects' engineering and environmental/permitting phase.

The additional effort placed in the planning phase of the project will produce efficiencies in project delivery. More information describing and defining necessary project details early will require time and attention from project sponsors, HATS planning staff, PennDOT, federal and state environmental review agencies. This enhanced project planning is now being incorporated into the HATS process and resources will be made available as needed to perform the necessary additional tasks (for instance, develop purpose and needs statements or identify potentially affected environmental resources).

The established HATS project suggestion form and ranking criteria remain part of the process, however the timing and application of these elements will adjust to meet the new process objective. These changes are intended to be consistent with PennDOT's right-sizing and smart transportation objectives, as well as Federal linking planning and NEPA requirements.

Policy Objective

To better define projects before they are programmed on the TIP to generate more realistic scopes, costs, and schedules for project delivery.

Pre-Application Conference

Because a significant change to HATS' project planning approach is being implemented, all potential project sponsors are required to participate in a pre-application conference with HATS planning staff. This conference will provide an orientation to the HATS process, address questions and expectations, and identify information and resources necessary to deliver a project using federal transportation funds. It may be concluded during this conference that HATS is not the appropriate funding source for a project, or other programs/approaches may produce more practical results. Therefore, **HATS PROJECT SUGGESTION FORMS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT A SPONSOR'S PARTICIPATION IN A PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE.**

It is intended that the project suggestion form will be completed by the project sponsor after the pre-application conference. The pre-application conference will provide information necessary for the project sponsor to make an informed decision whether or not to pursue HATS funding and to properly prepare the project for federal funding consideration by providing complete information as requested on the project suggestion form. Project sponsors are strongly encouraged to make arrangements for a pre-application conference by contacting HATS planning staff

(717-234-2639) prior to filling out a project suggestion form. **PROJECT SUGGESTION FORMS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED AT THE PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE.**

Project Suggestion Forms

Following the pre-application conference, a project can be proposed to HATS at any time through the submittal of a project suggestion form. This form represents the minimum information required regarding the proposed project to adequately prepare the project for HATS' consideration.

The form can be downloaded from the HATS website (www.tcrpc-pa.org/HATS.htm) and submitted as an attached email document (preferred) or through US Mail. (A web-based application will be developed in the future.) Changes to the HATS form have been coordinated with an ongoing statewide effort and will provide for a smoother transition to the state's future requirements when implemented.

Project forms will be initially screened for completeness and federal funding eligibility by HATS staff. If not eligible, the applicant will be notified and processing of the project through HATS will end at this point. HATS and appropriate County Planning Commissions will be notified of the ineligible project applications.

Required Project Information

Project definition begins with a purpose and need statement. This statement must be included on the project suggestion form as this is necessary documentation and the beginning point for project scoping, environmental clearance, and federal funding. Guidance will be provided on what information should be included in a purpose and need statement. Briefly, the purpose describes the problem to be solved, and the need provides the data to establish that a problem exists. The complexity of the statement will vary depending on the complexity and anticipated level of environmental review for the project.

Most projects funded through HATS are categorical exclusions (CE), which have no significant effect on the environment and require the most basic level of environmental review. Therefore, most purpose and need statements will likely only be a few sentences long. At the other extreme, environmental impact statement (EIS) projects have significant environmental impacts, will require the most rigorous level of environmental review, and generate the most complex purpose and need statements. There are no EIS projects currently in the HATS region.

Alternative approaches considered in the solution of the defined problem, potential controversies, impacted environmental resources, and a cost estimate with any funding commitments should all be indicated on the form.

Project Review

The project form will be forwarded to the appropriate County Planning Commission for more detailed discussion and evaluation. The Planning Commission should:

1. Clarify the purpose and need of the project - *Is the problem identified and data-driven?*
2. Discuss alternatives and impacts - *Is additional local planning needed?*
3. Determine the project's priority amongst existing County projects on HATS record
4. Notify HATS of evaluation results

Based on the County's evaluation results, HATS staff will determine if additional project scoping is necessary. The project sponsor, PennDOT, and environmental review agencies will be included in the project scoping discussion. At this point:

1. An understanding of project scope, requirements & process for project delivery, and revised costs are determined. *(The planning partners checklist could be applied at this point, if necessary.)*
2. An agreement to forward project to HATS Technical Committee for program consideration is reached, and/or alternatives suggested for the project sponsor to pursue.
3. HATS project ranking criteria is applied *(all projects must be ranked to be programmed for funding through HATS)*, and a determination is made as to whether or not the project is within HATS' foreseeable fiscal capacity based on its priority ranking.
4. All project information is forwarded to the HATS Committees for program consideration.

The HATS Technical Committee will review and make a recommendation to add/not add the proposed project to the program. Formal action is then taken by the Coordinating Committee, directing the project to be added to the RTP (during the next update), added to the TIP immediately, or not to add the project to the program at all. Project sponsors are notified of HATS' final action.

HATS staff will generate an updated project priority list on an ongoing basis, as project suggestion forms are processed to distribute and use as a guide in RTP and TIP updates.

The following chart summarizes the steps and information addressed in the HATS process.

STEPS	1 PROCESS REQUIREMENTS Pre-Application Conference	2 BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION Screening / Review Form	3 PLANNING BASIS County Planning Commission review	4 DETAILED PROJECT DATA Project Scoping meeting	5 FUNDING PRIORITY & FEASIBILITY Apply Project Ranking Criteria
I N F O R M A T I O N A D D R E S S E D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What is the HATS process? ✓ What can be expected? ✓ What types of information will be needed? ✓ Who/what other resources may be available? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Is the project eligible for federal funding? ✓ Is the application complete? ✓ What is the problem to be solved? ✓ How is the problem identified or measured? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Is the problem identification clear and data driven? ✓ Is additional local planning needed? ✓ What are other ways to address the problem? ✓ Are there environmental or other qualities/concerns affected? ✓ How does this compare with other County priorities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What is the extent of the project? ✓ Are there other alternatives to consider? ✓ Is more detailed environmental assessment needed? ✓ What will it take to deliver (cost, schedule)? ✓ Do the costs need to be refined? ✓ Are there other funding sources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ How does the project rank compared with others on the HATS program? ✓ Is the project within the fiscal limitation of the RTP? ✓ Are there other funding sources?
A C T I O N	<p>Sponsor decides whether or not to pursue funding through HATS.</p>	<p>Sponsor, HATS & County informed of form status.</p>	<p>County evaluation forwarded to HATS.</p>	<p>Recommendation to add/not add to HATS program.</p>	<p>HATS amend or modify RTP/TIP, add to 'illustrative' list, or decline application -- advise sponsor.</p>
L E A D	<p>HATS staff Sponsor</p>	<p>HATS staff</p>	<p>County Planning staff Sponsor</p>	<p>HATS staff, PennDOT, FHWA/FTA, Environ Agencies, Sponsor</p>	<p>HATS staff HATS Committees</p>