

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

**Friday, February 22, 2008  
9:30 a.m.  
College Township Municipal Building**

**Minutes**

**Voting Members**

Bill MacMath	Spring Township
Michele Barbin	Mountaintop Planning Region
Karen Michael	PennDOT District 2-0
Dave Modricker	Ferguson Township
Brent Brubaker	Patton Township
Amy Story	State College Borough
Bob Crum	Centre Regional Planning Commission
Hugh Mose	CATA
Bob Jacobs	Centre County Planning and Community Development
Sue Hannegan	Centre County Planning and Community Development
Doug Weikel	Benner Township

**Non-Voting Members**

Teresa Davis	Penn State University
--------------	-----------------------

**Others Present:**

Tom Zilla	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Trish Meek	CRPA
Greg Kausch	CRPA
Lori Shingler	CRPA
Mike Bloom	CCPCDO
Vicki Rusnak	PennDOT District 2-0

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Approval of Minutes**

*Mr. MacMath made a motion to approve the January 9, 2008 minutes with one change. Ms. Story seconded and the motion carried unanimously.*

**3. Election of Officers**

*Mr. MacMath made a motion to retain Kent Baker as Chair and Hugh Mose as Vice-Chair of the Technical Committee. Mr. Crum seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Friday, February 22, 2008

Page 2

### 4. Citizens' Comments

There were no comments for items not on the agenda.

### 5. Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan

Mr. Kausch reviewed that the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan is required in order for CATA to be eligible for three federal transit programs: Job Access/Reverse Commute (JARC), New Freedom and Section 5310. An interim plan was adopted last year and this year several changes were made in order to comply with the final requirements. Specific updates included:

- Added language regarding the Public Participation Plan (page 8)
- Revised to reflect final FTA Circular Numbers for the JARC, New Freedom and Section 5310 programs (page 16)
- Removed references to the “interim” planning requirements (pages 19-20)
- Added new language regarding project selection (pages 19-20)
- Added a section regarding current trends within the “Centre Commute” (formerly RideShare) Program (page 82)
- CCOT -- Updated to reflect new contractor for maintenance services (pages 84-85)
- CCOT -- Added language regarding Medical Assistance Transportation Program mileage reimbursement (pages 84-85)
- CATA -- New Maps and schedule information for Centre Line and Loop/Link service (pages 86-97)
- CATA – Revised “Centre Commute” section to include new “branding” for former RideShare Program and absorption of PSU employee vanpools (pages 86-97)
- Revised/added fare and schedule information for AA Transit, Fullington Bus Company, Greyhound Lines, and All State Bus (pages 100-108)
- Added language regarding the funding assistance received from Centre County (page 135)
- Added language addressing Act 44 as a potential source of non-federal matching funds
- Will have to inset placeholders for anticipated Section 5310 grant requests
- Corrected spelling/punctuation errors, removed most references to “interim” planning process and revised the table of contents.

Mr. Kausch reviewed the project timeline, saying that it is anticipated that the Coordinated Committee will adopt the updated plan next week. The plan must be submitted to PennDOT by March 15, 2008.

Ms. Davis pointed out that in addition to All State; there is also KK Bus Company, which departs from the former OW Houts building parking lot. Schedules are available at [gotobus.com](http://gotobus.com).

Mr. Mose said that if the County decides to submit applications this year, at what point should those projects be included on the Transit Element of the TIP. Mr. Kausch said that the CCOT Director should be getting involved in the process now.

*Mr. Modricker made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee adopt the Coordinated Plan, as amended. Ms. Story seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

**6. FY 2008-09 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Zilla reviewed the background and key tasks included in the UPWP. The biggest issue is the supplemental planning funds. At the end of January, the Coordinating Committee directed staff to submit two candidate projects to PennDOT Central Office:

- Update the Travel Demand Model and socioeconomic forecast Data
- Develop a municipal bridge database

A response is expected from PennDOT in mid-March about whether either or both of these projects will be approved.

Mr. Zilla noted that the next UPWP may include a one-time addition of up to 25 percent over the base allocation, which would amount to \$23,207 for Centre County. PennDOT has heard from some MPOs that they could use additional funding for MPO planning activities and Centre County is one of those that have been saying that. The constraint is usually the local match, as many of the smaller MPOs do not have elected officials who are willing to put up that funding. This is not the case with Centre County. PennDOT is doing a survey of the MPOs and RPOs to determine if they should restructure the method in which they distribute planning funds starting in 2009-10. Staff found out later that this was not actually supposed to be in the Planning Priorities letter, but for those who have expressed an interest, they are going to allow them to submit what they would like to use the additional funding for.

The Planning Priorities letter specified the types of tasks that they would be interested in funding with the additional money. These deal with land use/transportation coordination and some of the new initiatives about “right sizing” and “smart transportation.” Mr. Zilla noted that in initial discussions with PennDOT, staff has proposed adding funds to two line items. This was not included on the budget sheet since it was not really supposed to be included in the letter. PennDOT has not worked out how the funding will work because it is 80 percent federal funds and typically 20 percent non-federal match, which is split between state and local. PennDOT said that if the money is given, we would have to pay for the entire 20 percent non-federal share. The two line items staff is proposing are:

- IV.D. Land Use Coordination – this line item has been used on projects that do not involve a basic review, but are bigger projects such as the Waddle Road Interchange project. This would also supplement funding for the Route 550/64 project and the Halfmoon/Patton Area Plan.
- VI.A. Streamline Project Implementation – PennDOT is trying to change the project development process to have more work done on the front end by MPOs and RPOs to scope projects, get cost estimates and work with the PennDOT District Office to have more clarity as the project moves through the environmental process. The Waddle Road Interchange and the Whitehall Road Widening Project would be good candidates to pilot this program.

Mr. Zilla said that this funding will need to be included in the budget at some point. The UPWP will go to the Coordinating Committee on March 26 for adoption and staff will submit it in early March. Staff will have to wait to hear about the supplemental planning projects and the additional funds.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Friday, February 22, 2008

Page 4

*Mr. MacMath made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee adopt the FY 2008-09 Unified Planning Work Program, with the inclusion of \$23,000 in additional base funds for items IV.D. and VI.A. Ms. Michael seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.*

### **7. UPWP Time Extensions for Supplemental Planning Funds**

#### **a. FY 2006-07 UPWP – Task VII.A.**

Mr. Zilla said that the MPO has supplemental planning funds for the Coordinated Public Transit Plan. Because of the accelerated schedule that came about after the MPO had submitted for supplemental planning funds, Mr. Kausch did the project in-house, without an outside consultant as anticipated. That left a large balance and staff has asked PennDOT if those could be used as updates are prepared and through the application process over the next four months. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) now requires that the MPO take action to amend the Work Program to extend the date.

*Mr. Weikel made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee amend the CCMPO's FY 2006-07 UPWP to extend the termination date for Task VII.A. – Coordinated Public Transportation – Human Services Plan from March 31, 2008 to June 30, 2008. Ms. Barbin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

#### **b. FY 2007-08 UPWP – Tasks VII.A. and VII.B.**

Mr. Zilla reported that this task is in the current year and would allow staff access to the two supplemental planning funds projects that are in the process: 1) land/transportation coordination in the Route 550/64 and Patton/Halfmoon areas; and 2) the assessment of public transportation services in Centre County. These will extend beyond June, 2008.

*Mr. Modricker made a motion recommending that the Coordinating Committee amend the CCMPO's FY 2007-08 UPWP to extend the termination date for Tasks VII.A. and VII.B. from June 30, 2008 to June 30, 2009. Ms. Story seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

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

Ms. Meek reported that the MPO has taken the approach of actually listing projects on the LRTP rather than using line items, which is typically done by other MPOs. Some line items will be added, but staff is still recommending that an actual project list be used as part of the Plan. Ms. Meek reviewed actions that will take place with the 2008 update:

- Remove completed projects
- Add Act 44 projects
- Update project cost estimates
- Adjust for Year of Expenditure (YOE)
- Remove projects to maintain fiscal constraint

Explaining the YOE regulations, Ms. Meek said that the MPO must now account for revenue growth and cost inflation. Project phases must be illustrated in the year of anticipated expenditure. Non-compliance jeopardizes FHWA/FTA approval of TIP and LRTP amendments and air quality conformity analysis. The base year for cost estimates is 2008, with a recommended four percent annual cost inflation factor. Ms. Meek reviewed the annual revenue growth projections, which vary depending on the type of funding. Cost bands or year periods are acceptable for the LRTP.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Friday, February 22, 2008

Page 5

Ms. Meek reviewed specific changes for each project type.

### Bridges:

- Remove completed projects
- Add Act 44 projects
- Add structurally deficient (SD) bridges
- Add bridge preservation line item
- Add bridge maintenance line item
- Adjust project costs
- Fiscal constraint may require projects to be removed

### Transportation Enhancements (TE):

- Remove completed projects
- Only list the two approved TE projects
- Add TE line items
- Attach list of projects

### Highway and ITS:

- Remove completed projects
- Add Act 44 projects
- Add Safety line item
- Add CMAQ line item
- Add Pavement Restoration line item
- Adjust project costs
- Fiscal constraint may require projects be removed

### Transit:

- Remove completed projects
- Add Act 44 projects (operating and capital)
- Adjust project costs
- Fiscal constraint may require projects be removed

Ms. Meek reviewed the schedule for the LRTP update, saying that staff is hoping for approval of the final draft update in March. Following this will be a public comment period and air quality conformity analysis. Adoption should occur in June.

## **9. Funding for State Bridges (Added Agenda Item)**

Mr. Zilla noted that since the agenda was mailed, there have been changes in the funding of state bridges. These will affect the LRTP and TIP updates.

The financial guidance for the TIP update provided for about \$65 million on the highway side, which included the new funding from Act 44. There were 29 SD bridges on the Preliminary Draft TIP – all the bridges on the TIP were SD bridges. The TIP also included a Box Culvert line item and a Maintenance and Preservation line item.

Mr. Zilla said that on February 5<sup>th</sup>, Governor Rendell announced a new infrastructure investment program across the Commonwealth. One of the elements of that is improving the situation with structurally deficient state bridges. One of the goals is to repair or replace 1,000 SD bridges in the next three years and reduce the number of SD state bridges by 40 percent over the next ten years.

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Friday, February 22, 2008

Page 6

That does include the possibility of other bridges that may become deficient in the mean time. The expenditures would increase from \$1.1 billion per year to \$1.6 billion. Two mechanisms were identified for funding. One would be to shift some of the Act 44 revenues that had been earmarked for pavement restoration back to the bridge side. Second would be to issue bonds that would generate \$200 million per year over the next ten years that would be distributed to all the planning partners to help with the bridge initiative.

Mr. Zilla said that staff was already anticipating that additional bridges would be added to the LRTP and they are going to be added to the TIP as part of this initiative. On February 11<sup>th</sup>, staff attended a Planning Partners workshop and was given funding targets for the bridges and the additional revenue that can be anticipated. Centre County would receive approximately \$3.35 million over the four years of the next TIP. From the Planning Partners meeting, the target expenditure for Centre County is a total of \$31,824 million over four years on SD state bridges. The Preliminary Draft TIP programs approximately \$26-\$27 million, so it is not a large gap once the additional bond money comes through. However, in the last couple of days it has been announced that the focus should perhaps not be on the expenditure, but the number of bridges being done.

Ms. Michael said that the goal is 1,000 SD bridges statewide. Centre County has a fairly low percentage of SD bridges (about 5%), so the proposed number to be addressed annually is four. She said that PennDOT believes that replacing or rehabilitating four bridges is a very doable target because there were already quite a few bridges on the LRTP and PennDOT is doing a lot with the Bridge Preservation line item. She said that the expenditure target is actually very low compared to some of the other regions, who have large gaps between what they are programming and what the target is.

Mr. Zilla reviewed the revised financial guidance, saying that the funding allocation for highways and bridges at the beginning of the TIP process was a little over \$50 million. With the Act 44 funding and the new bond issue funds, the total allocation for the TIP is up to \$69,072,000. He said the key is how much of the Act 44 funding can be shifted over from the pavement restoration side.

Ms. Michael said they need to look at Act 44 and strike some sort of balance because if all the money is put toward the bridges, there will not be enough for pavement restoration. She said that right now the International Roughness Index (IRI) numbers are good, but if money is not provided for restoration that will not be the case in the future.

Mr. Zilla said that District 2-0 has requested spike funds for bridges and the MPO has requested money for the local access interchange in Marion Township. Staff has been told informally that the MPO's request does not look good because there will be a big effort across the Commonwealth to meet the SD bridge goal. Therefore, a lot of the spike funds will be focused on those bridges. If spike funding is approved for some of the bridges that District 2-0 requested, that gives us more bridge funding from the base allocation available to meet the goals and helps on the highway side.

Staff is also working to identify additional municipal bridges to add to the TIP. Currently there are two municipal bridges on the TIP that are both SD. The new initiative focuses entirely on state bridges, so municipal bridges must be done with base bridge funds. Staff would like to add one or two additional local bridges to the TIP so that there is always one or two moving through the process on the TIP.

Mr. Zilla noted that changes are anticipated for the Preliminary Draft TIP and staff believes those can be accommodated in the schedule. The Preliminary Draft TIP was submitted to PennDOT at the end of January, but a revised Draft TIP now has to be submitted in early March. That will involve

## CCMPO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Friday, February 22, 2008

Page 7

shifting line items and adding bridges. Staff is still hoping that a Final Draft TIP will be approved at the end of March because it takes about a month to do the air quality analysis. The public comment period would run from the end of April to the end of May and the TIP would be adopted in June. Mr. Zilla said they would not hear about the spike funding until the middle of April.

### 10. Federal Funding Earmarks

Mr. Zilla noted that the Performance Review Committee had requested a discussion of the federal earmarking process and whether the MPO should be involved in that. He said that earmarking of federal funds occurs through the Annual Appropriations Bill that Congress passes or passage of the Authorization Bill, which authorizes federal transportation fund spending over a five year period (SAFETEA-LU). A list of recent earmarks was included in the agenda.

Mr. Mose said that CATA has been very successful in securing earmarks, but does not really compete with anybody in the Centre County. He said that on the highway side, Centre County might be more successful if some consensus could be developed about what the most important projects are so that the county is speaking with one united voice. He thought this was probably less an issue for CATA and maybe on the Appropriations side of the process. However, the reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU is coming up and that would be an opportunity for Centre County to get involved for one or more significant projects.

Mr. Modricker felt that this was a policy issue rather than a technical issue. He said that in Ferguson Township, the manager and local officials were involved in the Western Inner Loop. He did not know if the MPO had been involved. Mr. Zilla said it originated from one of the Township Supervisors who knew Congressman Peterson and there was very little MPO involvement, although that was a high priority project for the MPO.

Mr. Crum noted that if there was going to be a coordinated county effort, it should be based on the LRTP. He said that there would be a disconnection in the planning process if that was not the case. Mr. Jacobs agreed that the LRTP should be used as the guidance document.

Mr. Zilla noted two pending earmarks: the North Atherton Signal Coordination project (in place of the Eastern Inner Loop) and the Fraser Street Realignment project in State College Borough. He also noted that if staff works on lobbying efforts, it cannot be charged to the MPO because lobbying is not allowed with federal funds.

### 11. Announcements

Mr. Jacobs announced that former Bellefonte Borough Assistant Manager Sue Hannegan has been hired as Assistant Director of the Centre County Planning and Community Development Office.

### 12. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Z. Shingler  
Recording Secretary