

**CENTRE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO)  
COORDINATING COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, January 23, 2007  
6:00 pm  
College Township Municipal Building**

**Minutes**

**Voting Members Present:**

John Elnitski	Benner Township
Dan Klees, Chair	College Township
George Pytel	Ferguson Township
Bob Neff	Halfmoon Township
Chris Lee	Harris Township
Jeff Luck	Patton Township
Elizabeth Goreham, Vice Chair	State College Borough
Jack Shannon	Moshannon Valley Planning Region
Ray Hankinson (for Bob Corman)	Penns Valley Planning Region
John Spychalski	Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA)
Ron Buckalew	Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC)
Kevin Kline	PennDOT District 2-0 Office
Dean Roberts (for Tom TenEyck)	PennDOT Central Office
Jadine Reese	Upper Bald Eagle Planning Region
Chris Exarchos	Centre County
Frank Royer	Spring Township

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Rob Cooper	Penn State University
Frank Halderman	Bellefonte Borough

**Others Present:**

Bob Crum	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Trish Meek	CRPA
Tom Zilla	CRPA
Greg Kausch	CRPA
Lori Shingler	CRPA – Recording Secretary
Hugh Mose	CATA
Mike Bloom	Centre County Planning and Community Development Office
Michelle Barbin	Mountaintop Planning Region
Amy Farkis	Harris Township Manager
Don Franson	Harris Township Engineer
Jim Eckerd	Senator Corman's Office

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Klees called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. Election of Officers**

*Ms. Goreham nominated Dan Klees to serve as Chair of the Coordinating Committee. Mr. Elnitsky seconded the nomination.*

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 23, 2007

Page 2

*Mr. Pytel nominated Elizabeth Goreham to serve as Chair. Mr. Buckalew seconded the nomination.*

*Mr. Spsychalski moved that the nominations be closed, seconded by Mr. Lee. Mr. Crum asked for voting in favor of Dan Klees to serve as Chair. There was a majority vote (9 in favor) to elect Dan Klees to serve as Chair.*

*Mr. Pytel nominated Elizabeth Goreham to serve as Vice-Chair of the Coordinating Committee. Mr. Elnitski seconded the nomination.*

*Mr. Pytel moved that nominations be closed, seconded by Mr. Neff. The vote was unanimous in favor of Elizabeth Goreham serving as Vice-Chair.*

*Mr. Buckalew nominated Bob Crum to serve as Secretary of the Coordinating Committee. Mr. Spsychalski seconded the nomination.*

*Mr. Neff moved that nominations be closed, seconded by Mr. Pytel. The vote was unanimous in favor of Bob Crum serving as Secretary.*

### **3. Approval of Minutes**

*Mr. Spsychalski made a motion to approve the November 28, 2006 Coordinating Committee minutes. Mr. Pytel seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

### **4. Citizens' Comments**

There were no citizen comments.

### **5. Transportation Enhancements/Home Town Streets/Safe Routes to School Program**

Ms. Meek provided an overview of the Transportation Enhancements (TE) program, noting that in December 2005 there was a significant change in program policy. At that time, MPOs were forbidden from carrying over unobligated program funds into the next year. This change resulted in concerns about losing unobligated line item funds. Ms. Meek also pointed out that TE funds must be fiscally constrained by TIP year.

There are two TE program actions for consideration tonight. The first is related to the Military Museum Access Bridge project. Ms. Meek stated that there is currently \$25,825 in federal funds on the TIP for this project. No federal funds, however, have actually been expended on the project. The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission is the sponsor of this project, and is unable at this time to perform the design work that is required to move the project forward. Accordingly, they have provided a letter asking the MPO to deprogram the project. In that letter, they also encouraged the MPO to transfer the federal funds slated for the Access Bridge project to the South Atherton Street Path project, because this latter project will provide a benefit to the Museum property.

The second action for consideration pertains to the South Atherton Street Path. Ms. Meek reported that Harris Township has a PennDOT cost estimate for this project in the amount of \$215,293. At this time, \$128,225 is programmed on the TIP for this project. Harris Township is committed to providing an additional \$20,068 for the project, and they are requesting an additional \$67,000 from the MPO to complete the project.

**CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, January 23, 2007**

**Page 3**

Ms. Meek said that there would need to be movement of funds between three TIP line items to address these actions. First, \$25,825 would have to be moved from the Historic Site Access Bridge project to the South Atherton Street Path project. Second, money would have to be moved from the TE line item to the South Atherton Street Path project in the amounts of \$4,950 for 2007 and \$36,225 for 2008. The total of these amounts would add up to the additional federal funds needed by Harris Township to complete the South Atherton Street Path project. Ms. Meek said that there is only one other TE project on the TIP that is not moving forward right now – the State College Borough Streetscape project.

Ms. Meek reviewed the policy for approval or disapproval of TE project cost increases. She noted that Harris Township is committed to providing additional local funds. The TE Review Committee received a presentation about this project, and is recommending that the Military Access Bridge be deprogrammed, and additional money be granted to the South Atherton Street Path. That same recommendation was presented to and endorsed by the Technical Committee.

Mr. Pytel asked if there were any other projects ready for bid. Ms. Meek said there were not.

Mr. Franson, Harris Township Engineer, provided some details on the South Atherton Street Path project. He said that the current path was six feet wide, and currently has stormwater structures in the middle of the pathway. These structures will be eliminated under the new design – in fact, one of the reasons this project was initiated was because there were problems with drainage. In 2004, a Bobcat vehicle crashed through the pathway as a result of pipes collapsing underneath. Pipe conditions were later found to be a problem throughout the length of the path. Emergency repairs were completed, and Harris Township then requested money from the TE program to make further improvements to the path.

Reviewing the project schedule, Mr. Franson stated that if the request for additional funds is approved, the project will be let in July 2007. Construction will start in September and be complete in October of this year.

Mr. Cooper asked if the path would be widened as part of the project. Mr. Franson said that it would not be widened, because of right of way and utility constraints.

Mr. Shannon asked what the total length of the path was. Mr. Franson said it was approximately 2,000 feet.

*Mr. Pytel made a motion to eliminate the Military Museum Access Bridge in the amount of \$25,825 and approve the additional funding request for \$67,000 for the South Atherton Street Pathway project. Mr. Neff seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

**6. FY 2006-07 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Kausch reported that since the presentation was finalized earlier in the afternoon, there have been late-breaking developments to the project under consideration. He said that under the current 2006-07 UPWP, there is an approved project to develop a Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan with supplemental planning funds. The purpose of this plan is to allow CATA to tap into three new sources of federal funds:

- Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Program
- New Freedom
- Section 5310

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 23, 2007

Page 4

Centre County is asking the MPO to request additional supplemental planning funds for a subsequent phase of this current project. This additional phase would involve looking at alternative service delivery models that would better integrate services offered by both CATA and the Centre County Office of Transportation. The already-approved Coordinated Plan project would identify concentrations of target populations (low-income individuals, senior citizens, persons with disabilities) throughout Centre County. Given that CATA and the Centre County Office of Transportation are the two largest providers of services to these populations in the County, the second phase would evaluate the full range of issues necessary to better coordinate these services. Ultimately, it is hoped that the second phase will result in increased mobility within the Centre Region and Centre County, increase coordination between the two agencies, take advantage of economies of scale, and help to build efficiency.

Mr. Kausch said that staff is recommending amendment of the current UPWP and looking at the upcoming UPWP to reflect this two-phased approach. The first phase would be to complete the Coordinated Plan, which is approved under the current Work Program. Phase II would use the findings and recommendations from the Coordinated Plan to assess the issue of coordination between CATA and the Centre County Office of Transportation, and recommend action from there. Staff would like to request that this project be considered for supplemental funds in the 2007-08 Work Program, utilizing consultant and staff time to complete the work. Mr. Kausch listed work tasks that Phase II might include.

Mr. Kausch said that this approach presents a practical opportunity to augment an existing project, and may help to improve the delivery of transportation service to the target populations throughout Centre County. He stated that this approach has been endorsed by the Centre County Board of Commissioners. It has also been endorsed by PennDOT, but the original plan to amend the current year's UPWP to request additional supplemental funds has not been endorsed. The approach was also recommended by the Technical Committee earlier in the month.

The requested action is to approve an amendment to the current UPWP to extend the time available for the preparation of the Coordinated Plan, and to propose Phase II as a project for the upcoming UPWP. If additional supplemental planning funds are approved, the necessary contracts will have to be executed between PennDOT and the Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC).

Mr. Zilla said that as staff went through the Technical Committee and received their recommendation, the intent was to come to the Coordinating Committee to determine if they thought this project was important enough to amend the current UPWP and ask PennDOT for funding. In anticipation of this meeting, staff has been talking to PennDOT Central Office to see how favorably that request would be received. Late this afternoon, PennDOT indicated that this could not be done under the current UPWP. However, the question remains as to whether this is an important enough project to continue the pursuit of additional funding.

Mr. Sychalski reported that the CATA Board of Directors supports this initiative and feels that this study is important.

Mr. Exarchos said that Centre County feels that this coordination is important to look at and that a lot of benefits could result for the citizens of the County.

Mr. Lee asked if this would be in competition with other projects for funding. Mr. Klees said that it would certainly be in competition for staff time. Mr. Roberts reported that it would be in statewide competition for funding.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 23, 2007

Page 5

Mr. Klees asked if this type of coordination was unique to Centre County. Mr. Mose said that there is a study being done in a seven-county region northwest of here, including a small system in the Dubois area. It is a similar situation, and the region is assessing three different models to bring the services together.

Ms. Goreham asked if CATA would provide staff for both systems. Mr. Mose said he was not sure of that at this point. He said that the larger issue is whether there are redundant services being offered by the County Transportation Office and CATA, and whether there would be benefits to coordinating those services. Another question is if there is a way for the Centre County services to be offered on a self-supporting basis.

Ms. Goreham asked what the timing would be for the initial analysis. Mr. Mose said that he talked with the staff at the Bureau of Transportation earlier and they suggested reorganizing the MPO's projects. The Coordinated Plan might perhaps be less pressing than the approach to the CATA/Centre County Office of Transportation question. Rather than waiting until 2008, staff might do an abbreviated Coordinated Plan and address the County/CATA question right away.

Mr. Lee asked if there was a benefit to the users if the two systems are coordinated. Mr. Mose thought that within the Centre Region, CATA operates a paratransit program that is for people with disabilities, as required by the ADA, and for seniors under the state's Shared Ride Program. Within the Centre Region, the County also operates a Shared Ride Program. There may be an opportunity for the two programs to be brought together and save money.

Mr. Exarchos said that CATA does a good job of mass transit in the Centre Region, but the rest of the county is not served as well. He thought mass transit was something that needs to be thought about in terms of countywide mobility. He thought there was an opportunity to save taxpayers money, and also for a more efficient utilization of resources.

Mr. Pytel said he would be interested in which projects would be eliminated or slowed down if this project were advanced. Mr. Zilla said that Mr. Kausch would be in charge of this study. He is already doing the foundation work for the Coordinated Plan. This would be a primary responsibility for him from the middle to end of 2007.

Mr. Pytel was concerned about whether coordination or consolidation would be a burden to CATA. He stated that he was worried about the Centre Region taking on the County's responsibility financial obligations. Mr. Exarchos said that he assumed that this was a Centre County MPO and this would create a better system overall. The implication that Centre County is trying to "unload" the system is not factual, and does nothing to advance the discussion. Mr. Pytel said that he was leery because Bellefonte did not want to support CATA service to that area, and he could see the same thing happening here. He said that he agreed that CATA is a good service provider and should be expanded if possible, within reason.

Mr. Mose said that one potential area for examination is how the funding would come together. CATA's Articles of Agreement stipulate that they cannot use Centre Region tax dollars to support services outside the Centre Region.

Mr. Lee said there would be a competition for transit planning time, but if this competition would not affect current initiatives to coordinate land use and transportation planning, or complete model runs, he thought it was important in the larger scheme of things.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 23, 2007

Page 6

*Mr. Lee made a motion to amend the FY 2006-07 UPWP to change the completion date of task VIIA (JARC Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan) from June 30, 2007 to March 31, 2008. Mr. Elnitski seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

### 7. Draft FY 2007-08 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Zilla provided background information on the UPWP, stating that it is updated every year in February. The UPWP lists the work tasks for the MPO staff and important actions to be taken by the MPO. He said that what staff wants to focus on tonight are the MPO's priorities for supplemental planning fund projects. There are two candidate projects, in addition to the previous discussion about a study to assess transit coordination. Mr. Zilla said that the Technical Committee did not reach consensus with respect to the two projects in the agenda.

The first candidate project is updating the travel demand model. This would be done with a combination of staff and consultant time. Mr. Zilla listed the tasks involved:

- Refine traffic analysis zones, roadway and transit networks
- Upgrade software and input data for air quality conformity
- Update socioeconomic data, including new parcel database for land use forecasts
- Recalibrate to current traffic volumes
- Complete model runs
- Procure updated software and hardware

The second candidate project involves coordinating land use and transportation planning. There are several areas in the county that are experiencing growth and development in a concentrated fashion. Examples include the Route 550/I-99 interchange area and the Route 64/Walker Township area. Mr. Zilla said that this effort would differ from a traffic impact study that typically looks at a 10-year timeframe. This project, rather, would look at what impacts development would have on the transportation network in the next 20-30 years. There were several other areas of development that Mr. Zilla listed. This would be done with a combination of staff and consultant tasks.

Mr. Zilla reviewed tasks that are new in the base UPWP:

- Prepare 2008-2012 TIP
- TIP projects (26, 322 and 350; Whitehall Road; North Atherton Street)
- CMAQ process
- Implement changes MPO performance review
- Statewide work group for smart transportation and right-sizing
- Collect additional traffic data before and after I-99 opens

With respect to funding, the typical 3% increase in FHWA support is expected. The new base level of FTA funds was increased 26% in the 2005-06 Work Program, but will decrease 11% for the 2006-07 UPWP. Mr. Zilla said that staff would like for the Coordinating Committee to start identifying their priority projects for supplemental planning funds. Based on this discussion, a final draft UPWP will be prepared for adoption and submittal at the end of February.

Mr. Roberts said that February 6 was PennDOT's date to select projects that will be funded with supplemental planning funds. Mr. Lee asked how that coordinates with the February 28 deadline for submitting the UPWP. Mr. Roberts said that the MPO will know by that date what supplemental projects have been funded, and those can be incorporated into the UPWP. Mr. Klees asked if something would be submitted before the MPO meets in February. Mr. Roberts said that historically this has occurred in March. This year, the supplemental project approval is coming before the UPWP approval and the MPO

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 23, 2007

Page 7

will know at the next meeting what supplemental studies can be incorporated. Mr. Roberts said he would like for the MPO to tell him tonight what their preference for supplemental projects is.

Ms. Goreham asked how much the supplemental fund request would be for the CATA/County study. Mr. Zilla said that would be \$50,000. Ms. Goreham asked what the percentage of local match would be required for the two other candidate projects. Mr. Zilla said that it was an 80/20 split for all the candidate projects.

Mr. Lee said that there has been an effort on the part of the CCMPO to align various processes (TIP, LRTP, model runs) so that they have the right tools to make policy decisions. There are a number of things that need to be done by staff, and some discretionary items – including the model runs, land use and transportation planning and the study of the relationship of the County and CATA's paratransit services. He said that what was not on the list of options was studying transit-oriented design and he thought the area was still lacking a comprehensive approach in Centre County. Mr. Lee thought that the model run could be done after the other two projects and he preferred that land use and transportation planning be the priority project. In addition, he felt that the areas that needed review should be reviewed on a policy level so that it creates dialogue among elected officials and they can present it to their municipal boards.

Mr. Klees asked if the projects were different enough, with one being a transit project and one not, that they might both be successful in getting funding. Mr. Roberts said that both could be submitted, and there are two separate funding pots for each type of project.

Mr. Elnitski asked what federal and state routes were involved with the Halfmoon/Patton Township Area Plan. Mr. Zilla said that these would be Route 322 and Route 550.

Ms. Reese referred to the impacts that were identified under the update of the travel demand model and asked if those funds could be used to look at the rural areas where impacts would be realized. Mr. Zilla said that for the model project, staff would be looking at growth forecasts in the entire county. He said that they would like to convert the forecasting system to a parcel-based system for the entire county. Ms. Reese asked if that data was available now. Mr. Zilla said that there is old data available. Ms. Meek added that outside the old MPO area, the forecasting was done on a traffic analysis zone level.

Mr. Elnitski asked how far apart the tasks were for updating the travel model and what staff wants to do with the land use coordination effort. Mr. Zilla thought they were substantially different in the approaches and scopes. He said that if they are looking at hotspots and trying to identify impacts over a long period of time, staff is going to be pretty focused on just those areas. That is one of the reasons why the coordination of land use and transportation would involve more in-house staff and less consultant time. Updating the travel demand model would involve more technical work by a consultant.

Mr. Pytel asked how staff plans for municipalities that do not have zoning. Mr. Zilla said that when they have done forecasts before, they relied on the municipality to tell them what was anticipated. Ms. Meek added that one of the biggest factors is where public water and sewer are going to be available.

Mr. Pytel asked how it will affect other projects that are in the program if the CATA study is done. Mr. Zilla said that the three options mentioned are what should be compared. Tasks in the base Work Program are going to be funded and completed.

Mr. Lee referred to coordinating land use and transportation planning, and said that the review of things at the policy level is important, especially Developments of Regional Impact. He would also like to see the process being open to a broader, more comprehensive scope because right now only four or five areas are mentioned. He said that large highways are going to shape our communities in a dramatic way and the MPO should be looking to a future where it is a forum for discussion of issues like SCCCTS. Otherwise,

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 23, 2007

Page 8

he felt that they were abdicating their coordinating role to lobbyists, trucking associations and private interests.

Mr. Luck felt that all the projects should be forwarded to PennDOT. Mr. Klees worried that the projects would then be in competition with one another.

Mr. Hankinson thought that the models both involved inter-county travel and demand. He thought what was more useful to the MPO was to go with the more “surgical” of the models. He thought the travel demand model better matched the scale that members look at for projects.

Mr. Roberts asked if the MPO has prioritized their supplemental tasks in the past. Mr. Zilla said that most of the time the MPO has only requested one project. One of the reasons for that is that staff has to manage their ability to administer the projects. Mr. Luck asked how many projects staff feels they can handle in the next year. Mr. Zilla said that one project is probably preferable, two at the most.

Mr. Zilla reported that there are three statewide pots of funding available: supplemental funds (\$900,000), land use initiative (\$600,000), and special initiatives and primary activities (\$2 million).

*Mr. Lee made a motion to endorse Land Use and Transportation Planning Coordination as the priority for and the study to assess coordination between CATA and the Centre County Transportation Office as the second priority for supplemental funding in the UPWP. Mr. Buckalew seconded the motion.*

Mr. Pytel noted that there is a better chance of getting the funding if the vote is county-wide in favor of these projects.

*Mr. Lee’s motion was approved unanimously.*

### **8. Centre County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2007 Update**

Ms. Meek reviewed that there are two types of revisions being done as part of the 2007 update. These are SAFETEA-LU compliance items and consideration of additional, air quality exempt projects. The additional projects consist of bike/ped and bridge projects.

Related to the SAFETEA-LU Compliance items, Ms. Meek said that a consultation has to be held with resource agencies. She noted that staff has scheduled a meeting in May. Ms. Meek said that the Participation Plan will be discussed in February. She said that there are new regulations in SAFETEA-LU that are more stringent. Staff has received several examples from across the state that have been endorsed by FHWA, and these will be presented to the MPO.

Related to the consideration of non-air quality significant projects, staff has sent correspondence to municipalities where there is a potential project that the Ranking Committee will be looking at. Ms. Meek said that there are 24 bike/ped projects and 9 bridge projects. She said that two letters of support have been received back. Staff wanted the municipalities to provide some kind of indication about whether the project was something they would like to see on the LRTP.

Ms. Meek reviewed the schedule, saying that input would be received from the municipalities until February 21, 2007. The Project Ranking Committee will review the projects in March. The Public Participation Plan will be advertised in March because it requires a 45-day public participation period. In June the MPO will adopt the update.

Mr. Lee asked if the community planning module has been changed for the project ranking process. Ms. Meek said it has not. Staff indicated in the LRTP that a full analysis would be done of this

**CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, January 23, 2007**

**Page 9**

component as part of the four-year update. Mr. Lee said that this criterion negated the impact on land use and communities. Mr. Bloom said that when the process was gone through, all the projects defaulted to a score of five. To offset that, there are other land use considerations built into the other nine criteria. He said that these new projects will be put into the list with the other 169 projects, so he would not want to change the process in the middle.

Ms. Goreham thought that PennDOT was going to provide their prioritization of bridge projects. Ms. Meek said that the nine projects are what PennDOT feels are the most critical in terms of need right now. She said that in February, Karen Michael will talk to the MPO about bridges. The MPO may want to defer the bridge prioritization to PennDOT at some point because it is very technical in nature and they have their own pot of funds.

Mr. Elnitski referred to Benner Township's experience with Transportation Enhancements projects and having to turn money back because the project got out of hand due to the requirements. He asked if it was possible to send a letter to show that the requirements are eliminating projects that could improve air quality. Mr. Klees felt that a lot of the requirements were driven at the federal level. He agreed that there seems to be a disconnect between the money available and the regulations. Ms. Meek said that this has been going on since the beginning of the program and seems to be a national problem. She said that when a project uses federal funds, federal guidelines must be followed. She said that staff could draft a letter, but she did not know if it would help. Mr. Lee said that he could agree to streamline the process, but not eliminating the environmental review.

**9. Announcements**

Mr. Klees reviewed upcoming meetings:

Technical Committee	Wednesday, February 14, 9:30 a.m. at College Township
Coordinating Committee	Tuesday, February 27, 6:00 p.m., Patton Township

Mr. Kline reported on the acid rock situation, saying that relative to the immovable material permit they are currently smoothing and putting liners down in the buttress area. He thought this work was about 40 percent complete. Related to the movable material permit, PennDOT is working on the stormwater management and ENS plans.

**10. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lori Shingler  
Recording Secretary