

Meeting Minutes for April 15th, 2010
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting
Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

Attendees:

- Lynn Heckman, Allegheny County Economic Development
- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission*
- James Camp, Beaver County Public Works
- Tammy Frank, Beaver County
- Joel MacKay, Butler County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Commission
- Kevin Gray, Greene County
- Jeff Raykes, Indiana County Planning Commission
- Amy McKinney, Lawrence County Planning Department
- Jeff Leithauser, Washington County Planning Department
- Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning Department
- Patrick Hassett, Pittsburgh Department of Public Works
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office
- Doug Dupnock, PennDOT District 10-0
- Ernie Cascino, PennDOT District 10-0
- Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0
- Jeff Skalican, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stacey Rabatin, PennDOT District 12-0
- Domenic Sacchetti, PennDOT District 12-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association
- Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Management Association
- Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- David Totten, SPC Staff
- Karen Franks, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
- (Indicates Voting Member)

* Indicates participation via conference call

1. March 18th, 2010 TTC Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)

Chuck DiPietro called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Chuck asked everyone to introduce themselves. The March 18th, 2010 meeting minutes were approved with no changes.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. FHWA/PennDOT Central Office Reports

a). State and Federal Budget Updates

Kevin McCullough reported that most people are probably aware that the U.S. DOT recently rejected the PA Turnpike Commission revised application for the tolling of I-80. Kevin stated that he has no additional information to the media reports that have coming out over the past two weeks on the subject. Kevin noted that obviously this is a major setback for the Act 44 concept for funding infrastructure projects by utilizing revenue from the tolling of I-80. Chuck DiPietro noted that it is also a major setback with regard to transit funding. Kevin noted that information on the next steps to addressing the transportation funding gap is now coming out of the Governor's office. Kevin noted that there has been a lot of speculation in the media regarding the Governor's request for a special legislative session to address the short falls in transportation infrastructure funding. Chuck noted that everyone should continue to contact state representatives to make them aware of the critical nature of the transportation funding crisis.

Kevin noted that the State Transportation Commission's Transportation Advisory Board (TAC) will be issuing an update of their previous study, The Status of PA Transportation Infrastructure. Chuck DiPietro added that in a recent conference call with Secretary Biehler the forthcoming TAC report findings were discussed and there is concern over the growing gap between transportation revenues and infrastructure needs that this report will soon reaffirm. Chuck elaborated that the bridge deterioration in the state continues to be the driving factor worsening the gap between needs and resources. Kevin noted that he is not sure exactly when or how the new TAC report will be released, but the MPO/RPOs will all be included in its distribution. Lynn Heckman reminded everyone that the local bridges will likely not be included in the TAC study conclusions; so in reality the situation is worse than the TAC report will convey. Chuck noted that SPC staff has been constantly raising this issue in various statewide forums of the Linking Planning and NEPA initiative (item 5).

Kevin reported that the extension of SAFETEA-LU has been passed and signed by the President. This extends the current federal funding levels for transportation until

(Attachment A)

December 31, 2010. Kevin McCullough noted that the rescissions that were part of the previous SAFETEA-LU extensions have been reversed in this extension, resolving the prior, potential 30% short fall in funds. Kevin noted that a new transportation authorization act does not appear to be high on the administrations priorities at this time, although some rough ideas are supposed to emerge by the end of June from U.S. Secretary of Transportation LaHood's concept paper. Chuck DiPietro noted that in a recent article in AMPO (an MPO national association) speculated that there will be no second stimulus or transportation authorization passed in 2010. Chuck noted a lot of concern out there over funding the climate change proposals.

A second stimulus bill to provide states with additional transportation infrastructure funding has not been passed by Congress. Therefore, Kevin noted, the candidate stimulus two projects that were approved for programming at the March TTC have not been approved by FHWA and will remain in the TIP as placeholders, but are not approve to move forward. Kevin expects that these projects may be pulled off the TIP or reprogrammed with other funds if the second stimulus bill is clearly not imminent. Karen Franks noted that the SPC version of the TIP does not show these candidate stimulus two projects because they have not been approved by FHWA and are not considered part of the current TIP. Kevin responded that the only place the projects exist is in the PennDOT MPMS.

b.) May 18-20 Statewide Heritage Conference (Attachment B)

Chuck DiPietro referred everyone to Attachment B which was a flyer on the upcoming Statewide Heritage Conference in Harrisburg.

c.) Ferry Boat Discretionary Program Application

Chuck DiPietro briefly noted that information regarding the Federal Ferry Boat Discretionary Program application was forwarded to the Port of Pittsburgh Commission. Candidate projects are due by May 11th to PennDOT Central Office.

4. Action on Amendments and Modifications to the 2009 to 2012 TIP

The current administrative action and amendment procedures are attached following these meeting minutes.

a.) PennDOT District 10-0 (Attachment C)

Doug Dupnock of PennDOT District 10-0 pointed to the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2009-2012 TIP. District 10-0 had seven amendment requests this month:

- o Lindsey Road Bridge – Add PE phase for \$75,000 to the current TIP for this structurally deficient bridge.

(Attachment A)

- Gypsy Bridge #2 - Add PE phase for \$150,000 to the current TIP for this structurally deficient bridge.
- Hoosicks Mills Bridge #1 - Add PE phase for \$265,000 to the current TIP for this structurally deficient bridge.
- Hoosicks Mills Bridge #3 - Add PE phase for \$265,000 to the current TIP for this structurally deficient bridge.
- Muntz Run Bridge - Add PE phase for \$255,000 to the current TIP for this structurally deficient bridge.
- Benbrook Road Intersection – Add Construction phase for \$825,000 to the current TIP.
- 2010 Surplus HSIP funds – adding three safety (United High School Curve, SR 403/553 Intersection, and Yellow Creek Park intersection) projects to the current TIP to make use of surplus HSIP funds.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 10-0 amendment and administrative action requests to the TIP.

b.) PennDOT District 11-0 (Attachment D and meeting handout)

Rob Miskanic District 11-0 pointed to the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2009-2012 TIP. District 11-0 had three amendment requests:

- West End Bridge South Approach – add right of way phase for \$560,000 to current TIP.
- Triboro Streetscape (Heidelberg Borough, Scott Township, and Carnegie Borough) – Add \$300,000 to the PE phase of the project on the current TIP.
- Alle-Kiski Bridge – Add study phase for \$160,000 to the current TIP.

Kevin McCullough noted that many of the administrative actions in District 11-0 were the adjustment of ARRA funds between projects that was necessary to balance for reporting and accounting purposes. The ARRA funds were originally obligated very quickly and they needed to be revisited and adjusted. Lucinda Beattie asked for a clarification on the ARRA projects that came in under budget. Rob stated that if a project had surplus ARRA funds they were moved to another ARRA project. Kevin McCullough noted that many projects were split funded with ARRA funds so that PennDOT was confident that all the ARRA funds would be obligated. This led to movements of funds due to some ARRA projects having surplus funds and some ARRA projects requiring additional funds.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 11-0 amendment and administrative action requests to the TIP.

c.) PennDOT District 12-0 (Attachment E)

Stacey Rabatin of PennDOT District 12-0 pointed to the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2009-2012 TIP. District 12-0 had no amendment request this month.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the administrative action requests to the TIP that were over \$1 million.

d.) Bridge Preservation Project in Lawrence County (six bridges on U.S. 422) Handout 1&2

Matt Pavlosky summarized that the U.S. 422 bridge preservation project required a public comment period prior to going to the full SPC commission for consideration at the April 26th meeting. Matt referred everyone to Handout 1, which was the notice of public comment and public meeting for the project. Matt summarized the public meeting, which included a lot of discussion on the proposal to toll I-80 and ways to fund transportation infrastructure. Matt referred everyone to Handout 2, which summarized the comments received during the comment period for the U.S. 422 bridge preservation project.

Matt Pavlosky also reviewed the public comment and meetings associated with the candidate stimulus two projects (JC2) that were approved by the TTC in March in anticipation of the passage of the second stimulus. Matt referred everyone to the public comment report handout. Matt thanked everyone from the districts and the planning departments that participated in the public meetings. Kevin McCullough thanked Matt and the SPC staff for carrying out the public comment period, even though stimulus two legislation was never passed by Congress. Kevin and Matt noted that the meetings did help to educate people on critical issues related to financing transportation infrastructure.

5. Linking Planning and NEPA Update (Meeting Handout)

Chuck DiPietro reviewed the status of the ongoing PennDOT statewide initiative to redesign the project development process to integrate linking planning and NEPA principals. Chuck noted that FHWA has requested that PennDOT quickly proceed with pursuing the implementation of this initiative. The initiative will result in a new process for project development in Pennsylvania and will include major revisions to the Design Manual 1 and 1A, the EIS handbook, the EA handbook, and the CEE Handbook as well as several new guidance publications. Chuck acknowledged that there is a lot of background that has led to the formation of the current four statewide work groups. Each of the workgroups is tasked with a different aspect of the redesigned project development process. The work groups include representation from PennDOT Central Office, the Districts, and MPO/RPOs from across the state. Chuck noted, for example, that SPC staff is actively involved in all four of the work groups; he also noted that Asset Management work group is being chaired by Dan Cessna and the Communications work

group is being chaired by Joe Dubovi.

Chuck conducted a PowerPoint presentation that highlighted the changes being proposed in the project development process. Chuck noted that the presentation was originally done for the our region's ASHE section at a seminar on March 26, 2010.

Following the presentation, Chuck stressed there is a lot more work to be done to in order to come to closure with all parties on the new project development process. Chuck expects a multi-month review period for the process and accompanying design manuals and guidance documents. Chuck then expects a lot of education and training on the new process for the Districts, the MPO/RPOs, and the planning and public works departments across Pennsylvania. The schedule anticipates the release of the new process, design manuals, and guidance books by the end of September. Chuck added that he will continue to keep the TTC updated on the developments of the Linking Planning and NEPA statewide initiative.

6. Closure on 2011-2014 TIP Update

Chuck DiPietro summarized that many of the key unknowns with regard to the development of the 2011-2014 TIP at the time of last TTC have been resolved: 1) the spike funding decisions have been made and announced; 2) the uncertainty over a second stimulus has dissipated because it is now not anticipated this year; 3) uncertainty about Act 44 funds is no longer an issue for the draft TIP with the recent U.S. DOT rejection of the Turnpike's revised application to toll I-80 in the Commonwealth.

a.) Round 5 of District Work Sessions

Chuck DiPietro referred everyone to the schedule in the agenda for the remaining meetings for the fifth round of District work sessions. Chuck noted that the fifth work session with District 11-0 was held on April 14th.

b.) Spike and Act 44 Discretionary Projects (Attachment F)

Chuck DiPietro referred everyone to Attachment F, which was the 2011 program list of Spike and Act 44 Discretionary projects for Pennsylvania broken down by planning region. Chuck noted that additional funds from both these sources resulted in an approximately \$23 million in additional funds to the region. Kevin noted that most of the projects were carryover projects with spike funds from previous TIPs. Kevin briefly reviewed the spike projects listed in the SPC region. Chuck DiPietro called attention to page four of the spike list where the statewide programs were detailed. Chuck noted that this includes support for Hometown Streets and Safe Routes to School programs in 2013 and 2014, ITS initiatives, and Smart Transportation Initiatives. The Smart Transportation Initiative line item spike is what funded the PCTI program. Kevin noted that there is a big effort underway to deliver PCTI projects in 2010. Kevin also stated that the funding

(Attachment A)

programmed to start in 2013 with the 2013 TIP for Home Town Streets and Safe Routes to School is there in case federal TE funding becomes available in the next federal authorization.

c.) Remaining County/Local Project Needs

Chuck DiPietro noted that the final revisiting of county and local projects is part of the fifth round of District TIP work sessions.

d.) Interstate Management Program (Attachment G)

Chuck DiPietro pointed to Attachment G, which was the latest listing of the 2011 Interstate Management Program.

e.) Air Quality Non-neutral project identification.

Chuck DiPietro stated that Chuck Imbrogno and his staff are reviewing the project lists associated with the draft 2011 TIP for air quality non-neutral projects. The air quality assessment of the Draft TIP will be conducted over the next month and a half.

f.) Transit TIP Closure

Chuck DiPietro updated the status of the transit TIP development. The April 21st Transit Operators Committee will focus on closure of the draft 2011 TIP. Kevin McCullough noted that some adjustment in funding codes on the transit TIP are necessary stemming from the issues surrounding Act 44 funding sources. David Totten concurred that coding modification have been made along with some adjustments in the Port Authority projects.

g.) Draft Amendment Procedures (Attachment H and I)

Karen Franks reviewed the draft 2011 TIP amendment procedures focusing on the proposed changes made since the last TTC meeting. Karen reviewed the proposed criteria for determining a major TIP amendment and the special expedited approval procedures. Karen noted that some of the revisions since last TTC meeting were due to changes in the statewide MOU between FHWA and PennDOT regarding the STIP (Attachment I). One of these revisions involved adding text to the administrative action definition to include 100 percent state or locally funded projects. Kevin McCullough noted that FHWA is allowing more flexibility on 100 percent state or locally funded projects. Chuck noted that we need to decide if we want to be tighter in defining some of these types of projects as amendments or to utilize the same language as the MOU. Karen noted another area where a revision was made to be consistent with the MOU on page two with regard to deleted TIP projects/phases and associated statewide line items being categorized as TIP amendments.

h.) Schedule of key activities thru July 26th TIP adoption (Attachment J)

Chuck DiPietro referred everyone to Attachment J, which provided a timeline of important activities on the Draft TIP up to adoption on July 26th.

6. Other Business

a.) May 12th Ped/Bike Meeting

Sara Walfoort briefly reported some of the ongoing activities related to the upcoming Ped/Bike Meeting. Sara also reviewed the proceedings of the recent SPC Freight Forum. Kevin McCullough asked if anyone from Central Office attended the recent Freight Forum. Sara responded that no one from Central Office attended the Freight Forum although the meeting agendas and reports are always distributed to Central Office. Lucinda Beattie asked if the Freight Forum includes any discussion on commuter rail. Chuck DiPietro noted that any discussion involving passenger commuter rail is typically held at the TOC.

b.) May 19th TTC Meeting, 10:00 AM

Chuck noted the next TTC meeting will be held on a Wednesday; May 19th at 10:00 AM.

c.) May 19th TOC Meeting, 10:00 AM

David Totten noted the meeting will include closure on the 2011 draft TIP, further discussions on the amendment and administrative action, and a presentation by Deep Local on iphone aps for transit users named Route Shout.

d.) Joint TTC/TOC Meeting

Chuck DiPietro stated that following the TTC and TOC meetings on May 19th, a Joint TTC/TOC meeting will be held. Chuck reviewed the proposed agenda which will include a half hour session discussing SPC's Road Safety Audits and a half-hour session discussing the Rochester Roundabout Project, a PCTI project with both highway and transit aspects.

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for April 26th.

(Attachment A)

Attachment: Current TTC administrative action and amendment procedures

For general information purposes, SPC is using the following administrative action and amendment procedures:

Administrative Actions

To be considered as an administrative action a proposed change must meet the following criteria:

- Exempt from air quality testing
- Does not add or delete an existing project
- No significant change in project scope or design concept
- Maintains overall and year-to-year fiscal balance

Administrative actions may include any of the following types of changes:

- Adds a project for emergency relief purposes except those involving substantial, functional, location, or capacity changes
- Correction of a misprint or data entry error
- Addition or correction of local match funds
- Schedule change, for projects or phases in any of the first three years of the TIP
- Incidental ROW changes
- Change in the funding source
- Exempt projects

New or Deleted Phase

The technical committee can approve an administrative action to add a new phase or delete a phase if the phase cost is \$5 million or less for a highway project or \$2 million for a transit project.

Line Items

The recognition/programming on the TIP of specific projects within an approved line item (i.e., betterments, rail-highway crossings, Transit Section 5310 Program, transportation enhancements, local bridges, etc.) is an administrative action as long as the line item is reduced by the same amount as the eligible project. Line item-based actions require technical committee

approval.

For a betterment line item or a rail-highway crossing line item there are no restrictions based on project cost; identification of projects of any amount can be considered as an administrative action. It is also permitted as an administrative action to remove funding from a “line item” project (betterment or rail-highway only) as long as the funds are returned to the respective line item.

Cost Changes

Changes in the cost of a project or project phase can be handled as an administrative action if the cost change is \$5 million or less. A project sponsor is permitted to make an administrative cost change \$1 million or less by reporting the change to the technical committee for informational purposes only. The technical committee must approve a cost change greater than \$1 million but less than \$5 million for a highway project. The action becomes effective when it is forwarded by the technical committee to PennDOT and FHWA or FTA.

Administrative actions do not require Federal approval but FHWA and FTA reserve the right to disallow an administrative action if it is not consistent with federal regulations or the MOU. The project sponsor must provide full documentation prior to SPC acceptance of the requested change and reflecting it on the TIP. SPC and PennDOT will work cooperatively to address and respond to any FHWA and/or FTA comments on these actions.

TIP Amendments

Any project change that cannot be processed within the rules governing administrative actions must be handled as a TIP amendment. A proposed change must be considered as a TIP amendment if it meets any of the following criteria:

- Affects air quality conformity (regardless of funding source)
- Adds or deletes a project (regardless of project cost, except for existing approved line item changes that are considered administrative actions)
- Adds a new project phase or deletes a phase that exceeds \$5 million for a highway project or \$2 million for a transit project
- Creates a new line item
- Involves a major change in the project scope of work or design concept
- Changes the project selection status

New or Deleted Project

The technical committee can approve an amendment to add a new project or delete an existing project if the total cost change is \$10 million or less. Total cost changes that exceed \$10 million for a highway project or \$2 million for a transit project require approval by the Commission.

Cost Changes

For changes in the cost of an already approved project or project phase, the dollar level of the change will determine the procedures that are required for approval. Changes of \$5 million or less are administrative actions. Changes that exceed \$5 million are amendments. Cost changes of \$10 million or less can be approved by the technical committee. Changes that exceed \$10 million require approval by the Commission.

Air Quality

Amendments with an air quality impact require air quality testing and a 30-day public comment period including a public meeting before they can be presented to the Commission.

Major Fiscal Impact

Amendments with a fiscal impact that exceeds \$10 million are subject to a 30-day public comment period before they can be presented to the Commission.