

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

**Tuesday, September 25, 2007
6:00 pm
College Township Municipal Building**

Minutes

Voting Members Present:

Ron Buckalew	Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC)
Bob Corman	Penns Valley Planning Region
John Elnitski	Benner Township
Elizabeth Goreham	State College Borough
Ken Hall	Mountaintop Planning Region
Dan Klees, Chair	College Township
Kevin Kline	PennDOT District 2-0 Office
Chris Lee	Harris Township
Jeff Luck	Patton Township
Bob Neff	Halfmoon Township
George Pytel	Ferguson Township
Jadine Reese	Upper Bald Eagle Planning Region
John Saylor	Centre County
Harold Nanovic (for Tom TenEyck)	PennDOT Central Office
John Spychalski	Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA)

Non-Voting Members Present:

Rob Cooper	Penn State University
Frank Halderman	Bellefonte Borough

Others Present:

Bob Crum	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Tom Zilla	CRPA
Trish Meek	CRPA
Greg Kausch	CRPA
Lori Shingler	CRPA – Recording Secretary
Mike Bloom	Centre County Planning and Community Development
Bob Jacobs	Centre County Planning and Community Development
Hugh Mose	CATA
Michelle Barbin	Mountaintop Region
Denny Prestash	PennDOT District 2-0
Dan Abruzzo	Chamber of Business & Industry of Centre County
Senator Jake Corman	34 th District
Steve Miller	34 th District
Keith Mullins	Jacobs Edwards and Kelcey
Tom Fountaine	State College Borough
Cliff Warner	Harris Township

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 2

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. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Elnitski made a motion to approve the June 26, 2007 Coordinating Committee minutes. Mr. Pytel seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

3. Citizens' Comments

There were no citizen comments.

4. PennDOT District 2-0 Regional Operations Plan (ROP)

Mr. Keith Mullins, from Jacobs Edwards and Kelcey, explained that the purpose of the ROP was to improve the transportation system in the region. He said that his consulting group built on PennDOT District 2-0's Strategic Plan, which listed priority needs as well as projects to address those needs.

Reviewing the ROP process, Mr. Mullins said that a kickoff meeting was held in March 2007. Stakeholder workshops and Task Force meetings were held through June. The Centre County MPO is one of three planning agencies in the District 2-0 region. One of the first activities was to identify needs and need areas. These included traveler information, traffic signals, incident/emergency management, institutional coordination and maintenance/construction.

Mr. Lee asked if federal dollars were spent on this process. Mr. Mullins said that the ROP was funded by the PennDOT Central Office. Federal dollars will probably need to be spent on project implementation. Mr. Lee asked who served on the steering committee for Centre County. Mr. Mullins said that Mr. Zilla was the lead contact, as well as Mr. Bloom, representation from Penn State and Centre County 911.

Mr. Mullins stated that the ROP sets the stage for regional implementation of elements of the Statewide System Operation Plan (TSOP). The projects will hopefully be included in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and reflected in the 2009 TIP update. He mentioned that adoption or acceptance of this plan does not mean that all the projects will be added to the TIP; rather, District 2-0 asks that the MPO consider these projects as it is developing its TIP and LRTP. He also noted that the projects are broken into two categories: short-term and long-term.

The ROP projects were prioritized at the second Stakeholder Workshop based on complexity and constructability. Mr. Mullins reviewed short-term priority projects that were applicable to Centre County, in order of priority:

1. Develop links between operations centers (District 2-0, PSP, County 911 centers)
2. Develop inter-agency communications protocols (TSOP 05)
3. Deploy ramp closure gates for access ramps to I-80
7. I-80 traffic surveillance in Centre County (2 locations)
10. I-80 DMS in Centre County (WB approach to Exit 161)
11. Update high priority traffic signal corridors: W. College Ave. – SR 26 (Ferguson Township)
14. Implement recommendations from "Signal Strategic Plan"

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 3

16. Phase 1 Highway Advisory Radio deployment (PA 26, SR 220)
17. District 2-0 Region detour route GIS mapping

Mr. Luck noted that many of the short-term projects are based on information gathering, but this was mostly of a government-to-government nature. He asked if getting information to the public was part of the plan. Mr. Mullins said that many existing projects that are underway were not included in the ROP, and many of these address public information. PennDOT is in the final stages of developing a 511 system, which is a dedicated traveler information phone system. There will also be a 511 website. This system should be rolled out in 2008.

Mr. Lee asked when these projects would come to the policy level. Mr. Mullins said that the TIP process is just getting underway for 2009. PennDOT is asking for consideration of these projects within that process. Mr. Lee asked how these would be ranked since the MPO has been told that only the LRTP projects would be considered. Mr. Zilla said that some of these projects may already be on the LRTP. Others would likely have to wait until an LRTP update. He noted that the North Atherton Street Corridor does not show up on these recommendations because the project is already on the TIP and moving forward. This was one of the high priority projects that was identified in the prior ITS effort.

Long Term prioritized projects in Centre County include:

1. Construct multi-agency regional traffic management center
2. Deploy small-size DMS at I-80 ramp approaches in coordination with Signal Strategic Plan
4. I-80 DMS in Centre County (EB approach to Exit 147, WB approach to Exit 147, WB approach to Exit 161)
6. Event Management Plan for PSU/State College
7. Variable Speed Limit (VSL) on I-80
8. CATA transit traveler information
10. Traveler information kiosks
11. Phase 2 HAR deployment (SR 144 Potters Mills)
12. Regional transit fare card
14. Deploy technology assisted speed enforcement
15. CARSD deployment for CATA and DuFAST
16. State College multi-modal facility

Mr. Mullins said that in addition to identifying projects, stakeholders came up with institutional suggestions. These are being compiled in each of the districts and will be provided to the Central Office. He also noted that the ROP will be updated every two years to be kept current with emerging needs.

Mr. Lee asked about the "complete streets" concept, involving land use solutions to transportation problems. Mr. Mullins said that the ROP effort was limited to ITS and using technology to better the system. Planning elements are being looked at by the District as part of different efforts.

Mr. Luck said that one of the long-term projects is CATA traveler information. He thought that project was already being implemented. Mr. Spsychalski said there are several phases of CATA's GPS initiative and traveler information would be the second phase. The first phase is information for control of dispatch and operations.

Mr. Zilla said that staff has been asked by District 2-0 for some type of approval of this plan. Staff has discussed whether this should be formal adoption, approval or acceptance. ROP elements can then be

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 4

incorporated as part of the long range planning process. An Executive Summary was included with the agenda, and staff is working on getting the entire report to members in advance of the November meeting.

Mr. Pytel said that most of the ROP projects seem to be based on reaction and asked if there was anything to prevent accidents from happening again. Mr. Klees thought that more cameras should reveal issues before they lead to accidents. Mr. Prestash said that some of these measures are proactive, used to identify and help maintenance departments respond more quickly. One of the proactive measures used in ITS is bridge systems. These are sensors in the pavement that help PennDOT spray the bridge automatically when ice forms. Mr. Luck noted that the variable speed limits are also proactive measures.

Mr. Spsychalski made a motion to receive the Regional Operations Plan, seconded by Mr. Lee. The motion passed unanimously.

5. **2007-2010 Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Zilla stated that current procedures permit project sponsors (typically PennDOT and CATA) to make changes to the TIP without action by the MPO, within certain limits. He reported that CATA has completed an administrative action to shift \$50,000 in CMAQ funds from the Buy Down of Fares Program in 2007 to the other two projects that were funded with CMAQ funds: the vanpool and W Route projects. The Buy Down of Fares Program is not ready to start in 2007, so CATA wanted to shift the funds to projects that were moving forward.

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

a. **South Atherton Street Path Cost Increase – Phone Ballot Results**

Ms. Meek stated that this project was approved in 2005. It involves replacing a portion of the path where an underground metal drainage pipe is corroding. In 2005, \$128,225 in federal funds was put on the TIP for this project. Harris Township has since come back and requested additional funding in the amount of \$137,707, which was granted. Harris Township also contributed an additional \$20,000. However, when the project went out to bid in July, the project came in over the amount estimated. Since there were no funds available left in the TE line items, staff requested additional money from the PennDOT Central Office, who provided an additional \$48,668. Harris Township also contributed an additional \$30,000 in local funds.

This cost increase action was handled with an email/telephone ballot because there was some urgency in awarding the project. If the funds were not obligated by the end of August, they would lapse. Ms. Meek reported that ten responses to the staff email were received, all in favor of granting the increase. Staff is asking for confirmation of that ballot.

Mr. Lee made a motion to confirm the August 2007 phone ballot approving \$48,668 in additional federal funding from the statewide TE line item for the Atherton Street Path TE project. Mr. Neff seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

b. **W. Beaver Avenue/S. Fraser Street Streetscape Project**

Ms. Meek explained that this is an approved project for streetscape improvement on the existing TIP, using TE funding. Staff will discuss methods by which to get the project obligated and off the Program

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 5

so that it does not have to be carried into the new funding allocation. The TE project is part of a much larger project, and there are some potential actions the MPO may need to take in order for the project to be eligible for federal funds in the future.

Mr. Tom Fountaine, State College Borough Manager, provided an update on the West Beaver Avenue/South Fraser Street realignment and safety improvement project. He showed a diagram of the project area, explaining that it is a challenging intersection with safety concerns. Since 2004, when the TE project was approved, the Borough has advanced \$2 million to acquire the property for this project in order to keep it moving along. However, funding challenges continue.

Mr. Fountaine reported that \$251,850 has been secured thus far through Home Town Streets (HTS) funding. This project once included a pedestrian node on the northeast corner, four textured crosswalks and 35 streetlights. Because of the timing of the West Beaver intersection realignment and increased construction costs, the project has been scaled back to include 35 streetlights and two textured crosswalks.

Phase I of the overall project is the TE/HTS streetscape project. Next steps include executing a design professional contract so that the project keeps moving forward and the funds are obligated by August 2008. Construction should be completed in early 2009. One of the goals has been to coordinate the TE/HTS component of the project so that the funding can be maximized with the \$1 million of additional construction necessary to complete the full realignment.

The Borough applied for \$447,175 in additional streetscape improvements during the 2005-2006 TE application cycle. The project was forwarded by the MPO to PennDOT for TE statewide discretionary funds, but those funds were not provided. Mr. Fountaine noted that the project is adjacent to an economic development project, and the Borough is coordinating the construction activities, so the realignment must be completed by September 2009. The Borough is also working with Congressman Peterson to restore an earmark for \$1 million in the 2007 budget, and at the same time, talking to state officials about the possibility of the Governor's discretionary transportation money to fund the gap in this project.

To ensure that the project is eligible for reimbursement with federal funds if they become available, the Borough is requesting several actions from the MPO in future meetings:

- Add preliminary engineering to the current TIP
- Add other project phases to the 2009-2012 TIP
- Add the project to the Long Range Transportation Plan

Mr. Elnitski asked if the requests for earmarks would be presented to the MPO to decide whether they should be spent that way. Mr. Klees said that this would not be an earmark that the MPO is requesting, but the MPO is required to add it to the TIP. Mr. Elnitski said that this project is not as safety related, as in the case of a bridge problem, and he had a problem spending money that should be put to better causes. Mr. Klees thought that the MPO could apply for earmarks as well, but was not the "keeper" of the earmark system.

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 6

c. Proposed Projects for 2009-2012 TIP

Ms. Meek noted that with the new TIP update comes additional funding for TE projects. For 2009 and 2010, there will be a combined \$630,000 available in federal funds. Because the MPO has been successful in moving projects off the Program, only one project still remains – the Borough Streetscape project. However, because there is such a backlog of projects in other planning areas across the state, there will not be a typical application funding cycle. Since the projects in Centre County will be completed by the time new funds are awarded, PennDOT has given their approval to add new TE projects to the TIP.

There was a TE funding cycle in 2005, and three projects applied at that time:

1. Centre Hall Sidewalk Rehabilitation Project (\$441,578)
2. Village of Boalsburg Streetscape Improvements (\$172,787)
3. W. Beaver Ave./S. Fraser St. Street Realignment and Pedestrian Improvement (\$447,175)

The MPO reviewed and ranked all of these projects, and they are shown in ranked order. The MPO did not have any available money in their program, because it was attempting to be conservative with funding. These projects were forwarded to the state for discretionary funds, but no funds were provided.

Staff is recommending that the two highest ranked projects from the 2005 cycle be approved for funding with the TE line item funds in years 2009 and 2010. There would be about \$15,000 left over to serve as contingency. Ms. Meek noted that these two projects could easily be scaled back if necessary.

There are several reasons for staff's recommendation. First, if an application cycle were started, it would be five to six months before projects could be added to the program. Second, it is anticipated that PennDOT will schedule a statewide application cycle in 2009, so there would be an opportunity for new projects in the future. In addition, if projects were approved through a new application cycle, design would not likely begin until late 2008. Thus, the TE funding for construction of the projects would not be expended until at least 2011. Ms. Meek said that the two recommended projects could be advanced immediately.

The MPO should consider and approve a process to move forward. Staff could formally meet with candidate project sponsors to determine their interest in advancing their projects. She said that she has talked informally with the host municipalities, and both are interested in moving their projects forward. If both formally proceed, the current TIP could be amended to include these candidate projects, and the project sponsors could begin executing reimbursement agreements and start design. When the 2009-2012 TIP is adopted, these projects would be included.

Mr. Lee asked about the reimbursement agreement. Ms. Meek explained that this agreement sets up the mechanism for federal funds to flow to the project sponsors to pay contractors. It needs to be in place before the project starts. This protects PennDOT as the keeper of the funds and protects the sponsors by guaranteeing the funding as long as all rules are followed.

Ms. Meek reported that the Technical Committee recommends authorizing staff to formally determine if the sponsors of the two highest ranked projects are interested in advancing them.

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 7

Mr. Lee made a motion to authorize staff to formally determine if the sponsors of the two highest-ranked TE projects from the 2005-2006 TE application cycle are interested in advancing the projects using the CCMPO's TE funding allocation for the 2009-2012 TIP. Mr. Buckalew seconded.

Mr. Pytel asked that if one of the projects could not be done, would another project that is ready to go be eligible. Ms. Meek said that having a project ready to go is difficult. If it looked like one of these projects was not going to proceed, the MPO could go to PennDOT and ask if there was a way to slide another project in. At this point, though, there are two projects ready to go. Mr. Pytel said that the rest of the Pine Grove Mills project is ready to go as well.

Mr. Zilla noted that this direction would allow both of the project sponsors to execute the reimbursement agreement with PennDOT now, if the 2007 TIP is amended to include them. When the 2009 funding is available, the projects would also be ready. This recommendation is designed to maximize the use of available time.

Mr. Corman expressed concern that the allocations are far below what they need to be for projects. He suggested scaling the projects into phases, based on the funding available. Ms. Meek said that the intent was to ask for revised cost estimates when staff talks to the sponsors.

The above motion was voted upon and approved unanimously.

7. Pennsylvania Act 44 – Transportation Funding Legislation

Mr. Zilla reviewed the new funding levels that Act 44 is providing for transportation improvements throughout the state. In the first year, FY 2007/08, there will be \$450 million for the Highway side and \$300 million for the Transit side. The legislation provides for annual growth of revenue. He noted that these amounts were less than what was recommended by the Transportation Funding and Reform Commission.

Reviewing the revenue sources, Mr. Zilla stated that the legislation includes existing revenue that was in place before on the Transit side. New funding will come through a 50-year agreement between PennDOT and the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, with a range of sources:

- I-80 tolls
- Turnpike toll increases
- Debt financing
- Cost savings from I-80 maintenance and capital expenditures, paid by toll revenues in the future

Centre County's share of the Highway/Bridge revenue will amount to \$415,000,000 for state highways and bridges in 2007/08. There is \$5,000,000 set aside for county bridges and \$30,000,000 for municipal roads and bridges. Mr. Zilla noted that the funding for county and municipal roads and bridges are fixed amounts and will not change over time.

Mr. Zilla said that 15% of the Highway/Bridge monies will be reserved for the Secretary of Transportation's discretionary fund. The remaining 85% will be distributed by the TIP Financial Guidance formula. He added that there will be no commingling of Act 44 revenue with other funding, so that will create issues with programming projects. As the MPO goes into the next four years of the 2009/12 TIP, the total funding will be about \$15.7 million. The focus of the new legislation is on system

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 8

preservation and restoration, operations and maintenance, structurally deficient (SD) bridges, ride quality, and safety/capacity management (not capacity expansion).

Mr. Mose reviewed the Transit funding. There is \$300 million in new transit funding through Act 44, in addition to the \$778 million in existing sources. He noted that the funding programs have been completely restructured. The funding program is dedicated and inflation-sensitive, which it has not been in the past. Allocations are based on transit needs and performance.

Mr. Mose said that the program allows for a base operating allocation, which is the amount the transit system received in FY 2004/05, inflated by 5.06%. The new formula includes four factors: passengers, senior passengers, hours of service, and miles of service. These factors are applied to allocate the new money. However, each transit agency is capped at a 50% increase over the base allocation in the first year and subsequent 20% increases over the previous year after that. Operating assistance requires a 15% local match, but the increases needed to catch up to that level are limited to 5% of the current local share annually. Mr. Mose noted that the Centre Region is already at or very close to the 15% level. He stated that no local match is required for formula capital funds. The capital program is based solely on passengers, which is a good thing for CATA. Lastly, the transit funding program provides for a new source of funds that can be used as the non-federal match for the Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom programs.

Mr. Mose explained that CATA's base operating allocation is about \$2.8 million in FY 2007/08. When the formula is fully realized, state operating assistance is estimated to be \$4 million, but that will take several years given that caps on annual increases. The formula-based capital assistance will generate about \$1 million a year for CATA.

Mr. Saylor asked if all of the new funding was based on I-80 tolls. Mr. Mose said his understanding is that it depends on the ability of the PA Turnpike Commission to remit to PennDOT the number of dollars required.

Mr. Zilla said that there would be a significant change in PennDOT rulemaking and regulations for transit funding. Act 44 has restructured the transit funding formula and program in the Commonwealth. Mr. Mose said that there have been multiple programs that have resulted in at least four different funding programs, all with different criteria and reporting requirements. This bill has consolidated those into an operating program and a capital program.

Mr. Zilla said that there will be new revenue coming in for FY 2007/08, so the TIP will need to be amended to add projects for that revenue. New revenue and projects will also have to be included in the 2009-2012 TIP. In addition, the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) will need to be amended to add projects to be funded with the Act 44 revenue.

Mr. Lee asked if one of the decisions for the MPO is how to amend the LRTP to add the projects. Mr. Zilla said this was one of the issues. He noted that it would be mostly bridge projects and a lot more maintenance and preservation. There will not be a lot of capacity-adding projects, due to the state mandate. There are also issues on the federal funding side, which will be discussed further in November.

Senator Jake Corman, 34th District, addressed transportation funding needs in Pennsylvania. The TFRC report last year estimated that a \$1.7 billion increase is needed to properly fund highway and bridge maintenance and construction projects and for mass transit. A recent report on costs for repairing bridges in Pennsylvania – following the bridge collapse in Minneapolis – estimates the total need at \$11

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 9

billion for 6,000 bridges. Pennsylvania ranks number one in the country in structurally deficient bridges. This is due to many long-standing transportation issues:

- Declining growth in current state funding sources (gas tax, licensing, registration fees)
- Increased maintenance costs
- Increased costs of new construction
- Increases usage and congestion
- Uncertainty regarding future federal funding

Options for dealing with the funding shortfall include increasing the gas tax, increasing fees, doing nothing and public/private partnerships. Senator Corman said that a gas increase of 12-14 cents per gallon would be needed to meet the \$1.7 billion funding level annually.

Senator Corman stated that he did not support Act 44, but that the legislation was better than doing nothing. It is anticipated that Act 44 will only provide approximately \$900 million a year, which is \$800 million short of what is needed. Another problem with Act 44 is that it does not provide for new capacity.

To achieve the \$900 million in new funding, the following sources are to be utilized:

- 25% increase in PA Turnpike tolls in 2009 (3% increase each year thereafter)
- Toll revenue from I-80
- Motor License Fund backed debt of \$5 billion
- Turnpike debt financing
- Turnpike I-80 lease payment to the Commonwealth
- PennDOT maintenance and operations savings on I-80

Senator Corman thought that one alternative to Act 44 is public/private partnerships. The Commonwealth can contract with public or private entities to build new roads, with tolls, that would eventually be turned back to the state. Advantages include:

- Improved efficiency in construction, operation and maintenance
- Private sector tendency to adopt new technologies and construction methods
- Use of current state assets to fund critical state and local transportation needs
- New private sector investment
- Opportunities to address new capacity transportation projects

Over 20 other states allow for some form of public/private partnerships. Most notable are the Chicago Skyway and the Indiana Toll Road. Senator Corman said that there is no pain-free way to solve the transportation funding issues in the state. The only way to achieve the dollars needed and repeal Act 44 is to lease the PA Turnpike.

Senator Corman noted some of the capacity-adding projects needed in Pennsylvania:

- South Central Centre County Transportation Study (SCCCTS)
 - Making Route 322 four lanes in Centre County
 - I-99/I-80 high speed interchange
- Central Susquehanna Valley Thruway

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 10

There are some concerns with private/public partnerships. First, people generally do not like foreign ownership. State or national emergencies are also a concern, and specific contract language would have to be written to allow the state to take over the road during those situations. Senator Corman said that the agreements would be detailed and structurally-sound, and only entered into with experienced and proven private entities. In addition, the Commonwealth would maintain ownership and access to roads in times of emergencies.

In conclusion, Senator Corman said that Act 44 funding is clearly not enough. Turnpike fees are already increasing, which was one of the concerns associated with leasing the Turnpike. He thought the best we could do in terms of capacity enhancement is legislation that would allow for private/public partnerships that exclude the PA Turnpike.

Mr. Halderman noted that Representative Peterson had thought that a five cent increase in gas tax was enough to raise the money needed for transportation. Senator Corman thought that with Act 44 in place that may be enough, but it would not be if Act 44 were repealed.

Mr. Halderman referred to the hardship on truckers if I-80 is tolled. Senator Corman said that the primary options to raise needed funds were raising the gas tax, tolling I-80 or leasing the Turnpike. He preferred leasing the Turnpike.

Mr. Pytel said he could not understand how the state can lease the Turnpike to someone else and make a profit for both the state and the private entity. Senator Corman said the Turnpike's mission right now does not include making money. Clearly, the tolls would have to be raised to make a profit. In addition, there would be money paid up front if the road were leased. Mr. Pytel asked what would keep the trucks on the Turnpike if the tolls were raised. Senator Corman said there is the risk that trucks would use side roads.

Mr. Cooper asked if it were true that there is an untapped advertising income along the Turnpike. Senator Corman said he did not know that.

Mr. Lee thought there was a public perception that existing roads had already been paid for. He said that the idea that adding capacity relieves congestion has been challenged. He thought that adding capacity stimulates demand. He said that a gas tax should be a percentage rather than a set amount. Mr. Lee also thought funding transportation by usage should be explored. He then asked what kind of structure a private/public partnership would take. Senator Corman said that a structure would have to be developed. The desire would be to allow both protections for the consumers, and an opportunity for private enterprise. For added capacity, there would be no money up front for the Commonwealth; the benefit would be a new highway for the state. The private entity would be allowed to toll for a certain amount of time, then the road would be turned back to the state. Before he could accept any proposal, Senator Corman said he would have to see a plan for how much the lease would pay and what the tolling, maintenance and emergency requirements would be.

Mr. Buckalew referenced SCCCTS and cautioned that it is still just a study and there are no details for that as yet.

Mr. Elnitski commented that doing nothing is not a good option. He also thought that the Senator should look at all the states when reviewing interstate tolling. He asked about fire protection, saying that 60-

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 11

80% of fire department responses take place on the interstates. Since they are volunteer companies, he thought they should be given consideration.

Mr. Luck stated that regardless of the revenue source identified for maintaining already-constructed roads, it should be proportional to those constituencies that actually create maintenance issues on the roads. Ms. Goreham agreed.

Mr. Klees referred to the gas tax, saying that the percentage increase was not great. When one looks at that process versus tolling one or two interstates, it may be less painful to adopt a one-time gas increase. Senator Corman replied that the problem with a gas tax is that there are a great many people commuting to work each day and an increase would be hard on those families. He preferred leasing the Turnpike because it impacted his district the least and also because it makes the most sense – with the least amount of pain – for the Commonwealth overall. Leasing has been successful in other places and he thought it could be successful here as well. Mr. Klees said that the Legislature has talked about the sales tax for funding different programs. He suggested a one percent sales tax that applied only to transportation, on purchases such as tickets for airlines or buses, fuel, wiper blades or new cars.

Senator Corman said that clearly Act 44 cannot be repealed until another solution is developed. He reiterated that doing nothing is not an option. He still felt that leasing the Turnpike was the best idea. The last option would be to leave Act 44 in place.

Mr. Zilla noted that previous comments by the MPO were included in the agenda. He suggested that members review that and if another discussion about transportation funding issues was desired at a future meeting was desired, that could be arranged.

8. 2009-2012 Centre County TIP

Mr. Zilla reviewed updated guidance for the Centre County TIP allocations. This incorporates changes in formula and the Act 44 funding:

- TIP formula highway allocation (total for 4 years) = \$50,009,000
 - \$34,723,000 roadways
 - \$13,975,000 bridges
 - \$1,311,000 TE Program
- Act 44 roadway/bridge funding (total for 4 years) = \$15,713,000
- Total Centre County highway allocation = \$65,722,000
- Total Centre County transit allocation = \$25,372,000

The TIP should be adopted by June 2008. The Preliminary Draft TIP should be approved by January 25, 2008. Mr. Zilla pointed out that approval of this Draft is often done by staff in other districts.

Major highway projects include the completion of I-99. This includes the portion south of State College (to Bald Eagle) and the two I-80/I-99 interchanges. Full opening of I-99 is scheduled for late 2008, contingent upon the acid rock mitigation. Mr. Kline gave a brief update on that mitigation.

Mr. Zilla said that the top priority is construction of the I-99/I-80 interchanges. The local access interchange needs to be constructed first, and the latest estimate for that project is \$40 million. The high

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 12

speed interchange is estimated at \$82.5 million. The local access interchange will be ready to be bid in December 2008 if funding is available. Spike funding will have to be requested for this project.

Mr. Zilla said that when the current TIP was adopted, he had cautioned that there were a lot of projects starting and they would not all be able to proceed at once. A list of the Safety/Congestion Mitigation projects and Betterment projects was presented. Mr. Zilla said that he anticipates that most of these will carry over to the new TIP.

PennDOT is currently completing their technical assessment of bridges, with the focus on Structurally Deficient (SD) bridges. The goal is to dedicate 85% of the capital bridge funding to SD bridges. Mr. Zilla stated that 4 of the 15 bridges on the current TIP have been completed or are under construction, and will probably not need to appear on the new TIP. He explained that there are 61 SD state bridges in Centre County, with 8 of 9 state bridges on the TIP being SD bridges. One was repaired on a temporary basis. There are 15 SD state bridges on the LRTP. There are 17 SD local bridges in Centre County and all 3 local bridges on the TIP are SD bridges.

Mr. Zilla said that public transportation will be a big issue with the new funding. Projects include:

- Rolling stock rebuild and new purchases
- Advanced technologies
- Service restoration and expansion
- Rideshare, vanpool efforts

Mr. Lee asked if fare buy-down was included. Mr. Zilla replied that it was included in 2008 and Mr. Mose can provide input about what he might want to spend CMAQ dollars on in the new TIP.

Other transit projects to consider include Park and Ride projects in Old Fort, Cold Stream Dam in Philipsburg and three other candidate corridors.

Mr. Zilla reported that five TE projects were recently completed, or are under construction. Three candidate projects were submitted in the 2005-06 cycle, and staff will report back once they get more information from the project sponsors.

Mr. Zilla reviewed the next steps in the TIP process:

- Update bridge priorities
- Update highway project schedules and costs
- Investigate whether any new highway projects can be included on the new TIP within limits of fiscal constraint
- Assess transit TIP projects relative to Act 44 revenue
- Develop first draft TIP, with fiscal constraints
- Identify spike funding requests
- Provide report at November CCMPO meeting

Mr. Saylor asked when the local access interchange would start. Mr. Zilla said that if funding is committed in the new TIP, the bid let date is December 2008.

CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Page 13

Mr. Lee viewed the TIP as the fundamental policy decision that the MPO makes. He asked if this was an “off-year” TIP since only projects from the LRTP were being considered. Mr. Zilla said this TIP is on a normal two-year cycle. Mr. Lee said that it seemed that the MPO was backing into choices, and not considering broader questions. He thought transportation should be looked at more proactively, where we do and do not want growth. Mr. Klees said that in 2006, a two-year TIP and a four-year LRTP were adopted. In 2008, a two-year TIP will be adopted and in 2010 another four-year LRTP will be adopted. Mr. Zilla pointed out that the LRTP drives the TIP. He said the process that led to the adoption of the LRTP in 2006 started in 2002. That included public involvement, technical analysis (such as growth forecasting), and modeling based on that data. This process will start again in 2009. He assured Mr. Lee that a process was in place to develop the LRTP that meets many of Mr. Lee’s concerns. He asked that Mr. Lee be specific about what he would like to see. Mr. Lee said that would include a topographic map and growth projections. Mr. Zilla said that these documents are included in the LRTP.

Mr. Klees noted that the TIP discussion will take place again in November and preliminary draft action will be requested in January. January is the organizational meeting, so there may be new members.

9. Announcements

Mr. Klees reviewed the meeting dates in November.

Mr. Klees reported that the MPO Performance Review Committee has discussed structure, bylaws and finances. Members have reached an impasse on the structure discussion, so the focus will not shift to the bylaws. He thought there had to be bylaws by which the MPO operates to accommodate normal issues and atypical issues as well.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Shingler
Recording Secretary