

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

**Hybrid Meeting  
Thursday, January 30, 2025  
2:00 PM**

<b><u>GENERAL MEETING INFORMATION</u></b>	
RSVP	<b>To ensure an overall quorum of members, please let us know how you intend to participate:</b> <a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/qWKAsktWQAuqCDH1CVU43w">https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/qWKAsktWQAuqCDH1CVU43w</a>
Remote Participants	<b>To attend via Zoom:</b> <a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/qWKAsktWQAuqCDH1CVU43w">https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/qWKAsktWQAuqCDH1CVU43w</a> To attend by phone: +1 301 715 8592   Meeting ID: 816 1385 4012
In-Person Participants	<b>COG Building, Suite 4 CRPA Conference Room</b> 2643 Gateway Drive, State College PA 16801
Meeting Contact: email: <a href="mailto:officemanager@crcog.net">officemanager@crcog.net</a>   814-231-3050	
<b><a href="#">Click HERE to locate the AGENDA and ATTACHMENTS</a></b> <i>Should you desire to annotate any attachments, you must download them first</i>	

- The chat feature for this meeting will be disabled. A recording of the meeting will be made available on the COG website upon its conclusion.
- We ask that non-voting participants that are attending remotely remain muted with their video turned off unless recognized to speak. To reduce audio interference, please remain off of speakerphone during the meeting.
- **VOTING PROCEDURES:** Members will provide their vote by voice. Clarification will be sought by the Chair if the vote is unclear. For additional information on Voting Procedures, please click [HERE](#).
- **PUBLIC COMMENT GUIDELINES:** Members of the public may comment on any items not already on the agenda (five minutes per person). Comments relating to specific items on the agenda should be deferred until that point in the meeting. For additional information on COG public meeting guidelines, please click [HERE](#).
- To access agendas and minutes of previously held meetings, and to learn more about the CCMPO Projects Committee, please click [HERE](#).

**Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO)  
Projects Committee Meeting**

**Thursday, January 30, 2025**

**2:00 PM.**

**AGENDA**

1. **Call to Order**
2. **[Election of Officers for 2025](#)**
3. **Approval of Minutes:** *October 9, 2024, Projects Committee meeting*
4. **Public Comments:** *For items not on the agenda.*
5. **New Agenda Items:** *Members may request that an additional item(s) be added to the agenda, following state law and exceptions for official action on items not included on the agenda.*
6. **[Grant Applications Update](#)**  
*No action required*
7. **[2025 Projects Committee Work Plan](#)**  
*No action required*
8. **[Project Prioritization – Initial Results](#)**  
*No action required*
9. **[Bridge Project Prioritization Matrix](#)**  
*No action required*
10. **[Project Request Form](#)**  
*Finalize form and set process for updating project list*
11. **Member Reports**
12. **[Announcements](#)**
13. **Adjourn**

# CENTRE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO) PROJECTS COMMITTEE

## Minutes

Wednesday, October 9, 2024

*(please refer to the COG audio/video meeting file website when referring to timestamps)*

Commissioner Concepcion called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

**Members Present:** Amber Concepcion; Centre County, Daryl Schafer; Outlying Planning Region Municipalities, David Rishel; CATA, Ray Forziat; Centre Region Municipalities, Mark Schultz; PennDOT District 2-0.

**Others Present:** Marcella Hoffman; Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA) Transportation Grant Specialist, Reagan Mann; CRPA Office Manager, Mike Tylka; CRPA Director, Anne Messner; CRPA Senior Planner, Jim Saylor; CRPA Principal Planner; Greg Kausch, CRPA Senior Planner; Jamie Bibleheimer, PennDOT District 2-0.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS (00:01:40)**

No public comments.

### **NEW AGENDA ITEMS (00:01:45)**

No new agenda items were requested.

### **ACTION ITEMS (00:01:34)**

**Approval of Minutes** – August 16, 2024, Project Committee meeting.

*Motion was made by Mr. Forziat and seconded by Mr. Schultz to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.*

### **GRANT APPLICATIONS UPDATE (00:02:04)**

Ms. Hoffman presented a brief update on the three grant applications.

#### **Safe Streets for All (SS4A)**

On September 5, the CCMO staff was notified that the May 16 SS4A application submission was successful. The CCMPO was awarded \$192,000 (total project cost \$240,000) to expand the current action plan, Centre County Active Transportation Plan. On September 30, staff attended the U.S. DOT Webinar for information related to SS4A Grant Agreements. The U.S. DOT and FHWA will contact staff soon to begin negotiations for the agreement.

### Bridge Investment Program (BIP)

Staff executed a work agreement with Michael Baker to assist with developing the BIP application for the 4005 Bridge over I-80 in Snow Shoe Township. Snow Shoe took official action at its September meeting to support the BIP application as the sponsor. During the Centre County Commissioners' informational meeting, it was determined that it would be beneficial to conduct the benefit-cost analysis for the bridge application prior to official action from the Commissioners. This allows the consultant and staff to determine if the application is competitive enough to complete and submit. The application is due November 1.

### Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation PROTECT Program

The Notice of Funding Opportunity for PROTECT is set to be released in October. Applications will be due late 2024 or early 2025. Staff are continuing to build the narrative for the application. Once the work order for the consultant is carried out, staff will work with both consultants to determine if a resilience Improvement Plan application is viable.

Ms. Hoffman also presented the discretionary funding programs for which the CCMPO would be eligible in next year's applications. They are as follows: Corridor Charging, RAISE, LCTM, Community Charging, ATTAIN, SS4A, ATIIP, PROTECT and Wildlife Crossings. Please refer back to the agenda for more detailed descriptions.

## **CCMPO PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS LIST FOR PRIORITIZATION (00:17:00)**

### **A. Criteria for Project Prioritization**

Ms. Hoffman presented the first draft of the Project Prioritization Matrix (criteria) for each project, broken into six categories depending on the project type. This process will determine what projects should be pursued under Federal Discretionary Grant Funding and make project lists on the LRTP. The scoring mechanism in each category has been chosen based on its alignment with federal performance measures required for project development. Scoring mechanisms are qualitative and quantitative measures that provide a balance of data.

The purpose of the following discussions in the Projects Committee is to provide a ranking of each criterion in terms of importance and then assign a point value to each criterion depending on importance. It is also important to note that each matrix has five general criteria: Economic Impact, Environmental Impact, Project Sponsor, Readiness of Project, and Equity.

Each matrix provides Criteria Name, Criteria Description, Scoring Mechanism, and More Information. Please refer to the corresponding Matrix provided in the meeting agenda. The following are the discussions that ensued regarding ranking each criterion and other decisions made for each matrix.

### Safety – Congestion Projects Screening (00:20:00)

The criteria ranking order for Safety will be determined at a later date. Mr. Schultz will ask PennDOT District 2-0 about the data used in the network screening and compare it to the Pennsylvania Crash Information Tool (PCIT).

Ms. Hoffman will run example projects through the matrix and provide the committee with examples to help them better understand how the process might look. Specialized criteria should have a higher rating/scoring than General criteria.

### Technology Projects Screening - Criteria ranking:

1. Integration & Connectivity
2. Cost Effectiveness/ Scalability
3. Economic Impact
4. Safety Crash Data
5. Project Readiness
6. Project Sponsor
7. Environmental Impact
8. Equity

### Active Transportation Projects Screening – Criteria ranking:

1. Accessibility & Connectivity
2. Health/Wellness Impact
3. Safety Crash Data
4. Project Readiness (add row)
5. Project Sponsor
6. Economic Impact
7. Equity
8. Environmental Impact

### Major Highway – Capacity Adding Projects Screening – Criteria ranking:

The Committee did not have strong feelings about ranking criteria 1-3. The Committee ranked criteria 6 and 7 the same.

1. Safety and Crash Info
2. State of Good Repair
3. Available Development & Capacity
4. Project Readiness
5. Project Sponsor
6. Economic Impact
7. Environmental impact
8. Equity

### Resiliency Projects Screening – Criteria ranking:

The Committee was not prepared to rank the specialized criteria as they felt they were closely related. They would like to see how the example projects score to ensure the criteria are scored as intended. The general criteria were ranked as follows:

1. Project Readiness
2. Project Sponsor
3. Economic Impact
4. Environmental Impact
5. Equity

Under the Criticality to Community criterion, the Committee suggested separating the facilities. One scoring mechanism would include hospitals, medical centers, emergency services, etc.; the other would consist of homes, businesses, manufacturing centers, intermodal facilities, gov't facilities, etc.

### Transit - Rail - Aviation Projects Screening – Criteria ranking:

1. Ridership Demand
2. Intermodal Access and Connectivity
3. Service Reliability
4. Asset Management/ State of Good Repair (of equipment)
5. Safety and Security
6. Project Sponsor
7. Project Readiness
8. Environmental Impact
9. Economic Impact
10. Equity

### **B. Criteria for Bridge Projects (02:47:21)**

Ms. Hoffman and staff met with PennDOT on October 1 to review the Bridge Prioritization Criteria. A matrix for the criteria isn't yet available, but the following is what is currently being proposed.

#### Local Bridge Prioritization Criteria

- NBI – Is the bridge a National Bridge Inventory?
- Bridge Condition – Is the bridge ranked four or less for deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert condition?
- Dead-End – Is the bridge a dead-end bridge that serves residents or businesses?
- Design Phase – Has the design phase for the bridge been completed or started?
- Local Commitment – Is there a local commitment (local finding match) for the bridge?

### State Bridge Prioritization Criteria

- Bridge Condition – Is the bridge ranked four or less for deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert condition?
- Cost – Is the total project cost over \$3 million total? (BIP awards no less than \$3.125 million)
- Tip Funding – Is the bridge funded with mixed (non-bridge) funds on the tip?
- Infrastructure- Does the bridge serve critical infrastructure?
- Design – Has the design phase for the bridge been completed or started?

Ms. Hoffman will work on getting these into a matrix format by the next meeting.

### **C. CCMPO Project Request Form (02:58:17)**

Ms. Hoffman indicated that she developed the Project Consideration Application because there is no formal process for requesting projects. Since the last Projects Committee meeting, she has updated the Application with the recommendations made. The discussion surrounding this application and the filtering process will occur at the next meeting.

### **MEMBER REPORTS (03:05:16)**

No member reports were made.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS (03:05:16)**

There were no additional announcements outside of what was provided in the agenda.

### **ADJOURN**

There being no other business, the October 9, 2024, CCMPO Projects Committee Meeting was adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Reagan Mann

Recording Secretary

## ITEM 2

### Election of Officers for 2025

The Projects Committee should elect a Chair and Vice Chair for 2025. In 2024, Commissioner Concepcion (Centre County) served as Chair, and David Rishel (CATA) served as Vice-Chair.

<b>2025 Voting Members of the Projects Committee</b>		
Centre County	Amber Concepcion	Centre County Commissioner
CATA	David Rishel	Interim CEO and Executive Director
Centre Region Municipalities	Ray Forziat	Centre Regional Planning Commission Chair
Outlying Municipalities	Daryl Shaffer	Haines Township Supervisor
PennDOT District 2-0	Mark Schultz	Transportation Planning Manager

Presented by: Marcella Hoffman

Action: Election of Officers for 2025

## ITEM 6

### Grant Applications Update

#### **Safe Streets and Roads for All**

The CCMPO has been collaborating with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to develop an SS4A Grant Agreement. Staff and the COG solicitor reviewed the agreement before it was sent to the FHWA on December 5, 2024. The FHWA representative informed staff that obtaining approval from the FHWA finance team would take a few weeks. Once the Grant Agreement is executed at our end, it will be sent back to FHWA for its final approval and execution. Staff hopes to complete the Grant Agreement by mid-February.

Staff has developed a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to solicit consultant support for the completion of Centre County's Action Plan, *Centred on Safety*, using SS4A funds. Along with MPO staff, a few stakeholders will be invited to join the selection committee to assist staff with selecting the consultant(s) that will provide services to complete the SS4A grant, including the completion of plans, fieldwork, inventory work, data collection, and technical analysis. Staff anticipates that the contract will begin in early June 2025, and all work will be completed by December 31, 2026.

#### **Bridge Investment Program**

On October 9, 2024, CCMPO staff began working with Centre County, PennDOT, and a consultant team to develop and submit a grant application for the SR 4005 Snow Shoe Bridge replacement project. The grant requested 80% of the construction costs, about \$9.1 million. On November 1, 2024, Centre County submitted the grant application on behalf of the CCMPO. Staff expect the award announcement to come mid-year 2025. If the grant funds are awarded to the project, the County will elect to have the funds "pass-through" to PennDOT via the Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), whose staff will manage the project and administer the grant. The supplemental narrative of the application is attached separately due to the length of the document.

#### **Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program**

The PROTECT grant program opened on October 25, 2024, and applications are due February 24, 2025. Staff are working with Michael Baker to develop a grant application for a Resilience Improvement Plan, focusing on several areas in the County that experience severe flooding issues during significant weather events. Staff proposes developing a grant application to support a three-phase approach for a Resilience Improvement Plan.

The first phase identifies locations, issues, disruptions, and overall vulnerabilities within the transportation system. The second phase prioritizes projects based on the assessments conducted in the first phase and initiates preliminary engineering for the highest-priority projects. The third phase will encompass the implementation and permitting processes. This phase will also include the creation of a funding plan to facilitate the construction of prioritized projects while ensuring coordination with relevant partners and stakeholders. Given the complexities often associated with the permitting process, particularly with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), it is crucial to incorporate permitting assistance in the application. This support will enable municipalities to navigate the process and advance toward construction effectively.

A Resilience Improvement Plan will also assist with the implementation of Centre County's Hazard Mitigation Plan, specifically mitigation action number 24, "Coordinate the performance of detailed flood studies for the County's high-hazard areas to determine a full range of flood-recurrence intervals for use in future vulnerability analyses." A Resilience Improvement Plan will also allow the MPO to pursue implementation/construction funding through the PROTECT Program once the plan is completed.

**The Projects Committee should receive the report.**

Presented by: Marcella Hoffman, CRPA

No action required – comments and questions are welcome.

## ITEM 7

### 2025 Projects Committee Work Plan

The CCMPO's staff will continue implementing the actions recommended in the CCMPO Strategic Plan adopted in June 2023. One implementation step directed staff to prepare work plans for the CCMPO Committees to be presented at the first meeting of each year.

A draft work plan for 2025 is attached. The document provides a brief overview of expected committee activities for 2025. The work plan includes the listings for the following:

- 2025 Committee Meetings Schedule
- Expected reports and action items for each meeting
- A proposed schedule of activities for the Projects Committee and the Transportation Grant Specialist
- Input Opportunities on Funding/Planning Programs

The work plan is intended to aid members in planning for and participating in committee activities. Comments on the work plan to increase its effectiveness are welcome.

Attachment: CCMPO 2025 Projects Committee Work Plan

**The Projects Committee should review the work plan and provide comments to CCMPO staff.**

Presented by: Marcella Hoffman, CRPA

Action: Provide comments to MPO staff

## PROJECTS COMMITTEE WORK PLAN FOR 2025

### INTRODUCTION

The CCMPO is a transportation planning organization that works in partnership with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to fulfill federal and state metropolitan transportation planning requirements for Centre County (the State College, PA Urbanized Area).

Members of the MPO serve as transportation decision makers, monitoring the planning process, receiving information from staff and other planning agencies, and making decisions considering that information and their knowledge of the transportation needs within Centre County.

The policy-making body of the CCMPO is the Coordinating Committee, which is responsible for the transportation planning activities mandated in federal laws and regulations. The Coordinating Committee is advised by the Technical Committee, which provides comments and recommendations on an ongoing basis, and the Projects Committee, which is responsible for devising and maintaining a project selection process, collecting information regarding transportation funding opportunities, and reviewing transportation-related studies and plans to determine regional priorities for the CCMPO.

This document is intended as a brief outline of the tasks and activities the CCMPO Projects Committee can expect in 2025.

### MEETINGS

Meetings for the Projects Committee are expected to occur 2-3 times a year; however, because the Committee is new, it is likely to meet at least four times in 2025, with additional meetings, if needed. Staff anticipates the Projects Committee to meet in January, March, May, and at some point in the fall. Meeting days and times are to be determined in the future.

## AGENDA ITEMS

Over the year, the Projects Committee will be given informational updates and asked to review and approve grant opportunities and efforts. The following list and table show major items that we anticipate for each of the 2025 meetings:

### January

- Election of Officers
- Grant Applications Update & SS4A Grant Selection Process
- Project Prioritization – Initial Results
- Draft Bridge Project Prioritization Matrix
- Project Request Form

### March

- Grant Applications Update
- Project Prioritization – edits and final scoring
- Initial Bridge Project Prioritization Results
- Initial Active Transportation Project Prioritization Results
- UPWP Supplemental Planning Studies Priorities
- Long Range Transportation Plan – List of Projects
- Municipal Grant Workshop

### May

- Grant Applications Update
- Project Prioritization Update
- Bridge Project Prioritization – Edits and Final Scoring
- Active Transportation Project Prioritization – Edits and Final Scoring
- Bridge Investment Program – Snow Shoe Bridge Grant Application
- Municipal Grant Workshop
- 2026 Grant Applications

### Fall

- Grant Applications Update
- Project Prioritization Update
- 2026 Grant Applications

In addition to the items noted above, members can expect to receive regular updates and announcements about funding opportunities and awards. Members are also welcome to recommend discussion items for meetings; however, it is requested that they make these recommendations as far in advance of the meetings as possible.

# CURRENT AND FUTURE GRANT APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE AND TRANSPORTATION GRANT SPECIALIST EFFORTS

	Final Deadline	Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4		
		Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
SS4A	December 2026	●	■			■							
PROTECT	February 24, 2025	■									■		
Snow Shoe Bridge BIP	November 1, 2024						■						
FY 2026 BIP	November 1, 2025	■											
Municipal State Grant Workshop				■									
Input Opportunity	March & May			● L RTP UPWP		● TIP							

● Grant program open   
 ● Grant agreement development   
 ● RFQ and consultant selection   
 ● Project development

\*MPO staff intend to host two Municipal Grant Workshops in 2025, as shown in the row with vertical lines.

## INPUT OPPORTUNITIES ON MPO FUNDING/PLANNING PROGRAMS

- Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Year Two Supplemental Planning Studies: Preparation of the UPWP is a required element of federal metropolitan transportation planning regulations. The UPWP lists the transportation planning activities to be completed by the CCMPO between two specified years. The CCMPO can request additional funds for special studies each year of the UPWP. Year one of the current UPWP began July 1, 2024; the second year will begin July 1, 2025. The Committee will review priority special studies at its March meeting.

- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Project Priorities: Every two years, the CCMPO is responsible for developing and adopting a short-range, four-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP details the planned expenditures of federal and state funds for specific projects within specific limits of fiscal constraint. Projects on the TIP must also be included in the CCMPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Part of the TIP development is identifying project priorities. The Projects Committee will review and provide input on the preliminary project priorities of the 2027-2030 TIP at its May meeting.
- Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2055—Prioritization of Projects: The LRTP serves as the official transportation plan for the CCMPO. It documents current and future transportation demands and identifies long-term improvements and projects to meet those demands over a 30-year period. The LRTP includes all modes of transportation, evaluates the system based on performance measures, and requires a fiscally constrained project list. The Projects Committee will be tasked with reviewing the Project Request Forms from municipalities, stakeholders, and residents that will be included in the LRTP at its March meeting.

## CONCLUSION

This work plan is intended as a guide to help members understand the matters they will be asked to consider in 2025. Other issues may be recommended by members or dictated by conditions, but this provides a rough outline of major work items for Calendar Year 2025. It is important to note that staff acknowledges the work plan outlines a significant workload for Committee members. As the Projects Committee is new, establishing the Project Prioritization Process and developing a clear path for pursuing discretionary grant funding programs requires considerable effort. We recognize that this committee demands a substantial time commitment, but we anticipate that after this year, the Committee will return to the original plan of holding two to three meetings per year to guide staff and the process.

## Item 8

### Project Prioritization – Initial Results

The Projects Committee is tasked with applying criteria to each project for the project prioritization process. It is recommended that the prioritization process be simple but repeatable and transparent. The criteria will be used for the current project prioritization process and will serve as a foundation for future grant funding opportunities. Furthermore, the criteria will contribute to developing the project list in the CCMPO's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

At the October 9, 2024 meeting, staff reviewed the scoring mechanisms for each project category matrix. The Projects Committee discussed each project category matrix and the associated criteria and scoring mechanisms to rank the criteria in each project category. Staff used the Committee's input to weigh the criteria in each project category and conducted an initial scoring exercise to ensure the data associated with each criterion was adequate to score each project. Please see the *enclosed* meeting summary for an overview of the October 9, 2024 meeting discussion.

Staff have scored several projects within each project category, except for the bridge and active transportation project category. Once the Committee reviews the proposed criteria for bridge projects, staff will conduct the scoring exercise for Committee review. The active transportation matrix is dependent on data from the Centre County Active Transportation Plan, and staff are still working on gathering the data. The Committee will review the scoring results of these two categories at its March meeting. *Enclosed* is the CCMPO Initial Project Ranking Result report, which provides an overview of the scoring results in each project category and the observations gathered for the scoring mechanisms during the process.

The Committee should discuss the ranking results and identify any issues with the scoring mechanisms or results. In addition, the Committee should consider ranking the data-oriented criteria in the Safety-Congestion, Major Highway-Capacity Adding, and Resiliency Project Categories.

Attachments:

1. October 9 meeting – Prioritization discussion summary
2. CCMPO Initial Project Ranking Result Report and scoring sheets for sample projects

**The Projects Committee should review the prioritization matrix, provide comments to CCMPO staff, and consider ranking the criteria in the Safety/Congestion, Major Highway/Capacity Adding, and Resiliency project categories for future ranking efforts.**

Presented by: Marcella Hoffman

Action: Consider providing ranking (weights) to the criteria in Safety/Congestion, Major Highway-Capacity Adding, and Resiliency project categories.

## Hoffman, Marcella

---

**From:** Hoffman, Marcella  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 10, 2024 2:20 PM  
**To:** Amber Concepcion; Daryl Schafer; David Rishel; iforziati@aol.com; Mark Schultz  
**Cc:** Saylor, James; Messner, Anne; Kausch, Greg; Xochi Confer  
**Subject:** Projects Committee Meeting Summary

Good afternoon all,

First, I want to thank everyone who attended the meeting yesterday – it was a long one! I am providing a summary of the prioritization matrix discussion since it was very long and detailed. I want to ensure I captured the high-level points of the discussion and what the committee would like to see moving forward. Generally, the Committee requested that staff perform a practice screening for each prioritization matrix to see how the projects score and ensure the criteria is scoring the way it's intended. Once this exercise is completed, staff will share the results with the Projects Committee.

### Safety-Congestion

- The Committee felt that Project Readiness and Project Sponsor were important and should be ranked higher than the other three general criteria – Economic Impact, Environmental Impact, and Equity.
- The other criteria were not ranked. The Committee would like to see how the projects score to ensure there isn't double counting while using the PennDOT Network Screening Tool and the PA Crash Information Tool.
- The Committee added a third option to the Safety Subcommittee Project criterion – “Not Reviewed,” in case of timing issues between the two Committee meetings.

### Technology

- Integration and Connectivity criterion should be graded on a scale instead of yes or no.
- The Committee ranked the criteria for point values as follows: 1) Integration and Connectivity; 2) Cost Effectiveness/Scalability; 3) Economic Impact; 4) Safety Crash Data; 5) Project Readiness; 6) Project Sponsor; 7) Environmental Impact; 8) Equity

### Active Transportation

- Under the Accessibility/Connectivity criterion, the Committee would like to see “Addresses Gaps or Barriers in Network.”
- Connects/Creates corridors of a distance of 1 mile or more would get a certain number of points and Connects/Creates Corridors of a distance of less than 1 mile would get a certain number of points.
- “Impacts to Other Transportation Modes” (Yes or No) should be added as a scoring mechanism.
- “Critical Community Facilities” under Economic Impact should include recreation areas/parks.
- The Committee ranked the criteria for point values as follows: 1) Accessibility/Connectivity; 2) Health/Wellness Impact; 3) Safety-Crash Data; 4) Project Readiness; 5) Project Sponsor; 6) Economic Impact; 7) Equity; 8) Environmental Impact

### Major Highway – Capacity Adding

- Under the Available Development Capacity criterion, the scoring mechanism should be changed to “Capacity adding for Economic” (Yes or No) and “Capacity Adding for Safety/Congestion” (Yes or No)
- The Committee ranked the criteria for point values as follows: 1) Available Development Capacity; 2) State of Good Repair; 3) Safety-Crash Data; 4) Project Readiness; 5) Project Sponsor; 6) Economic Impact; 7) Environmental Impact; 8) Equity

#### Resiliency

- The Committee ranked the general criteria as follows: 1) Project Readiness; 2) Project Sponsor; 3) Economic Impact; 4) Environmental Impact; 5) Equity.
- The Committee was not prepared to rank the other criteria as they felt the criteria were very closely related and would like to see how projects score to ensure the criteria are scoring as intended
- Under Criticality to Community, the Committee suggested separating the medical/hospital/emergency services as a separate scoring mechanism from the other critical community facilities.

#### Transit-Rail Aviation

- Under the Intermodal Access and Connectivity, “Impacts to Other Modes” should be added as a scoring mechanism
- The Committee ranked the criteria for point values as follows: 1) Ridership Demand; 2) Intermodal Access and Connectivity; 3) Service Reliability; 4) Asset Management/State of Good Repair; 5) Safety and Security; 6) Project Readiness; 7) Project Sponsor; 8) Environmental Impact; 9) Economic Impact; 10) Equity

I hope this is helpful. Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Best regards,



**Marcella Hoffman, Transportation Grant Specialist**

Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization

2643 Gateway Drive, Suite 4 | State College, PA | Main: 814-231-3050 | Social: @centrecountympo

## CCMPO Initial Project Prioritization Ranking Results

### Safety-Congestion Project Category (16 Possible Points)

The initial scoring exercise scored five projects in the Safety-Congestion Project Category. They included projects that varied in project type so that observations could be made about how the scoring mechanism functioned. The following projects were scored and are ranked from highest-scoring to lowest-scoring:

1. Boalsburg Avenue Road Diet – 11.25
2. Benner Pike Corridor Study – 9.75
3. SR 3007 Park Avenue Widening – 9.25
4. SR 26/45 Pine Grove Mills Intersection – 8.5
5. SR 150 Phoenix Avenue Intersection – 6.5

**Observations:** The PennDOT Network Screening tool is a separate calculation from the PCIT crash data criteria, and there are very limited intersections and segments in the Network Screening Tool that are above 0.9; therefore, the Network Screening Tool seems to boost projects in points with more serious safety issues. In addition, out of the above projects, only the Benner Pike Corridor Study received a point under the Network Screening Tool (urban segment score of 0.95). The crash data utilized from the Pennsylvania Crash Information Tool (PCIT) to score projects was from 2018 to 2023, which is consistent with PennDOT and FHWA assessments. It was also observed that due to the criteria's scoring mechanisms, studies score similarly to construction projects. Compared to other project categories, the criteria are data-based, and the data is easily found for study projects. Additional observations include minimal safety projects that the Safety Subcommittee has reviewed; however, this is expected to change in the future. As a general observation, it has been noted that in most project categories, projects have not received points for "Incorporates environmental protection" under the Environmental Impact Criterion because there is not enough information in the details of the proposed project to be able to score it as a "yes." Lastly, under economic impact, there should be a defined area (miles) to indicate whether a project will provide improved access to employment centers and recreation/tourism and improve freight mobility. Freight mobility is currently defined as "within 5 miles of."

## Safety - Congestion Projects Screening

**Project Name:** Boal Ave Road Diet  
**Total Score:** 11.25

*Implementation of Boal Avenue Road Diet Study - goal of improving the functionality of Boal Avenue from SR 45 interchange and Warner Blvd while providing safer access to commercial, cultural, and recreational sites along the corridor, balancing the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
PennDOT Network Screening Tool	Screening completed by PennDOT to develop potential safety projects. The range refers to the term known as Excess Value that any thing above a 1 should be investigated	Greater than 1 HIGH	2	0	This road segment was not listed in the PennDOT Network Screening Tool.
		0.9 to 0.99 MEDIUM	1		
		Less than 0.9 LOW	0		
Crash Data for Project area	Recorded crashes in Pennsylvania's Crash Information Tool	Fatality HIGH	3	3	Fatalities have been recorded in the project area.
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	2		
		Other Crash LOW	1		
Safety Subcommittee Project	Is this a project advanced by the Safety Subcommittee but not eligible for HSIP funding?	Yes	2	1	The safety subcommittee has not reviewed this project.
		Rejected	0		
		Not reviewed	1		
Traffic Volume	For the road(s) in the proposed project, what is the ADT and how does it compare to the functional classification average ADT?	ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - Yes	2	2	Boal Avenue is categorized as a principal arterial (3,396,622 AADT,) and the AADT calculation comes in at 4,257,243
		ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - No	1		
		Volume not counted - local road	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.75	The project area is not in a federally designated economic distressed area.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		The project area is near Mount Nittany Middle and Elementary Schools
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		The project area is immediately adjacent to the Pennsylvania Military Museum.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		This project is within 5 miles of South Atherton/Boal Avenue Intersection & SR 45/Earlstown Rd SR 322 Interchange.
Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0				
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0.5	The proposal of a road diet and increased alternative transportation infrastructure meets the eligibility of PennDOT's CRP.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		There is not enough information in the draft project to indicate whether the project provides environmental protection.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	2	Yes one sponsor.
		No	0		
Readiness of Project	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	2	Yes, Harris Twp completed a Road Diet Study, and potential projects are in the queue after SR 322 SCAC.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	1	0	The project area is not in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Safety - Congestion Projects Screening

**Project Name:** Benner Pike Corridor Study  
**Total Score:** 9.75

*Study to identify cumulative impacts of commercial and residential development along and served by the SR 150 corridor east of I-99 to Myrtle Street to identify potential mitigations.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
PennDOT Network Screening Tool	Screening completed by PennDOT to develop potential safety projects. The range refers to the term known as Excess Value that any thing above a 1 should be investigated	Greater than 1 HIGH	2	1	This road segment was listed in the PennDOT Network Screening tool (0.95 - urban segments).
		0.9 to 0.99 MEDIUM	1		
		Less than 0.9 LOW	0		
Crash Data for Project area	Recorded crashes in Pennsylvania's Crash Information Tool	Fatality HIGH	3	3	Within the study area, a fatality was recorded.
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	2		
		Other Crash LOW	1		
Safety Subcommittee Project	Is this a project advanced by the Safety Subcommittee but not eligible for HSIP funding?	Yes	2	1	The safety subcommittee has not reviewed this project.
		Rejected	0		
		Not reviewed	1		
Traffic Volume	For the road(s) in the proposed project, what is the ADT and how does it compare to the functional classification average ADT?	ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - Yes	2	2	Benner Pike is categorized as a principal arterial (3,396,622 AADT,) and the AADT calculation comes in at 12,234,951.
		ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - No	1		
		Volume not counted - local road	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.75	The project area is not in a federally designated economic distressed area.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		The project area is near Centre County Government and Centre County Correctional Facilities.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		The project area is near Fisherman's Paradise/Tallyrand Park.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		
Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0	This project encompasses Critical Urban Freight Corridor of Benner Pike from Benner Twp line to Stone Crest Dr.			
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?		Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50	There is not enough information in the draft project to indicate whether the project provides environmental protection.	
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	2	Yes there are multiple local sponsors.
		No	0		
Readiness of Project	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	0	No, this study would provide more information on a potential project.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	1	0	The project area is not in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Safety - Congestion Projects Screening

**Project Name:** Park Avenue Widening  
**Total Score:** 9.25

*Project includes widening, adding turn lanes, installing/upgrading traffic signals, and providing bike lanes and a sidewalk or a bike path. Project limits would be between Bigler Road and Orchard Road.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
PennDOT Network Screening Tool	Screening completed by PennDOT to develop potential safety projects. The range refers to the term known as Excess Value that any thing above a 1 should be investigated	Greater than 1 HIGH	2	0	This road segment was not listed in the PennDOT Network Screening Tool.
		0.9 to 0.99 MEDIUM	1		
		Less than 0.9 LOW	0		
Crash Data for Project area	Recorded crashes in Pennsylvania's Crash Information Tool	Fatality HIGH	3	2	Serious injury crashes have been recorded within the project limits.
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	2		
		Other Crash LOW	1		
Safety Subcommittee Project	Is this a project advanced by the Safety Subcommittee but not eligible for HSIP funding?	Yes	2	1	The safety subcommittee has not reviewed this project.
		Rejected	0		
		Not reviewed	1		
Traffic Volume	For the road(s) in the proposed project, what is the ADT and how does it compare to the functional classification average ADT?	ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - Yes	2	2	Park Avenue is categorized as a minor arterial (1,658,955 AADT,) and the AADT calculation comes in at 5,839,142
		ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - No	1		
		Volume not counted - local road	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.75	The project area is not in a federally designated economic distressed area.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		The project area is immediately adjacent to Penn State University.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		The project area is near Beaver Stadium/BJC/Arboretum.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		This project is within 5 miles of I-99 (Primary Highway Freight System)
Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0				
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0.5	The proposal of installing/upgrading traffic signals and providing bike lanes/path or sidewalk is eligible under PennDOT's CRP.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		There is not enough information in the draft project to indicate whether the project provides environmental protection.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	2	Yes, one sponsor for the traffic signals.
		No	0		
Readiness of Project	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	1	Partially completed, a concept plan was completed in 2009.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	1	0	The project area is not in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Safety - Congestion Projects Screening

**Project Name:** SR 26/SR45 Pine Grove Mills Intersection  
**Total Score:** 8.5

*Realignment of the intersection and installation of a full functioning traffic signal (if warranted) at the intersection of SR26/45 & Nixon Rd (project limits) in Pine Grove Mills located in Ferguson Township. Currently, there exists a flashing traffic signal at this location.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
PennDOT Network Screening Tool	Screening completed by PennDOT to develop potential safety projects. The range refers to the term known as Excess Value that any thing above a 1 should be investigated	Greater than 1 HIGH	2	0	This road segment was not listed in the PennDOT Network Screening Tool.
		0.9 to 0.99 MEDIUM	1		
		Less than 0.9 LOW	0		
Crash Data for Project area	Recorded crashes in Pennsylvania's Crash Information Tool	Fatality HIGH	3	1	Minor injury crashes and property damage only crashes have been recorded within the project area.
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	2		
		Other Crash LOW	1		
Safety Subcommittee Project	Is this a project advanced by the Safety Subcommittee but not eligible for HSIP funding?	Yes	2	1	The safety subcommittee has not reviewed this project.
		Rejected	0		
		Not reviewed	1		
Traffic Volume	For the road(s) in the proposed project, what is the ADT and how does it compare to the functional classification average ADT?	ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - Yes	2	2	Pine Grove Road is categorized as a minor arterial (1,658,955 AADT,) and the AADT calculation comes in at 2,450,543
		ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - No	1		
		Volume not counted - local road	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.5	The project area is not in a federally designated economic distressed area.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		The project area is near Ferguson Elementary school.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		The project area is near Rothrock State Forest.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		This project is not within 5 miles of any Primary Highway Freight System or Critical Urban/Rural Freight Corridor.
Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0				
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0	The proposed project does not have components that are eligible under PennDOT's CRP Program.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		There is not enough information in the draft project to indicate whether the project provides environmental protection.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	2	Yes.
		No	0		
Readiness of Project	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	2	Yes, several analyses have been completed, including the PGM Small Area Plan.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	1	0	The project area is not in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Safety - Congestion Projects Screening

**Project Name:** Phoenix Avenue Intersection  
**Total Score:** 6.5

*Bridge Improvement Program study phase to identify solutions for SR 150 over Logan Branch and related intersection issues paired with bridge improvement or complex program application for implementation. Project limits are from Logan Branch Bridge to just east of SR 144.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
PennDOT Network Screening Tool	Screening completed by PennDOT to develop potential safety projects. The range refers to the term known as Excess Value that any thing above a 1 should be investigated	Greater than 1 HIGH	2	0	This road segment was not listed in the PennDOT Network Screening Tool.
		0.9 to 0.99 MEDIUM	1		
		Less than 0.9 LOW	0		
Crash Data for Project area	Recorded crashes in Pennsylvania's Crash Information Tool	Fatality HIGH	3	1	Within the project area, only property damage crashes have been recorded.
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	2		
		Other Crash LOW	1		
Safety Subcommittee Project	Is this a project advanced by the Safety Subcommittee but not eligible for HSIP funding?	Yes	2	1	The safety subcommittee has not reviewed this project.
		Rejected	0		
		Not reviewed	1		
Traffic Volume	For the road(s) in the proposed project, what is the ADT and how does it compare to the functional classification average ADT?	ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - Yes	2	1	Willowbank Street is classified as a principal arterial (3,396,622 AADT,) and the AADT calculation comes in at 3,120,064.
		ADT > than AADT on functional classification? - No	1		
		Volume not counted - local road	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	1	The project area is in a federally designated economic distressed area.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		The project area is immediately adjacent to Centre County Government and near Centre County Correctional Facilities.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		The project area is immediately adjacent to Spring Creek and Tallyrand Park.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		
Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0				
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0.5	This project includes intersection improvements and possible traffic signal improvements, which are eligible under CRP.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		There is not enough information in the draft project to indicate whether the project provides environmental protection.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	0	No local sponsor currently.
		No	0		
Readiness of Project	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	1	Yes, several analyses have been completed, but an alternative has not been selected.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	1	1	The project area is in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

### **Technology Project Category (22 Possible Points)**

The initial scoring exercise scored two projects, as only two are in the Technology Project Category. The following projects were scored and are ranked from highest-scoring to lowest-scoring:

1. SR 3014/North Atherton Street Signals Upgrades – 15.5
2. College Ave/High Street Intersection (Pedestrian crossing) – 8.5

**Observations:** There was insufficient information to score the Cost Effectiveness/Scalability criterion for the College Ave/High Street Intersection project. This project came out of the State College Borough's Downtown Master Plan (2013); however, it is not listed in the Borough's Next Gen Plan (2024), so it may be no longer feasible or necessary. Staff notes that the State College Borough is interested in updating its Downtown Master Plan. The High-Injury Network for Centre County is currently being developed and should be available for the scoring exercise in the near future; this criterion received points based on whether there were a high number of fatalities or serious injuries in the project area (i.e., North Atherton corridor has a fatality and several serious injuries from 2018-2023). The scores in this project category are subject to change based on additional information from the High-Injury Network. As a general observation, it has been noted that in most project categories, projects have not received points for "Incorporates environmental protection" under the Environmental Impact Criterion because there is not enough information in the details of the proposed project to be able to score it as a "yes." Lastly, under economic impact, there should be a defined area (miles) to indicate whether a project will provide improved access to employment centers and recreation/tourism and improve freight mobility. Freight mobility is currently defined as "within 5 miles of."

## Technology Projects Screening

**Project Name:** North Atherton Street Signals - future project  
**Total Score:** 15.5

*Improve efficiency of operations through the corridor (Valley Vista Dr to W College Ave project limits) by upgrading traffic signals with the latest technology.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Safety-Crash Data	Is the project located on the High-Injury Network? Recorded crashes in Pennsylvania's Crash Information Tool (high medium low)	Yes	1	3	High-Injury Network is being developed - scored it as a yes because of the number of serious injury and fatality crashes recorded.  One fatality and serious injuries have been recorded on the N. Atherton Street corridor.
		No	0		
		Fatality HIGH	2		
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	1		
		Other Crash LOW	0		
Integration and Connectivity	Does the project improve the integration of new and existing systems and promote connectivity of infrastructure, connected vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and the broader traveling public?	High integration - both new and existing systems	5	5	New signal technology would have to integrate with existing technology for maximum efficiency, and the aim is to promote connectivity of infrastructure and modes of transportation.
		Medium integration - only new systems	3		
		Low integration - neither new or existing integration	0		
Cost Effectiveness/ Scalability	Does the project pilot a new technology or technique that could be expanded to additional projects and does the project provide for an opportunity for reduced operating and maintenance costs?	Pilot a new technology or technique: Yes	2	2	Not enough information as to what kind of new technology would be pursued.  Scored as a yes because increased efficiency and connectivity should help reduce operating costs for all motorists.
		Pilot a new technology or technique: No	0		
		BCA value > 1 or proven to reduce operating/maint. costs - Yes	2		
		BCA value > 1 or proven to reduce operating/maint. costs - No	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	1	3	No, this project is not in an economic distressed area.  Improved efficiency and connectivity will improve access to the many employment centers on the corridor.  Tudek Park and the Penn State Arboretum are near N. Atherton Street  Improved efficiency and connectivity will improve freight mobility - all of N Atherton is a Critical Urban Freight Corridor
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	1		
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	1		
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	1		
Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0				
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0.5	Yes, this project could be considered an advanced transportation and congestion management technology project.  There is not enough information to determine whether this project incorporates environmental protection.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	0	Unclear at this time. A Green Light Go grant application was pursued years ago for this corridor. Unsure of where this stands.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	1	Partially - a similar project was completed in 2013 and there may have been some data available for the GLG application.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	1	1	Yes, a portion of N. Atherton Street near the Walmart plaza.
		No	0		

## Technology Projects Screening

**Project Name:** SR 26 College Avenue/High Street Intersection

**Total Score:** 8.5

*As proposed in the 2013 Downtown Master Plan, signalize the intersection of College Ave and High St (project limits) for traffic calming and to permit safe crossings of pedestrians; provide pedestrian and handicapped access on both the east and west side of intersection to connect to Penn State campus.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Safety-Crash Data	Is the project located on the High-Injury Network? Recorded crashes in Pennsylvania's Crash Information Tool (high medium low)	Yes	1	0	High-Injury Network is being developed - scored it as a no because only property damage crashes have occurred at this intersection.  Multiple property-only crashes at this intersection.
		No	0		
		Fatality HIGH	2		
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	1		
		Other Crash LOW	0		
Integration and Connectivity	Does the project improve the integration of new and existing systems and promote connectivity of infrastructure, connected vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and the broader traveling public?	High integration - both new and existing systems	5	3	The installation of new traffic calming devices would integrate new systems and promote connectivity of infrastructure and the broad traveling public.
		Medium integration - only new systems	3		
		Low integration - neither new or existing integration	0		
Cost Effectiveness/ Scalability	Does the project pilot a new technology or technique that could be expanded to additional projects and does the project provide for an opportunity for reduced operating and maintenance costs?	Pilot a new technology or technique: Yes	2	0	Not enough information as to what kind of new technology would be pursued.  Traffic calming measures would not reduce operating or maintenance costs because there is not an existing signal at this intersection.
		Pilot a new technology or technique: No	0		
		BCA value > 1 or proven to reduce operating/maint. costs - Yes	2		
		BCA value > 1 or proven to reduce operating/maint. costs - No	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	1	4	Yes, this intersection is in an economic distressed area.  Improved efficiency and connectivity will improve access to the many employment centers on the corridor.  Beaver Stadium, the BJC, and Medlar Field are nearby.  The proposed project is within 5 miles of North Atherton Street (Valley Vista to Boal Ave) which is a Critical Urban Freight Corridor.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	1		
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	1		
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	1		
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0.5	Yes, this project could be considered a transportation alternatives project under PennDOT's CRP.  There is not enough information to determine whether this project incorporates environmental protection.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	0	Unclear at this time. This project was listed in the 2013 SCB Downtown Master Plan, but is not referenced in the Next Gen Plan.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	0	No, unaware of any PE/study/concept plan that has been completed for this intersection.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	1	1	Yes, a portion of this intersection is in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

### **Major Highway – Capacity Adding Project Category (11.5 Possible Points)**

The initial scoring exercise scored three projects in the Major Highway-Capacity Adding Project Category, and all three projects included a new road. The following projects were scored and are ranked from highest-scored to lowest-scored:

1. Route 322 Corridor O-1 – 6.75
2. Tri-Municipal Park Road – 5.75
3. Airport Road Connector – 4.75

**Observations:** The three data-oriented criteria are not ranked/weighted because the Projects Committee had no strong feelings about which criterion should be most important. Under the State of Good Repair criterion, the Tri-Municipal Park project specifically states that the new road will alleviate the need to improve surrounding roads. For the Airport Road Connector and the Corridor O-1 projects, no information alludes to the idea that the existing roads will be improved by developing a new road; however, points can be given to the “Addresses pavement or base infrastructure” scoring mechanism because it can be assumed that building a new road will extend the life of the current infrastructure.

The Route 322 Corridor O-1 project received two points under the “Safety and Crash Information” criterion because SR 322 near Shangri Lane (the route in which motorists currently travel to connect to I-80 in Clearfield) scored a 1.27 on the rural segment of the PennDOT Network Screening tool. The Corridor O-1 project has been stalled since 2004 due to statewide funding issues that cause over 20 highway projects across the state to be stopped or stalled. To score the projects for crash information, staff looked at the crash rates on the existing roads that motorists use to travel to the destination (State College Airport=Fox Hill and Fox Hollow Road; Tri-Municipal Park=Brush Valley Road and SR 45/Earlystown Road; I-80 in Clearfield=SR 322 and SR 53).

None of these projects have local sponsors, but all have completed some preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies. As a general observation, it has been noted that in most project categories, projects have not received points for “Incorporates environmental protection” under the Environmental Impact Criterion because there is not enough information in the details of the proposed project to be able to score it as a “yes.” Lastly, under economic impact, there should be a defined area (miles) to indicate whether a project will provide improved access to employment centers and recreation/tourism and improve freight mobility. Freight mobility is currently defined as “within 5 miles of.

## Major Highway - Capacity Adding Projects Screening

**Project Name:** Route 322 Corridor O-1  
**Total score:** 6.75

*Four lane connector road to link I-99 in Worth Township (Centre County) near Port Matilda to I-80 in Graham Township (Clearfield County)*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Safety and Crash information	PennDOT Network Screening Tool and recorded crashes for project area using PA's Crash Information Tool	Greater than 1 HIGH	1	2	SR 322 near Shangri Lane scored a 1.27 on the Rural Segment of PennDOT's Network Screening Tool.  There have been several fatalities on SR 322 from Port Matilda to Philipsburg, SR 322 from Philipsburg/Chester Hill to SR 970, and SR 53 from Philipsburg to the Kylertown Interchange (roads motorists currently use to access I-80)
		0.9 to 0.99 MEDIUM	0.5		
		Less than 0.9 LOW	0		
		Fatality HIGH	1		
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	0.5		
		Other Crash LOW	0		
State of good repair	Does the project extend the life of the infrastructure? Does the project restore or improve existing core infrastructure?	Addresses pavement or base infrastructure - Yes	0.5	0.5	Building a new road to connect I-99 in Worth Twp to I-80 in Graham Twp will extend the life of the current infrastructure by moving thru-traffic to the new road.  This new road will not contribute to restoring/improving existing infrastructure.
		Addresses pavement or base infrastructure - No	0		
		Restore/improve exist. infrastructure - Yes	0.5		
		Restore/improve exist. Infrastructure - No	0		
Available Development Capacity	Is the project within an area that has available development capacity?	Yes - Capacity-adding for Economic	0.5	1	The proposed project, as noted in previous studies, will facilitate economic development activities in Moshannon Valley and central PA.  The proposed project, as noted in previous studies, will address safety issues on existing roads connecting I-99 to I-80 (SR 322 & SR 53)
		No - Capacity-adding for Economic	0		
		Yes - Capacity-adding for Congestion/Safety	0.5		
		No - Capacity-adding for Congestion/Safety	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.75	The project area is in a federally designated economic distressed area.  The project is near the Philipsburg Osceola School District.  Aside from state game lands, there are no recreational/tourism entities near the project area.  This project creates a new road to connect I-99 to I-80, both of which are Primary Highway Freight Systems.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0	The proposed new road is not eligible under PennDOT's CRP.  There is not enough information in the project to indicate whether the project provides environmental protection.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	0	There is not a project sponsor - this project has been idle since 2004.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	3	2	Partially completed - a recommended alternative was identified, and the project was nearing environmental clearance in 2004. However, a new study would need to be completed with new data.
		Partially completed/In progress	2		
		No - none completed	1		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0.5	The project area would go through a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Major Highway - Capacity Adding Projects Screening

**Project Name:** Tri-Municipal Park Road  
**Total score:** 5.75

*This is a new road to improve access to Brush Valley Road (SR 2006) and the 165-acre Tri-Municipal Park west of Centre Hall. The intent is to alleviate traffic in Linden Hall, along Rimmey Road, and on West Church Street in Centre Hall Borough.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Safety and Crash information	PennDOT Network Screening Tool and recorded crashes for project area using PA's Crash Information Tool	Greater than 1 HIGH	1	1	This road segment was not listed in the PennDOT Network Screening tool within the scoring mechanism definitions.  There have been serious injury and one fatality crash on Brush Valley Road/SR 45 (Earlstown Road) - the roads that motorists currently use to access the park.
		0.9 to 0.99 MEDIUM	0.5		
		Less than 0.9 LOW	0		
		Fatality HIGH	1		
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	0.5		
		Other Crash LOW	0		
State of good repair	Does the project extend the life of the infrastructure? Does the project restore or improve existing core infrastructure?	Addresses pavement or base infrastructure - Yes	0.5	1	Building a new road to connect Brush Valley Road and SR 45/Earlstown Road to the Tri-Municipal Park will extend the life of the current infrastructure and maintain the maintenance cycle for West Church Street, Rimmey Road, and roads in Linden Hall.  Building a new road to connect Brush Valley Road and SR 45/Earlstown Road to the Tri-Municipal Park will alleviate the need for improvements to West Church Street, Rimmey Road, and the roads in Linden Hall (as described in the project request form from 10 years ago).
		Addresses pavement or base infrastructure - No	0		
		Restore/improve exist. infrastructure - Yes	0.5		
		Restore/improve exist. Infrastructure - No	0		
Available Development Capacity	Is the project within an area that has available development capacity?	Yes - Capacity-adding for Economic	0.5	1	The proposed project is adjacent to land areas that are suitable for economic growth - residential tracts of land between the park and the agricultural areas of Potter Twp.  The proposed project addresses congestion and safety issues on Brush Valley Road and SR 45/Earlstown Road.
		No - Capacity-adding for Economic	0		
		Yes - Capacity-adding for Congestion/Safety	0.5		
		No - Capacity-adding for Congestion/Safety	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.75	The project area is not in a federally designated economic distressed area.  The project is near Centre Hall Elementary School.  The project is immediately adjacent to the Grange Fair Grounds and the Tri-Municipal Park.  This project is within 5 miles of a Critical Rural/Urban Freight Corridor - SR 45 from Route 322 interchange to Con-Stone Inc. building.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0	The proposed new road is not eligible under PennDOT's CRP.  There is not enough information in the project to indicate whether the project provides environmental protection.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	0	Currently, there is not a sponsor (Potter, Gregg, and Centre Hall Borough were the original sponsors of the Tri-Municipal Park).
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	3	2	Partially completed - a concept plan was completed in 2009 for the LRTP.
		Partially completed/In progress	2		
		No - none completed	1		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0	The project area is not in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Major Highway - Capacity Adding Projects Screening

**Project Name:** Airport Road Connector  
**Total score:** 4.75

*A new road connection from I-99 to State College Regional Airport via Minute Man Lane.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Safety and Crash information	PennDOT Network Screening Tool and recorded crashes for project area using PA's Crash Information Tool	Greater than 1 HIGH	1	0.5	This road segment was not listed in the PennDOT Network Screening tool within the scoring mechanism definitions.  There have been serious injury crashes on Fox Hill and Fox Hollow Road, the roads that motorists currently use to access the airport.
		0.9 to 0.99 MEDIUM	0.5		
		Less than 0.9 LOW	0		
		Fatality HIGH	1		
		Serious Injury MEDIUM	0.5		
		Other Crash LOW	0		
State of good repair	Does the project extend the life of the infrastructure? Does the project restore or improve existing core infrastructure?	Addresses pavement or base infrastructure - Yes	0.5	0.5	Building a new road to connect I-99 to the airport will extend the life of the current infrastructure and maintain the maintenance cycle on Fox Hill Road  This new road will not contribute to restoring/improving existing infrastructure.
		Addresses pavement or base infrastructure - No	0		
		Restore/improve exist. infrastructure - Yes	0.5		
		Restore/improve exist. Infrastructure - No	0		
Available Development Capacity	Is the project within an area that has available development capacity?	Yes - Capacity-adding for Economic	0.5	1	The proposed project is adjacent to land areas that are suitable for economic growth in Patton, College, and Benner.  The proposed project addresses safety issues on Fox Hill and Fox Hollow Road.
		No - Capacity-adding for Economic	0		
		Yes - Capacity-adding for Congestion/Safety	0.5		
		No - Capacity-adding for Congestion/Safety	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.75	The project area is not in a federally designated economic distressed area.  The project is near Penn State University.  The project is near Beaver Stadium/BJC/Medlar Field.  This project creates a new road to connect the airport directly to I-99, a Primary Highway Freight System.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project contain strategies or components that are eligible under PennDOT's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)? Does the project incorporate environmental protection strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.50	0	The proposed new road is not eligible under PennDOT's CRP.  There is not enough information in the project to indicate whether the project provides environmental protection.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.50		
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	0	There is not a project sponsor.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	3	2	Partially completed - a concept plan was completed in 2009 for the LRTP.
		Partially completed/In progress	2		
		No - none completed	1		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0	The project area is not in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

### **Resiliency Project Category (17.5 Possible Points)**

The initial scoring exercise scored two projects in the Resiliency Project Category. Because the construction projects in the category are contingent on the results of the studies, only the studies were scored. The following projects were scored and ranked from highest-scoring to lowest-scoring:

1. Flooding Vulnerability Study – 12.41
2. Retaining Walls Study – 10.41

**Observations:** At the October 9, 2024 meeting, the Projects Committee did not rank the specialized criteria (non-general) in this project category. Therefore, staff took the liberty to rank the criteria to score the projects. In this prioritization matrix, scoring the studies was more difficult because of how the criteria were written. Some scoring mechanisms seem to focus more on physical construction projects, i.e., “Does the project improve the ability of the system to withstand, adjust to, or respond to the weather/environment-related impacts?” The study itself does not do these things, so neither project received points for this criterion. However, the Risk Assessment criterion asks, “Does the project address a high-risk area that is exposed to vulnerabilities?” Both studies received points because high-risk areas exposed to vulnerabilities should be identified and addressed through analysis and assessments as part of the study phase. The same can be said about Criticality to Community and Reinforcement of Infrastructure. Both projects received points under these criteria, even though the criteria are written to score construction projects. Staff felt that the scope of these projects would identify roads, bridges, and retaining walls that provide access to/support roads that provide access to critical community facilities and address current and future vulnerabilities and risks for the infrastructure.

The “Incorporates environmental protection” scoring mechanism points can be given to both studies due to the nature of the projects being environmentally oriented. The Flooding Vulnerability Study received a higher score because there is a local sponsor for this study, as the CCMPO is preparing to apply for a grant through the PROTECT Program. Lastly, under economic impact, there should be a defined area (miles) to indicate whether a project will provide improved access to employment centers and recreation/tourism and improve freight mobility. Freight mobility is currently defined as "within 5 miles of."

## Resiliency Projects Screening

**Project name: Flooding Vulnerability Study**

**Total score: 12.41**

*A study to develop a Resilience Improvement Plan for the areas in the county that are vulnerable to flooding; includes SR 322 in Philipsburg, SR 220 in Port Matilda/Unionville, SR 1002 in Liberty/Curtin Townships, and Penns Creek Road and Coburn Road in Penn Township.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments	
Redundancy	Does the project improve the ability of the system to withstand, adjust to, or respond to weather/environment related impacts?	Yes	2	0	The study itself does not improve the system.	
		Partially	1			
		No	0			
Risk Assessment/ Mitigation	Does the project address a high-risk area that is exposed to vulnerabilities? (severe storms, flooding, drought, levee/dam failures, wildfire, rockslides, mudslides, extreme weather, earthquakes)	Yes	3	3	The study will identify and address high-risk areas that are exposed to vulnerabilities (flooding).	
		Partially (maybe)	2			
		No	0			
Criticality to Community	Does the project provide access to critical community facilities? (homes, businesses, intermodal & govt facilities etc.)	Yes	0.5	1	The study will identify roads and bridges that provide access to critical community facilities.	
		No	0			
	Does the project provide access to critical emergency facilities? (emergency/medical services)	Yes	0.5			
		No	0			
Reinforcement of Infrastructure	Does the project address current and future vulnerabilities or risks for the anticipated infrastructure service life?	Yes	4	4	Yes, the study will identify and address current and future vulnerabilities/risks.	
		Partially	2			
		No	0			
Environmental Impact	Does the project incorporate components that reduce transportation emissions? Does the project incorporate environmental protection measures and carbon reduction strategies? Does the project incorporate nature-based solutions?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.33	0.66	The study is not eligible under PennDOT's CRP.	
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0			
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.33		It can be assumed that the study will identify environmental protection measures.	
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0			
		Incorporates nature-based solutions - Yes	0.33			It can be assumed that the study will identify ways to incorporate nature-based solutions.
		Incorporates nature-based solutions - No	0			
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.25	Yes, the study cover the Philipsburg area, which is in an economic distressed area.	
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0			
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		No, the study itself will not provide improved access to employment centers.	
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0			
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25			No, the study itself will not provide improved access to recreation/tourism.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0			
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		No, the study itself will not provide improved access to freight mobility.	
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0			
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	2	Yes - one sponsor.	
		No	0			
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	3	1	None at this time- after the study is completed, this will score as a 2.	
		Somewhat - partially completed	2			
		No - none completed	1			
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0.5	Yes, Philipsburg, Liberty, and Curtin are in transportation disadvantaged census tracts.	
		No	0			

## Resiliency Projects Screening

**Project name: Retaining Walls Study (retaining walls that support a roadway)**

*A study to determine retaining wall deficiencies (retaining walls that support a roadway) throughout the county - will provide insight into the conditions of these structures and help prioritize maintenance and repair efforts to ensure public safety and infrastructure integrity.*

**Total score: 10.41**

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Redundancy	Does the project improve the ability of the system to withstand, adjust to, or respond to weather/environment related impacts?	Yes	2	0	The study itself does not improve the system
		Partially	1		
		No	0		
Risk Assessment/ Mitigation	Does the project address a high-risk area that is exposed to vulnerabilities? (severe storms, flooding, drought, levee/dam failures, wildfire, rockslides, mudslides, extreme weather, earthquakes)	Yes	3	3	The study will identify and address deficient retaining walls in high-risk and vulnerable areas to prioritize maintenance and repair efforts.
		Partially (maybe)	2		
		No	0		
Criticality to Community	Does the project provide access to critical community facilities? (homes, businesses, intermodal & govt facilities etc.)	Yes	0.5	1	The study will identify retaining walls that support roads that provide access to critical community facilities.
	Does the project provide access to critical emergency facilities? (emergency/medical services)	No	0		
		Yes	0.5		
	No	0			
Reinforcement of Infrastructure	Does the project address current and future vulnerabilities or risks for the anticipated infrastructure service life?	Yes	4	4	Yes, the study will identify and address current and future vulnerabilities/risks.
		Partially	2		
		No	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project incorporate components that reduce transportation emissions? Does the project incorporate environmental protection measures and carbon reduction strategies? Does the project incorporate nature-based solutions?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.33	0.66	The study is not eligible under PennDOT's CRP.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.33		It can be assumed that the study will identify environmental protection measures.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
		Incorporates nature-based solutions - Yes	0.33		It can be assumed that the study will identify ways to incorporate nature-based solutions.
		Incorporates nature-based solutions - No	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.25	Yes, the study will be county-wide, which will cover economic distressed areas.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		No, the study itself will not provide improved access to employment centers.
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		No, the study itself will not provide improved access to recreation/tourism.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		No, the study itself will not provide improved access to freight mobility.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	2	0	No.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	3	1	Unsure at this time - after the study is completed, this will score as a 2.
		Somewhat - partially completed	2		
		No - none completed	1		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0.5	Yes, the study will be county-wide, which will cover transportation disadvantaged census tracts.
		No	0		

### **Transit-Rail-Aviation Project Category (23.5 Possible Points)**

The initial scoring exercise scored three construction projects and two study projects in the Transit-Rail-Aviation Project Category. The following projects were scored and are ranked from highest-scoring to lowest-scoring:

1. Intermodal Transportation HUB – 21
2. College Avenue/Allen Street Transit Facilities – 18.75
3. College/Beaver Avenues TSP & ITS – 13.25
4. Transit Stop Safety and ADA Accessibility Study – 6.25
5. Passenger Rail Access Study – 4.75

**Observations:** Similar to the Resiliency scoring matrix, studies were difficult to score because of how the criteria were written. In this matrix, neither study could be scored using non-general data. In other words, staff could only use general criteria to score the project (Environmental/Economic Impact, Project Sponsor, Project Readiness, and Equity). Both studies only received a quarter of the points the construction projects received because of this. As a general observation, it has been noted that in most project categories, projects have not received points for “Incorporates environmental protection” under the Environmental Impact Criterion because there is not enough information in the details of the proposed project to be able to score it as a “yes.” Lastly, under economic impact, there should be a defined area (miles) to indicate whether a project will provide improved access to employment centers and recreation/tourism and improve freight mobility. Freight mobility is currently defined as “within 5 miles of.”

## Transit-Rail-Aviation Projects Screening

**Project name: Intermodal Transportation Hub**

**Total score: 21**

*Construct an intermodal transportation hub to promote public transportation usage and facilitate connections between modes. This facility will serve as a central transit focal point, and will include connections to automobile parking and intercity bus service, as well as bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Project limits are not defined at this time.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Ridership Demand	Does the project meet existing ridership needs and/or future ridership demand?	Existing - Yes	2.5	5	The proposed project would meet existing needs.
		Existing - No	0		
		Future - Yes	2.5		The proposed project would meet future needs.
		Future - No	0		
Asset Management/ State of Good Repair	Does the project restore and modernize existing core infrastructure, resulting in lower maintenance costs and more consistent reliability?	Yes	2	2	The proposed project will modernize the existing core infrastructure by developing an intermodal transportation hub at the existing bus terminal.
		No	0		
Intermodal Access and Connectivity	Does the project enhance connectivity between transportation modes, and address gaps identified in the network?	Improves Connectivity btwn modes- Yes	1.5	4.5	The project proposes to include connections to automobile parking, bus service, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities to improve mode connectivity.
		Improves Connectivity btwn modes - No	0		
		Addresses gaps in network - Yes	1.5		The project proposes to implement connections to other modes of travel, which will address gaps in the network.
		Addresses gaps in network - No	0		
		Impacts to other modes - Positive	1.5		
Impacts to other modes -Negative	0	The project proposes improving connections to other modes of transportation, which will have a positive impact on other modes.			
Safety and Security	Does the project improve the safety and security of passengers/goods?	Yes	1	1	The project proposes a more seamless transition of people from mode to mode, enhancing the safety and security for passengers.
		No	0		
Service Reliability	Does the project improve or expand the dependability and consistency of service, measured through key performance indicators (KPIs)?	Yes	3	3	This project will increase on-time performance and increase the dependability and consistency of service by having seamless connections between modes.
		No	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project improve the resilience of at-risk infrastructure to extreme weather events and natural disasters? Does the project incorporate environmental protection measures and carbon reduction strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.75	0.75	This project includes a central transit hub/depot, which is eligible under PennDOT's CRP.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.75		There is not enough information to indicate whether this project incorporates environmental protection.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.75	This project is not in an economic distressed area.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		Yes, this project facilitates service to connect to Penn State University.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		Yes, this project facilitates service to connect to Beaver Stadium/BJC/Penn State Arboretum.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		The proposed project is within 5 miles of North Atherton Street (Valley Vista to Boal Ave) which is a Critical Urban Freight Corridor.
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	3	3	Yes, possibly multiple.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	1	Partially completed - prior request from CATA for the LRTP with a project request form that included details on the needs of the project.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0	Yes, this project is in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Transit-Rail-Aviation Projects Screening

**Project name: College Avenue/Allen Street Transit Facility**

**Total score: 18.75**

*Improve or relocate existing CATA bus stop along College Ave near Allen St (project limits). This stop is served by the majority of CATA's fixed routes and utilized by significant numbers of student & community-based riders. Improvements may include safe curbing area, adequate staging capacity, shelter, lighting, pedestrian & bicycle connections, dedicated right-of-way, & signal enhancements.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Ridership Demand	Does the project meet existing ridership needs and/or future ridership demand?	Existing - Yes	2.5	5	The proposed project would meet existing needs.
		Existing - No	0		
		Future - Yes	2.5		The proposed project would meet future ridership needs as it is improving a major bus stop that is served by the majority of CATA's fixed routes.
		Future - No	0		
Asset Management/ State of Good Repair	Does the project restore and modernize existing core infrastructure, resulting in lower maintenance costs and more consistent reliability?	Yes	2	2	The proposed project will modernize the existing core infrastructure and increase reliability by improving and updating a major bus stop that serves a majority of CATA's fixed routes.
		No	0		
Intermodal Access and Connectivity	Does the project enhance connectivity between transportation modes, and address gaps identified in the network?	Improves Connectivity btwn modes- Yes	1.5	4.5	The project proposes to create bike and pedestrian connections within the project area.
		Improves Connectivity btwn modes - No	0		
		Addresses gaps in network - Yes	1.5		The project proposes to include pedestrian and bicycle connections, which will address gaps in the network.
		Addresses gaps in network - No	0		
		Impacts to other modes - Positive	1.5		
Impacts to other modes -Negative	0	The project proposes to install safe curbing area, adequate staging capacity, shelter, lighting, pedestrian and bicycle connections, dedicated right-of-way, and signal enhancements - which positively impacts other modes.			
Safety and Security	Does the project improve the safety and security of passengers/goods?	Yes	1	1	The project proposes to create safer conditions for passengers waiting for the bus.
		No	0		
Service Reliability	Does the project improve or expand the dependability and consistency of service, measured through key performance indicators (KPIs)?	Yes	3	3	This project proposes to include signal enhancements and a dedicated transit facility where routes and modes would meet, which could improve the dependability/consistency of service.
		No	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project improve the resilience of at-risk infrastructure to extreme weather events and natural disasters? Does the project incorporate environmental protection measures and carbon reduction strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.75	0.75	Yes this project includes bus passenger shelters and staging areas, which are eligible under PennDOT's CRP.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.75		There is not enough information to indicate whether this project incorporates environmental protection.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	1	This project is in an economic distressed area.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		Yes, this project is immediately adjacent to Penn State University.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		Yes, this project facilitates service to connect to Beaver Stadium/BJC/Penn State Arboretum.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		The proposed project is within 5 miles of North Atherton Street (Valley Vista to Boal Ave) which is a Critical Urban Freight Corridor.
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	3	0	Unsure - not sure where this fits into CATA's current priorities.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	1	Partially completed - this project was part of a larger project to improve the bus stops at Heister St and University Club (now defunct). Heister Street bus stop has been improved.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0.5	Yes, this project is in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Transit-Rail-Aviation Projects Screening

**Project name: College/Beaver Avenue TSP and ITS**

**Total score: 13.25**

*Implement transit signal priority and related ITS technologies along the college and Beaver Avenue corridors in State College Borough. The project limits include intersections at Atherton Street, Burrowes Street / Road, Fraser Street, Allen Street, Pugh Street, Garner Street / Shortlidge Road, and the University Drive ramps.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Ridership Demand	Does the project meet existing ridership needs and/or future ridership demand?	Existing - Yes	2.5	5	The proposed project would meet existing needs.
		Existing - No	0		
		Future - Yes	2.5		The proposed project would meet future ridership needs as it is improving a major bus stop that is served by the majority of CATA's fixed routes.
		Future - No	0		
Asset Management/ State of Good Repair	Does the project restore and modernize existing core infrastructure, resulting in lower maintenance costs and more consistent reliability?	Yes	2	2	The proposed project uses technology that already exists within the traffic signals but is not being utilized. It would result in modernizing existing infrastructure and more consistent reliability for transit operators.
		No	0		
Intermodal Access and Connectivity	Does the project enhance connectivity between transportation modes, and address gaps identified in the network?	Improves Connectivity btwn modes- Yes	1.5	0	The project proposes to implement transit signal priority and related ITS technologies -does not improve connectivity between modes
		Improves Connectivity btwn modes - No	0		
		Addresses gaps in network - Yes	1.5		The project proposes to implement transit signal priority and related ITS technologies -does not address gaps in network.
		Addresses gaps in network - No	0		
		Impacts to other modes - Positive	1.5		
Impacts to other modes -Negative	0	The project proposes to implement transit signal priority and related ITS technologies, meaning possibly longer stop/wait times for motorists and pedestrians - a negative impact to those modes.			
Safety and Security	Does the project improve the safety and security of passengers/goods?	Yes	1	0	The project does not have a safety improvement component.
		No	0		
Service Reliability	Does the project improve or expand the dependability and consistency of service, measured through key performance indicators (KPIs)?	Yes	3	3	The project proposes to implement transit signal priority and related ITS technologies along the college and Beaver Avenue corridors, which improves on-time performance, headway adherence, and passenger wait time.
		No	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project improve the resilience of at-risk infrastructure to extreme weather events and natural disasters? Does the project incorporate environmental protection measures and carbon reduction strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.75	0.75	Yes this project includes integration of ITS, which is eligible under PennDOT's CRP.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.75		There is not enough information to indicate whether this project incorporates environmental protection.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	1	Yes, several of the intersections in the project scope are in an economic distressed area.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		Yes, this project is immediately adjacent to Penn State University.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		Yes, this project facilitates service to connect to Beaver Stadium/BJC/Penn State Arboretum.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		The proposed project is within 5 miles of North Atherton Street (Valley Vista to Boal Ave) which is a Critical Urban Freight Corridor.
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	3	0	Unsure - not sure where this fits into CATA's current priorities.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	1	Partially completed - this project was submitted by CATA for the 2040 LRTP - project request form has additional details of project scope.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0.5	Yes, this project is in a transportation disadvantaged census tract.
		No	0		

## Transit-Rail-Aviation Projects Screening

**Project name: Transit Stop Safety and ADA Accessibility Study**

**Total score: 6.25**

*Project to identify stop improvements designed to eliminate barriers & provide safe, well connected, fully ADA compliant access to transit. Recommendations will enhance the safety & comfort of all users & offer expanded employment, social, & recreational opportunities for transportation disadvantaged residents, lower income individuals, people with disabilities, & older adults. Project limits have not been defined (study will define them).*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Ridership Demand	Does the project meet existing ridership needs and/or future ridership demand?	Existing - Yes	2.5	0	The study itself would not meet existing ridership need, but would define what that need is.
		Existing - No	0		
		Future - Yes	2.5		
		Future - No	0		
Asset Management/ State of Good Repair	Does the project restore and modernize existing core infrastructure, resulting in lower maintenance costs and more consistent reliability?	Yes	2	0	The study itself would not restore and modernize existing core infrastructure.
		No	0		
Intermodal Access and Connectivity	Does the project enhance connectivity between transportation modes, and address gaps identified in the network?	Improves Connectivity btwn modes - Yes	1.5	0	The study will identify ways to improve connectivity at bus stops.  The study will identify transit accessibility gaps in the network.  The study may potentially address impacts to other transportation modes.
		Improves Connectivity btwn modes - No	0		
		Addresses gaps in network - Yes	1.5		
		Addresses gaps in network - No	0		
		Impacts to other modes - Positive	1.5		
Safety and Security	Does the project improve the safety and security of passengers/goods?	Yes	1	0	The study will not physically improve the safety and security of passengers.
		No	0		
Service Reliability	Does the project improve or expand the dependability and consistency of service, measured through key performance indicators (KPIs)?	Yes	3	0	The study itself will not improve or expand the dependability of service, but may provide analysis on the measures to do so.
		No	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project improve the resilience of at-risk infrastructure to extreme weather events and natural disasters? Does the project incorporate environmental protection measures and carbon reduction strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.75	0.75	This project includes indentifying unsafe transit facilities, bus depots, and bus passenger shelters, which is eligible under PennDOT's CRP.  There is not enough information to indicate whether this project incorporates environmental protection.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.75		
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	1	Yes, this project covers the CATA service area, of which many areas are considered economically distressed.  Yes, this project is near several of the top 25 employment centers and will cover CATA's entire service area.  Yes - this project is near several recreational/tourism areas as this project will cover CATA's entire service area.  Yes - this project covers CATA'S entire service area and is within five miles of a Primary Highway/Critical Rural/Critical Urban Freight System/Corridor.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	3	3	Yes one local sponsor.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	1	Partially completed - CATA submitted a RAISE grant application which will most likely have preliminary data gathered.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0.5	Yes, this project is in a transportation disadvantaged census tract as it will encompass CATA's entire service area.
		No	0		

### Transit-Rail-Aviation Projects Screening

**Project name:** Passenger Rail Access Study

**Total score:** 4.75

*Study to further develop options for providing improved rail access via the AMTRAK Pennsylvanian. Project limits have not been defined.*

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	Comments
Ridership Demand	Does the project meet existing ridership needs and/or future ridership demand?	Existing - Yes	2.5	0	The study itself would not meet existing ridership need, but would define what that need is.
		Existing - No	0		
		Future - Yes	2.5		
		Future - No	0		
Asset Management/ State of Good Repair	Does the project restore and modernize existing core infrastructure, resulting in lower maintenance costs and more consistent reliability?	Yes	2	0	The study itself would not restore and modernize existing core infrastructure.
		No	0		
Intermodal Access and Connectivity	Does the project enhance connectivity between transportation modes, and address gaps identified in the network?	Improves Connectivity btwn modes- Yes	1.5	0	The study will identify ways to improve connectivity at bus stops.
		Improves Connectivity btwn modes - No	0		
		Addresses gaps in network - Yes	1.5		The study will identify transit accessibility gaps in the network.
		Addresses gaps in network - No	0		
		Impacts to other modes - Positive	1.5		
Impacts to other modes -Negative	0	The study may potentially address impacts to other transportation modes.			
Safety and Security	Does the project improve the safety and security of passengers/goods?	Yes	1	0	The study will not physically improve the safety and security of passengers.
		No	0		
Service Reliability	Does the project improve or expand the dependability and consistency of service, measured through key performance indicators (KPIs)?	Yes	3	0	The study itself will not improve or expand the dependability of service, but may provide analysis on the measures to do so.
		No	0		
Environmental Impact	Does the project improve the resilience of at-risk infrastructure to extreme weather events and natural disasters? Does the project incorporate environmental protection measures and carbon reduction strategies?	Eligible project under CRP - Yes	0.75	0	This project is not eligible under PennDOT's CRP.
		Eligible project under CRP - No	0		
		Incorporates environmental protection - Yes	0.75		There is not enough information to indicate whether this project incorporates environmental protection.
		Incorporates environmental protection - No	0		
Economic Impact	Is the project in an economic impacted/distressed area? Does the project provide increased access to employment centers & job opportunities? Does this project provide increased access to Centre County regional parks, State parks, or the top five visitor destinations? Does this project improve freight mobility?	Economic Distressed Area - Yes	0.25	0.25	Yes this project is county-wide.
		Economic Distressed Area - No	0		
		Employment Centers Improved Access	0.25		This study itself will not provide improved access, but may provide future projects to do so.
		Employment Centers No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Recreational/Tourism Improved Access	0.25		This study itself will not provide improved access, but may provide future projects to do so.
		Recreational/Tourism No change/Decreased Access	0		
		Freight Mobility Improves	0.25		This study itself will not provide improved access, but may provide future projects to do so.
		Freight Mobility No Change/Decrease	0		
Project Sponsor	Is there a project sponsor(s)?	Yes	3	3	Yes - multiple local sponsors.
		No	0		
Project Readiness	Are any preliminary engineering/concept plans/studies completed?	Yes - completed	2	1	Partially completed - the Keystone West High Speed Rail Study was completed in 2014. A new study will need to be completed to revisit the alternatives.
		Partially completed/In progress	1		
		No - none completed	0		
Equity	Is the project in a transportation disadvantaged census tract?	Yes	0.5	0.5	Yes, this project is in a transportation disadvantaged census tract as it is a county-wide study.
		No	0		

## **Conclusion:**

Staff feels that the priority matrices generally work as intended, and there were no big surprises on the project scores in each category. There is some concern that study projects will not be able to be scored adequately enough to move forward. One solution could be that the studies continue to be scored within the project category using the existing criteria but are then separated from the construction project scores so as not to compete with the construction projects. Studies are typically not funded through the same discretionary grant/funding programs as construction projects, so they wouldn't necessarily be competing by being scored in the same matrix. However, it may be difficult for the Projects Committee to compare study scores across the project categories due to the different criteria. Another solution could be for staff to create a separate prioritization matrix exclusively for studies. This would allow the studies to be ranked together and let the Projects Committee put forth the highest priority studies for discretionary grant programs and the Unified Planning Work Program. However, the criteria for a study prioritization matrix must be general and focus more on overall County priorities instead of specific project category data and criteria.

In addition, staff feels that the scoring mechanism "incorporates environmental protection" is not working as intended. There is insufficient information in the project files, or the project is not developed enough to indicate that it will incorporate environmental protection; therefore, most projects (except for Resiliency) cannot receive points for this scoring mechanism. Also, as stated before, under economic impact, there should be a defined area (miles) to indicate whether a project will provide improved access to employment centers and recreation/tourism and improve freight mobility. Freight mobility is currently defined as "within 5 miles of."

It may surprise Committee members that SR 322 Corridor O-1 scored as the highest project in the Major Highway-Capacity Adding Project Category; however, this project dates back to the late 1990s. The proposed project is a four-lane highway linking I-99 in Worth Township near Port Matilda to I-80 in Graham Township (Clearfield County). This project was intended to alleviate safety issues with steep grades, narrow roads, and heavy truck traffic on existing SR 322 and SR 350. Preliminary engineering work began in 1999 and proceeded in a timely manner until March 2004, when work was suspended on over 20 major highway projects across the Commonwealth, including the South Central Centre County Transportation Study, currently known as the State College Area Connector. At that time, a recommended alternative for Corridor O-1 had been identified, and the project was nearing environmental clearance. The project has not moved since then.

## Item 9

### Bridge Criteria Matrix for Project Prioritization

In the initial development of potential criteria to score and rank projects, staff suggested using PennDOT's ranking and prioritization methods for bridge projects, as PennDOT already has a prioritization method for the order in which bridge projects are funded and moved forward on the Centre County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

CCMPO staff met with PennDOT District 2-0 on October 1 to discuss bridge project criteria and the prioritization process. From that meeting, it was determined that the bridge condition data was the most important determining factor in prioritizing bridges in poor or fair condition. Staff proposes the following criteria to prioritize local bridges:

- Is the bridge on the National Bridge Inventory (bridges over 20 feet)
- Is the bridge ranked four or less for deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert condition?
- Is the bridge a dead-end bridge that serves residents or businesses?
- Has the design phase for the bridge been completed or started?
- Is there local commitment (local match) for the bridge?

The Bridge Investment Program (BIP) requires a 20% match of non-federal funds. Sometimes, it can be challenging for a municipality to commit a 20% non-federal match for a local bridge project. To address this, bundling a state bridge project with several local bridges for a BIP application could allow the municipality to leverage state bridge funds to reduce the amount of its local match. This would lessen the financial burden on each municipality while still demonstrating their commitment to their respective bridges.

Staff recommends prioritizing state bridge projects separately from local bridges. State bridges would be prioritized based on which would be the most compelling to bring in discretionary grant funds. Staff proposes the following criteria to prioritize state bridges:

- Is the bridge ranked four or less for deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert condition?
- Is the total project cost over \$3 million total (BIP awards no less than \$3.125 million)
- Is the bridge funded with mixed (non-bridge) funds on the TIP?
- Does the bridge serve critical infrastructure?
- Has the design phase for the bridge been completed or started?

Attachments:

- Bridge project list
- Bridge project prioritization matrix

**The Projects Committee should review the proposed criteria matrix for prioritizing local and state bridge projects and provide comments to staff.**

Presented by: Marcella Hoffman, CRPA

Action: Provide comments to staff about the proposed bridge criteria matrix.

**Bridge Project List - Local and State - Updated 01/2025**

<b>Priority Score</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Future Construction Cost</b>	<b>Status</b>
	SR 150/Holt Hollow Run bridge	Boggs	Bridge Improvement	BRKEY 9466	\$1,900,000	Planning Phase in 2025 TIP and Construction in 2027 TIP
	T-400 Wallace Run Road over Wallace Run	Boggs	Bridge Rehabilitation	Retro program for rehabilitation. BRKEY 9799	\$160,000	PennDOT Local Bridge List
	SR 45 Branch Pine Creek	Haines		MPMS #88333 - BRKEY 9262		PennDOT Local Bridge List PE in 2028
	SR 2006 Hayes Run bridge box	Harris	Bridge Improvement	Bridge improvements on State Route 2006 over Hayes Run east of the village of Linden Hall BRKEY 9626	\$1,300,000	Planning Phase in 2027 TIP and Construction in 2029 TIP
	SR 45 Roaring Run Bridge	Harris		MPMS #88360 - BRKEY 9238		PennDOT Local Bridge List PE in 2031
	SR 1009 over Lick Run	Howard	Bridge Improvement	BRKEY 9610	\$2,300,000	Planning Phase in 2027 TIP and Construction in 2029 TIP
	SR 3021 Steele Hollow Rd bridge Over Willaims Run	Huston	Bridge Improvement	BRKEY 9740	\$1,200,000	PE in 2030
	SR 3040 Laurel Run Bridge #2	Huston		MPMS #88206 - BRKEY 9446		PennDOT Local Bridge List PE in 2030
	T-867 Eagleville Road over Bald Eagle Creek	Liberty		This is the longest local bridge in Centre County. It serves numerous homes and several businesses. This is likely a bus route. BRKEY 9821	\$5,228,400	PennDOT Local Bridge List
	SR 445 over Roaring Run	Miles	Bridge Restoration	BRKEY 9538	\$2,300,000	Planning Phase in 2027 TIP and Construction in 2029 TIP
	T-524 Brown Road	Miles		This (dead end) bridge serves as the sole access to 1-2 homes and a dairy farm. BRKEY 9823	\$1,650,000	PennDOT Local Bridge List
	SR 322 Sinking Creek Bridge	Potter	Bridge Improvement	BRKEY 9519	\$2,600,000	Planning Phase in 2025 TIP and Construction in 2027 TIP
	SR 2010 Tributary to Muddy Run box	Potter	Bridge Improvement	BRKEY 9638 Improvement of the bridge carrying SR 2010 (Upper Georges Valley Road) over an unnamed tributary to Potter Run approximately 2 1/2 miles northeast of the village of Potters Mills	\$1,200,000	Planning Phase in 2027 TIP and Construction in 2029 TIP
	SR 144 Over Potter Run	Potter		MPMS #85145 - BRKEY 9333		PennDOT Local Bridge List PE in 2033
	T-710 Kato Road over Sandy Run	Snow Shoe	Bridge Replacement	Retro program leading into replacement (retro buys us 5-10 years) BRKEY 56876	\$100,000	PennDOT Local Bridge List
	Hannah Lane bridge over Bald	Taylor		This (dead end) bridge serves as the sole access to 1-3	\$1,000,000	PennDOT Local Bridge List
	SR 3040 Sparrow Run Bridge	Taylor		MPMS #88187 - BRKEY 9425		PennDOT Local Bridge List PE in 2029

	T-344 Unionville Pike over Bald Eagle Creek	Union		Recommended from PennDOT asset management program - maintenance project critical repair to extend life. BRKEY 9846	\$1,600,000	PennDOT Local Bridge List
	T-312 Shadydell Road over Laurel Run	Worth		Structurally deficient, posted for load 30T/40T. BRKEY 9849	\$226,800	PennDOT Local Bridge List
	SR 3040/Bald Eagle Valley Road over Reese Hollow	Worth	Bridge Replacement	Bridge Replacement - MPMS #120547 - BRKEY 9428		PennDOT Local Bridge List PE in 2029
	Location-based bridge bundle	Haines Ferguson		Fiedler Road over Pine Creek in Haines Township (replacement) Quarry Road over Fiedler Run in Haines Township (rehabilitation) SR 45 over branch Pine Creek in Haines Township - state bridge ----- Gatesburg Road over Halfmoon Creek and Marengo Road over Halfmoon Creek (state bridge) in Ferguson Township	\$1,576,650 ----- \$657,300	Fiedler Road over Pine Creek and Halfmoon Creek in Ferguson Township are on PennDOT's bridge list
	Box beam bridge rehabilitation bundle	Multiple		Eagleville Road over Bald Eagle Creek in Liberty Township Main Street Extension over Marsh Creek in Liberty Township Quarry Road over Pine Creek in Haines Township Brush Valley Road over Spring Creek in College Township	\$7,273,200	
	Bridge replacement bundle	Multiple		Brown Road over Elk Creek in Miles Township Fiedler Road over Pine Creek in Haines Township Stahl's Lane over Big Fill Run in Taylor Township	\$931,450	Fiedler Road over Pine Creek and Stahl's Lane over Bill Fill Run on PennDOT's bridge list
	Centre County capital bridge planning	Multiple		Bridge improvement program study phase to identify key future preservation and maintenance projects on state-owned bridges, emphasizing innovative approaches leading to bridge improvement program or complex program application for implementation.		Short term

### Local Bridge Projects Screening

**Project Name:**  
**Total Score:**        0

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	More information
National Bridge Inventory	Is the bridge on the National Bridge Inventory? (bridges over 20 feet)	Yes - Over 20 feet			
		No - Under 20 feet			
Bridge Condition	Is the bridge ranked four or less for deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert condition?	Deck condition four or less			Points awarded if condition is four or less
		Superstructure condition four or less			
		Substructure condition four or less			
		Culvert condition four or less			
Dead-end Bridge	Is the bridge a dead-end bridge that serves residents or businesses?	Yes - serves residents/businesses			
		Yes - but does not serve residents or businesses			
		No - not a dead end			
Design Phase Status	Has the design phase for the bridge been started or completed?	Yes - Completed			
		Yes - Started			
		No			
Local Commitment	Is there local commitment (local match) for the bridge project?	Yes - 20% or More Local Match			
		Yes - Less than 20% Local Match			
		No Local Match			

### State Bridge Projects Screening

**Project Name:**  
**Total Score:**        0

Criteria Name	Criteria Description	Scoring Mechanism	Point Value	Given Score	More information
Bridge Cost	Does the total project cost over \$3 million?	Yes - \$3 million or more in cost			The BIP awards no less than \$3.125 million
		No - Less than \$3 million in cost			
Bridge Condition	Is the bridge ranked four or less for deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert condition?	Deck condition four or less			Points awarded if condition is four or less
		Superstructure condition four or less			
		Substructure condition four or less			
		Culvert condition four or less			
Non-Bridge Funding	Is the bridge funded with mixed (non-bridge) funds on the TIP?	Yes - Fully by NHPP or STP			
		Yes - Partially by NHPP or STP			
		No - Fully by bridge funds			
Design Phase Status	Has the design phase for the bridge been started or completed?	Yes - Completed			
		Yes - Started			
		No			
Critical Infrastructure	Does the bridge serve critical infrastructure?	Yes - Direct access			Need to define critical infrastructure Need to define nearby access/within x miles
		Yes -Nearby access			
		No critical infrastructure within x miles			

## Item 10

### CCMPO Project Request Form – Process Discussion

The Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO) does not have a formal process for evaluating and considering new projects for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program and the Long Range Transportation Plan. Currently, projects are added to the plans upon request from planning regions, municipalities, CCMPO members, PennDOT, and other stakeholders. Additionally, including projects on the list is influenced by concerns and input raised during various meetings.

CCMPO staff presented the initial Project Consideration Application form at the August 16 meeting. The form contains basic information such as municipal sponsor, project type, need/description, project location, project description, and additional project details. Based on the comments provided, staff updated the form to include “Entity/Organization/Interested Party” and the project’s location. Enclosed is the draft Project Consideration Application for review.

At the August 16 meeting, the Projects Committee briefly discussed how projects will be submitted and considered for scoring through the prioritization matrix. The Projects Committee was amenable to requesting additional information from the applicant related to the criteria contained in the project category. The additional information would assist staff with the data to include in the prioritization matrix for scoring the project.

The Projects Committee should discuss the following staff suggestions to advance this process further:

- Should the call for projects be made based on known application deadlines, once a year, or another time period to allow sufficient time to submit the project request form?
- How many times a year should staff run the prioritization matrix exercise? Should it be conducted at set times that align with the call for projects or when known applications are due? Should every project on the existing list be scored again in conjunction with new projects with the latest, up-to-date criteria data?
- Can staff provide the review of each Project Consideration Application form prior to the request for additional information from the applicant to expedite the review process?

Attachment:

- Project Consideration Application

**The Projects Committee should review the draft Project Consideration Application and discuss the process of reviewing and scoring project consideration applications.**

Presented by: Marcella Hoffman, CRPA

Action: Provide comments to staff about the Project Consideration Application form.

**Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO) LRTP 2055**

**Project Request Form – Deadline March 14, 2025**

**Please return to Anne Messner at [amessner@crcog.net](mailto:amessner@crcog.net)**

<b>Entity/Organization/ Interested Party</b>	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	
<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Phone Number:</b>	

**Project Location (address, intersection, corridor, or map):**

**Project Type – Please check the box(es) below that best describes the project type:**

- Safety improvement
- Bridge project  
*(repair/replace)*
- Major road/highway  
*(capacity adding)*
- Transit/Rail/Aviation
- Technology *(traffic signals/EV infrastructure/  
transportation technology/etc.)*
- Resiliency  
*(extreme weather event mitigation, etc.)*
- Active Transportation  
*(bike lane/shared use path/sidewalk/etc.)*

**Need/Problem Description – Please describe the nature and location of the need/problem (please use additional pages if necessary)**

**Project Description** – Please describe how this project will address the need/problem. Please explain how the project will improve the conditions (please use additional pages if necessary).

<b>Project Details:</b>	
Have any preliminary engineering, studies, or concept plans been completed?	Yes ____ No ____ Partial ____
Please explain:	
Is the entity willing to be the project sponsor (provide local match)?	Yes ____ No ____
Estimated total project cost ( <i>please attach detailed estimate if available</i> )	
Amount of local contribution:	
Amount of other funding, if applicable:	

## ITEM 12

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Future Meeting Dates

- a. Technical Committee:                      Wednesday, February 12, 2025, 9:30 a.m.  
Zoom and in-person at the Centre Region COG Building
  
- b. Coordinating Committee:                  Tuesday, February 25, 2025, 6:00 p.m.  
Zoom and in-person at the Centre Region COG Building
  
- c. Projects Committee                            March – TBD - Hybrid Meeting  
Zoom and in-person at the Centre Region COG Building
  - Grant Applications Update
  - Project Prioritization – edits and final scoring
  - Initial Bridge Project Prioritization Results
  - Initial Active Transportation Prioritization Results
  - UPWP Supplemental Planning Studies Priorities
  - LRTP List of Projects
  - Municipal Grant Workshop

2. Upcoming Notice of Funding Opportunities (BIL):

- Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation (PROTECT) – Due February 24, 2025
- Local and Regional Project Assistance Grants (RAISE) – Due January 30, 2025
- Bridge Investment Program – Due November 1, 2025
- Bus Programs – Busses and Bus Facilities; Low or No Emissions – Opens Spring 2025
- All Stations Accessibility Program – Opens Spring 2025
- Safe Streets and Roads for All – Opens Spring 2025
- Strengthening Mobility & Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) – Opens Summer 2025

More information: <https://www.transportation.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/key-notices-funding-opportunity>

3. State Grant Funding Opportunities:

Program Name and Website	Application Cycle
<a href="#">DCED Multimodal Transportation Funds</a>	March 1 and July 31 annually
<a href="#">DCED Greenways, Trails, and Recreation Program</a>	February 1 to May 31 annually
<a href="#">DCNR Community Conservation Partnership Program (C2P2)</a>	January to April annually
<a href="#">PennDOT Multimodal Transportation Funds</a>	Fall of each year
<a href="#">PennDOT Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program</a>	Spring to early fall, odd years
<a href="#">PennDOT Automated Red-Light Enforcement Program</a>	June 1-30 annually
<a href="#">PennDOT Green-Light-Go Program</a>	December to February annually
<a href="#">DEP Alternative Fuels Incentive Grants</a>	June 28 and December 20 in 2024
<a href="#">DCED Local Share Account</a>	September to November annually
<a href="#">2025-26 PA WalkWorks Active Transportation Planning Grant</a>	January 15 to March 21, 2025

4. PennDOT’s Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) provides training courses free of charge, sponsored by the SEDA-COG MPO – link: <http://seda-cog.org/departments/transportation/local-technical-assistance-program/>
  
5. US DOT, FHWA and FTA continue to provide updates on programs available under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. Members should check for new updates regularly and consider signing up for email alerts. Notable sites are included in the table below:

Description	Site
BIL overview and assistance site	<a href="https://billaunchpad.com/">https://billaunchpad.com/</a>
DOT Discretionary Grants Dashboard	<a href="#">DOT Discretionary Grants Dashboard   US Department of Transportation</a>
FHWA Fact Sheets	<a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/fact_sheets.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/fact_sheets.cfm</a>
FHWA Guidance and Regulations	<a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/guidance.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/guidance.cfm</a>
US DOT BIL Website	<a href="https://www.transportation.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law">https://www.transportation.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law</a>
FTA BIL Website	<a href="https://www.transit.dot.gov/BIL">https://www.transit.dot.gov/BIL</a>
FHWA Policy of Using BIL Resources to Build a Better America	<a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/building_a_better_america-policy_framework.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/building_a_better_america-policy_framework.cfm</a>
FHWA Newsroom	<a href="https://highways.dot.gov/newsroom">https://highways.dot.gov/newsroom</a>
BIL Overview Presentation	<a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/docs/bil_overview_20211122.pdf">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/docs/bil_overview_20211122.pdf</a>

6. CCMPO staff contact information:

Centre Regional Planning Agency	Telephone: 814-231-3050
2643 Gateway Drive	Fax: 814-231-3083
State College, PA 16801	

Mike Tylka, Director	<a href="mailto:mtylka@crcog.net">mtylka@crcog.net</a>
Jim Saylor, Principal Transportation Planner	<a href="mailto:jsaylor@crcog.net">jsaylor@crcog.net</a>
Greg Kausch, Senior Transportation Planner	<a href="mailto:gkausch@crcog.net">gkausch@crcog.net</a>
Anne Messner, Senior Transportation Planner	<a href="mailto:amessner@crcog.net">amessner@crcog.net</a>
Pam Adams, Sustainability Planner	<a href="mailto:padams@crcog.net">padams@crcog.net</a>
Marcella Hoffman, Transportation Grants Specialist	<a href="mailto:mhoffman@crcog.net">mhoffman@crcog.net</a>
Reagan Mann, Office Manager	<a href="mailto:rmann@crcog.net">rmann@crcog.net</a>

Centre County Plng & Community Dev. Office	Telephone: 814-355-6791
420 Holmes Street – Willowbank Office Building	Fax: 814-355-8661
Bellefonte, PA 16823	

Ray Stolinas, Director	<a href="mailto:rjstolinas@centrecountypa.gov">rjstolinas@centrecountypa.gov</a>
Elizabeth Lose, Assistant Director	<a href="mailto:eatuck@centrecountypa.gov">eatuck@centrecountypa.gov</a>

On the web at [www.ccmpto.net](http://www.ccmpto.net) . Like and share the CCMPO’s Facebook page at <https://www.facebook.com/centrecountympo/> .