

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

**Wednesday, January 10, 2007  
9:30 a.m.  
Patton Township Municipal Building**

**Minutes**

**Voting Members**

Kent Baker	College Township
Dave Modricker	Ferguson Township
Brent Brubaker	Patton Township
Bill MacMath	Spring Township
Amy Story	State College Borough
Bob Crum	Centre Regional Planning Commission
Bob Jacobs	Centre County Planning & Community Development Office (CCPCDO)
Chris Price	CCPCDO
Karen Michael	PennDOT District 2-0
Harold Nanovic	PennDOT Central Office
Hugh Mose	CATA
Michele Barbin	Mountaintop Planning Region
Doug Weikel	Benner Township
John Knowles	Moshannon Valley Planning Region
Ray Hankinson	Penns Valley Planning Region

**Non-Voting Members**

Teresa Davis	Penn State University
Matt Smoker	FHWA

**Others Present:**

Tom Zilla	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Trish Meek	CRPA
Lori Shingler	CRPA
Greg Kausch	CRPA/CATA
Mike Bloom	Centre County Planning & Community Development Office (CCPCDO)
Vickie Rusnak	PennDOT District 2-0
Amy Farkis	Harris Township Manager
Don Franson	Harris Township Engineer
Mike Joseph	Centre Daily Times
Gary Sinderson	Channel 10 News

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Baker called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

*Mr. MacMath made a motion to approve the November 1, 2006 meeting minutes. Ms. Story seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.*

**3. Citizens' Comments**

There were no comments for items not on the agenda.

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

Ms. Meek reviewed that in 2005 there was a change in policy regarding the TE/HTS/SR2S program. MPOs are no longer permitted to carry over unobligated funds into the next TIP year. Therefore, staff felt it was very important to use the unobligated funds. She noted that TE funds are fiscally constrained by TIP year.

Currently on the TIP, there is \$25,825 for the Military Museum Access Bridge project. No federal funds were expended on this project. The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, who operates the museum, has very limited resources and is unable to perform the design of the project at this time. These funds need to be expended in fiscal year 2007 or they will lapse and the MPO will lose them. The Military Museum is canceling their project and encouraging the MPO to consider transferring the TE funds to the South Atherton Street Path project, which will provide benefit to the museum property.

Reviewing the South Atherton Street Path project, Ms. Meek said that they have requested additional funds. Currently, the PennDOT cost estimate for this project is \$215,293. The TIP contains federal funding in the amount of \$128,225. She said that Harris Township has committed additional funding in the amount of \$20,068, so the amount of additional money that they are requesting is \$67,000. Ms. Meek reviewed details of how the money would be transferred from the Historic Site Access Bridge and the TE line item in 2007 and 2008.

Ms. Meek reviewed the MPO policy for approval of TE project cost increases. She noted that the TE Review Committee met prior to this meeting and recommended that the increase be granted to Harris Township.

Mr. Baker asked about the fiscal years 2007 and 2008 and when the bid letting would occur. Ms. Meek said that the current let date is in 2007, but PennDOT Central Office has committed to moving whatever projects are ready to move in 2007 and 2008.

Mr. Don Franson, Harris Township Engineer, gave an overview of the South Atherton Street Path. He said that it starts at the College Township line and ends at Warner Boulevard, traveling along South Atherton Street. The existing path is deteriorated and the water inlets are located in the middle of the path. In 2004, emergency repairs had to be made to the underground pipes and other deficiencies still remain. The application for TE funds was granted in 2005 and Harris Township awarded the contract to Keller Engineers. They proceeded through design and to this date, \$25,014 has been expended. He noted that with the approval of additional funds, construction can begin in September and be completed in October.

Mr. Modricker made a motion to recommend to the Coordinating Committee approval of additional funding for the South Atherton Street Path project and transfer of funds from the cancelled Military Museum Access Bridge project to the South Atherton Street Path. Mr. Jacobs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Zilla reported that the County Commissioners have requested that the MPO to consider asking for additional supplemental planning funds for the current UPWP in order to accomplish an assessment of options for better integrating some of the transportation services provided within Centre County. There are two primary providers: CATA and the County Office of Transportation.

Mr. Zilla reviewed that the MPO already has supplemental planning funds in the current UPWP for the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Human Services Transportation Plan, which is a related project. This is necessary in order for any of the public transit entities to be eligible for specific sources of federal funds.

The assessment would look at options for coordinating public transportation services throughout the County. Mr. Zilla said this idea was brought up a couple of years ago as part of CATA's Strategic Plan. The study will address a full range of issues. He said that the foundation data for this assessment is going to be done anyway through the Human Services Transportation Plan. Staff feels that doing this as a "part two" of the current effort makes the most sense. One consultant could be then be used for the entire package of studies. The Human Services Transportation Plan is being done with a combination of staff and consultant services and it is envisioned that part two could be done the same way. Mr. Zilla listed some of the work tasks that would be included.

If the MPO decides to request additional funds, the current UPWP would have to be formally amended by the Coordinating Committee. A formal request would have to be made to PennDOT, although staff has asked Mr. Nanovic to provide some preliminary thoughts about whether this would be received favorably. If PennDOT would approve the funding, a contract supplement would have to occur between PennDOT and the CRPC, the contracting entity.

Mr. Nanovic relayed that PennDOT thinks this is a good project and meets the requirements for a supplemental planning process. He said that this request has been discussed and is before Larry King now to see if he will approve this. Mr. Nanovic felt that this should be rushed so that Phase One and Phase Two can be done together.

Mr. Mose noted that the CATA Board is very much in favor of doing this study. He said that there are a lot of fundamental financial and institutional issues that have to be addressed, and the CATA Board is very interested in having an evaluation of all the things that would be required to bring the two transportation entities closer together.

Mr. Modricker made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee amend the 2006-07 UPWP to describe work tasks to complete an assessment of options for better integrating the public transportation services in the County, contingent upon approval of supplemental planning funds. Ms. Story seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

**6. FY 2007-08 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Zilla reviewed that the 2007-08 UPWP would be effective from July 1, 2007 until June 30, 2008. The Work Program lists work tasks for MPO staff and important actions that the MPO will take during that year. It must be adopted and submitted by February 28.

Mr. Zilla said that the biggest issue that staff needs a recommendation on is the supplemental planning funds. Last year there were five candidate projects, with the JARC Human Services Transportation Plan being chosen as the project for which to request funds. This year, there are two

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, January 10, 2007

Page 4

potential projects: updating the travel demand model and coordinating land use and transportation planning.

Task VII.A. in the draft UPWP is updating the travel demand model. Mr. Zilla said that this would be done with a combination of consultant and staff tasks. It would refine the traffic analysis zones, roadway and transit networks. This project would also include upgrading the software and input data so that it could be used for air quality conformity. Reviewing specific tasks, Mr. Zilla said that a large part of this would be updating the socioeconomic data, including a new parcel database for land use forecasts. Ms. Meek did this a couple of years ago on a parcel-by-parcel basis in preparation for the LRTP. This information is also used for other land use planning by both the regional and county planning offices.

Task VII.B. is coordinating land use and transportation planning. This would also involve a combination of staff and consultant work. There are several areas that have become "hot spots" for comprehensive land use planning activity:

- I-99/Route 550 Interchange area (Bellefonte/Spring Townships)
- Route 64/Walker Township area
- Halfmoon/Patton Area Plan
- State College Area Plan
- Developments of Regional Impact

Mr. Modricker asked how well staff has used the travel demand model in the past for the Long Range Plan or new developments. Mr. Zilla said that it has primarily been used to develop background information for the LRTP. He said that these regional models are not good for site development review. He added that the hope is that it can be used for air quality conformity analysis at some point. In addition, if the Corridor O1 and SCCCTS projects come back in the future, this model could be used for those.

Mr. Hankinson asked if this was an actual package that would be bought. Mr. Zilla said that it was the latest generation of traffic simulations. He said that the forecasting part of it was developed by staff. Ms. Meek noted that commercial areas especially are much different in some areas than what staff forecasted. She thought that updating that information every three to five years would save a lot of effort in the long run.

Mr. Baker referred to the estimate of \$150,000 and asked how much of that would be consultant services versus staff services. Mr. Zilla said that they had estimated \$100,000 for updating the model. He felt that approximately 75-80 percent of that would be for the consultant and purchase of software. For coordinating land use and transportation planning, probably 50 percent of the \$50,000 would be for consultant services.

Mr. Baker asked if the staff costs could be picked up by other parts of the budget if supplemental funding was not approved. Mr. Zilla noted that probably only one of the supplemental projects would be approved. He said that staff time is limited, so he would probably recommend only choosing one of these. In addition, they do require local matches. Supplemental is over and above the base work program and what is budgeted for staff overall. If the MPO does not get one of these approved, it does not hurt the budget. However, if more money is realized, it reduces the local funds that are needed to support the MPO staff.

Mr. Modricker asked how often the travel model would be updated. He said that the land use/transportation coordination looked to be more of an annual update. Mr. Zilla said that he would like to have a significant update to the model every five years. He said that he has also questioned

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, January 10, 2007

Page 5

how to sustain the work in the second project and has lobbied at the state level for more money in the base Work Program for tasks like this, but that has not been successful. Mr. Modricker said that from a technical perspective, he thought that updating the traffic demand model was the priority. This project would also require less staff time.

Mr. Nanovic noted that if the MPO wanted the coordination of land use and transportation planning to be a continuing process, he recommended that it be put in phases. This would give it more of a chance of being approved every year for supplemental funding.

Mr. MacMath noted that staff does not have time for actual planning any longer and the land use/transportation coordination involved more of that. He felt that this was just as important as updating the model.

Mr. Hankinson asked if some of the data needed is available in the GIS system. Ms. Meek said that it was a cooperative effort between the County and the Centre Region planning offices. The baseline data was the 2000 census, which was easily incorporated into GIS. But the forecasting data was not readily available. Mr. Zilla said that putting this data into Access would make it easier to manipulate. He added that one of the bigger changes that have occurred since staff went through this process is that there are two more areas in the county that have multi-municipal comprehensive plans. There will be a lot more coordination involved in the future. Mr. Hankinson thought that this data was a priority.

Mr. Zilla said that a bigger policy question that the MPO Review Committee is looking at and the Coordinating Committee will have to consider is what they want the MPO to be doing in future years. Currently, staff is not doing a lot of planning.

Mr. Zilla highlighted some of the key elements of the Work Program:

- Prepare new 2009-2012 TIP
- Participate in TIP projects
- Complete CMAQ process
- Implement changes from MPO performance review
- Participate in statewide work group studying “smart transportation” and “right-sizing”
- Collect additional traffic data before and after I-99 opens

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

Ms. Meek reviewed that two types of updates will be made in 2007: SAFETEA-LU compliance items and consideration of additional air-quality exempt projects which fall into the categories of bike/pedestrian and bridge.

One item that needs to be done to fulfill some of the SAFETEA-LU requirements is a consultation with the resource agencies. Staff has scheduled their presentation with the Agency Coordination Meetings (ACM), where all the resource agencies are present. This will be done on May 23, 2007. In addition, a new public participation plan is required, which outlines what will be done with the transportation program. There will be new elements that will be presented in February.

Related to the consideration of new projects, Ms. Meek said that a letter was sent out asking municipalities to comment on their support for the projects in their areas. There are 24 bike/ped projects and 9 bridge projects. She said that these projects were received during the 30-day public comment period for the LRTP and the MPO committed to ranking those projects as part of this update.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, January 10, 2007

Page 6

Mr. Modricker asked if municipalities should anticipate being asked to contribute local money. Ms. Meek said this was not necessarily true. Staff is asking for basic support of the project. If a municipality does want to contribute financially, that project would get more points in the ranking process. Mr. Modricker asked who would sponsor some of the projects. Ms. Meek said that some projects never move forward. This is just a way to get a project in the queue and make federal dollars a possibility.

Mr. Modricker asked what other members were doing with the bike/ped projects in their municipalities. Ms. Meek said that State College Borough put their projects in priority order and indicated those for which financial support would be available.

Mr. Baker said that some of the projects that were presented were obvious and some were more conceptual or not possible. Ms. Meek said that it is beneficial to have some of the projects on the LRTP because it helps support the project in grant applications.

Mr. Modricker asked if a project would show up on the LRTP if it did not have municipal support. Ms. Meek said that the Coordinating Committee would have to make a policy decision on that question.

Ms. Meek reviewed the schedule for the LRTP update. One change is that the public comment period will be advertised in March because the Public Participation Plan requires a 45-day comment period.

### **8. Announcements**

Mr. Baker reviewed future meeting dates.

### **9. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Z. Shingler  
Recording Secretary