

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

**Wednesday, April 16, 2008  
9:30 a.m.**

**Centre Region Council of Governments Building**

**Minutes**

**Voting Members**

Bill MacMath	Spring Township
Michele Barbin	Mountaintop Planning Region
Karen Michael	PennDOT District 2-0
Dave Modricker	Ferguson Township
Amy Story	State College Borough
Bob Jacobs	Centre County Planning and Community Development
Sue Hannegan	Centre County Planning and Community Development
Kent Baker	College Township
Karen Brown	Halfmoon Township
Ray Hankinson	Penns Valley Planning Region
Dean Roberts (for Harold Nanovic)	PennDOT Central Office
Brent Brubaker	Patton Township
Hugh Mose	CATA
Mike Savage (for John Knowles)	Moshannon Valley

**Non-Voting Members**

Matt Smoker	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Doug Holmes (for Teresa Davis)	Penn State
Dallas Gallo	Bellefonte Borough

**Others Present:**

Tom Zilla	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Trish Meek	CRPA
Greg Kausch	CRPA
Lori Shingler	CRPA
Mike Bloom	CCPCDO
Vickie Rusnak	PennDOT District 2-0
Jim Moser	Representative Scott Conklin's Office

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Baker called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

*Mr. MacMath made a motion to approve the March 12, 2008 minutes. Mr. Jacobs seconded and the motion carried unanimously.*

**3. Citizens' Comments**

There were no citizen comments.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 16, 2008

Page 2

### 4. Member Reports

Mr. Baker reported that College Township will be resurfacing Transfer Road this year. The work will be done at night so the road will not have to be closed. Tomorrow night Council will be awarding the design contract for replacement of the Trout Run Bridge.

Mr. Brubaker noted that Patton Township will be resurfacing a part of Park Forest Avenue and a section of Scotia Road. There is potential for a new signal on the North Atherton corridor in the proximity of the former Mellot mobile home park. He added that staff is working on the timing of the light signals on Valley Vista at the Lowe's site.

Ms. Brown stated that Halfmoon Township will be resurfacing part of Sawmill Road and Municipal Lane this year.

Ms. Hannegan reminded members that flood insurance maps have been posted. Anyone who has not submitted information should do so as soon as possible.

Ms. Story reported that the Medical Arts Building on the corner of Fraser Road and Beaver Avenue is in the process of being torn down to make way for the new Fraser Center. The realignment of Fraser Street will take place next year.

Mr. Holmes said that Penn State is doing repair work on Curtin Road, Bigler Road, and the University Drive/Porter Road intersection.

Mr. Savage noted that Resource Recovery has submitted development plans, choosing not to make a presentation to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jacobs said that the Centre County Planning Commission approved the Sheetz rebuild in Wingate. Part of that redevelopment includes a PennDOT Betterment project to put a traffic signal at the site. He added that Gypsy Moth spraying will start next month.

Mr. Hankinson said that surveyors are working in Centre Hall, in preparation for the TE sidewalk project. He noted that Greg Township is worried about the traffic flow through Spring Mills as the bridge is being repaired.

Mr. MacMath said that the Dominion gas line will be coming soon, which will also affect Potter Township. Spring Township will be paving Blanchard Street and a road in Pleasant Gap this year.

Mr. Gallo reported on a new Rite Aide project on Bishop Street in Bellefonte. Right now a traffic study is being done. The Borough is also in the process of putting Talleyrand Park back together after a sewer line was installed there.

Ms. Rusnak stated that PennDOT is working on draft TIPs and trying to get ahead of the air quality analyses. Staff has also been working with Central Office to advance bridge projects.

Mr. Modricker noted that Ferguson Township opened contracts for the road reclamation project (Beaver Branch Road, Johnson Road, High Ridge Circle, Princeton Drive, Wiltshire Drive, Middle Street) and has received favorable pricing. He reported that there will be a new traffic signal at Blue Course Drive and Westerly Parkway.

**5. Final Draft 2009-2012 Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Zilla noted that the MPO is reaching the end of the TIP development process and will adopt the TIP in July. He said that the Governor's new bridge initiative in February affected the schedule somewhat because it required changes before submission to PennDOT. Responses were due from PennDOT last week.

Mr. Zilla reviewed the Transit Element, saying that it focuses on replacement of rolling stock, advanced technologies, service restoration and expansion, rideshare/vanpool efforts and expansion of the bus storage facilities. Changes that have occurred since January include the following:

- Revised costs and schedules for vehicle rebuilds and replacements
- Adjusted costs for Year of Expenditure (YOE) requirements
- Revised operating assistance funding to reflect new state funds (Act 44)
- Removed one bus purchase that has been completed

One of the unique things about the Transit Element is that the TIP must include projects that were approved several TIPs ago so that CATA can continue to receive the grant funding for those projects.

Reviewing the Bridge Element, Mr. Zilla said that the focus is on Structurally Deficient (SD) bridges. The goal is for 85% of the capital bridge funding to be dedicated to SD bridges. There are 39 bridges and box culverts on the revised Preliminary Draft TIP. There is still a small maintenance/preservation line item included, but for the most part those funds have now been converted to projects. Revisions since January include:

- Annual target is to complete 4 bridges, with 3 to be SD
- District 2-0 program includes an average of 5+ SD bridges each year
- Costs, phases, and schedules have been updated
- New bridges added
- Waiting for PennDOT decision about spike funding for three bridges
- T-365 Spring Creek Bridge (College Township) to be added (Preliminary Engineering phase)

Other changes to the Preliminary TIP include:

- Revised cost/phases for several highway projects
- Reduced Pavement Restoration Line Item
- Will not show I-80/Route 26 Section A18 Local Access Interchange unless spike funding is provided

Mr. Zilla showed a map of the highway projects included on the TIP. He noted that the Fraser Street realignment is on the TIP with local funds so that if the Borough receives an earmark, that project can move forward.

Staff is expecting that the Coordinating Committee will finalize the Final Draft TIP so that an air quality conformity analysis can be done and it can be advertised for the public comment period. July 21 is the deadline for submission of the TIP, so staff is looking at alternate dates for the July meeting.

**CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, April 16, 2008**

**Page 4**

Mr. Roberts reported that PennDOT Central Office is still reviewing the TIPs and asked for patience.

*Mr. Modricker made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee approve the Final Draft 2009-2012 Centre County TIP, for an air quality conformity analysis and to be advertised for public comment. Ms. Story seconded the motion.*

Mr. Zilla noted that staff would like to send this forth with a recommendation to add the preliminary engineering phase for the bridge in College Township and also add the Fraser Street project.

Mr. Roberts stated that changes cannot be made to the draft TIPs until October 1 and suggested that the bridge be listed and put on as an addendum.

Mr. Baker asked where the funds for this bridge would come from. Mr. Zilla said the MPO would have to agree to not remove any projects, but move funding around or if spike funding is received, that would free up money to retarget. He said that the recommendation could be structured that way.

Mr. Zilla said he was concerned about changes not being able to be made to the TIP. Mr. Roberts said that the TIPs were frozen as of right now. He said he was hoping that there would be a small window to add projects after they were released, but he could not promise that. Mr. Zilla asked why the MPO was meeting and a public comment period was being held if changes could not be made. Mr. Roberts said that discussion could still take place and changes could be shown on a fiscal chart. Mr. Zilla said this was supposed to be a negotiating process.

Mr. MacMath asked if a motion could be made to add the projects with conditions, to be revisited on October 1. Mr. Zilla said that could be done.

Mr. Smoker asked if the fact that the TIPs have been frozen as been disseminated to all the planning partners. Mr. Roberts said it was more word of mouth. Mr. Smoker said this was supposed to be a collaborative process between the MPOs, state and public transit providers, with public participation. Mr. Roberts said that PennDOT wanted to have something frozen so that they could move forward. He thought the process was still the same in that a list of changes could be submitted to be included, but systematically those changes would be made on October 1.

Ms. Meek thought the concern was that the MPO is required to adopt a TIP in July that will go into effect on October 1. If significant comments were received, those could not be included. It does not meet the intent of federal legislation. Another concern would be the air quality analysis. If there was a problem, the TIP could not be adopted because it would not be compliant. Mr. Roberts thought that it was just the systematic adjustments that were being delayed. He said he would take the MPO's concerns back to his office.

*The above motion was voted upon and approved unanimously.*

*Ms. Story made a motion to add the construction phase of the realignment of West Beaver Avenue/South Fraser Street and the College Township bridge to the 2009-2012 TIP, whenever these can systematically be added. Mr. MacMath seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

**6. Centre County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2008 Update**

Ms. Meek reviewed that an update is being done to the LRTP, primarily to add the Act 44 projects, adjust for Year of Expenditure (YOE), remove some projects to maintain fiscal constraint, add line items, and update project cost estimates. She said that the YOE regulations require that the LRTP account for growth and cost inflation for projects. Project phases must be illustrated in the year of anticipated expenditure. Non-compliance jeopardizes FHWA and FTA approval of the TIP and LRTP amendments and air quality conformity analysis. Ms. Meek went on to explain the cost and revenue factors required, as well as the base funding sources.

For spike funding, staff is waiting for additional guidance from PennDOT about what spike funds will be received. If money is received, it will free up other money in the TIP and LRTP to be used on other projects. Starting in 2011-2014, \$1 million is being included every four years. Ms. Meek thought this was a conservative estimate. The MPO does have earmark dollars in the amount of \$6,918,040 in 2009-2010. There is also \$55,000,000 in Appalachian funds available for the high-speed interchange. Unfortunately, there is not adequate funds to show that project on the LRTP, so even though the money is there, it is not being shown on what is available for projects because it is dedicated to that project. Interstate Maintenance funding is showing now on the LRTP, which can be used on I-99 repairs. This does not come from the base allocation.

Ms. Meek noted that project lists were included with the agenda. Staff has deleted all projects that have been completed and new projects are highlighted (including line items). At the request of the Coordinating Committee, staff has defined the funding periods as "proposed" and the previous time period is shown so that members can see how the projects shift as the YOE adjustments were made.

Mr. Bloom reviewed the Highway and ITS project list. A number of line items were added, including Pavement Restoration, Safety, CMAQ, and Interstate Maintenance. Three new projects were added:

- Pleasant Gap Betterment (previous approved by MPO, delayed due to the hauling of acid rock)
- Benner Pike Improvements (earmarked funding to pay for projects that have been completed)
- Beaver Avenue/Fraser Street Intersection Improvements (all local funds)

Two projects were moved to the list of projects for future consideration because they are outside fiscal constraint:

- Route 26/I-80 Local Access Interchange
- I-99/I-80 Exit 161 High Speed Interchange

Mr. Bloom said that the list of projects for future consideration generated discussion at the Coordinating Committee meeting, particularly for the SR350 "S" Curve Long Term Project. Staff had presented an option of removing some of the later phases of that project to allow other projects to remain on the project list. Preliminary engineering would still remain for the SR 350 project, to study its feasibility. The Coordinating Committee was not in favor of this option. In the current draft list, eight projects that originally appeared in the previously adopted LRTP will be moved to the list outside of fiscal constraint. Ms. Meek thought the consensus of the Coordinating Committee was that a major update of the LRTP would be done in two years and they wanted to stay with the current ranking until that time. Members discussed the fact that projects on the lists now may not

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 16, 2008

Page 6

even be viable with the current state of the economy and world affairs and the project ranking criteria may need to change significantly in the next major update.

Ms. Story referred to the Whitehall Road Project, #69 on the list. Mr. Bloom said that was different from the work that is being done now on Whitehall Road and involved overall expansion to include two additional lanes.

Mr. Modricker referred to the Route 26 safety projects and asked if the Route 26 Bypass was included on any of the lists. Ms. Meek said it was #103 on the list of projects outside fiscal constraint.

Mr. Bloom reviewed the revisions on the Bridge list, saying that staff has added the additional Act 44 revenue and structurally deficient (SD) state bridges. Line items have been added, including Bridge preservation/maintenance, bridge maintenance box culvert and local bridge (starting in 2011). Project costs were also adjusted. No bridge projects were removed and no bridge projects fall outside of fiscal constraint at this time. Staff proposes adding one additional local bridge at this time (Trout Road Bridge in College Township).

Revisions to the Transportation Enhancements (TE) list include removing completed projects and only listing the two approved TE projects (Centre Hall Streetscape and Boalsburg Streetscape). Line items were added for TE in the further out years, showing what funding is expected. A list of candidate projects submitted for the LRTP is being attached. TE projects are different in that they require a local sponsor in order to move through the process.

Mr. Hankinson asked if there would be opportunity to submit new TE projects. Ms. Meek said that the state sets up the funding rounds and that is when new projects can be submitted.

Mr. Kausch reviewed the Transit Element of the LRTP, which included significant changes in order to bring into closer alignment the MPO's TIP/LRTP and CATA's planning and budgeting process. He felt this had been accomplished.

Mr. Kausch explained the federal, state, and local funding sources and what was assumed for these revenues over the life of the LRTP:

- 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. Kausch noted that staff assumed no change in the member municipalities over the life of the LRTP.

Reviewing the project lists, revisions included removing completed projects and reconciling TIP projects with CATA's own records of projects. Mr. Kausch said that going forward, staff

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 16, 2008

Page 7

considered CATA's five-year major capital plan which specifies major capital improvements and costs in their year of expenditure. This was also used to estimate when vehicles would be rehabilitated and replaced. Project costs were adjusted and staff believes the lists are within fiscal constraint for the most part. However, there may be an issue in 2011-2014 where it seems to be out of fiscal constraint by approximately \$4 million. Mr. Kausch said that the Intermodal Transportation Center falls within that time frame and that may have to be pushed out to another funding period. Staff did not feel it appropriate to make that decision and therefore left the project list as is, showing the shortfall in funding.

Mr. Mose noted that it has been understood for some time that Penn State needs to take the land where the intercity bus terminal currently resides, so taking the Intermodal Transportation Center off the list is not a good strategy. At some time, it will need to be determined when the project fits into the LRTP and who is sponsoring it. For now, he recommended leaving it where is was, understanding that it leaves a negative number for that period. Ms. Meek noted that if federal funds are going to be used, it must be included on the LRTP.

Mr. Mose asked what the implications would be if the project had to be moved further out in the funding period, but Penn State decided two years from now that they were ready to start the project. He asked if it could be moved up at that time. Ms. Meek said other projects could be pushed back or the Intermodal Transportation Center could be broken into phases and shown as just preliminary engineering in that time period. Environmental Clearance would require that all the funding was in place. Mr. Smoker noted that highway and CMAQ funds could be used on this project as well as transit funds. He added that when FHWA reviews the document for fiscal constraint, they do not look at transit and highway separately. Mr. Bloom stated that if the project is moved further down on the list, YOY increases will have to be shown.

Mr. MacMath suggested pushing the project back unless there is a commitment for funding. Ms. Meek asked if members would be comfortable with keeping the preliminary engineering phase in the 2011-2014 period and moving the other phases back.

*Mr. MacMath made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee approve the LRTP, with the preliminary engineering phase of the Intermodal Transportation Center remaining in the 2011-2014 time period and the other phases being pushed to further out years. Mr. Mose seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

Mr. Mose noted that on the federal side the reauthorization is about to start, which could change the entire structure of federal transit. As fuel prices increase and there seems to be a greater interest in carbon footprint and green issues, the amount of funding for public transit is more likely to increase in the next authorization.

On the state side, even though the people who crafted Act 44 were careful to disassociate the tolling of Interstate 80 from transit funding, if the tolling does not go forward Mr. Mose thought it would have a profound effect on Act 44 overall that will eventually ripple down to the amount of state funding to CATA. He thought doing what has been done is the right course of action, but there is a potential for dramatic changes.

### 7. Announcements

Mr. Zilla reported that staff is looking at July 2 or 9 for the next Technical Committee meeting and July 8, 9, or 16 for the Coordinating Committee meeting. Staff may send out an email asking for availability to determine the next Technical Committee meeting. The June meetings for the MPO will be canceled.

**CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, April 16, 2008**

**Page 8**

**8. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Z. Shingler  
Recording Secretary