

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

**Tuesday, November 25, 2008  
6:00 pm  
College Township Municipal Building**

**Minutes**

**Voting Members Present:**

Ron Buckalew	Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC)
Ray Hankinson (for Bob Corman)	Penns Valley Planning Region
Jon Eich	Centre County
Elizabeth Goreham, Vice-Chair	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
Steve Miller	Ferguson Township
Jadine Reese	Upper Bald Eagle Planning Region
Bob Jacobs (for Rich Rogers)	Centre County
Barbara Spencer	Halfmoon Township
John Spychalski	CATA
Larry Shifflet	PennDOT Central Office

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Matt Smoker	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Rob Cooper	Penn State University
Frank Halderman	Bellefonte Borough

**Others Present:**

Tom Zilla	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Trish Meek	CRPA
Greg Kausch	CRPA
Lori Shingler	CRPA – Recording Secretary
Mike Bloom	Centre County Planning & Community Development Office
Mike Joseph	Centre Daily Times
Hugh Mose	CATA
Frank Hampton	PennDOT Central 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. Approval of Minutes**

*Mr. Spychalski made a motion to approve the October 28, 2008 Coordinating Committee minutes. Mr. Buckalew seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 2

### 3. Citizen Comments

There were no citizen comments.

Mr. Klees noted that the CCMPO/CATA MOU agenda item would be moved to follow the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) agenda item.

*Mr. Lee made a motion to move the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) agenda item to follow the Route 322 Corridor Safety Improvements agenda item. Mr. Buckalew seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

### 4. Route 26 Pine Grove Mountain Safety Improvements (formerly Item 5)

Ms. Karen Michael, PennDOT District 2-0, explained that work on this safety project commenced approximately a year and half ago. The project consists of three parts: a truck pull-off at the top of Pine Grove Mountain, an upper escape ramp to be constructed before the sharp turn above Pine Grove Mills, and a lower escape ramp located further down the mountain, almost in the residential area.

Ms. Michael noted that preliminary engineering was well underway when PennDOT attended a Ferguson Township Supervisors Meeting to discuss the project costs, which came in at a level higher than that initially programmed. Ferguson Supervisors directed PennDOT to proceed with the first two elements of the project. Although they expressed interest in the lower escape ramp, funding will have to be located for that element of the project to advance.

Currently, the amounts approved for each phase of the project are as follows:

- Preliminary engineering: \$315,000
- Final design/Utility relocation: \$84,000
- Right of way acquisition: \$52,000
- Construction (over two years): \$1.063 million

Ms. Michael explained that the funding needed for the first two phases of the project is more than what is currently available, and PennDOT will work with MPO staff to identify additional sources of funding.

PennDOT is currently working to obtain environmental clearance, and to complete a bid package for the first two phases of the project by June 2009.

Mr. Zilla noted that the MPO must commit the full constructed cost of all three elements in order for PennDOT to receive environmental clearance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Staff's intent is to consult with PennDOT and come back in January with a plan to fund the entire project, as well as a TIP amendment reflecting those plans.

Mr. Luck asked which of the project elements would have mitigated the most recent accidents that have occurred in Pine Grove Mills. Ms. Michael replied that the purpose of the top pull-off are is to slow trucks down and make drivers aware of the sharp curves located further down the mountain. The state police have also discussed locating an inspection area at this top pull-off.

Mr. Kline noted that the lower escape ramp is more technically complex in terms of environmental clearance. Moreover, the closing of a township road must be coordinated and a home may have to be taken. Splitting the project into its three basic elements helps PennDOT move the first two portions while working on clearance for the lower ramp.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 3

Mr. Zilla explained that there is no easily available source of additional funds for the project. Staff and PennDOT will work to identify projects that are not moving forward, and evaluate the possibility of moving funds from these projects. He noted that this particular project is not eligible for National Highway System funds. Mr. Klees asked if it was possible to request additional funds. Mr. Shifflet explained that all discretionary funding in the current program has been allocated to structurally deficient bridges, although he did note that identification of cost savings might be one way to address the funding shortfall.

### **5. Route 322 Corridor Safety Improvements (Harris and Potter Townships) (formerly Item 6)**

Ms. Michael reported that, about one year ago, PennDOT and McCormick Taylor initiated a study examining potential safety improvements along the Route 322 Corridor. On November 7, PennDOT met with Potter and Harris Township staff, CRPA staff, and law enforcement officers to present their findings and receive input. PennDOT also attended Potter and Harris Township Supervisor meetings on November 10 and the Technical Committee meeting on November 12, to receive further input.

Ms. Michael referred to a spreadsheet and a map during her presentation. The spreadsheet showed, for each potential project in the study, a description, cost estimates, a benefit-cost ratio, and a level of priority. Ms. Michael reviewed these elements for each of the proposed projects.

Several of the projects on the list have already been completed. These include centerline rumble strips along the entire corridor, shoulder rumble strips from the Elks Country Club to Neff Road, and the removal of two of three passing zones.

Ms. Michael explained that a lot of comments were received regarding excessive speed throughout the corridor, but positive responses have also been received with respect to the speed indicator signs that have been placed within the corridor. She said these will remain in place until snow plowing begins. There seems to be strong interest in installing overhead speed indicator signs at the intersection of Route 322 with PA Route 144.

Mr. Klees noted that several of the intersection projects are already on the TIP. Mr. Zilla further explained that these include intersections at Taylor Hill Road, Dogtown Road, and Wagner Road. He added that staff views these projects as “placeholders” on the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), knowing that this PennDOT study was in process and would likely yield a wide range of improvements. As the next TIP and LRTP are being developed, changes will be made to reflect a more broad slate of improvements along the corridor. The key for staff will be to come up with priorities that the MPO can evaluate and use to make decisions. Mr. Zilla further noted that Route 322 is on the National Highway System, and as such is eligible for every category of highway funds.

Mr. Lee noted that Harris Township residents have expressed concern about snow plowing. Ms. Michael explained that Route 322 is a principle arterial and receives the highest priority during a snow event.

Ms. Michael noted that there were originally three passing zones within Harris and Potter Townships, and PennDOT has closed two of those based on the findings of the study. The only one remaining is near Tait Farms, and PennDOT is currently reviewing whether to remove that one as well.

Mr. Eich noted that this corridor is a very high priority, and he thanked PennDOT for the short-term improvements that have already been completed. He explained that any steps that can be taken to complete additional long-term improvements would be appreciated.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 4

Mr. Luck expressed appreciation for the fact that the spreadsheet relates various improvements to crash history. He contrasted this to the discussion about Pine Grove Mills improvements, noting that it appears as though speculation may play a role in that decision-making process. Mr. Kline assured the Committee that PennDOT looked at accident history in Pine Grove Mills before planning solutions. He noted that the area where the upper escape ramp will be constructed has seen a high number of crashes.

Mr. Kline reported on crash reductions resulting from short-term improvements.

### **6. Centre County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) (formerly Item 10)**

Mr. Bloom explained that, as part of the last major LRTP update in 2004-2006, ranking criteria was adopted and a Project Ranking Committee was formed. He reviewed the representation on that Project Ranking Committee. As part of the ranking process, an independent evaluation was done, and recommendations made for future improvements. These included the following:

- Reevaluate the community planning objectives criterion
- Add more to project impact statements for Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Transportation Enhancements (TE) classifications.
- Use fewer raters on the Project Ranking Committee
- Require each local governing body or sponsor to provide detailed and accurate information about each project
- Establish a process for evaluating bridges

The Ranking Committee echoed these recommendations, especially that requiring more information about each project.

MPO staff is recommending that a Project Ranking Committee again be created for the next LRTP update. This Committee would be responsible for reevaluating project ranking criteria, refining the bridge ranking process, and ranking all candidate projects. Mr. Bloom noted that the previous Committee was made up of Technical Committee members and staff. Based on comments received, staff is proposing that the new Committee also include Coordinating Committee members. The formation of a new Project Ranking Committee was discussed with the Technical Committee, and there were several volunteers, although some members were interested in only taking on certain tasks. Pursuant to the CCMPO Bylaws, the formation of a special committee and its membership must be approved by a majority vote of the Coordinating Committee.

Ms. Goreham asked why staff was suggesting that Coordinating Committee members be included on the Ranking Committee. Mr. Bloom explained that staff has received interest in involvement from some of the policymakers.

Mr. Klees endorsed the differentiation of roles between Technical and Coordinating Committee members in the ranking process. He noted that during the last update, there was a subgroup of Coordinating Committee members who reviewed the rankings. He explained his preference for having the Ranking Committee made up of only Technical Committee members, as the Technical Committee has an advisory role and the Coordinating Committee has more of a deciding role. Mr. Luck agreed, explaining that the process is cleaner because the Technical Committee looks at the projects objectively, based on ranking criteria. Mr. Klees noted that the policymakers will make decisions on the criteria that will be used.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 5

Mr. Lee asked when the Coordinating Committee would evaluate the project ranking criteria. Mr. Bloom explained that this would occur as the Ranking Committee developed the criteria, likely in February and April of 2009. Mr. Klees reasoned that the overall goals of the LRTP should be developed before the Ranking Committee begins to define the criteria. Ms. Meek noted that the criteria would be developed based on the goals and objectives approved by the Coordinating Committee.

Mr. Lee expressed a desire for staff to provide the Coordinating Committee with demographic and geographic information in advance of any listing of projects, so that members are made aware of salient trends. These trends should be known before any projects are identified. He reasoned that this approach was more logical and would save time. Mr. Klees asked if this was in relation to new corridor projects, as opposed to new safety projects, or improvements to existing corridors. Mr. Lee explained that in the long run, it should be both. Members should look at where growth is heading, and where it will be stimulated by transportation improvements, and determine if these are the same places where growth is wanted.

Ms. Reese referred to the requirement for providing more accurate information on candidate projects. She asked if assistance would be given to smaller municipalities, to allow them to put forth competitive proposals. Mr. Bloom explained that staff will develop a standard form so that all sponsors will be on a level playing field. He noted that in the past, he supplied each Ranking Committee member with identical spreadsheets containing the required, regardless of how the request for a project came in.

Mr. Zilla responded to Mr. Lee's request for information in advance of a list of projects. He expressed doubt that staff could meet the letter of his request to put all of this information together before projects are solicited. He expressed optimism, however, that they could meet the intent of this request by pulling information together as the MPO goes through the process. This is to better time discussion of demographic and geographic information with discussion of projects. An example would be transit possibilities to outside areas, where some funding programs and philosophies may exist that would help in the decision-making.

Mr. Zilla also noted that FHWA and PennDOT Central Office are jointly crafting a new project development process that links the environmental process with transportation projects and programs. It will involve more up-front thought about community and environmental impacts and cost estimating. At the local and regional levels, there are three multi-municipal comprehensive plans in place that will help with transportation planning.

Mr. Klees asked that the project solicitation request sent out to municipalities include the LRTP goals and objectives as well as project ranking criteria. This will help sponsors choose projects to submit.

*Mr. Eich made a motion to form a new Project Ranking Committee, with eight representatives as presented and those seats should be filled with the four Technical Committee members who volunteered (Michel Barbin, Ray Hankinson, Bill MacMath and Paul Weener). Mr. Hall seconded the motion passed unanimously.*

Ms. Meek presented information on the Travel Demand Model and Socioeconomic Forecast Data, which will cover all of Centre County. Staff will update the socioeconomic data, including the type and timing of development projected to occur in the LRTP timeframe. To accomplish this, they will attend municipal meetings, update the data to a 2008 baseline, forecast the data to 2040, and input data into the database. A consultant will be hired to design the forecast database, and update and run the model. Staff has sent out a request for proposals (RFP) from consultants, and so far there is a great deal of interest in the project. A contract will be awarded in February, and design of the database will begin immediately thereafter.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 6

Ms. Goreham asked if there would be a comparative analysis between the results of the current and new model. She also asked how much was budgeted for this entire process. Ms. Meek explained that \$100,000 is budgeted for the project, which will include staff time, procurement of a new laptop to run the software, and consultant services. She noted that at this point, staff is not entirely certain what the consultants will be able to do with the money available, but comparisons may be negotiated into the process.

Mr. Luck asked if it would be possible to get different models based on different development scenarios, and Ms. Meek replied that it will. The RFP does not specify number of model runs, but rather asks each consulting firm to set a number that will be provided under the contract. In the past, there generally have been six or seven different runs.

Mr. Lee asked where the model runs fit into the overall LRTP process. Ms. Meek replied that they will be needed for the project ranking process.

### **7. 2009-2012 Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

#### **a. Amendments to Transit Element – November 2008**

Mr. Zilla explained that proposed amendments to the Transit Element were outlined in the agenda. He asked for any questions regarding these amendments.

*Mr. Luck made a motion to approve the proposed amendments to the Transit Element of the 2009-2012 Centre County TIP. Ms. Spencer seconded the motion.*

Mr. Lee asked where the local matching funds would come from. Mr. Mose explained that non-federal match typically comes from the state, although there is sometimes a small local component as well.

*The motion passed unanimously.*

#### **b. Amendments to the Highway Element – November 2008**

Mr. Zilla explained that proposed amendments to the Highway Element were outlined in the agenda. He asked for any questions regarding these amendments.

*Mr. Spsychalski made a motion to approve the proposed amendments to the Highway Element of the 2009-2012 Centre County TIP. Ms. Goreham seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

Mr. Zilla noted that the Procedures for TIP Modifications permit project sponsors to complete certain TIP administrative actions without formal approval by the CCMPO. These actions were attached to the agenda.

### **8. Pennsylvania Community Transportation Initiative (PCTI)**

Mr. Zilla explained that this program was unveiled at the Planning Partners meeting in October, and is moving forward as a collaborative effort between 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania and the Secretary of Transportation. The goal is to advance Smart Transportation projects. Mr. Zilla noted that \$60 million is being made available for this initiative from the spike fund allocation controlled by Secretary.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 7

Key elements of the program include the following:

- Projects must be encumbered or under agreement in Fiscal Year 2009 or 2010
- Federal and state guidelines, eligibility criteria, and regulations apply
- Applications must be submitted December 15
- Up to \$5 million can be awarded for a construction project
- Up to \$300,000 can be awarded for a planning project
- MPOs are eligible to submit applications

Mr. Zilla noted that staff from the MPO and District 2-0 has discussed potential projects, looking at the TIP and LRTP for projects that could both move quickly, and meet the intent of the program. Two such high priority projects are the Philipsburg Park and Ride Lots and the Whitehall Road/University Drive Extension (preliminary engineering phase). Other candidate projects include Route 45 Betterment (Old Fort), Route 550 Bishop Street Betterment, Centre Hall Sidewalk Rehab, Boalsburg Streetscape, and West Beaver Avenue/South Fraser Street Intersection. A full list of these projects was presented to the Technical Committee, who recommended that an application be submitted for planning funds for the Whitehall Road project. In addition, they recommended that staff evaluate and make a recommendation to the Coordinating Committee about the Route 45 and Route 550 Betterment projects.

Mr. Zilla explained that after evaluating the candidate projects with District 2-0, staff recommends the following:

- Submit an application for planning funds for Whitehall Road/University Drive Extension
- Submit an application for planning funds for Philipsburg Area Park and Ride Lots (feasibility study)

He noted that the Moshannon Valley Economic Development Partnership had emailed staff about the initiative, and also discussed the potential for park and ride lots in the Philipsburg area. He further noted that staff is not recommending the Route 45 and Route 550 Betterment projects for submission.

Mr. Zilla explained that, in addition to submitting applications on behalf of the MPO, staff will also review all other applications that are submitted by sponsors within Centre County. Decisions by PennDOT Central Office with respect to successful applicants are expected in early 2009. If the MPO's applications are approved, TIP amendments would be required in 2009. Mr. Zilla noted that this program is unique in that a project can be sponsored by just about any entity.

Mr. Shifflet noted that the \$5 million available for any PCTI construction project can also include pre-construction phases. However, the project would need to advance to construction by September 2010.

Mr. Klees asked the Coordinating Committee members if they felt the MPO should submit its own applications, recognizing that they may be putting themselves in competition with individual municipalities. Mr. Luck said that if there were a vast number of local municipalities, he would not want the MPO to submit separately. However, that is not the case, so the MPO would be ignoring a real opportunity if they did not submit applications.

Mr. Shifflet noted that the Central Office has been very consistent about urging individual callers consult with their regional planning office. PCTI funds come from both federal and state sources, so any funding received would have to come through the TIP process.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 8

*Mr. Spsychalski made a motion to authorize staff to submit initial PCTI applications to PennDOT for the Whitehall Road/University Park Extension project and Philipsburg Area Park and Ride lots. Mr. Lee seconded the motion.*

Mr. Eich asked how many municipalities have contacted staff about submitting applications. Mr. Zilla explained that staff has formal confirmation from Ferguson Township, as well as informal discussions with College Township. They have also talked to the County planning staff about several trail projects in the eastern part of the County, and had some discussion with stakeholders in the Moshannon Valley. State College Borough staff also provided some indication that they may be interested in applying.

Mr. Eich further asked if there would be a second round of PCTI funding. Mr. Zilla explained that his understanding was that there will be only one round.

Ms. Reese asked if the Moshannon Valley Economic Development Partnership would be working in cooperation with the MPO. Mr. Zilla replied that the two agencies would work together on the Park and Ride lot study. He noted that the idea was first developed when Ms. Michael conducted initial research into formalizing some of the informal lots in the area. Together, PennDOT District 2-0 and MPO staff decided that a feasibility study may be needed to evaluate various locations before finalizing a direction.

*Mr. Spsychalski's motion was voted upon and passed unanimously.*

Mr. Miller noted that Ferguson Township will be submitting an application. He asked if there was a process for having MPO staff review the application before it was submitted. Mr. Zilla explained that this was not required, but encouraged. Mr. Shifflet added that in such a case, when the application is submitted, it should be noted in the description that the municipality did review it in cooperation with the MPO.

### **9. Appalachian Highway Development Program Designation – I-80/PA 26 Local Access Interchange**

Mr. Zilla explained that the Commonwealth had requested the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) designate a portion of the Route 15 corridor between Harrisburg and I-80 as part of the Appalachian Highway Development (APD) system. This would occur by a transfer of APD mileage from the Clearfield County portion of Corridor O1.

Mr. Zilla noted that the I-99/I-80 Interchanges are the final step in completing I-99 in Centre County. The Local Access Interchange will provide circulation to local roads in the area, and is needed in order for a new High Speed Interchange to be constructed at the site of the current Exit 161 of I-80. The High Speed Interchange will be a closed interchange that provides for traffic circulation directly between I-99 and I-80.

The two interchanges have advanced through the design phase and are ready for construction; however, both interchanges were ultimately removed from the LRTP and 2009-2012 TIP because funding was not available for the construction phase. One possible source of funding for the Local Access Interchange is the ARC. I-99 in Blair and Centre Counties is designated as part of the APD system, including the High Speed Interchange. However, the Local Access Interchange is not designated as part of the APD system.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 9

Staff is recommending that the MPO consider authorizing correspondence to the Governor, Federal and State Legislators, and the ARC asking that the Local Access Interchange also be designated as part of the APD system. Placement on the APD system is not a guarantee of funding, but the goal is to increase options for constructing this interchange by making it eligible for an additional source of funding. APD funding comes with a requirement for a minimum 40% non-federal match, which would typically be state funds.

Mr. Zilla noted that during the development of the 2009-2012 TIP, MPO staff asked whether the Local Access Interchange could be designated as part of the APD system. The PennDOT Central Office subsequently requested the ARC designate the interchange as part of the system, but the ARC declined at that time to approve the designation.

Mr. Klees referred to the Commonwealth's request to designate a part of the Route 15 corridor, noting that it is proposed to occur by shifting mileage from a portion of the Corridor O1 in Clearfield County to Route 15. He asked why this shift had to take place, and what that means to the future viability Corridor O1. Mr. Shifflet explained that the ARD system was developed decades ago, and involves 13 different states, so adding new mileage to the system has always been a difficult undertaking. He stressed that he shift would not move money from corridor to another, but rather the eligibility for funding. Therefore Corridor O1 could still be a viable project at some future point. He suggested that the MPO also consider asking for a provision to toll credit the Local Access Interchange. That ability was eliminated as part of SAFETEA-LU, but would allow for the ability to use a percentage of those revenues to gain 100% federal share.

Mr. Eich noted that letter should include language that if money must be taken from Corridor O1, then the MPO would like to see it stay within Centre County.

*Mr. Eich made a motion to authorize the CCMPO Chair to send correspondence to Governor Rendell, members of Pennsylvania's U.S. Congressional delegation and the ARC requesting that the I-80/Route 26 Local Access Interchange be designated as part of the Appalachian Highway Development System. Mr. Hall seconded the motion.*

Mr. Klees suggested that MPO staff draft such correspondence, to be reviewed by the MPO members.

*Mr. Eich's motion was voted upon and approved, with PennDOT Central Office and District 2-0 staff abstaining.*

### **10. FY 2009-10 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (formerly Item 11)**

Mr. Zilla explained that the UPWP is adopted every year in February, and lists work tasks for staff and major policy actions by the MPO. Staff has been told not to expect any increase in funding for the 2009-10 UPWP. However, there is still an opportunity to request supplemental planning funds. Potential projects for supplemental funds include:

- Preparing a detailed inventory of municipal bridges for project identification and prioritization
- Continue efforts to coordinate land use and transportation plans
- Continue the update of socioeconomic and land use forecasts, as well as the travel demand model for the 2010 LRTP
- Update the 1998 Centre Area Public Transportation Plan (this would be a follow-up to the Assessment of Public Transportation Services in Centre County now underway)

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Page 10

Ms. Reese noted that a neighboring RPO was currently working on a bridge inventory, and asked if there was the opportunity to cooperate or share information. Mr. Bloom said that the MPO has previously been turned down for supplemental planning funds for this initiative because other areas were interested in conducting similar projects. PennDOT asked MPOs and RPOs to come together as a municipal bridge task force to discuss this undertaking, as well as methods for incorporating it into the larger planning process. These task force meetings are ongoing, and Lycoming County has piloted an inventory project. Mr. Bloom reasoned that some additional direction should be coming as a result that project.

Mr. Lee asked about supplemental funds candidate projects that were deferred from last year. Mr. Zilla replied that last year the bridge inventory and the Centre Area Public Transportation Plan update were candidate projects. He noted that last year, there was a one-time influx of additional planning funds, which was worked into land use/transportation coordination projects.

Mr. Lee further asked that the Planning Priorities letter be sent to Coordinating Committee members when it is received.

Mr. Klees explained that the LRTP is in the early stages of a major update, and there are already two supplemental planning funds projects in process. He asked if staff time was an issue in deciding whether new projects should be requested. Mr. Zilla replied that this was indeed a concern. He said that the land use/transportation coordination project has not moved along, because Halfmoon Township wanted to wait to see the effects of a full opening of I-99. He also noted that the CRPA is down one staff member. He said that if additional money is needed for the LRTP modeling project, supplemental funding could be used. The problem is that staff will not know if additional money is needed until later next year.

Mr. Klees referred to the opening of I-99 and the fact that staff wanted to do some assessment of traffic counts once the road had fully opened. He asked if supplemental planning funds could be requested for that project, and if the project could be completed in time to be beneficial to the LRTP process. Mr. Zilla reasoned that this initiative would be completed a little late to be beneficial to the LRTP process. Ms. Reese asked if PennDOT could conduct this assessment. Mr. Zilla replied that the PennDOT Central Office, RPOs and MPOs are key players in traffic counts, but CCMPO staff takes the lead.

Ms. Spencer referred to the upcoming gas well drilling that will occur in Centre and Clearfield Counties, noting that Halfmoon Township has already received several requests to drill. One of the biggest concerns with that is wear and tear on the local road network, and municipalities are not well prepared for that. She asked if there was anything the MPO could do to help better prepare them. Mr. Jacobs replied that Centre County is trying to coordinate these activities with northern municipalities and PennDOT. There is also potential legislation to increase road-bonding fees at the municipal level in an effort to offset some of those issues. Mr. Zilla committed to talk further with the County about what is involved and what the MPO might be able to do.

Mr. Zilla noted that staff would develop some candidate projects to present at the January meeting, including one dealing with the effects of gas drilling on local road networks, counts for I-99, and additional funding for the 2010 LRTP. Once a Planning Priorities letter is received, the MPO can discuss potential supplemental projects further.

**CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, November 25, 2008**

**Page 11**

**11. CCMPO/CATA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (Formerly Item 4)**

Mr. Kausch reported that every three years the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) pays an on-site visit to CATA to assess compliance with federal regulations, laws and policies. There are typically no issues, but one deficiency noted in the most recent visit was that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between CATA and the CCMPO was out of date. The MOU defines responsibility between agencies for various elements of the MPO process. This is done from an overall system standpoint, from a project-specific standpoint, and for environmental review issues.

Mr. Kausch noted that everything covered in the document is already worked on cooperatively between CATA and the CCMPO. The Technical Committee and the CATA Board of Directors recommend adoption of the MOU. He explained that the language is taken directly from MOUs in other areas of the state and is acceptable to FTA.

*Ms. Spencer made a motion to approve the MOU between the CCMPO and CATA for transportation planning responsibilities. Mr. Buckalew seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

**11.a. 2008-2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Amendment (Item added)**

Ms. Meek noted that PennDOT Central Office has approached MPO staff to partner in hosting the 2009 Planning Partners Conference. Normally such an activity would be included in the Work Program that will be adopted in February. However, staff will need to make hotel arrangements in late December or early January, and this would fall under the scope of the current UPWP. PennDOT has agreed to amend the existing UPWP to provide the necessary funding to move forward with the conference planning.

*Mr. Spsychalski made a motion to approve the amendment to the 2008-09 UPWP to include the funds for the Planning Partners Conference. Mr. Hall seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

**12. 2009 Meeting Schedule**

Mr. Zilla noted that the 2009 proposed meeting schedule was included in the agenda.

*Mr. Buckalew made a motion to approve the 2009 meeting schedule. Ms. Spencer seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

**13. Announcements**

Mr. Klees reviewed the schedule of upcoming meetings.

**14. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Shingler  
Recording Secretary