1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Rebert called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. **NOMINATION/ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Mr. Piper stated that the committee needs to nominate and elect officers today. He said that the current slate of officers is the District Executive, Michael Rebert, as chairman and James Mason, Berks County Planning Commission, as vice chairman. Both gentlemen have expressed their willingness to stay on in that capacity.
MOTION: Mr. Tomaszewski made a motion to retain and elect the current slate of officers. Commissioner Scott seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

3. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 21, 2013

Chairman Rebert asked if there were any questions or comments to the November 21, 2013 Coordinating Committee Meeting minutes.

MOTION: Mr. Knoblauch made a motion to approve the Coordinating Committee Meeting minutes of November 21, 2013. Ms. Reed seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

5. REQUEST FOR LETTER OF SUPPORT – BERKS COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY – RAIL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM – COLEBROOKDALE SPUR

Mr. Piper stated that we are in receipt of request from the Berks County Redevelopment Authority for a Letter of Support for their application to PennDOT under the Bureau of Rail Freight/ Rail Transportation Assistance Program. It is for rehabilitation to the Colebrookdale Rail Spur that extends from Pottstown to the Boyertown area. They are proposing to make improvements to the line to be able to service two new businesses (American Steel Processing Company and AmeriGas), and also for future additional use to the line. In order to accomplish that, the existing siding needs to be rehabilitated and add a few passing sidings and switches.

Mr. Piper said that the Berks County Redevelopment Authority proposal will remove approximately 3,330 truck loads from state highways and create 15 new jobs. This is the first phase of an estimated $10 million multi-phase project. It has independent utility. The project itself is about $1.36 million. The Berks County Redevelopment Authority is requesting $952,839 million in RTAP. The balance is coming from local and other federal sources. As a requirement of the RTAP Program, the project must be included on the state capital budget which it is.

Mr. Piper stated that projects such as this are consistent with our MPO goals of providing balance multi-modal systems and maximizing use of rail system for existing county businesses. The recommendation from the Technical Committee is to endorse sending the Letter of Support. A map of the project is included in the memorandum with a copy of the Letter of Support. Mr. Price asked who owns the spur. Mr. Pick stated that the spur is currently owned by the County of Berks and is to be transferred to the Berks County Redevelopment Authority. Commissioner Scott stated that counsel
was obtained to advise the County of Berks on how to properly complete the transfer according to all of the applicable federal regulations. The Berks County Redevelopment Authority will continue to own the spur. Mr. Price asked if money is invested into it, does the spur make money. Commissioner Scott said it depends on the commodity being shipped. He thinks that AmeriGas is more lucrative than scrap metal would be. He also thinks, for safety reasons, it should have more capital put into a line. It would make it break even and also provides financial support to make the passenger excursion train envisioned for the line much more viable. The operator wants to do both freight and passenger weekend tourist line. Freight would probably subsidize the service until the passenger line would be able to break even. It was asked who the operator is. Commissioner Scott stated that the operator is Colebrookdale Preservation Trust. Mr. Pick stated that the railroad entity is Eastern Berks Gateway Railroad and Colebrookdale Preservation Trust owns that entity. The freight line is Eastern Berks Gateway Railroad and the operator of the passenger tourist line will be Colebrookdale Preservation Trust. Mr. Price asked if the operator actually have locomotives and freight cars that they own and use. Commissioner Scott stated that the cars are provided by the shipper.

MOTION: Commissioner Scott made a motion to send the Letter of Support. Mr. Price seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PENNDOT REQUESTED AMENDMENTS/MODIFICATIONS TO FFY 2013-2016 TIP

Mr. Tomaszewski gave a report on the Amendments/Modifications to FFY 2013-2016 TIP.

Administrative Actions:

1. SR 183 Schuylkill Avenue (OSA) Bridge – Portion of Discretionary funding ($1,259,200) cash flowed to FFY 2013 & 2014 to position with construction 12/5/13 let date.

Statewide Discretionary Reserve is used for constraint and the source.

2. SR 662 Lake Ontelaunee Bridge – Final Design - Additional funding ($90,250) requested for alignment modifications.


SR 662 Lake Ontelaunee Bridge – ROW – Partial source. Updated ROW estimate.

Appropriation 916 Reserve Line Item is the partial funding source.

3. SR 345 over Hay Creek – Additional Construction funding ($90,000) requested to cover current expenditures.
SR 1018 over Tributary Stony Run – Funding cash flowed based on current encumbrances.

GAI-Tronics Bridge – Preliminary Engineering – Funding cash flowed based on current encumbrances.

GAI-Tronics Bridge – Final Design – Funding cash flowed based on anticipated need.

SR 1010 over Swabia Creek - GAI-Tronics Bridge – Funding cash flowed based on anticipated need.

Appropriation 916 Reserve is the funding source.

4. SR 645 Resurface – Project is not eligible for federal funding. Federal funding returned to the line item.

Urban Reserve Line Item is used for constraint.

Highway Reserve Line Item is the funding source.

5. Rt. 222-422 Urban ITS – Additional funding ($225,000) needed to match negotiated agreement. Urban Reserve Line Item is the funding source.

6. SR 73 Boyertown Main Streetscape - Funding ($35,000) needed for additional curb and sidewalk quantities not accounted for in original design. Enhancement Reserve Line Item is the funding source.

7. SR 222 & 73 – Preliminary Engineering - Additional design funding ($576,800) requested for project extension to north to include intersection with Schaeffer Road.

SR 222 & 73 – Utility funding repositioned to align with expected need and with other available funding type to keep phase fully funded.

SR 222 & 73 – Construction – Balancing phase by cash flow over two federal fiscal years.

Bridge Reserve is a partial funding source.

8. 422 Expressway Resurfacing – Partial cash flow to FFY 2014 and Scope to be determined to start design details.

RATS Bridge Preservation & Repair #3 – Additional Construction funding ($28,000) requested.

Highway Reserve is used for constraint. Urban Reserve is the funding source.
9. SR 724 over Angelica Creek – Additional Preliminary Engineering funding ($135,000) requested to fully fund phase.


SR 3020 GAI-Tronics – Partial cash flow to Construction FFY 2016 based on anticipated need.

Appropriation 916 Line Item is the funding source.

10. Willow Street Railroad Upgrade – Additional funding ($81,110) requested for Norfolk Southern Corporation signal upgrades on Willow Street in the Borough of Fleetwood at PennDOT Crossing #592449K.

Rail Reserve Line Item is the funding source.

11. Hill Road Railroad Upgrade – Additional funding ($137,376) requested for Norfolk Southern Corporation signal upgrades on Hill Road in Maiden Creek Township at PennDOT Crossing #592441F.

SR 222/183 Interchange – De-obligation funding returned to the region is the source.

12. SR 61 and Tuckerton Road – ROW - Additional funding ($481,450) requested due to changes in Laureldale Cemetery and Wolfe takes.

SR 61 and Tuckerton Road – Construction – Funding cash flowed to provide state match.

Highway Reserve is the state source.

SR 222-183 Interchange – De-obligation funding returned to the region for redistribution of the federal source.

13. SR 183 Schuylkill Avenue Bridge – Preliminary Engineering - Additional design funds ($150,000) needed in response to alternative analysis requiring the bridge be raised an additional 4 feet to accommodate rail cargo.

SR 183 Schuylkill Avenue Bridge – Final Design – Anticipated of start of phase in December 2014; align funds with anticipated need.

RATS Bridge PM and Bridge Reserve are partial funding sources.

Highway Reserve is used for fiscal constraint.
14. TAP Management – Funding ($50,000) is requested for Transportation Alternatives Project Management, formerly Transportation Enhancement Management. TAP funding is not eligible for Management of projects.

Transportation Alternatives (TAP) – Funding returned to the line item.

Highway Reserve is the funding source.

15. PA 29 Resurface – Additional funding ($72,000) requested to fully fund Preliminary Engineering phase.

PA 100 Resurface – Additional funding ($40,000) requested to fully fund Preliminary Engineering phase.

City of Reading - De-obligation funding returned to the region is the federal funding source.

Lancaster Pike - De-obligation funding returned to the region is the federal funding source.

SR 61 and Tuckerton Road – Funding cash flowed to provide state match.

Highway Reserve is the state funding source.

Information Only:

1. I-78 Krumsville Interstate – Additional funding ($400,000) requested to complete design phase changes for intersection modifications needed during the Right of Way coordination phase for Dietrich Meats, Krumsville Diner and Greenwich Township School.

2. I-176 Reconstruction, I4R-Phase 1 – Construction cost increase ($25,000) to cover additional consultant services.

Interstate Contingency – The Interstate Contingency Line Item is being used as the funding source to maintain fiscal constraint.

Mr. Price had a question regarding the Rt. 73/222 intersection. The Tea Room building is up for sale. He asked if PennDOT ever buy buildings rather than wait for someone to fix it up and pay more money later under eminent domain. Mr. Piper said that the Tea Room building is a historic structure so PennDOT cannot buy it. That is why all of the designs for that intersection are attempting to avoid it. Mr. Rudderow said, as far as the status of the building being historic, if it is placed on a historic list and a new owner sees that, can the new owner remove it from the list. Mr. Piper stated that the bottom line is that public dollars cannot be use to take down a historic structure. As long as there is a reasonable, feasible alternative and as far as the federal agencies are concerned, the option is?
Rudderow asked if the building could be moved. Mr. Price said if you design around the building, someone could knock it down and build something else. Ms. Reed asked if the building is on the National Register as being historic. As a private owner, anything can be done to the building. Chairman Rebert stated that, years ago, someone moved a building and it took many years and many dollars.

Commissioner Scott had some concerns regarding the Krumsville Interchange. There is concern from Dietrich’s Meats regarding the approaches and loss of visibility to their billboard. Chairman Rebert stated that there was concern about the billboard because of the exit when you are coming southbound, you will get off before the interchange. Even after the sound wall is put up, he believes the billboard will still be able to be seen. Another concern is encroachment on their property with some of the drainage swales that are needed along the ramp. PennDOT did minimize the drainage.

Commissioner Scott asked if the Dietrich’s were given the option of moving the billboard. Chairman Rebert said that PennDOT will not hit the billboard now and they could move it if they want on their own property or another property located to the west. Commissioner Scott asked if property PennDOT acquires would be capable of locating the billboard or is it prohibited. Chairman Rebert said that PennDOT cannot buy someone else’s property to erect a billboard. Commissioner Scott stated that there was a vote taken by a group of impacted people and the sound wall was approved. Another concern would be that the sound wall would obscure some of their properties as well. Chairman Rebert stated that if you go west from where the wall is going to end, there is approximately 700 feet. He does not envision a lot of sight issues. There is a row of trees that will have to be removed because the road is going to get widened.

7. **UPDATE ON PROPOSED FFY 2015 TIP FUNDING AND SCHEDULE**

Mr. Piper explained the financial impacts of the new transportation funding legislation. He said the MPO was anticipating receiving a total of $56.6 million in FFY 2014; $47 million in FFY 2015, and $58 million in FFY 2016 under the current FFY 2013-2016 TIP. This included both base and discretionary funds.

Mr. Piper stated that, as the MPO moves into the development of the current 4-year update of the TIP, we were faced with a number of issues. First of all is the full implementation of the regulations coming out of MAP-21, which reallocated the dollars within the program. There were some slight increases that were reflected in the chart and increased by about $2 million in base federal funding for each of FFY 2015 –FFY 2018. As the MPO began the TIP update process, the state took its action on implementing state revenue enhancement. This means that all of the new gasoline tax money and the related fees will begin to flow into TIP’s and projects across the state. Because we are currently in the middle of a TIP and will be collecting funding throughout this year, the state has elected to allocate an additional $16.575 million for the balance of 2014 that must be included in the current TIP and encumbered by the end of this federal fiscal year (October 1, 2014). There is an additional $10 million for highways and $6.5 for bridges. These funds might be used for the beginning of
engineering for some of our major long-term projects, additional engineering for new bridge projects, and reallocating dollars for construction for highway and bridge projects that are currently under design. It is anticipated to be presented to the committee within the month.

Mr. Piper stated that the base state funding progressively increased from the current $9.7 million in FFY 2014 up to $29 million per year in FFY 2017 and 2018 when the legislation is fully implemented.

Mr. Piper stated that, as far as the actual development of the next four-year TIP, it has been put on hold for a while as PennDOT’s staff tries to figure out how to incorporate the new $16 million into the balance of this year. This means that our schedule gets compressed for developing that new 4-year plan and trying to maintain the overall schedule. The MPO and the Department need to be able to identify all of the projects that will fall within that period by cost and phase so it makes sense from an engineering standpoint and fully uses the appropriate amount of dollars within each of the categories and federal fiscal years.

Mr. Rudderow asked if the federal dollars coming into the state all go to the Department of Transportation and then the money is divided up. Mr. Piper said yes. Mr. Rudderow asked for an explanation of how the money comes from the federal and state governments and is divided into the districts. Mr. Piper stated that all of the money comes to PennDOT by category. Through an agreement in Pennsylvania, the various planning regions have worked with PennDOT to come up with a formula that allocates funds across the state in a uniform way based primarily on population, lane miles and traffic. In the case of bridge dollars, it is based on the condition of the bridges. The worse condition of your bridges, you receive more funds to address those bridges.

Mr. Rudderow asked if the overall federal number is constant and how is that determined. Mr. Piper stated that it comes out of federal legislation. That number is set based on the law in MAP-21. There is a formula that allocates that to the states and it is then sub-allocated into the different regions. Mr. Rudderow asked is that why it is fairly constant across all four-years of the TIP. Mr. Piper stated no. The reason is because MAP-21 is only a two year piece of legislation, which runs out at the end of FFY 2014. It is assumed for budgeting purposes that FY 2015 will be equal to the last year of MAP-21 and that there will not be an increase in federal dollars over the remaining three years. The federal line in the chart is exactly the same over each of the four years. If the federal government changes its mind and increases the amount of funding to be allocated, the TIP would be re-adjusted to reflect any change. Mr. Rudderow asked how much influence Pennsylvania’s delegation has on how much money Pennsylvania receives in Federal Highway funds. Mr. Piper stated that it depends on how the legislation is written. Right now at the federal level, most of the money that is allocated is formula driven based on the various programs. In years past, there was a lot of discretionary funding built in. There might still be discretionary money in some of the programs, but it is a lot less than it used to be. For the most part, it is formula driven. Mr. Rudderow said that
the federal and state dollars come in and that how our roads are funded. If the federal money increases, will it then increase at the state level as well? Mr. Piper said no. There is no connection between the two. Most federal money that comes in requires a match. The match varies depending on the particular program. One of the reasons that the state needed to increase its own gas tax was because it was getting to the point where the existing gas tax revenues were getting close to the point of not being able to match the federal dollars. Chairman Rebert stated that the dollars all go into a formula and get divvied out to each MPO or RPO.

Mr. Rudderow asked if that is a fairly level distribution or do some districts and MPO’s receive more than others. Mr. Piper stated that some get more and some get less total dollars. But they get the same ratios based on the criteria of population, lane miles, traffic and square foot of bridges and deck. Mr. Rudderow is looking at this from a township level where it costs $100,000 a township road mile to repair and resurface is getting tougher for the municipalities to come up with funds to take care of its own roads. A lot of this is tied to Liquid Fuels. Trying to figure out, at the local level, how to address this and understand the formula to see if there is a way that if funding was increased on the federal side or how it would work to ease the townships. Mr. Piper stated that the federal money does not influence the amount of money that goes to the municipalities. Liquid Fuels funds are strictly allocated state dollars. There is nothing in the federal funding allocation that goes directly to municipalities. Also, there are only certain roads that are eligible to be able to use those dollars. This is known as the Federal Aid System. Federal funds may also be used on certain local bridges. Mr. Rudderow said that this makes it difficult for the townships because there are no federal dollars coming in. Mr. Piper agreed. Mr. Rudderow said that the state is strained because it needs to match for the bigger projects, so that leaves the townships at the bottom struggling.

Ms. Halper asked if there is money in the new legislation for local projects. Mr. Piper said there are a number of different programs. First of all, there is an increase in the amount of money that will ultimately be distributed to municipalities under the Liquid Fuels Fund. This will grow over the next five years. There are also two other programs that are dependent on coordination with PennDOT. One is related to bridges under bridge bundling. This could lower the match requirements on local bridge projects. The other program relates to potential coordination and improvement of traffic signals. Chairman Rebert explained that bridge bundling is bridges that are similar in nature that are put on one contract. The state would take ownership of the project, replace the bridges and give the brand new bridge back to the municipality.

Mr. Piper stated that there are a lot of good ideas in this bill but he is not sure all of the implementation details have been worked out yet. Chairman Rebert stated that when the TIP’s are put together, even if there are line items for a local bridge bundling, money may be set aside to start engineering.

Mr. Piper stated that, as far as meeting the requirements for the schedule, negotiations were to start December 15, 2013. They have not begun yet. The state has
said that we will be required to have the draft list of projects submitted to PennDOT by February 28, 2014. This will require us to hold a separate special meeting. We are proposing to hold a Joint Technical and Coordinating Committee meeting on Thursday, February 20, 2014. This would give us time to work with the District to put together the draft TIP. Submitting the draft list of projects does not necessarily mean it is the final approval. It is telling PennDOT what the MPO wants included beyond the budget in the TIP. PennDOT will review the list and could supplement it out of whatever discretionary funds are available.

Mr. Piper stated that the goal for the February 20, 2014 joint meeting would be to (1) bring back the Department’s proposal for how to use that $16 million worth of new projects that fall within FFY 2014; and, (2) present the new draft of the four-year TIP. The two of them are tied together because the Department cannot decide what they want to do over the next four years without knowing the impact of the $16 million in the current year.

Mr. Piper stated that projects were solicited from municipalities across the county. The complete list is included in the packets. It is listed in alphabetical order and the priority number that goes with that is not from the MPO, but from the municipality itself. He noted that there is not a lot of overlap between the projects that are included in the list and his review of PennDOT’s Decade of Investment. The Decade of Investment projects deal primarily with state highways and most of the requests included on the list are local in nature. These are projects that the municipalities feel they cannot handle with the regular Liquid Fuels allocations. Mr. Price asked if it is true, based on earlier discussion, that these projects cannot be considered. Mr. Piper explained that bridge projects, in particular, could be considered based on their size as long as the bridge is over 20 feet in length, it would qualify as being eligible for federal and/or state participation in that bridge. It is a matter of the MPO figuring out where this falls in the overall priority and trying to match this up with the available dollars.

Mr. Price asked if we could identify the projects that cannot be funded and should be taken off the list. Chairman Rebert stated that, at some point, the Department will have to go through the list to determine if the resurfacing projects or bridge projects less than 20 feet, or resurfacing and not covered under federal aid, cannot happen anyway.

Mr. Price felt that most of the $16 million will go to fast moving existing projects to get the engineering started. Chairman Rebert said yes. He mentioned the West Shore Bypass and 222 North as examples. Mr. Price mentioned the Penn Street Bridge and Mr. Piper said that is already covered in the current TIP. Mr. Price questioned what is going to be done to the Schuylkill Avenue Bridge over the Norfolk Southern Rail Line in Reading. Mr. Tomaszewski stated that they are going to raise the bridge four feet.

MOTION: Mr. Rudderow made a motion to hold a special Joint Technical and Coordinating meeting on February 20, 2014. Ms. Reed seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
8. **RECOMMENDATION ON FFY 2014-2016 WORK PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. Piper stated that, included in the packets, is the Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This program is the agreement that we prepare with PennDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). It lays out the tasks that the MPO will be doing over the next year. This process will now be extended to a two-year program. A two-year agreement will be done, which is essentially two identical years of the same general tasks. The only real difference between the two years is that in the first fiscal year 2014-15, PennDOT was offering an extra $50,000 in Discretionary Transit Planning Funding. BARTA has developed a proposal to do an Asset Management Plan for all of their facilities using those funds. The Department seems to be receptive to a program like that. The MPO would submit this request to use the Special Studies Funding for that purpose in addition to our regular allocation.

Mr. Piper stated that this document serves as a basis for our reimbursement agreement with PennDOT for staff services for both the MPO and, under certain tasks, BARTA. The MPO also needs included in that resolution authorization to develop a reimbursement agreement with BARTA. This process is done every year.

MOTION: Mr. Knoblauch made a motion to approve the document submitted to PennDOT for contract execution and also to authorize development of the Reimbursement Agreement with BARTA. Mr. Furgerson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

9. **RECOMMENDATION ON DRAFT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN UPDATE**

Mr. Golembiewski explained that, back in 2008, the MPO adopted its first Public Participation Plan. That took the place of a bunch of two-page resolutions that would be incorporated as part of the TIP and Long Range Transportation Plan approval process.

Mr. Golembiewski stated that the Public Participation Plan, which is required by federal legislation, documents our current and necessary actions that are taken to get public input on everything that is done. When the plan was first adopted, the federal agencies liked it. Over the subsequent years, and at the 2012 Certification Review, there were inconsistencies that were found between required dates, language changes that needed to be made, Title VI versus Environmental Justice and the way various laws were referred to. In addition, there is a separate Limited English Proficiency process that was included in the original plan. The MPO covered only 2 out of 4 of the required steps as part of that process.

Mr. Golembiewski stated that we addressed those inconsistencies that were identified. The Limited English Proficiency Process was taken out and will be completed as a separate document. It is not ready today.
MOTION: Ms. Reed made a motion to approve putting the document out for a 45-day public comment period. Mr. Furgerson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Price asked if the Limited English Proficiency correction is not good enough, how it can be known if the proposal is good enough. Mr. Golembiewski stated that there is a four-step assessment set up in federal law that needs to be completed. How many non-English speakers are there and where are they? How do our programs reach those people? How many of those people are affected by our programs? What can we do to accommodate them? In the current plan, we only discussed two of the four pieces of the assessment. We will be doing a separate process that will cover all four parts.

10. RECOMMENDATION ON HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. McGough stated that one of the recommendations out of the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan in September 2013 was the formation of a Human Services Transportation Coordinating Committee. According to federal law, projects selected for funding under the Section 5310 Program require that recipients certify that the project is included in a locally developed Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan. The project selection must be based on a competitive process.

Mr. McGough stated that formation of a Human Services Coordinating Committee will help meet these requirements and make sure the projects are selected in accordance with applicable federal laws and guidelines. Once the committee is formed, it is envisioned that the committee, with staff support, will solicit projects for funding, score the projects, and make a recommendation to the MPO for funding. Mr. Piper stated that BARTA will be a part of that committee, but the committee cannot just be BARTA making the recommendation. Other agencies need to be involved as well. Mr. Price asked what other agencies will be on the committee. Mr. Furgerson stated that other human service providers that may or may not provide transportation themselves, such as the Area Agency on Aging, Boyertown Multi-Services and others. Mr. Price noted that the committee would not be people from this (the MPO) committee, but people from the outside dealing with people with special needs. Mr. Piper said that this is correct and that the new committee would provide the recommendations to the Technical Committee who would then make the recommendation back to the Coordinating Committee. The final decisions would still rest with MPO Coordinating Committee.

MOTION: Mr. Furgerson made a motion to approve creating the Human Services Transportation Coordinating Committee. Mr. Tomaszewski seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
11. **COMMUTER SERVICES**

   Mr. Piper stated that the Commuter Services Monthly Activity Report is included in the packets. The Fall/Winter 2014 Update was released yesterday and was distributed.

   Mr. Price questioned the BARTA connection with Lebanon and that the bus line is no longer in service. Mr. Furgerson stated that the BARTA board voted to discontinue the service. Mr. Price asked what the reason for the failure is because it seemed like there was a demand for it and suddenly it fizzled. Mr. Furgerson stated that it was a first attempt that was put in place to replace the service that was discontinued by Bieber. The thought was there and you never know your actual ridership until the service is put out there. Then you can see the response. In the four months that it ran, there was some ridership growth but it plateaued at a level of a subsidy of $38 per passenger. That is not effective for providing transportation. Mr. Price asked if the bus would go out to Lebanon, turn around and the Lebanon bus would come into Reading. Mr. Furgerson stated that there were three runs in the morning where the bus would leave from Reading, go all the way the Lebanon and return as an express with very limited stops. In the afternoon, Lebanon would come to Womelsdorf and there would be a transfer to BARTA and come back into Reading.

   Commissioner Scott asked if four months was a long enough time. Mr. Furgerson stated that four months is not a long time. Everything got complicated when Bieber Bus pulled out service and Mr. Louwerse decided to provide interim service. This ideally was going to be a study that took place without service actually being on the ground. When you put the service before you do the study, you are hemorrhaging or losing money while you are doing the study. With that being said, the service was running while the study was also running. Usually, ridership would be allowed six months to a year to develop. One financial aspect was that PennDOT was subsidizing some of the Bieber service. PennDOT did not subsidize any of the service that was provided as an interim. Something that was subsidized at a larger level immediately became a local burden. The decision of the board was, without any other contributions and over $40,000 already invested, and the route not showing signs of improvement, that it was time to shut it down and cut the losses.

12. **PENNDOT UPDATE ON MAJOR PROJECTS**

   Mr. Tomaszewski gave an update on PennDOT’s Major Projects. (See Attachment).

13. **OTHER BUSINESS**

   - Chairman Rebert gave an overview on what PennDOT is doing in the way of a P3, which is a Public Private Partnership regarding bridges. At this time, the Department is looking to put out a statewide partnership agreement with a developer that is to be selected. This will happen over the next nine months. The Department has a Request for Qualifications out to a number of developers (a big
contractor or a big corporation). There is a significant amount of funds available to them and would employ a number of contractors and engineers to design and build anywhere from 500-600 bridges. There are 900 bridges listed as candidates at this time and will be whittled down to 500-600 bridges. There are a number of developers looking at it. Once PennDOT gets the qualifications from all of the developers, they will be short-listed in March 2014 down to three or four who would put together a proposal. The proposal will need to tell the Department how many and which bridges they will be able to deliver over a five-year period and for how much money. There will be one successful developer that will be chosen. This process is referred to as bridge bundling. There may be pockets of similar bridges that can use the same basic design. The whole payment plan is yet to be worked out.

Chairman Rebert stated that for every one of these bridges, PennDOT will be doing core borings. You cannot have a feel for what is needed for a bridge replacement unless there are core boring to see what the bridge is being put on top of. This week and next, PennDOT will be working on various Berks County bridges that are P-3 candidates doing core borings to gather information.

Chairman Rebert stated that in the first year, which is 2015, projects will be done in southwest and northeast Pennsylvania. Twenty-five bridges will be done in northeast Pennsylvania. The districts have to get the environmental permits, clear the right of way and have a type, size and location for that bridge. He is not sure how many bridges are scheduled to be done in southwestern Pennsylvania. From this point, the developer will make the schedule for completing the rest of the bridges, which includes the design, right-of-way, and permitting. After the first twenty-five bridges are chosen, the developer must choose a team to do this work. Mr. Rudderow asked if it is the same developer for the southwest and the northeast. Chairman Rebert said it will be the same developer for the whole state of Pennsylvania. Southwest and northeast bridges will be started in the first year. They will have that additional information and have the Right-of-Way cleared. He envisions a lot of contractors and engineers on the team.

Chairman Rebert stated that there is money being held at Central Office for this project. There are several Berks County bridges in the mix and he is very hopeful that the MPO will not be paying 100% of the replacement costs but maybe 50% for Berks County’s share of the bridges in the program.

- Mr. Piper asked the representatives from the federal elected officials if the Continuing Resolution was passed yesterday. Ms. Halper stated that the House of Representatives passed an Omnibus Appropriations Bill. It is not a CR. Ms. Gabriel stated that she thinks the Senate passed it yesterday also. There are issues that are coming up. At the federal level, there was a Continuing Resolution that funded all of the funded agencies that was set to expire yesterday. If the Omnibus Appropriations Bill was not approved and a CR was not approved, we will need to worry about where the federal funding was coming from. This relates to the 2014 Transportation Appropriations Bill that would be included as a part of that.
There are differences between what the House of Representatives and the Senate are looking at.

- Mr. Piper stated that the overall Federal Transportation Funding Bill (MAP-21) expires at the end of the federal fiscal year. Congress is looking at different ways to re-write that, extend it and see how that funding is going to go forward.

- Mr. Piper attended a presentation by PennDOT consultants this morning regarding the West Shore Bypass project and their proposals. The consultants will give a full presentation at the March 2014 Coordinating Committee meeting. The plan is to do what needs to be done to rebuild everything from Warren Street to Perkiomen Avenue.

- Mr. Rudderow received a letter from the Maidencreek Township manager on behalf of the Board of Supervisors regarding the bridge on Rt. 73 over the Norfolk Southern spur. He is not sure who owns it. He read the letter to the committee. Apparently, the bridge has not been in inspected or maintained in eighty years. Also, Maidencreek Township is interested in improving the intersection of Maidencreek Road (SR 1005) and SR 73 and asked for it to be considered for inclusion on the TIP. In addition, the township has been in contact with Norfolk Southern, who is responsible for the substructure of the closed Calcium Road Bridge and indicated a willingness to contribute towards the Maidencreek Road and SR 73 intersection improvement. Norfolk Southern has requested a Scope of Working Plan and cost estimate of the project. Mr. Rudderow understands that the City of Reading may actually own the bridge on Rt. 73. If Norfolk Southern decides to abandon that spur, then there is no need for that bridge. The bridge can be removed and then Maidencreek Road can be straightened. Apparently, Lehigh Cement wants to keep the railroad open. Commissioner Scott asked if the bridge is closed. Mr. Rudderow stated that the Calcium Road Bridge, which is a smaller township road, is closed. The cost to repair that was not bearable for Maidencreek Township. If the spur becomes abandoned, that opens up to a potential fix to a lot of issues. Maybe there will be some consideration for improvement for that area.

- Mr. Golembiewski stated that, in July, the MPO went into an Air Quality Conformity lapse. All of the projects must meet certain air quality goals that are set by the federal government for the entire county. Through many factors that came into play, Berks County’s Air Quality Conformity Plan was no longer meeting federal requirements. Berks County was not allowed to add any new air quality significant projects to the current TIP until the paperwork snafu was taken care of. On December 21, 2013, the MPO received a letter from FHWA and FTA stating that Berks County has met the goals and the paperwork is in line and are no longer in the conformity lapse and are free to place new projects on the TIP.
14. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Ms. Reed made a motion to adjourn the meeting and the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Date: 3/20/14

Alan D. Piper, Secretary