

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

**Wednesday, November 14, 2007  
9:30 a.m.  
College Township Municipal Building**

**Minutes**

**Voting Members**

Bill MacMath	Spring Township
Chris Price	CCPCDO
Michele Barbin	Mountaintop Planning Region
Vickie Rusnak (for Karen Michael)	PennDOT District 2-0
Kent Baker, Chair	College Township
Dave Modricker	Ferguson Township
Brent Brubaker	Patton Township
Ray Hankinson	Penns Valley Planning Region
Amy Story	State College Borough
Paul Weener	Harris Township

**Non-Voting Members**

Teresa Davis	Penn State University
Sue Hannegan	Bellefonte Borough

**Others Present:**

Tom Zilla	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Trish Meek	CRPA
Greg Kausch	CRPA
Lori Shingler	CRPA
Mike Bloom	CCPCDO
Matt Smoker	FHWA
Emily Gette-Doyle	Moshannon Valley Economic Development Partnership
Bert Kisner	Citizen
Amy Farkas	Harris Township
Don Franson	Harris Township

**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 September 12, 2007 minutes, seconded by Amy Story.  
The motion carried unanimously.*

**3. Citizens' Comments**

There were no comments for items not on the agenda.

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

Mr. Zilla reviewed that the consultants gave a presentation on the ROP at the September meeting. They were asking MPOs and RPOs to adopt these plans, although staff pointed out to them that it is unusual to adopt documents that were not prepared by the MPO. Staff is suggesting that the MPO accept the ROP. There are many recommendations contained in the document, but whether the MPO will be able to implement those depends on their prioritization and fiscal constraints.

Mr. Zilla reviewed the individual projects that were applicable to Centre County, prioritized by the consultant. He said that the ROP will be updated every two years to keep current with most recent needs.

Mr. MacMath asked how this plays into the takeover of I-80 by the Turnpike Commission. Mr. Zilla said that staff understands that projects along the I-80 corridor that are already programmed on the TIP and Twelve Year Program (TYP) are the responsibility of PennDOT, through the MPO, to implement. Anything beyond that becomes the Turnpike Commission's responsibility. He said that there have been discussions about how to divide those responsibilities. One concern is how the interchanges in Spring and Marion Townships will be handled.

Mr. MacMath thought that the Turnpike Commission and consultant seemed unaware of the interchange dilemma. Mr. Zilla said that staff sent an email after the meeting highlighting these concerns. Mr. Kisner said that the Turnpike Commission was aware of the interchange projects, although that may not have filtered down to the staff at the public meetings. He was under the impression that the Commission was committed to doing these if they were not started before the Commission takes over.

Mr. Baker asked if there was a possibility of the projects on the ROP being funded without going through the TIP process. Mr. Zilla answered that it was possible if they were funded with state money, but any type of federal funding would come through the MPO.

Mr. MacMath said that the longer term projects will probably fall under the Turnpike Commission's responsibility. However, they operate on toll revenue. Mr. Smoker said that in other areas with toll roads, major air quality or congestion adding projects have to be on the TIP and LRTP. If they are funded by the Turnpike Commission, it would show as additional funding.

*Mr. Modricker made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee accept the ROP, considering impacts regarding funding and tolling of I-80 as uncertainties that were identified. Mr. MacMath seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

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

**a. Philipsburg Front Street Streetscape Phase II Project**

Ms. Emily Gette-Doyle, Moshannon Valley Economic Development Partnership, said that the TE streetscape project is now complete. The overall project is in the last stages. The initial plan was to bury the utilities, install street lights, sidewalks and curbs. In January 2003, Philipsburg Borough applied for CDBG funds, which were awarded. The MPO awarded the Borough \$137,304 in TE funds in 2004 to be used on this project. In addition, the Borough received \$99,645 in Home Town Streets funds for sidewalks along Presqueisle Street, which was redirected to the Front Street Project in 2005. Total funding for this project was \$940,545.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Page 3

Currently, the new sidewalks and curbs are installed, along with traffic-calming measures. The utilities were not able to be buried, but instead relocated to the back of the buildings. The only things that are not complete at this point are the benches, trash receptacles, banners and the planting of trees.

Ms. Gette-Doyle said this project has made a big impact downtown and she thanked the MPO for their role.

### **b. Project Selection Process for 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Ms. Meek reviewed that for the 2009-2012 TIP there is an allocation of \$630,000 that can be used for TE projects. This MPO has been able to move the TE projects, so there were no carry-over projects for this money. There will not be a statewide selection process this year, so staff recommended funding the two highest ranked projects from the last cycle. These are the Centre Hall Sidewalk Rehabilitation Project (\$441,578) and the Village of Boalsburg Streetscape Improvements (\$172,787). The Coordinating Committee approved this in September. Staff met with the project sponsors and was assured that both were still interested in pursuing their projects. Ms. Meek said that the sponsors were aware that this was the only funding available, but the projects will be easy to scale back if necessary. There is a little over \$15,000 remaining after the cost of these projects.

Staff is recommending that these two projects be included in the 2009-2012 TIP. In addition, the current TIP should be amended to include the projects so that the sponsors can execute reimbursement agreements and get the projects underway.

Mr. Modricker asked if this was enough funding for these projects since the costs for TE projects often double from the original estimates. Ms. Meek answered that in the past, the MPO carried over projects from year to year. In 2005, PennDOT changed their philosophy on this practice, so there are no additional funds. It has been made clear to the sponsors that this is the only money available and the only way that would change is if one of them did not carry forward.

Mr. MacMath noted that it would be two or three years before construction of these projects. He asked if inflation was accounted for. Ms. Meek said that it was not, but this is the only money available. These projects are easy to scale back if the funding is not enough to complete the entire project.

*Mr. Modricker made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee formally indicate that the Centre Hall Sidewalk Rehabilitation Project and the Village of Boalsburg Streetscape Improvements advance using Centre County's TE funding allocation for the 2009-2012 TIP. Mr. Hankinson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

*Mr. Weener made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee amend the 2007-2010 Centre County TIP to include the Centre Hall Sidewalk Rehabilitation Project and the Village of Boalsburg Streetscape Improvements Project on the TIP, using funding from the TE line item in 2009 and 2010. Ms. Story seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **c. PennDOT District 3-0 Transportation Enhancements Program Project Development Process**

Ms. Meek reported that at the last meeting Mr. Weikel brought up the fact that PennDOT District 3-0 handles TE/HTS projects differently. Staff looked into this and found that their process is significantly different.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Page 4

First, local bid lets are permitted in District 3-0. This means that the sponsor can let the project the way they let any other project, in accordance with whatever their advertising and contract procedures are. Before they can advance, they must receive concurrence for the local let from PennDOT Central Office, who makes sure that requirements are met. District 3-0 allows the sponsor to prepare the bid documents, advertise and award the projects, but all the federal requirements must still be followed (traffic control plan, EMS plan, typical sections, stormwater, etc.).

In District 3-0, an alternative plan format can be used. District 3-0 reviews the plans to ensure that they buildable and standard reviews are still performed prior to the let. In District 3-0, the majority of the projects are not entered into the EMCS system. Only the let date and funding is entered. This is very different from District 2-0, where all TE projects go through this system. Once the project is let, the construction unit has some oversight.

Ms. Rusnak stated that District 2-0 has taken the responsibility of doing the reviews and setting up all the projects. Some of these projects are costing the District \$25,000-\$50,000, which is a savings to the local sponsor. In District 3-0, the sponsor can do their own lets, but they still have to go through all the requirements. Staff does not see any time savings with this approach because the electronic system is quicker. In addition, the sponsor in District 3-0 has to pay a consultant to write the proposal and put it into the EMCS system. District 2-0 writes the proposals, enters it into the EMCS and also pays for the advertising. However, if sponsors want to do a local let, they can request it and the District will give it consideration.

Mr. Modricker said that this is a very frustrating process for small projects. He could see merit in handling it the way District 3-0 does.

Mr. Baker said that with the bike path in College Township, there were at least 40 sheets of plans. He did not think that would change. There would still be several rounds of cost estimates and reviews, which add cost to the project.

Mr. Modricker asked about the alternative plan format. Ms. Rusnak said the format can be a little different, but all the design criteria must still be followed. Mr. Modricker thought that anything that could be done to make the process less cumbersome, the better.

Ms. Hannigan said that the federal highway construction standards slowed the Bellefonte project down. She asked if there could be a different standard used for bike/pedestrian projects. Mr. Smoker said that there are some projects that are located outside the highway right of way that can follow the common rule procurement process. However, in most cases, the PennDOT process is just as arduous as the federal process. PennDOT could consider developing their own rules for these types of projects. Ms. Rusnak stated that they would discuss this with the Central Office.

### **d. South Atherton Street Path Cost Increase**

Ms. Meek reported that the South Atherton Street Path project is virtually complete. The MPO approved the project in 2005, originally providing \$125,225 in federal TE funds. In 2007, the MPO approved an additional \$70,707. Bids were opened in July 2007 and the low bid exceeded the amount of funding programmed for the project by \$78,600. In order to award the bid without reducing the scope of work, Harris Township committed an additional \$29,932 in local funds and the PennDOT Central Office committed the remaining \$48,669 from the statewide TE line item. The project was bid and constructed in September/October 2007. The final cost is estimated to

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Page 5

exceed the available funding by \$33,500. Harris Township has requested \$22,000 in additional TE funds and they will contribute the remaining balance with local funds.

Ms. Meek said that there are cost savings in the Puddintown Road Bike Trail project. Staff is recommending that \$22,000 be de-obligated from this project and put toward the South Atherton Street project.

Mr. Baker asked why Harris Township was only requesting \$22,000 when they were \$48,000 short on funds. Ms. Meek said that staff is hesitant about taking all the money from the Puddintown Road project until it is completely closed out. Mr. Weener asked if the remaining \$26,000 would be lost if the Puddintown Road project did not use it. Ms. Meek said it would be put into a line item on the TIP.

*Mr. Modricker made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee approve \$22,000 in additional funding for the South Atherton Street Path Project, transferred from cost savings on the Puddintown Road Bike Path project.*

Mr. Baker said that he estimates that there will be a \$70,000 savings on the Puddintown Road project. He recommended giving the South Atherton Street project the entire \$48,000. Ms. Rusnak noted that the Project Manager for the Puddintown Road project was guaranteeing a \$22,000 cost savings, but it was not officially closed.

*Mr. Modricker amended his motion to recommend that \$30,000 in additional funding be approved for the South Atherton Street Path project. Mr. Baker seconded and the motion passed with one opposed (B. MacMath).*

### **6. 2007-2010 Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

#### **a. Amendments to Transit Element – November 2007**

Mr. Zilla reported that the transit TIP works differently than the highway TIP and there are typically additional sources of funding coming in through the year. In this case, there were two funding sources that became available to CATA:

- In 2008, an additional \$155,000 in federal funds for improvements to the CATA Operations and Maintenance Facility (exterior landscaping).
- Additional \$120,000 in state funds to year 2008 for improvements to the CATA Operations and Maintenance Facility (interior office, maintenance and equipment).

Mr. Zilla said these projects do not affect any other projects on the TIP because it is an additional allocation of funds. However, since they are new projects, they must be added to the TIP before CATA can file a grant application and access those funds.

Mr. MacMath asked how federal transit funds can be used to landscape a building. Mr. Weener said it is CATA's facility, which is covered by transit money. He asked if there was any justification for using it for this purpose and if it could have been used for other purposes. Mr. Zilla said that, as a result of renovations to the CATA building, they are required by ordinance to do exterior landscaping. This is one potential funding source to do that. Mr. Kausch added that the project also includes sidewalks, lighting and paving.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Page 6

*Mr. Weener made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee approve amendments to the Transit Element of the 2007-2010 Centre County TIP. Ms. Story seconded. The motion passed with one vote against the motion (B. MacMath).*

Ms. Story noted that if this money is available to pay for the landscaping, it saves costs to the municipalities.

### **b. Amendments to Add Act 44 Projects – November 2007**

Mr. Zilla reviewed that due to the passage of Act 44 in September, an allocation of funds will be coming to the MPO in fiscal year 2007/08. PennDOT has looked at potential projects and come up with a proposal. The focus of Act 44 funding is the maintenance and restoration of the highway and bridge system, particularly structurally deficient bridges. It cannot be used for capacity addition.

PennDOT recommended five priority bridge projects:

- SR 3017 (S. High St.) over Bald Eagle Creek – Port Matilda Borough
- SR 4002 (Clarence Rd.) over North Fork Beech Creek – Snow Shoe Township
- SR 2006 (Rock Hill Rd.) over Mackey Run – Harris Township
- SR 45 (Pine Grove Mills) over Spruce Creek – Ferguson Township
- SR 1002 (Little Marsh Creek Rd.) over Little Marsh Creek – Boggs Township

The proposal is for the preliminary engineering phase to be added to year 2008 of the TIP, using Act 44 funds.

Mr. Zilla said that the agreement with Act 44 was that the funds would come through the MPO, even though they are state funds. One program of state funds that PennDOT has been using for years to pave roadways that does not come through the TIP process is the 711 Maintenance Program. District 2-0 has provided a list of those projects each year to the MPO. The bulk of the funds from the Act 44 funding (\$2.4 million) would go into the 711 Maintenance Program for pavement restoration on various state routes throughout the County.

Mr. Zilla said that all five of the above bridges are structurally deficient (SD) and do reflect the revised priority list that PennDOT is now using for this funding and the new TIP development.

Mr. Baker asked if the amounts were for the entire anticipated costs. Mr. Zilla said that four of the five were for preliminary engineering only. The box culvert on SR 1002 was for construction. Mr. Modricker asked where the construction was programmed. Mr. Zilla answered that this would show up on the new 2009-2012 TIP.

Mr. Modricker asked if this was a new infusion of money. Mr. Zilla said that it was all Act 44 funds. Over the life of the 2009-2012 TIP, the MPO will receive an additional \$15 million in Act 44 funds, beyond the base allocation. The main reason for amending the current TIP is that the first year of funding is being allocated in 2008. In order for PennDOT to spend that, the projects have to be on the current TIP.

Mr. Modricker asked if the construction money was contingent upon I-80 being tolled. Mr. Zilla said the Act 44 legislation does depend on the I-80 conversion plan. Mr. MacMath said that the legislation called for the Turnpike Commission to pay PennDOT a certain amount of money in each of the first two years of the agreement, which is a big infusion of money. Mr. Zilla said that staff is operating on the assumption that this is the law and this is what they are following.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Page 7

Mr. Modricker referred to the money being put toward the 711 Maintenance Program and asked if the MPO had any say about whether the funding be put there or on other projects. Mr. Zilla said the MPO had a say about what projects it goes toward in terms of maintenance of the existing highway system.

Ms. Rusnak said that the District is trying to start as many new bridges as possible. They are trying to have the money “captured” by the March/April timeframe. The 711 Program list will be ready before that.

Mr. Modricker asked if the influx of funds doubles the 711 Maintenance Program money. Ms. Rusnak said that the District had to cut back the 711 Program money because they are trying to do different analyses in order to deal with the structurally deficient bridges. She said the new funding adds to the program, but does not double it.

Mr. Zilla said that for the new TIP, staff is thinking of creating a line item that would be for pavement restoration. This would give the MPO an opportunity to provide input about what projects they would like to see done in that line item, similar to the CMAQ and Safety line items in the current TIP.

*Mr. MacMath made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee approve the proposed amendments to the 2007-2010 Centre County TIP to add funding from Pennsylvania Act 44. Mr. Modricker seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

Mr. Weener asked what was involved in preliminary engineering. Mr. Zilla answered that it included the initial stages of a project, most importantly receiving environmental clearance to proceed.

### **c. Amendments to Meet Federal Year of Expenditure (YOE) Regulations – November 2007**

Mr. Zilla reported that in February, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued statewide and metropolitan planning regulations. Within those were stipulations that TIPs and LRTPs have to account for revenue growth and cost inflation. Also, project phases must be placed in the years where expenditures would actually occur. The TIP and LRTP must be compliant with these regulations by December 11, 2007. Mr. Zilla said that non-compliance jeopardizes FHWA or FTA approval of TIP amendments and air quality analyses.

The guidance was provided by PennDOT Central Office in September and the District and MPO staffs have been working with project costs to come up with a solution to this. The base year being used is 2008. Beyond that, the recommendation was to use a four percent annual inflation factor for project costs. There are several different approaches for revenue growth projects, depending on what type of funding it is.

Mr. Zilla said that in the current LRTP, project costs are escalated by ten percent for each four-year period for highway and bridge projects. Because actual projects were included in the LRTP instead of simply putting in line items, as some of the other MPOs do, staff will have to look hard at the Year of Expenditure (YOE) issue. There is a buffer because the LRTP includes Betterment line items in each four-year segment and the bridge portion also includes some line items. Mr. Zilla said that the MPO will not have an LRTP that is revised to reflect YOE by December 11. Staff has been talking to Mr. Smoker about how to address that.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Page 8

The TIP will require adjustments for years 2009 and 2010. The Transit Element has been adjusted for capital projects only. The operating assistance reflects the maximum amount of grant funding available, so that cannot be escalated. However, there are still a lot of questions statewide about how to handle the Transit Elements because the funding tends to operate more as a grant. When CATA puts in something for a capital project, it reflects what they might receive, not necessarily the cost of a project.

Mr. Zilla reviewed changes to the Highway Element:

- Wingate Betterment Project – the schedule is being advanced. Money was shown in year 2009, but will not be necessary because the let date will be sooner. Additional funding has to be shown in 2008 to reflect the last cost estimate.
- Old Fort Betterment Project – the schedule will extend into the new TIP, so funding is being removed in year 2008 of the current TIP and what remains in 2009 has been adjusted for YOE.
- Beaver Avenue Betterment Project – the schedule will extend into the new TIP. Additional needed funding is reflected in 2008 and 2009.
- Betterment line item – Funding was shown in year 2008, which has been shifted to Beaver Avenue and a small portion of it will remain in year 2009.

Mr. Baker referred to the Old Fort Betterment and asked why the funding level went down. Mr. Zilla said that the remaining that will be needed will be shown in the new 2009-2012 TIP. It cannot be shown on the current TIP because of fiscal constraint.

Mr. Zilla reviewed adjustments being made for bridge projects, reflecting changes in schedule, changes in cost estimates, YOE adjustments and removal of projects to maintain fiscal constraint.

- SR 45 Penns Creek Bridge – schedule was advanced, so additional funding is needed in 2008. Most of the funding has been removed from year 2010, adjusted for YOE.
- SR 504 Moshannon Creek Bridge – schedule has been extended, so funding was removed in 2008. Additional funding was put in year 2010, adjusted for YOE.
- SR 1001 Marsh Creek Bridge, SR 2012 Muddy Creek Bridge and SR 2014 Trib Penns Creek – there are no schedule changes to these bridges and reflect only YOE adjustments.
- SR 2009 – proposed to be removed from the TIP. This was a structurally deficient bridge, but repairs were made. This is a candidate for the new TIP.
- SR 3006 Mill Race Bridge and 3032 Laurel Run Bridge – these are structurally deficient, but are in better condition than what is remaining on the TIP and the Act 44 bridges. Proposed to be removed from the TIP.
- SR 3023 Laurel Run Bridge -- adjustments made for YOE.
- Bridge Reserve Item – this must be shown in years to maintain fiscal constraint.

Mr. Zilla noted that administrative actions were listed in the agenda and do not require action.

Mr. Smoker asked about adjustments to year 2008 projects. Mr. Zilla said that according to the guidance received, staff is not adjusting 2008 since it is the base year. Mr. Smoker said that his understanding was that original cost estimates that show up in year 2008 were done in 2006 and he thought that all project costs had to be updated to base year 2008. Ms. Rusnak said those were based on new cost estimates, so inflation was not added.

*Mr. Modricker made a motion recommending to the Coordinating Committee approval of the proposed amendments to the 2007-2010 Centre County TIP to address YOE requirements. Mr. MacMath seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

**d. West Beaver Avenue/South Fraser Street Intersection Realignment and Safety Improvement Project**

Mr. Zilla recalled that there was discussion in September about two elements of this project. One was the TE element and the second part was that the Borough is still seeking federal and state funds for the street/intersection relocation portion of the project. The federal earmark did not come through in the current appropriations bill, but has the potential for coming through in a future bill. In order for the Borough to start the design and preserve eligibility to use federal funds for construction, the preliminary engineering phase must be added to the TIP as a 100 percent locally funded project.

Staff included a potential recommendation for an amendment to the current TIP to add the preliminary engineering phase of this project, using local funds from State College Borough. This would essentially be a placeholder on the TIP and does not involve any other projects.

*Mr. MacMath made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee approve an amendment to the 2007-2010 TIP to add the preliminary engineering phase of the West Beaver Avenue/South Fraser Street Intersection Realignment and Safety Improvements Project, using 100% local funds to be provided by State College Borough. Mr. Modricker seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

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

Mr. Zilla said that the TIP formula allocation for the 2009-2012 TIP is approximately \$50 million. Act 44 funding, totaling \$15.7 million, will be added to that. This is a significant increase over past years. He said that in January, the Coordinating Committee will be asked to approve a Preliminary Draft TIP for submission to PennDOT. A key part of the response from PennDOT in February will be spike funds for the local and high speed interchanges.

Safety and Congestion Mitigation Projects include:

- Route 26 Pine Grove Mountain
- Route 322 Potter Township
- Route 350 Sandy Ridge Mountain
- Whitehall Road/University Drive turning lane
- North Atherton Street signal improvements
- Route 150 CCIP

Betterment Projects include:

- Route 26 Beaver Avenue
- Route 45 Old Fort
- Route 26/64 Pleasant Gap to Zion
- Route 550 Bishop Street

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Page 10

Mr. Zilla said that for bridge projects, the focus will be on structurally deficient (SD) bridges. The goal is for 85% of capital bridge funding to be dedicated to SD bridges. He said there are 61 SD state bridges and 17 SD local bridges in Centre County. Bridges include:

- SR 1001 Marsh Creek
- SR 3023 Laurel Run
- Route 504 Black Moshannon
- Route 45 Bridge at Spring Mills

On the transit side, there are several carry-over projects:

- Rolling stock rebuild and new purchases
- Advanced technologies
- Service restoration and expansion
- Rideshare, vanpool efforts
- Opportunities related to Act 44 revenue
- Park and Ride
- Potential commuter service to rural areas

Mr. Zilla reviewed Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), saying that the MPO has talked about a potential line item set-aside for public transit projects and a selection process for these funds. Park and Ride projects are good projects for this type of funding.

Mr. Zilla said that there will probably not be opportunities for adding new projects to the TIP. He reviewed upcoming tasks.

### **8. FY 2008-2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Zilla reviewed that the main issue that needs feedback at this time is supplemental planning projects. In the current UPWP, there are two supplemental projects. The first is coordinating land use and transportation planning. The main areas are in the Spring/Walker Township area along Route 550 and 26 and also the area along the border of Halfmoon and Patton Townships. This task is just starting. The second project is an assessment of public transportation services in Centre County, looking at CATA and County van services to see if there are opportunities for integration of service. This will build on the Human Services Transportation Plan. This task is also just starting.

Staff has discussed some tasks for possible inclusion in the next Work Program. One is to continue the land use/transportation planning. This would involve trying to provide the two planning agencies and municipalities an additional source of funding and a staff consultant effort to work out land development and transportation issues. Another option is updating all the socio-economic forecasts that were done as part of the travel demand model for the LRTP. Staff believes this is a good time to do this since the MPO will be updating the LRTP in 2008. Another task would be a detailed inventory of municipal bridges, as PennDOT has done with the state bridges. Mr. Zilla said that another option is replacing equipment (plotter, laptop). The last candidate task would be updating the CATA Transportation Plan, which was adopted in the late 1990's. He said this was a good project, but felt that since the CATA/County assessment has not been done, it might make better sense to wait a year.

Mr. Zilla said he would email this list and additional information to members and asked that feedback be sent back on these potential projects.

**CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, November 14, 2007**

**Page 11**

**9. Announcements**

Mr. Baker reviewed upcoming meetings.

**10. Adjourn**

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Z. Shingler  
Recording Secretary