



**Southwestern
Pennsylvania
Commission**

Officers:

Allegheny County
Dan Onorato
Chairman

Beaver County
Charles A. Camp
Vice-Chairman

Indiana County
Rodney Ruddock
Secretary-Treasurer

Executive Committee:

Allegheny County
Dan Onorato

Armstrong County
Patricia Kirkpatrick

Beaver County
Joseph Spanik

Butler County
James L. Kennedy

City of Pittsburgh
Luke Ravenstahl

Fayette County
Vincent Vicites

Greene County
Pam Snyder

Indiana County
Rodney Ruddock

Lawrence County
Steve Craig

Washington County
Bracken Burns

Westmoreland County
Tom Balya

At-Large
Charles A. Camp
Jake Wheatley

Governor's Office
John Paul Jones

PA Dept. of Transportation
James D. Ritzman

PA Dept. of Community and
Economic Development
Jack Machek

Executive Director
James R. Hassinger

Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
Telephone: 412.391.5590
Fax: 412.391.9160
E-Mail: comments@spcregion.org
www.spcregion.org

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission

4:30 p.m. – October 26, 2009
31st Floor – Regional Enterprise Tower

AGENDA

1. **Action on Minutes of the September 28th Meeting**
2. **Public Comment**
3. **Freight Database Presentation– Chuck Imbrogno**
4. **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Update– Chuck DiPietro**
5. **Committee Reports**

Intergovernmental Affairs Committee– Tom Ceraso/Jim Scahill
Regional Policy Advisory Committee– Steve Craig
6. **Staff Report/Other Business/Announcements– Jim Hassinger**

State Transportation Commission Public Hearing– November 5th
Next Meeting Date– December 14th
7. **New Business**
8. **Adjourn**

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Minutes of the Meeting of
September 28, 2009 – 4:30 p.m.
31st Floor • Regional Enterprise Tower • 425 Sixth Avenue • Pittsburgh, PA 15219

The seventy-eighth meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission was called to order by Vice Chairman Charles Camp.

Commission members present were: Tom Balya, Steve Bland, Bracken Burns, Charles Camp, Daniel Cessna, Dave Coder, Karl Eisaman, Jim Gagliano, Kevin Gray, Lynn Heckman, Dave Johnston, John Paul Jones, Jim Kennedy, Patricia Kirkpatrick, Robert Macey, Jack Machek, Larry Maggi, Robbie Matesic, Kevin McCullough, David Miller, Mary Jo Morandini, Dale Pinkerton, Carmen Rozzi, Rod Ruddock, Jim Scahill, Michael Silvestri, Pam Snyder, Anthony Spossey, Rob Stephany, Gealy Wallwork, and Norma Wintermyer.

Commission members absent were: Tony Amadio, Shirl Barnhart, Andrew Boni, Tom Ceraso, Steve Craig, Terry Daughenbaugh, Rick DeBlasio, Joseph Dubovi, Patricia Evanko, Richard Fink, David Frick, Jessica Greathouse, Dana Henry, Michael Herron, Donald Kinosz, James Lokhaiser, Dan Onorato, William Peduto, Bill Piper, Luke Ravenstahl, James Ritzman, Robert Schiffbauer, Mark Schneider, Richard Shaw, Kelly Shroads, Mark Snyder, Joe Spanik, Byron Stauffer, Joe Szczur, Letitia Thompson, Vincent Vicites, Daniel Vogler, Jake Wheatley, Angela Zimmerlink, and Yarone Zober.

Staff: Kirk Brethauer, Chuck DiPietro, Chuck Imbrogno, Tom Klevan, Vince Massaro, Marge Nalesnick, Shannon O'Connell, Dee Pamplin, Kay Tomko, Debbie Tritsch, and Lew Villotti.

Others: Ed Typanski, Port Authority of Allegheny County, John Verbanac, SPC Consultant.

1. Action on Minutes of the July 27th Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the July 27, 2009 meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission by Commissioner Kennedy which was seconded by Commissioner Pinkerton. The affirmative vote to approve the minutes was unanimous.

2. Public Comment

None.

Commissioner Camp started the meeting with the introduction of a new SPC member from Allegheny County. Robert Macey, County Councilman for Allegheny County was appointed by Chief Executive Dan Onorato.

3. Financial Report

Mr. Massaro gave the financial report for the period July 1, 2009 through August 31, 2009. The report reflects the operations of the Corporation, Commission and the RET. Recognized and recorded revenues to date, including encumbrances total \$1.7M vs. the annual budget at \$12,438,058 or 13.69% of the budget recognized to date. These two months works out to 16.67% of the fiscal year completed for the reporting period. On the total carry-over revenues from last fiscal year to this fiscal year, we have recognized and recorded to date, including encumbrances \$3,398.00 vs. the budget of \$183,800 or 1.85% of the budget recognized for the

reporting period. The two carry-over projects include the West Busway TOD Study and the Truck Parking Study both expected to be completed this year.

For RET revenues, \$5,071,000 has been budgeted with no encumbrances. Actual to date revenues of \$836,000 or 16.5% of the budget recognized. No contributions from the endowment have been budgeted. The endowment is currently around \$4M and until it gets above \$5M we can't make any drawdowns. The \$41 is interest income from funds that were previously drawn down from the endowment.

Total project related expenditures are budgeted at \$12,443,058 through the end of August, actual and encumbered is \$1.7M or 13.71% of the budget recognized. No carry-over project expenditures. Total RET expenditures before amortization and depreciation at \$5M budgeted that was recorded \$739,146 or 14.2% of the budget. To date, total expenditures of \$18.9M budgeted, \$2.6M recorded and recognized or 13.9% of the budget recognized.

Auditors are in the SPC offices for the next couple of weeks, performing their annual audit of the financials through the end of June 30, 2009. The draft audit report is due to the Audit Committee by mid-November.

4. Action of Resolution 17-09 to Amend the Region's 2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program to Increase Funding for the City of Washington's Route Assessments Project

Chuck DiPietro explained the request to change the cost of a current program in the City of Washington on our work program and insure that the project moves forward under FTA review. There is a need to amend how it's shown on our work program.

Commissioner Balya moved to approve Resolution 17-09:

WHEREAS, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) authorizes funding and support of transportation planning, research and demonstration activities; and

WHEREAS, the following transportation planning project was approved for funding in the 2009-2010 Program by Commission Resolution 9-09 on April 27, 2009:

1. "Route Assessments" at a total cost not to exceed \$40,000 (\$32,000 Federal Section 5307 Formula Program funds; \$8,000 non-federal match) to perform an evaluation of the City's fixed route structure and services and to gain recommendations for implementation in order to provide a more efficient and cost effective service to the public. This assessment is to also follow recommendations contained in the recent Washington County Transit Study and is to be developed with focus on the Intermodal Transit Facility/Garage Project being developed for the East Chestnut Street Garage in the City's Main Street/Business District.

WHEREAS, the Transit Operators Committee acted at its September 16, 2009 meeting to revise the project on the 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program for funding in FY 2009 to move the project from FFY 2009 to FFY 2010 and increase the funding for the project to \$75,000 to be funded with previously allocated Federal Transit Administration Urban Formula funds; and,

WHEREAS, planning projects must also be included on an approved Unified Planning Work Program before federal funding can be approved.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission approves revisions to the 2009-2010 UPWP as requested by the City of Washington.

Commissioner Maggi seconded and the affirmative vote was unanimous.

5. Advance 2011-2014 TIP Update

Chuck DiPietro outlined the 2011-2014 TIP update schedule:

a. Statewide/SPC Schedule

- September 28th - Status Report to Commission
- November 5th – State Transportation Commission Public Hearing for SPC Region in Regional Enterprise Tower
- By October 8th - first round work sessions with member planning departments at District level - revisit current TIP individual project scopes/costs/schedules
- By October 2nd - draft Interstate Management Program of Projects from Central Office
- October 19th-21st – Statewide Planning Partners discussion/feedback at State College Forum
- November/December - second round work sessions with member planning departments at District level – advance preliminary draft TIP
- December 14th - Status Report to Commission – preview preliminary draft TIP submission
- By December 31st - preliminary draft TIP submitted to Central Office for review
- By January 15th - Central Office meetings with SPC/Districts to review any issues with preliminary draft TIP
- By January 30th - PennDOT submits comments/proposed revisions to SPC's preliminary draft TIP submission including final “Spike Funding” decisions
- By February 26th - third round of work sessions with member planning departments at District level - respond to Central Office comments on preliminary draft submission with revised draft TIP
- By March 1st - SPC/PennDOT reach agreement on draft TIP program of projects
- March 29th - Status Report to Commission – present Draft TIP to be processed for public review and comment
- April/May - document Draft TIP, complete air quality conformity analysis, prepare for public review/comment
- June/early July - SPC & PennDOT conduct joint 30 day public comment period on draft TIP/STIP (PPP meetings)
- July 26, 2010 - request for Commission approval of Air Quality Conformity Assessment & adoption of TIP

- August 16th 2010 - STC approves Twelve Year Program
 - August 17th 2010 - Governor/PennDOT Secretary submit STIP to FHWA/FTA for review/approval
 - October 1st 2010 - TIP becomes effective with FHWA/FTA joint approval
- b. STC Public Hearing Rescheduled – November 5th, 31st Floor, RET
- SPC PowerPoint presentation
 - Needs/Revenues/Gap
 - State roads & bridges
 - Local roads & bridges
 - Transit/multimodal/additional
- c. Public Involvement /PPP Outreach
- PPP Chairpersons invited to participate in first round of district work sessions (Sept 29, October 8)
 - Webcasts for Panel Members to update & educate regarding the new TIP Cycle
 - Demonstrate Timeline for 2011-2014 TIP Cycle
 - Recap of the District Work Sessions
 - Discuss financial guidance
 - Discuss TIP Project Selection Process
 - November 5th - STC Public Hearing for SPC Region
 - Initial round of Public Meetings for the Counties (early December)
 - Potential Public Meetings or Webcast Update (March 2010)
 - Last Round of Public Meetings as Draft 2011-2014 TIP released for final Public Comment (June – July 2010)
- d. CMAQ Call for Candidates and Selection Committee
- Call for Projects - candidates due October 5th
 - September 14th - Information Forum with Sustainable Pittsburgh
 - Available Funds - \$103M over 4 year TIP
 - Project Solicitation: September 1st
 - Applications Due: October 5th
 - Testing Phase: October
 - Evaluation: November
 - Recommendation to Executive Committee: December 14th

CMAQ Evaluation Committee

- Commuter Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements
 - Travel Demand Management
 - Highway/Road Improvements
 - Park & Ride Facility Improvements
 - Diesel Retrofits
 - Transit Improvement Projects
 - Other
 - ✓ Planners 11 - Counties/City of Pgh
 - ✓ PennDOT 3 - Districts 10, 11 & 12
 2 - Central Office
 - ✓ Transit Operators 3 - Urban/Small Urban/Rural
 - ✓ Transportation Management Association - 1
 - ✓ Pedestrian/Bike - 1
 - ✓ Freight - 1
 - ✓ Air Quality – 1
- Total Membership: 23**

e. TIP Work Sessions

- Transit Project Sponsors to Participate in First Round of PennDOT District Work Sessions – by 10/8
- STC Public Hearing for SPC Region – 11/5 in Regional Enterprise Tower
- Draft Programs of Projects and Financial Capacity Documentation from Transit Project Sponsors – by 11/18
- Status Report to Commission – preview preliminary draft TIP submission – 12/14
- Preliminary draft TIP submitted to Central Office for review – by 12/31

First Round Work Sessions

- With member planning departments at District level
- PPP chairs and transit properties invited
- Revisit current TIP individual project scopes/costs/schedules
- September 30th – 9:30 a.m. at Indiana (District 10-0)
- September 30th – 1:30 p.m. at Bridgeville (District 11-0)

- October 8th – 12:30 p.m. at Uniontown (District 12-0)

f. Statewide Financial Guidance

- Assumptions
 - Act 44 funds reduced 65% to reflect no tolling of I-80
 - 3% inflation factor applied annually to each project cost estimate to satisfy YOE requirement
 - Interstate Program continues to be managed at statewide level
- Highway Program
 - FFY 2011 & 2012 – 1% annual increase
 - FFY 2013 & 2014 – 4% annual increase (anticipated new federal legislation)
 - State funding decreased 52% per revenue estimates and debt service on bonds
 - Discretionary Spike Funding program continues unchanged
- Transit Program
 - FFY 2011 & 2012 – 1% annual increase
 - FFY 2013 & 2014 – 2.67% annual increase reflecting current federal estimates
 - State transit funding continues at the Act 44 guaranteed level
 - 5 state funding programs established under Act 44 continue
 - *Operating Program*
 - *Capital Improvement Program*
 - *Asset Improvement Program*
 - *New Initiative Program*
 - *Programs of Statewide Assistance*
- SPC 2011-2014 TIP Update Targets vs. Current TIP (2009-2012)
 - Overall - 17% reduction, or \$312.5 million for region
 - State Act 44 – 65% reduction, or \$216.5 million for region
 - State Highway – 47% reduction, or \$69.1 million for region
 - State Bridge – 34% reduction, or \$72.3 million for region
 - Federal Bridge – 5% reduction, or \$25.1 million for region
 - District 12-0 Bridge – 32% reduction, or \$75.9 million for District

g. Statewide General and Procedural Guidance

- At a minimum, 90% of each MPOs fund directed to system preservation
- At a minimum, 85% of each MPOs bridge funds directed to structurally deficient bridges
- TIP shall only include a project or phase of a project if full funding can reasonable be anticipated to be available; also need to document the portion of the project cost that extends beyond the TIP.
- All cost estimates must reflect “year of expenditure dollars”

- TIP must include all regionally significant transportation projects being advanced, regardless of their funding source

David Miller questioned the status of Project Region implementation in our planning process. Identify where we have significantly made changes in our priorities that would reflect the values of Project Region. Could there be a more formal presentation on how Project Region is being implemented and how it's impacting the decisions we are making. Chuck responded that the key state focus has been on bridge work and we do have to deal with that, although, the CMAQ program gives opportunity to advance the smart projects. And, the discussions we're having about the Smart Transportation Initiative are relevant as we get ready for the new federal authorization.

Dr. Hassinger reiterated what Chuck described as the detailed process in terms of the TIP development which illustrates how complex it is. Discussions we've had in the Regional Policy Advisory Committee about the development of a new Smart Transportation/Smart Growth program where we would emphasize more and preference money specifically for Smart Transportation-Smart Growth Initiatives. That is under development and will be discussed at the next Regional Policy meeting in October. There was also discussion recently with deputy secretary of DOT in Washington about an element of the reauthorization bill that is under consideration that has to do with Smart Transportation that we think has opportunities matching our initiative under development. We are crafting a way of incorporating additional resources to where projects meet the criteria that are related to the goals of Project Region's key policies. Presentations to the State Transportation Commission will contain the prefix of how Project Region relates to the program and how we developed the plan that exists. The preference for additional funds to sustain the existing Transportation System doesn't reflect one of the key goals in the discussions coming out of Project Region. The Bridge Program will absorb larger amounts of money because it became obvious of the need for bridge preservation of work. We do expect to be able to present in more detail how these things are connected to the world policy for Project Region in the presentation to the STC.

David Miller said that was great and that the things we're doing to implement Project Region should be articulated, put it where it can be shared with constituents who thought Project Region was a great step forward. Dr. Hassinger responded that an updated report that specifically discusses the implementation of this will be developed.

Lynn Heckman commented that all through the process we've studied two parts; starting with CMAQ criteria with the \$103M program, and for how we will evaluate it all include Project Region based criteria and Smart Transportation initiatives.

Jack Machek said examples of new initiatives now are really two distinct issues. One issue is, we're working to provide issues for the Smart Transportation to take advantage of Federal funding that will be available. Two, from all the information that Chuck has presented how is the body and velocity of what's in Project Region being used to guide which of those are being selected. Project Region should be used to inform and guide decisionmaking. Take it to the next step and continue to evolve.

Dr. Hassinger said that the 2035 Plan which is the current funding allocation was adopted consistent with the policies and criteria in Project Region process. We reviewed the projects in the 2035 Plan for consistency with Project Region development policies. The Plan itself is consistent with Project Region and we need to be more attentive to making that point and how it relates to Project Region in future communications.

Commissioner Camp introduced another new member, Rob Stephany, Executive Director URA from the City of Pittsburgh.

6. Staff Report/Other Business/Announcements

Next Meeting Date - October 26, 2009

7. New Business

None.

8. Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney Ruddock
Secretary-Treasurer

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission

ALLEGHENY • ARMSTRONG • BEAVER • BUTLER • FAYETTE • GREENE • INDIANA • LAWRENCE • PITTSBURGH • WASHINGTON • WESTMORELAND



October 26, 2009



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 1

Action

Meeting Minutes
September 28, 2009



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 2

Public Comment



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 3

Report

Freight Planning / Data Overview

Why Focus on Freight Data?

- **SAFETEA-LU Programs:**
 - Projects of National and Regional Significance
 - National Corridor Infrastructure Improvement
 - Truck Parking
 - Freight Professional Development
 - National Cooperative Freight Research Program
- **Reauthorization:**
 - Expect Greater Emphasis on Intermodal/Multimodal Issues

Why Focus on Freight Data?

- **Transportation Planning Regulations:**
 - **TIP** – Support the Movement of People and Goods
 - **Long Range Plan** – Facilitate Safe and Efficient Movement of People and Goods
 - **Planning Process** – Serve the Mobility Needs of People and Freight
 - **Participation Plan** – Include Reasonable Opportunity for Interested Parties to be Involved in the Planning Process (including Providers of Freight Transportation Services)

Why Focus on Freight Data?

- **Regional Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania:**
 - **Policies Impacting Goods Movement:**
 - Investment In Infrastructure Improvements Will Be Coordinated and Targeted at the Corridor level to Optimize the Impact of the Investment
 - Transportation and development Choices Will Reflect a Priority on Safe and Secure Multimodal and Intermodal Networks for Both People and Goods
 - The Region Will Place a Priority on Business Development with a Focus on Existing Business Retention and Expansion
 - **Freight Infrastructure Summarized in Plan:**
 - Waterways and Ports
 - Aviation
 - Rail Lines
 - Highways

Why Focus on Freight Data?

- **Still a Need To:**
 - **Integrate Freight / Goods Movement into Transportation and Land-Use Decisions.**
 - **Better Understand Relationships Between –**
 - Goods Movement
 - Regional Business and Workforce
 - Economic Development
 - Agriculture
 - Environment
 - Public Health
 - **Coordinate Freight Interests Within Regional Planning Context –**
 - Transportation
 - Economic Development
 - Environmental Planning

Freight (Tons) To / From / Through Region

TOTAL FREIGHT (TONS) 2007				
TO REGION: FROM REGION:	TO 10-COUNTY SPC REGION	TO 25-COUNTY EXTERNAL REGION	TO OTHER AREAS	TOTAL TONS
FROM 10-COUNTY SPC REGION	36,739,821	6,533,509	68,610,581	111,883,911
FROM 25-COUNTY EXTERNAL REGION	15,647,517	18,139,027	56,519,203	90,305,746
FROM OTHER AREAS	53,879,718	46,374,639	281,516,921	381,771,277
TOTAL TONS	106,267,055	71,047,174	406,646,705	583,960,934

Freight (Value) To / From / Through Region

TOTAL FREIGHT (VALUE) 2007				
TO REGION: FROM REGION:	TO 10-COUNTY SPC REGION	TO 25-COUNTY EXTERNAL REGION	TO OTHER AREAS	TOTAL VALUE
FROM 10-COUNTY SPC REGION	\$18,656,795	\$3,401,551	\$134,810,726	\$156,869,072
FROM 25-COUNTY EXTERNAL REGION	\$5,235,981	\$10,695,202	\$98,764,851	\$114,696,034
FROM OTHER AREAS	\$160,542,463	\$129,172,882	\$1,140,492,004	\$1,430,207,350
TOTAL VALUE	\$184,435,240	\$143,269,635	\$1,374,067,582	\$1,701,772,457

* VALUES ARE REPRESENTED IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS

Freight (Value/Ton) To / From / Through Region

TOTAL FREIGHT (VALUE PER TON) 2007				
TO REGION: FROM REGION:	TO 10-COUNTY SPC REGION	TO 25-COUNTY EXTERNAL REGION	TO OTHER AREAS	TOTAL VALUE PER TON
FROM 10-COUNTY SPC REGION	\$507.81	\$520.63	\$1,964.87	\$1,402.07
FROM 25-COUNTY EXTERNAL REGION	\$334.62	\$589.62	\$1,747.46	\$1,270.09
FROM OTHER AREAS	\$2,979.65	\$2,785.42	\$4,051.24	\$3,746.24
TOTAL VALUE PER TON	\$1,735.58	\$2,016.54	\$3,379.02	\$2,914.19

Growth – Freight From SPC Region

TOTAL FREIGHT ORIGINATING IN THE 10-COUNTY SPC REGION			
	2007	2035	% CHANGE
TONS	111,883,911	112,136,339	0.2%
VALUE *	\$156,869,072	\$206,997,822	32.0%
VALUE PER TON	\$1,402.07	\$1,845.95	31.7%

* VALUES ARE REPRESENTED IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS

Growth – Freight To SPC Region

TOTAL FREIGHT DESTINED TO THE 10-COUNTY SPC REGION			
	2007	2035	% CHANGE
TONS	106,267,055	130,136,290	22.5%
VALUE *	\$184,435,240	\$336,614,851	82.5%
VALUE PER TON	\$1,735.58	\$2,586.63	49.0%


* VALUES ARE REPRESENTED IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS

Freight From SPC Region – By County


TOTAL FREIGHT ORIGINATING IN THE 10-COUNTY SPC REGION, 2007			
	TONS	VALUE	AVG VALUE PER TON
Allegheny County	62,952,816	\$85,696,264,134	\$1,361.28
Armstrong County	7,391,473	\$1,157,838,701	\$156.65
Beaver County	5,034,741	\$14,846,540,541	\$2,948.82
Butler County	7,516,565	\$9,883,143,580	\$1,314.85
Fayette County	3,658,519	\$4,687,672,921	\$1,281.30
Greene County	6,596,941	\$516,858,560	\$78.35
Indiana County	3,105,227	\$5,385,787,634	\$1,734.43
Lawrence County	3,805,789	\$9,618,184,094	\$2,527.25
Washington County	6,181,975	\$14,061,694,271	\$2,274.63
Westmoreland County	5,639,865	\$11,015,088,126	\$1,953.08
Total	111,883,911	\$156,869,072,564	\$1,402.07

Freight To SPC Region – By County



TOTAL FREIGHT DESTINED TO THE 10-COUNTY SPC REGION, 2007			
	TONS	VALUE	AVG VALUE PER TON
Allegheny County	67,451,959	\$113,426,867,247	\$1,681.59
Armstrong County	3,031,946	\$3,201,513,039	\$1,055.93
Beaver County	3,559,242	\$8,478,349,950	\$2,382.07
Butler County	7,480,776	\$14,036,778,680	\$1,876.38
Fayette County	1,750,618	\$3,136,819,859	\$1,791.84
Greene County	1,314,763	\$4,887,937,740	\$3,717.73
Indiana County	2,064,691	\$6,115,162,589	\$2,961.78
Lawrence County	4,008,136	\$7,442,620,063	\$1,856.88
Washington County	5,048,238	\$11,160,985,537	\$2,210.87
Westmoreland County	10,556,689	\$12,548,205,513	\$1,188.65
Total	106,267,055	\$184,435,240,218	\$1,735.58







COMMODITY	TONS	% OF TOTAL
Bituminous Coal	22,881,736	20.5%
Broken Stone Or Riprap	11,921,685	10.7%
Wet Corn Milling Or Milo	7,788,605	7.0%
Warehouse & Distribution Center	7,680,146	6.9%
Electrometallurgical Products	4,458,763	4.0%
Ready-mix Concrete, Wet	4,450,660	4.0%
Gravel Or Sand	4,116,880	3.7%
Soybean Oil Or By-products	3,548,681	3.2%
Primary Iron Or Steel Products	3,545,937	3.2%
Misc Coal Or Petroleum Products	3,441,938	3.1%
All Other Commodities	38,048,879	34.0%
Total Tons	111,883,911	100.0%




COMMODITY	TONS	% OF TOTAL
Bituminous Coal	24,796,587	23.3%
Broken Stone Or Riprap	16,857,569	15.9%
Warehouse & Distribution Center	15,608,885	14.7%
Gravel Or Sand	9,743,784	9.2%
Ready-mix Concrete, Wet	4,617,947	4.3%
Misc Waste Or Scrap	4,232,383	4.0%
Petroleum Refining Products	3,543,470	3.3%
Electrometallurgical Products	1,724,233	1.6%
Nonmetal Minerals, Processed	1,629,907	1.5%
Misc Coal Or Petroleum Products	1,579,296	1.5%
All Other Commodities	21,932,993	20.6%
Total Tons	106,267,055	100.0%







Freight To Butler County



Why Focus on Freight Data?

- **Benefits of Freight / Goods Movement Data:**
 - **Better sense of benefits of transportation infrastructure improvements –**
 - Provide estimates of value / tonnage of freight on key highways
 - Provide projections of how that may change in the future.
 - **Better sense of how goods flow in and out of the region –**
 - Where does freight entering the region come from?
 - Where does freight leaving the region go to?
 - How much stays within the region?
 - How much is just passing through?
 - **Better sense of commodity types –**
 - In / out / through the region
 - How commodity mix may change in the future.
 - **Better sense of the value to the local economy**

Why Focus on Freight Data?

- **Benefits of Freight / Goods Movement Data:**
 - **Provides Information to Better Integrate Transportation and Land-use Decisions**
 - **Facilitates Better Understanding of Relationship Between –**
 - Goods Movement
 - Regional Business and Workforce
 - Economic Development
 - Agriculture
 - Environment
 - Public Health
 - **Provides Ability to Better Coordinate Freight Interests Within Regional Planning Context –**
 - Transportation
 - Economic Development
 - Environmental Planning

Thank You!

Questions?



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 4

Update

2011-2014
Transportation Improvement Program
(TIP)



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 4

TIP Update Key Dates

- December 31 – SPC Preliminary Draft TIP due to Central Office
- January 30 – Central Office Response to Preliminary Draft (including spike “decisions”)
- March 1 - Closure with Central Office on Draft TIP
- March/April/May – Technical Documentation/Air Quality Testing
- May/June/July – Public Review/Comment
- July 26 – Request for Commission Adoption



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 4

Work Sessions with Individual TOC Transit Operators

- Advance TIP Program of Projects from LRP

Public Involvement/PPP Outreach

- November 5 – STC Public hearing RET
- November 9 – Introductory Webinar
- PPP Educational Forums



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 4

CMAQ Program of Projects

- Funds Available Over 4 years - \$102.7 M
- 32 Carryover Projects @ \$95.6 M
- 53 Applications Received @ \$142.2 M
- Testing/Evaluation Underway
- December 7 - Evaluation Committee Recommendations
- December 14 – Present to SPC Executive Committee



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 4

District Work Sessions Advance Projects from LRP

- Round 1 - Completed – Update Project Costs & Schedules
- Round 2 - November 16-17 – Advance Preliminary Draft TIP
- Round 3 - December 8-15 – Refine/Revisit Preliminary Draft TIP



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 4

- Interstate Management Program Preliminary Draft
- State of SPC Region Report at November 5 STC Public Hearing



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 5

Committee Reports

Intergovernmental Affairs Committee
Regional Policy Advisory Committee



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 6

Staff Report Other Business Announcements

State Transportation Commission Hearing:
November 5, 2009

Next Meeting Date:
December 14, 2009



October 26, 2009
Agenda Item No. 7

New Business

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission

ALLEGHENY • ARMSTRONG • BEAVER • BUTLER • FAYETTE • GREENE • INDIANA • LAWRENCE • PITTSBURGH • WASHINGTON • WESTMORELAND



October 26, 2009