

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

**Tuesday, February 25, 2020
6:00 p.m.
Patton Township Municipal Building**

Minutes

Voting Members Present:

Eric Bernier	College Township
Barbara Spencer	Halfmoon Township
Frank Harden	Harris Township
Theresa Lafer	State College Borough
Lisa Strickland	Ferguson Township
Betsy Whitman	Patton Township
Mark Higgins	Centre County Board of Commissioners
Michael Pipe	Centre County Board of Commissioners
David Wise	Nittany Valley Planning Region
Ken Hall	Mountaintop Planning Region
David Veneziano	Lower Bald Eagle Valley Planning Region
Keith Reese	Upper Bald Eagle Valley Planning Region
Dick Decker	Penns Valley Planning Region
Jon Eich	Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC)
John Spsychalski	Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA)
Tom Zurat	PennDOT District 2-0

Non-Voting Members Present:

Rob Cooper	Penn State University (PSU)
------------	-----------------------------

Others Present:

Tom Zilla	Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA)
Trish Meek	CRPA
Greg Kausch	CRPA
Anne Messner	Centre County Planning & Community Development Office (CCPCDO)
Matt Wise	Senator Corman's Office
Mark Long	Representative Benninghoff's Office
Chris Groshel	Centre County Airport Authority
Bryan Rodgers	University Park Airport
Steve Dietz	PennDOT District 2-0
Archie Gettig	Marion Township
Cindy Kunes	Congressman Thompson's Office

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Bernier called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Approval of Minutes

Motion was made by Dr. Spsychalski and seconded by Mr. Reese to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2020 CCMPO Coordinating Committee meeting, as distributed. The motion carried 16-0.

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. University Park Airport Updates

The Pennsylvania State University owns the land and most facilities that comprise the University Park Airport, located in Benner and Patton Townships. The University is responsible for operating and maintaining the airport facilities, except for the passenger air terminal and associated parking, which are owned and operated by the Centre County Airport Authority.

University Park Airport Director Bryan Rodgers provided an informational presentation about recent activities at the Airport. Mr. Rodgers' last presentation to the CCMPO was in November 2015, shortly after the completion of the University Park Airport Master Plan.

Existing non-stop destinations include the Dulles International Airport, Philadelphia International Airport, O'Hare International Airport, Detroit Metro Airport, St. Pete-Clearwater International Airport, and the Orlando Sanford International Airport. These flights are served by Delta, United, American Airlines, and Allegiant. Allegiant services started in October 2019 and serves flights to Orlando Sanford and St. Pete-Clearwater Airport. In 2017, there were 138,423 passenger enplanements with 31,585 flights. In 2018, there were 153,571 passenger enplanements with 32,423 flights. In 2019, there were 193,377 passenger enplanements with 33,660 flights.

In 2017, the University Park Airport updated its Airport Security Plan with the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to operate with a full Airport Security Plan which allows the Airport and airlines to operate scheduled passenger aircraft of passenger seating of 60 seats or more.

Mr. Rodgers spoke about upcoming and future projects for the Airport. In 2020, the Airport plans to construct a new Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Station and acquire new snow removal equipment. In the future, the Airport has plans to rehabilitate the Alpha Taxiway pavement, which is over 20 years old. Estimated costs equal \$35 million and construction is expected to start in spring of 2021. In addition, the Centre County Airport Authority will continue its parking lot expansion project in the spring of 2020.

In 2015, the Airport completed its Airport Master Plan update and included projects such as acquiring a new Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting vehicle, updating the terminal plan, rehabilitating Taxiway Alpha, rehabilitating and redesigning Runway 6/24 and Taxiway Bravo and Foxtrot, acquiring snow removal equipment, and reconstruction and design of the cargo apron.

In response to a few questions from Ms. Lafer, Mr. Rodgers explained that the Centre County Airport Authority is responsible for the parking lot, while the University is responsible for the Airport operations; however, the Centre County Airport Authority has no plans to construct a parking structure instead of expanding its at-grade parking lot. Mr. Rodgers explained that there is coordination between the Airport itself and the airlines, but at the end of the day, the Airport is responsible for accessibility for travelers and airlines. The Airport has no control over whether the airlines' planes leave and arrive on time.

In response to a few questions from Ms. Whitman, Mr. Rodgers clarified that the Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting station has seven full-time staff members that are designated as rescuers and fire fighters. These full-time employees also have other duties, so there is also part-time staff employed to help supplement the workload. Mr. Rodgers clarified further that the Airport has two fire trucks stationed at the Airport and the new Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting building will house both of those vehicles, along with housing for personnel. The new building will also have training rooms, storage rooms, and will double as a command post during fire emergencies. The Airport has had discussions regarding installing solar panels on airport facilities; however, there has been no action. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has guidance on how and where to install those, and there are several studies that must be completed before solar panels can be considered for Airport use. Mr. Rodgers explained that when the Airport completed its Airport Master Plan, it was one of the first Airports to complete a sustainable Airport Master Plan that focuses on responsibility with environmental resources and practices. In response to a question from Mr. Bernier in relation to

Ms. Whitman's question, Mr. Rodgers explained that Penn State University is a partner during the planning of the Airport Master Plan. The Airport receives funding from the FAA to update its Master Plan but also has a Master Plan Advisory Committee that is made up of University, community, municipal, Chamber of Business and Industry of Centre County (CBICC), and environmental group representatives.

In response to a question from Dr. Spsychalski, Mr. Rodgers explained that the runway extension is addressed in the Master Plan and shown on the Airport Layout Plan; however, at this point in time, there are no plans to extend the runway because there is no justifiable need from any of the airlines nor from an operator perspective. Mr. Rodgers stated that there is not going to be an increase in pavement strength for Taxiway Alpha.

In response to a question from Mr. Wise, Mr. Rodgers communicated that the Allegiant Airline has been operating its flights at about a 75% capacity and is well within Allegiant's expectation for the market.

In response to a few questions from Mr. Eich, Mr. Rodgers explained that with the expansion of the Centre County Airport Authority's parking lot, the driveway entrance to the airport will be realigned with Alexander Drive near the FedEx building to create an intersection. Mr. Rodgers clarified that the Airport uses materials required by the FAA in order to fight fires on the property, which does include a type of foam. Mr. Eich stated that a major concern has been growing regarding fire-fighting foam that contains components known as PFAS, which has been identified in the water source of a private well near the Airport property. Mr. Eich wondered if the Airport has the ability to use foams that do not contain that component. Mr. Rodgers responded that the FAA provides no alternative in terms of a different type of fire-fighting foam that does not contain PFAS. He went on to say that there has been federal legislation that instructs the FAA to research other avenues of fire-fighting foam that does not contain PFAS by June of 2021. In response to a question from Mr. Pipe, Mr. Rodgers communicated that as a Part 139 Certificated (Federal regulations) Airport, the University Park Airport is required to test the fire-fighting foam by discharge in the presence of an FAA inspector within six months of its annual inspection. During this test, the foam is discharged into contained collection equipment.

Mr. Bernier thanked Mr. Rodgers for his update to University Park Airport activities.

5. Centre County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2050 - Review Estimated Finding Allocations

Mr. Zilla communicated that Federal Planning Regulations 450.324(e) require LRTPs to be financially constrained and also require that LRTPs demonstrate how the existing transportation system will be adequately operated and maintained. Only projects for which construction and operating funds are reasonably expected to be available are to be included on the LRTP, based on a fiscal constraint analysis included in the Plan.

Federal and state funds are authorized and appropriated through legislative actions, and local funds are appropriated by Centre County, municipalities, and other entities on a project-by-project basis. Most local funding is necessary to match federal dollars, although local funds may also be contributed on a voluntary basis to leverage federal and state dollars and expedite the implementation of projects.

Mr. Zilla referred to the tables provided in the agenda that provide the estimated funding allocations for highway/bridge and transit for the 30-year horizon of the LRTP 2050. The tables have been revised from previous LRTP estimated funding allocations to reflect current sources and allocations as specified in the financial guidance for the new 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The tables include a base funding section reflecting federal, state, and local funding sources and a discretionary funding section.

Ms. Messner then provided a brief presentation regarding the estimated funding allocation for highway and bridge projects. She stated that compared to the current LRTP with 10 funding sources, the new LRTP will only be funded from 6 sources. The 2030 and the 2040 LRTPs saw an annual increase of funding by 2.5% and 4%, respectively; however, the 2044 and the 2050 LRTPs did not and will not see an annual increase.

CCMPO Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Page 4

Ms. Messner stated that even though the 2050 LRTP is not seeing an increase in funding, there are several projects that have been funded with spike funds, including the I-80/I-99 Interchanges, the State College Area Connector (SCAC), Route 322 Potters Mills Gap, and the I-99 Exit 71 Waddle Road Interchange. Ms. Messner explained that assumptions have been made that there will be no growth in funding over the plan horizon due to uncertainty in state funding, specifically related to multiple factors that were identified in the Risks to Transportation Funding Report given to the CCMPO in 2019. In addition, there is uncertainty in federal funding due to the unknown outcome of the reauthorization of the federal Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, as well as a lack of revenue generation for the Highway Trust Fund. Ms. Messner then turned the floor over to Mr. Kausch.

Mr. Kausch stated that the 2050 LRTP transit allocation will be funded from 10 sources, compared to 7 sources in the 2044 Plan. Growth in funding has remained flat since the 2040 Plan that saw a 2.67% annual increase. Mr. Kausch explained that over the plan horizon, the growth will be flat to slow due to state funding uncertainties. He noted that the TIP allocation has increased from the last TIP but will be flat over the life of the new 2021-2024 TIP. Mr. Kausch explained that he was conservative with his estimates, but in all probability, there will be at least modest growth in funding for transit.

In response to a question from Mr. Bernier, Ms. Messner clarified that at the February Technical Committee meeting it was suggested that staff use lower funding projections since the trend in funding has decreased over the past few LRTPs. Mr. Bernier communicated that the Coordinating Committee should consider comments from the Technical Committee regarding projections for the LRTP 2050 because the Committee needs to provide guidance to staff so that these numbers are firmed up. After funding projections are finalized, the Committees will start plugging in the projects, which will need to be fiscally constrained.

In response to a question from Mr. Pipe, Ms. Messner explained that she is not aware of any penalty in having a more conservative approach; however, the LRTP must be fiscally constrained, so the projects in the plan cannot go over the amount of funding provided. Mr. Zilla added that if projects are not fiscally constrained then concerns are raised by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and PennDOT Central Office, and the LRTP could be denied by these agencies.

In response to a concern from Ms. Whitman regarding the Centre Region Council of Government's (CRCOG) initiative to assess its greenhouse gas emissions inventory, Mr. Zilla communicated that sustainability and greenhouse gas emissions are definitely a concern on the transit side as well as some projects on the highway side, since the Centre Region and Centre County are still primarily car-driven societies.

Mr. Eich communicated that in the current LRTP, there is a section titled "outside fiscal constraint," and the CCMPO has managed to fund two major projects from that list with various supplemental, discretionary, and spike funds. He went on to say that perhaps the way to respond to the Technical Committee's comments is to say that if the CCMPO finds that it is getting less funds than the estimated funding projection, the lowest priority projects could be shifted to the "outside fiscal constraint" category. Mr. Zilla explained that it is certainly within the CCMPO's realm to communicate to PennDOT its priority to focus on small projects instead of large, capacity-adding projects. Mr. Zilla provided a list of project that are moving through the pipeline at one phase or another that are funded by base allocations: Route 150/Phoenix Avenue Intersection in Bellefonte, a drainage study in Boggs Township along Route 144, Route 26/150 Intersection in Howard Township, and an intersection in Pine Grove Mills. These projects can all be considered for funding under the LRTP 2050; however, because of the amount of funding and the costs associated with those projects, the CCMPO will have to make decisions as to what projects will be fiscally constrained and what will go in the "outside of fiscal constraint" category.

Mr. Eich spoke about the slide in Ms. Messner's PowerPoint that shows discretionary funding sources for the SCAC project. He communicated that he was disappointed that most of the funding for the SCAC will not be available until the years 2033-2040, when previously, the CCMPO was told that construction for this project would be completed by December 31, 2030. He stated that while he is glad there is a commitment of funds for this project, he is disappointed in the huge jump of the anticipated completion date. Mr. Zilla responded that

CCMPO Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Page 5

he would not necessarily say that those years are the anticipated project completion dates. Beyond the \$20 million that is on the current TIP, there is no other funding committed for the SCAC project; however, because there is already commitment of \$20 million from legislators in Harrisburg, Mr. Zilla is confident that this project will get the full funding that it needs to be completed and could even be pushed up a few years. The funds in the table are consistent with the guidance that MPO received for the 12-Year Program.

Ms. Lafer communicated that while the CCMPO may not have funding for the projects outside of fiscal constraint, it is important to continue to include those projects in the LRTP so that if a funding opportunity arises, the CCMPO can use those funds to move those projects into fiscal constraint. Projects outside of fiscal constraint may stay in that category for years, but if the CCMPO doesn't include them, they may never get funded. In addition, the CCMPO could potentially lose out on funding if legislators see that the CCMPO has not included projects in its "outside of fiscal constraint" category.

Ms. Spencer stated that up until about last year, the I-80/I-99 Interchanges project was listed in the "outside of fiscal constraint" category and was not considered for funding for a long time. The CCMPO decided to put aside some of the smaller projects and committed to help fund some of the I-80/I-99 Interchanges project. She continued and stated that the SCAC is a project that the CCMPO cannot commit funding to at this time, much like in prior years for the I-80/I-99 Interchanges project; however, it's important to keep this project on a priority list, even if it is outside of fiscal constraint.

Mr. Higgins communicated that he is disappointed because he feels that the funding allocation for the highway and bridge components in the LRTP 2050 are way too conservative. He continued and stated that 50 years ago, the County's population was less than 100,000 people. The County's growth percentage has increased tremendously since World War II and projecting flat funding in this plan does not match that growth. In the lifetime of some of the older CCMPO members, Centre County has moved from a 7th class County to a 4th class County currently, and in 2050, Centre County may be on the cusp of being a 3rd class County. To project flat funding to be able to handle the possible addition of 45,000 residents, not counting the addition of thousands of residents that will be traveling to Centre County to work, is too conservative. Mr. Higgins stated that he believes that the CCMPO needs to ask its elected officials for funding to support the inevitable population increase, either for alternative transportation, for transit, or for additional secondary tertiary road systems.

Mr. Harden stated that the CCMPO has to keep in mind that these numbers are just projections, and the method that is decided upon by the CCMPO needs to be sound. The CCMPO should also keep in mind that what is decided today for this plan will not be the same when the year 2050 rolls around, and most likely, the plan will have changed five or six times. The LRTP 2050 does not have to be perfect; however the CCMPO needs to figure out where it wants to be in 5, 10, and 20 years down the road. Mr. Harden communicated that he is not totally unhappy with the proposed method of funding allocations, but Technical Committee members' comments and comments made tonight point to going back to the methodology to tweak funding allocation numbers closer to what reality might be.

Dr. Spsychalski stated that there's a question of what is the factual foundation for developing projections to which dollar value would be attached? There are various components of any growth scenario, and how does one parse those components out and put a price tag on each of them? Dr. Spsychalski stated that at the very least, he does not disagree with the principles of what Mr. Higgins communicated, but at the same time, the CCMPO has to figure out what kind of factual base is valid for the LRTP 2050.

Mr. Bernier communicated that the question before the Coordinating Committee tonight is, does the CCMPO support staff's approach of making the assumption that funding will track as they have projected? The discussion should centered around the projected revenue stream, not the expenditures of projects that should be on the list.

Mr. Higgins stated that the women and men who are going to have the children that will make up the population 30 years from now have already been born and a large fraction of them already live in the County.

Based on a study done by the State College Area School District and the Carnegie Mellon Demographer, there is already a projected number of children that will attend the State College Area High School 15 to 20 years from now. He went on to say that there are already statistics showing that the population will increase, and it is unwise to assume that the cost of constructing a mile of road will remain the same over a 30-year time period.

Ms. Spencer stated that she would caution against asking elected officials for more funding for transportation projects because the future shows that there is less money coming in for transportation projects, especially with the advancement of technology. If the County is growing in population, there will be many other needs besides the roads. Ms. Spencer communicated that she would take a conservative approach and focus on the small safety projects that the CCMPO is already focusing on and use discretionary funding for bigger projects when the money is available.

Mr. Bernier communicated that from what he is hearing regarding the Technical Committee's comments in terms of going backwards in projections, he doesn't feel that there is any consensus from the Coordinating Committee to support those comments. Mr. Eich asked if it would be possible, if once the funding numbers are more concrete and look like they will be decreasing, to move projects low on the priority list to the "outside fiscal constraint" category. Mr. Zurat explained that the first two years of the TIP includes real funding allocations. The next two years is estimated money that PennDOT has provided based on a specific formula. There is also a 12-year plan that PennDOT estimates funding projections for based on what the funding is as well as the funding formula for distribution. PennDOT projects funding out to the year 2032 (the first 12 years of the LRTP), so for the years after that, the MPO staff is asking based on what is shown in funding up until 2032, what should the funding be estimated at?

Ms. Lafer stated that it would be beneficial to include a footnote in the LRTP that reflects the fact that the CCMPO believes that regional growth will have an impact on funding and the Region's needs. It should also be clear that the CCMPO is looking for increased funding to come in the future to address the items that are in the TIP that are not funded. Ms. Lafer communicated that she is fine with leaving the funding projection as flat.

Mr. Pipe communicated that at a future meeting, it would be beneficial for the CCMPO to see a comparison of the LRTP's projected funding from 20 years ago, compared to what it actually received. He stated that three years ago, the CCMPO advocated for an additional \$200 million to fund the I-80/I-99 Interchanges project as well as the SCAC project, which now have been fully or partially funded. One can argue that because of the funding of these projects, there has been a huge sum of discretionary funding added to the current LRTP to anticipate the growth that will occur. Mr. Zurat added that Centre County also does a very good job of receiving alternative funding for multi-modal projects like local bridges, trail connections, and bike infrastructure, which is outside of the funding listed in the tables.

Mr. Reese communicated that the Coordinating Committee members need to remember that a lot of the variables that staff has presented are out of the CCMPO's control. It is very hard to predict what the economy will be like in 2030 and beyond, so the Committee should make its best educated guess based on trends and percentages and have flexibility in the future to change the plan if necessary.

Ms. Messner communicated that in general, she hears a consensus from the Committee members to leave the funding projections as-is for the new LRTP 2050, but also recognizes concerns for the future and having a strong appendix or chapter that expresses that additional funding is needed. Mr. Zilla added that from talking to both the Coordinating and Technical Committees, it is very clear that neither Committee wants to take projects off the "outside fiscal constraint" list.

6. Federal and State Funding Outlook

Mr. Zilla stated that over the past ten years, the CCMPO has periodically provided input about transportation funding to federal and state officials, including prior to the development of federal and state transportation

CCMPO Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Page 7

legislation. In September 2019, the Coordinating Committee indicated that it wanted to discuss the topic again, based on its discussions about the challenges associated with decreasing federal and state funding for the new 2021-2024 TIP.

From the state perspective, the challenges facing the Commonwealth regarding state transportation funding were articulated in the “Risks to Transportation Funding in Pennsylvania” presentation provided to the MPO Committees in June 2019.

From the federal perspective, the immediate challenge is the upcoming reauthorization of the FAST Act, which is set to expire on September 30, 2020. One of the key questions involved in reauthorization of the FAST Act is how to ensure the long-term solvency of the federal Highway Trust Fund. Reauthorization proposals have been prepared by the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, but there is concern that a long-term reauthorization bill may not be approved until after the November 2020 presidential election.

In the past, the CCMPO has taken policy positions regarding long-term solvency and federal reauthorization for the Highway Trust Fund and the FAST Act, specifically in 2015. In addition, the CCMPO made a policy statement in 2010 regarding state transportation funding to adjust the motor fuel tax to compensate for the rate of inflation over the past 10 years and index it for future inflation, as well as action from the state to increase the level of funding committed to the Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank.

Mr. Zilla spoke about some potential actions the CCMPO can take after its discussion tonight:

- Receive a presentation about the Southeast/Southwest PA Partnership for Mobility Studies
- Receive a presentation about the State Legislature’s activities
- Prepare policy statements/comments regarding state activities
- Prepare policy statements/comments regarding federal reauthorization of the FAST Act.

Mr. Bernier clarified that the CCMPO will not be preparing any policy statements or comments during this meeting; however, it is something that members will need to discuss during the meeting to decide if that is a route they want to take.

Ms. Strickland communicated that to begin to prepare policy statements or comments, the CCMPO should receive presentations regarding the Southeast/Southwest PA Partnership for Mobility Studies and the State Legislature’s activities to ensure that the CCMPO has the most recent and up-to-date information to be able to prepare those policy statements. Mr. Harden agreed with Ms. Strickland and stated that the Coordinating Committee typically only meets every two months, so if this directive is something that needs to be done sooner rather than later, then the Coordinating Committee members should consider holding a meeting between the months that they typically meet to discuss this matter in more depth. Mr. Zilla explained that he is unsure of the timeline on the state side; however, on the federal side, he does not believe that there will be a consensus between the three entities to reauthorize the FAST Act before the November 2020 presidential election. Dr. Spsychalski communicated that while it is important to be conscientious of what could happen during the next presidential election, the CCMPO should still make a clear and articulate policy statement soon and reinforce its position in the future, regardless of whether there are new representatives in office after the election. Mr. Eich communicated that time is of the essence because both the federal and state government are in budget cycles. On the federal side, republican senators have introduced a transportation funding bill that has a three-pronged revenue approach that has been recommended by the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, and includes indexing the federal gas tax, introducing a new electrical vehicle fee, and issuing a vehicle-miles traveled fee on truck fleets. Mr. Eich continued and stated that he read a report titled, “Guiding Principles for Transportation Investment” from a group called Transportation for America that outlines recommendations for planning for funding allocations. The first recommendation was to prioritize maintenance, which PennDOT started doing about 20 years ago, with the goal of reducing maintenance backlog by half over the length of the next funding bill. The second goal was to design for safety over speed, so that local roads have slower, safer designs that connect people to jobs and services.

Mr. Bernier communicated that it seems like there is consensus from the Committee to prepare a policy statement; however, the question now is the timing of preparing the policy statement so that it is received by legislators during their budget sessions. The March Coordinating meeting was originally scheduled tentatively; however, to be able to prepare policy statements before June, the Committee should consider holding a March meeting to receive input about the policy statements. At the April meeting, the Committee would finalize the policy statement to be sent to legislators shortly after. Mr. Zilla stated that the consultants who prepared the Mobility Study would most likely not be able to attend a meeting in March if it was held. Mr. Long and Mr. Wise both agreed that it may be difficult to get state and federal legislators to a CCMPO meeting to discuss legislature activities on such short notice. It was clarified that the legislators themselves would not attend the March meeting, rather their staff or representatives from the State Transportation Commission would attend the meeting. Ms. Spencer voiced that the CCMPO also wants to meet with the actual legislators themselves since they are the ones voting on funding bills and making the changes. Mr. Harden suggested that staff contact legislators to see what their availability is, and depending on the CCMPO member's availability, it can then be decided whether the meeting in March will be to discuss the policy statements, or to have a discussion about federal and state activities regarding funding.

Mr. Bernier communicated that he will meet with MPO staff and come up with a plan for the March meeting.

7. Member Reports

Mr. Zurat communicated that the consultant for the State College Area Connector project was approved and the first agency coordination meeting will take place on February 26, 2020 to provide updates on the project.

Ms. Lafer communicated that she will be attending the National League of Cities Conference in Washington D.C. in two weeks and plans to discuss some of the funding issues and projections that were discussed tonight.

Mr. Higgins communicated that he will be attending the County Commissioners National Legislative Conference on February 29, 2020, and while he is not on the Transportation Committee, he is on the Economic Development Committee and plans to discuss fiscal constraints as well as transportation funding projections.

Mr. Pipe communicated that at the Commissioner's meeting today, there was a discussion regarding the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the Centre Regional Planning Agency, the CCMPO, and the County. He stated that final approval is anticipated for next week.

Ms. Whitman announced that newly appointed, Ms. Pamela Robb, will be taking over as the Patton Township representative for the CCMPO. Mr. Abrams was the previous representative, and Ms. Whitman served as the alternate.

Mr. Harden thanked the CCMPO Coordinating Committee and MPO staff for its discussion last month regarding Harris Township's request for assistance in lowering the speed limit to 45 mph on Route 45.

8. Announcements

Mr. Bernier directed the Committee's attention to agenda item number one under Announcements. He stated that the next Technical Committee meeting is on March 11, 2020 at 9:30 a.m. at the College Township municipal building. The next Coordinating Committee meeting, should staff decide that a meeting is needed, is on March 24, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. at the Patton Township municipal building. Should the Coordinating Committee not meet in March, the next meeting will take place on Thursday, April 30, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. at the Patton Township municipal building.

9. Adjournment

There being no further business, the February 25, 2020 CCMPO Coordinating Committee meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcella Laird
Recording Secretary