

Meeting Minutes for February 17th, 2011
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting
Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

Attendees:

- Lynn Heckman, Allegheny County Economic Development
- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Bernie Rossman, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission
- James Camp, Beaver County
- Tammy Frank, Beaver County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Commission
- Jeff Raykes, Indiana County Office of Planning and Development
- Doniele Andrus, Lawrence County
- Pat Hassett, Pittsburgh Department of Public Works
- Jeff Leithauser, Washington County Planning Commission
- Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning Department
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office
- Matt Smoker, FHWA
- Dave Cook, PennDOT District 10-0
- Kathy Reeger PennDOT District 10-0
- Cheryl Moon Sirianni, PennDOT District 11-0
- Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stephanie Spang, PennDOT District 11-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0*
- Stacey Rabatin, PennDOT District 12-0*
- Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Association
- Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
- Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association
- Ryan Ambrose, DCRG
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Sara Walfoort, SPC Staff
- Ken Flack, SPC Staff
- Karen Franks, SPC Staff
- Doug Smith, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- Dave Totten, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff

- (Indicates Voting Member)
- * Via Conference Call

1. January 20th, 2011 TTC Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)

Chuck DiPietro called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The January 20th, 2011 meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. FHWA/PennDOT Central Office Reports

a.) First Quarter TIP Progress Report (Attachment B)

Kevin McCullough reviewed the first quarter TIP Progress Report (Attachment B). Kevin noted that you do not get a full perspective on how things are going in the first quarter progress report. Kevin explained that things will be ramping up in the second quarter and we should get a better picture of the program with the second quarter report. Kevin noted the obligation authority is being slowly released due to the continuing resolution status we are currently in through March 4th 2011. Due to the unknown funding and authority levels for the year, the establishment of draft targets is not yet possible.

b.) April Planning Partners Meeting and 2013 TIP Update Kick-Off.

Chuck DiPietro pointed to the upcoming PennDOT Planning Partners Meeting to begin the 2013 - 2016. Chuck noted that two statewide work groups will be meeting in advance of the planning partners meeting; the General and Procedural Guidance Work Group and the Financial Guidance Work Group. Chuck anticipates an STC hearing in the region this summer and that SPC will be taking action on a new TIP in June or July of 2012.

c.) STC & TAC Website Upgrades (Attachment C)

Kevin reviewed Attachment C, which was a press release containing a link to the new website for the State Transportation Commission and the Transportation Advisory Board. Chuck DiPietro noted that the various TAC technical reports can also be accessed from this site.

d.) Other

Matt Smoker reviewed a handout on the Obama administration's recently proposed 2012 U.S. DOT budget. Matt noted that it is organized as a 2012 budget proposal and the first

year of a multi-year reauthorization. Matt explained that the budget represents a 48% increase for highway and bridge funding over SAFETEA-LU levels. Matt also directed attention to the last page of the handout, which illustrated the proposed collapse of over 50 transportation programs into 5 core areas. Matt noted that the proposed budget does not identify a revenue source for funding the budget at these levels. Ken Flack stated that to achieve revenues of this magnitude would translate roughly into a 15 cents per gallon increase in the gas tax (currently set at 18 cents per gallon). Matt noted that the current continuing resolution for SAFETEA-LU is set to expire in March 4th. Matt noted that with the change in leadership in the house, it is unknown what will happen at the end of the continuing resolution.

4. Action on Amendments and Modifications to the 2011 to 2014 TIP

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

a.) PennDOT District 10-0 (Attachment D & Handout 1)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 pointed to the administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 10-0 had no amendment request this month. Karen Franks noted that several of the administrative actions would require action by the TTC due the dollar values exceeding the threshold required for TTC action.

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 E & Handout 2)

Rob Miskanic of PennDOT District 11-0 pointed to the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 11-0 had three amendments:

- SR 18, 9th Ave to 32nd Street in Beaver Falls – Add \$235,000 of construction funds to the current TIP.
- West End Bridge Approach – add \$650,000 of construction funds to the current TIP.
- West End Bridge lane control system - add \$2.6 million in construction funds to the current TIP. Rob noted that this is additional 100% state funds.

Pat Hassett asked if the City of Pittsburgh will be the owners of the lane control equipment. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni responded yes it is replacing the old equipment, which was owned by the City of Pittsburgh.

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 F)

Stacey Rabatin of PennDOT District 12-0 pointed to the amendments and administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 12-0 had four amendments this month.

- Montour Trail Bridges – Adding \$456,796 of TE funds for Construction to the Current TIP.
- Washington & Jefferson – adding construction phase to the current TIP.
- Avonmore Bridge - adding construction phase to the current TIP.
- Leechburg Bridge – adding the construction phase to the current TIP.

Jeff Leithauser asked if there were any developments on the Chartiers 40 project. Stacey replied that there are cost increases on the right-of-way and construction phases of this project and that she anticipates that it will be presented at next month's TTC meeting.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 12-0 amendments and administrative action requests to the TIP.

5. Long Range Plan Update

a.) Financial Plan Update (Attachment G)

Chuck DiPietro introduced the financial planning aspects of the region's long range transportation plan update. Chuck noted that information will be presented today and then there will be an opportunity for people to meet directly with Ken Flack to work out any details over the next two weeks. Ken Flack reviewed Attachment G, which were projection tables for the proposed funding through 2040. Ken noted that one key to these projections is that they are the result of the same framework and methodology that was utilized for the last long-range plan update. New information coming out of the administration's proposal this week on the multi-year reauthorization are not included in these projections because there is no concrete real revenue source to support the numbers in the budget at this time. Chuck DiPietro anticipates that the statewide Financial Guidance Work group will be taking a conservative view of future revenue projections.

b.) Asset Management/Needs Assessment (Attachment H)

Chuck DiPietro pointed to the work being done on the asset management needs assessment for the long range transportation plan. Ken Flack reviewed attachment H, which summarized the annual revenue needs in each District for preservation,

(Attachment A)

replacement, and structurally deficient bridges. Ken noted that the table will show a deep hole in terms of keeping up with infrastructure replacement at current revenues. Chuck DiPietro stressed that these numbers need to be reviewed by the PennDOT Districts, and each should coordinate directly with Ken as needed. Feedback was requested by March 4th. Staff, as needed, will provide an update at the March 17th TTC meeting.

c.) Updated 2040 LRTP Investment Project list (Attachment I)

Chuck DiPietro stated that the individual project lists for the LRTP will need to soon be finalized in order for the coding of the transportation networks and for the air quality analysis and conformity determination to proceed on schedule. Ken Flack stated that the last TTC meeting included a review of the projects table from the last LRTP. Ken noted that 28 projects from that table have been completed. Ken stated he reviewed the TIP and the 2011 Twelve Year Program and has listed any new projects that are over \$15 million for a bridge or over \$10 million for pavement, which resulted in 21 projects being added to the preliminary draft list. Cheryl Moon Sirianni noted that major projects that expect to be ready for environmental approval in the next four years should be listed on this table. These major projects will not advance out of design if they are not listed in the LRTP. Pat Hassett stated that he is aware of several big bridges within the City that may fit these criteria and requested that this table be e-mailed out to him so that he can provide a formal response.

Cheryl asked Matt Smoker if, in terms of acquiring environmental clearance for projects, if it is permissible to list general corridors in the LRTP, which may have several specific projects. Matt replied that it depends on the project, but generally this would be permissible for things listed in stage 2, but not for projects listed in stage 3. Cheryl noted that this suggested approach may allow for a little additional flexibility.

Kevin McCullough pointed to the work that Central Office has been doing on the Interstate Program. The statewide Long Range Plan for Interstates is currently being updated; it is anticipated to be released next month. Central Office will be having discussions with the planning partners pertaining to inclusion of the Central Office Interstate program into the individual MPO/RPO regional LRTP. Cheryl Moon Sirianni noted that it may be necessary to show future Interstate candidates on the regional project list to reflect critical Interstate needs of the region that are not met with the statewide Interstate Maintenance Program. Chuck DiPietro asked for feedback from the individual TTC members on all the tables presented by Ken Flack by March 4th. Staff will provide an update on these tables at the March 17th TTC.

d.) Illustrative List (Handout 4)

(Attachment A)

Sara Walfoort explained the purpose for the illustrative list to highlight some other significant projects outside of the fiscal constraint of the plan. Sara reviewed Handout 4, which was a draft of the illustrative list. Sara noted that some new categories were added to the list. The “other modes” category was created to cover some nontraditional projects that have been successful in receiving TIGER grants such as rail-freight projects or river navigation projects. Lynn Heckman suggested adding some of the Allegheny County bike and pedestrian projects. Lucinda Beattie asked why the Mon/Fayette and Maglev projects were listed. Chuck DiPietro added that they are on there for discussion purposes and feedback since they were shown on the last plans illustrative list.

Chuck DiPietro stated that any feedback from the TTC is needed by March 4th. Chuck especially urged the county planning representatives to provide input on what projects need to be listed. Staff will provide an update on these tables at the March 17th TTC.

e). Draft Plan Studies (Handout 5)

Chuck noted that in the past the LRTP has included recommendations of potential studies between plan updates. The concept is to screen study activity between the four-year update. Plan cycles that will both advance plan implementation and assist preparation for the next plan update cycle. Sara Walfoort conducted a presentation that reviewed some of the previously funded UPWP special studies, the expectations for future study efforts, the subject areas where studies are being funded. Sara concluded by asking if there are areas for future studies that members of the TTC would like to see listed in the plan. Lynn Heckman added that bicycle commuter hubs to transit networks and Marcellus Shale guidance for local governments are some areas for future study. Chuck DiPietro added that others with feedback on the plans mentioned in the LRTP should coordinate with Sara by March 4th. Staff will provide an update on these tables at the March 17th TTC.

g.) Input from TOC

Tom Klevan reviewed the input received on the long range plan update from the Transit Operators Committee. Tom referenced Handout 4, which contained a long list of candidate transit projects being screened for possible inclusion into the LRTP. Tom noted that many of the projects listed are of direct interest to the PennDOT Districts and the SPC member planning offices.

6. Linking Planning and NEPA (Handout 6)

Chuck DiPietro stated that PennDOT Central Office has been working to redefine the program and project development process in a statewide “Linking Planning and NEPA” (LPN) initiative.

(Attachment A)

The initiative has included new editions of the PennDOT Design Manuals (including DM1-A: PreTIP and TIP program Development Procedures). Chuck referenced the training dates for the DM-1 trainings: at District 12-0, Uniontown (March 1-3) and at District 11-0, Bridgeville (April 25-27). Chuck explained that after the Design Manual 1 trainings have been conducted, a LPN implementation session will be held in each District including SPC staff, District staff, and county planning department staff. Chuck stated that the following work group meetings have been scheduled in each District:

- March 23rd, 9:30 AM at Indiana District 10-0
- May 10th, 9:30 AM at Bridgeville District 11-0
- April 5th, 9 AM at Uniontown District 12-0

Chuck provided an extract from a presentation given by PennDOT's Deputy Secretary for Planning Jim Ritzman at the recent SPC policy conference on the Linking Planning and NEPA initiative at PennDOT. The presentation covered the basic themes of Linking Planning and NEPA and some of the new aspects to the process. The key objectives of the new LPN process are: 1) Joint MPO/RPO – PennDOT ownership of fiscal responsibility; 2) Select projects that are needed, affordable, and supportive of state, regional, and community goals; and 3) Improve and increase the efficiency of the environmental process. Deputy Secretary Ritzman described the new LPN process as a fundamental shift in how we do business; emphasizing shared information, decision-making, and enhanced participation. Chuck reviewed handout 6, which was a preliminary draft of agenda and material for the upcoming LPN implementation sessions. Chuck asked that if any of the TTC members have any feedback on the preliminary agenda to coordinate directly with him.

7.) Proposed STP Urban Program (Attachment J)

Chuck DiPietro stated that SPC is proposing to implement a project selection process for the STP urban funds with the next TIP update. Chuck stated that Karen Franks will review some of the details of the proposal and staff is seeking TTC feedback.

Karen Franks conducted a presentation on the proposal to implement project selection for the STP urban funds. Her presentation touched on the following:

- The Proposed STP Urban Eligibility
- A map of the applicable urban areas and urban clusters of the region
- The proposed distribution of funds by District
- Two set-aside programs to be funded out of these funds: SPC Signal Program and the Regional Smart Transportation Program
- Carryover project priority
- Next step after TTC closure – to present the TTC recommendation to the SPC Executive Committee on May 23rd.

Jeff Leithauser stated that Karen and Chuck may want to look at how the potential carryover STP Urban funding compares to the District distribution percentages provided in the presentation. Lucinda Beattie asked about the SPC Smart Transportation Program initiative. Chuck DiPietro noted that it is a proposal to do a regional PCTI-like program in the region. A workgroup continues to meet after each TTC Meeting to advance a recommendation that will also be presented to SPC's Executive Committee on May 23rd.

There was some discussion of the urban designated areas map. Chuck noted that a key point is that each county has some area designated as urban and therefore eligible for this funding. Matt Smoker noted that it is SPC staff suggestion to restrict the STP-Urban funding to urban areas. He noted that STP Urban funds are eligible to be spent anywhere in the SPC region. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni agreed with the staff suggestion of targeting these funds to be used only in urban areas. She noted it makes sense in other areas of the region like Cranberry or Butler. There was consensus from the TTC members to keep the STP-Urban funds restricted to projects in the urban areas displayed on the map of the region. Chuck Imbrogno reviewed the census defined urban areas and urban cluster areas displayed on the map, noting that new 2010 census numbers will change the map and also the geographic application of STP-Urban funds. Doug Smith suggested that the adjusted urban boundaries used for the highway functional classification system be used for this program rather than the boundaries that come straight out of the census. Karen Franks noted that for the 2013 TIP update will use the current urban map based on 1990 census numbers. Transition to the 2010 census based urban areas would be made in the future under this proposal.

There was discussion on the set aside regarding the signal program. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni stated that she strongly feels that the signal program should continue to be funded through CMAQ. She elaborated that CMAQ is one of the least flexible funding sources that exists and it is very useful to utilize CMAQ funds for a program as beneficial as the signal program. Chuck DiPietro stated that the two issues with CMAQ funding for the signal program are: no eligibility for projects in Lawrence County, particularly New Castle and the local match requirements are an extreme hardship for many distressed municipalities. Chuck questioned could a consideration be made to provide 100 percent CMAQ funding to the signal program. Cheryl stated to keep in mind we are already assisting the municipalities 80% with fixing signals that are entirely their responsibility to maintain and that she feels a local commitment is reasonable. Domenic D'Andrea reiterated the fact that 20% funding requirement can eliminate many of the distressed municipalities. A consensus on this point was reached to advance the possibility that, for distressed municipalities only, projects could be considered for funding with 100% CMAQ funds and to advance the STP-Urban set aside for the signal program in Lawrence County.

Kevin McCullough cautioned that the eligibility of CMAQ funds for certain types of signal projects may be an issue.

Sara Walfoort expressed concern while emphasizing that currently there are only two federal programs (CMAQ and STP-Urban) for bicycle and pedestrian projects to compete in and they

are both historically very competitive programs.

8. Regional Operations Organizational Structure (Attachment K)

Doug Smith made a presentation on the need to consider formalizing the organizational structure of the regional Transportation Operations and Safety Committee, which is currently an open forum with no formal committee structure. A formal committee membership and reporting structure could provide SPC with a more organized way to coordinate with PennDOT and other Planning Partners on all aspects of operations and safety in the region, specifically the programming of HSIP funds. Doug presented the concept for feedback from the TTC. The concept would make the Operations and Safety Committee a subgroup of the TTC. Pat Hassett thought it was a good idea and recommended that the City of Pittsburgh's traffic engineer be included as a voting member of the committee. Chuck DiPietro noted that this will also be discussed at the Operations and Safety meeting on February 24th. Doug will provide an update at the March 17th TTC.

9. Other Business

a.) Public Participation Plan

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the activities underway to update the SPC Public Participation Plan. Matt stated that there will be a public review/comment period from February 28th through April 15th prior to recommending Commission adoption of the plan at the April 25th meeting. Matt noted that associated with this public comment period there will be a review meeting for the proposed Public Participation Plan on March 24th at 5 pm at the Regional Enterprise Tower lobby. Matt will provide an update at the March 17th TTC meeting.

Matt noted that he will have more information about the public outreach meetings associated with the update of the LRP at next month's meeting.

Next Transportation Technical Committees – March 17th and April 14th.

Next Commission Meeting – February 28th

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 a new project or delete an existing project (except for emergency situations and 100% state or local funded projects as stated below)
- 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
- Adds a project from a funding initiative or line item that utilizes 100% state or local funding
- Correction of a misprint or data entry error
- Addition of local match funds
- Schedule change, for projects or phases in any of the first four years of the TIP
- Change in the funding source
- Exempt projects

New or Deleted Phase

The Transportation Technical Committee or Transit Operators Committee can approve an administrative action if the cost is \$5 million or less for a highway and/or transit project.

Line Items

The programming on the TIP of specific projects within an approved line item (i.e., betterments, rail-highway crossings, Transit Section 5310 Program, transportation enhancements, bridge preservation and 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 Transportation Technical Committee or Transit Operators Committee approval.

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 of \$1 million or less by reporting the change to the committee for informational purposes only. The Transportation Technical Committee or Transit Operators Committee must approve a cost change greater than \$1 million but \$5 million or less for a highway and/or transit project. The action becomes effective when it is forwarded by the committee to PennDOT and FHWA or FTA.

Administrative actions do not require Federal approval but FHWA and FTA reserve the right to reject an administrative action if it is not consistent with federal regulations and the current STIP/TIP Modifications Memorandum of Understanding between PennDOT, FHWA, and FTA. SPC and PennDOT will work cooperatively to address and respond to any such administrative actions rejected and returned by FHWA and/or FTA.

TIP Amendments

Any project change that cannot be processed within the rules governing administrative actions must be handled as a TIP amendment request. 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 and any emergency projects that are considered administrative actions)
- Adds a new project phase or deletes a phase that exceeds \$5 million for a highway and/or transit project
- Creates a new line item
- Adds or deletes a project or a project phase that transfers Federal funds between a TIP and a Statewide line item
- Involves a major change in the project scope of work or design concept

New or Deleted Project

The Transportation Technical Committee or Transit Operators 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 and/or 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 Transportation Technical Committee or Transit Operators Committee. Changes that exceed \$10 million require approval by the Commission.

Major TIP Amendments

A proposed change must be considered as a Major TIP amendment if it meets any of the following criteria:

- Turnpike projects advancing under the 1987 Turnpike Expansion Act
- Amendment requests with an air quality impact that requires air quality testing and conformity determination and a 30-day public comment period including a public meeting before they can be presented to the Commission.
- Highway funds flexed to Transit projects
- A major significant change in the scope and/or schedule of an existing project
- A major deferral/delay to a lower priority project
- High visibility projects deemed potentially controversial. The Transportation Technical Committee or Transit Operators Committee will interpret if any such proposed TIP change should follow the Major TIP Amendment procedures.
- A Major fiscal impact to the region

An opportunity for public review and comment will be provided for all major TIP Amendment requests. Amendment requests with an impact that has been deemed Major, are subject to a 30-day public comment period and a public meeting before they can be presented to the Commission.

Transportation Technical Committee or Transit Operators Committee Authorization to handle TIP modifications as Administrative Actions and/or Amendments is an option intended to streamline the procedures and the effectiveness of the review process. Transportation Technical Committee or Transit Operators Committee members may request that Major TIP Amendment requirements be applied regardless of whether the change would otherwise qualify.

Special Expedited Approval Option

A proposed change requiring Transportation Technical Committee, Transit Operators Committee, or Commission action, may be expedited via e-mail, fax, and/or telephone ballot if it meets any of the following criteria:

- The safety of the public would be jeopardized by waiting until the TTC/TOC/Commission meets formally
- A project or projects would be significantly delayed by waiting until the TTC/TOC/Commission meets formally
- A delay would significantly and adversely affect, the scheduling, cost and/or funding of the project or projects
- The project is not considered a Major TIP Amendment
- When special funding uniquely made available through federal or state channels may be jeopardized by delays in project delivery or funding obligation

Expedited Procedures

A project narrative will be prepared by the project sponsor requesting expedited action including the project name and contact person, project description (including map), requested action, the justification for the ballot, the project funding, impacts to other projects, and any other discussion needed to supply the best information to the voting members.

The project request and narrative, will be e-mailed, faxed, and/or mailed to all voting members of the appropriate Committee and/or Commission within an appropriate time for a decision to be made. (A minimum of one week will be allowed for review and questions prior to the request for a vote. If less than one week is needed for the vote, justification shall be given.)

A deadline will be established for the tallying of votes. If a vote is not received by the deadline, SPC staff will attempt to contact the voting members to receive their votes. If approved, the action will then be forwarded by SPC staff to PennDOT and FHWA or FTA in accordance with established procedures. TIP amendments only become effective when federal approvals are received by SPC. As with administrative actions, SPC and PennDOT will work cooperatively to address and respond to any FHWA and/or FTA comments on TIP amendment actions.

Results of the vote will be presented at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee/Commission. Any remaining discussion of the issue will be allowed.