

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission  
Minutes of the Meeting of  
June 27, 2016 – 4:30 p.m.  
Two Chatham Center • Suite 400 • 112 Washington Place • Pittsburgh, PA 15219

The one hundred twentieth meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission was called to order by Chairman Chuck Anderson.

Members present were: Tony Amadio, Charles Anderson, Kevin Boozel, Scott Bricker, Robert Brooks, Daniel Camp, Jack Cohen, Steve Craig, Rich Fitzgerald, Jim Gagliano, Jr., Kim Geyer, Joe Grata, Richard Hadley, Fred Junko, Ted Kopas, David Lohr, Robbie Matesic, David Miller, Erin Molchany, Leslie Osche, Rich Palilla, Johnna Pro, Aurora Sharrard, Harlan Shober, Michael Silvestri, George Skamai, Byron Stauffer, Jr., Joe Szczur, Archie Trader, Vince Vicites, Angela Zimmerlink, and Blair Zimmerman.

Others: Ann Ogoreuc, Allegheny County Economic Development.

Staff: Jim Hassinger, Kirk Brethauer, Dominic D’Andrea, Linda Duffy, Chuck Imbrogno, Vince Massaro, Shannon O’Connell, Matt Pavlosky, Doug Smith, Tom Straw, Kay Tomko, Dave Totten, Cathy Tulley, and Lew Villotti.

1. Chairman Anderson called to order the June 27, 2016 meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
  - a. Quorum – There being a quorum present the meeting proceeded.
  - b. Any Conflict of Interest Declarations on Action Items – None.
2. Presentation of the Joseph A. James Excellence in Local Government Achievement Award to Michael A. Silvestri, Peters Township Manager

Mr. Miller provided background information on Joe James and the Memorial Award.

Chairman Anderson introduced Michael Silvestri and presented him with a certificate and a plaque.

Mr. Silvestri provided an acceptance speech.

3. Action on Minutes of the March 28, 2016 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the March 28, 2016 meeting by Commissioner Vicites which was seconded by Ms. Molchany. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

4. Public Comment – None.
5. Staff Profile – Chuck Imbrogno / Cathy Tulley

Mr. Imbrogno introduced Catherine Tulley, a Data Analyst for the Models & Data Staff.

Cathy grew up in Hollidaysburg (Blair County) and Gibsonia. She received an Associate of Science in Network Administration from Community College of Allegheny County; a Bachelor of Science in Geography (GIS/RS) from Slippery Rock University; and took coursework towards her Masters in Geography from Ohio University, earning 75 credits.

Cathy began her career at the age of 19 working for Network Tech Support at North Pittsburgh Telephone Company. She started her professional career as a GIS Analyst in environmental consulting at Wallace & Pancher, Inc. in Canonsburg. She currently serves on the Tri-Boroughs Joint Planning Commission for her home borough of Bellevue. The three communities served are Avalon, Bellevue and Ben Avon.

Cathy is a fourth generation family member to work in government service. She is a “bird nerd” and has participated in both published research and “civic” science. She enjoys gardening and nature photography in her spare time.

Cathy’s work at SPC includes working with Data Visualization in Tableau: Population Pyramids. Population pyramids are a graphical illustration of population dynamics; show distribution of age groups with a population; and tells us how many people are in each age range. A chart was presented showing the SPC region in a typical population summary. An interactive, data-driven visualization called a “dashboard” or a “viz” was created using Tableau Desktop. Ten-year comparisons were shown for years 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010. Cathy explained that presenting planning data is important as the interactivity can quickly and easily show us patterns in the data. An example of a typical suburban profile using Pine Township and examples of various college districts with similar demographics was demonstrated.

Cathy then showed the Commission members how to find the Data Library on SPC’s Website and demonstrated “dashboards” based on several suggestions from the members.

#### 6. Financial Report – Vince Massaro

Mr. Massaro reported on the financials for the fiscal period ending May 31, 2016 which includes the approved budget and reflects the operations of the Commission and the Corporation.

Total project related revenues actual and encumbered to date are \$10.9M or 85% of the budget recognized. The carry-over project revenues relate to the Regional Freight Plan project that was carried over from the prior fiscal year. It should be completed by June 30. The consultant contract at WRA is completing that work and presenting the deliverables to the Committee for review and acceptance. Total project expenditures of \$11.1M encumbered and recorded to date versus the approved annual budget of \$12.9M reflects 86% of the budget recognized to date.

The accounting staff will be in the process of finalizing the financial reports for the fiscal year ending June 30. In preparation for the annual audit, the auditors will be here in early September and the final audit report will be presented to the Commission members in December.

#### 7. Report on Public Comment Period Response for Draft 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment of the Draft 2017-2020 TIP, Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Draft 2017-2020 TIP, Amendment to the region’s transportation plan *Mapping the Future: The Southwestern PA Plan* to reflect project phasing and cost information included in the Draft 2017-2020 TIP – Doug Smith / Matt Pavlosky

Mr. Smith explained that MPOs are responsible for developing and maintaining the region’s Long Range Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program and the Unified Planning Work Program. The TIP is a 4-year program of projects that is updated every 2 years. The display boards in the back of the room were used as part of the recent Public Participation Panel outreach meetings held around the region. There were three rounds of outreach as part of the TIP development process. We started off the TIP process with public outreach and getting public input on what the needs are around the region.

Another round of public outreach in the fall gave everybody an update on where we were in putting the Draft TIP together. Most recently we had the official 30-day public comment period that is required to end the process so that the public can review the actual draft documents. There were four different documents put out for public review: 1) the TIP itself, which is a list of short-range projects; 2) the Environmental Justice Report that analyzes the program of projects to make sure we are not benefitting or burdening any particular segment of the population disproportionately; 3) the Air Quality document, which makes sure we are not having a negative impact on air quality in the region; and 4) the Long Range Plan amendment. The TIP is the first 4 years of the LRP, so when we update the TIP we also update the Long-Range Plan. Because of the FAST Act and updated statewide financial guidance, we updated the fiscal projections for the Long Range Plan.

The TIP is a key delivery mechanism for the Long Range Plan, which sets the vision and strategic direction. We maintain the consistent themes that were established in the Long Range Plan in the TIP:

- Infrastructure Condition / Asset Management
- Safety, Efficiency & System Reliability
- Multimodal Options

Mr. Smith reported that bridge maintenance is still a key regional priority. He summarized a number of key features of the 2017 TIP including:

- \$789M for bridge maintenance
- Reconstruct/Rehab 178 SD bridges
- Engineering for another 120 SD bridges
- \$403M+ in safety and operations projects
- \$23.6M to address high crash corridors
- ~300 new fixed route buses including at least 34 CNG and 17 diesel/electric hybrids
- Transit Signal Priority in Pittsburgh BRT corridor
- Butler Multimodal Center and Commuter Service (CMAQ)
- Park-n-ride expansions
- ~\$266M on I-70 in WACO and WECO
- ~\$68M for I-376
- ~\$46M for I-79 PM
- Freedom Road (BECO)
- SR 228 (BUCO)
- US 422 (ARCO-INCO)
- US 119 (FACO-WECO)
- Bridges, Bridges, Bridges

Mr. Smith stated that many multimodal improvements are mainstreamed into regular maintenance and asset management projects. For example, there is a \$6M road diet project programmed on the 2017 TIP for Liberty Avenue in the Strip District. This project will result in a lot of improvements for pedestrians and bicycles, but for categorization purposes it is considered a safety project, because that is the primary function. Monroeville Boulevard in Allegheny County, a safety project there will have significant benefits for bicyclists and pedestrians, but again, it gets classified as safety.

Mr. Smith mentioned that on the transit side of the TIP, all of the funding for operations flows through the TIP. On the highway side, that's not the case. The money that PennDOT uses to plow roads in the winter, for example, is maintenance money that's separate from the TIP. It doesn't flow through the TIP. The money that Port Authority or Butler Transit or any other transit operators get to operate and pay their drivers and put fuel in their buses, that does flow through the TIP.

Mr. Smith highlighted aspects of the TIP's transit investments including having almost \$2B worth of total investment in public transit over the next four years. The bulk of that goes to operations, just maintaining existing service. Part of the TIP also includes replacing approximately 300 buses, which includes a "greening of the fleet" with a move toward CNG and electric hybrid buses.

Mr. Smith also highlighted traffic signal improvements in the BRT corridor between Downtown and Oakland and CMAQ projects in Butler County to provide commuter service between Butler and Pittsburgh. Park and ride expansions were highlighted as well.

Mr. Smith concluded that there are some major projects going on in all the counties and many of the key corridors of the region.

Mr. Pavlosky provided a recap of the 30-day public comment period. This was three-phases. Early in the year we had solicitation for projects across the board. Then in December we had a technical approach. And we finished up with the public draft document for review.

Phase 3:

#### Advertisement / Communications

- Regional Newspapers (PG, TRIB, New Pittsburgh Courier, La Jornada Latina)
- SPC "Region" Newsletter, City/County Planning, TMA's, Public Participation Panels, Web Portal
- Websites, newsletters, E-blasts

#### Information Network

- 64 regional libraries
- County & City of Pittsburgh Planning
- SPC website
- Tribal Nation Consultation Network

#### 30-Day Public Comment Period

- Wednesday, May 4<sup>th</sup> to Friday, June 3<sup>rd</sup>
- 12 Meetings Held, Attendees: 187
- 66 Public Comments Received
- 5 specialized outreach meetings
- Event Surveys (10):
  - Average Score : "Very Good"
  - Open House Format
    - "Appreciate the Staff Interaction"
    - "Easy to get questions answered"
    - "Shorter, Impactful Meetings"

#### Comments & Surveys

- Public Comments: 66
  - Allegheny / Pittsburgh (28)
  - Armstrong (1)
  - Beaver (4)
  - Butler (1)
  - Fayette (5)
  - Greene (2)
  - Indiana (2)
  - Lawrence (2)

- Washington (3)
- Westmoreland (17)
- SPC Region/General (1)
- Comment Types
- Public Meetings (35)
- TIP Comment Form (15)
- comments@spcregion (16)

### Top Comments

1. Mount Washington Infrastructure (City of Pittsburgh)
2. Bicycle Infrastructure (City of Pittsburgh)
3. Support for Transit Options (Westmoreland County)

Ms. Sharrard asked if we used social media to get the word out. Mr. Pavlosky said we rely more on our county partners and our public participation panels on getting the word out. Mr. Smith said that it's a challenge as there is not a lot of federal guidance regarding social media input.

Mr. Bricker said there are 58 of us and only 66 comments were received and about 16 people showed up at meetings on average. He volunteered to help figure out how to do more outreach and get more people at those meetings. It's very important to get people engaged in this process. Mr. Smith noted the three-phased aspect of the outreach effort and that SPC, in partnership with the State Transportation Commission did receive over 2,000 comments at the beginning of the process, which is the most effective time to be able to consider input. Mr. Pavlosky thanked Mr. Bricker for volunteering.

Ms. Pro said she was reading through the comments online the other day and a comment from Westmoreland County had some concerns regarding the Shell cracker plant and she commented that the Shell announcement came after we began the whole TIP process so how will that fit in with what we are doing or do we not consider that until we update the TIP again in another couple of years. She suspects that in many areas, Beaver County, in particular with the development of that plant, is going to have significant impact on transportation. Mr. Smith indicated that Appendix 8 in the Draft TIP includes a major project to realign Route 18 in the area. The Southern Beltway is also on the Draft TIP, which does a lot in terms of providing improved access to that part of the region. So there are a few projects underway that are already in the development pipeline. Lew's economic development department also did a study called the "Emerging Industries Corridor Study" that looked at potential development sites in that corridor and what the associated transportation needs might be. We've started to do the planning for that.

Ms. Pro said that when you're referring to bridges, do you mean little bridges throughout the various counties as well as large bridges that span our rivers? Mr. Smith answered yes. Typically a bridge has to be over 20 feet long to qualify for federal funding, but there are smaller bridges on the Draft TIP that are funded with state and local funds, so typically the TIP is a mixture of both.

Mr. Miller asked for help understanding the infrastructure of all the plans. We have a Transportation Improvement Plan, an Environmental Justice Plan, and a Long Range Transportation Plan. In the presentation, you documented the priorities. A few years ago we had Project Region. Is that now too old? Can we talk about how these three plans integrate with Project Region and our broader strategy or how they're going to develop. Mr. Smith explained the cyclical nature of the planning process. Every four years we update the Long Range Plan. Every two years we update the Transportation Improvement Program. Project Region has been supplanted by the most recent Long Range Plan, *Mapping the Future*, but the vision, policies, strategies and priorities established in Project Region have created the foundation for subsequent plans, so they are still in them. Each time we update the Plan, we basically build on that

foundation. If you look at the latest Plan that you recently approved and you look at the Plan Policy statements and the regional vision statement that are in there, they were actually developed as part of Project Region. The priorities for this TIP are not new – they are consistent with the foundational principles established in Project Region and continued in the new Plan.

Mr. Miller said this raises two questions. The first is why wouldn't we have a slide in terms of consistency so there is another set of themes? Will it mean that we need to consider going through a new Project Region type approach, something that's going to be broader in which the three working documents sort of fit into? Are we looking at the vision we had through Project Region? Mr. Smith said that's something we did with the new Plan last June. When we get ready for our next Plan update, we should discuss again. Mr. Miller then asked if there was some sort of timetable for when would be an appropriate time for us to consider thinking about that? Mr. Smith said our next Long Range Plan would be due June 2019. Mr. Miller commented that we are now in the position that over the course of the next six months we ought to be thinking about what the next process is going to look like in terms of how comprehensive is it going to be relative to the scenarios of Project Region. Maybe it's appropriate to do a more extensive update of where we think we're headed.

Mr. Bricker commented that one of the main themes in response to the comments on the TIP is still not a number of visionary ambitious projects or anything that's talking about expanding transit service not just maintaining current service and things like that. So we can talk about that as we gear up for another Long Range Plan process next year. He also asked if there was a way to use this forum to talk about some of those issues about federal funding instead of just relying on their responding saying there's not enough money. How do we as decision makers in this room start having these difficult conversations? Commissioner Anderson said it's certainly appropriate to ask questions. Bring good ideas to the floor and see what sticks.

Mr. Silvestri said one of the things we haven't done for a long time which was a good opportunity to do this interaction was having an annual retreat. Commissioner Anderson said we have a "Save the Date" for October 3<sup>rd</sup> at Saint Vincent College in Westmoreland County on Route 30 in the Fred M. Rogers Center. That will be a good opportunity.

8. Action on Resolution 9-16 to Make a Finding of Air Quality Conformity for 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and *Mapping the Future: The Southwestern PA Plan* – Chuck Imbrogno

Mr. Imbrogno noted that action on the air quality conformity assessment is required before the TIP can be adopted.

He explained that transportation air quality conformity, as EPA defines it, is an analytical process designed to ensure that emissions from mobile sources will not worsen existing violations of air quality standards and will not contribute to any new violations of those standards. The assessment process we followed for the TIP conformity assessment is mandated by federal Clean Air Amendments 4 enacted in 1990. EPA sets the air quality standards. They continuously monitor emissions levels. They study the health impacts of the various pollutants and they set the standards using health-based criteria. EPA then designates areas that are not in attainment of the standards. Parts of all ten counties have been designated as non-attainment areas. The EPA and Federal Highway Administration adopted regulations and procedures for conducting conformity assessments. The intent of the conformity process is to ensure that the transportation planning process results in transportation investments that are consistent with air quality plans and that those investments will help the region achieve the air quality standards. The conformity report documents the process, the analysis that was used, the assumptions we made, the interagency coordination with PennDOT, EPA, USDOT, and PaDEP and demonstrates that the region's

TIP and Plan conform to the requirements of the Clean Air Act. The draft conformity report was out for public comment with the TIP. No public comments were received on the conformity assessment.

Ms. Sharrard said given the numbers that were run for downtown Pittsburgh for the transportation baseline that showed air emissions reductions of 35% by 2030 from just the federal vehicle fuel efficiency standards already being implemented, would air conformity or the TIP fall under that classification or is that something that would happen no matter what we would do? Mr. Imbrogno said that a lot of the transportation emission reduction nationwide over the next 20 years will be due to technical improvements in fuels and vehicles.

A motion was made to approve Resolution 9-16 by Commissioner Boozel which was seconded by Mr. Stauffer. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

9. Action on Resolution 10-16 to Certify SPC's Transportation Planning Process – Doug Smith

Mr. Smith said in the handout packet there is a section titled "Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission Self-Certification Process". This is a checklist that outlines 12 different federal requirements that we need to meet whenever we adopt the TIP. This shows that the TIP is financially constrained and meets the requirements of the Clean Air Act, all Title VI requirements, ADA, Older Americans Act, all different federal rules that the TIP has to conform to. It's a checklist to see that we have followed all the rules and that we haven't forgotten something. This is the first time we have provided this checklist form and it was developed by Andy Waple of our staff and it's actually been shared with all the other MPOs in the state as a best practice. The FHWA really liked this as a checklist to make sure we're not forgetting something.

A motion was made to approve Resolution 10-16 by Commissioner Junko which was seconded by Mr. Cohen. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

10. Action on Resolution 11-16 to Adopt the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program – Doug Smith

Mr. Smith stated that this is the actual resolution to adopt the TIP and to authorize us to submit it to PennDOT for approval. It meets all the federal guidelines mentioned in the checklist and that we are okay to submit the TIP and the companion documents for approval.

A motion was made to approve Resolution 11-16 by Mr. Silvestri which was seconded by Commissioner Kopas. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

11. Action on Resolution 12-16 to Approve and Endorse the Region's Area Development Project Priority Listing and Authorize Submission of an Application for Funds – Lew Villotti

Mr. Villotti reported that annually we look at the Area Development Program. The Economic Development Strategy Committee reviews and makes recommendations to this body to submit for ARC funding. ARC grant programs are a competitive process. The project sponsors compete here regionally. Then they compete on the State level then the Federal Government. We develop a list and submit the list to the State. The State then compares the list with all the other Local Development Districts throughout the Commonwealth. Then they forward the projects to ARC who also reviews them and selects them for ultimate funding.

ARC is not obligated to adhere to this ranking process, but they generally stick with it. We've been doing it this way for quite some time.

The Committee evaluates two sets of projects. Eligible access roads which are one set and are looked at separately. There are also the construction and non-construction projects.

Sec. 214 Construction and Sec. 302 Non-Construction

1. The Penn State New Kensington Entrepreneurial Center

This project will support construction costs to use entrepreneurship and co-working space to spur economic development in the city of New Kensington by creating constant traffic, energy, and investment through training, incubation of the business, and product ideas of students, faculty, and community members.

1. AMPAC Schaeffer Intermediate School Renovation Project

This project will support engineering costs to transform a closed (and recently purchased) Pittsburgh Public School, Schaeffer intermediate School, into a non-union plumbers training facility to serve the seven- (7) county region around Pittsburgh.

Mr. Villotti noted that when the Committee went through the process, these two projects tied and the Committee determined they were not going to separate them and would submit them as co-number 1.

3. Community Health Center Indiana County

This project entails planning and engineering activities for a new health complex serving a disadvantaged population in Indiana County. The site will provide locations for dental offices, pharmacies, and behavioral health providers serving the county.

4. Ruff Creek Sanitary Sewage Project at Interchange of I-79 Greene County

The land adjacent to the I-79 interchange is Washington Township's greatest opportunity to capitalize on the Marcellus Shale natural gas activity occurring within the region. The municipal sewage system is the final piece to ensure this property is developed.

5. Be Local Mobile App. & Mobile Farm Market

The proposed project will expand the Republic Food Enterprise Center's (RFEC) efforts and capacity to create jobs by opening new markets for healthy, fresh, locally sourced foods throughout the region. Through the project, the RFEC will implement the region's first mobile farm markets, which will combine the benefits of consuming healthy, fresh foods with the convenience of scheduled markets in low-income, low-access locations throughout the year.

Sec. 201 Local Access Road Project

Business Park Access Road, Fayette County

This project will fund the engineering costs for minor reconstruction and resurfacing of an access road at the Industrial Park Road in Menallen Township, Fayette County.

A motion was made to approve Resolution 12-16 by Commissioner Zimmerman which was seconded by Commissioner Shober. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

12. Action on Resolution 13-16 to Adopt a Meeting Schedule for 2016-2017 – Jim Hassinger

Dr. Hassinger reported that this schedule is advertised so people have advance notice when the meetings are going to be held particularly the Commission Executive Committee and full Commission. It also includes a special workshop that is intended to be a Commissioners' Workshop at Fred Rogers Center at Saint Vincent College. We anticipate a program where we talk about integrating planning programs. The action allows us to advertise the dates.

A motion was made to approve Resolution 13-16 by Ms. Pro which was seconded by Commissioner Amadio. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

13. Staff Report/Other Business/Announcements – Jim Hassinger

- Next Meeting Date – July 25th
- SPC is hosting a work place emergency planning procedures meeting on August 5th, 4th Floor Conference Area – All Commission members are welcome to attend – RSVP to Kay
- Commissioners’ Workshop – October 3rd, Fred Rogers Center at Saint Vincent College, Westmoreland County

14. New Business – None

15. Adjourn

Commissioner Boozel moved to adjourn the meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission and Commissioner Junko seconded. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

Respectfully Submitted

Rich Fitzgerald  
Secretary-Treasurer