

DRAFT
READING AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
MINUTES OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN-PERSON AND
VIRTUALLY
MAY 21, 2026

ATTENDANCE

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Chris Kufro, PennDOT District Executive, Chair*
Raymond Green, PennDOT Central
Commissioner Michael Rivera, County of Berks (V)
Lisha Rowe, 1st Class Townships (Cumru Township)
Keith Boatman, South Central Transit Authority (representing Greg Downing) (V)
Donna Reed, City of Reading
Dante Santoni, Jr., Reading Regional Airport Authority (V)

*Tie-breaking vote only
(V) Attended Virtually

COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT ATTENDING

Arthur Lambert, 2nd Class Townships (Upper Bern Township)
Brian Hoffa, Boroughs (Sinking Spring)
Tom McKeon, Berks County Planning Commission

OTHERS

Michael Donchez, PennDOT 5-0 (V)
Scott Vottero, PennDOT 5-0 (V)
Jennifer Ruth, PennDOT 5-0 (V)
Lawrence Peterson, PennDOT 5-0 (V)
Don Edwards, City of Reading (V)
Ronnique Bishop, FHWA (V)
Alan Piper, Berks County Planning Commission, MPO Secretary
Matthew Boyer, Commuter Services of PA (V)
Nyomi Nonnemaker, PennDOT Central
Nick Raio, PennDOT Central (V)
Ashley Showers, Berks County Planning Commission (V)
Leo Scott, Berks County Planning Commission (V)
Amanda Timochenko, Berks County Planning Commission
Michael Golembiewski, Berks County Planning Commission
Devon Hain, Berks County Planning Commission
Matthew McGough, Berks County Planning Commission (V)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kufro called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT/BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There were no public comments or business from the floor.

3. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 19, 2026 JOINT TECHNICAL AND COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Kufro asked if there were any questions or comments on the March 19, 2026 Joint Technical and Coordinating Committee meeting minutes. There were no questions or comments.

MOTION: Mr. Green made a motion to approve the March 19, 2026 Joint Technical and Coordinating Committee meeting minutes. Ms. Rowe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. COMMUTEPA UPDATE

Mr. Boyer presented the April 2026 Monthly Activity Report to the committee for their information. In April CommutePA added 225 new members, recorded 10,519 commuter trips, saved commuters \$140,917 in gas money, and reduced 194,368 miles on the road by carpooling, biking, or using public transit. Participants in the program burned a combined 570,674 calories by using other modes of transportation like biking or walking and saved 8,255 gallons of fuel.

Mr. Boyer presented a slide deck detailing the outreach efforts at various outreach events, businesses, and agencies that CommutePA performed during the month of April 2026.

Mr. Boyer added that as part of their Bike Month celebration they held a Berks Bike Smart Safety Fest at Reading Area Community College this past Saturday. This event was held with help from Reading Hospital/Tower Health. There was a good turnout of about 20 to 25 kids where they were able to receive free helmets and event organizers handed out three new bikes. There were a number of vendors there also.

Mr. Boyer thanked Mr. Golembiewski for attending and helping with set-up and tear down after the event. Mr. Boyer said he looks forward to next year's event and because of it's success he anticipates it being even bigger in following years.

Mr. Golembiewski added that it was indeed a great event. The team at CommutePA and community outreach people from Tower Health did a great job at organizing the event. There were members from the Tower Health trauma team as

well as the Reading Police Department, State Police, and Reading Fire Department ambulance team. All in all, it was a great event and he looks forward to it next year.

5. CONFIRMATION OF E-BALLOT REQUEST M.P.M.S. 117723 S.R. 737 (KRUMSVILLE ROAD) SLOPE REPAIRS

Mr. Piper reminded the committee that in early April 2026 an e-Ballot was conducted regarding an Amendment to the F.F.Y. 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program. The Amendment was required to add \$750,000 for Preliminary Engineering for the S.R. 737 (Krumsville Road) Slope Repair project (M.P.M.S. #117723) on the current F.F.Y. 2025 R.A.T.S. T.I.P.

The R.A.T.S. Technical and Coordinating Committees were forwarded the information regarding this Amendment along with the associated fiscal constraint table documenting the recommended funding moves by an e-Ballot on April 6, 2026. A YES vote was asked to approve the action providing the additional funds for the S.R. 737 project.

The results of the e-Ballot were as follows:

Technical Committee

Nonnemaker – Yes (4/6/26)
Piper – Yes (4/6/26)
Golembiewski – Yes (4/6/26)
Edwards – Not Voting
Zeiber – Yes (4/6/26)
Boatman – Yes (4/6/26)
Tempesco – Not Voting
Vottero (Chair) – Tie Break Only
Approved 5-0 w/ two not voting

Coordinating Committee

Green – Yes (4/6/26)
Rivera – Yes (4/6/26)
Santoni – Yes (4/6/26)
McKeon – Yes (4/8/26)
Rowe – Yes (4/6/26)
Lambert – Not Voting
Hoffa – Yes (4/6/26)
Reed – Yes (4/6/26)
Downing – Yes (4/6/26)
Kufro (Chair) – Tie Break Only
Approved 8-0 w/ one not voting

Mr. Piper informed the Committee that we need a motion to confirm the above votes by the e-Ballot today.

MOTION: Ms. Rowe made a motion to confirm the e-Ballot votes for the S.R. 737 (Krumsville Road) Slope Repair project.. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

6. PENNDOT REQUESTED AMENDMENTS / MODIFICATIONS TO F.F.Y. 2025-2028 T.I.P.

Mr. Donchez gave an update on PennDOT's requested Amendments / Modifications to the F.F.Y. 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (T.I.P.) from February 26, 2026 to April 29, 2026.

- There were sixteen (16) Administrative Actions – the actions address such things as increases for final design and preliminary engineering supplements, aligning funding with need, balancing sources to maintain fiscal constraint, utilities increases due to changes in design standards and project design, increases for railroad agreements, right-of-way acquisition, increases per low bid award/analysis, increase for 971 claim damage estimates, increase to cover phase of bog turtle survey, report, resilience design assessment, and wetland and watercourse study, increases to match current estimates, cash flow to align with anticipated need due to let date changes, increases due to inspection, staging, phasing, design-build during night and day shifts, increases due to revisions for new RC/DM2 standards, revisions to comply with new structure best practices, utility coordination not previously scoped, and for permit modifications for bat survey and coordination, increases due to unforeseen additions of epoxy bonded overlay, toe wall repairs, slotted barrier additional costs, pipe run “B” and CENG additional costs
- There was one (1) Amendment – S.R. 737 (Krumsville Road) Slope Repair for adding preliminary engineering phase utilizing federal Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation Program (PROTECT) funding.
- There were no Statewide Administrative Actions.
- There were no Interstate Management Administrative Actions.

Mr. Donchez informed the committee that no vote will be needed to approve the one amendment listed above because a vote was made to confirm the amendment by e-Ballot under item # 5 of this meeting agenda.

None of the modifications presented in the chart adversely affect project delivery schedules or air quality conformity.

Mr. Piper asked if it was fair to say that we will be seeing more of these amendments in the next couple of months because we’re working towards the end of the current T.I.P. and Federal funding cycle and need to be tying down our allocations for F.F.Y. 2026?

Mr. Donchez responded that is accurate. Probably the July/August timeframe we’ll probably see an increase in movements to make final adjustment before the close-out of the Federal Fiscal Year.

7. S.C.T.A. REQUESTED TRANSIT T.I.P. MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Boatman presented the spreadsheet listing the modifications to the Transit T.I.P. to the committee. The modifications that S.C.T.A are requesting are to meet the match for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant funding and the program of projects for the period July 10, 2025 to May 13, 2026. Mr. Boatman described some of the projects included in the modifications chart and asked if there were any questions. There were none and he concluded his presentation.

8. UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SET-ASIDE PROGRAM AWARDS

Mr. Piper presented that starting late last year and into the beginning of this year the MPO had a round of statewide and local T.A.S.A. funding. There was a recommendation to use the local T.A.S.A. funds for the Berks County Redevelopment Authority for the Colebrookdale Railroad project in Boyertown and also recommended that the other projects submitted be funded using the Statewide funding available for T.A.S.A. projects.

Mr. Piper updated the committee that funding has been approved for the Colebrookdale Railroad project. None of the other projects received statewide funding and will not proceed at this time.

He then addressed a current project in the T.I.P. Two years ago the MPO approved funding for a project by Berks Nature to build a trail extension in Kenhorst Borough. Berks Nature has been trying to work their way through the process and are getting close but not necessarily there yet. The MPO is trying to resolve an issue in that if they cannot get their final approval and have the funding obligated by the August 2026 obligation and since it is the end of the funding period they may lose their funding. The MPO staff is trying to do what they can to help them but not sure if there are any options if they get to the end of the period and they do not have anything in place. Mr. Piper stated he is working with various people at the department to move this through the process.

Mr. Green asked if the project is prepared to move ahead on the current T.I.P. or are there plans to move it to the next T.I.P.? Mr. Piper responded that what they need to do is to finalize their design but the problem is that they still need a cooperative agreement with Kenhorst Borough for the right-of-way and also need them to sign off on a signal maintenance agreement for a rapid rectangular flashing beacon where the trail is proposed to cross Route 625. Until they have these items, they cannot process the 4232 to obligate the funds.

Mr. Piper added that Berks Nature has a meeting with the borough engineer in about two weeks. Hopefully they can begin to advance it through the borough. There has just been some difficulty in getting on the municipal schedule and getting things

approved because the borough recently hired a new engineer but also stated that he is not aware of the other issues encountered by Berks Nature during the process.

Mr. Kufro asked if there is a clause in the agreement where they file an official request and ask for an extension? Mr. Piper responded that they have formally requested an extension but, because the funding was approved under IIJA and that expires at the end of this fiscal year, there is no rollover.

Mr. Piper finished by stating that this is something he wanted the committee to be aware of as the staff continues to try to work it out.

9. L.R.T.P. / T.I.P. DEVELOPMENT PROCESS OVERVIEW

Mr. Piper stated that this item is to provide an overview of the actions the committee is going to make for items 10 through 17 on this meeting's agenda.

In October 2023 staff started the process of T.I.P. and Long Range Transportation Plan (L.R.T.P.) development by beginning the 30 month process with PennDOT, MPO staff, Federal Highway Administration, and various other stakeholders.

This then led to the establishment of the local steering committee in July 2024. There were 27 individuals from various agencies and backgrounds that served on the committee. The committee met eight times over the past two years to review and provide feedback on the draft sections and issues presented by MPO staff. Mr. Piper shared a thank you to everybody that participated in the process for their commitment and hard work on the development of the L.R.T.P. and associated documents. It was the first time the MPO used a steering committee during the development of the L.R.T.P. and it provided a broad perspective and input from outside the MPO's internal staff.

Additionally, over the past two years staff conducted two separate rounds of public input prior to developing the draft L.R.T.P. In the fall of 2024 staff conducted four in-person meetings and one virtual meeting to review and revise the vision statement and the goals and objectives of the L.R.T.P. Following up with those meetings, in the spring of 2025 the staff conducted seven in-person and two virtual meetings to review the revised goals and objectives, and to discuss regional issues and needs and project recommendations. Very good feedback was received during those sessions. The in-person meetings were held at various locations throughout the County to accommodate as many people and regions as possible.

Mr. Piper added that also during this time MPO staff made presentations on the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. to various agencies and organizations throughout Berks County.

In the spring of 2025, working in coordination with the State Transportation Commission (S.T.C.), we encouraged citizens to participate in the S.T.C.'s 12-Year

Program survey. That also gave staff great feedback on the opinions of people from Berks County as well as an additional opportunity for citizens to provide input on projects and needs for the region.

In the fall of 2025, staff had five meetings with PennDOT staff in-person at District 5-0 and virtually to develop the fiscally constrained draft T.I.P. and the 12-Year Program listings. That process wrapped up in January 2026 where both the draft T.I.P., 12-Year Program, and L.R.T.P. project listings were reviewed by the MPO and PennDOT Central Office staff prior to the MPO approving the project listing at their meeting on January 15, 2026.

Between January and March 2026, staff worked to turn the finalized project listing into complete draft documents for the L.R.T.P. and the T.I.P. Staff prepared the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the Community Demographics Assessment that looked at both the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. In March 2026 the documents were brought back to the Committee for authorization to circulate them for public review and comment. That review and comment period began on March 22, 2026 and extended through April 24, 2026. During that time, staff held two in-person and two virtual public meetings. People also had the opportunity to review and comment on the materials online through the MPO's T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. development webpage.

Mr. Piper continued that, following all of the actions he covered during this presentation, the only actions left to be completed are MPO approval of each of those items and then submission to PennDOT. Staff is asking the committee to approve the:

- Air Quality Conformity Analysis Report which documents that both the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. conform to all of the appropriate federal air quality standards and regulations.
- Air Quality Conformity Resolution which affirms that the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. meet federal air quality standards
- Community Demographic Assessment which documents that there is no disproportionate distribution or impacts from projects across the region.
- Response to Comments
- T.I.P. Amendment M.O.U., which defines the procedures to be used to revise the T.I.P. prior to the next full update
- Transportation Improvement Program document and Appendix,
- Long Range Transportation Plan document and Appendix subject to the addition of response to comments, and the
- Self-Certification Statement that certifies that all applicable Federal rules and regulations were followed in developing the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. and associated documents described above.

Alan went on to commend BCPC, SCTA and PennDOT staff for their hard work in developing and putting together these documents.

Mr. Kufro thanked Mr. Piper and the team for their efforts in the development of the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P.

10. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS REPORT FOR F.F.Y. 2027-2030 T.I.P. AND F.F.Y. 2027-2050 L.R.T.P.

MOTION: Ms. Rowe made a motion to approve the Air Quality Conformity Analysis Report for F.F.Y. 2027-2030 T.I.P. and F.F.Y. 2027-2050 L.R.T.P. Mr. Green seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

11. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY RESOLUTION

MOTION: Mr. Green made a motion to approve the Air Quality Conformity Resolution. Mr. Boatman seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

12. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF F.F.Y. 2027-2030 COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT

MOTION: Ms. Rowe made a motion to approve the F.F.Y. 2027-2030 Community Demographic Assessment. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

13. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Piper presented to the committee that all of the documents listed above were out for the mandatory public review and comment period that extended from March 22, 2026 through April 24, 2026. Staff held two virtual meetings during this time and comments could be submitted either verbally, electronically, or on paper. Any comments received during this period are required to be documented and responses prepared for those comments. The responses must be approved by both the Technical and Coordinating committees prior to plan adoption.

Mr. Piper went through each comment individually and received concurrence from the committee on the documented responses. All comments and their responses will be included in the appendices of the final documents. The final T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. documents will be modified as appropriate based on the approved responses.

He added more discussion on the following input from public comment:

Mr. Piper added that one of the comments received did not relate directly to the T.I.P. or L.R.T.P. but it is an item that should be brought to the board's attention. It relates to the membership composition of the Coordinating Committee. During the virtual public meeting staff held on April 24, 2026, Mr. Andrew Kline, a member of

the Oley Valley School Board asked how school districts can be better incorporated into the transportation planning process? Mr. Piper responded/explained that there are four possible ways to participate in the process : 1) attend MPO meetings and get on the mailing list; 2) school districts could be invited to participate in the PennDOT Connects pre-engineering meetings; 3) school districts would receive invitations to the public plan display meetings conducted by PennDOT, and 4) school districts are always incorporated into the announcements that go out for issues related to projects under construction that could affect school district transportation and circulation.

Mr. Piper added that Mr. Kline is in favor of the projects on the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. but Mr. Kline also asked if there is any way that school districts could be represented on the MPO? Mr. Piper stated that the MPO bylaws do not allow for school district representation and that would be something that would have to be considered by the board.

Mr. Kufro added that he liked the idea of using PennDOT Connects as an avenue to have involvement from school districts and they could try early coordination through that avenue. There is a lot that the PennDOT does throughout the design process that school districts may not be aware of or visible because the department takes them into account when planning projects to not impact them (schools). An example of which would be paving and bridge repairs. They tend to schedule them in the spring and summer for the least impact on school bus routes. Mr. Kufro thinks using PennDOT Connects with early coordination would be the best way to go.

Mr. Piper also went over a comment received from a developer of a large mixed-use development proposal regarding infrastructure improvements around the area of the train station in the City of Reading. The comments were forwarded directly to the City Planning and Traffic Engineering departments. Feedback from the Planning department stated that they were encouraged to see that type of proposal in the City as it would promote transit-oriented development and from an infrastructure standpoint, they would be able to accommodate development in that area.

The City's Public Works department also provided comments that they would like to see the City's Vision Zero Action Plan referenced in the L.R.T.P. as a way to provide for transit-oriented development and promote safer non-motorized transportation throughout the City. The City submitted their priority improvements plan from their Vision Zero Action Plan with a number of recommendations totaling just over \$2M. Mr. Piper commented that we do not have funding available now to incorporate these in either the T.I.P. or the funded portion of the L.R.T.P. but our recommendation is that, based on the City comments, we recommend modifying the text in the L.R.T.P. to more fully address the City's Vision Zero Action Plan. Staff will add that in the non-motorized transportation section in Chapter 3 of the report. The draft Plan currently states that the M.P.O. will work with the City to achieve their safety goals as expressed in the Vision Zero Safety Plan in the Issues and Needs section in Chapter 4. Staff recommend adding a specific line item to the current

unfunded highway, bridge, and transit project list for implementation of the Reading Vision Zero Action Plan using the cost data provided. As staff moves forward they will be looking at discretionary programs to try and find ways to come back and fund projects.

Mr. Don Edwards, City of Reading engineer, added that besides the obvious transportation related issues, these priority improvements, if they are implemented, will help the City's goal of revitalization. That is an important part of the request that was made regarding the comments above.

Mr. Piper noted that staff received recommendations from Ronnique Bishop, from the Federal Highway Administration. One comment regarded the L.R.T.P. project listing in the Goals and Strategic Performance Measures chapter. She commented that there should be sufficient detail of design concepts and design scope descriptions of all existing and proposed transportation facilities to develop cost estimates.

Mr. Piper responded that text will be added to the L.R.T.P. in this section referring the reader to the Appendix document where we will include the FFY 2027-2038 12-Year Program (T.Y.P.) Public Narratives for Highway, Bridge and Interstate Projects. Transit information is derived directly from the S.C.T.A./B.A.R.T.A. Capital Improvement Program.

Ms. Bishop also commented that it is great that the MPO includes the relevant T.I.P. projects that improve the system performance measures. In addition, the system performance report should also include any actual regional data points in comparison to the baseline data and performance recorded in previous reports.

Mr. Piper's response included that text will be added to the L.R.T.P. including links to the current R.A.T.S. Traffic Safety Report and the R.A.T.S. Pavement and Bridge Condition Report which contain the requested information.

Mr. Piper finished this item by describing the additional comments received and informed the committee that during the early public outreach efforts related to the L.R.T.P. and T.I.P., certain areas were identified for either study or improvements that could not be incorporated into a funded project at this time. As such, we have added the following items to the Unfunded Highway, Bridge and Transit Projects listing in the L.R.T.P. as candidates for future funding considerations:

Womelsdorf Area Traffic Study – evaluation of truck movements along PA 419 through the Borough of Womelsdorf travelling to or from points in Lebanon County to / from either US 422 to the north of the Borough or continuing on PA 419 to I-78 in northern Berks County.

PA 724 Congestion / Safety Study – evaluation of PA 724 from US 222-B (Lancaster Avenue) in Cumru Township, through Spring Township and the US

222 interchange area to US 422 (Penn Avenue) in the Borough of Sinking Spring. This corridor is identified as a concern on both the RATS Congestion Management Process as well as the RATS Annual Safety Report.

Douglass Township SR 2022 (Ben Franklin Highway) Road Diet – The Ben Franklin Highway (SR 2022) in Douglass Township was at one time the main highway between Reading and Pottstown and the Philadelphia urban area. It has a wide four-lane cross section, only a low mountable median barrier, and primarily unsignalized intersections with no separate turn lanes. With the construction of the US 422 expressway around Pottstown in the 1960's, most regional traffic was diverted away from this roadway. Douglass Township has expressed a desire to create a more pedestrian friendly commercial corridor here and would like consideration of completing a "road diet" to narrow the existing highway to a single lane in each direction, provide safe turning lanes as necessary and promote safe bicycle and pedestrian movements along both sides of the highway including connections to the parallel Schuylkill River Trail.

Two other corridors were also identified during these meetings but are already included on the unfunded list:

PA 183 Safety Improvements (SR 4016 to I-78) in Jefferson and Upper Tulpehocken Township

SR 3222 Lancaster Avenue (SR 422 / 10 interchange) to Kenhorst Boulevard

Each of these have studies funded under prior L.R.T.P./T.I.P.'s that have either been completed or are wrapping up but could not be included in the current plans due to lack of funding.

Mr. Piper continued that one project that is not on this list is the SR 737 corridor that goes from the Borough of Kutztown up to Interstate 78. Funding for this project was put on the T.I.P. to move forward with the preliminary design for slope repairs. PennDOT recently informed us that they will be expanding the scope of the engineering to include a traffic study that will look at issues in the corridor. Staff will have to evaluate funding moving forward to look at the implementation stage.

Mr. Piper finished that what he has gone over during this presentation are the official Response to Comments for the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. What he needs from the committee is an action to approve the proposed Responses to Comments and then they will be incorporated into the final document prior to submittal. Mr. Piper opened the floor for any questions.

Mr. Green added that it seems as though many of these comments are safety themed. It brought him to think about what Mr. Piper's thoughts are regarding the Highway Safety Improvement Program (H.S.I.P.) funding within the M.P.O.? Are you

doing a good job of expending these funds? Mr. Piper answered yes, but staff would take as much H.S.I.P. funding as the department will give. Staff allocates every dollar that they get.

MOTION: Mr. Green made a motion to approve the Response to Public Comments. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

14. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF T.I.P. AMENDMENT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (M.O.U.)

Mr. Piper stated that this M.O.U. is the standard process that staff and the department use to modify or amend the T.I.P. The dollar values have not changed just some textual wording that was added that applies to different situations, but it is more procedural than anything else. It makes it a little more liberal than in the past.

MOTION: Mr. Santoni made a motion to approve the T.I.P. Amendment Memorandum of Understanding (M.O.U.). Ms. Rowe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

15. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF F.F.Y. 2027-2030 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (T.I.P.) AND APPENDIX

Mr. Piper stated that staff has broken the document apart into both the T.I.P. itself and an appendix. The appendix goes along with both the T.I.P. and L.R.T.P. and includes all of the background material. It is much easier for readability. The T.I.P. itself has 102 highway, bridge and transit projects totaling over \$464M over the four years. 89 projects valued at \$385M addressing highway and bridges and 13 projects valued at \$79M addressing transit. It also references the Interstate management program that contains an initial investment of \$740,000 on Interstate 176. There is also reference to projects by the P.A. Turnpike Commission that address bridge replacements on Route 23 and Twin Valley Road and the ultimate widening of the turnpike to the Morgantown interchange.

The projects in the T.I.P. have been reviewed with the committee at previous meetings. Mr. Piper asked if there were any questions? There were none.

MOTION: Mr. Boatman made a motion to approve the F.F.Y. 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (T.I.P.) and Appendix. Ms. Rowe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

16. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF F.F.Y. 2027-2050 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (L.R.T.P.) AND APPENDIX

Mr. Piper reminded the committee that they are approving the document subject to the revisions outlined in the Response to Comments (Item 13 of this agenda).

MOTION: Mr. Green made a motion to approve the F.F.Y. 2027-2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (L.R.T.P.) and Appendix. Mr. Santoni seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

17. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF RATS SELF-CERTIFICATION RESOLUTION

Mr. Piper presented that this document certifies that staff followed all appropriate federal guidelines when preparing and adopting the T.I.P., L.R.T.P. and all other documents required under federal regulations.

MOTION: Ms. Rowe made a motion to approve the RATS Self-Certification Resolution. Mr. Green seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

18. LTAP PROGRAM UPDATE

Mr. McGough updated the committee on the status of the 2026 LTAP program in Berks County. He stated that due to a scheduling conflict with the instructor the class (Asphalt Road Maintenance) that was scheduled for May 6, 2026 was rescheduled for June 24, 2026. There is another class (Pipe Culvert Installation and Replacement) also scheduled for June 10, 2026. Currently, staff is waiting for coordination from PSATS on scheduling the remaining class requests for 2026.

19. OTHER BUSINESS / PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. McGough informed the committee that there was one comment under the Q & A function for the virtual element of the meeting. That comment was from Mr. Andrew Kline (Alsace Township resident and Oley Valley School District Board member) and reiterated his previous comment from the 5-7-26 Technical Committee meeting and submitted comment from 4-21-26 about his thoughts on how valuable it would be to bring a school district member to RATS for better coordination in the future.

Mr. Piper addressed this comment under Item 13 of this agenda. Mr. Kufro added Mr. Kline's comments are noted.

Ms. Reed added that there are still issues with speeding and accidents on Hampden Boulevard. The City's transportation engineer is working on ideas to alleviate these issues. There are also issues with speeding on Schuylkill Avenue between the City's boundary with Bern Township and Windsor Street.

Mr. Kufro asked Mr. Edwards if the improvements that PennDOT has done so far on Hampden Boulevard have made any difference? Ms. Reed answered that it has not really done anything. Mr. Edwards added that he has been out on Hampden

Boulevard to document some things and he has witnessed excessive speed through the corridor. Mr. Edwards believes that the only thing that is going to alleviate the problems are some physical improvements and traffic calming. It is a very serious issue. Mr. Edwards said that the City has received conceptual plans for traffic calming on eleven corridors throughout the City with Schuylkill Avenue and Hampden Boulevard being two of them. The City formed a traffic advisory committee and they are going to discuss these conceptual plans and be aggressive in trying to secure funding to make some meaningful improvements to slow down traffic in the City.

Mr. Kufro thanked both Ms. Reed and Mr. Edwards for their comments. Mr. Edwards added that the City would really appreciate PennDOT's support as they move forward with the traffic calming improvements.

Mr. Kufro asked when the City would expect to submit the traffic calming proposals? Mr. Edwards answered by saying their advisory council will review the proposals and make recommendations to City Council and seek administration support. Once that is done, they will focus on securing grants and that is when they ultimately are going to need PennDOT support.

Mr. Piper added that one thing the City should consider is when they are going through the process of reviewing the proposals they should continually work with PennDOT to see if there is any funding either out of the T.I.P. or any discretionary programs because that could save a lot of time as opposed to going through the various grant program applications.

There was no other business or public comment.

20. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Santoni made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Green seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 2:22 PM.

Date: _____

Alan D. Piper, MPO Secretary