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LVIA Area Freight Study - Geographic Context

- Bounded by US 22 on the south, PA 512 on the east, PA 248 to the north, and PA 145 on the west.
- Approximately 29,000 acres in size, including 13 municipalities in both Lehigh and Northampton counties.
- Positioned near the geographic center of the Lehigh Valley.
- Approximately 100 miles west of the Port of New York/New Jersey and 70 miles northwest of the Port of Philadelphia (PhilaPort).
- Encompasses several of the top 100 freight-generating locations in the state.
- Includes a segment of US 22, which is part of the National Highway Freight Network and one of the top truck bottlenecks in Pennsylvania.
Study-Area Infographics: By the Numbers

Land Area

- 29,000 acres
  (45 square miles)

Municipalities

- 13

Population

- 173,329
  (including Bethlehem)

Freight-related Jobs

- 19,000

Share of Land Devoted to Warehousing/Manufacturing/Industrial Uses

- 11.3%

Approved Warehouse Development (MSF)

- 4.1
  (an additional 3.0 has been proposed)

Recommended Truck Corridors

- 9

Miles of Recommended Truck Corridors

- 37.9

Peak Hour: New Truck Trips Generated

- 2,927
Study-Area Chronology

While the following listing of study-area milestones is not exhaustive, it does illustrate the outsized and growing role of the study area as a driver for economic development, job creation, and commercial vehicle travel within the broader Lehigh Valley region. Global trends have also contributed to changes within the study area, including the rise of e-commerce, the expansion of the Panama Canal, the raising of the Bayonne Bridge, and the dredging of the Delaware River, to cite a few examples. These developments have all sparked increases in freight volume. The study area’s strategic position within the Lehigh Valley, the state, and the nation means that planning for land use and transportation infrastructure will remain an ongoing need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley International Airport begins operations</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of impact to study area, Pennsylvania General Assembly passes Act 89, generating $2.3 billion from higher gas taxes and motorist fees</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Group multi-warehouse complex (3) approved, totaling 2.4 million square feet in Allen Township (includes 1.1 million square feet for FedEx Ground and $40M for roadway improvements)</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work begins on a $65 million project to widen US 22 to six lanes from MacArthur Road east to the Lehigh River</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama Canal expansion completed at a cost of $5.25 billion, accommodating container ships up to 13,000 20-foot equivalent units (TEUs) in size</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx Ground breaks ground in Allen Township on a $330 million freight hub, which opens in September 2018</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Business Center multi-warehouse complex (6) proposed in Allen Township, totaling 2.4 million square feet; Century Commerce Plaza multi-warehouse complex (3) approved, totaling 1.65 million square feet</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the U.S., e-commerce sales as a percentage of total retail sales exceeds 10% for the first time</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Commonwealth passes Act 31, allowing 102-inch-wide trailers on all public roadways; LVTS, DVRPC, and TCRPC host Pennsylvania’s first-ever freight summit in Bethlehem; Liberty Trust begins construction of Century Commerce Plaza; Grace Industries begins construction of Airport Road Lot #1</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Group begins construction on Rockefeller Group Logistics Park, a 1.3-million-square-foot distribution center complex (2) in Allen Township</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work begins on $5 million widening of Airport Road</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

Why did we conduct this study?

The increase in the number of proposed and approved warehouses in the Lehigh Valley has drawn the attention of planners, state and local officials, and the public. These large structures, coupled with increased freight movement in general, have served to make the Lehigh Valley one of the fastest-growing freight markets in the world. The growth in e-commerce has revolutionized retail and spurred the growth of these massive, freight-generating land uses.

The area around Lehigh Valley International Airport (LVIA) just north of Allentown has become the latest frontier in the burgeoning market for warehousing and distribution centers within the Lehigh Valley, with four major new land developments approved during 2018. FedEx Ground, the largest of the four, is that company’s largest distribution center in the U.S. The development includes an 800,000 square foot facility (with a planned expansion to 1.1 million square feet), and includes two additional warehouses for a combined 2.4 million square feet of space. Farther to the north, Jaindl Watson Land Company has proposed building 2.4 million square feet in warehouse space. Local officials have also approved plans for Century Commerce Plaza, which will add an additional 1.65 million square feet of space across three separate buildings. As the study process was concluding in the first half of 2019, Majestic Realty Company announced that it would be developing 350 acres of the “airport flight path” properties adjacent to LVIA with spec construction.

The arrival of these freight-generating uses has enormous implications for the surrounding roadway network. Rockefeller and FedEx have contributed $30 million in private-sector money toward improving certain roadways adjacent to their developments in order to compensate for the added traffic. Additionally, Liberty Trust, Jaindl-Watson, and Grace Enterprises (Airport Road Lot #1) have contributed or are bound to commit an additional $10 million in private money toward roadway improvements associated with their developments. Other roadways “downstream” from these major freight generators will experience the strain from accommodating the cumulative traffic volume impacts, even though they may be miles away and in different municipalities.

The implications are clear. These developments are merely a sample of the activity taking place within the study area, yet they all attest to the Lehigh Valley’s red-hot commercial real estate market. If not properly planned for, these major new land developments (and others under speculation) could overwhelm the area’s already-strained transportation network, particularly cumulative traffic proceeding south through the study area to access US 22. The intent of this freight study is to develop strategies for diverting traffic, identifying needed roadway and bridge improvements, and recommending changes in local land use policy to prevent future freight-related land developments from overburdening the area highway network. For the region to be successful, transportation planning must be performed in tandem with land use planning. In other words, land developments need to be considered within the context of available supporting infrastructure.

What was studied, and how?

The formal study area generally included the area immediately surrounding LVIA and included 13 municipalities in both Lehigh and Northampton counties. The study area is roughly bounded by PA 145, PA 248, PA 512, and US 22. The latter roadway is an urban freeway and serves as the Lehigh Valley’s...
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Main Street. US 22’s role as a significant freight corridor has been recognized by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), which has placed it on its National Highway Freight Network (NHFN), making it eligible for federal freight funding and grants.

The study team collected information concerning the study area through a series of roundtable discussions with economic development officials. The team also conducted one-on-one interviews with municipal officials throughout the study area. Finally, a 24-member steering committee met four times over the course of the study to provide input on draft products and serve as a sounding board to the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study’s (LVTS) planning staff.

The planning team drew from available traffic impact studies from the study area’s major land developments, and calculated anticipated new trips that would be generated based on existing municipal zoning ordinance provisions (taking into account lot size, permitted use, setback distances, etc.). Trips were then distributed across the study area roadway network using Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data to determine which segments and intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service over time. The analyses focused on two indices for measuring the extent of future traffic congestion against two scenarios: the Travel Time Index and the Planning Time Index. These indices are described elsewhere in this report.

What were the study results?

The study produced recommendations of various types, including capital improvements, operational improvements, and changes in land use policy. The study concluded that clearly, multi-municipal and even regional approaches are needed in order to solve the land use–transportation planning challenge. LVTS and the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) District 5-0 are the two agencies in the best position to spearhead this challenge.

1. LVTS should monitor the anticipated impacts to capacity and free-flow speed on the primary roadway segments identified through the study process. LVPC and PennDOT District 5-0 should use the land development and HOP process to study and complete improvements at the time of development. These include the following major roadway segments, which are expected to experience significant declines in levels of service and should be added as candidate projects to the region’s Long-Range Transportation Plan:

   a. Schoenersville Road (SR 1009) between PA 987 (Airport Road) and US 22.
   b. Race Street (SR 1004) between Airport Road (PA 987) and Fashion Drive.
   c. Airport Road (PA 987) between US 22 and PA 329.
   d. PA 329 between Airport Road (PA 987) and MacArthur Road (PA 145).
   e. MacArthur Road (PA 145) between PA 329 and Columbia Street.

2. Expand fixed-route and deviated public transportation service in the study area.

3. Upgrade Mill Street as a truck route.

4. Raise the signal heads/signs at the intersection of PA 987 (Airport Road) and SR 3014 (Hanoverville Road) in East Allen Township.
5. It is recommended that East Allen Township revise its Official Map to include a corridor linking PA 329 to Weaversville Road (SR 3017).

6. Ensure that funding for improvements is secured from developers and other stakeholders to realign Weaversville Road (SR 3017) and improve its connection to PA 987.

7. Promote the adoption of Act 164 Airport Hazard Zoning.


9. Implement a Recommended Truck Route Network as a planning tool.

10. Address noise reduction.

11. Pursue functional classification upgrades on PA 329 and PA 987 from Minor Arterial to Principal Arterial.

12. Consider creating a Transportation Development District (TDD) or a Transportation Impact Fee District.

Who led the study?

LVTS worked with Michael Baker International, a Pennsylvania-based transportation planning and engineering consulting firm, to conduct the study. A project management committee, consisting of staff members from LVTS and PennDOT District 5-0 and Central Office, met bi-weekly to guide the study process.

What happens next?

The development of the region’s $2.73 billion long-range transportation plan (LRTP) coincided with that of the LVIA Area Freight Study report. Projects flowing out of this study will be considered for placement in the updated LRTP, as well as the 2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Note that a candidate project’s listing in the LRTP does not guarantee future funding—it is only the first step in ensuring that a candidate project can ultimately be considered for a future four-year TIP. The MPO’s current TIP includes more than $534 million to fund more than 100 road, bridge, trail, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects and plans.

Who paid for it?

LVTS funded the study through a grant from PennDOT.
Introduction

The Lehigh Valley Transportation Study (LVTS), as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Lehigh and Northampton County region, initiated this study in response to growing development pressure within the Lehigh Valley International Airport (LVIA) study area.

Recent plans conducted by PennDOT indicate that goods movement within the Lehigh Valley is expected to mushroom from a 2011 total of 39 million tons to 75 million tons by 2040. Approximately 90 percent of this freight is being carried by truck, underscoring the importance of the region’s roadway network to the safe and efficient movement of freight.

The study area encompasses 13 municipalities and includes the airport as a major regional freight hub within the Lehigh Valley. The study area is approximately 45 square miles in size with approximately 350 linear miles of state- and locally-owned roadways.

The study area is experiencing a sharp increase in major land speculation, development, and investment in transportation infrastructure. Since 2013, 26.2 million square feet of new warehouse and distribution center space has been approved by municipal officials in the two-county region (while over that same time period, 11.7 million square feet has been proposed, but not approved). Since 2013, in the LVIA Freight Study Area, 4.1 million square feet of new distribution and warehouse space has been approved; 3.0 million square feet has been proposed, but not approved. Growth is further evidenced by the Lehigh Valley MPO’s total four-year spending plan, nearly a quarter of which ($97 million) has been programmed for improvements within the study area. This figure does not include an additional estimated $40 million in private sector funding.

Even during the relatively short duration of the study (12 months), there were several significant events that had repercussions on the study process and its outcomes:

- “Transportation and Warehousing” became the Lehigh Valley’s fifth-largest employment sector (surpassing Education), with over 25,000 jobs.
- “Northern Lights” – The study area has been experiencing an increase in commuter traffic, with more workers from Carbon County commuting into the Lehigh Valley for employment. Much of this traffic is destined to points south using study area roadways such as PA 248, Indian Trail Road, and Cherryville Road.
- LVTS, along with the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission and Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, hosted Pennsylvania’s first-ever freight summit in June 2018, with more than 225 participants representing all levels of government and the private sector. The summit addressed issues ranging from truck parking to land use to the changing needs of the labor force. It was agreed that regional perspectives and solutions are needed in planning for increases in freight transportation.
- Also in June 2018, the Commonwealth passed Act 31, which allowed 102-inch-wide trailers to operate on all roadways. As this study was underway, PennDOT completed engineering and traffic operations studies to determine which roadways should remain restricted to these large commercial vehicles.
• The Lehigh Valley International Airport was in the process of developing a new master plan to address growth in both cargo and passenger traffic.¹ In January 2018 the airport sold three lots along Willowbrook Road totaling more than 100 acres for $4.5 million. A lot on the west side of the roadway is set to accommodate another million-square-foot warehouse, while a lot north of the FedEx site would host a 291,000-square-foot warehouse.

• The FedEx Ground hub underwent construction in Allen Township, generating strong interest from developers looking to build industrial projects near that site. FedEx will initially employ 800 workers at the new 1.166-million-square-foot facility.

New proposals, such as the development of the “airport flight path” properties by Airport Road in Hanover Township (Northampton County) were coming online even as the study process drew to a close. As pressure for warehouse and distribution center development has increased, it has put a greater burden on study-area roadways as well as the “gateway” communities between the study area and the larger Lehigh Valley region. How the study area interacts with the rest of the state, nation, and world has a direct impact on communities such as Bath and Hanover Township (Northampton County), as well as on the roadways that provide access from US 22 to the study area’s developing interior. The study process examined development trends, convened stakeholders, and developed a series of recommendations for projects and policies to help inform future planning and programming by LVTS and its partners.

¹ The airport has 7 to 8 cargo flights daily.
Profile of Existing Conditions

Roadway Network

The study area is criss-crossed by approximately 350 miles of both state- and locally-owned roadway. US 22 is the highest-order roadway serving the area, directly connecting motorists and motor carriers to destinations in New Jersey and New York City, as well as Harrisburg. US 22, also known as the Lehigh Valley Thruway, skirts the southern extent of the study area. It is also a part of the National Highway System (NHS), a federal designation created by Congress in 1995 as part of the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) four years earlier. US 22 is a limited-access facility and an urban expressway, and features six interchanges within the study area: at MacArthur Road (PA 145), Fullerton Avenue (SR 1015), Airport Road (PA 987), Fred B. Rooney Highway (PA 378), Schoenersville Road (SR 1009), and Center Street (PA 512). It is a strategic roadway serving not only the travel needs of the study area but the greater Lehigh Valley region. It is an alternative to Interstate 78 and provides redundancy on the network when there is an incident on the interstate. The roadway sees the highest traffic volumes in the Lehigh Valley region, and portions of it exceed 25 percent truck traffic.

LVTS identified US 22 as a potential candidate for inclusion on the federally-designated National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN), considering US 22 as a Critical Urban Freight Corridor (CUFC). (In addition, the MPO submitted a portion of PA 987 (Airport Road) between US 22 and Schoenersville Road as a candidate for consideration.) FHWA certified the proposed segments on February 28, 2019, thus making them eligible for federal freight funding and grants.2

Other primary roadways within the study area include the PA-signed routes of PA 145, PA 248, PA 329, PA 512, and PA 987, and a series of lower-order “SR” roadways.

LVTS has classified many of the remaining roadways in the study area as minor arterials. These roadways are generally designed for lower speeds and serve more local trip purposes. They augment the principal arterials and place more emphasis on land access, and thus offer a lower level of traffic mobility.

Given their functionally local classification, Indian Trail Road and Old Carriage Road could be considered as candidates for PennDOT’s Turnback Program. Through this program, PennDOT would provide the municipalities with an annual maintenance payment of $4,000 per turnback mile3 in exchange for ownership. Roadways that are functionally classified as “local” provide service to travel over relatively short distances and are not generally on the Federal Aid System—the system of roads eligible for federal financial assistance for maintenance and repair.

---

2 The National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN) is a creation of the FAST Act, which was passed by Congress in December 2015. The NMFN is the primary subject of federal freight investment.

3 By linear mile
Several other study-area roadways are locally-owned, yet are on the Federal-Aid System. These include portions of Hanoverville Road, Howertown Road, Irving Street, and Jacksonville Road. There are several other examples within the more built-up areas of the boroughs of North Catasauqua and Northampton.

The remainder of the study-area roadways consist of locally-owned streets and roads. They constitute the majority of the study area’s total roadway mileage, and—of all roadway types—offer the greatest level of accessibility to trip origins and destinations. One major study-area roadway meeting this classification is Willow Brook Road in Allen Township and Hanover Township (Lehigh County).

A road of some distinction is Indian Trail Road (SR 3016). The portion in Allen Township is state-owned but the adjacent portion in Lehigh Township is locally owned. The roadway, along with Kreidersville Road (SR 4003), facilitates the movement of traffic to and from the broader study area and points northwest. Cherryville Road serves a similar function and has been recently posted “no trucks” by the Township.
Average Annual Daily Traffic

Within the study area, US 22 experiences the greatest amount of daily traffic with total traffic volumes now surpassing 95,000 (depicted in Figure 1). Major north–south state routes within the study area have moderate average annual daily traffic (AADT) values, with PA 145 (MacArthur Road) and PA 987 both carrying the highest levels of traffic off of US 22. Roadways in the northern portion of the study area are less-traveled, with the exception of PA 248, which averages roughly 8,000 vehicle trips per day.

Figure 1: Overall Traffic Volumes

Source: PennDOT Roadway Management System (RMS)
In addition to experiencing the highest traffic volumes within the study area, US 22 also handles the greatest volume of truck traffic. The western portion of the study area experiences significantly less truck traffic, with most roadways carrying less than 500 trucks per day (shown in Figure 2).

Figure 2: Average Annual Daily Traffic for Tri-axle Trucks and Greater

Source: PennDOT Roadway Management System (RMS)

---

4 Heavy trucks are defined using FHWA’s standardized vehicle classification: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/infrastructure/pavements/ltpp/13091/002.cfm.
Traffic Safety – Reportable Crash Data

PennDOT maintains detailed crash data sets that are derived from the information filed on each reportable crash.

MacArthur Road and the Lehigh Valley Thruway experienced the highest number of fatalities and suspected serious injuries within the study area, accounting for roughly 41 percent of the 56 fatal and suspected serious injury crashes reported over the five-year analysis period (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>SR Number</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>5-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley Thruway</td>
<td>US 0022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Rd</td>
<td>SR 0145</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Dr/Pheasant Dr</td>
<td>SR 0248</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor-Bath Blvd</td>
<td>SR 0329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-Bath Pike</td>
<td>SR 0512</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Rd</td>
<td>SR 0987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race St</td>
<td>SR 1004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenersville Rd</td>
<td>SR 1009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaversville Rd</td>
<td>SR 3017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seemsville Rd</td>
<td>SR 3021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Rd</td>
<td>SR 3023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Congestion

An assessment of traffic congestion provides a basis for identifying transportation needs and strategies to improve mobility. For the project study area, information on traffic congestion was assembled based on historical travel time data from the TomTom and INRIX providers.

TomTom travel time data was acquired by PennDOT in early 2017. The data represents average weekday peak hour travel times over a two-year period (2014-2016) from both passenger vehicles and trucks. The TomTom travel times are aggregated over small roadway segments and include many of the study area’s key roadways. Despite being several years old, this data source can be used to evaluate the locations and levels of historical traffic congestion. Based on the travel time data, a travel delay measure was estimated for each road segment. The delay represents the difference between peak period (highest of AM and PM time periods) and off-peak travel times, multiplied by the total traffic volume.

Traffic volumes were obtained from PennDOT’s Roadway Management System (RMS). The calculated delay values were divided by the roadway segment lengths to produce a delay per mile measure. As illustrated in Figure 3, the roadway connections to US 22 at the study area’s southern extent experience the highest delay levels. These locations include PA 145 (MacArthur Road), PA 987 (Airport Road), and Schoenersville Road. When isolating truck volumes by segment, US 22 emerges as the corridor with the highest levels of truck delay (Figure 4), primarily due to the construction activities that have occurred since 2015 and the high traffic volumes. The intersections of PA 329 (W. 21st Street) and Main Street in Northampton Borough and PA 329 (Nor-Bath Boulevard) and Weaversville Road in Allen Township also demonstrate high levels of truck delay per mile, as do PA 987’s intersections with PA 329 and Orchard Road.

PennDOT currently maintains access to the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS). RITIS is an interface and reporting tool for INRIX travel time data and includes historical travel time data for every hour since 2010. As compared to the TomTom information obtained by PennDOT, INRIX includes more recent travel times and the ability to process that data in more detail. However, the INRIX reporting segments are larger with less roadway coverage in the project study area. Based on information obtained from January 1 – December 31, 2018, the following performance measures were evaluated:

- **Travel Time Index (TTI) = (Average Travel Time) / (Free-Flow Travel Time)**

  TTI provides a measure of traffic congestion. Values higher than 1.3 indicate moderate levels of congestion. Values higher than 1.6 indicate heavier or more severe traffic conditions. The average travel time represents the 50th percentile condition for all weekdays. Therefore, these values represent the conditions that can be expected on most weekdays.

- **Planning Time Index (PTI) = (95th Percentile Travel Time) / (Free-Flow Travel Time)**

  PTI is a ratio of the near-worst travel time to light or free-flow conditions. This measure is often used to assess traffic reliability, indicating whether traffic congestion is highly variable. This measure may be highly impacted by traffic incidents, peak days of freight or airport access in the study area, or construction activities. Values higher than 2.5 generally indicate unreliable conditions.

Figure 5 spatially depicts the study area’s TTI values for the PM (4:30-5:30 p.m.) peak hour.
Figure 3: Average Weekday Vehicle Delay per Mile (2014-2016)\(^5\)

Source: TomTom Average Weekday Travel Times and PennDOT RMS Traffic Volumes

---

\(^5\) PennDOT’s latest version of TomTom speed profile data is available for 2014-2016 average weekday conditions.
Figure 4: Average Weekday Truck Delay per Mile (2014-2016)\(^6\)

Source: TomTom Average Weekday Travel Times and PennDOT RMS Truck Volumes

\(^6\) Truck delay is estimated.
Figure 5: INRIX Travel Time Index (TTI) for Study Area Roadways
(Average Weekday PM Peak Hour Conditions from January 1 – December 31, 2018)

Source: RITIS Trend Map for 4:30-5:30 using January 1-December 31, 2018 INRIX Travel Time Data

For each of the congested corridors illustrated in Figure 5 (other than US 22), Appendix A: INRIX Travel Time and Planning Time Index Summary provides additional details of the average TTI and PTI values by day of the week and direction of travel. Observations related to the most congested roadway approaches in the study area include:
MacArthur Road Southbound from Schadt Avenue to US 22 – This section has the highest overall traffic congestion (TTI) in the study area with significant variability in travel times (PTI). Traffic congestion and reliability issues are encountered during the midday and PM peak periods every day. Weekend days have higher congestion levels on average than weekdays. The Lehigh Valley Mall shopping trips are most likely a major contributor to the delays.

Airport Road Southbound from Schoenersville Road to US 22 – Significant delays and reliability issues are encountered on weekdays during the AM and PM peak periods. PM delay exceeds AM delay on most days. Travel times are highly variable and may be impacted by airport travel and trucking activity within the study area.

PA 329 Westbound from Howertown Road to Main Street – High traffic congestion and reliability issues primarily occur on weekdays during the PM peak period, though moderate congestion can also occur on weekdays during the AM and midday periods.

Race Street Westbound from Willow Brook Road to Airport Road – Traffic congestion and reliability issues exist for weekdays during the PM peak period.

Airport Road Northbound to PA 329 – This corridor is often observed to be congested from Schoenersville Road to PA 329.

Appendix A provides details on several other roadway approaches with moderate traffic congestion including Airport Road northbound from Hanoverville Road to PA 329, Schoenersville Road southbound from Airport Road to US 22, Jacksonville Road southbound from Hanoverville Road to US 22, and PA 248 from Maple Drive to Locust Drive.

Planned Improvements

There are nearly 20 transportation infrastructure improvement projects planned within the study area, representing an investment of more than $97 million. These projects comprise nearly a quarter of all planned highway and bridge investment within the Lehigh Valley MPO region for the four-year period ending in 2022. Planned improvements are a mix of developer-funded and publicly funded through the MPO’s 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program, which was approved by FHWA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in September 2018.

An especially noteworthy investment within the study area is the widening to six lanes of US 22. Additional bottlenecks being addressed include the bridges over the Lehigh River (although these structures are being replaced due to age and weight restrictions, not primarily to expand capacity). In addition to addressing roadway and bridge needs, the study area’s planned project mix includes a range of operational improvements, including adaptive signal upgrades and signal hardware.

Figure 6 depicts the various projects that are planned and programmed within the study area. Table 2 provides the detail for each.

---

7 $32 million of this is focused on US 22
Figure 6: 2019 Transportation Improvement Program Project Locations
Table 2: 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost ($000s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 22 widening</td>
<td>Hanover; South Whitehall; Whitehall Twp</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>$26,148</td>
<td>Widen to 6 lanes between 15th Street and Airport Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cementon bridge</td>
<td>Whitehall Twp (L); Northampton Boro (N)</td>
<td>Bridge replacement</td>
<td>$17,083</td>
<td>Replacement/rehabilitation of the Cementon Bridge carrying PA 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coplay/Northampton bridge</td>
<td>Coplay Boro; Northampton Boro</td>
<td>Bridge rehab</td>
<td>$12,059</td>
<td>Replacement/rehabilitation of the Coplay-Northampton Bridge on Chestnut Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh_Race St. Intersection</td>
<td>Catasauqua Boro</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$7,119</td>
<td>Signalization of Race Street intersections with Lehigh Street, Front Street, and Second Street. Conversion of Front Street and Second Street to two-way streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 22 – Farmersville Rd. to PA 512</td>
<td>Bethlehem Twp</td>
<td>Resurfacing</td>
<td>$6,171</td>
<td>Highway resurface/ restoration of US 22 from Farmersville Road to PA 512 mainline, and PA 191 and PA 512 interchange ramps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 248 Realignment</td>
<td>Bath Boro</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$5,428</td>
<td>Reduces the number of turning movements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>Hanover Twp (L)</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>PA 987 widening SB from north of City Line Rd to US 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Rd. resurface</td>
<td>Whitehall Twp (L)</td>
<td>Hwy restoration</td>
<td>$4,933</td>
<td>Highway resurface of MacArthur Rd. from Grape Street to PA 329.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howertown Rd. bridge</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
<td>Bridge replacement</td>
<td>$2,431</td>
<td>Replace/rehab of SR 3017 Howertown Rd. bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Street over Lehigh River</td>
<td>Catasauqua Boro; Whitehall Twp (L)</td>
<td>Bridge rehab</td>
<td>$2,214</td>
<td>Bridge replacement of SR 1004 (Race St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Trail Rd. bridge</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
<td>Bridge replacement</td>
<td>$1,999</td>
<td>Replacement/rehabilitation of the bridge carrying SR 3016 (Indian Trail Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 248 bridge rehab</td>
<td>Moore Twp</td>
<td>Bridge rehab</td>
<td>$1,545</td>
<td>Bridge rehab of PA 248 over tributary of Hokendauqua Cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 248 bridge rehab</td>
<td>Moore Twp</td>
<td>Bridge rehab</td>
<td>$1,236</td>
<td>Bridge rehab of PA 248 over tributary of Hokendauqua Cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Rd. adaptive signal upgrade</td>
<td>Allentown; Whitehall Twp (L)</td>
<td>Signalization improvements</td>
<td>$1,187</td>
<td>Adaptive signal upgrades along PA 145 (MacArthur Road) from 6th Street to Chestnut Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 512 Adaptive Signal upgrade</td>
<td>Hanover Twp (N)</td>
<td>Signalization improvements</td>
<td>$836</td>
<td>Adaptive signal upgrades along PA 512 from Center St to Jaindl Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Carriage Rd. bridge replacement</td>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
<td>Bridge replacement</td>
<td>$734</td>
<td>Replace SR 3018 Old Carriage Road bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-Bath bridge replacement</td>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
<td>Bridge replacement</td>
<td>$655</td>
<td>Replacement/rehabilitation of the PA 512 (Beth-Bath Pike) bridge over tributary of Monocacy Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost ($000s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoenersville Rd. Corridor</td>
<td>Bethlehem; Hanover Twp (N)</td>
<td>Signalization</td>
<td>$393</td>
<td>New signal timing plans; updated signal hardware from Avenue C to 8th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>$284</td>
<td>Upgrade RR safety equipment where PA 512 crosses NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Lehigh Valley Transportation Study*

Additionally, a total of $40 million in private funding has either been contributed or bound to be committed to study area roadway improvements, including for the widening of Race Street and Airport Road, as well as roadways affected by the developments proposed by Liberty Trust, Jaindl-Watson, and Grace Enterprises.

**StreetLight Data Origin-Destination Analysis**

Advancements in data collection technology and “big data” analytics are rapidly transforming how agencies plan for and manage an evolving transportation system. StreetLight Data has developed a streamlined, user-friendly approach for processing the hundreds of millions of location records created by mobile devices.

One key product available from StreetLight Data is origin-destination matrices that help visualize how both personal and commercial trips are occurring within a defined area. For this study, a zonal structure comprising 42 unique zones was created to analyze travel movements (the small zone sizes allow a more granular assessment of travel patterns). The LVIA study area includes 18 of the 42 zones. The StreetLight Data zonal structure can be organized into “internal” zones (zones indicating travel within a defined region) and “external” zones (zones associated with pass-through travel outside of the region). The LVIA study area StreetLight Data zonal structure is depicted in Figure 7.
For every commercial trip completed, there are two trip ends: the origin and the destination. Total trip ends can be summed by zone to determine where the greatest number of truck traffic is beginning and ending. **From March 2017 to February 2018, there were 4,054,720 commercial trip ends in Lehigh and Northampton counties.** As shown in Figure 8, the southwestern portion of the region currently experiences the greatest intensity of commercial trip activity, with more than 42 percent of trips ending in one of two zones. The 18 study area zones were merged into one larger zone to determine total trip ends. The combined zone accounts for 535,305 (or 13.2 percent) of commercial vehicle trip ends region-wide.
A review of total trip ends by study area zone indicates greater commercial activity west of the Lehigh River along PA 145 (MacArthur Road) and east along PA 512 (Beth Bath Pike). Shown in Figure 9, three zones currently account for more than 62 percent of all truck trip ends occurring within the study area.
Figure 9: Total Commercial Trip Ends by Study Area Zone (Average Day)

Source: StreetLight Data 2017-2018
Trips originating in the study area can be linked to a destination zone to determine where commercial vehicles are traveling. **Figure 10** depicts the commercial destinations by zone for truck trips originating in the study area on an average day. Nearly 40 percent of all truck trips begin and end in the study area and approximately 17 percent of trips that begin in the study area travel south and to destinations in Allentown. Fewer than 7 percent of truck trips currently originating in the study area leave the LVPC region.

**Figure 10: Commercial Destinations for Truck Trips Originating in Study Area (Average Day)**

Source: StreetLight Data 2017-2018

Detailed trip interchange maps for the 18 study area zones is provided in Appendix B: StreetLight Data Commercial Interchanges by Study Area Zone.
StreetLight Data can also determine, by zone, the percentage of trips leaving the region. Shown in Figure 11, a higher percentage of trips originating in the western zones begin in the region but reach their destination outside of the region.

Figure 11: Commercial Trips Leaving the Region

Source: StreetLight Data 2017-2018
Public Transportation

Public transportation in the Lehigh Valley is primarily operated by the Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority (LANTA). LANTA provides both fixed-route bus and shared-ride services in Lehigh and Northampton counties.

There are currently 28 bus routes in the LANTA fixed-route system and 10 of those routes serve the study area (Figure 12). The study area is located north of LANTA’s central service area, however land use quickly becomes more rural north of LVIA and east of the Lehigh River. As a result, only the southern and western portions of the study area are served by fixed-route transit. Three fixed routes converge at LVIA, an important transportation connection point. Nine routes converge at the Lehigh Valley Mall, the second-largest transfer point in the LANTA service area.

Fixed routes within the study area are found in Appendix C: LANTA Fixed Routes.

Figure 12: LANTA Fixed-Route Bus Service within Study Area

Source: Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority and Remix (2017)

LANTA serves 2,174 bus stops. The study area contains 254 stops, or nearly 12 percent of all stops, shown in Figure 13. The highest-ridership stop within the study area is in Whitehall Township at Lehigh Valley Mall with 806 average daily riders, making it the second-busiest stop in the LANTA system. All remaining bus stops within the study area have average daily ridership less than 50.
Approximately 187,000 riders board and alight buses within the study area each year, accounting for nearly 23 percent of LANTA’s overall ridership. More than 80,500 bus trips pass through the study area annually. Annual ridership by route number and day of week are provided in Appendix C.
Demographic and Socioeconomics

The municipalities within the study area have an estimated combined population of 173,329. Subtracting the City of Bethlehem (only a small portion of which is within the study area), the figure is closer to 98,036. Of greater importance to this study is the change in population for the Lehigh Valley region, which continues to exhibit strong growth rates. Growth within the region in fact is outpacing that of Pennsylvania overall. The City of Allentown overtook Erie during the 1990s to become the state’s third-most-populous city. The Lehigh Valley is not only a major shipper and receiver of freight, but a major consumer market in its own right. Growth in total population increases demand for goods and services, and the warehouses and infrastructure that are needed to support them.

Within the study area, growth rates have been the strongest within Allen Township, which has added an estimated 600 residents since 2010. Larger study-area municipalities, such as Hanover Township (Northampton County) and Lower Nazareth Township, have also grown by hundreds since 2010. The boroughs have registered slight declines over the same period. Table 3 provides more detail on changes in study-area population by municipality. The study area is growing at the same rate as the region as a whole.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2016 (est.)</th>
<th>2010-16 Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath Borough</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>2,693</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem City</td>
<td>71,427</td>
<td>71,329</td>
<td>74,982</td>
<td>75,293</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catasauqua Boro</td>
<td>6,662</td>
<td>6,588</td>
<td>6,436</td>
<td>6,544</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
<td>4,572</td>
<td>4,903</td>
<td>4,903</td>
<td>4,868</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover Twp – L</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover Twp – N</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>9,563</td>
<td>10,866</td>
<td>11,575</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Twp</td>
<td>9,296</td>
<td>9,728</td>
<td>10,526</td>
<td>10,419</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Nazareth Twp</td>
<td>4,483</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>5,674</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Twp</td>
<td>8,418</td>
<td>8,673</td>
<td>9,198</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Catasauqua Boro</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Boro</td>
<td>8,717</td>
<td>9,405</td>
<td>9,926</td>
<td>9,863</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Twp</td>
<td>22,779</td>
<td>24,896</td>
<td>26,738</td>
<td>27,423</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL STUDY AREA</strong></td>
<td>153,414</td>
<td>160,429</td>
<td>170,631</td>
<td>173,329</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lehigh Valley Region</strong></td>
<td>538,235</td>
<td>579,156</td>
<td>647,232</td>
<td>665,441</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census*

While population estimates for municipalities within the study area indicate steady growth, employment numbers have been fluctuating since 2005. According to the most recent 2015 estimates from the Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) program, the study area contains 40,544 primary jobs. Primary jobs are defined by the LEHD program as all public- and private-sector jobs, one job per

---

8 Not including the City of Bethlehem, which represents a very small share of the study area
worker. This employment total increased by roughly 0.2 percent since 2005, with a more significant increase occurring between 2014 and 2015 (3.8 percent), shown in Figure 14.\(^9\)

![Graph showing primary and freight-related employment within the study area (2005-2015)](image)

A review of freight-related employment within the study area indicates a similar trend, with a more significant decrease in employment coinciding with the Great Recession, which began in December 2007 and ended in June 2009.

For this review, freight-related employment includes jobs in the following industry sectors:

- Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction
- Construction and Manufacturing
- Wholesale and Retail Trade
- Transportation and Warehousing

The highest concentrations of total employment occur along US 22 to the south and along the Lehigh River to the west (shown in Figure 15).

---

\(^9\) At the time this report was being written, the latest LEHD data available was 2015.
Figure 15: Total Employment (2015)

Source: U.S Census/Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD)
Existing Land Use

Shown in Figure 16 and Figure 17, the study area’s existing land use is characterized by an abundance of agricultural and open space uses in the northern portion and denser, mixed uses in the southern portion. The availability of large, undeveloped tracts of land within the study area has led to an increase in the number of warehouse and distribution centers (under development).

Figure 16: Study-Area Existing Land Use

Source: LVPC
Highlights of the study area’s existing land use include:

- During 2016, Lehigh County municipalities approved 7.3 million square feet (MSF) of non-residential development, a nearly four-fold increase from the previous year.

- In neighboring Northampton County, an additional 3.5 MSF were approved.

- One of the top non-residential projects the LVPC reviewed during 2016 was the 1.16 MSF FedEx Ground facility in Allen Township, adding to the study area’s already abundant inventory of shippers and receivers.

- Less than 1 percent of the study area’s land area is classified as “warehouse distribution,” according to LVPC’s existing land use database. Despite its small share of the study area, this land use has a disproportionate impact on the area’s travel patterns.

- In addition to FedEx Ground, three other large-scale warehousing and distribution center developments have been approved in the study area, as depicted in Figure 18.
Figure 18: Approved Warehouse/Distribution Centers within the Study Area

Source: LVPC
The LVPC Comprehensive Plan, last updated in 2010, includes guidance on preferred future land use within the region. The general future land use categories and their associated objectives include:

- **Farmland** – to protect farmland and to promote farming as an economic activity
- **Natural Resources** – to protect sensitive natural resources, particularly flood plains and steep slopes, from inappropriate development
- **Rural Development** – to provide development opportunities consistent with the context of rural land use patterns and capabilities
- **Urban Development** – to provide areas where development can occur, coordinated with the provision of infrastructure and to meet the needs for development sites

Shown in [Figure 19: Study Area Future Land Use](image), the study area is characterized by urban development future land uses to the south and west, along major transportation corridors and within denser, predominately built-out municipalities. The recommended future land use in the northern portion of the study area is predominately farmland, rural development, and natural resources, with the exception of Bath Borough.
Figure 19: Study Area Future Land Use

Source: LVPC
Zoning Analysis

The study area consists of 13 municipalities containing nine proposed truck corridor routes, as mapped in Figure 20. Recommended truck corridors within the study area are as follows:

- US 22
- PA 329 (Nor-Bath Blvd)
- East Race Street
- SR 3017 (Weaversville Road)
- PA 512 (Beth Bath Pike)
- PA 248 (E. Northampton Street)
- PA 987 (Airport Road)
- Willow Brook Road
- PA 145 (MacArthur Road)

An analysis of zoning provisions within each study area municipality was conducted to identify inconsistencies between current zoning requirements and recommended truck corridor routes. Land use inconsistencies are defined as those zoning districts that allow (either by right or by special exception or by conditional use process) trucking-related uses on vacant or underutilized parcels along roadways other than those designated as truck corridor routes. Vacant and/or underutilized lands that have been determined to be inconsistent with the designated truck corridor routes are located within the municipalities of Lehigh Township, Hanover Township, Catasauqua Borough, and Bath Borough.
Appendix D: Study-Area Truck-Generating Parcels against Proposed Truck Network summarizes each municipality's current zoning, existing land uses, and zoning inconsistencies against this proposed truck network.
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**Stakeholder Engagement**

The LVIA Area Freight Study process included community outreach that directly engaged key stakeholders and members of the public to gather meaningful input on freight development trends and issues within the study area.

Stakeholder roundtables offered an opportunity to provide detailed feedback on proposed high impact developments and identify specific transportation improvements that are needed to address the ongoing growth in the study area.

**Stakeholder Roundtables**

On June 18 and 19, 2018, LVPC hosted a municipal representative roundtable and an economic development stakeholder roundtable to collect input on the most pertinent issues related to freight movement in the study area. Approximately 20 individuals participated as part of the stakeholder roundtable series. Input received ranged from general observations about freight activity and its impacts on the regional transportation system to detailed specifications on approved land development plans.

Key themes that emerged during the stakeholder roundtables included:

- **Truck parking and related impacts** – There has been a dramatic increase in truck traffic within the study area and it is resulting in truck parking issues. There have been instances of trucks parking in the center of roadways and along the shoulder near the new distribution centers. Because there are no truck stops in the study area, there are few options for drivers who are restricted by hour-of-service regulations.

- **102”-wide vehicles** – Act 31 went into effect in June 2018. Prior to the new law, 102” vehicles were limited to the “truck access network,” which consists of interstates, numbered traffic routes (e.g., PA 987, PA 512, PA 248, etc.), and four-digit state routes that were added on a case-by-case basis. Act 31 removes this limitation for any legally registered standard vehicle unless a traffic study is completed to justify prohibition of certain types of trucks. This new law will have impacts on the roadways within the study area, where new warehouse and distribution centers have been approved for construction.

- **Congestion** – Traffic congestion was a frequently noted concern among municipal and economic development stakeholders. Within the study area, there are residential and open space areas with older roads that were not built for high traffic volumes. The intermingling of freight with regular traffic creates poor travel conditions. Economic development stakeholders noted the detrimental impact severe congestion has on attracting businesses to the region.

- **Roadway geometry** – Certain roadways are currently not built to handle large, heavy trucks. Similarly, there are known geometry concerns within the study area (alignment, turning radii, width, lack of shoulders, sight distance, etc.) at major intersections, hampering traffic flow and safety.

- **Multi-municipal approaches** – There is a need for increased coordination and planning among municipalities within the study area. Higher-intensity developments have been approved in certain municipalities and those developments create negative impacts on adjacent areas.

Meeting summaries from the June 2018 stakeholder roundtables are included in Appendix E: Stakeholder Roundtable Meeting Summaries.
Municipal Interviews

While the municipal roundtable provided local government representatives an opportunity to discuss broad themes and issues related to freight, follow-up interviews were needed to further assess the potential land use changes that may occur over the study horizon. One-on-one interviews were conducted with the following municipalities:

- Allen Township
- Bath Borough
- East Allen Township
- Hanover Township (Northampton County)
- Lehigh Township
- Moore Township

The municipal interviews were guided using a set of predefined questions that focused less on high-level regional issues and more on anticipated high-intensity local development. Specifically, the municipalities were asked to provide information on known development plans that were either approved or in a preliminary state. They were also instructed to disclose any recent zoning changes that would allow for an increase in development. Each potential development site was added to a master list of “Wild Card” parcels, or parcels that are expected to build out over the next 10 years. The “Wild Card” parcels were also mapped alongside the four approved warehouse and distribution center sites to provide a complete “full build-out” scenario, shown in Figure 21.

The “Wild Card” parcels were categorized by future land use type and are described in Table 4.
Figure 21: Future Development Sites within the Study Area

Source: LVPC and Municipal Interviews
### Table 4: Future Development Details by Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MapID</th>
<th>Development Description</th>
<th>Lot Acreage</th>
<th>Building SF / Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rockefeller Lot 5 – The site is assumed to redevelop for industrial uses and is currently accessible from Willowbrook Road. <em>(PIN: M5 2 16E)</em></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 MSF</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rockefeller Lot 4 – The site is assumed to redevelop for industrial uses. It is located adjacent to both the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority (LNAA) Tract and the FedEx Distribution Center. The development is expected to include a Regional Distribution Hub and a warehouse. <em>(PID: M5 2 16D)</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>290,000 SF</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LNAA Tract – This property is currently a farm in an agricultural zone. It was the subject of a rezoning request for a light industrial use, which was denied. It is located adjacent to Weaversville Road. <em>(PIDs: M5 2 16; M5 2 5; M5 2 4)</em></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1.5 MSF</td>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aircraft Flight Path Property – The lot is currently open space in an agricultural area, but it is assumed to redevelop for light industrial uses. The site is accessible by Airport Road and Schoenersville Road. <em>(PID: M5 7 14)</em></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3 MSF</td>
<td>Hanover Twp (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Property Zoned Light Industrial / Business Park – The site is currently zoned Light Industrial / Business Park and is owned by the Jaindl Company. The existing Imperial Realty business park, Airport Road Commercial Park, is being considered for redevelopment as a warehouse. <em>(PID: L5 7 1A)</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98,800 SF</td>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Property Rezoned – This 198.6-acre site is zoned as Agricultural/Rural Residential. A recent rezoning request for Light Industrial/Business Park was withdrawn by the owner. <em>(PIDs: L6 5 3A; L6 5 1; L6 5 2)</em></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2.5 MSF</td>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Federal White Corporation – The site is currently zoned I-2 Industrial District and has the potential for active industrial use in the future. <em>(PIDs: L4 8 4D 0522 and L4 8 4D-2 0522)</em></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northampton Boro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MapID</td>
<td>Development Description</td>
<td>Lot Acreage</td>
<td>Building SF / Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Industrial Zone – Airport Property</strong> – This is one of the largest industrially-zoned parcels in the study area. LNAA’s Airport Master Plan includes the development of restaurants and a 125-room hotel. (PIN: 641819088171)</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Hanover Twp (L) / Catasauqua Boro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Commercial Zone – Commercial Zone</strong> – This site is located immediately south of the Northampton Industrial Park and is zoned Commercial. While the property does not have a specified development plan, it presents a development opportunity for commercial use. (PID: L4 12 1)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>500,000 SF</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Approved Strip Mall</strong> – The existing land use for this property is open space, however the Jaindl Company has proposed developing the site into a strip mall. The parcel has been rezoned to Light Industrial. (PID: L4 18 4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>288,000 SF</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Mixed Use Zone – Mary Immaculate Property</strong> – This parcel is the former site of the Mary Immaculate Catholic seminary. The Jaindl Company has submitted plans to convert the 400-acre site into a mixed-use resort and residential community. (PIDs: K3 11 15; K3 11 15)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>501 DU</td>
<td>Allen Twp / Lehigh Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Former Mineral Extraction Site</strong> – The site was formerly a mineral extraction operation. However, there have been preliminary discussions on converting the property into a mixed-use development. (PINs: 549906586088; 548997529774)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Whitehall Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Residential Zone – Approved Single-Family Development 1</strong> – Two parcels to the west of Cherryville Road have been approved for single-family residential development. The sites will contain 134 residential units. (PIDs: K3 10 11; L3 6 3)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81 DU</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Approved Single Family Development 2</strong> – This property has been approved for low-density single-family residential development. (PIDs: L4 1 1; K3 18 1)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>134 DU</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Approved Single-Family Development 3</strong> – This property has been approved for residential development. (PIDs: L4 12 1-63 through L4 12 1-84)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MapID</td>
<td>Development Description</td>
<td>Lot Acreage</td>
<td>Building SF / Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Future Medium-Density Residential – The parcel is currently zoned R2 – Medium Density Residential and is owned by the Jaindl Company. It is anticipated that this site will be developed for residential uses. <em>(PID: L4 15 10)</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26 DU</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fuller Tract – This property is currently a golf course; preliminary plans are in place for high-density residential development. <em>(PID: M4 6 2)</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>900 DU</td>
<td>Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Approved Single-Family Development 4 – This site is located west of Airport Road and is being considered for single-family residential development use. <em>(PID: L5 13 1)</em></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81 DU</td>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Approved Medium-Density Residential Age-Restricted Development – This parcel is situated west of Beth Bath Pike near the residential developments off Hanoverville Road. This site’s first phase of development will entail nearly 100 single-family, duplex, and triplex homes for the private community. In total, the site is expected to eventually host a total of 243 homes. <em>(PIDs: L6 15 7; L6 15 11; L6 15 8; L6 15 8A)</em></td>
<td>198.6</td>
<td>243 DU</td>
<td>East Allen Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Northampton Area School District – This parcel is affected by the relocation of Seemsville Road and is located adjacent to the Northampton Business Center. No development has been proposed for this parcel. <em>(PID: L5 1 12)</em></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>East Allen Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Municipal Interviews*
LVIA Area Traffic Impact Analysis and Future Growth

Traffic Analysis Process

To assess future transportation needs within the study area, a traffic analysis was completed based on the anticipated development locations highlighted in the previous sections of this report. The analysis was used to determine potential traffic volume growth on study-area roadways and intersections and the associated impacts on traffic congestion. These projections, along with stakeholder comments, consultant field views, and engineering judgement, were used to develop strategies to improve mobility and safety within the study area.

Both the PennDOT statewide and Lehigh Valley MPO regional travel demand models were reviewed to identify roadways in the study area that are projected to experience significant increases in total traffic and truck volume. Both travel models indicate relatively small traffic volume growth across the study area but do not consider the potential build-out of the parcels discussed in this study. For the statewide model, truck volume growth was relatively uniform across the study area, with annual growth rates less than 1 percent per year.

FHWA’s Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) provides national-level truck traffic volumes for roadways with higher functional classifications (i.e., not local streets). Like the statewide model, the FAF forecasts similar truck volume growth rates across roadways within the study area including PA 145, Airport Road, PA 512, PA 329, and PA 248. The annual truck growth rates are generally around 1.5 percent per year. The FAF does predict nearly 2.5 percent annual growth in trucks on US 22 near the Lehigh Valley Airport.

Due to the limitations of these data sources and their lack of direct consideration of future land use, enhanced traffic forecasts for the study area were developed using a manual process that included the following steps:

1. Determination of Site Characteristics

   The determination of site characteristics is needed to estimate the potential trips generated from each development parcel. Site characteristics are available for developments where existing traffic impact studies (TIS) have been completed. For other development locations, assumptions were made on the types of development that may occur. Determinations considered stakeholder comments, zoning categories, and estimated facility square footage (based on area of the parcel).

2. Trip Generation

   Based on the site characteristics, both auto and truck trips were estimated for each parcel. The generated trips were determined from either the available TIS or from an estimate developed according to methods specified in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th edition. Consistent with the manual, the following land use categories were used for generating trips:

   - Land Use Code 110 – General Light Industrial
   - Land Use Code 210 – Single-Family Detached Housing
   - Land Use Code 221 – Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)
   - Land Use Code 251 – Senior Adult Housing – Detached
   - Land Use Code 560 – Church
Land Use Code 710 – General Office Building

To support traffic analyses, trips were then allocated to the AM and PM peak hours. This allocation process utilized information available from the TIS documents and from StreetLight Origin-Destination analyses at select roadway locations in the region.

3. Trip Distribution

Trips generated from each of the developments were distributed to defined locations both inside and outside the study area. Where available the TIS studies provided some insight into the potential distribution of trips; however, in most cases the TIS only distributed trips for a short distance to nearby intersections. Further efforts both for these locations and others were needed to estimate the entire trip movement through the study area.

Assumptions on the origins and destinations of auto trips were based on commuting flow information from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) program (Figure 22 and Table 5). This data set provided insight into the number of auto trips that may stay within the study area or be destined to specific roadways at study-area boundary locations.

Figure 22: Study-Area Distance/Direction Analysis for All Workers (2015)
Table 5: Study-Area Commuter Trips by Cardinal Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cardinal Direction</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information on truck origins and destinations was obtained from the StreetLight origin-destination assessment as discussed in the Profile of Existing Conditions section. Based on typical truck origin and destination locations, assumptions were made on roadway entry/exit points. Using the LEHD commuter distance/direction data and the Streetlight origin-destination data, the AM and PM peak-hour trips were distributed and aggregated for key roadway locations throughout the study area.

4. Traffic Analyses at Select Locations

The traffic analysis for this study was conducted at a planning level. Limited information on existing intersection turning movements prevented detailed analyses using the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 Edition (HCM 2010). However, the relationships between traffic volume and roadway capacity can provide important insight into potential transportation needs, especially with the understanding that many of the development characteristics are still unknown at this time.

The planning-level traffic analysis was conducted with planning software developed by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for roadways that implement HCM 2010 concepts. ARTPLAN is FDOT’s multimodal conceptual planning software for arterial facilities that is based on the HCM’s urban streets methodology. For automobile estimates, it provides a simplified Level-of-Service (LOS) analysis of the through movements on a road segment or at a signalized intersection. ARTPLAN uses average travel speed as the service measure. The FDOT ARTPLAN software is a generalized tool for assessing LOS—there are many default assumptions used in deriving the LOS. HIGHPLAN is FDOT’s conceptual planning software for two-lane and multilane highways. In developed areas, HIGHPLAN
implements the HCM Class III LOS thresholds based on percent of free-flow speed (PFFS), which is the percentage of vehicles able to travel the road segment at free-flow speed. Both software programs were used to develop a LOS for each study-area roadway segment, depending on the roadway segment characteristics.

Roadway attributes including the number of lanes, average annual daily traffic (AADT), heavy vehicle percentage, segment length, median type, and intersection control characteristics were used to estimate the roadway capacity. Base-year traffic volumes were extracted from PennDOT’s Roadway Management System (RMS). Available travel-time information was used to assess current peak-hour congestion and adjust or calibrate the roadway capacity to ensure reasonable results when projecting future traffic volume growth’s impact on congestion. The LOS thresholds for two-lane highways and arterial roadways are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Relationship Between PFFS and LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Two-Lane Highways</th>
<th>Arterials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PFFS (%)</td>
<td>Class I ATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&gt; 91.7</td>
<td>&gt; 35 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 83.3 – 91.7</td>
<td>&gt; 31 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 75.0 – 83.3</td>
<td>&gt; 23 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 66.7 – 75.0</td>
<td>&gt; 18 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 58.3 – 66.7</td>
<td>&gt; 15 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 58.3</td>
<td>&lt; 15 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 presents LOS for the study-area roadway segments based on average daily traffic (ADT). For the study area, an LOS of D or better is desired. Segments with an LOS of E or F are highlighted red. As described above, the LOS were generated at a high planning level using ARTPLAN and HIGHPLAN methodology. The LOS presented represent a composite LOS calculated based on road segment lengths, ADT, speed limits, heavy vehicle percentage, and directional factor. The LOS were presented in this format due to limited data available. An analysis was done for the study-area roadway segments under existing conditions, as well as future conditions which include a partial build-out (developments for which traffic impact studies are available), and a full build-out (which includes the aforementioned land developments as well as the “Wild Card” parcels as documented in Figure 21).

Table 7: PFFS and LOS Summary for Existing and Future Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Existing Condition LOS</th>
<th>Future Condition LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TIS Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 145 (MacArthur Rd)</td>
<td>Between PA 329 &amp; Roosevelt St.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between PA 329 &amp; Columbia St.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 248</td>
<td>Between SR 4001 (Blue Mountain Dr.) &amp; SR 3016 (Indian Trail Rd.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Existing Condition LOS</td>
<td>Future Condition LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 3016 (Indian Trail Rd.) &amp; SR 4008 (Valley View Dr.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 4008 (Valley View Dr.) &amp; SR 3021 (Seemsville Rd./Allen Dr.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 3021 (Seemsville Rd./Allen Dr.) &amp; SR 3023 (Airport Rd.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 3023 (Airport Rd.) &amp; PA 329 (Race St.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between PA 329 (Race St.) &amp; Wolf St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 329</td>
<td>Between PA 248 &amp; SR 3023 (Airport Rd.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 3023 (Airport Rd.) &amp; SR 3017 (Weaversville Rd./Howertown Rd.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 3017 (Weaversville Rd./Howertown Rd.) &amp; Main St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Main St. &amp; SR 145 (MacArthur Rd.)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 145 (MacArthur Rd.) &amp; SR 4008 (Cement St.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 512 (Bath Pike)</td>
<td>Between Silver Crest Rd &amp; Locust Rd.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Locust Rd &amp; SR 3014 (Hanoverville Rd.)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 3014 (Hanoverville Rd.) &amp; US 22</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 987 (Airport Rd)</td>
<td>Between US 22 &amp; SR 1004 (Race St.)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 1004 (Race St) &amp; SR 3014 (Hanoverville Rd.)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between SR 3014 (Hanoverville Rd.) &amp; PA 329</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 1004 (Race St)</td>
<td>Between PA 987 (Airport Rd.) &amp; Fashion Dr.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Fashion Dr. &amp; Second St.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 1009 (Schoenersville Rd)</td>
<td>Between Colonial Rd. &amp; PA 987 (Airport Rd.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between PA 987 (Airport Rd.) &amp; US 22</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 41 segments included in the traffic analysis, 30 did not experience a significant change in LOS with full build-out. In other words, the new trips generated and distributed from the TIS and “Wild Card” parcels did not impact the segments enough for the existing LOS figure to change appreciably. The remaining 11 segments experienced a decrease in LOS. Figure 23 depicts the LOS impacts of a full build-out scenario where TIS and “Wild Card” parcels are developed.

Source: Michael Baker International calculations
Figure 23: Existing and Future LOS Changes for Road Segments within the Study Area

Source: Michael Baker International calculations and PennDOT Approved Traffic Impact Studies
The following five segments experienced the largest reduction in free-flow speed between existing conditions and future conditions in the traffic analysis:

- **PA 1009 (Schoenersville Road) between PA 987 (Airport Road) & US 22 – LOS decrease from C to E.** As this segment already experiences heavy traffic during the peak hours, it is expected that future developments will worsen congestion.

- **SR 1004 (Race Street) between PA 987 (Airport Road) and Fashion Drive – LOS decrease from B to D.**

- **PA 987 (Airport Road) between US 22 and SR 1004 (Race Street) – LOS decrease from B to E.**

- **PA 329 between Main Street and PA 145 (MacArthur Road) – No LOS decrease, however the existing and future conditions experience an LOS E.** As this segment also experiences heavy traffic during the peak hours, it is expected that future developments will also worsen congestion on this segment.

- **PA 145 (MacArthur Road) between PA 329 and Columbia Street (LOS decrease from D to E).**

As the study area is experiencing development, future analysis and planning is required to ensure that the road network operates sufficiently. Many of the study-area road segments operate at LOS E currently and in projected future conditions; improvements will need to be made in the future to improve capacity.

**Estimated Trip and Traffic Volume Growth**

_Figure 24_ highlights the daily truck and auto peak-hour trips generated from each of the study-area parcels. **In total, approximately 10,856 total daily peak-hour trips are estimated to be generated from new development, including 2,927 trucks.** The daily trips were allocated to the AM and PM peak hours to support traffic analyses. The total AM and PM peak-hour trips are estimated to be 3,871 (1,228 trucks) and 3,685 (1,699 trucks) trips, respectively. A breakdown of AM and PM peak hour trips by study area parcel is included in _Table 8_.

---

10 Auto and truck trips were distributed as part of two development scenarios, including: 1) a partial build-out consisting of the planned developments for which a TIS has been completed (Scenario 1) and 2) a full build-out consisting of all the identified development parcels (Scenario 2). Note that any parcel designated for agriculture preservation does not produce any vehicle trips. Traffic volume increases in both scenarios included a background growth rate determined from the average annual growth identified within the project study area in the Lehigh Valley Travel Demand model.
Figure 24: Peak Period Trips Generated from Study Area Parcels

Source: Michael Baker International calculations and PennDOT Approved Traffic Impact Studies
Table 8: Peak Period Trips Generated from Study-Area Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Parcel Name</th>
<th>AM Cars</th>
<th>AM Trucks</th>
<th>AM Total</th>
<th>PM Cars</th>
<th>PM Trucks</th>
<th>PM Total</th>
<th>Peak Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mary Immaculate Property</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approved Single-Family Development 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approved Single-Family Development 2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Former Mineral Extraction Site</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>2546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northampton Industrial Park*</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Northampton Business Center*</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Commercial Zone</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Approved Single-Family Development 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Future Medium-Density Residential</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Approved Strip Mall</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fuller Tract</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rockefeller Lot 5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FedEx*</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>2097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rockefeller Lot 4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LNAA Tract</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Aircraft Flight Path Property</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Approved Single-Family Development 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Property Zoned Light Industrial / Business Park</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Airport Lot 1*</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Property Rezoned</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Future Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aerial Flight Path Property</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Approved Single-Family Development 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Approved Strip Mall</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fuller Tract</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rockefeller Lot 5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FedEx*</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>2097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rockefeller Lot 4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LNAA Tract</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Aircraft Flight Path Property</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Approved Single-Family Development 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Property Zoned Light Industrial / Business Park</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Airport Lot 1*</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Property Rezoned</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Future Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>10,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PennDOT-approved Traffic Impact Study is available for this parcel
Recommendations

Major recommendations flowing out of this study are organized into three primary areas:

1. **Capital projects** to ease congestion for both motorists and heavy truck operators. In some cases, additional study and evaluation would be required during preliminary engineering phases to determine the project’s proper scope.

2. **Operational improvements** to enhance system operations at specific intersections and along certain roadways.

3. **Land use policies and multimunicipal approaches** to address the study area’s collective issues. These range from land use management ordinances, to land use management techniques, to changes in federal roadway functional class. Land use policies can often create conflicts with incompatible neighboring land uses, and can be inconsistent, particularly when weighed against the area’s freight transportation system. Truck-generating uses need to be strategically located within the study area.

Capital Improvements

1. **For freight shippers, reliability is a vital transportation consideration.** As new land development proposals are submitted, LVTS should monitor the anticipated impacts to capacity and free-flow speed on the primary roadway segments identified through the study process. LVPC and PennDOT District 5-0 should use the land development and HOP process to study and complete improvements at the time of development. These include the following major roadway segments, which are expected to experience significant declines in levels of service and should be added as candidate projects to the region’s Long-Range Transportation Plan:

   a. Schoenersville Road (SR 1009) between PA 987 (Airport Road) and US 22.
   b. Race Street (SR 1004) between Airport Road (PA 987) and Fashion Drive.
   c. Airport Road (PA 987) between US 22 and Race Street (SR 1004).
   d. PA 329 between Main Street and MacArthur Road (PA 145).
   e. MacArthur Road (PA 145) between PA 329 and Columbia Street.

Operational Improvements

2. **Expand fixed-route and deviated public transportation service in the study area** – LANTA’s service within the study area currently meets the demand for job access and service span with its fixed-route network; however, continued growth in the area may expand service needs. One corridor identified as a potential future fixed route would connect the boroughs of Northampton and Bath along PA 329, continuing to the Borough of Nazareth outside the study area. The inclusion of this corridor in the fixed-route network would be bolstered by planned developments of the Northampton Business Center and Northampton Industrial Park near the intersection of PA 329 and Howertown Road.

   In addition to fixed-route service, LANTA provides a reservation-based curb-to-curb transit service called LANTAFlex. This service is useful in areas of low-density destinations with fluctuating demand.
While there are currently no LANTAFlex zones in the study area, the growth in low-density developments across the northern and eastern areas of the study area may produce an opportunity to add this service. This potential service could cover the entire northern half of the study area and provide connections to industrial park developments from fixed-route services in Northampton and along PA 329 (should service be added).

3. **Upgrade Mill Street as a truck route** – Improving Mill Street (and specifically the Mill Street bridge), a locally-owned street in Bath Borough, is a recommendation of the Bath Multimodal Study and Parking Analysis Report. The roadway connects PA 512 with PA 987 and includes a bridge spanning Monocacy Creek which is currently posted at 6 tons. Trucks are currently prohibited from using the roadway. Opening the roadway to truck traffic (and promoting it as a truck route) would help decongest downtown Bath. This recommendation would be implemented in tandem with a corresponding initiative by the Borough to implement upgraded signal control and coordination at four key intersections. (The borough’s signalized intersections operate on a timed system, with no designated turning lanes.) It should be noted that the bridge (Northampton County Bridge #115), once replaced, will not have a posted weight restriction, but was not designed to accommodate a proposed increase in truck traffic, thereby shortening its life span, and inducing increased maintenance costs to the County. Further discussions between the County, PennDOT, and the Borough are necessary regarding any implementation of this recommendation.

The recommendation also entails LVPC adding the intersection of PA 512 and Mill Street to the LRTP. The proposal would include a signal warrant analysis of Mill Street’s intersections with PA 512/Walnut Street and Race Street (PA 329/987). Bath Borough is a gateway to and from the study area. New development east of the borough (and just outside of the defined study area) will add to travel demand through the borough. The borough, despite being only one square mile in size, has a dense network of roadways totaling nearly 11 linear miles, nearly half of which are state-owned. The borough is looking to reduce traffic congestion through operational improvements to its signal network, and is also considering instituting a series of one-way streets.

Mill Street compares favorably with alternative truck routes, such as East Allen Township’s Jacksonville Road, a locally-owned roadway located 1.1 miles farther south which also has a bridge spanning Monocacy Creek, but is currently posted at 13 tons. Other impediments to using Jacksonville Road as a truck route include an at-grade crossing of Norfolk Southern right-of-way, the Northampton County Nor-Bath Trail crossing, and a community park (Jacksonville Park) with poor access management providing free access from the roadway to off-street parking spaces. The roadway also intersects with PA 987 at a skewed angle.
4. **Raise the signal heads/signs at the intersection of PA 987 (Airport Road) and SR 3014 (Hanoverville Road) in East Allen Township** – The intersection of PA 987 (Airport Road) and SR 3014 (Hanoverville Road) experiences heavy vehicles hitting signal heads and signs on the mast arm facing the southbound approach of PA 987 (Airport Road). The Left Turn Yield on Green sign is tilted and the backplates of the signal heads are also bent.

According to LiDAR data, the height clearance for the signs/signal heads is approximately 14.5 feet, which is substandard clearance. According to PennDOT Publication 149 (Traffic Signal Design Handbook), the bottom of the signal face shall be a minimum of 15 feet above the pavement grade. It is recommended that the brackets attaching the signal heads and signs to the mast arm be raised to allow for additional clearance. After the signal heads and signs are raised, it is also recommended to monitor the intersection to see if the signal heads/signs continue to be hit. If collisions continue, it is recommended that the mast arm be raised and the signal equipment be replaced.
5. **It is recommended East Allen Township revise its Official Map to include a corridor linking PA 329 to Weaversville Road (SR 3017)** – The position of Weaversville Road in connecting the interior of the study area (including the Northampton Business Center and Northampton Industrial Park) with US 22 means it will experience significant increases in travel demand in coming years. The passage of Act 31 of 2018 may only contribute to the demand for travel along this roadway.\(^{11}\)

The purpose of an Official Map is to reserve private property and/or corridors for future public use. It legally establishes the location of existing and proposed streets and other public facilities within a municipality. The intent of the recommendation would also be to notify affected land owners and developers concerning the location of future planned improvements. Thus, it reserves strategic real estate without immediate purchase.

The initiative is part of a broader concern aimed at creating a truck route connecting PA 329 Nor-Bath Boulevard with Weaversville Road. The intent of the recommendation is to create more favorable conditions for trucks traveling north/south on the Weaversville Road corridor between new distribution centers on PA 329 and US 22. The corridor would be approximately a third of a mile long and allow trucks to bypass a residential area surrounding Howertown Park. The route would intersect with PA 329 at its planned intersection with Seemsville Road (SR 3021).

\(^{11}\) PennDOT has placed a “No Trailers Over 45’ long” restriction on the roadway in place of the current “No 102” signs.
6. **Ensure improvements are secured from developers and other stakeholders to realign Weaversville Road (SR 3017) and improve its connection to PA 987** – At the southern extent of Weaversville Road, the roadway features challenging geometry for trucks. The potential future development of the LNAA lot to the east of the FedEx/Lot 4 area to a “logistics center” use has the potential to generate up to approximately 1,600 additional truck trips and radically change the traffic profile along Weaversville Road. Any future development of this parcel will load traffic directly onto Weaversville Road.

Hanover Township in its Official Map has identified a corridor between Innovation Drive and Weaversville Road that should be considered as a new alignment for Weaversville Road as the corridor develops. A realigned Weaversville Road would improve safety and also remove truck traffic from existing residential areas at Weaversville Road’s southern extent. PennDOT has posted the corridor with a “No Trailers Over 45’ Long” restriction in place of the “No 102” signs.

Any realignment of Weaversville Road should be assessed to ensure conformance with LVIA’s Airport Layout Plan.

7. **Promote the adoption of Act 164 Airport Hazard Zoning** – Air cargo and passenger traffic is growing; LVIA will require compatible surrounding land development in order to remain viable. Several municipalities within the study area do not have Act 164 Airport Hazard Zoning. These include: Allen Township, Coplay Borough, East Allen Township, Hanover Township (Lehigh County), Lehigh Township (Northampton County), and Northampton Borough. The intent of the recommendation is not to stifle development, but to ensure that planned development helps maintain the safety and viability of LVIA’s passenger and commercial operations. **Figure 25** shows the status of Act 164 Airport Hazard Zoning in municipalities adjacent to LVIA while **Appendix F** depicts a complete listing in tabular format.
8. **Adjust performance standards in municipal zoning ordinances** – Certain municipalities, such as Allen Township, have modified their zoning ordinance to require truck parking accommodation as part of major warehousing and distribution center land developments. The provision keeps truck traffic on these commercial/industrial properties. This recommendation could be implemented in tandem with development of LVPC’s forthcoming freight toolkit. Providing on-site truck parking would help address a larger regional, systemic problem—with insufficient truck stops and other designated parking available, truck drivers are forced to park in non-designated areas (shoulders, on- and off-ramps, etc.) that were not designed to sustain those loads. This recommendation addresses a growing public policy issue and addresses safety and environmental concerns.

9. **Implement a Recommended Truck Route Network as a planning tool** - The intermingling of truck traffic with overall vehicular traffic has been a consistent concern expressed throughout the study process. The study is advancing the concept of a recommended truck route network, as shown previously in Figure 20. The proposed truck network has been overlaid with parcels within the study area that municipalities have zoned for truck-related or freight-generating uses. The network can be used as a tool by LVTS in consultation with municipal planners as decisions are being made regarding proposed changes to land use, over time. Ideally, parcels that are not located adjacent to
a proposed truck route would be discouraged from accommodating uses that would generate heavy truck traffic.

The proposed truck network predominately features Principal Arterials that can accommodate growth in truck traffic. Municipalities such as East Allen have no infrastructure north of PA 329, and the soils are not favorable north of that corridor for onsite water and sewer. Other lots in Allen Township north of the roadway have been proposed for downzoning to less intensive, residential uses.

10. **Address noise reduction** - Related to the Truck Route Network recommendation above, study-area municipalities should consider enacting engine brake (“Jake brake”) prohibitions on non-truck-route network roadways to address noise concerns of residential property owners. Study-area municipalities can play a role in managing environmental impacts created by truck-generating uses, and can help industrial uses such as warehouses and distribution centers be “good neighbors” to the study area’s existing residential areas and neighborhoods by mitigating excessive noise.

11. **Pursue functional classification upgrades on PA 329 and PA 987 from Minor Arterial to Principal Arterial** - The passage of the FAST Act in December 2015 provided new guidance to state DOTs and MPOs regarding the classification of roadways: Principal Arterials are expected to connect to other Principal Arterials (or Interstates) as a closed system. The study area features two examples where roadways classified as Principal Arterials do not satisfy this requirement:

   a. PA 329 (Nor-Bath Boulevard) changes classification from Principal Arterial to Minor Arterial at Catasauqua Creek in East Allen Township.

   b. PA 987 (Airport Road) is a Principal Arterial between US 22 and SR 1009 (Schoenersville Road). North of that intersection, it is classified as a Minor Arterial.

LVTS is encouraged to approach FHWA and PennDOT’s Bureau of Planning and Research to initiate changes to functional classification within the study area. This could be performed as a stand-alone request or added to a future biennial work program as part of a broader effort encompassing the entire region. Successful upgrades of these portions of PA 329 and PA 987 from Minor Arterials to Principal Arterials would make these two roadways eligible for National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) funding, which, at an estimated $33 million a year, is by far the MPO’s most significant funding category. A proposed change on PA 329 could also be extended to its intersection with PA 248 in Bath Borough.

**Figure 26** shows the study area’s existing functional classification scheme.

---

12 An exception would include PA 329 in Whitehall
Figure 26 Study-Area Roadway Functional Classification

Source: PennDOT Roadway Management System (RMS)
12. Consider creating a Transportation Development District (TDD) or a Transportation Impact Fee District -

A Transportation Development District (TDD), as authorized under the Transportation Partnership Act (TPA), is a relatively underutilized transportation financing tool that has been in place since the 1980s. Key factors that reportedly dissuade municipalities from adopting a TDD are: obtaining property owner buy-in and agreement, vague regulatory requirements, and upfront planning and transportation study costs.

A few municipalities that have successfully deployed a TDD have done so in conjunction with financing the district through a companion Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance Act (LERTA) district, often known as a LERTA RAP (Revenue Allocation Program). Under this financing mechanism enabled through the TPA, property owner abatements under LERTA are voluntarily applied toward property owner assessments as part of the TDD and used to fund transportation improvements in the established TDD.

Where municipalities have studied establishing a TDD but have opted not to do so, tools such as Transportation Impact Fees, Tax Increment Financing (TIF), the Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank (PIB), or municipal-wide tax increases have been used to fund or finance transportation improvement projects.

Further details regarding the use of Transportation Development Districts in Pennsylvania are provided in Appendix G: Transportation Development District Overview.
Appendix A: INRIX Travel Time and Planning Index Summary
### Appendix H – INRIX Travel Time and Planning Time Index Summary by Corridor

#### MacArthur Road (US 22 to Schadt Avenue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Travel time index</th>
<th>Planning time index</th>
<th>Travel time index</th>
<th>Planning time index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Midday</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Days</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Airport Road (US 22 to Schoenersville Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Travel time index</th>
<th>Planning time index</th>
<th>Travel time index</th>
<th>Planning time index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Midday</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Days</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Airport Road Road (Hanoverville Road to PA 329)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel time index</td>
<td>Planning time index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Days</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Schoenersonville Road (US 22 to Airport Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel time index</td>
<td>Planning time index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Days</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Jacksonville Road (US 22 to Hanoverville Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel time index</td>
<td>Planning time index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Week</td>
<td>Travel time index</td>
<td>Planning time index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Days</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race Street (Willow Brook Road to Airport Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel time index</td>
<td>Planning time index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Days</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PA 329 (Howertown Road to Main Street)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel time index</td>
<td>Planning time index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Days</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PA 248 (Maple Drive to Locust Drive)
Appendix B: StreetLight Data Commercial Interchanges by Study Area Zone
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[Image of a map showing Zone 1040 with different color sections indicating commercial trip destinations: <1%, 1%-2.5%, 2.5%-5%, 5%-12%, >12%. There are specific percentages labeled on the map: 26.7% and 12.3%.]
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[Map showing the Zone 1046 with percentage labels and a legend indicating commercial trip destinations for Zone 1046.]
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[Map showing distribution of commercial trip destinations for Zone 1050 with percentages indicated on the map.]
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Appendix C: LANTA Fixed Routes Operating in the Study Area

- **Route 103 South Bethlehem – Northampton**: Provides service to Downtown Allentown, South Bethlehem, Lehigh Valley Industrial Park (LVIP) VII, Fountain Hill, Mountainville Shopping Center, Lehigh Valley Mall, Whitehall Mall, Catasauqua, North Catasauqua, Northampton, and Cherry Square. Operates seven days per week.

- **Route 104 Emmaus – Lehigh Valley Mall**: Provides service to Emmaus, South Mall, Good Shepherd Hospital, Downtown Allentown, and Lehigh Valley Mall.

- **Route 105 LV Mall – South Bethlehem/Hellertown**: Provides service to Lehigh Valley Mall, Westgate Mall, Bethlehem, Lehigh University, Sands Casino, Commerce Center Boulevard, and Hellertown. Most of the portion of this route within the study area is express along US 22 without stops. Operates seven days per week.

- **Route 211 Lehigh Valley Hospital – Presidential Village**: Provides service to Lehigh Valley Hospital, Cedar Crest Professional Park, Downtown Allentown, Lehigh Valley Mall, Whitehall Mall, Whitehall Square, Presidential Village, Olympic Gardens, Spring Ridge Apartments, and Overlook Road.

- **Route 215 Hellertown – Lehigh Valley Airport/LVIP**: Provides service to Hellertown, Bethlehem, Westgate Mall, LVIP 1, LVIP II, LVIP III, LVIP VII, Lehigh Valley International Airport, Macron Blvd, and Postal Road. Operates Monday through Saturday.

- **Route 319 Lehigh Valley Mall – Bethlehem Square via Lehigh Valley Airport**: Lehigh Valley Mall, Catasauqua, LVIP I, LVIP II, LVIP IV, Lehigh Valley International Airport, Brodhead Road, and Bethlehem Square. Operates Monday through Friday.

- **Route 324 Allentown – Lehigh Valley Airport**: Provides service to Downtown Allentown, Downs Drive, PennDOT, LVIP I, LVIP III, and Lehigh Valley International Airport.

- **Route 325 Lehigh Valley Mall – Walnutport**: Provides service to Lehigh Valley Mall, Whitehall Mall, Whitehall Shopping Center, Hokendauqua, Coplay, LCCC-Schnecksville, Neffs, Slatington, and Walnutport.

- **Route 602 MacArthur Road WhirlyBird**: Provides service to Lehigh Valley Mall, Whitehall Mall, Whitehall Shopping Center, MacArthur Towne Center, and Whitehall Square.

- **Route 603 Lehigh Valley Mall – Parkway Shopping Center**: Provides service to Lehigh Valley Mall, Gross Towers, B’nai B’rith, Lehigh Valley Hospital-17th Street, William Allen High School, St. Luke’s Hospital, Episcopal House, YMCA/YWCA, and Parkway Shopping Center.
### Table 9: Bus Trips by LANTA Route within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Weekday # of Trips</th>
<th>Saturday # of Trips</th>
<th>Sunday # of Trips</th>
<th>Total Weekly Trips</th>
<th>Weekday First Trip</th>
<th>Weekday Last Trip</th>
<th>Weekday Span of Service</th>
<th>Weekday Peak</th>
<th>Weekday Midday</th>
<th>Weekday After 6:30pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 103</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5:40 AM</td>
<td>10:45 PM</td>
<td>17:05</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 104</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5:29 AM</td>
<td>10:48 PM</td>
<td>17:19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 105</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>9:44 PM</td>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 211</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5:46 AM</td>
<td>8:10 PM</td>
<td>14:24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 215</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6:30 AM</td>
<td>5:25 PM</td>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 319</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6:27 AM</td>
<td>6:07 PM</td>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 324</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6:34 AM</td>
<td>5:51 PM</td>
<td>11:17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 325</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>7:16 PM</td>
<td>12:16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 602</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6:25 AM</td>
<td>9:40 PM</td>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 603</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6:45 AM</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority, Department of Planning (May 2017)*
Lehigh Valley International Airport Area Freight Study

Appendix D: Study-Area Truck-Generating Parcels Evaluated against Proposed Truck Network

LEHIGH COUNTY

Catasauqua Borough

Catasauqua Borough is located west of LVIA and does not include any designated truck routes. The Borough permits trucking and other freight-related uses in its Industrial Office (IO) and Airport (A) zoning districts. Land behind residential lots, currently ball fields along Race Street heading west into the Borough of Catasauqua, allows trucking-related uses by Special Exception. This area of the Borough is located less than a half-mile from the intersection of Race Street and Willow Brook Road. Also, in this same region, there are parcels in the Airport zoning district that allow trucking-related uses. Current zoning is considered inconsistent with the proposed designated truck corridors; however, this land could be considered as future lands for trucking-oriented uses.

Coplay Borough

Coplay Borough is located north of LVIA and does not contain any recommended truck routes. Coplay Borough is a densely developed community with a mix of residential uses and parklands. Moreover, the borough does not have any zoning districts that permit trucking-related uses.

Hanover Township

Hanover Township (Lehigh County) is the host municipality to LVIA. The township contains three designated truck route corridors: US 22, Race Street, and Willow Brook Road. Hanover Township permits trucking and other freight-related uses across several zoning districts, including: Planned Commercial (PC), Planned Industrial Office (PIO), Airport-Industrial (AI), and Planned Unit Development (PUD). Most of the airport properties are in Hanover Township (Lehigh County). Existing industrial development does exist or is planned for the properties directly on or stemming off recommended truck corridors in the study area. Local zoning allows trucking-related uses on a vacant property along Race Street a quarter-mile west of Willow Brook Road. The intersection of Willow Brook Road and E. Race Street is a designated truck route corridor. Currently the zoning for this parcel is considered inconsistent with the proposed truck corridor route; however, this land could be considered for future trucking-oriented uses.

North Whitehall Township

North Whitehall Township is located northwest of LVIA and contains one proposed truck corridor, PA 145. The township is predominately rural residential and agricultural, with several densely populated villages throughout the township. Land uses along PA 145 are agricultural and include lands identified for future conservation. Currently, trucks travel to the southeastern portion of the township to industrial and quarry operations within the Mineral Extraction General Industrial (ME-I) zoning district.

Whitehall Township

Whitehall Township is located west of LVIA and has three recommended truck routes: PA 329, US 22, and PA 145 (MacArthur Road). The township has one primary zoning district that allows trucking-related businesses just off the MacArthur Road and E. Columbia Street intersection. There are a variety of existing industrial uses in industrial zoning districts having no direct access to MacArthur Road as
designated truck corridor. There are agricultural, commercial, and residential lands that lie between the Industrial zone and MacArthur Road. The properties between the corridor and the Industrial zones may experience growth pressures from surrounding industrial and commercial land uses.

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

Allen Township

Allen Township is located north of LVIA and contains two recommended truck corridors, PA 329 (Nor Bath Blvd) and Willow Brook Road. Zoning in Allen Township promotes industrial development (I/C and I Districts) in the central and southern portions of the township. Industrial Districts I/C and I allow trucking and freight-related uses by right. The I/C District location is consistent with the proposed truck corridor on PA 329. There is an existing trucking-related use located in an Industrial (I) District along Savage Road. A large tract on Willow Brook Road in the southernmost portion of the township, currently zoned Industrial, is consistent with the proposed designated truck route corridor.

Bath Borough

Bath Borough is located northeast of LVIA and contains three recommended truck routes: PA 987, PA 512, and PA 248 (East Northampton Street). There are two zoning districts (Manufacturing/ Commercial (M-C & M-C2)) that allow trucking- and freight-related uses. One MC district of approximately 35-40 acres is located on the north side of W. Main Street. It is currently vacant and is not consistent with the study's proposed truck route network.

East Allen Township

East Allen Township is located northeast of LVIA and contains four recommended truck routes: PA 329, Airport Road, PA 512, and Weaversville Road. The Township permits trucking-related uses in two zoning districts, Light Industrial/Business Park (LI/BG) District and General Industrial (I) District, by Conditional Use. The two industrial zoning districts encompass several properties throughout the southern half of the township, each of which are located on or near recommended truck route corridors.

Hanover Township

Hanover Township (Northampton County) is located southeast of LVIA. Four recommended truck route corridors have been identified in the township: PA 987, Schoenersville Road, US 22, and PA 512. The township permits trucking-related uses in its Planned Industrial/Business District (PIBD). Truck parking is supported as a conditional use and warehousing is permitted as an accessory use in the Planned Office, Research and Residential District (PORR) District. The PIBD and PORR Districts are located within recommended trucking corridors. All other commercial districts specifically prohibit trucking-related uses.

Lehigh Township

Lehigh Township is located north of LVIA and does not contain any recommended truck corridors. Zoning provisions in Lehigh Township allow, by special exception, trucking and freight-related uses in the Industrial (I) zone located in the westernmost portion of the township along Riverview Drive. The Industrial zoning district also features available rail transportation. The Township also permits warehouse uses by right in the General Commercial (GC) District. The GC and I zoning districts in the Township are located close to the project study area but are a considerable distance from any
recommended truck route. This could be considered inconsistent with the network of designated truck route corridors.

**Moore Township**

Moore Township, Northampton County is located on the northern-most portion of the study area. There are no proposed truck route corridors identified in the township. Within the township’s portion of the study area, land uses are predominately agricultural and low-density residential. There are no zoning districts located within the study area that permit trucking-related uses.

**Northampton Borough**

Northampton Borough, located northwest of LVIA, does not contain any recommended truck routes. The borough contains two zoning districts, I-1 and I-2, that permit trucking and freight-related uses by Special Exception. All industrial zones in the borough are built-out or nearly built-out with a variety of pre-existing industrial uses.

**North Catasauqua Borough**

North Catasauqua Borough is located northwest of LVIA and does not contain any recommended truck routes. A Multi-Purpose (M1) zoning district in the Borough permits trucking-related uses along the Lehigh River along with regional freight rail lines. However, existing industrial uses do not rely on rail freight service for business operations. Although this land area is very small, it is not a favorable location for future trucking-related uses since all trucks must use borough streets with smaller turning radii. Local zoning is not consistent with the proposed truck route network.
Appendix E: Stakeholder Roundtable Meeting Summaries

The stakeholder roundtables were guided by a series of questions aimed at maximizing stakeholder engagement:

- What major trends and issues have you observed with respect to freight activity and its impacts in the study area?
- Where is there anticipated growth or land development pressure for freight-generating activities in the study area?
- Where are existing major freight bottlenecks located?
- Are there any administrative or institutional issues that are barriers to planning for freight movement?
- What, if any, land use management strategies are needed to lessen the current impacts of freight and address future concerns?
- Are there any transportation-specific capital improvements (e.g., improved intersection geometry, passing lanes, etc.) that should be considered in the LVIA Freight Study?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>June 18, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>LVPC, 961 Marcon Blvd. #310, Allentown, PA 18109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Name</td>
<td>LVIA Area Freight Study: Municipal Stakeholder Roundtable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Purpose:** Offer municipal stakeholders the opportunity to provide input on local freight trends, anticipated land developments, existing freight bottlenecks, and capital improvements needed to address freight impacts.

**Summary of Stakeholder Input**

What are some of the observed trends and issues related to freight within your municipality?

a. Over the past 10 years, there has been an increase in tri-axle trucks on the study area road network due to mineral extraction activity. The trucks are bringing in dirt from New York and New Jersey, with a large number traveling on PA 329 and PA 248. The trucks traveling on PA 248 tend to head north into Carbon County or to Coplay across the river.
  i. The braking of heavy trucks is creating a washboard effect at certain intersections. The current road network wasn’t built to handle such heavy trucks.

b. There is a dramatic increase in truck traffic and it is resulting in truck parking issues. There have been instances of trucks parking in the center of roadways and along the shoulder near distribution centers. Because there are no truck stops in the study area, there are few options. In Lower Nazareth, there are semi-permanent parking areas
(e.g., a truck driver can stop in a rest area with a larger parking lot), but not every municipality has such facilities available.

c. Walmart prohibits truck parking. The Carmike Cinema (AMC Theater) has had issues with trucks parking in their lot and now they have prohibitive signs posted, with state police enforcement.

d. There is a need for increased enforcement with respect to truck parking. However, enforcing truck parking restrictions would consume a lot of police time. Three of the municipalities within the study area rely on state police. The penalty for a truck driver exceeding their hours of service is greater than parking fines.

e. Some of the new warehouses and distribution centers are including spaces for truck parking.

f. Municipalities need to consider the environmental impacts of truck parking. When trucks idle, it creates air quality concerns.

g. Some municipalities require roads to be built to a higher standard for trucks. For example, a road could have “full depth reclamation” (8” – 16”). Heavy trucks wear on the road and unless roads are required to be built to a higher specification, there will be more expensive and long-term maintenance on municipally-owned roads.

h. As of April 1, 2018, the truck driver hours of service regulations are being enforced by the state police and PennDOT. Every truck driver may work only 14 hours and then must take 10 hours off. Within the first 8 hours, the driver must take a 30-minute break (truck turned off, no wheels can turn). Some drivers run out of time and warehouses won’t allow them to stay. Drivers have to find the first safe haven to shut down and take their required 30-minute break.

  i. Upper Macungie Township is trying to address this by recommending 10 to 12 truck parking spots for any industrial development. They are also looking at including driver facilities (e.g., bathrooms, showers, etc.).

i. As far as tri-axle trucks on PA 329, PennDOT issues a $25 permit to cross the bridge over the Lehigh River. Dump trucks are a lot heavier and they will wear roadways more (more weight on fewer axles).

j. There is signage at one of the warehouses that directs truckers to turn right to deter their GPS units from sending the trucks into a residential area. Once a truck turns, they are committed and can’t turn around easily. Paper maps are still the best option for truck drivers.

k. Improvements to the road system have been very slow. With the FedEx development, it was thought that the improvements on US 22 would be completed by now. The bridge work won’t begin until next year.

l. In the northeast portion of the study area, there are three cement plants. All of the plants are working deeper and deeper into limited reserves. To continue operation,
the companies will need to supplement the lesser-grade material with higher-grade material that is imported. This area may see an uptick in hauling shipments if there is an increased building cycle. Nearly all of the truck traffic in the cement-hauling industry is heavily regulated, so there shouldn’t be an issue with those trucks seeking alternative routes.

i. The cement industry has dedicated company drivers. Their routes are prescribed. FedEx has the opposite practice. They do not have a company driver; all of their drivers are contracted/independent. It is more difficult to manage those routes.

m. There needs to be a push to get developers to contribute to signalized intersections. PA 329 has had upgrades.

n. One opportunity for diverting traffic away from Bath Borough is a bypass to PA 248; Bath Borough has a five-point intersection.

o. The biggest impact is on municipally-owned roads that aren’t maintained by PennDOT, especially when a distribution center is built in a neighboring community.

p. On March 2, 2018, there was a massive snowstorm and many trucks were taking back routes because the main roads were closed. There is a lack of network redundancy to handle these issues.

q. The ongoing backup on US 22 makes it difficult for truckers to get onto the highway at peak hour. Airport Road is also gridlocked, without the FedEx facility open.

r. It would be ideal to cluster warehouse and distribution center development to take pressure off municipalities to the north. The approach would have to be very regionally-coordinated.

i. This may not be an easy fix; if you cluster industrial development, all of the tax revenue would be generated in that municipality. Other municipalities would lose out.

What are some of the observed trends and issues related to freight within your municipality?

a. If there is a multi-municipal comprehensive plan that includes 8 to 10 municipalities, they won’t recommend warehousing/commercial for municipalities that don’t have sewer service.

b. Lower Nazareth is working with 10 municipalities on a joint comprehensive plan. At the end of the scoping process, East Allen Township decided not to participate.

c. The farther away from US 22, the more independent the municipalities tend to be.

d. When developers are looking at their options, they see the peripheral municipalities as inexpensive land. Farmers who want to retire view their land as retirement income.
e. Whitehall Township zoned an area industrial and they wanted to down-zone it because the land use didn’t align with the zoning. They immediately received letters from attorneys representing land owners because the down zone would represent a “taking.”

Looking at major parcels within study area, are there any that could turn over in the next 20 years that the study needs to address?

a. Airport Road/Chambers Road – there is a land lease in place (Majestic Realty)

b. There are a few housing developments near Airport Road off of PA 512.

c. Developers are interested in constructing more housing for individuals age 55 and older. What happens to these developments over the next 20 years as boomers pass on and there aren’t enough older individuals to occupy that specific housing type?

d. Weaversville Road isn’t accessible to some trucks. There is a new law in effect (SB 880) and it opens up access for 102” wide vehicles. Any bridge that was previously marked as prohibited for size/weight will remain prohibited. Municipalities must petition to restrict the size and weight of vehicles and if it is a state highway, the municipality must register and apply through PennDOT. An engineering study must be completed to prove the truck should not be on the road. When a municipality seeks to implement these restrictions, they must have a replacement path [alternative route]. Some municipalities have no replacement path.

e. There is a current rezoning request for light industry for a property in East Allen Township.

f. There are significant mineral extraction activities in and around the study area and regulating heavy trucks is a challenge. DEP has relaxed its definition of “reclamation fill”; quarries that aren’t being filled aren’t being regulated as closely. East Allen Township has seen 90,000-pound trucks and it is only going to get worse as brownfields are being reclaimed.

g. The intersection of PA 512 and US 22 needs to be improved.

h. One item to explore is alternative routing. Specifically, look at the option of colored routes around the city.

i. One relief point for PA 512 congestion may be an additional exit ramp near Township Line Road in Bethlehem; this may relieve traffic pressure from the industrial park.

j. Increased dynamic messaging along US 22 should be permanent.
Meeting Purpose: Offer economic development stakeholders the opportunity to provide input on local freight trends, anticipated land developments, existing freight bottlenecks, and capital improvements needed to address freight impacts.

Summary of Stakeholder Input

What are some of the observed trends and issues related to freight and economic development?

a. Developers and communities are dealing with truck traffic. There are residential areas with older roads that were not built for high volume. The intermingling of freight with regular traffic creates poor conditions.

b. In recruiting business development to the region, there hasn’t been much feedback within the study area as compared to the rest of the region. Labor is an issue. If the Lehigh Valley is to attract more workers, there needs to be places to live.

c. There is a need for road enhancement but there is also the issue of private property rights and acquisition of right-of-way.

d. There needs to be municipal cooperation. Allen Township is a good example; they want to be a good partner. They have been communicating what they need for their community and what is beneficial for the region. Other townships aren’t as vocal.

e. Revenue at the federal and state levels can present challenges. Municipalities can’t be enticed to do something without a carrot. Dealing with the state budget is a challenge, regardless of the agency.

f. Most recently with DEP, there have been environmental regulations that have been tricky. In Northampton County, the conservation district reports to DEP that there is a lack of direction as to how they handle certain things. The developer lost 6 months of advancement and construction over this issue and the developer was the one forcing the issue.

g. The relationship and coordination between developers and PennDOT District 5-0 and Central Office had issues on the ROW side. In reviewing plans, the developer would receive direction from District 5-0 and follow it, only to receive conflicting comments from Central Office. PennDOT wasn’t speaking with one voice.
h. Is there political will for certain infrastructure improvements to come to fruition? For example, if a bypass around Bath Borough was proposed, would municipalities be willing to enact eminent domain for the greater good?

i. FedEx’s question prior to selecting the Lehigh Valley was “where don’t we have traffic?” There are groups now coming out against FedEx’s development.

j. The state legislator’s office hears from constituents regarding traffic concerns because so much work has been done over the years (e.g., major bridge replacements). People in the legislator’s jurisdiction don’t remember what life was like prior to construction.

k. If municipalities want to be protected from development impacts, transportation improvement funding should be targeted where development is intended to occur. Focus on channeling commerce to those “on-the-way” developments and less on prepping land for future development.

l. LVPC only invests in areas where there is existing growth. They have a structurally deficient bridge problem and the counties jointly own a series of bridges that need improvements. The counties can’t close all 3 bridges spanning the Lehigh River at once and they are doing everything they can to move money with PennDOT to improve those facilities. LVPC is working collaboratively with the counties and PennDOT to figure out what infrastructure they need to plan for, where signal retimings should occur, etc.

m. Two big developments in the study area are about to advance and Weaversville Road is not prepared for the additional truck traffic. The ongoing question is, should vehicles and trucks be routed toward PA 33 or to US 22? The problem with the PA 329/248 scenario is a huge swath of that area is not marked for development. There is also high residential growth, so it’s not only truck traffic concerns.

n. Every time a new warehouse or logistics center/large employer is planned, LVPC notifies LANTA. LANTA reaches out to the company to coordinate a fee-for-service schedule. Unfortunately, it isn’t feasible to run transit lines to every single cluster of businesses. LANTA’s executive director is working with Uber on a shared-ride agreement to help close mobility gaps.

o. Allen Township is requiring developers have a location for a LANTA stop so the transit provider can safely drop off and pick up.

p. The farther north in the study area, the less sense it makes from an economic development standpoint.

q. With respect to labor, it is outside the domain of this study but developers are looking for the experience that the Rockefeller Group has had. Spec builders want to be able to get workers to their sites. It is an existential question as to whether the Lehigh Valley wants to compete for these developers.
r. LVPC has identified growth areas in their county comprehensive plan, which is being updated now. It is known that one of the townships in the region wants zero development. If that municipality bans development, it will leapfrog further north. It is important that small boroughs are positioned to have restaurants and other service-type businesses to support other industries.
### Appendix F: Municipality Act 164 Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Lehigh Valley (ABE)</th>
<th>Queen City (XLL)</th>
<th>Braden (N43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushkill Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catasaqua Borough</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Allentown</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bethlehem</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coplay Borough</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Allen Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmaus Borough</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forks Township</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover-Lehigh County</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover-Northampton County</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Macungie Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Nazareth Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Towamensing Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazareth Borough</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
<td>Unconfirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Catasaqua Borough</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Whitehall Township</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Borough</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer Township</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Whitehall Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockertown Borough</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatamy Borough</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Macungie Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Nazareth Township</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnutport Borough</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Township</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Township</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The City of Easton has not adopted Act 164*

*Source: LNAA*
Appendix G: Transportation Development District Overview

Establishing a Transportation Development District (TDD) is one potential tool to help fund future transportation infrastructure improvements. While TDDs are not common in Pennsylvania (based on research conducted for this study), a TDD can be effective when combined with other financing tools and leveraged with other state and federal funding sources.

This section provides an overview of TDDs—why the tool was developed, how a TDD is established, and a few takeaways from municipalities that have used the tool to help finance transportation projects.

What is a Transportation Development District (TDD)?

A Transportation Development District (TDD) is a specific area or designated areas established to plan, finance, acquire, develop, construct, and operate a planned program of transportation projects.

Why were TDDs established?

In 1985 the Pennsylvania General Assembly recognized that transportation facilities and services were either not available or not adequate to support the community and economic growth of Pennsylvania communities. Specifically, federal, state, and local funding is not always available for communities to keep pace with transportation needs. Recognizing the gap between community/economic growth and funding, the legislature enacted the Transportation Partnership Act (TPA) (P.L. 287, No. 47). The TPA enables the creation of Transportation Development Districts (TDDs) to fund transportation projects.

The act encourages municipal and private sector cooperation "to provide funding for transportation projects in areas where economic growth and development has made the transportation facilities and services inadequate." (Section 1.1(b) of the Act)

How is a TDD Established?

A municipality or municipal authority establishes a TDD, either alone or jointly with other municipalities or municipal authorities. The governing body of the municipality or municipal authority designating a TDD has the authority to exercise all powers otherwise granted by law in order to plan, finance, develop, improve, or operate any transportation facilities or services.

Eligibility Conditions

- Municipal authorities are required to obtain permission from the municipalities they serve before either establishing or joining in a TDD designation.
- A TDD may not be established for the purpose of maintaining or repairing an existing facility.
- All properties that have a substantial relationship to the proposed transportation facility/service are considered to benefit from the facility/service and should be included in the TDD.

Paying for TDD Projects

Transportation projects within a TDD may be funded and financed using one of the following five methods:
1. Imposing a fair and reasonable assessment (tax) upon business property located within the district per the requirements of the Business Improvement District Act of 1967 (P.L.658, No.305; sections 2(2) through (5), 3 and 4).

2. Imposing a fair and reasonable assessment (tax) on each benefited property within the TDD based on methodology adopted by the municipality. The methodology is based upon actual or projected use of each transportation project by each property within the district. No exceptions, exclusions, or preferences are granted to any property.

3. Imposing a tax to subjects of taxation located within a transportation development district and restricting the tax receipts to the financing of transportation projects. Such transportation districts must be within a “deteriorated area” as defined by the Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance (LERTA) Act of 1977 (P.L.237, No.76, section 4(a)).

4. Issuing notes and bonds and entering into leases, guarantees, and subsidy contracts pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Unit Debt Act of 1972 (P.L.781, No.185), or in the case of a municipal authority, pursuant to the provisions of the Municipality Authorities Act of 1945 (P.L.382, No.164).

5. Accepting grants, gifts, and donations.

Transportation Planning Required to Establish a TDD

Planning Study

Municipalities or municipal authorities establishing a TDD are required to complete a comprehensive study, per federal, state, and regional standards for integrated transportation planning and programming, to determine a program of projects to be advanced within the TDD. The study identifies the beneficiaries of all projects and includes an analysis of cost allocation according to projected benefits. Two types of transportation projects may be financed: facility projects and service projects.

Transportation Facility Projects

Allowable transportation facility projects include any public highway or passenger transportation system, including but not limited to:

- Local streets, roads, sidewalks, alleys, passageways, traffic-control systems, structures, roadbeds, railroads, buses, trolleys, subways and other equipment for public passenger transportation, guideways, elevated structures, buildings, stations, terminals, docks, shelters, waterways, ferryboats, airports, and parking areas for use in connection with any of the preceding;
- Tunnels, systems for connecting transportation routes or corridors, and rights-of-way;
- Communication systems, equipment, furnishings, paving, or any other materials required for any of the preceding; or
- Any fractional or undivided co-ownership interest in any one or a combination of any of the foregoing that may be deemed by the municipality or municipal authority to be necessary and desirable.

A transportation facility project cannot include the maintenance or repair of existing facilities.
Transportation Service Projects

Allowable transportation service projects include:

- Any system of public passenger transportation by any mode and salaries and associated costs;
- The provision of any system of public highway transportation and salaries and associated costs; and
- Any method by which a municipality or municipal authority provides, plans for, implements, undertakes, or otherwise makes available to the public transportation facilities.

Multiyear Transportation Improvement Program and Financial Plan

Municipalities or municipal authorities establishing a TDD develop a multiyear transportation improvement program and financial plan. The multiyear transportation improvement program identifies priorities and provides a schedule for transportation facilities to be constructed or transportation services to be offered.

The financial plan must include projects by funding source and use and requires submission to municipal, county, and regional planning commissions for approval.

Any TDD projects that affect the state highway system should be coordinated through the county’s transportation improvement program and the regional planning commission—and ultimately with PennDOT—for review, approval, and consolidation into the regional transportation plan and program.

Enabling Ordinance

A TDD-enabling ordinance specifies the location of the TDD, the proposed projects to be accomplished, and associated costs. Costs may include but are not limited to: the transportation project; engineering, architectural, legal, or other consulting fees; and financing costs. A public hearing is required to enact the ordinance.

If property owners within the proposed TDD with an assessed property valuation of more than 50 percent of the total TDD property valuation file a written protest against the ordinance, it cannot be enacted.

Termination of a TDD

A TDD shall not be terminated until:

- The proposed transportation projects have been completed or canceled by the governing body of the municipalities or municipal authorities designating the TDD.
- The municipalities or municipal authorities have paid and satisfied all notes, bonds, or other obligations issued and or agreed upon.
- Municipalities that have jointly designated a TDD may terminate the designation only upon action by all municipalities. Similarly, municipal authorities that have jointly designated a TDD may terminate the designation only upon action by all municipal authorities.
TDD Experience of Pennsylvania Municipalities

While TDDs are not a common transportation project funding and financing tool within Pennsylvania, the tool has been used to varying degrees of success and is often layered with other tax-enabling legislation. This section discusses experiences of a few municipalities that have established TDDs and identifies TDD benefits and challenges. It is not a comprehensive listing of municipalities that have enacted or have considered enacting a TDD.

Due diligence from Internet research was combined with discussions including municipal officials and professionals representing the following municipalities: Moon Township, Allegheny County; Town of McCandless, Allegheny County; Washington County; Ferguson Township, Centre County; Springfield Township, Mercer County; and East Pennsboro Township, Cumberland County.

**Moon Township, Allegheny County**

Moon Township through the Moon Township Transportation Authority (MTA) has financed and constructed three new interchanges and several connector roads since it was established in 1987. The MTA has successfully combined the use of a TDD and LERTA district. LERTA is one of the five methods used to fund projects in a TDD per the Transportation Partnership Act (TPA). In effect the amount of tax abatement received through LERTA is voluntarily applied by property owners to finance construction of improvements within a specified district. At a high level, the mechanics for this methodology include the following.

- Properties within the designated transportation district are exempted from local taxes on the value of new buildings or improvements to commercial properties for up to 10 years, per LERTA.
- Participating property owners “contribute” funds (their LERTA tax abatement) to the MTA in the like amount of exempted taxes to facilitate specific transportation projects. “Contribution” includes grants, gifts, and donations as defined in the TPA.
- Projects include any eligible construction, reconstruction, or improvement for which a building permit is issued on or before a specified time in the designated district.
- When all transportation facility projects are completed, a terminating ordinance is adopted and the LERTA ordinance becomes null and void.

Moon Township’s LERTA ordinance, in which the TPA is referenced, is granted authority through several statutes:

- Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance Act, 72 P.S. §4722 et seq., as amended.
- Transportation Partnership Act, 53 P.S. §1621 et seq., as amended.
- Second Class Township Code, 53 P.S. §65101 et seq., as amended.
- Urban Redevelopment Law, 35 P.S. §1701 et seq., as amended.
- Neighborhood Improvement District Act, 73 P.S. §831 et seq., as amended.
- Neighborhood Assistance Act, 62 P.S. §2081 et seq., as amended.
**Town of McCandless, Allegheny County**

Similar to Moon Township, the Town of McCandless (McCandless) has used a TDD through a companion LERTA program. Under the Business and Taxation section of municipal codified ordinances, McCandless has established a Revenue Allocation Program (RAP) Ordinance. The ordinance is granted authority through several statutes:

- Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance Act, the Act of December 1, 1972, P.L. 237, No. 76, 72 P.S. Sec. 4722 et seq.
- Transportation Partnership Act, as the same may be amended, the Act of July 9, 1985, P.L. 189, No. 47, 53 P.S. Sec. 1621 et seq.
- The Business Improvement District Act, the Act of November 30, 1967, P.L. 658, No. 305, 53 P.S. Sec. 1551 et seq. (BIDA).
- The Act relating to Inter-Governmental Cooperation, 53 P.S. Sec. 481 et seq.
- The Public School Code of 1949, 24 P.S. Sec. 1-101 et seq. (Ord. 1076 Sec. 2. Passed 7-20-92.)

The ordinance establishes an “eligible area” known as the “McCandless Economic Development District” which meets the definition of deterioration required under LERTA. Application of the RAP is limited to the eligible area. Properties located in the eligible area are considered “benefitted properties” per TPA, BIDA, Municipalities Authorities Act (MAA) (53 P.S. Sec. 301 et seq.), or HRCOPL.

The ordinance further establishes “contribution” as a voluntary taxpayer payment within the eligible area for McCandless’ use in developing public infrastructure facilities projects or services. “Contribution” includes grants, gifts, and donations as defined in the TPA, BIDA, or MAA.

Property owners within the eligible area and who make improvements to property apply for and receive an exemption under LERTA after receiving a building permit for improvements verified by both the municipality and school district. The abatement application includes language referencing the property owner’s desire to participate in the Tax Abatement Program for the purpose of financing the expenses to be applied toward the construction of the McCandless Economic Development District Improvements.

McCandless has also used Transportation Impact Fees authorized under the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) to finance transportation projects. The TDD was found to be more complicated to implement; the Transportation Impact Fee is more prescriptive, making it easier to implement. Transportation Impact Fees charge a one-time fee with the fee amount based upon an estimate of the share of program and improvements, whereas a TDD is built on a program of improvements.

McCandless also faced legal challenges when it sought to deploy “imposing a fair and reasonable assessment on each benefited property within the TDD by way of a formula adopted by the governing body” as a method to finance TDD projects. The municipality carefully crafted methodology to derive an assessment based upon actual or projected usage by each property within the district of the transportation facilities or services to be financed. While the methodology was not overturned legally, it was reported that the use of LERTA to finance a TDD was easier to explain and obtain buy-in from property owners and local taxing bodies as compared to developing a fair and reasonable assessment methodology to finance a TDD project.
Washington County

Washington County established a RAP through resolution in 1993 for portions of 13 municipalities. Similar to Moon Township and the Town of McCandless, the RAP program contribution is a payment made voluntarily by a taxpayer whose property is within a defined eligible area to a trust fund administered by the County Authority to develop public infrastructure facilities projects or services.

Ferguson Township, Centre County

In the early 1990s Ferguson Township began studying the feasibility of implementing a TDD to fund necessary transportation improvements. The township is 50 square miles and includes a growth area of 10 square miles adjacent to State College Borough, home to Penn State University. Through the planning study conducted as part of implementing a TDD, property owners in the proposed district were assigned assessments based on developed methodology. After nearly a decade of working with property owners and taxing bodies, the political will was not in place to pass the TDD. It was reported that the development community was effective in discouraging property owners from adopting the TDD.

While the TDD was not adopted, Ferguson Township utilized the land use planning work conducted for the TDD as baseline information for trip forecasting. The Township determined that a dedicated revenue stream to fund the significant transportation improvements associated with growth in and around State College needed to be identified. In doing so the Township ultimately chose to raise three Township taxes (real estate, earned income, and real estate transfer) to help fund transportation improvements. The Township leverages these increased tax revenues with state funding and impact fees to fund transportation improvements.

Springfield Township, Mercer County

Similar to Ferguson Township, Springfield Township in Mercer County considered using a TDD to finance transportation improvements and opted instead to use a different financing tool. Springfield Township is home to a sizable retail outlet mall located adjacent to I-79, four miles south of I-80. The Township evaluated the use of a TDD to finance transportation improvements surrounding the retail area but opted to use Tax Increment Financing (TIF) as an alternative. The key consideration was property owner concern about paying an assessment on vacant land.

East Pennsboro Township, Cumberland County

East Pennsboro Township’s Partnership Highway Improvement Ordinance was challenged by a statewide trade association and local builders. The ordinance was challenged based on the “fair and reasonable assessment methodology” used to determine benefitted properties. The ordinance was enacted in 1987 to fund a 10-year capital improvement program for construction of township roads. The entire township was designated a TDD because it was determined that all properties within the township would benefit from TDD implementation. The ordinance required new property owners to be assessed based on the projected benefit the new property owners would receive from the Township's highway improvement program. The contribution from existing property owners, however, was obtained from the Township’s general revenue funds and not from an assessment levied against the existing property owners based on their actual or projected usage of the planned projects. Since the TPA requires all benefited properties be assessed fairly and reasonably based on the actual or projected usage of the projects, it was determined that the Township’s method of determining a fair and
reasonable assessment for properties within the TDD violated the Transportation Partnership Act. The Township repealed the ordinance in 2009.

**General Observations about TDDs**

*Reported Barriers to TDD Implementation*

1. **Assessing Vacant Land**

   The Transportation Partnership Act enables five ways to fund a program of projects identified within a TDD. One of those ways is imposing a fair and reasonable assessment on every property within a TDD. Because assessment under a TDD is levied on all benefitted property owners, owners of vacant land are required to pay the assessment up front, before projects are constructed. Obtaining property owner buy-in for the assessment has been challenging for several municipalities. If property owners within the proposed TDD with a total assessed property valuation of more than 50 percent of the total TDD property valuation oppose the TDD, a TDD cannot be enacted.

   Unlike a transportation financing tool such as a Transportation Impact Fee, a TDD is an annual assessment rather than a onetime fee. Annual assessments must be applied to undeveloped property which creates an issue with the land owners paying for transportation improvements before they sell or develop their property. Alternatively, an impact fee is only paid when the land is developed. It was reported that one way in which attorneys working on behalf of TDDs have addressed this issue is to propose that assessments accrue over time and are held until property is sold. This ensures the municipality will receive funding in the future without the property owner actually paying an annual assessment.

2. **Assessment Methodology Challenges**

   Imposing a “fair and reasonable” assessment on a TDD should be approached with some caution based on experiences in other communities. Imposing a fair and reasonable assessment requires the municipality to develop a formula based upon the actual or projected usage of the new transportation facilities by each property within the district. The fairness of the methodology for calculating benefit in an equitable manner has been legally challenged.

   In the case of McCandless, the methodology prepared and adopted by the Township was upheld. In the case of East Pennsboro Township (Cumberland County), the courts determined that the adopted methodology was unfair to new property owners compared to existing property owners. The TDD ordinance was eventually repealed.

3. **Complexity and Costs to Establish**

   The TPA legislation has been found to be somewhat vague and not as definitive as legislation developed for Transportation Impact Fees. Explaining the benefits of a TDD to property owners and taxing bodies can be challenging and has been found to be a limiting factor.

   It requires time and money to conduct the transportation planning studies required to establish a TDD, as well as a Transportation Impact Fee program per the MPC. Variables include the scope of the study area, including the number of roads and intersections. Planning, engineering, and legal fees are reported to be sizable and upwards of $50,000.
4. Property Owner Support

The use of any type of financing requires clear community support. Property owners located within a TDD, or LERTA or TIF district, need to clearly understand and be on board with benefits and implications associated with using the financing tools. Ferguson Township found that the lack of political will, reportedly driven by developers and land owners, put a halt to a nearly decade-long push for a TDD. Instead, the municipality opted to raise taxes to help fund necessary transportation infrastructure improvements.

TDD legislation has a provision that if TDD formation is opposed by property owners whose land totals more than 50 percent of the assessed land value in the proposed district, a TDD cannot be formed. Therefore, meeting with taxing authorities and property owners upfront and throughout the process is critical. Practitioners using the tool found that other tools were easier to explain to property owners and enact.

Benefits of a TDD

**Combining with LERTA**

Several municipalities have successfully financed transportation projects by combining a TDD and LERTA. Moon Township has been particularly effective in doing so. Properties within a designated LERTA/TDD district are exempted from local taxes on the value of new buildings or improvements to commercial properties for 10 years. Property owners who participate in the program contribute funds to the transportation authority in like amount of the tax abatement. The contributions are used for the construction of identified transportation projects. The benefit is that TDD assessments are paid for through use of diverted tax revenue rather than a new fee being imposed on the landowner.

Note that in using LERTA in combination with a TDD, a municipality must identify an area as “deteriorated.”

**Assessment on Non-Profits**

A TDD allows a municipality to assess funds on non-profits, while tools such as a Transportation Impact Fee do not.

**Borrow Funds for Transportation Improvements**

Once approved a TDD levies an annual assessment to currently used and vacant land. It allows a municipality to borrow funds to construct infrastructure improvements within an established time limit.

**Alternative Transportation Financing Tools**

A few municipalities have explored the use of a TDD to finance transportation improvements but opted to use alternative financing options. The following tools/sources for financing transportation were identified.

- Transportation Impact Fees
- Tax Increment Financing
- LERTA
• Municipal tax increases (real estate, earned income, real estate transfer)
• Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank (PIB) – low-interest loans used to accelerate priority transportation projects and spur economic development.

Leveraging with Other Financing Tools

On its own, a TDD will not generate enough funds to fully cover the costs of transportation improvements. While a TDD can generate revenue through assessments, realistically it can only fund a portion of the costs of a transportation project. Therefore, the revenues generated need to be combined with state or other federal funds.
Appendix H: Acronyms and Definitions

AADT – Annual Average Daily Traffic

**Act 31 of 2018** – An act by the Pennsylvania General Assembly amending Title 75 of the state’s Vehicle Code, providing for the length and width of vehicles on operation of certain combinations on interstates. The total outside width of a vehicle, including any load, shall not exceed eight feet *six inches* except as otherwise provided for.

CRFC – Critical Rural Freight Corridor, a component of the larger NHFN

CUFC – Critical Urban Freight Corridor, a component of the larger NHFN

DEP – Department of Environmental Protection

DU – dwelling unit

FAF – Freight Analysis Framework

**FAST Act** – A 5-year funding and authorization bill governing federal surface transportation spending. Congress passed the act in December 2015.

FHWA – Federal Highway Administration

FTA – Federal Transit Administration

GIS – Geographic Information System

HCM – Highway Capacity Manual

INRIX – Transportation data company specializing in transportation analytics from real-time anonymous mobile phones, connected cars, trucks, and other fleet vehicles

ITE – Institute of Transportation Engineers

LANTA – Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority, the region’s primary provider of public transportation services

LEHD – Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics

LNAA – Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority

LOS – Level of Service, a qualitative measure used to relate the quality of traffic flow

LRTP – Long-Range Transportation Plan

LVIA - Lehigh Valley International Airport

LVPC – Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. The LVPC provides staff and administrative support to the Lehigh Valley MPO, or LVTS.

LVTS – Lehigh Valley Transportation Study, the MPO for the Lehigh and Northampton County region

MAP-21 – Predecessor legislation to the FAST Act; Congress passed the act in July 2012.
MPC – Municipalities Planning Code

MPO – Metropolitan Planning Organization. For Lehigh and Northampton counties, the MPO is the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study, the organization that controls how state and federal dollars are invested within the two counties’ surface transportation system.

MSF – Million square feet

NHFN – National Highway Freight Network, a federally-designated highway network eligible for federal freight funding and grants. It is a subset of the larger National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN).

NHS – National Highway System

PennDOT – Pennsylvania Department of Transportation

PFFS – Percent Free Flow Speed

RITIS – Regional Integrated Transportation Information System

RMS – Roadway Management System, a PennDOT-owned inventory of Pennsylvania’s state-owned highway network, its conditions, and characteristics.

ROW – Right-of-way

SR – State Route

TDD – Transportation Development District

TIP – Transportation Improvement Program

TIS – Traffic Impact Study

Trip Distribution – The second step in the traditional four-step transportation forecasting model. It is a model of the number of trips that occur between certain origins and destinations. Succeeding steps include mode choice (what mode travelers use), and route assignment (selection of routes).

Trip Generation – The first step in the traditional four-step transportation forecasting model. It focuses on the social and economic attributes of a parcel and its ability to produce or “generate” trips.

UPWP – Unified Planning Work Program
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Appendix I: Project News Stories
Allen moves Tuesday's meeting to accommodate crowd coming to hear about warehouse projects

Two warehouse developments that will boost truck traffic are driving Allen Township supervisors to move their Tuesday meeting to a larger venue.

**Kevin Duffy** Special to The Morning Call

Two warehouse developments that will boost truck traffic are driving Allen Township supervisors to move their Tuesday meeting to a larger venue.

Jaindl-Watson, which wants to build six warehouses on Nor-Bath Boulevard, and The Rockefeller Group, which has approval for two warehouses next to the Fed-Ex Ground hub, are scheduled to give presentations at the 7 p.m. meeting.

The meeting is expected to draw a large crowd so it will now take place at the Allen Township fire company building at 3530 Howertown Road.

In recent months, the fire company building has become the ersatz venue for township Planning Commission meetings as he township Municipal Building is too small for large crowds.

Both developers are listed on the agenda as discussing road improvements.
Jaindl-Watson wants to build warehouses totaling 2.5 million square feet on nearly 300 acres bounded by the Nor-Bath Boulevard (Route 329) and Seemsville and Howertown roads. The project is in the preliminary planning stage.

David Jaindl is expected to discuss improvements where his property abuts Mud Lane and Howertown, including possible landscape buffering and other considerations.

He also has pitched moving Seemsville Road, the sole entry and exit point for tractor trailers to his planned industrial park, to provide greater site distance for motorists exiting onto Nor-Bath Boulevard as well as to lessen the impact on neighboring property owners.

He plans to shift the road 650 feet to the east across 92 acres of school district property in order to create a new signalized intersection at Nor-Bath Boulevard. The existing intersection would then be abandoned.

Rockefeller, in November, won township approval for a 1-million-square-foot facility on 80 acres on the west side of Willowbrook Road on what is designated as Lot 5.

It also got approval for 291,000 square feet of warehouse space on Lot 4, a 22-acre parcel along Radar Drive.

Rockefeller has committed $3.5 million in road improvements at and near the intersection of Nor-Bath and Howertown/Weaversville Road.

The developer, whose FedEx project is under construction, is preparing to begin the roadwork and will present the timeline and sequencing of those improvements, township Manager Ilene Eckhart said.

The New York-based developer plans to add turn lanes at the intersection as well as widen Nor-Bath to the west where it meets Savage Road.
Allen Township warehouse growth should not be surprise

Construction continues on the Fedex Ground Lehigh Valley hub on Willowbrook Road, Allen Township, in April.  
(APRIL BARTHOLOMEW/THE MORNING CALL)

How one township says no to warehouses

According to a Morning Call article on Allen Township's warehouse addiction, township supervisors are all a bit surprised by the 6.5 million square feet of warehouses that somehow are making their way into their township. Supervisors Chairman Larry Oberly, is flummoxed. "No one ever figured the letter 'I' on a zoning map would lead to so many giant warehouses."

Yes, airport parcel land deals are being brokered among numerous financial interests. And perhaps there truly was nothing that township supervisors could do except get out of the way of the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority, Rockefeller Group, FedEx, Willow Brook Farms and Northampton County. But I find it hard to believe that these warehouses would be popping up without township help and approval.

I live in Hanover Township, Northampton County. Part of the airport land parcel is in our township too. Our township receives requests from businesses needing warehouses as well as pressure from the airport authority wanting to maximize its investment. Our supervisors recently rejected any warehouse proposal in our township, pointing out that airport land is
zoned as a Flightpath Highway Business District which forbids giant warehouses. Many thanks to our supervisors for their backbone and foresight.

*Lyn Curtis*

*Hanover Township,*

*Northampton County*
The Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority inched closer to selling two Allen Township properties Tuesday night as it amended the potential sales price to $4.5 million.

Earlier this year, the authority agreed to sell the two properties as well as a third in East Allen Township to the Rockefeller Group, a New York developer. The 244 acres in the deal border the 1.1 million square-foot FedEx Ground distribution center being constructed in Allen Township just north of Lehigh Valley International Airport.

Rockefeller plans to build two warehouses on the three properties, one in Allen Township west of the FedEx site and the other east of it in East Allen Township, airport officials said.

The East Allen Township property is zoned for agriculture, however, and Rockefeller is still going through the appeals process for its warehouse plan. The proposal has drawn widespread opposition during public hearings, and another hearing is planned for next month. Even if East Allen supervisors deny the zoning change, authority officials said they would move forward with their plan to sell the two Allen Township lots.

If sold, the East Allen property would net the airport authority at least $3.9 million.

Rockefeller and the authority has until the middle of October to finalize the sale of the three properties. Aside from the zoning issue in East Allen Township, the Federal Aviation Administration must sign off on the deal.

When the authority agreed to the sale in April 2016, the two Allen Township properties were appraised at $38,000 an acre — the same price as the FedEx property. The final appraisal pushed the two properties up to $44,000, which is expected to net the authority approximately $500,000 more than first thought. The authority plans to use the revenue to address longstanding capital expenses that have been delayed by years of financial hardships.

The details of some of the capital improvement projects remain up in the air. The authority is in the midst of creating its 25-year master plan, which will attempt to plot a course for future
airport growth at LVIA. One possible project is building corporate hangars on undeveloped parcels already owned by the airport.

To prepare for those plans, the board of governors voted Tuesday night to purchase 121 and 131 Willowbrook Road in Hanover Township, Lehigh County, for slightly more than $21,000. The properties, which are about 4.5 acres combined, border LVIA’s northern boundary, and the authority plans to demolish most of the buildings currently on the sites.

J. Michael Dowd, chairman of the authority’s board of governors, said the demolitions will allow the airport to widen Race Street to accommodate the anticipated truck traffic brought by the warehouses. The land will also allow easier access to whatever the authority winds up developing on the property.

“This provides us with a number of opportunities as we develop our master plan,” Dowd said of buying the two Hanover Township properties.

In other business, the board approved a $307,346 contract to begin repairing the floor of one hangar and demolishing two other hangars, the terminal and other old buildings at Braden Airpark in Forks Township. A Northampton County grant will pay for $250,000 worth of work at the general aviation airport off Sullivan Trail with the authority picking up the remainder.
Airport area land development study plans to examine warehouse impact

By Brian Pedersen, January 11, 2018 at 11:25 AM

The new industrial development going up on hundreds of acres of land near Lehigh Valley International Airport will also bring changes in transportation as developers plan more warehouses and distribution centers in the area.

These changes, coupled with the increases in population, traffic and global growth in freight and transportation-based businesses prompted the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission to develop a study that would examine the impact of all these changes to the communities near LVIA.

The LVPC selected Michael Baker International, an engineering firm based in Moon Township, with a local office in Allentown, to be the consultant for the project.

The state Department of Transportation will fund the study, which should be complete in December, said Becky Bradley, executive director of the LVPC.

The Airport Area Transportation Study starts next month and will examine transportation, land use and freight changes in an area that reaches from Route 512 in the east to the Lehigh River in the west and from Route 22 in the south to north of Route 329, Bradley said.
The area covers several municipalities in both Lehigh and Northampton counties, including Allen and East Allen townships, Lower Nazareth, Bath, Whitehall and Hanover Township, all of which will provide data.

The FedEx Ground hub under construction along Willowbrook Road in Allen Township has sparked strong interest from developers looking to build industrial projects near that site.

“FedEx was proposed almost five years ago and there has been a whole lot of interest for freight-based businesses,” Bradley said. “We need to look at how everything fits together from a global perspective. We need to look at what happens to the system as a whole because there will be a transportation impact. We have a very high growth rate of freight-based businesses not only in the state, but in the country.”

Adding to increases in traffic from freight-based businesses is the fact that population has been increasing every year as well as the number of passenger vehicle registrations, she said.

The LVPC approached PennDOT to address the need for a network-based study of transportation needs in that area and they agreed to fund it, Bradley said.

Bradley said this is the first time that PennDOT has funded a study for a specific area.

Sean Brown, spokesperson for PennDOT said this is the first study of this kind for the area of the Lehigh Valley and said the state agency is estimating about $150,000 to fund the study.

A combination of public and private funds will finance the improvements outlined in the study, Bradley said.

“What will come out of this is a better plan for how we deal with the network as a whole,” Bradley said.

Aside from impacts of new truck and car traffic, the study will determine the type of land and road improvements needed to handle the new industrial development. The study will also create a freight transportation-planning model, identify new truck routes and explore opportunities to reuse buildings and possibly increase density in the industrial parks in the study area.

The study will also consider the impact this growth will have on nearby residents and businesses.

Brian Funkhouser, senior transportation planner of Michael Baker International at its Harrisburg office, will be the lead consultant, Bradley said.
Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority finalizes land sale for two more warehouses

As expected, the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority sold more than 100 acres along Willowbrook Road last week, furthering warehouse development north of Lehigh Valley International Airport.

Tom Stoudt, the authority’s interim executive director, confirmed Tuesday the authority sold three Allen Township lots to the Rockefeller Group Jan. 22 for $4.5 million. The New York developer and the authority had been discussing the sales for years, and last week’s deal was largely a formality.

“It’s been a long process the board identified back in 2012,” he said. “It really is about good planning.”
Allen Township officials approved plans late last year for two distribution centers on the properties, which are alongside the million-square-foot FedEx distribution center already under construction. The lot on the west side of Willowbrook Road is set to house another million-square-foot warehouse while a lot north of the FedEx site would host a 291,000-square-foot warehouse.

The final lot is a 10-acre property that will provide storm water management to the surrounding lots. Allen Township Planning Commission Chair Gene Clater said hundreds of trees will be planted on the third property.

The Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority inched closer to selling two Allen Township properties Tuesday night as it amended the potential sales price to $4.5 million.

Earlier this year, the authority agreed to sell the two properties as well as a third in East Allen Township to the Rockefeller Group,...

(Tom Shortell)

Clark Machemer, Rockefeller’s senior vice president, said no tenant is in place for either warehouse, but the company is planning to begin construction on both sites by this summer. He expects household retailers or e-commerce companies to eventually call the properties home.

Because the authority bought the land years ago with Federal Aviation Administration funding, the proceeds of the sale can only be used for projects approved by the agency, Stoudt said. While the money is not being specifically earmarked for any projects, it will be placed in an account that is being used to pay for planned runway improvements at LVIA, Stoudt said.

The sales are just the latest part of radical changes of the land surrounding the Hanover Township, Lehigh County airport. The authority has placed a greater emphasis on the development and sale of its surrounding properties as a way to support LVIA.
To date, the authority has sold about 360 acres around the intersection of Race Street and Willowbrook Road to Rockefeller. In addition to last week’s sale, the authority sold 260 acres for the FedEx project in 2016 for $9.8 million.

The authority also agreed to sell Rockefeller another 155 acres in East Allen Township for $3.9 million, but the deal is on hold after the township rejected the proposed warehouse Rockefeller wants to build on the site. The township found the development would not align with the land’s agricultural zoning. Rockefeller has appealed the ruling and is paying the authority not to seek other deals on the property in the meantime.

The authority is also looking to develop 297 acres along the east side of Airport Road and on either side of Orchard Lane in Hanover Township, Northampton County. Unlike the other properties, the authority plans to act as a landlord for the property and lease it to a developer. The authority selected Majestic Realty Co. in December to act as the developer, and early discussions for the land include a hotel, commercial uses and office space.

In other news, the authority’s board of governors authorized the purchase of 121 and 131 Willowbrook Road, two small residential properties on 4.5 acres of land south of Race Street for about $21,000. The authority plans to eventually demolish the two residences in order to widen Race Street for the anticipated truck traffic.
St. Louis developer to build $45M industrial spec project near airport

By Brian Pedersen, February 2, 2018 at 11:14 AM

(Contributed) Architectural rendering shows what The Cubes at Lehigh Valley-Airport Road in East Allen Township will look like upon completion.

A 40-acre property on Airport Road in East Allen Township is the site for a St. Louis-based developer's plan to build a 450,000-square-foot-industrial building, a project that could cost $45 million or more.

CRG, headquartered in St. Louis, will build The Cubes at Lehigh Valley-Airport Road, which the company said would be in a position to capture the growth for large warehouse distribution and e-commerce fulfillment centers.

The Lehigh Valley corridor and central Pennsylvania are consistent with the company’s growth, based on customer demand, said Scott Caplan, vice president of the eastern region for CRG. The area of centralization is about 60 miles from the Port of Newark in New Jersey, he added.

“It’s become attractive to national retailers and logistics companies,” Caplan said.

Construction will start in early spring and finish in the fourth quarter, he said.

The speculative building could be home to a manufacturer or logistics company, Caplan said.

He envisions more industrial properties for the company to develop and will announce new projects in central Pennsylvania, he said.
“It’s hard to find sites that are entitled and ready to go with the kind of population that services this market,” said Chris McKee, president of CRG. “We’re actively looking for sites in the region.”

The close proximity to the Lehigh Valley International Airport and the FedEx Ground hub under construction are two more benefits to the project, they said.

Caplan said his company would make significant road improvements on Airport Road and Nor-Bath Boulevard, where the property sits at the intersection. Improvements include traffic lights and road widening, he said.

CRG is a division of Clayco, the design-builder on the project, while Clayco’s subsidiary, Forum Studio, is the architect.

Depending on tenant improvement costs, total construction costs could be $45 million to $50 million, the company said.

Lee & Associates of Eastern Pennsylvania in Mechanicsburg is marketing and leasing the property.

CRG’s Clayco has completed nearly $2 billion in design-build activity, McKee said.

The company’s other projects include The Cubes at DuPont Center, a 1.6 million-square-foot business park in DuPont, Wash., The Cubes at Etna Park in Columbus, Ohio, and The Cubes Inland 85 in Spartanburg County, S.C.
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Townships ponder single speed limit

By Kevin Duffy
Special to The Morning Call

Allen and East Allen townships will explore establishing a single speed limit along a busy stretch of road that extends through both municipalities and is slated for a slew of truck traffic. The idea grew out of a meeting earlier this month of representatives from PennDOT and the townships on improving safety along Nor-Bath Boulevard (Route 329), Allen Township Manager Ilene Eckhart said.

During that meeting, Eckhart and her East Allen Township counterpart, Deborah Seiple, discussed conducting a joint traffic study that would include Nor-Bath Boulevard westbound from Airport Road to the intersection of Weaversville Road, and then south on Weaversville to the Hanover Township/Lehigh County line.

“The thought is to make it one consistent speed,” Eckhart said.

The board voted 4-1 in favor of requesting that PennDOT undertake the study, with Bruce Frack voting no.

Seiple will ask East Allen supervisors to consider the joint study, Eckhart said.

The corridor is in the cross hairs of increased tractor-trailer traffic with the forthcoming FedEx Ground hub on Willowbrook Road.

It is also near parcels slated for warehouse development by The Rockefeller Group, and plans by Jaindl-Watson Land Company for six warehouses totaling 2.5 million square feet between Howertown and Seemsville roads in Allen Township, just north of Nor-Bath Boulevard. Developer David Jaindl has proposed realigning Seemsville Road across land owned by the Northampton Area School District to create a new intersection and improve sight distance for motorists exiting Seemsville onto Nor-Bath.

Also in the pipeline are plans for industrial park space by Liberty Property Trust west of the Nor-Bath Boulevard/Weaversville Road intersection.

Nor-Bath is posted at 55 mph from Airport Road westbound to Walnut Street, where it drops to 40 mph before lowering to 35 at the Weaversville Road intersection. It is posted at 35 southbound on Weaversville before increasing to 40 mph at Colony Drive.

Tractor-trailers are restricted from traveling along Weaversville, but many residents who have attended public meetings in Allen Township regarding the FedEx project and Jaindl Watson proposal have complained about truck traffic along that road.
Massive FedEx Ground hub opens in September, spurring more growth

By Brian Pedersen, March 7, 2018 at 2:02 PM

FedEx Ground in East Allen Township will have an 800,000-square-foot hub, a gateway/welcome building, vehicle maintenance garage and a building to wash trailers. Willowbrook Road is to the right in the photo. PHOTO/STEVE WILLIAMS, FLIGHT QUEST AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

Nearly two years ago, officials from FedEx Ground stuck shovels in the ground on a patch of land on a 260-acre site in Allen Township to mark the start of construction on its massive package-handling facility.

As the company nears completion on its $330 million East Coast hub in about six months, it is looking to employ up to 700 when it opens in September at 1000 Willowbrook Road.

Just north of Lehigh Valley International Airport, the project offers room to grow, with employment potentially reaching more than 3,000 workers at full build-out, with an expansion from 800,000 square feet to 1.1 million square feet. The land offers space to expand the facility.

Physical construction is complete, said David Westrick, spokesperson for FedEx Ground. Now, the focus is on installing the material-handling system, which includes conveyor belts and scanners, throughout the building, and the potential to produce 75,000 packages per hour.

The $330 million investment in Allen Township includes road improvements and package-processing equipment.
At the groundbreaking ceremony in August 2016, a top official from FedEx Ground said the company continues to see steady growth in e-commerce and invested $1.6 billion in infrastructure for these types of facilities.

“There’s so much growth on the East Coast that we need these types of buildings,” Scott Burns, vice president of regional operations for the Eastern Region of FedEx Ground in Moon Township in suburban Pittsburgh, has said. “The growth is going to continue with e-commerce.”

The opening signals more than jobs. It raises the image of the Greater Lehigh Valley and fuels even more growth by conveying to businesses and consumers that it’s a thriving region on the leading edge of e-commerce and logistics.

“Its great significance is really as a new infrastructure asset for the region,” said Don Cunningham, president and CEO of Lehigh Valley Economic Development Corp.

**ACCELERATED DELIVERIES**

In addition to the main 800,000-square-foot hub building, the site will include a gateway/welcome building, vehicle maintenance garage and a building used to wash trailers.

Since 2005, FedEx Ground has opened 15 new hubs featuring advanced material-handling systems and expanded or relocated more than 500 local facilities.

The network enhancements have resulted in accelerating ground service delivery by one day or more in more than two-thirds of the United States, Westrick said.

**ASSET FOR THE REGION**

For the business community, the completion of the FedEx Ground hub marks the beginning of a huge investment in the Greater Lehigh Valley.

“The bottom line is this is something of a mega project for the region that we’ve been working on for close to five years now,” Cunningham said.

“This is a project of significant magnitude.”

**COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE**

The ability for a company to move many packages more quickly at the mega hub means it will be an attractive asset for other projects.

Not only will it be a competitive advantage to the companies already here but also will also encourage other businesses to be here, he said.
“It’s really a layered-on asset to the emergence of the whole industrial growth in the Valley,” Cunningham said. “It’s almost akin to having an airport or a good infrastructure network.”

Cunningham discussed the FedEx project before an international real estate group in Toronto, giving the project global attention well beyond Lehigh and Northampton counties.

**DRAWING INTEREST**

Cunningham said he already has companies talking to LVEDC about the project and seeking to learn more, noting that mega hub would be an asset even for those companies in locations 45 minutes away. The biggest challenge is finding available land for construction of industrial buildings.

The Lehigh Valley will have a premier delivery structure, Cunningham said.

Even manufacturers that are moving parts and products – any type of company involved in the transportation of goods – could benefit from the mega hub.

“It’s going to be a great asset for the region; it’s going to improve prospects,” he said. “It will be nice to have it operational.”
Demand for efficient, modern logistics space in the Interstate 78/I-81 corridor has led to an increase in warehouse/distribution building size.

This conclusion is one of several CBRE released in its biannual logistics report, which evaluates market trends among the inventory of properties in this corridor that includes Berks, Carbon, Lehigh, Monroe, Northampton and Schuylkill counties, as well as part of other counties in central and northeastern Pennsylvania.

The report analyzes the market for institutional-grade warehouse distribution properties by submarket, class and size. These large properties typically draw attention from national or international investors.

Sean Bleiler, senior vice president of CBRE Inc., which has an office in Upper Macungie Township, said the markets are strong.

“We’ve seen a strong focus on deals that want to service the New York market,” he said.

“Overall, the Valley is very strong, but I think the interesting thing is these deals have grown in building size. One million square feet is getting too small for the market.”

Size is one of the most notable trends in the market, as many new buildings are going up that are 1 million square feet or larger.

Bleiler said he is seeing several deals for buildings larger than 1.1 million square feet in the Lehigh Valley market now for similar type users. Retailers are driving some of those larger deals, and in some of those buildings, the employee head counts are coming down because of automation, he added.
“There’s also a drive to have more goods in close proximity to New York,” Bleiler said. “I think the market is very strong; we are seeing more activity in the same size range coming up behind it.”

He referred to the growth occurring along the Route 33 corridor in Northampton County.

“We are seeing the geography grow,” Bleiler said. “You are starting to see developers push out farther out as long as there’s interchange access and labor.”

As an example, J.G. Petrucci Co. recently built Wind Gap Logistics Center at the Route 512 exit off Route 33.

Furthermore, the I-78/I-81 corridor leads all major logistics markets in the country for the largest newly developed warehouse product, the report said. In addition, the Lehigh Valley experienced the fastest growth among the I-78/I-81 submarkets and commands the highest average rents along the I-78/I-81 corridor.

“As you push farther out, you see additional tracts along the I-81 corridor,” Bleiler said. “Eventually, all these markets will be seamless; they are quickly growing together.”

From a national perspective, investors view this corridor as the eastern Pennsylvania market, he said.

While the Route 33 corridor is becoming very active, and the Route 412 industrial park in Bethlehem shows “real strong” growth, one of the centerpieces of the Lehigh Valley market is the FedEx Ground megahub under construction and expected to open in Allen Township in September. That project is an example of the larger industrial properties under construction, with an expected 1.2 million square feet upon full build-out.

“I think FedEx is going to be great for the market,” Bleiler said. “They have really spurred a lot of growth.”

As an example, FedEx recently estimated its capital investment for its new Memphis hub project in Tennessee would exceed $1 billion over a six-year period, according to a news release. Following finalization of the project plans, construction could begin in 2019.
Allen Township officials will seek a meeting with their counterparts in East Allen Township over warehouse development proposed by Jaindl Watson Land Co. which impacts both municipalities.

Supervisors on Tuesday decided to reach out to their neighbors over developer David Jaindl’s proposal to shift Seemsville Road, a state road, 650 feet east over land in East Allen owned by the Northampton Area School District to connect to Route 329, as well as discussing who would be responsible for a stormwater retention basin that would be located on school district property.

“If the Northampton Area School District can be the responsible party for it, let them be the responsible party for it — it’s on their property,” Supervisor Gary Behler said of the retention basin.
Jaindl, who appeared before the board along with his traffic and engineering consultants and attorney Erich Schock, said it was his understanding that only one of the two municipalities, and not the school district, could be responsible.

Agreed upon Tuesday were plans to provide a water line extension to serve homes north of the project site in lieu of widening frontage along Mud Lane; making an interior road in the industrial development a public road with sidewalks on the south side and a deferral for them on the north side; and acceptance of 40.3 acres by the township as a conservation easement, with details regarding how it will be used to be determined later.

The board sought to provide clarification to township planners on all of the issues, part of a revised land development plan for six warehouses totaling 2.5 million square feet between Seemsville Road, Howertown Road and Route 329 submitted May 25.

The issues involving East Allen Township, however, proved too sticky for the board to resolve on its own.

“East Allen at the very least has to be at the table,” Behler said.

Traffic consultant AnnMarie Vigilante said moving Seemsville Road east was PennDOT’s preference due to limited sight distances for motorists.

As part of the plan, Seemsville Road would be converted into a cul-de-sac where it currently connects to Route 329, affecting four households.

The board voted in favor of taking over that stretch of Seemsville Road as a township road, with the remainder of Seemsville remaining a state road.

That, however, would have to be part of an intermunicipal agreement by both parties, along with who would be responsible for maintaining a traffic signal at the new connection point and the retention basin, Township Solicitor B. Lincoln Treadwell said.

The board voted 4-1 in favor of reaching out to their neighbors, with Bruce Frack voting no.

Frack said he preferred that trucks coming in and out of the proposed warehouse development use a widened and improved Route 329 rather than relocating it.
Allen Township taking steps to steer FedEx drivers

It plans signs to keep tractor-trailers off prohibited roads.

FedEx is instructing driving to use maps with specific directions to its new East Allen Township hub, so they won’t drive on prohibited roads. (APRIL GAMIZ/MORNING CALL FILE PHOTO)

By Kevin Duffy
Special to The Morning Call

With the opening of the massive FedEx Ground site, Allen Township will erect road signs detailing truck bans and directions to the facility.

Large trucks are prohibited on West and East Bullshead roads and from heading north on Willowbrook Road beyond Radar Drive. They are also banned along Atlas, Savage and Weaversville roads.

But since the Willowbrook facility officially opened this fall, tractor-trailer drivers have been ending up on prohibited roads. A big reason is they are using personal GPS devices, which don’t list the bans.
Allen Township Manager Ilene Eckhart previously reached out to FedEx, which is directing drivers to use system locator maps with specific directions to avoid the prohibited roads.

To further combat the problem, Eckhart said, neighboring East Allen Township agreed to allow street signs at the intersection of East Bullshead and Weaversville, notifying truckers of the bans.

Allen Township must maintain the signs and replace them as needed.

Eckhart said there will be no expense to the township because FedEx agreed to cover all costs.

Included also will be signs alerting tractor-trailers of the nearby overpass with 12 feet of clearance.

Eckhart also said Allen Township wants to place a directional sign at Airport and Schoenersville roads alerting tractor-trailer drivers to turn left to access Race Street and the FedEx site. She said she is working with Hanover Township, Lehigh County, to do so.
Freight Movement

Truck parking plan doesn’t pass smell test

Fullerton residents oppose use of vacant lot at Riverside Business Center.

By Sarah M. Wojcik Of The Morning Call

Gary Ward can already smell the diesel.

A Franklin Street resident of Whitehall’s Fullerton neighborhood, Ward is spearheading the residential opposition to a proposal that would turn a vacant lot at the Riverside Business Center, 1139 Lehigh Ave., into a parking lot for trucks and tractor-trailers.

Though the plans, filed with Whitehall Township on Oct. 25, specifically prohibit idling for refrigerated trucks within the parking area, residents are deeply skeptical.

“Think about sitting out on your deck or your patio and listening to a diesel engine run or smelling those diesel fumes,” Ward told a reporter Tuesday. “That’s a quality of life that they’re ruining, that they’re taking away from us.”

Lee Rackus, bureau chief for Whitehall’s Planning, Zoning and Development Office, said enforcement is sure to be a pivotal point of contention as the developer seeks a variance from the township’s Zoning Hearing Board.

The plans for the parking area would carve it into three separate lots. Lot A would have 23 parking spaces, Lot B would have 18 spaces and Lot C would have 14 spaces. The plans also create a 10-foot buffer from the road around the perimeter of the parking area.

The proposal is on the agenda for the Zoning Hearing Board’s Dec. 18 meeting. It’s slated to go before the township Planning Commission the following day for a conditional use hearing.

If the variance is granted and the planning commission recommends the lot be used for trucks and tractor trailers, the Whitehall Commissioners will have the final say.

Ward, believing the issue was up for discussion at Monday’s commissioners meeting, made a brief case against the proposal to township leaders. The retired Bethlehem Steel worker knocked on doors throughout his neighborhood and was able to get more than a dozen residents to come out Monday.
He said everyone with whom he spoke was against the idea. He’s hoping for a larger turnout when the matter comes before the Zoning Hearing Board.

Earlier this year, the Riverside Business Center was sold to 1788 Holdings, a Bethesda, Md.-based real estate investment company, for $11.65 million. Messages left with the developer Tuesday were not returned.

At the time of the sale in March, the 423,900-square-foot property was 87 percent leased, with 11 tenants, including Pennsylvania Steel Company and Reed City Power Line Supply. There was 29,281 square feet of light industrial space available at the time of the sale.

Neighbors still refer to the building as the former Tarkett plant, after a manufacturer of floor covers that occupied the building for decades.

Lee and Virginia Guth, Franklin Street residents, said they’ve had troubles with multiple tenants there — the noise, odors and truck traffic — for years. A fleet of refrigeration trucks idling in the lot over the summer became maddeningly disruptive throughout the night.

“When those trucks were there all night long, I heard this swoosh of air and our whole house would vibrate,” she said. “I just couldn’t sleep.”

Lee Guth said he’d have far less trouble with those trucks parking in the lot if they weren’t running.

“There’s a difference between a truck coming down the hill and one that’s going all night long,” he said. “There’s a big difference.”

Bill Hartzell, whose East Penn Lane home sits only about 20 feet from the Riverside Business Center’s property, has also found it impossible to sleep over the summer.

“I understand they need to make money parking trucks there, but they need to have a little respect for the neighborhood,” he said.

Ward worries the proposal could exacerbate traffic and safety for residents. Traffic in the area is already very congested, he said, and adding more trucks to the mix sounds disastrous.

He worries about the safety of bus stops situated at road corners and intersections if more trucks are traveling through to use the parking areas.

“This isn’t going to help the residents,” said Ward. “And I don’t see how this helps the township one iota.”
Residents around the FedEx Ground hub in Allen Township say drivers aren’t sticking to their designated routes. Allen Township officials said there’s been an uptick in complaints in the past week. (APRIL GAMIZ/THE MORNING CALL)

Enough of the big picture columns for once. Let’s tackle a few complaints about the new transportation changes in and around Allen Township and the FedEx Ground hub. As always, the letters from readers have been lightly edited for clarity.

Have you ever tried to turn left from Race Street onto Willow Brook Road at rush hour? You are almost forced to run a red light. There should be a left turn arrow there. Southbound traffic on Willow Brook gets the turn arrow, but it doesn’t appear to me that there will be a lot of traffic crossing in that direction.

Bob Kern, Allen Township

I’ve heard this complaint from a few readers, particularly from parents and grandparents heading out of Catasauqua to pick up students from Catasauqua High School. Willow Brook and this intersection have undergone quite a bit of construction to accommodate all the tractor
trailer traffic heading out of the FedEx Ground hub that opened last year. With the new traffic pattern, several people have echoed Bob’s cry about the difficulty of making this left.

First, let’s answer the easy question. Nearly all of the completed and planned construction along Willow Brook Road, Race Street and Airport Road are to keep traffic to and from the FedEx hub moving. Once it’s fully built out — and it isn’t yet — the hub will attract 14,000 vehicles a day, including 1,800 trucks.

So southbound traffic on Willow Brook has a turn arrow because the trucks leaving the hub are supposed to be heading to Route 22. Construction crews will begin building a new southbound lane on Airport Road this summer, allowing those trucks and vehicles to more easily reach the highway. PennDOT is contributing $5 million to that work, but the bulk of it is being paid by FedEx, which committed $40 million to improvements along Airport, Race and Willow Brook.

Not to diminish your legitimate concerns about the left turn arrow for Race Street, but my biggest concern is what happens when all those trucks reach Route 22. The Airport Road interchange is the center of the most congested portion of the region’s busiest road. PennDOT, the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission and several local municipalities are conducting a special study to examine this problem. I’m hoping they’ll find some good answers, but in the meantime, the situation is enough to give me agita.

But, back to the turn arrow. PennDOT spokesman Sean Brown said that during the permit process for the FedEx road work, engineers determined traffic heading east on Race didn’t meet the traffic count where PennDOT would consider installing a turn signal. From what I can tell, the left turn problem is mostly limited to the morning commute and weekday afternoons — during the school drop off and pick up times. PennDOT will keep an eye on the intersection, Brown said, but the spot doesn’t warrant a left turn arrow for now.

That said, there is reason to hope, Bob. Catasauqua Area School District Superintendent Robert Spengler said Friday his office began receiving complaints over the intersection last fall. He in turn reached out to the Rockefeller Group, the developer who brought in FedEx and intends to build other massive warehouses on Willow Brook. Rockefeller, he said, indicated it followed the PennDOT protocols when it designed the intersection.

At this point, the district plans to apply pressure to PennDOT to add the turn arrow. He agreed with your assessment.

“It’s difficult at best to make a left without an arrow, but then I’m preaching to the choir here,” he said. “It’s engineered for truck traffic to enter and leave the warehouse district, and it’s not considering the traffic heading east. We think that needs to change for the safety of our students, parents and anyone heading east on Race Street.”

Spengler noted the district had received a lot of complaints about the intersection, but he doubled back and emphasized that isn’t a bad thing. I couldn’t agree more. I’ve said it before,
and I’ll keep saying it: The only way to bring about positive change is to engage in your local government and be heard. That means introducing yourself to elected and appointed officials, conveying your problem clearly, and keep doing it until they fix the problem.

Almost every day I see huge FedEx double trailers drive by my house on West Bullshead Road. When the FedEx warehouse was in the planning stages, I attended most of the meetings. Needless to say, I was not happy with this project for a number of reasons — mainly increased traffic. We were assured by the Allen Township Board of Directors and the Rockefeller Group that the trucks would head south toward Race Street and not north toward Bullshead Road. Why then am I seeing these huge trucks drive by? By now, the drivers should know what the route is and how to get to their destination. I was also told there would be signs posted saying “No Trucks Allowed.” I haven’t seen these signs, but if they are posted, obviously they are not effective. I realize that because of FedEx, people are being hired for jobs, and that’s a good thing, but these big trucks have no business traveling on these small country roads.
The FedEx Ground hub in Allen Township, the international delivery company's largest distribution center in the world, has officially opened. It's only operating at partial capacity right now, but the expectation is they'll be up and running before the busy Christmas season begins. Photos taken on Thursday Sept. 2018. APRIL GAMIZ / THE MORNING CALL (APRIL GAMIZ / THE MORNING CALL)

The fate of 20 “wildcard” properties spread between Route 512 and the Lehigh River will likely determine the extent of truck traffic and congestion around the Lehigh Valley International Airport, according to a freight study coming out next week.

If municipalities want to control the truck traffic and warehouse development that has exploded around LVIA, they'll need to consider creating a special district, improving the flow of truck traffic around Weaversville Road and amending local zoning codes to prevent development in inappropriate areas, said Brian Funkhouser, a consultant leading the study, while previewing the report’s findings at a meeting of the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. The final version of the study will be released Aug. 7.
Over the last few years, the Lehigh Valley has become one of the fastest growing freight centers in the country. Much of that growth has been focused in the 45 square miles between Whitehall Township in the west, Route 512 in the east, Route 248 in the north and Route 22 in the south. More than 4 million square feet of warehouses have been approved in that area, with another 3 million square feet proposed.

Future development will likely focus on those 20 parcels, most of which are in Allen or East Allen Township. The presentation Wednesday did not identify the parcels, but Funkhouser said the land in its current zoning could allow for large warehouses.

While the approved development meets local zoning, the transportation grid in the area is not up to the task. Route 22 is the main route across the region, but the Airport Road interchange serving the region is already one of the most congested points in the Lehigh Valley. Funkhouser said several secondary arteries in the region will become bogged down with congestion by 2040 if development continues as planned without dramatic improvements.

The study, which is in the final stages of completion, graded important routes through the area and how they project in the future, Funkhouser said. Route 145 in Whitehall Township and Race Street and Airport Road in Hanover Township, Lehigh County, all earn B grades, he said, but would earn F’s by 2040. Schoenersville Road in Hanover Township, Northampton County, would fall from a C to a D; Route 329 between Route 145 and the Lehigh River would go from an F to an F-, he said.

Funkhouser outlined a number of ideas to limit the stress on the transportation grid. One would have townships modify the official designations of Route 329 between Bath and the Catasauqua Creek and Route 987 between Race Street and Route 329. If local municipalities agree to raise the engineering standards on those roads, they would become eligible for extra money for improvements.

He also singled out Weaversville Road for further attention. Trucks are supposed to stay clear of the spur route because of its tight turns and narrowness, but truckers frequently ignore signs telling them to avoid it. With more warehouses approved for the area around Seemsville Road, more trucks are likely to pass through. To address the problem, the study will suggest a new connection between Weaversville and Route 329 or that Weaversville be realigned with Route 987, Funkhouser said.

The study will also propose that local municipalities form a transportation development district. State law allows host municipalities to charge developers fees to address congestion and infrastructure issues that would arise from new facilities. Congestion from these developments often crosses municipal lines, but the funds do not. For example, Bath has seen an increase in truck traffic thanks to warehouses in surrounding communities. Creating a district would allow municipalities to dedicate money for highway and signal improvements to these downstream areas.
Members of the Planning Commission previously expressed caution about widening highways or building roads in the region. Those improvements are likely to bring more development, which would draw the traffic that the infrastructure was supposed to fix, planners have argued. Instead, the commission is trying to promote a centers-and-corridor plan, which would steer development to areas where highways and water lines already exist. Some of the areas marked for road improvements in the study are outside the commission’s plan.

Morning Call reporter Tom Shortell can be reached at 610-820-6168 or tshortell@mcall.com.

The freight study focuses on the following townships: Allen, East Allen, Whitehall, Hanover (Lehigh County) and Hanover (Northampton County); Northampton, Bath, Coplay, Catasauqua and North Catasauqua boroughs; and parts of Moore and Lehigh Townships and Bethlehem. Those municipalities could potentially be included in a proposed transportation development district.
As warehouses pop up around her home, Sue Lindenmoyer’s patience and sanity has been frayed by the growing presence of tractor-trailers. With the FedEx Ground warehouse up and running near the Lehigh Valley International Airport and more warehouses on the way on Route 329, the 30-year Allen Township resident said she’s sick of watching the open fields in her community give way to big-rig magnets.

“I will be listening to those trucks — beep beep beep — 24/7,” she said Wednesday.

A report released Wednesday by PennDOT made a dozen recommendations for the region to limit the damage from the burgeoning logistic hubs in the Lehigh Valley. Community leaders must consider building roads, redesigning routes, changing zoning laws and creating a special tax district if they want to stay ahead of the onslaught of truck traffic bombarding the area.

“If not properly planned for, these major new land developments (and others under speculation) could overwhelm the area’s already-strained transportation network, particularly cumulative traffic proceeding south through the study area to access US 22,” the Lehigh Valley International Airport Area Freight Study found.

The Lehigh Valley has become one of the fastest growing freight centers in the country as companies like Amazon and Walmart.com open multiple distribution centers in the region. The latest front of warehouse development has focused in previously rural areas north of the airport. More than 6 million square feet of warehouse space has already been approved in Allen Township since 2015. Another 8.3 million square feet of warehouses have either been proposed or would fit current zoning on another six properties in Allen Township, East Allen Township and Hanover Township, Northampton County, the report found.

The Rockefeller Group, the developer that brought in FedEx, partnered with PennDOT to create $40 million of improvements to Willowbrook Road, Race Street and Airport Road. But the study found that even larger highways may struggle with congestion if development continues at its current pace. Schoenersville Road, Airport Road, MacArthur Road, Route 329 and Race Street are projected to become traffic nightmares if more improvements aren’t made.
Some of the answers, according to the report, may mean making changes to the surrounding infrastructure:

- East Allen Township should consider building a truck route that would connect Weaversville Road to Route 329 at the Seemsville Road intersection. This would improve the flow of truck traffic and serve the approved but not yet built Northampton Business Center.

- Municipalities need to consider realigning Weaversville Road, which has sharp curves that make it difficult for trucks to navigate. Proposed but rejected warehouse development in the area would have fed truck traffic directly onto the road, and the road cannot support that amount of congestion.

- To limit the amount of truck traffic moving through Bath, the borough should consider opening Mill Street to truck traffic. The short, narrow road connects Route 512 and Route 329, but a small bridge owned by Northampton County across the Monocacy Creek cannot support tractor-trailers.

- Raise the traffic light mastheads on Airport Road and Hanoverville Road. Tractor-trailers are clipping the lights and signs, causing damage.

- The Lehigh Valley Planning Commission and PennDOT should target Race Street, Airport Road, Route 329, Route 145 and Schoenersville Road for improvements to reduce future congestion. Some parts of those roads are already undergoing improvements.

Safety matters, public transportation, zoning and planning changes should also be considered, according to the report. Some of these changes would not alter the situation on the ground, but could make the region eligible for extra federal funding.

- LANTA should explore expanding public transit options between Northampton and Nazareth along Route 248 and Route 329. Adding buses and van service could reduce the number of cars on the highways, relieving congestion.

- Some municipalities should change their zoning to reflect modern realities. For example, Allen Township requires warehouse developers to create parking zones for tractor-trailers on their sites. Steps like this can reduce the strain on the infrastructure and prevent truck traffic from drifting away from larger arteries.

- Municipalities across the study’s zone should create a recommended truck route network. Using this tool, municipalities can reconsider if industrial lots away from these roads should be rezoned for less intensive purposes. The proposed truck route included Route 22, Route 145 and Route 329 and portions of Route 512, Airport Road, Race Street and Willowbrook Road.

- If the truck route network is adopted, municipalities should consider passing noise pollution ordinances in areas away from those roads.
- State and local government should explore changing the designations of Route 329 and Airport Road. New federal guidelines say principal arteries should connect to one another. However, the designations for Route 329 and Airport Road abruptly switch designations in some points. While these changes wouldn’t directly change traffic patterns, they would improve the odds of getting federal funding to improve those roads.

- Several municipalities around the Lehigh Valley International Airport, including its host Hanover Township, Lehigh County, have not adopted Act 164 Airport Hazard Zoning, the study found. Adopting it would make sure appropriate development takes place without endangering public safety or airport operations.

Lastly, said Brian Funkhouser, the consultant who led the study, the region should consider forming a transportation development district, a partnership of municipalities that could raise money to address infrastructure problems through special tax tools. Normally, developers need to address congestion problems they could create in their host communities, but their actions don’t extend past municipal borders. This often leads to congestion elsewhere, like the glut of truck traffic in Bath despite the lack of warehouses in the borough.

If the communities could work together and agree upon a system, it could allow the region to address these downstream infrastructure problems, Funkhouser said. About a dozen communities across the state have followed similar strategies to mixed success.

Whatever steps are taken, solutions will likely need to come from the local communities soon, Funkhouser said.

“The crisis is today. It’s right now,” Funkhouser said. “Transportation is not a priority in Washington.”

Gene Clater, a former member of the Allen Township Planning Commission, agreed and advised PennDOT to reach out to the surrounding communities quickly. Local officials need to research the implications of the plan before they would even consider buying into a special partnership. Those municipalities could also lobby their leaders in Harrisburg to update the state’s antiquated zoning laws.

“The state has to wake up to the fact that ... if you do these developments, whether it be residential or commercial, there’s more impact than just a mile away from the site,” Clater said. “The state’s got to wake up, we got to get those lobbies and everybody else out of the way and do what’s right for the state.”

Not everyone was satisfied with the recommendations. Lindenmoyer said nothing in the report would improve the already bad traffic problems on Route 329. The two-lane highway cannot be expanded as houses lie on either side of the road, she said.
“It just seems people that have money can go in and do whatever they want and the rest of us have to sit there and suffer the consequences,” she said.

Morning Call reporter Tom Shortell can be reached at 610-820-6168 or tshortell@mcall.com.
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