

**Meeting Minutes for January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012**  
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting  
Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

Attendees:

- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission
- Joel MacKay, Butler County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Department
- Kelly Shroads, Greene County
- Jeff Grim, Indiana County Planning Department
- Amy McKinney, 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
- Jeff Skalican, PennDOT District 11-0
- Jason Kowalczyk, PennDOT District 11-0
- Joe Szczur, PennDOT District 12-0
- Rachel Duda, PennDOT District 12-0
- Mary Beth Kim, Airport Corridor Transportation Management Association
- Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association
- Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
- Eric Boerer, Bike Pittsburgh
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Sara Walfoort, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- Doug Smith, SPC Staff
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- David Totten, SPC Staff
- Karen Franks, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
  
- (Indicates Voting Member)
- \* Participated via conference call

**1. January 12<sup>th</sup> 2012 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 December meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

**2. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**3. FHWA/PennDOT Central Office Reports**

a.) Federal and State Updates

Matt Smoker noted that a recent reorganization at the Federal Transit Administration has resulted in Tim Lidiak being named the FTA Region III Grants Manager for the grantees in our region and the MPO liaison for the SPC region. Tom Klevan noted that Tim will be attending the TOC meeting next week. Matt added that there is really no new information on the Federal transportation reauthorization since last month. Different bills are progressing separately through the House and Senate. Kevin McCullough noted that the Senate has a bill called MAP-21, which is a 2-year authorization proposal.

Chuck DiPietro noted that the next cycle of federal appropriations bills will almost certainly not include earmarks. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni questioned if there is going to be any attempt to modify some of the existing federal earmarks to ensure implementation. Kevin McCullough noted that he believes that pressure to do this is increasing because there are millions of dollars tied up in outdated earmarks that need to be either rescinded or reworded.

Kevin McCullough discussed the status of the TFAC recommendations with the PA legislature. Kevin reported there has been no official statement coming out of the Governor's office on the TFAC recommendations. Other critical legislative priorities appear to have bumped the TFAC recommendations further into the future, potentially to the spring legislative session. Kevin noted that there is a consensus among the administration and the legislature that something on transportation funding needs to be done.

Chuck DiPietro noted the House Democratic Policy Committee hearings (most recent January 11<sup>th</sup> at Point Park University). Chuck noted that Secretary Barry Schoch and Dan Cessna both presented testimony on the transportation funding crisis. Talk surrounding the event indicated that the upcoming Governor's budget address may be an opportunity

(Attachment A)

for the Governor to unveil his proposals regarding the TFAC recommendations. Lucinda Beattie noted that the Secretary's remarks at the event were cautiously optimistic, indicating that the Governor would take some action, but also the likely scaling back on the TFAC recommendations. Kevin McCullough noted that PennDOT is already adopting some of the modernization recommendations. There may be some other fixes, on Act 44 for example, that can be implemented without major legislation or revenue increases.

b.) 2040 Plan Air Quality Conformity Determination (Attachment B)

Matt Smoker reported that the Federal review of the 2040 Long-Range Plan Air Quality Conformity Determination is complete and the document was approved by FHWA, FTA, and EPA. Chuck DiPietro emphasized that this is a thorough review process involving multiple federal agencies. Chuck noted that when SPC's air quality testing staff is requesting more information about projects, it is to prepare for and to ensure full compliance with this thorough agency review.

c.) TIGER III Awards (Attachment C)

Matt Smoker referred everyone to Attachment C, which was a list of the TIGER III national award winners. Matt noted that three of the projects selected are located in PA, including the \$10 million award to the Carrie Furnace Flyover Bridge that is sponsored by the Redevelopment Authority of Allegheny County.

Cheryl Moon-Sirianni noted that an upcoming meeting and field view for the Carrie Furnace Flyover Bridge Project is being planned for January 30<sup>th</sup>. Chuck DiPietro asked that SPC be included on invitations for both the meeting and field view. Matt Smoker noted that the TIGER projects are "highly scrutinized" at a high level within US DOT including extensive reporting and monitoring. Matt noted that, for example, the City project that funded through TIGER II (Allegheny Riverfront Boulevard) just had an eight hour meeting with the federal review team. Cheryl stated that her understanding is that the schedules are very tight and very important. Cheryl noted that FHWA has advised the county to pay for all the design work and use the TIGER funds to pay for construction.

Chuck DiPietro reviewed the national allocation of TIGER III funds citing 48% went to highways and bridge projects, 29% to transit projects, and 23% to ports, freight, and rail projects.

d.) FHWA Discretionary Programs: Candidates Submitted (Handout 1)

Matt Smoker reviewed Handout 1 that listed the applications for various discretionary US DOT programs. Matt noted that there was one additional project that came in just before

(Attachment A)

the deadline that was not listed on the handout; the Midland Borough Route 68 Signal Project. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni questioned if this Borough had submitted an application to SPC's Regional Signal Program. Domenic D'Andrea responded that he has not received any application to the program from Midland Borough.

e.) RFP Local Sustainability Matching Fund, March 5<sup>th</sup> Deadline.

Chuck DiPietro noted the RFP that is currently out from the Urban Sustainability Directors Network for applications for their sustainability matching fund. The Fund will provide partnership investments between \$25,000 and \$75,000, with a 1:1 match required. The Network anticipates that the Fund will support up to ten partnership projects in the first year in two rounds in the spring and fall of 2012. Chuck reviewed the eligible project types and the seven sustainability focus areas.

#### **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 2)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 reviewed the administrative action requests. District 10-0 had three amendment requests to the current TIP.

- Seward Truss Bridge - add project and \$2.7 million in construction funds to the current TIP.
- Scholars Run Bridge – add project and \$400,000 to the PE phase to the current TIP.
- 2012 All-Weather Pavement markings – add project and \$350,000 to the current TIP.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 10-0 Amendment request to the TIP.

b.) PennDOT District 11-0 (Attachment E and Handout 3)

Rob Miskanic of PennDOT District 11-0 reviewed the requested amendments and administrative actions. District 11-0 had two amendment requests:

- Munhall SRTS - add the project and the PE and CON phases to the current TIP.
- Center Township SRTS – add the project and the FD and CON phases to the current TIP.

(Attachment A)

Cheryl Moon-Sirianni noted that an additional Safe Routes to School project in District 11-0 does not seem to be moving and may soon require some future action.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved both the PennDOT District 11-0 amendment request and administrative actions to the TIP.

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

District 12-0 had no amendment requests this month.

Approval from the TTC was not required for the administrative actions presented.

Rachel Duda reviewed the concept of the divergent diamond interchange being proposed to replace the conventional cloverleaf at I-70 and Route 19 in South Strabane Township. The District recently held a well-attended public plans display on the project. Rachel stated that the project is exciting because it is the first of its type in Pennsylvania and the second of its type in the nation. This type of intersection is more efficient, safer, and cheaper to build than conventional cloverleaf intersections. Chuck DiPietro suggested that the TTC and the SPC Operation and Safety Committee would be interested in a presentation on this project. Rachel stated this could be accommodated.

## **5. 2013 – 2016 TIP Update**

a.) Revisit the TIP Amendment Procedures (Attachment G)

Karen Franks reviewed Attachment G, which was the first draft of the TIP amendment procedures for the 2013 TIP. Karen noted that the main change proposed to the procedures involves the handling of the PennDOT Linking Planning and NEPA Level 2 screening forms. Karen reviewed the proposed text that was highlighted. Chuck DiPietro noted that the proposed revisions to the amendment procedures would be included in the Draft TIP during public comment period later this spring. Chuck asked the TTC to review the draft text and provide any feedback.

b.) TIP Submitted to Central Office

Chuck DiPietro noted that the preliminary Draft TIP was submitted to PennDOT Central Office by December 29<sup>th</sup>. The Program Center at PennDOT Central Office is now reviewing the preliminary Draft TIP. Kevin McCullough stated that Central Office staff is working with the Districts to get updated project descriptions and project narratives. Kevin noted they are making a commitment to improve the accuracy of these descriptions and the effort will insure that the Central Office review sessions in each District are

focused.

c.) Transit TIP Submission

Tom Klevan stated that the draft transit TIP was submitted last week to the PennDOT Programming Center and the PennDOT Bureau of Public Transit. Tom noted that SPC staff also took extra time in adding additional accurate information to the project descriptions and narratives. Kevin McCullough noted that having an accurate transit TIP in early allows for smooth integration into the MPMS, which will improve the consistency between the transit and the highway/bridge components of the preliminary draft TIP. Kevin noted ongoing efforts within PennDOT to improve communication between transit grant making and the project programming.

d.) Central Office District visits

Chuck noted the upcoming Central Office visits to the each of the Districts to review the draft 2013 TIP. Chuck explained that following these meetings a seventh round of TIP work sessions are scheduled.

e.) Seventh round of TIP Work Sessions

Chuck DiPietro reviewed the schedule for the round seven TIP work sessions.

District 10 – February 14<sup>th</sup>, at 1:00 PM  
District 11 - February 16<sup>th</sup> at 12:30 PM  
District 12 – February 22<sup>nd</sup> at 10:00 AM

f). December 12<sup>th</sup> PPP Regional Partners Forum Debriefing

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the Regional PPP forum that was held on December 12<sup>th</sup>. Matt noted that full notes from the session are available on the PPP website. Key items from the discussion focused on the development of the PPPs' role in the planning process. December 12<sup>th</sup> feedback included:

Increasing the role of the PPPs in planning sessions

- Involvement with SPC committees
- Attendance at SPC board meetings

Diversifying meetings for the PPPs

- Less education, more work sessions
- More frequent meetings of Panels in a regional format

Advancing SPC's use of electronic media

- Facebook, twitter
- Email blast / newsletters

Amy McKinney stated that she is in full support of SPC establishing a Facebook page. Amy noted that Facebook has become a valuable communication/organization tool that she utilizes with area non-profit groups.

Matt explained that SPC is looking at pairing the feedback of the PPPs with the current Public Participation Plan and related activities.

g.) Update of the SPC Public Participation Plan (Handout 4)

Matt noted that an update of the SPC Public Participation Plan will be underway in early spring to incorporate text consistent with Linking Planning and NEPA and FTA mandated public display ad language. Chuck DiPietro noted that a 45-day public comment period is required before considering action on any updates to the public participation plan and that SPC staff is preparing to have the new document in place in time to oversee the 2013-2016 TIP public comment activities.

h.) LPN Screening Forms Central Office Update (Attachment H)

Chuck pointed to Attachment H, which was a letter from PennDOT Central Office regarding the deadline for the level 2 screening forms. Chuck noted that the letter is specific to this program update and we fully expect that in future TIP updates the level 2 forms will be required to be submitted much sooner. Kevin McCullough concurred emphasizing that an essential objective of completing the level 2 form is to provide more and timely information on individual projects to assist LRP and TIP development. Both Kevin and Cheryl Moon-Sirianni noted that integrating some of the nontraditional project applications into the level 2 screening form process could help collect earlier and better information critical to making individual project decisions.

## 7. Other Business

a). 2012 Road Safety Audits

Doug Smith reviewed the two upcoming Road Safety Audits:

April 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup>      Rostraver Twp, Westmoreland County – S.R. 51 from ALCO line to Fellsburg/Willowbrook Road (S.R. 3008)

May 8<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup>      Monroeville, ALCO – Monroeville Boulevard from James Street to Pitcairn Road

Doug explained that he is now revisiting in the field the past RSAs to evaluate program implementation of individual recommendations. Doug noted that he is seeing some great examples of the RSA recommendations being implemented.

Doug also provided an update of SPC's activities associated with Traffic Incident Management Regional Steering Committee. Doug noted that the Regional Steering Committee has had two meetings and that SPC is serving as the organizer/facilitator for the Committee. Doug reported that the TIM committee is pursuing a pilot project in the Warrendale area to explore what tangible actions a local TIM team can advance. Doug noted that he will also be distributing additional information about an upcoming Quick Clearance Seminar on February 28<sup>th</sup>.

b.) January 26 – CommuteInfo Partners

Chuck DiPietro provided a preview of the upcoming CommuteInfo Partners Meeting to be held on January 26<sup>th</sup>.

c.) January 18<sup>th</sup> Transit Operators Committee

Tom Klevan previewed the upcoming Transit Operators Committee. Agenda highlights include:

- Discussion of the travel demand workshop held in December.
- The recent announcement of apportionment for the FTA programs.
- Port Authority of Allegheny County's impending service cuts.

d.) Freight Forum

Sara Walfoort noted that SPC is hosting a Regional Freight Forum in spring of 2012. Sara noted that the event will be held on April 12<sup>th</sup> and include high level participation from the adjoining states in the region.

e.) Ped/Bike Committee

Sara Walfoort provided information on an upcoming Action 2020 Forum event to be held on January 20<sup>th</sup> on planning and programming for bicycle projects. Sara noted that several national experts have been invited to this event.

f.) Next TTC Meeting – February 16<sup>th</sup>

g.) Next Commission meeting January 30<sup>th</sup>



## **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.