

**Preliminary Draft 2009-2012 Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
Comments from the CCMPO Technical Committee Discussion  
January 9, 2009 Technical Committee Meeting**

1. PennDOT District 2-0 explained that state funding for PennDOT's annual 711 Pavement Maintenance Program will still be available, in addition to the funding provided in the Pavement Restoration line items. PennDOT noted that the level of 711 funding has been decreasing each year. PennDOT's 711 Program is not subject to MPO review and approval. However, District 2-0 annually provides the MPO with a list of paving projects to be completed through the 711 Program.
2. PennDOT District 2-0 explained that when using federal funds for repaving projects, there are certain guidelines for shoulder width. However, when using state funds for repaving projects, there are no requirements relative to paving shoulders.
3. Amy Story (State College Borough) reported that the Borough is still seeking federal or state funds to complete the West Beaver Avenue/South Fraser Street realignment project. The Borough recently received a copy of correspondence from State Senator Jake Corman, who recommended to state officials that funding be provided to the project.
4. Kent Baker (College Township) recommended that a bridge on State Route (SR) 3011 (Branch Road) at Segment 40 near Country Club Road be reconstructed at the same time, or in coordination with, the SR 3011 Segment 30 Branch Road bridge that is included on the Preliminary Draft TIP. The Segment 30 bridge is "structurally deficient (SD)", however, the Segment 40 bridge is not an SD bridge. PennDOT will review the condition of the bridge at Segment 40 to determine if it would be appropriate to program funds to replace that bridge in coordination with the replacement of the bridge at Segment 30.
5. PennDOT clarified that the Route 45 bridge improvement project near Deibler Road in Ferguson Township is not a complete replacement, but involves superstructure rehabilitation only. The bid letting for the project will occur in late 2008, with construction in summer 2009.
6. Staff will revise the summary of the transit element of the TIP to identify which projects are currently underway, based on their approval on prior TIPs. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires that all projects be included on the TIP, even if the project was approved on a prior TIP and only a small balance of funds remains. This approach differs from the highway element of the TIP. As a result, a large number of transit projects are illustrated in year 2009 of the Preliminary Draft TIP. Staff agreed to contact FTA to inquire if some of the carryover projects could be removed from the TIP.
7. Staff explained that the Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) project, which is a high priority on the Long Range Transportation Plan, could be included on the TIP if a sponsor for the project is identified and funding is committed. The Centre Region Council of Governments requested Penn State University to assume sponsorship of the ITC project, because of the possibility of co-locating the ITC with a new parking structure on the University's West Campus. However, no response has been received from the University to date.

*(Continued)*

**Preliminary Draft 2009-2012 Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
Comments from the CCMPO Technical Committee Discussion  
January 9, 2009 Technical Committee Meeting**

8. The Technical Committee discussed options for committing funding to the Construction phase of the I-80/Route 26 Section A18 Local Access Interchange project, if “spike” funds are not provided for the project. Staff explained that one option is to use a portion of the County’s base allocation of funds to finance a percentage of the cost of the project, by deferring some of the Safety, Congestion Mitigation and Air quality (CMAQ), and Betterment projects. Committee members emphasized that the CCMPO would have to carefully review the projects that would be deferred from the first two years of the TIP before making a decision. PennDOT advised staff not to pursue this approach until after the PennDOT Central Office determines if spike funds will be provided for the interchange.
9. PennDOT reported that spike funding will be targeted for structurally deficient bridges. Historically, spike funding was used for high-cost roadway improvement projects. PennDOT District 2-0 will request spike funds for selected bridge projects on the Preliminary Draft TIP.
10. Hugh Mose (CATA) questioned how the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) would interact with PennDOT and the CCMPO relative to the I-80/Route 26 Local Access and I-99/I-80 High Speed interchanges. Staff stated that the PTC would take over sponsorship of the projects from PennDOT, with the responsibility for deciding if and when they are constructed. Staff will be consulting with other MPOs to see how they work with the PTC.
11. Michele Barbin (Mountaintop Region) noted that the PTC’s I-80 Toll Conversion Project website does not include any information about the list of improvements to be made on I-80, and suggested that the I-80/Route 26 Section A18 Local Access and I-99/I-80 Section B18 High Speed interchanges need to be on the list of improvements.
12. Staff explained that a \$4 million earmark is still being included on the TIP for the Eastern Inner Loop, until federal legislation changes the language in SAFETEA-LU to reprogram \$400,000 of the \$4 million to the North Atherton Street signal improvement project. Staff also explained that the majority of the remaining funding will not be reprogrammed to other projects in Centre County.