

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

**Tuesday, April 29, 2008  
6:00 pm  
Patton Township Municipal Building**

**Minutes**

**Voting Members Present:**

Elliot Abrams (for Jeff Luck)	Patton Township
Ron Buckalew	Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC)
Bob Corman	Penns Valley Planning Region
Jon Eich	Centre County
John Elnitski	Benner Township
Ken Hall	Mountaintop Planning Region
Bob Jacobs (for Rich Rogers)	Centre County
Dan Klees, Chair	College Township
Chris Lee	Harris Township
Karen Michael (for Kevin Kline)	PennDOT District 2-0 Office
Steve Miller	Ferguson Township
Jim Rosenberger (for Elizabeth Goreham)	State College Borough
Mike Savage	Moshannon Valley Planning Region
Larry Shifflet (for Tom TenEyck)	PennDOT Central Office
John Sychalski	Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA)

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

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

**Others Present:**

Tom Zilla	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Trish Meek	CRPA
Lori Shingler	CRPA – Recording Secretary
Mike Bloom	Centre County Planning & Community Development Office
Michelle Barbin	CCMPO Technical Committee - Mountaintop Region
Harold Nanovic	PennDOT Central Office
Hugh Mose	CATA
Mike Joseph	Centre Daily Times

**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. Sychalski made a motion to approve the March 25, 2008 Coordinating Committee minutes, with minor editorial revisions. Mr. Corman seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 29, 2008

Page 2

### 3. Citizens' Comments

There were no citizen comments.

### 4A. 2007–2010 Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (*added to the agenda*)

Mr. Zilla explained that PennDOT District 2-0 requested that the 2007-2012 TIP be amended to include the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase of two bridge projects that are structurally deficient (SD):

- SR 4002 Section A03 North Fork Beech Creek Bridge in Show Shoe Township (\$250,000)
- SR 1005 Section A01 Nittany Creek box culvert in Marion Township (\$141,000)

The Construction phases of the projects are included on the Draft 2009-2012 TIP.

Mr. Zilla noted that \$161,000 in additional state funding is being provided by the PennDOT Central Office. The additional state funding is for fiscal year 2008, and must be encumbered by June 30. In addition, although the PE phase for the Miles Township T-523 Bridge is underway, the Final Design, Utility and Right-of-Way phases included on the TIP in 2008 will not be ready to advance. Thus, District 2-0 has asked to shift \$230,000 from these phases to the other two bridges. The phases are fully funded on the Draft 2009-2012 TIP.

*Mr. Spychalski made a motion to approve the amendments to the 2007-2010 Centre County TIP. Mr. Eich seconded the motion.*

Mr. Smoker stated that because the CCMPO's current TIP has not yet been approved for meeting federal Year of Expenditure (YOE) requirements, FHWA and the Federal Transit Administration will not approve any amendments to the current TIP. He recommended that the YOE documentation for the 2007-2010 TIP be sent to PennDOT Central Office as soon as possible. Mr. Zilla noted that the CCMPO approved amendments to the TIP in November 2007 to meet the YOE requirements, and stated that the documentation would be provided immediately.

*The motion was amended to make the approval contingent upon FHWA/FTA approval of the YOE requirements. The motion passed unanimously.*

### 4. Final Draft 2009-2012 Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Zilla noted that the CCMPO approved the submission of a Preliminary Draft 2009-2012 TIP to the PennDOT Central Office in January 2008. In February 2008, Governor Ed Rendell announced a new state bridge initiative, which required revisions to the Preliminary Draft TIP to incorporate additional bridge projects.

Mr. Zilla began his presentation by reviewing revisions to the Transit Element of the Preliminary Draft TIP, which reflect costs and schedules for vehicle rebuilds and replacements consistent with CATA's most recent capital plan. In addition, costs were adjusted for YOE requirements, operating assistance funding was revised to include new state Act 44 funding, and one bus purchase project was removed because it is completed.

Mr. Zilla then reviewed the bridge program, noting that 39 bridges and box culverts are included on the revised Preliminary Draft TIP. Thirty-seven of the bridge projects are structurally deficient (SD) bridges, and the other two are bridge preventative maintenance projects. Mr. Zilla explained that PennDOT District 2-0's annual target is to complete four bridges, with at least three of those being SD. The revised TIP reflects an average of five or more SD bridges being completed each year.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 29, 2008

Page 3

Mr. Zilla added that all of the costs and schedules of the bridge projects have been updated, and YOE requirements addressed. He noted that a few state bridges have been added to the TIP, and that the Technical Committee recommended adding the College Township T-365 Trout Road Bridge over Spring Creek to the TIP. Mr. Zilla reported that the PennDOT Central Office also awarded discretionary spike funds totaling \$2,297,000 for two bridge projects. Funds may be shifted from those two bridges into other projects, according to the following staff recommendation:

- Shift \$784,000 from SR 1001 Sec A01 in FFY 2009 to State SD Bridge Line Item
- Shift \$515,550 from SR 1001 Sec A01 in FFY 2010 to State SD Bridge Line Item
- Shift \$412,367 from SR 1001 Sec A01 in FFY 2011 to Local SD Bridge Line Item
- Shift \$585,000 from SR 3006 Sec A03 in FFY 2012 to State SD Bridge Line Item

Mr. Zilla said that PennDOT and MPO staff discussed adding at least one local (municipal) bridge to the TIP. Following the discussions, staff decided to recommend that a line item be created for local bridges in year 2011. The line item could be used for the College Township bridge, as well as other local bridges that may be proposed for improvements. He noted that two other municipalities had requested funding for local bridges.

Mr. Zilla stated that the SR 1001 bridge that awarded discretionary funding was shown on the Preliminary Draft TIP with federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, which are eligible to be used on both highways and bridges. Staff requested the PennDOT Central Office to consider shifting the STP funds to a highway project, however, the Central Office responded that the Commonwealth's goal is to program as much funding as possible for SD bridges, but that shifts of STP funds to highway projects could be negotiated in the future.

Mr. Zilla then displayed a map of the highway projects on the TIP, which have not changed substantially since submission of the Preliminary Draft. Mr. Zilla said that minor revisions were made to costs and phases, and the Pavement Restoration line item has been reduced because state Act 44 funds were shifted to SD bridges in response to the Governor's bridge initiative. The West Beaver Avenue/South Fraser Street intersection realignment will be included on the TIP with 100% local funds to ensure that it is eligible to receive federal earmarked funds in the future. The TIP does not include funding for the I-80/Route 26 Section A18 Local Access Interchange.

The adoption and submission of the TIP is now proposed to occur in July, following completion of an Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the required public comment period. Mr. Zilla suggested that the June MPO meetings be cancelled and meetings be scheduled in July to adopt the TIP.

*Mr. Lee made a motion to approve the Final Draft 2009-2012 TIP for an air quality conformity analysis and to be advertised for public comment. The TIP should include the correspondence from Harris Township about the SR 2004 Cedar Run Box Culvert and staff's recommendations about reallocating funds from the bridges that received spike funding. Mr. Eich seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

*Mr. Buckalew made a motion to cancel the June 24, 2008 Coordinating Committee meeting, and to schedule a special meeting on Wednesday, July 16, 2008 to consider adoption of the TIP and Long Range Transportation Plan 2008 Update. Mr. Corman seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 29, 2008

Page 4

### 5. Centre County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2008 Update

Ms. Meek explained that the 2008 LRTP update is being completed to:

- Add Act 44 projects
- Adjust for YOE requirements
- Remove projects to maintain fiscal constraint
- Add line items
- Update project cost estimates

Ms. Meek reviewed the federal YOE regulations, and the various funding streams that support the LRTP. She noted that for the state Act 44 funds, 20% was allocated for highways and 80% for bridges.

Mr. Elnitski asked if the guidance for cost escalation to address YOE requirements was accurate given increasing gas prices. Ms. Meek replied that the 4% cost escalation per year reflects the guidance from FHWA. A higher factor can be use, but documentation must be provided to show that it is reasonable. Mr. Elnitski commented that 4% was not realistic. Mr. Smoker stated that the 4% factor was provided by the FHWA Headquarters Office, but the CCMPO could use higher factors based on local circumstances. He added that the MPO could use a higher factor during the next major update of the LRTP.

Mr. Klees said that the funding levels are out of the CCMPO's control. He noted that there is a prioritized list of projects, but just because funding is not sufficient, that does not invalidate the priority list. Mr. Lee agreed that funding levels are not within the MPO's control, but programming the funds to specific projects is within its control. Mr. Elnitski commented that fuel tax revenue may decrease because people are not using as much gas. The CCMPO also needs to think more realistically about what projects are actually possible.

Ms. Meek noted that local funding illustrated in the fiscal analysis included funding for the West Beaver Ave./South Fraser St. intersection, and local funding for municipal bridges which require a non-federal match.

Ms. Meek continued to review other revenue sources identified in the LRTP fiscal analysis. Almost \$2.3 million in spike funding was included in the 2009-2010 period. Beginning in 2011-2014, staff assumed that \$1 million in spike funds would be provided every four years, which is a conservative estimate. Ms. Meek noted that there is almost \$7 million in federal SXF (earmarked) funds for projects specifically identified by federal legislation. There is also \$55 million in Appalachian Highway Development Program (APD) funds included for the I-99/I-80 high speed interchange, and Interstate Maintenance funding for future maintenance on I-99.

Ms. Meek explained that projects completed since 2006 have been removed from the LRTP. New projects are highlighted on the project lists. Line items are considered to be new projects. The project lists illustrate the proposed new funding period for the projects, and the funding period on the existing LRTP. All project costs have been adjusted for YOE requirements.

Mr. Bloom then reviewed the Highway and ITS project list, noting that line items were added in each period for Pavement Restoration, Safety, CMAQ, and Interstate Maintenance, starting in 2011-2014. Three projects were also added:

- Pleasant Gap Betterment – this project was previously proposed, but was delayed until the hauling of lime material to the I-99 acid rock drainage mitigation site is completed.
- Benner Pike Improvements – this project is complete, but the earmarked funding for the project must be accounted for in the LRTP Update.
- W. Beaver Ave./S. Fraser St. Intersection Improvements – this project is funded with 100% local funds.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 29, 2008

Page 5

Mr. Bloom noted that the I-99/I-80 High-Speed Interchange and I-80/Route 26 Local Access Interchange projects were moved to the category of "Projects for Future Consideration".

Mr. Savage referred to the Route 350 long term improvements project, noting that this project would provide a truck climbing lane and straighten out the "S" curves. While acknowledging the Technical Committee's comments about the \$80 million estimated cost of the project, Mr. Savage emphasized that it is a high priority for the Moshannon Valley and Philipsburg area.

Mr. Savage noted that the PE phase for this project is being shifted from the 2011-2014 time period to the 2015-2018 time period, but stated that he wanted to work closely with staff and the CCMPO during the next major update to advance the PE phase back to the 2011-2014 time period.

Mr. Bloom reviewed the bridge projects list, which had significant changes. He noted that additional Act 44 revenues were accounted for when adding several SD state bridges. Line items were also included:

- SD Bridges 2009-2010 and 2011-2014
- Bridge preservation/maintenance
- Bridge maintenance box culvert
- Local bridge (starting in 2011-2014)

Project costs were adjusted based on new estimates from PennDOT, but no bridge projects were removed. Staff proposed one additional local bridge (College Township T-365 Trout Road Bridge). Mr. Bloom added that the statewide task force for local bridge inventories met earlier today to establish the framework for this project, which is crucial to identifying local bridge priorities.

Ms. Meek clarified that the changes proposed by staff for the bridge projects on the 2009-2012 TIP have not been made yet, but will be made before the public comment period begins. The changes will account for the influx of discretionary funding for the two bridges on the 2009-2012 TIP.

Mr. Bloom reported that all completed Transportation Enhancements (TE) projects were removed from the TE project list, which leaves only two approved projects (Centre Hall Streetscape and Boalsburg Streetscape). Line items were included for TE funding in the future, along with a list of projects that have been requested in the past. Mr. Bloom noted that TE projects need a local sponsor to advance, and those determinations have not been made, so the projects cannot be shown in specific years. Ms. Meek added that the CCMPO has a specific process for selecting TE projects.

Mr. Lee asked if there would be line items when the LRTP is updated in the future, and how the line items related to the project ranking process. Ms. Meek said that staff feels there needs to be some line items to provide for cost increases on projects. Mr. Zilla noted that the CCMPO is one of the few MPOs that assigned specific projects on the LRTP. Members will have an opportunity to establish policy about how to address line items during the next major LRTP update.

Mr. Shifflet applauded the CCMPO's efforts to show specific projects on the LRTP. He said PennDOT would look for MPOs to implement very similar procedures statewide, including listing projects on their LRTPs.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 29, 2008

Page 6

Mr. Bloom reviewed the federal, state and local sources of transit funding and the assumptions for each revenue source:

- Federal 5307 (formula) – 2.67% increase/year over life of Plan
- Federal 5309 (discretionary) – average of \$1 million per four-year period
- Federal JARC/New Freedom – 2.67% increase/year over life of Plan
- State Capital Improvement Program (formula) – initial allocation, then a 2.5% increase
- State Asset Improvement Program (discretionary) – estimated \$1.4 million per four-year period
- State Operating Assistance Program (formula) – 20% increase for the first two years, 3% thereafter
- Local Operating Share – CATA is requesting no increase this year, consistent increases thereafter
- Local Capital Share – assumed current level of funding will remain flat over time

Mr. Bloom reported that completed projects were removed from the transit projects list, and the list was updated to reflect the most current status of the projects and CATA's five-year major capital plan, which provided updated cost estimates. Mr. Bloom explained that the vehicle replacement projects were based on estimated useful life, and that one round of rehabilitation was assumed before new purchases were listed. Mr. Bloom also noted that fiscal constraint limits required the Intermodal Transportation Center project to be phased, which addressed concerns expressed by the Technical Committee.

Mr. Spychalski noted that the CATA Board reviewed the list of transit projects and gave its unanimous consent.

Mr. Bloom reviewed the schedule for the LRTP 2008 Update, which is concurrent with the 2009-2012 TIP development process. The LRTP and TIP will be advertised for public comment in late May, with a public meeting tentatively set for June 24. In July, the MPO should adopt the TIP and LRTP Update.

*Mr. Spychalski made a motion to approve the Final Draft LRTP 2008 Update for an air quality conformity analysis and to be advertised for public comment. Mr. Buckalew seconded the motion.*

Mr. Shifflet referred to the 4% YOY inflation factor, noting that over a 25-30 year time period, it is probably reasonable. However, for the current four year period, it is probably not as reasonable. He noted that the rapid cost increases have declined a bit recently. He commented that using any inflation factor was a step forward, since escalation factors have not been used in the past.

Mr. Smoker commented that the LRTP project spreadsheets were well done, and will be recommending that other MPOs use the same format.

*The above motion was approved unanimously.*

### **6. Draft Bylaws for the CCMPO**

Mr. Klees explained that over the past two years, the Performance Review Committee met numerous times. The Committee focused on possible changes to membership and related financial aspects, but struggled to reach a consensus on those issues and decided to refocus their attention to establishing bylaws for the CCMPO membership structure as it currently exists. For the most part, proposed changes to how the CCMPO operates are minor, but the bylaws would institutionalize what the MPO has been doing informally. He suggested that the Coordinating Committee review the draft bylaws during the next two meetings.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 29, 2008

Page 7

Mr. Abrams suggested that the new bylaws be in effect for a year, and then be reviewed to see how they are working. Mr. Klees noted that if bylaws are adopted for the current structure, the Review Committee assumed that they would be in place until there is a change in the structure.

Mr. Klees went through the bylaws to solicit input.

In Section III - Purpose, Mr. Rosenberger noted the reference to federal earmarked funds, and asked if this was an official category of funds. Mr. Klees answered that it is a specific category under current law.

Mr. Lee referred to the first bullet point where it says "...making decisions about the allocation of federal and state funds...", and recommended that the wording be changed to "Decide the allocation of federal and state funds...".

Section IV addresses the appointment of MPO representatives, and Mr. Klees noted that the Review Committee recognized that there are several levels of appointments, but decided to recommend that representatives be elected members of the governing body of the County or municipality. The Committee struggled with establishing a date for appointments, and decided on January 21 in the years when an appointment is required.

Mr. Klees referred to item D - Representative's Length of Appointment. He noted that appointments being for a minimum of two years was new, but because of the cyclical nature of the TIP and LRTP updates and the length of time to get through the necessary steps, it would be beneficial to have members there through the entire process.

Mr. Klees said that item F - Representative's Responsibilities, was something that the Committee could not come to consensus on. He said that based on the variety of the members of the CCMPO, it is hard to be clear about who a member is to represent. The bylaws state that representatives are expected to support the views and policy positions of the specific entity that they represent.

Mr. Buckalew said this was a philosophical question of how much an individual's judgment is trusted. Members are not always going to be able to go back to their respective boards and ask what position they should take.

Mr. Elnitski said the Review Committee was trying to provide information using the bylaws that would help new representatives to understand their responsibilities.

Mr. Abrams said that the representatives should be supporting the policy decisions of the entity that appointed them.

Mr. Lee did not think that it was the CCMPO's responsibility to define how a representative was supposed to represent their entity. He thought this responsibility rested with the entity that appoints them.

Mr. Miller asked how a member would know a policy position when items come up that have not been discussed by the appointing entity. Mr. Klees said that this is a matter of trust, but noted that some members may have different viewpoints than the entity they are representing. He stated that this was a challenging issue, and that the language included in the bylaws was intended to emphasize that there is a level of responsibility to being appointed.

Mr. Abrams suggested adding in the words "to the extent possible."

Mr. Rosenberger said the point was well taken that members represent a particular entity. He thought that if the words "views and policy positions" were changed to "interests," that would give a little more flexibility.

## CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 29, 2008

Page 8

Mr. Corman said that many of the members represent more than one municipality. It is important for that individual to understand the importance of their decisions to the areas that they represent.

Mr. Elnitski noted that the practice has been to send elected officials as representatives, but the bylaws are opening the door for non-elected appointments. Elected officials on a board are more used to what they are supposed to be doing than a representative from the public. He felt that the bylaws would help representatives to understand their role. Ms. Barbin commented that she understood why elected officials would be preferable, and noted that this is the intent of the federal legislation governing MPOs, but it is sometimes unrealistic in rural areas. She did not have any problems with the language in the draft bylaws.

Mr. Klees took an informal count of those in favor of keeping the wording as specified in the draft bylaws. Twelve members were in favor of keeping the wording as presented and three were in favor of not including the paragraph related to representative's responsibilities.

Related to the next sections, Mr. Buckalew felt it was redundant to have "Absence of Chair and Vice-Chair" listed under Section V and Section VI. Mr. Zilla clarified that Section V referred to actions at regular meetings and the paragraph in Section VI. referred to special meetings.

Mr. Buckalew said that in Section VI - Regular Meetings, it was noted that meetings were open to the public. He suggested including the same note for Special Meetings. He also felt that under Order of Business, Election of Officers should be followed with "first meeting of the year" in parenthesis to show that this agenda item does not occur at every meeting.

Mr. Klees noted that the Technical Committee has already reviewed the bylaws and this draft incorporates their comments.

*Mr. Elnitski made a motion to table further discussion on the draft bylaws until a future meeting. Mr. Lee seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

### 7. Other Business

Mr. Klees reported that presidential candidates John McCain and Hillary Clinton have indicated their support for a federal gas tax "holiday" this summer, and questioned if the MPO should take a position on that issue.

Mr. Spsychalski commented that any cost savings from a gas tax holiday would be offset in the future. He noted that MPOs are having trouble now with the lack of funding for projects, and stated that he was in favor of the CCMPO expressing its opposition to the gas tax holiday. Mr. Lee agreed, saying that the way to develop the economy is to invest in infrastructure.

Mr. Abrams felt that the wording in any correspondence opposing the gas tax holiday should support transportation funding, particularly for bridges. Mr. Rosenberger said that the gas tax was the closest thing to a user tax, and should be supported. Mr. Halderman thought that letters to the federal legislators were effective because the number one thing they listen to is letters from constituents.

*Mr. Corman made a motion to send correspondence U.S. Representative John Peterson and Pennsylvania's U.S. Senators expressing the CCMPO's opposition to a gas tax holiday. Mr. Miller seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

**CCMPO COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, April 29, 2008**

**Page 9**

Mr. Elnitski said that he would like to gain a better understand of the state and federal funding sources, and suggested that staff provide a presentation for anyone interested in attending. Mr. Klees noted that staff has discussed doing this as part of a new member workshop, and that it may also be possible to work this into the next major update of the LRTP. Mr. Lee agreed that it was the members' responsibility to understand the funding streams in order to make policy decisions.

Mr. Klees noted that Harold Nanovic would be retiring from the PennDOT Central Office in June, and thanked Harold for his hard work on behalf of the CCMPO.

**8. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Shingler  
Recording Secretary