



## Centre County Long-Range Transportation Plan 2050

### Appendix I

## Coordinated Public Transit–Human Services Transportation Plan

# Appendix I

## Coordinated Public Transit–Human Services Transportation Plan

### Introduction

Consistent with an Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (MPO’s) charge, the Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO) presents this document to pursue—together with local public transportation providers such as the Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA), the Centre County Office of Transportation Services (CCOT), and private non-profit organizations — federal transit funding under the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program, codified under 49 USC §5310.

The preparation of a Coordinated Public Transit–Human Services Transportation Plan (hereinafter referred to as a “Coordinated Plan”) allows CATA, CCOT, and other local transportation providers to participate in this competitive selection process, and potentially secure a new source of funding with which to better serve the target populations of the program. Moreover, it serves as a robust addition to both CCMPO’s countywide transportation planning and CATA’s service development programs and presents a vital opportunity to better coordinate planning and operations across all Centre County transportation and human service providers.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania receives the entire state apportionment of program funds for all small urbanized and non-urbanized areas, and the agency designated by the governor of each state has the principal authority and responsibility for administering program funds in urbanized areas under 200,000 in population and non-urbanized areas. In Pennsylvania, this agency is the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT). According to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), designated recipients such as PennDOT:

- Notify potentially eligible local entities of funding availability;
- Develop project selection criteria;
- Determine applicant eligibility;
- Accept applications for program funding from eligible sub-recipients such as CATA, the CCOT, and other local transportation providers;
- Conduct a competitive selection process and award program funding grants;
- Certify a fair and equitable distribution of funds;
- Ensure that all sub-recipients comply with applicable federal requirements;
- Monitor coordination between projects under the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program, and projects assisted by other federal sources, and certify that each selected project was derived from a locally developed Coordinated Plan, whose development process includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation and human service providers and members of the public;
- Present the selected projects for inclusion in the LRTP for Centre County. Similarly, these projects must be included in the applicable Transportation Improvement Program (TIP);
- Oversee project audits and closeouts; and
- Submit reports and statistics as required by FTA.

## Program Purpose

The stated program purpose is to improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities by removing barriers to transportation service and expanding transportation mobility options. This program supports transportation services planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special transportation needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities in all areas—large urbanized (over 200,000), small urbanized (50,000-200,000), and rural (under 50,000). Eligible projects include both traditional capital investment and nontraditional investment beyond the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit services.

## Target Populations

The Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program has two distinct target populations: elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. Elderly individuals are those age 65 and older. Individuals with disabilities are defined in 49 USC § 5302(a)(5) as an individual who, because of illness, injury, age, congenital malfunction, or other incapacity or temporary or permanent disability (including an individual who is a wheelchair user and has semi-ambulatory capability), cannot use effectively, without special facilities, planning, or design, public transportation service or a public transportation facility. For the purposes of this program, the definition essentially mirrors that of the ADA.

## Program Funds

Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program funds are apportioned among the states by a formula which is based on the number of elderly persons and persons with disabilities in each state according to the latest available U.S. Census data. The annual apportionment for each state is published in the Federal Register following the enactment of the annual U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) appropriations act. Formula funds are also further allocated by type of area, with large urbanized areas allocated 60% of available funds, and small urbanized and rural areas each allocated 20% of available funds. States can transfer small urban or rural allocations to large urbanized areas, but not the other way around.

Program funds come with local matching requirements. For eligible capital projects, the federal share of costs may not exceed 80% of the net cost of the activity. For eligible operating assistance projects, this federal share may not exceed 50% of the net cost of the activity. Sources of local matching funds include the following:

- State or local appropriations;
- Other non-DOT federal funds (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [TANF], Medicaid, employment training programs, Rehabilitation Services, and Administration on Aging), so long as these are directly used for activities included in the total net project costs of the funding grant;
- Dedicated tax revenues;
- Private donations;
- Revenue from human service contracts;
- Toll revenue credits;
- Net income generated from advertising and concessions; and

- Non-cash sources such as donations, volunteered services, and in-kind contributions so long as the value of each is documented and represents a cost that would otherwise be eligible for funding under the program.

## Eligible Activities

At least 55% of program funds must be used on capital projects. Examples include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Buses and vans;
- Wheelchair lifts, ramps, and securement devices;
- Transit-related information;
- Technology systems including scheduling / routing / one-call systems;
- Mobility management programs; and
- Acquisition of transportation services under a contract, lease, or other arrangement—both capital and operating costs associated with contracted service are eligible capital expenses. User-side subsidies are considered one form of eligible arrangement. Funds may be requested for contracted services covering a time period of more than one year.

The remaining 45% percent of program funding can be used for other “nontraditional” projects. Under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program was modified to include projects eligible under the discontinued Section 5317 (New Freedom) program, described as:

- Capital and operating expenses for new public transportation services and alternatives beyond those required by the ADA, designed to assist individuals with disabilities and seniors. Examples include:
  - Travel training;
  - Volunteer driver programs;
  - Building an accessible path to a bus stop including curb-cuts, sidewalks, accessible pedestrian signals, or other accessible features;
  - Improving signage or wayfinding technology;
  - Incremental cost of providing same day service or door-to-door service;
  - Purchasing vehicles to support new accessible taxi, rides sharing, and / or vanpooling programs; and
  - Mobility management.

## What is the Coordinated Plan?

As stated earlier in this document, projects selected for funding under the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program must be derived from a locally developed Coordinated Plan. This plan must be developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit human services and transportation providers, as well as members of the general public. To the extent feasible, other transportation providers, advocacy groups, human service agencies, and passengers are to be encouraged to participate in coordination and planning efforts.

Essentially, the Coordinated Plan will identify the transportation needs of individuals in the target population(s), provide strategies for meeting these local needs, and prioritize potential solutions for funding and implementation. In this case, “local” refers to an area within the boundaries of Centre County, Pennsylvania.

### **Guidance from FTA Circular C 9070.1G**

At a minimum, the Coordinated Plan must include the following elements, consistent with available resources and the complexity of the local environment:

- An assessment of available transportation and human services that identifies current providers (public, private, and non-profit) within Centre County;
- An assessment of transportation needs for the each of the programs’ target populations. According to FTA, this assessment can be based on the experiences and perceptions of the planning partners or on more sophisticated data collection efforts, and should include an identification of any gaps in existing service based on these needs;
- Strategies and/or activities to address the identified gaps in service, and achieve efficiencies in service delivery; and
- Relative priorities for project implementation based on available resources, time, and feasibility.

The Coordinated Plan must maximize program coverage by minimizing duplication of services and identifying projects that will increase the overall efficiency of the Centre County public and human service transportation networks. Moreover, the Coordinated Plan should incorporate existing and planned activities offered under other programs sponsored by federal, state, and local agencies to greatly strengthen its impact.

Throughout the federal rulemaking process, FTA has repeatedly held that a completed Coordinated Plan that meets the elements listed above is required before Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program funding can be awarded. It is perfectly acceptable to build upon and modify existing Coordinated Plans, so long as all the required elements are still met.

FTA offers the following strategies for developing a Coordinated Plan that meets all the required elements:

- A community planning session or sessions with a diverse group of community stakeholders within Centre County to identify needs and strategies and set priorities, perhaps in cooperation or coordination with an already-existing planning process;
- Use of the self-assessment tool contained in FTA’s publication *The Framework for Action: Building the Fully Coordinated Transportation System* to assess progress toward transportation coordination, and the included Facilitator’s Guide to assemble an appropriate stakeholder group;
- A series of focus groups within various Centre County communities to provide opportunity for greater input from a larger number of representatives;
- Distribution and analysis of a survey instrument to evaluate unmet transportation needs and/or available resources. Any surveys should be statistically valid and take accessibility considerations into account;
- Completion of a detailed study and analysis using inventories, interviews, GIS mapping, and other research strategies; or
- Some appropriate combination of the above methods.

Based on the complexity of existing transportation and human service networks within Centre County, as well as the anticipated breadth of unmet transportation needs with respect to target

populations within the county, it is expected that the methods listed above will need to be successfully combined to yield the best possible results.

All federally mandated transportation planning processes must include a strong public participation component. The planning process that yields Centre County's Coordinated Plan is no exception. This public participation requirement underscores the need for a balanced and comprehensive array of plan development strategies as described in the preceding paragraph.

A Coordinated Plan requires consultation with an extensive list of Centre County stakeholders, possibly including, but not limited to:

- Transportation partners:
  - Area transportation planning agencies;
  - Public transportation providers;
  - Private transportation providers;
  - Non-profit transportation providers;
  - Past organizations funded under the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program; and
  - Human service agencies funding, operating, and/or providing access to transportation services.
- Passengers and advocates:
  - Existing and potential riders, including both general and targeted population passengers;
  - Protection and advocacy organizations;
  - Representatives from independent living centers; and
  - Advocacy organizations working on behalf of targeted populations.
- Human service partners:
  - Agencies that administer health, employment, or other support programs for targeted populations;
  - Non-profit human service provider organizations that serve the targeted populations;
  - Job training and placement agencies;
  - Health care facilities; and
  - Mental health care providers.
- Other:
  - Security and emergency management agencies;
  - Economic development organizations;
  - Faith- and community-based organizations;
  - Representatives of the business community;
  - Appropriate local and/or state officials and elected officials;
  - School districts; and
  - Other groups and individuals as appropriate.

It is expected that planning participants will have an active role in the development, adoption, and implementation of the Coordinated Plan, and should help to identify the process for adoption of the plan. Along with the completed plan, the CCMPO must have at its disposal a thorough documentation of the efforts utilized to solicit public involvement, as well as the results of these efforts.

With the requirement for public participation comes the need to employ a wide range of public outreach techniques, both to inform members of the community that a new planning process has commenced, and to solicit input and advice from these members. FTA recommends a mix of the following public outreach approaches:

- Notices or flyers in centers of community activity;
- Newspaper and/or radio announcements;
- E-mail list distribution;
- Website postings; and
- Invitation letters to government agencies, transportation providers, human service agencies, and advocacy groups;

Although the process to develop a Coordinated Plan is complex, there is ample opportunity to draw statistics, findings, and recommendations from existing statewide, metropolitan, and agency-level plans and reports. In fact, there should be appropriate consistency between the coordinated planning process and metropolitan or statewide planning processes. Potential areas of overlap may include, but are not limited to:

- Needs assessments based on the distribution of targeted populations and locations of employment centers, employment-related activities, community services and activities, medical centers, housing, and other destinations;
- Inventories of transportation providers and resources, levels of service utilization, duplication of service, and unused capacity;
- Gap analysis;
- Any grant or program eligibility restrictions; and
- Any already existing, identified, and/or potential opportunities for increased coordination of transportation services.

Moreover, the coordinated planning process and metropolitan and statewide planning processes are free to utilize coordinated or common schedules, agendas, and strategies to minimize duplication of time, effort, and cost.

Any projects identified in the coordinated planning process and selected for FTA funding through the competitive selection process must be incorporated into both the LRTP and TIP by the CCMPO. Accordingly, the coordinated planning process is paired with the update cycles for the Centre County LRTP.

## Plan Objectives

Based on CCMPO staff's understanding of the information contained in FTA's final circular for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program, as well as additional guidance received from PennDOT and the CCMPO Technical and Coordinating Committees, CCMPO's coordinated planning process is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

- Enhance public awareness of the role of the CCMPO in transportation planning and programming;
- Present the goals, target populations, anticipated funding levels, and eligible activities of the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program to ensure the consistency of all projects considered and put forward for funding;
- Adhere to all federal and state requirements;
- Conform to the generally accepted planning practices of the CCMPO;

- Ensure that the public, stakeholders, and CCMPO Technical and Coordinating Committee members have the information needed for sound analysis and decision-making through the following:
  - Use reliable and verifiable data sources to establish a basic demographic and socioeconomic profile of Centre County relative to the target populations
  - Present existing knowledge and data relative to unmet transportation needs and critical gaps in the transportation network
- Establish a comprehensive inventory of transportation services available within Centre County;
- Allow ample opportunity for the general public to comment on the information contained herein;
- Allow the CCMPO staff to act as an independent facilitator of stakeholder discussion and public comment;
- Build lasting and productive relationships among the CCMPO, local transportation providers, and human service agencies; and
- Accurately synthesize the results of the public meetings and public comment period and make recommendations accordingly.

## Centre County Demographic Characteristics

In examining the coordination of public transit and human services transportation in Centre County, it is critically important to understand the distribution of the target populations for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program—particularly low-income persons, persons with disabilities, and senior citizens—within the county. This information, when considered relative to the inventory of available transportation services in Centre County, helps to refine the coordinated planning process by highlighting specific areas that present the greatest need for transportation improvements.

Within this section, demographic data is presented relative to the following categories:

- Population and density
- Vehicle availability
- Income and poverty
- Labor force
- Distribution of jobs
- Distribution of age 65 and older population
- Distribution of population with disabilities
- Housing
- Travel time to work

### Population and Density

Centre County is a diverse area in terms of population and density. Although each census tract nationwide is drawn to include a standard number of residents (generally between 2,500 and 8,000) sharing similar socioeconomic characteristics, the area of each tract can vary widely. Accordingly, Centre County—with both vast rural lands and a significant urban center—includes both areas of very high and very low population density.

A table of Centre County population, land area, and population density by census tract follows. Of the census tracts with a higher-than-average population density, most are in the immediate areas surrounding State College and Bellefonte boroughs; however, significant population density also



exists in the Philipsburg area as well. By contrast, areas that are very sparsely populated include Burnside, Halfmoon, Rush, and Snow Shoe townships, and portions of the Mountaintop Region, Nittany Valley, Upper and Lower Bald Eagle valleys, and the Penns Valley.

High population density implies a high potential for efficient, effective, and successful transit operations. Conversely, serving sparsely populated areas with transit presents more challenges. Accordingly, many of the most densely populated areas within Centre County fall directly within the core **CATABUS** service area.

The population density of the county as a whole grew by 5.41% since the last coordinated planning process took place.

<b>Centre County Population Density by Census Tract</b>				
Tracts Listed in Decending Order by Number of Housing Units per Square Mile				
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Total Population	Land Area Square Miles	Population Density (Persons per Square Mile)
125	State College Downtown	4,497	0.13	34,592.31
126	State College Highlands South	3,671	0.21	17,480.95
121	University Park East	6,120	0.36	17,000.00
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	5,841	0.54	10,816.67
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	4,899	0.48	10,206.25
122	University Park West	5,243	0.56	9,362.50
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	6,172	0.67	9,211.94
123	State College - College Heights	2,287	0.54	4,235.19
111	Bellefonte	6,289	1.85	3,399.46
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	3,526	1.07	3,295.33
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	3,084	1.13	2,729.20
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	8,388	3.14	2,671.34
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	3,228	1.21	2,667.77
9812.02	Benner 2	3,687	4.23	871.63
114	Patton East	7,503	9.58	783.19
116	College North	4,685	7.23	647.99
113	Patton West	8,402	14.95	562.01
117.02	College South	5,462	11.00	496.55
110	Spring	7,741	27.13	285.33
112.01	Benner	5,555	27.53	201.78
118	Harris	5,612	31.21	179.81
119.02	Ferguson South	7,502	43.30	173.26
119.01	Halfmoon	2,755	23.60	116.74
107	Marion-Walker	6,142	60.41	101.67
106	Boggs-Milesburg	3,889	51.91	74.92
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	7,290	106.23	68.62
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	4,340	85.60	50.70
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	5,205	125.55	41.46
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	5,763	149.62	38.52
104	Rush	3,656	147.81	24.73
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	3,009	174.22	17.27
Pennsylvania		12,791,181	44,742.70	285.88
Centre County, Pennsylvania		161,443	1,113	145.05
= Tracts with housing density greater than the countywide average				
Sources: 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates				
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>				

## Households with No Available Vehicles

Centre County also features a wide disparity in terms of vehicle availability. Countywide, nearly 10% of households do not have a vehicle available for use.

A table of Centre County households with no available vehicles by census tract follows. Though census tracts with a higher-than-average lack of vehicle availability generally fall close to State College Borough and the Penn State campus, significant numbers of households without an available vehicle also exist in Philipsburg Borough, as well as a portion of the Penns Valley. By contrast, households in Halfmoon, Benner, Ferguson, Rush, and Spring townships are more likely to have at least one vehicle at their disposal.

Though a lack of vehicle ownership may suggest that a given community is developed in such a way that vehicle ownership is not critical (such as in State College Borough and the Penn State campus), it can also imply a high level of transit dependence, especially when this is validated by other socioeconomic indicators.

The percentage of households without an available vehicle fell slightly from 10.04% to 9.92% since the last coordinated planning process took place.

Centre County Occupied Housing with No Vehicle Available by Census Tract				
Tracts Listed in Decending Order by Percentage of Occupied Housing Units with No Available Vehicle				
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Number of Occupied Housing Units	Occupied Housing Units with No Vehicle Available	Housing Units with No Vehicle Available - Percentage of Total Occupied Housing Units
121	University Park East	5	5	100.00%
125	State College Downtown	1,648	910	55.22%
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	1,841	699	37.97%
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	2,114	751	35.53%
126	State College Highlands South	1,445	357	24.71%
122	University Park West	133	20	15.04%
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	2,769	415	14.99%
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	1,883	277	14.71%
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	1,605	235	14.64%
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	1,461	185	12.66%
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	3,330	325	9.76%
113	Patton West	3,524	290	8.23%
111	Bellefonte	2,702	156	5.77%
117.02	College South	2,297	127	5.53%
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	1,676	92	5.49%
116	College North	1,431	76	5.31%
123	State College - College Heights	963	45	4.67%
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	1,337	61	4.56%
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	2,089	95	4.55%
114	Patton East	2,783	105	3.77%
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	2,859	106	3.71%
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	1,170	43	3.68%
107	Marion-Walker	2,245	73	3.25%
106	Boggs-Milesburg	1,480	46	3.11%
118	Harris	2,239	66	2.95%
110	Spring	3,377	99	2.93%
104	Rush	1,363	25	1.83%
112.01	Benner	2,259	41	1.81%
119.02	Ferguson South	2,919	18	0.62%
119.01	Halfmoon	956	0	0.00%
9812.02	Benner 2	5	0	0.00%
Pennsylvania		5,025,132	552,690	11.00%
Centre County, Pennsylvania		57,908	5,743	9.92%
= Tracts with occupied housing units with no available vehicle greater than the countywide average				
Sources: 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates				
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>				

## Income and Poverty

### Median Household Income

Throughout Centre County, median household income is about \$58,055. However, it is important to note that this median is skewed downward somewhat by the large, generally low-earning student population in and around the Centre Region. Nevertheless, a significant disparity is present within the county in terms of income.

A table of Centre County median family income by census tract follows. Excluding the student population, for which a high level of transit service is already provided, significant proportions of lower-income families are present in Bellefonte and Philipsburg boroughs, and portions of the Lower Bald Eagle, Moshannon, and Penns valleys.

Households with a lower median family income represent an important target population for public transit and human services transportation. Such households generally tend to be more transit-dependent than average, and a well-developed transportation network can help these populations access essential employment, educational, medical, and shopping opportunities.

Countywide, median income rose 15.33% since the last coordinated planning process.

Centre County Median Household Income by Census Tract		
Tracts Listed in Ascending Order by Median Household Income		
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Median Household Income
125	State College Downtown	\$ 12,649
126	State College Highlands South	\$ 20,582
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	\$ 22,335
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	\$ 24,609
122	University Park West	\$ 33,750
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	\$ 39,175
113	Patton West	\$ 41,140
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	\$ 45,141
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	\$ 51,308
111	Bellefonte	\$ 51,818
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	\$ 53,569
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	\$ 54,571
104	Rush	\$ 54,915
106	Boggs-Milesburg	\$ 58,547
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	\$ 59,191
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	\$ 61,644
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	\$ 61,831
112.01	Benner	\$ 62,993
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	\$ 68,125
110	Spring	\$ 70,015
107	Marion-Walker	\$ 72,830
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	\$ 74,712
116	College North	\$ 76,089
114	Patton East	\$ 87,209
119.02	Ferguson South	\$ 95,606
117.02	College South	\$ 96,139
118	Harris	\$ 100,768
119.01	Halfmoon	\$ 106,875
123	State College - College Heights	\$ 112,868
121	University Park East	no data
9812.02	Benner 2	no data
Pennsylvania		\$ 59,445
Centre County, Pennsylvania		\$ 58,055
= Tracts with lower median household income than the countywide average		
Sources: 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates		
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>		

### **Poverty Rate**

Poverty is a condition in which a person or community is deprived of, or lacks the essentials for, a minimum standard of well-being and life. Current government poverty guidelines specify a maximum income of \$20,000 for a family of 4. About 18% of the Centre County population has an income falling below this standard, however, this rate is again skewed upward somewhat by the large, generally low-earning student population in and around the Centre Region.

A table of Centre County poverty rates by census tract follows. Excluding the student population, for which a high level of transit service is already provided, significant poverty rates exist in Philipsburg Borough and portions of the Upper Bald Eagle Valley. By contrast, poverty is generally much less prevalent in the suburban municipalities within and just outside of the Centre Region, as well as in Spring and Rush townships.

As with low-income populations, persons in poverty represent an important target population for public transit and human services transportation. Such persons generally tend to be more transit-dependent than average. In fact, individuals and families in poverty represent the people in most dire need of all manner of essential human services, including transportation.

The countywide poverty rate remained relatively constant at about 18.4% between coordinated planning processes.

Centre County Population in Poverty by Census Tract		
Tracts Listed in Decending Order by Percentage of Population in Poverty		
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Percentage of All People Whose Income is Below Poverty Level
121	University Park East	100.0%
125	State College Downtown	80.4%
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	64.2%
126	State College Highlands South	60.9%
122	University Park West	55.4%
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	53.2%
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	34.7%
113	Patton West	33.9%
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	20.4%
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	20.0%
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	16.1%
116	College North	13.3%
106	Boggs-Milesburg	11.7%
123	State College - College Heights	9.6%
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	9.5%
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	9.0%
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	8.0%
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	7.9%
118	Harris	7.6%
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	7.2%
119.02	Ferguson South	7.2%
112.01	Benner	6.9%
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	6.1%
107	Marion-Walker	6.1%
111	Bellefonte	5.8%
104	Rush	4.1%
114	Patton East	3.5%
117.02	College South	2.7%
110	Spring	2.3%
119.01	Halfmoon	1.7%
9812.02	Benner 2	0.0%
Pennsylvania		12.8%
Centre County, Pennsylvania		18.4%
= Tracts with percentage of people in poverty greater than the countywide average		
Sources: 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates		
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>		

## Percentage of Residents in the Labor Force

The civilian labor force is comprised of all individuals age 16 and older who are employed, are temporarily absent from a job for a variety of reasons, furloughed, or are unemployed but available for work and making specific efforts to find employment during the preceding four-week period. Currently, about 57% of the persons in Centre County age 16 and older are considered part of the labor force, with this rate skewed downward somewhat by the student population.

A table of the Centre County labor force by census tract follows. Excluding the student population, for which a high level of transit service is already provided, there is relatively low participation in the

labor force in Philipsburg Borough, and portions of the Mountaintop Region, Penns Valley, and Lower Bald Eagle Valley.

Those individuals not in the labor force may have a permanent disability or be experiencing an extended period of unemployment during which they have abandoned the search for a job. Areas with low participation in the labor force represent specific areas where a certain level of need may exist to connect individuals to essential services.

Countywide, participation in the labor force fell slightly from 58.9% to 57.3% since the last coordinated planning process.

Centre County Labor Force Age 16 and Over by Census Tract			
Tracts Listed in Ascending Order by Percentage in Labor Force 16 and Over			
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Persons in Labor Force Age 16 and Older	Percent of Total Population Age 16 and Older in Labor Force
9812.02	Benner 2	11	0.3%
121	University Park East	1,474	24.1%
122	University Park West	1,536	30.2%
120	State College Highlands North - Vallmont	1,997	35.1%
125	State College Downtown	1,905	42.5%
126	State College Highlands South	1,780	50.4%
116	College North	2,340	56.8%
112.01	Benner	2,706	57.5%
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	1,864	58.3%
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	1,521	58.4%
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	4,206	59.4%
117.02	College South	2,814	61.4%
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	1,537	61.5%
113	Patton West	4,848	61.6%
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	3,704	62.1%
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	2,355	62.7%
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	2,965	63.0%
118	Harris	3,034	63.1%
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	1,702	63.3%
104	Rush	2,041	64.3%
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	2,861	64.4%
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	2,715	64.7%
119.02	Ferguson South	3,948	65.5%
111	Bellefonte	3,536	67.4%
114	Patton East	4,031	68.2%
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	3,623	68.2%
107	Marion-Walker	3,411	69.5%
110	Spring	4,395	69.9%
123	State College - College Heights	1,409	72.3%
106	Boggs-Milesburg	2,338	73.3%
119.01	Halfmoon	1,590	74.8%
Pennsylvania		6,536,846	62.7%
Centre County, Pennsylvania		80,197	57.3%
= Tracts with percentage of persons age 16 and older in the labor force lower than countywide average			
Sources: 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates			
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>			

## Distribution of Jobs

Within Centre County, the Centre Region—and more specifically, State College Borough and the Penn State University campus—are home to a dominant share of major employers and jobs. Other employment centers are noted within the municipalities surrounding State College Borough, in the Bellefonte and Milesburg areas, and in the Moshannon Valley.

A table of Centre County’s 25 leading employers is presented on this page. Not surprisingly, Penn State University is by far the county’s largest job center. Federal, state, and county government are

all present within the list, as are three school districts, four health care providers, all three major Centre County grocery store chains, and several other retail and corporate entities.

It should also be noted that smaller businesses—both in the immediate State College area and throughout Centre County—are an important source of employment as well. Nevertheless, this information underscores the importance of transportation networks within the Centre Region, from other portions of the county into the Centre Region, and across county lines.

<b>Centre County Top 25 Employers</b>		
Listed in Descending Order by Number of Employees		
Rank	Employer	Location
1	The Pennsylvania State University	University Park
2	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	Various
3	Mount Nittany Medical Center	State College
4	State College Area School District	State College
5	Glenn O. Hawbaker, Inc.	State College
6	Wal-Mart / Sam's Club	State College
7	Centre County	Bellefonte
8	Geisinger Medical Group	State College
9	Mount Nittany Health System	State College
10	Weis Markets, Inc.	Various
11	United States of America	Various
12	Bellefonte Area School District	Bellefonte
13	Wegmans Food Markets, Inc.	State College
14	Restek Corporation	Bellefonte
15	Shaner Operating Corporation	State College
16	Accuweather, Inc.	State College
17	YMCA of Centre County	Various
18	Giant Food Stores, LLC	State College
19	Raytheon Company	State College
20	Bald Eagle Area School District	Milesburg
21	UHS of Pennsylvania, Inc.	Centre Hall
22	HRI, Inc.	State College
23	Sheetz, Inc.	Various
24	FourGSC, LLC	Various
25	United Parcel Service, Inc.	State College

Sources: Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, 4th Quarter 2019  
[https://www.workstats.dli.pa.gov/Documents/Top%2050/Centre\\_County\\_Top\\_50.pdf](https://www.workstats.dli.pa.gov/Documents/Top%2050/Centre_County_Top_50.pdf)

### Distribution of Age 65 and Older Population

Centre County features a diverse mix of young children and families, college students, young professionals, and older, more established residents. Currently, about 13.3% of Centre County residents are age 65 and older. Moreover, these senior Centre County residents are widely distributed in terms of geography.

A table of the distribution of age 65 and older residents within Centre County by census tract follows. Populations in Rush Township, portions of College and Ferguson townships, Philipsburg and Bellefonte boroughs, the Penns Valley, and portions of State College Borough have a larger-



than-average proportion of residents age 65 and older. By contrast, and not unexpectedly, the tracts including and immediately adjacent to the Penn State University campus are home to the lowest proportions of older residents.

The countywide percentage of residents over the age of 65 increased from 11.7% to 13.3% since the last coordinated planning process.

Persons age 65 and older are an important target population of the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program. It is critically important that projects under this program, as well as transit services funded with assistance from the Pennsylvania Lottery, further the connections between these populations and essential services.

<b>Centre County Persons Age 65 and Older by Census Tract</b>			
Tracts Listed in Decending Order by Percentage of Persons 65 and Older			
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Number of Persons Age 65 Years and Older	Percentage of Total Population Age 65 Years and Older
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	965	27.4%
104	Rush	865	23.7%
118	Harris	1,308	23.3%
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	729	22.6%
117.02	College South	1,163	21.3%
112.01	Benner	1,145	20.6%
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	622	20.2%
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	1,443	19.8%
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	828	19.1%
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	572	19.0%
111	Bellefonte	1,195	19.0%
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	920	17.7%
119.02	Ferguson South	1,306	17.4%
110	Spring	1,340	17.3%
123	State College - College Heights	382	16.7%
106	Boggs-Milesburg	597	15.4%
107	Marion-Walker	932	15.2%
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	827	14.4%
114	Patton East	861	11.5%
119.01	Halfmoon	307	11.1%
113	Patton West	872	10.4%
116	College North	445	9.5%
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	724	8.6%
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	458	7.4%
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	259	4.4%
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	157	3.2%
126	State College Highlands South	87	2.4%
9812.02	Benner 2	82	2.2%
125	State College Downtown	32	0.7%
121	University Park East	0	0.0%
122	University Park West	0	0.0%
Pennsylvania		2,229,861	17.4%
Centre County, Pennsylvania		21,423	13.3%
= Tracts with 65+ population greater than the countywide average			
Source 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates			
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>			

## Distribution of Population with Disabilities

Currently, about 9.6% of Centre County residents are persons with disabilities. Moreover, these Centre County residents with disabilities are widely distributed in terms of geography.

A table of populations with disabilities within Centre County by census tract follows. Populations mostly outside of the Centre Region—though not exclusively so—have a higher-than-average percentage of residents with disabilities. By contrast, nearly all of the tracts within the Centre Region seem to have a lower-than-average percentage of residents with disabilities.

The countywide percentage of residents with disabilities remained relatively flat, increasing from 9.4% to just 9.6% since the last coordinated planning process.

Persons with disabilities are an important target population of the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program. It is critically important that projects under this program further the connections between these populations and essential services.

Centre County Population with a Disability by Census Tract			
Tracts Listed in Decending Order by Percentage of Population with a Disability			
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Number of Civilian Noninstitutionalized Persons with a Disability	Percentage of Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population with a Disability
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	623	20.2%
112.01	Benner	895	17.3%
106	Boggs-Milesburg	669	17.2%
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	514	17.1%
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	678	15.6%
104	Rush	492	13.9%
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	477	13.7%
111	Bellefonte	798	13.2%
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	672	12.9%
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	927	12.8%
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	400	12.4%
107	Marion-Walker	699	11.4%
118	Harris	590	10.5%
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	593	10.3%
119.01	Halfmoon	284	10.3%
110	Spring	694	9.0%
113	Patton West	729	8.7%
117.02	College South	438	8.2%
114	Patton East	605	8.1%
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	674	8.1%
116	College North	355	7.6%
126	State College Highlands South	258	7.0%
119.02	Ferguson South	495	6.6%
123	State College - College Heights	123	5.4%
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	309	5.3%
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	296	4.9%
121	University Park East	285	4.7%
125	State College Downtown	169	3.8%
122	University Park West	168	3.2%
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	109	2.2%
9812.02	Benner 2	0	0.0%
Pennsylvania		1,751,584	13.9%
Centre County, Pennsylvania		15,018	9.6%
= Tracts with percentage of population with a disability greater than the countywide average			
Source 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates			
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>			

## Median Value of Owner-Occupied Housing Units

Centre County features a great disparity in terms of housing values. Currently, the median value of an owner-occupied Centre County housing unit is about \$220,500—well above the Pennsylvania median.

A table of Centre County housing values by census tract is presented on this page. Excluding non-owner-occupied units on the Penn State Campus, census tracts with the most affordable housing fall within Philipsburg and Bellefonte boroughs, the Mountaintop Region, Rush Township, the Nittany Valley, and the Upper and Lower Bald Eagle valleys. By contrast, housing units within the Centre Region are the least affordable.

The countywide median price for an owner-occupied housing unit rose by nearly 14.5% from \$192,600 since the last coordinated planning process.

The distribution of housing values within Centre County suggests relatively long commutes for some members of the workforce, and a real barrier between the most needy portions of the population and sustaining employment.

Centre County Median Value of Owner-Occupied Housing Units by Census Tract		
Tracts Listed in Ascending Order of Median Value of Owner-Occupied Housing Units		
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Median Value of Owner-Occupied Housing Units
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	\$104,200
104	Rush	\$115,800
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	\$124,800
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	\$143,700
106	Boggs-Milesburg	\$152,500
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	\$157,800
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	\$161,700
112.01	Benner	\$180,600
111	Bellefonte	\$182,600
110	Spring	\$183,700
107	Marion-Walker	\$211,200
116	College North	\$222,600
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	\$227,500
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	\$246,800
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	\$247,500
113	Patton West	\$258,200
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	\$274,900
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	\$278,000
114	Patton East	\$279,100
126	State College Highlands South	\$279,800
119.02	Ferguson South	\$285,100
117.02	College South	\$288,900
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	\$292,900
119.01	Halfmoon	\$293,000
118	Harris	\$298,000
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	\$365,000
123	State College - College Heights	\$426,700
121	University Park East	-
122	University Park West	-
125	State College Downtown	-
9812.02	Benner 2	-
Pennsylvania		\$174,100
Centre County, Pennsylvania		\$220,500
=Tracts with median home value greater than the countywide average		
Source: 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates		
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>		

## Mean Travel Time to Work

Centre County workers tend to have shorter commute times than the Pennsylvania average, with a current mean commute time of just over 20 minutes. This is much lower than the Pennsylvania average of about 27 minutes, owing in part to the proximity of major employers.

A table of Centre County mean travel times to work by census tract follows. In general, the tracts with longer commute times are in outlying Centre County, while those with shorter commute times are in the Centre Region and Bellefonte areas, suggesting prevailing commutes to the nexus of employment within the Centre Region.

Relatively short commutes within Centre County indicate a more favorable balance between jobs and housing in the Centre Region, and comparatively low traffic congestion for an urbanized area. Longer commutes suggest areas where public transit can play a role in meeting transportation challenges.

Centre County Mean Travel Time to Work by Census Tract		
Tracts Listed in Decending Order of Mean Travel Time to Work for Those Not Working at Home		
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Mean Travel Time to Work in Minutes
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	34.0
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	32.0
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	31.3
104	Rush	29.1
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	28.2
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	28.1
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	26.7
119.01	Halfmoon	24.5
106	Boggs-Milesburg	22.7
107	Marion-Walker	22.7
112.01	Benner	22.3
110	Spring	20.9
119.02	Ferguson South	19.8
113	Patton West	18.5
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	18.4
125	State College Downtown	18.1
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	17.9
111	Bellefonte	17.6
116	College North	17.2
114	Patton East	16.7
126	State College Highlands South	16.5
118	Harris	16.3
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	16.1
123	State College - College Heights	15.6
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	15.2
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	15.1
117.02	College South	15.0
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	14.3
121	University Park East	12.2
122	University Park West	12.1
9812.02	Benner 2	-
Pennsylvania		26.9
Centre County, Pennsylvania		20.3
=Tracts with mean commute time greater than the countywide average		
Source 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates		
<a href="https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map">https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/united-states/quick-facts/pennsylvania/land-area#map</a>		

## Centre County Census Tracts by Need Index

Considering the extent of the demographic data presented previously in this document, CCMPO staff has developed a “public transit–human service need index” for each census tract within Centre County. This index overlays demographic data elements, offering stakeholders and the general public one method for determining where the greatest needs exist and helping to focus the coordinated planning effort.

To develop this need index, each census tract within Centre County was assigned an individual ranking in the following key areas:

- Population density (high to low)
- Vehicle availability (low to high)
- Income (low to high)
- Poverty rate (high to low)
- Labor force participation (low to high)
- Age 65 and older population (high to low)
- Percentage of persons with disabilities (high to low)
- Housing values (low to high)
- Commute time (high to low)

These individual relative rankings were then assembled into an average ranking, and then further assembled into a relative ranking. This approach, which assumes that each key indicator carries an equal weight, attempts to define the census tracts exhibiting higher and lower need for public transit and human services, on average, across all areas.

The following table presents the need index by census tract, and displays the factors used to calculate the index.

Centre County Public Transit - Human Service Need Index by Census Tract													
Tracts Listed in Ascending Order by Average Rank for Key Demographic Indicators													
Census Tract Number	Census Tract Description	Population Density	Vehicle Availability	Income	Poverty	Labor Force	Age 65 and Older	Persons with Disabilities	Housing Value	Commute Time	Average Rank	Relative Rank	
103	Philipsburg - South Philipsburg	11	10	6	9	10	7	1	1	1	6.22		1
125	State College Downtown	1	2	1	2	5	29	28	-----	16	10.50		2
120	State College Highlands North - Vallamont	4	3	4	3	4	25	25	23	15	11.78		3
126	State College Highlands South	2	5	2	4	6	27	22	20	21	12.11		4
127	State College South - Penfield-Tusseyview	10	9	19	15	9	1	7	14	25	12.11		4
101	Curtain-Howard-Liberty	27	15	12	23	16	9	5	4	3	12.67		6
102	Burnside-Snow Shoe	31	22	15	18	13	10	4	3	2	13.11		7
121	University Park East	3	1	-----	1	2	30	27	-----	29	13.29		8
112.01	Benner	20	28	18	22	8	6	2	8	11	13.67		9
108	Haines-Miles-Milheim-Penn	29	8	11	11	22	18	14	6	5	13.78		10
113	Patton West	17	12	7	8	14	21	17	16	14	14.00		11
111	Bellefonte	9	13	10	25	24	11	8	9	18	14.11		12
122	University Park West	6	6	5	5	3	31	29	-----	30	14.38		13
104	Rush	30	27	13	26	20	2	6	2	4	14.44		14
109	Centre Hall-Gregg-Potter	26	21	17	17	15	8	10	13	6	14.78		15
105	Huston-Port Matilda-Taylor-Union-Worth	28	19	16	16	21	12	9	7	7	15.00		16
115.02	Ferguson Northwest	12	11	8	7	11	23	20	18	28	15.33		17
106	Boggs-Milesburg	25	24	14	13	30	16	3	5	9	15.44		18
128	State College Southwest - Greentree	7	7	9	10	26	24	26	15	17	15.67		19
124	State College Urban Village - Holmes-Foster	5	4	3	6	17	26	30	26	26	15.89		20
115.01	Ferguson Northeast	13	18	22	20	19	4	11	17	23	16.33		21
116	College North	16	16	23	12	7	22	21	12	19	16.44		22
107	Marion-Walker	24	23	21	24	27	17	12	11	10	18.78		23
117.02	College South	18	14	26	28	12	5	18	22	27	18.89		24
118	Harris	21	25	27	19	18	3	13	25	22	19.22		25
110	Spring	19	26	20	29	28	14	16	10	12	19.33		26
123	State College - College Heights	8	17	29	14	29	15	24	27	24	20.78		27
114	Patton East	15	20	24	27	25	19	19	19	20	20.89		28
119.02	Ferguson South	22	29	25	21	23	13	23	21	13	21.11		29
9812.02	Benner 2	14	31	-----	31	1	28	31	-----	-----	22.67		30
119.01	Halfmoon	23	30	28	30	31	20	15	24	8	23.22		31

The top one-third of the ranking includes Philipsburg Borough, portions of State College Borough, the Lower Bald Eagle Valley, the Mountaintop Region, Benner Township, and the eastern portion of Penns Valley. The middle one-third includes portions of the Center Region, Bellefonte Borough, Rush Township, the western portion of Penns Valley, the Upper Bald Eagle Valley, and other portions of State College Borough. The lower one-third of the rankings includes mostly census tracts from the Centre Region and the Nittany Valley.

## Transportation Providers

A comprehensive accounting of public transportation, ridesharing, demand-responsive, microtransit, university-related, intercity bus, taxi, transportation network company (TNC), and car-sharing services are presented in Chapter 3 (Existing Conditions) of the main Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) document.

## Candidate Transportation Projects

As mentioned earlier in this document, PennDOT advised CCMPO staff to draw potential candidate projects from existing planning documents, including the LRTP, TIP, and CATA strategic plan. Each candidate project must meet the intent of the funding program, be oriented toward target populations in the areas of greatest need, and be assigned a relative priority through coordination with stakeholders and input from the general public.

Accordingly, the CCMPO presents the following candidate projects, which are described below:

### 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- CATA Operating Assistance – CATA's estimate of federal, state, and local assistance that will be needed to cover the cost of day-to-day operations during TIP years 2021 through 2024 not directly covered by farebox revenues, pass sales, and purchase of service agreements.
- CCOT Operating Assistance – CCOT's estimate of state and local assistance that will be needed to cover the cost of day-to-day operations during TIP years 2021 through 2024 not directly covered by farebox revenues, pass sales, and purchase of service agreements.
- Replace Paratransit Vehicles – Purchase of paratransit vehicles for the Centre Area Transportation Authority and Centre County Office of Transportation Services to replace the existing fleet as it meets / exceeds useful life and thus allow the agencies to accommodate the demand for paratransit services.
- Replace Vanpool Vehicles – Purchase of vans for the Centre Area Transportation Authority to replace the existing fleet as it meets / exceeds useful life and thus allow the agency to accommodate the demand for vanpool services.
- Replace Buses – Purchase of buses for the Centre Area Transportation Authority to replace the existing fleet as it meets / exceeds useful life and thus allow the agency to accommodate the demand for fixed-route bus services.
- Replace Microtransit Vehicles – Purchase of microtransit for the Centre Area Transportation Authority to replace the existing fleet as it meets / exceeds useful life and thus allow the agency to accommodate the demand for microtransit services.

- Purchase Expansion Microtransit Vehicles – Purchase of microtransit vans for the Centre Area Transportation Authority to expand the existing fleet and thus allow the agency to accommodate increasing demand for microtransit services.
- Purchase Expansion Buses – Purchase of buses for the Centre Area Transportation Authority to expand the existing fleet and thus allow the agency to accommodate increasing demand for fixed route bus services.
- Advanced Public Transportation Systems (APTS) – Purchase and installation of hardware, software, and equipment to expand the capabilities of the Centre Area Transportation Authority's existing advanced public transportation systems. Examples include additional wayside signage at key stops, installation of security cameras and real-time video recording, installation of electronic fare collection, and improvement of vehicle monitoring and engine diagnostics.
- Shelters and Amenities – Add new bus shelters and related amenities as needed within the Centre Area Transportation Authority's service area. Examples may include signs, sign poles, concrete stop pads, sidewalk segments, trash cans, and solar panels.
- Major Bus and Building Parts – Purchase of bus and building parts (engines, transmissions, differentials, A/C units, etc.) which cost more than \$300 to reduce operating expenses for the maintenance of the Centre Area Transportation Authority's revenue vehicles.

### Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2050

- Operating Assistance – Annual line item.
- Replacement Vehicles – Annual line item.
- Expansion Vehicles – Annual line item.
- Advanced Public Transportation Systems (APTS) – Annual line item.
- Shelters and Amenities – Annual line item.
- Major Bus and Building Parts – Annual line item.
- College Avenue Transit Facilities – Improve three existing CATA bus stops along College Avenue in State College Borough: at Heister Street, Allen Street, and University Club. These stops are served by the majority of CATA's fixed routes and utilized by significant numbers of student and community-based riders. Improvements may include safe curbing area, adequate staging capacity, shelter, lighting, and pedestrian and bicycle connections.
- CATA Service Area Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Study – Examine the state of the practice in implementing BRT elements, the effectiveness of these elements, and the opportunities to utilize such elements to improve operating efficiency and passenger throughput along a number of high-density corridors within the CATA fixed-route service area.
- College – Beaver Avenue Transit Signal Priority (TSP) and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) – Implement transit signal priority and related ITS technologies along the College and Beaver Avenue corridors in State College Borough. The project area will include intersections at Atherton Street, Burrowes Street / Road, Fraser Street, Allen Street, Pugh Street, Garner Street / Shortlidge Road, and the University Drive ramps.
- Regional Park-and-Ride Lot Study – Update the previous 1997 study to account for changing commute patterns in the region, provide the opportunity to re-prioritize existing potential sites, add new sites as appropriate, identify potential environmental issues early in

the site selection and design processes, and work with PennDOT District 2-0 and other stakeholders to maximize opportunities for use of public right-of-way.

- Moshannon Valley Park and Ride Lot – Construct improvements to an existing informal lot, or construct a new lot, to accommodate a significant population of those who commute via alternative mode—including vanpooling and other ridesharing—and currently utilize informal and unimproved locations.
- Penns Valley Park-and-Ride Lot – Construct improvements to an existing informal lot, or construct a new lot, to accommodate a significant population of those who commute via alternative mode—including vanpooling and other ridesharing—and currently utilize informal and unimproved locations.
- CCOT Operations and Storage Facility Upgrade – Construct or lease an expanded and updated operations and vehicle storage location for the CCOT at a Centre County facility to be determined.

## Public and Stakeholder Involvement

### 30-Day Public Comment Period

The Coordinated Plan was, along with the rest of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2050, advertised on August 14, 2020, for a 30-day public comment period which concluded on September 14, 2020. [No questions or comments were received.](#)

### Public Meeting

In conjunction with the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2050, a public meeting for the Coordinated Plan was held September 2, 2020, via the Zoom videoconferencing platform. [No input was received specific to the Coordinated Plan.](#)

### Human Service Transportation Stakeholders

FTA guidance with respect to the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program specifies that all projects selected for funding under these programs must be derived from a locally developed Coordinated Plan. This plan must be developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit human services and transportation providers as well as members of the general public. To the extent feasible, other transportation providers, advocacy groups, human service agencies, and passengers shall be encouraged to participate in coordination and planning efforts.

Along with the background information contained in the preceding sections, documentation of the actions described immediately above will form the core of CCMPO's final Coordinated Plan.

Accordingly, CCMPO has developed a range of stakeholders that includes members of the following types of organizations:

- Transportation service providers
- Human service agencies and advocacy groups
- Faith-based organizations
- Economic development agencies
- Employers and educational institutions

A list of stakeholders is presented in the following table.:



Name	Title	Agency	Agency Type	Location
<b>Rebekah Cunningham</b>	Chief Executive Officer	The Arc – Centre County	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Vickey Confer</b>	Center Manager	Bellefonte Senior Resource Center	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Bellefonte
<b>Pauline Raab</b>	Executive Director	CenClear Child Services, Inc.	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Bigler
<b>William Zupich</b>	Executive Director	Central Pennsylvania Community Action, Inc.	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Clearfield
<b>Louwana Oliva</b>	Executive Director / Chief Executive Officer	Centre Area Transportation Authority	Transportation Service Provider	State College
<b>Lori Haines</b>	Executive Director	Centre County Housing Authority	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Bellefonte
<b>Natalie Corman</b>	Administrator	Centre County Mental Health / Intellectual Disabilities / Early Intervention and Drug & Alcohol Office	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Faith Ryan</b>	Director	Centre County Office of Adult Services	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Bellefonte
<b>Kenneth Pendleton</b>	Director	Centre County Office of Aging	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Bellefonte
<b>David Lomison</b>	Director	Centre County Office of Transportation	Transportation Service Provider	Milesburg
<b>Brian Querry</b>	Director	Centre County Office of Veterans' Affairs	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Bellefonte
<b>Wendy Vinhage</b>	Executive Director	Centre County United Way	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Leanne Lenz</b>	Executive Director	Centre Helps	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Cindy Stahlman</b>	Supervisor	Centre Region Active Adult Center	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Anne Ard</b>	Executive Director	Centre Safe	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Jessica Confer</b>	Director	Easter Seals Central Region – State College Division	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Nicole Summers</b>	Executive Director	FaithCentre, Inc.	Faith-Based Organization	Bellefonte
<b>Jonathan Berzas</b>	President / Chief Executive Officer	Fullington Auto Bus Company	Transportation Service Provider	State College
<b>Noreen Byers</b>	President	Handy Delivery, Inc.	Transportation Service Provider	State College

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Agency Type</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>Robin Cooke</b>	President	Hearing Loss Association of America - Central Pennsylvania Chapter	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Morgan Wasikonis</b>	Executive Director	Housing Transitions, Inc.	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Curt Knouse</b>	Executive Director	Interfaith Human Services	Faith-Based Organization	State College
<b>Amy Wilson</b>	Executive Director	Mid-State Literacy Council	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Stan LaFuria</b>	Executive Director	Moshannon Valley Economic Development Partnership	Economic Development Agency	Philipsburg
<b>Omer Ahmed</b>	Founder and Chief Executive Officer	Nittany Express, Inc.	Transportation Service Provider	State College
<b>Judy Fitzgerald</b>	Site Administrator	PA CareerLink Centre County	Economic Development Agency	Bellefonte
<b>Rob DeMayo</b>	Director of Transportation	Penn State University	Major Employer / Educational Institution	University Park
<b>Paula Snyder</b>	Center Manager	Penns Valley Senior Resource Center	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Madisonburg
<b>Julie Blazosky</b>	Center Manager	Philipsburg Senior Resource Center	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Philipsburg
<b>Cheryl Johnson</b>	Executive Director	Private Industry Council of Centre County, Inc.	Economic Development Agency	State College
<b>Brenda Reeve</b>	Coordinator	Retired and Senior Volunteer Program of Centre County	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Bellefonte
<b>Elin Kjelgaard</b>	Office Coordinator	Salvation Army – State College	Faith-Based Organization	State College
<b>William Muzzy</b>	President	Sight-Loss Support Group of Central Pennsylvania, Inc.	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Rebecca Aungst</b>	President / Chief Executive Officer	Skills of Central Pennsylvania, Inc.	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College
<b>Sandy Repasky</b>	Center Manager	Snow Shoe Senior Resource Center	Human Service Agency / Advocate	Snow Shoe
<b>Cynthia Pasquinelli</b>	Chief Executive Officer	Strawberry Fields, Inc.	Human Service Agency / Advocate	State College

## Survey Instrument

Each stakeholder was forwarded a copy of the draft Coordinated Plan, and asked the following five questions:

- 1) What do your agency and your clients consider to be the most critical transportation gaps to, from, and within Centre County, and why?
- 2) How have transportation services to, from, and within Centre County improved for your agency and clients over the last 5 years? How have they worsened?
- 3) Does your agency currently provide transportation services directly to clients? If so, please describe.
- 4) Which of the candidate projects presented on the Centre County Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2050 and 2021-2024 Centre County TIP would be most beneficial to your agency and clients, and why?
- 5) Are there any additional potential projects beyond those presented on the Centre County Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2050 and 2021-2024 Centre County TIP that would be beneficial to your agency and clients, and why?

No input was received with respect to the five survey questions.