

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission  
Minutes of the Meeting of  
April 29, 2013

Two Chatham Center • 4th Floor • 112 Washington Place • Pittsburgh, PA 15219

The one hundred and first meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission was called to order by Chairman Rod Ruddock.

Members present were: Tony Amadio, Alfred Ambrosini, David Battaglia, Tom Ceraso, Daniel Cessna, Jack Cohen, Tyler Courtney, Terry Daughenbaugh, Rich Fink, Rich Fitzgerald, Joe Grata, Lynn Heckman, David Johnston, Clifford Levine, Robert Macey, Jeff Marshall, Robbie Matesic, Bruce Mazzoni, William McCarrier, Kevin McCullough, David Miller, Charles Morris, Rich Palilla, A. Dale Pinkerton, Carmen Rozzi, Robert Rubinstein, Rod Ruddock, Daniel Shimshock, Michael Silvestri, Joe Spanik, Wendy Stern, Joe Szczur, Archie Trader, Angela Zimmerlink and Blair Zimmerman.

Members absent were: Robert Bower, Robert Brooks, Ricky Burgess, Brigid Hynes-Cherin, Steve Craig, Albert D'Alessandro, Patrick Dowd, Joseph Dubovi, Mary Ann Eisenreich, Patricia Evanko, David Frick, Jim Gagliano, Jr., Kelly Gray, Fred Junko, Larry Maggi, Ellen McLean, Laura Mohollen, Mary Jo Morandini, Dennis Nichols, Luke Ravenstahl, James Ritzman, Richard Shaw, Harlan Shober, Renee Sigel, Robert Del Signore, Mark Snyder, Byron Stauffer, Jr., Diana Irey Vaughan, Daniel Vogler, Christopher Wheat, and Yarone Zober.

On Conference Call: Charles Anderson.

Others: Robert Johnson, Governors Office; Jon Smith, Allegheny County Transit Council; David Williams, Michael Baker Jr., Inc.; Greg Bednar, Charlie Camp and Jeff Davis, Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission; Keith Johnson, URS Corporation, Ann Ogoreuc, Allegheny County, and Ned Williams, Montour Trail.

Staff: Jim Hassinger, Kirk Brethauer, Chuck DiPietro, Chuck Imbrogno, Vince Massaro, Dee Pamplin, Matt Pavlosky, Shannon O'Connell, Rachel Roche, Bob Schwartz, Lisa Kay Schweyer, Kay Tomko, Lew Villotti and Sara Walfoort.

1. Action on Minutes of January 28th Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2013 meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission by Commissioner Pinkerton which was seconded by Mr. Macey. The affirmative vote to approve the minutes was unanimous.

2. Public Comment – None

3. Action on Turnpike Commission's Request to Amend the TIP and 2040 Plan to Include Southern Beltway Project from U.S. 22 to I-79

**a. Project and Financial Overview by Turnpike Team – Greg Bednar and Dave Williams**

Mr. DiPietro introduced the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission Team. First, Greg Bednar provided an overview and background of the project. Dave Williams from Michael Baker Jr., followed with an overview of the financial plan.

Greg Bednar, Project Manager for the Southern Beltway Project, Route 22 to I-79 outlined the seven independent projects that are part of the Mon Fayette and Southern Beltway. Mr. Bednar then highlighted the purpose and need of the Southern Beltway Route 22 to I-79 Project.

**MAKES CRITICAL CONNECTIONS AND IMPROVES ACCESS**

- Further extends Southern Beltway and connects I-79 to I-376 at the Pittsburgh International Airport
- Provides better access and reduces travel time from areas south & west to the Pittsburgh International Airport

**RELIEVES CONGESTION WHILE IMPROVING SAFETY**

- Relieves congestion on I-376, I-79, US Routes 22 & 50
- Also providing a local connector to Morganza Road to give access to and from the Expressway as well as I-79.
- Provides emergency vehicles, businesses and the public with a safer alternative

**PROMOTES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- Provides access to existing and future business and office parks
- Consistent with local comprehensive land use and regional planned growth studies

Mr. Bednar next provided the following schedule highlights/project milestones.

**September 2008:** FEIS approved/Record of Decision (ROD) issued by FHWA

**October 2008:** Right-of-Way negotiations started for properties

**Fall 2008 to fall 2009:** Preliminary Design started/completed

**January 2010:** FHWA approved Preliminary Design

**November 2012:** PTC requested that SPC consider amending LRP/TIP

**February 2013:** PTC provided SPC with Draft Financial Plan

SPC prepared Draft Air Quality Conformity Determination

**April 2013:** Request SPC approval to amend LRP/TIP

Dave Williams of Michael Baker Jr., continued by highlighting the project's financial plan. The overview included presenting a cash flow chart and highlighting design and project cost information. Design is estimated at \$47.2M, right-of-way at \$20M, utility relocation at \$17.5M, construction at \$498M and construction management/construction inspection at \$49.8M for a grand total of \$632.5M. The 13.3 miles of the Southern Beltway Route 22 to I-79 project will be complete electronic tolling. We will decommission and retrofit the existing Findlay Connector the six miles from Route 22 up to the airport. The Turnpike has a balance of \$158.9M, the escrow proceeds are \$50M, and the excess oil franchise tax revenues which will fund this project amounts to about \$14M per year. A major funding element of the project is a federal TFIA Loan. The Turnpike has submitted a TFIA Loan letter of interest but has not yet been invited to formally apply. They intend to apply and use \$129M of TFIA funds in 2014. In 2019 there is the issue of oil franchise bond issue of \$169M. This totals \$632.5M.

**b. Summary of Response to Public Comment Period and Public Meetings – Matt Pavlosky**

Mr. Pavlosky summarized the Public Comment Period for the Southern Beltway.

- Public Comment Period (30 Days)
  - Friday March 1, 2013 – Monday, April 8, 2013
- Public Meeting Dates/Location
  - Tuesday, March 12 – Pittsburgh International Airport
  - Wednesday, March 13 – Washington County Courthouse
- Total Attendees: 48
- Public Comments Received: 5

**c. Action on Resolution 6-13 to Make a Finding of Conformity that the Proposed Amendments to the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area (TMA) and the region's 2040 Transportation and Development Plan (the 2040 Plan) are Consistent with the Requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act – Chuck Imbrogno**

Mr. Imbrogno pointed out the air quality conformity requirements.

Air Quality Conformity Requirements –

- Conducted in accord with the federal Clean Air Act
- Assesses the impact of new/amended TIPs/Plans on regional air quality
- Cannot approve Plans/TIPs that do not conform with Clean Air Act.

Findings for proposed amendment to Plan/TIP –

- Implementation of amended TIP/Plan will not adversely impact regional air quality.
- Amended TIP/Plan conform with Clean Air Act
- Amended TIP/Plan satisfy applicable conformity criteria under air quality standards for:
  - Ozone, Fine Particulates (PM2.5), Coarse Particulates (PM10), Carbon Monoxide

Findings for proposed amendment to Plan/TIP –

- Conformity results were available for public comment
- No comments were received on conformity findings

The TTC at its April 18 meeting recommended that the air quality conformity finding be approved.

Mr. Grata motioned to approve Resolution 6-13 and Mrs. Heckman seconded.

WHEREAS, the federal Clean Air Act authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), to define the boundaries of areas not in attainment of the Standards, and to establish criteria and procedures for attaining and maintaining the Standards; and

WHEREAS, the EPA has designated three nonattainment and maintenance areas in the SPC planning region for the 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS; these include the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley nonattainment area (comprised of the seven counties: Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Washington, and Westmoreland); the Greene County maintenance area; and the Clearfield-Indiana maintenance area (comprised of Clearfield County, which is outside of SPC's planning area, and Indiana County which is within SPC's planning area); and

WHEREAS, the EPA has designated three nonattainment areas in the SPC planning region for both the daily and annual PM 2.5 NAAQS; these include the Liberty-Clairton nonattainment area (comprised of five municipalities within Allegheny County); the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley nonattainment area (comprised of Beaver, Butler, Washington, and Westmoreland counties in their entirety and portions of Allegheny, Armstrong, Greene, and Lawrence counties); and the Johnstown nonattainment area (comprised of portions of Indiana County within SPC's planning area, and all of Cambria County which is in the planning area of the Johnstown MPO); and

WHEREAS, the EPA has designated a maintenance area in the SPC planning region for the PM 10 NAAQS consisting of five municipalities within Allegheny County; and

WHEREAS, the EPA has designated a maintenance area in the SPC planning region for the Carbon Monoxide (CO) NAAQS consisting of the City of Pittsburgh's central business district; and

WHEREAS, the EPA, in the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 93), provides criteria and procedures to be followed by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in making conformity determinations regarding transportation plans, programs, and projects within designated nonattainment and maintenance areas; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Conformity Rule and Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act (Sections 7504 and 7506(c) and (d) of Title 42 U.S.C.) require that the MPO not approve any plan, program, or project which does not conform with the Clean Air Act; and

WHEREAS, the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC), as the MPO for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area, is responsible under Section 134 of Title 23, U.S.C. and Section

5303 of Title 49, U.S.C. for carrying out a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process; Section 174 of the Clean Air Act designates this same organization as responsible for the transportation-related air quality planning within designated nonattainment and maintenance areas to achieve and maintain NAAQS; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Conformity Rule identifies projects and project types which are “exempt” from regional conformity analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Conformity Rule requires a new finding of conformity by the MPO prior to an MPO action to adopt or amend the Transportation Plan or TIP when that action involves projects or project types which are not "exempt" from regional conformity analysis, or prior to any federal action to approve project designs, environmental documents, or other aspects of “non-exempt” projects that are not required to be programmed on the regional Plan or TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission has proposed amendments to the 2040 Plan and 2013-2016 TIP to add the “non-exempt” project “Southern Beltway – US 22 to I-79”; and

WHEREAS, SPC has conducted a qualitative and quantitative analysis for the designated PM 2.5, PM 10, CO, and 8-Hour Ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas within the SPC region in accordance with the applicable criteria and procedures of the Clean Air Act and the Transportation Conformity Rule, and has demonstrated that the amended 2013-2016 TIP and 2040 Plan conform with the Clean Air Act; and

WHEREAS, the results of the conformity analysis were made available for public review and comment consistent with SPC’s established public review procedures from March 1, 2013 through April 8, 2013 including two public meetings; responses to all public comments have been compiled and made available to Commission members for review.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission finds that the region’s adopted 2013-2016 TIP and 2040 Plan, as amended to include the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission’s proposed project “Southern Beltway – US 22 to I-79”; conform to the Clean Air Act by supporting its intention of achieving and maintaining the NAAQS.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the region’s amended 2013-2016 TIP and 2040 Plan are consistent with the Clean Air Act and Transportation Conformity Rule; no goals, directives, recommendations, or projects in the TIP or Long Range Plan contradict in a negative manner any specific requirements or commitments of the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP).

RESOLVED FURTHER that assessment of the designated PM 2.5, PM 10, CO, and 8-Hour Ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas within the SPC region demonstrates that the amended transportation plans, programs, and projects for those areas conform to the provisions of the Clean Air Act and the applicable criteria and procedures of the Transportation Conformity Rule.

Mr. Silvestri, while expressing support for the project, also expressed concern and disappointment with the response from the Turnpike Commission to his formal testimony submitted during the public

comment period, dismissing his concerns on the basis of jurisdictional boundaries. As a metropolitan planning organization, we need to look beyond the immediate alignment of any regional project. This project will change the travel patterns at the end of Morganza Road and create traffic problems coming from Route 19 to the new interchange. It's going to require significant improvements to the travel routes of West McMurray, Georgetown and Valley Brook Road as well as Morganza Road. Our role as a Commission is to ensure that companion arterial improvements in impacted areas by Southern Beltway construction, are also advanced to completion.

Mr. Miller inquired does the process of certifying that it's consistent with requirements of the clean air act imply that therefore it is a project that ought to be adopted, or would negative air quality findings be the basis for SPC to reject the amendment request? Mr. DiPietro responded that Mr. Miller's comments are on target. Action on the Conformity Resolution is a condition that must be approved before we can even proceed to consider action on the request to amend the TIP and Plan. It is an action that must precede it. The Conformity Requirement requires us to test the project in the context of the current TIP, and the current Long Range Plan, and ensure that regional air quality is not negatively affected for the region.

Mr. Miller asked has there been a project that has come before this Commission that we have not certified as consistent with the Federal Clean Air Act? Mr. Imbrogno commented that if we had a request to amend the TIP or Plan, and we went through the Air Quality Conformity technical analysis, we wouldn't proceed to take it out for public comment if it failed the various conformity tests. We would not present it to the Commission for action.

Chairman Ruddock said a motion has been made and seconded to approve Resolution 6-13. Are there any more comments or questions? The affirmative vote was unanimous.

**d. Action on Resolution 7-13 to Amend the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program and the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan – Chuck DiPietro**

Mr. DiPietro explained the key parts of Resolution 7-13 including the following:

For the Turnpike to proceed with this project that will go through different review steps and federal checks, it must be on both the TIP and Plan. SPC has spent time with the Turnpike staff and come to the conclusion that this passes all tests of the financial plans consistent with FHWA guidance.

WHEREAS, project implementation will require various federal approvals by the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), thereby requiring that the project be included on the adopted TIP and Plan for information.

Mr. DiPietro also reported feedback from SPC's Transportation Technical Committee at its April 18 meeting resulting in the following language.

WHEREAS, the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission's Financial Plan for this Southern Beltway Project does not include any TIP funding as presented, nor will any TIP funding be available through completion of construction of this project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission is also requested to place high priority on assembling the necessary funding to advance to completion the proposed Turnpike Access Project for the Greater New Stanton Area in Westmoreland County (the Turnpike Interchange Slip Ramp at SR 981) in partnership with PennDOT as part of the proposed Laurel Valley Improvement Project.

Mr. Ceraso said in the financial plan presented there was a loan and some bonding. What is the total cost of the project over the life of the debt once you add in the cost of the financing? Mr. Williams responded that he was not aware of the number but, that it can be supplied. The life term of the interest I don't know. The total of the project is based on the \$632.5M and the Turnpike has 35 years to pay that bond issue.

With the traffic counts on the Beltway, is there enough revenue specifically from the traffic on the Beltway to pay off the bonds in 35 years? Mr. Williams said the Turnpike feels there is enough traffic.

Do you know what the tolls will be? Mr. Williams responded I don't have that information.

Mr. Ceraso next asked if the Turnpike has traffic counts? Mr. Williams responded we're only in preliminary design; we will update traffic projections during final design.

Mr. DiPietro added that SPC assists with the traffic forecast. We do free-flow traffic projections, the Turnpike Team does dampening for tolling. As they move into final design, there will be refinements to traffic forecasting, including detailed looks at intersections and access points. There will be continuing forecast work through the completion of the project which is projected to be 2021, with the first section of construction scheduled for 2014.

Mr. Ceraso asked what is the specific cost of the Morganza Road Connector improvements as part of the project? Mr. Williams responded that the cost for Morganza Road improvements is very minor when compared to the \$632.5. Mr. Ceraso responded I was trying to compare it to the \$20M planned Turnpike Slip Ramp in Westmoreland County. Since it's a minor number, I would like to know what the Turnpike thinks is a minor number. So when we go back and ask for \$20M for an interchange in Westmoreland County I can remind you it was said today that that was a minor amount of money. We've been told that \$20M was too much to spend on an interchange in Westmoreland County because you don't have the money. But, if you have \$632.5M and you're doing a small portion as a connector to this project. I just want to be able to compare apples to apples when we continue to push for the Turnpike Slip Ramp project in Westmoreland County.

Jeff Davis commented you are talking about a slip ramp along the mainline of the Turnpike and we're talking about a Turnpike expansion project. There are two different pots of money we have at the Turnpike. What you are referring to is a slip ramp that would be out of our capital program which would compete with our mainline projects. This is oil franchise money which is only used on Turnpike expansion programs as directed by Pennsylvania legislation in the 1980's.

Mr. Ceraso asked in response, is that an internal rule or a law? Mr. Davis stated it's a rule that we have followed to date. All the oil franchise money has only been used on the expansion program.

Mr. Ceraso said it was also stated that this was going to be a big economic generator. Do you know how big of an economic generator this project is going to be? Did you do a study? Mr. Davis responded he was not aware that we have exact numbers, but we did look at job creation. Mr. Williams responded that a needs document was prepared. A study was also done with regards to the advantages of the construction jobs created from it. We can provide you that information.



Mr. Ceraso stated that in the final paragraph of the resolution I would like to know what that means to the Turnpike Commission. Do you have any intention of doing anything other than placating us because we put language in this resolution?

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission is also requested to place high priority on assembling the necessary funding to advance to completion the proposed Turnpike Access Project for the Greater New Stanton Area in Westmoreland County (the Turnpike Interchange Slip Ramp at SR 981) in partnership with PennDOT as part of the proposed Laurel Valley Improvement Project.

Mr. Davis responded we plan to work with PennDOT because our interchange isn't going to work without their part of the Laurel Valley Improvement project and theirs isn't going to work without ours. A draft master plan was done last fall that includes the Turnpike Interchange Slip Ramp at SR981. We have requests for new access points along the Turnpike in Westmoreland County and in the Philadelphia area.

Mr. Ceraso commented you come before this Commission and you ask for \$660M worth of changes in the TIP, no one in Philadelphia gets to vote. That's not a concern to me living in Westmoreland County paying tolls to the system every day on my way to work. We wanted to bring up all these points as part of the resolution and make sure that everybody knows that there is another project of significance and would like cooperation when we try to move that project forward.

Mr. Rozzi asked if they were still in the preliminary stages – does an environmental impact statement still have to be done? Mr. Williams responded that the environmental impact statement will be re-evaluated. The project was stopped at design field use. There is still 80 percent of the design to be completed. There will be a re-evaluation of the FEIS.

Robert Johnson asked when you set up those numbers have you factored any new revenue into that chart? Mr. Williams responded that this is based on what we know in 2013--assumptions regarding future funding, any future increases in oil franchise tax cap, what was in the bank to start, and the federal approval of the anticipated TFIA Loan, and anticipated bond funding in 2019.

Mr. Cohen commented that in Butler County we have a million cars a week going through the intersection of Route 228 and Route 19 we can't get funds to fix that project. This may not be our money to spend, and it may come from somewhere else, but if you're paying tolls, that's still our money. Until we figure out where there is already economic development that is already done, and people are already driving and we can't fix the road, why would we advance this project to construction without knowing its full return to the region?

Mr. Ceraso asked what does it do to this project if we table it until June 24 to get some answers back on these specifics? Mr. Williams responded that the Turnpike will continue working with what we know, and advance project development activities.

Mr. Davis asked the Commission members what specific questions do you want answered? Mr. Ceraso responded--What is the total cost of financing over the life of the debt? What is the cost of the Morganza Interchange as part of the project? What are some economic development numbers other than big? Is there some documentation to back it up?

Mr. Miller asked can we label this project as consistent with Project Region? Did we make that determination as part of our review process? Mr. DiPietro responded that there is a formal and approved needs document on record that describes the project's purpose and need.

Mr. Miller said that means that Project Region can be used to justify any project that we would undertake. I think that defeats the purpose of what we're trying to do with Project Region. I don't think this is consistent with what we tried to do with Project Region years ago. I can't see how this project is consistent with the direction of SPC's Regional Plan. There is going to be \$630M of public investment that is being made in our region. It's not an investment that is being made on what are the most pressing needs that exist in our region. If we wanted to address the problem of congestion, I turn to PennDOT. If you had \$630M to reduce congestion, is this where you would invest that \$630M? If the answer to that question is yes; this is the biggest impact in reducing congestion that we could advance. My sense is that is not where we would invest our money. We are going to end up being transportation planners that aren't really planning transportation. We're taking advantage of the Turnpike Commission when they see an opportunity to make money, while other projects aren't getting done. I'm not sure that is the way we should be doing transportation planning.

Commissioner Battaglia added that we would also need to know what the projected traffic is and how much the toll will be?

Mr. Ceraso motioned to have the original motion tabled and Commissioner McCarrier seconded. The affirmative vote to table the original motion was unanimous.

#### 4. Staff Profile – Bob Schwartz

Mr. Imbrogno introduced staff member Bob Schwartz, Data Administrator. Mr. Schwartz has been compiling data and making it available for staff, our planning partners, and Commission members for a long time.

Mr. Schwartz summarized his career by explaining that he graduated with a B.A. degree from the University of Pittsburgh in 1968. His major was geography. Mr. Schwartz started with SPRPC; who is the predecessor to SPC. SPRPC is the Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission. When he started working at SPRPC the region covered six counties, Allegheny County and five surrounding counties. He interned at SPRPC between 1966-1968 full-time during the summer and part-time while going to Pitt at the entry level position of Coder. He has also been a Planning Assistant, Planning Technician, Planner, Systems Analyst, and Data Analyst; all together with the Commission full-time has been 44 years.

Chairman Ruddock and the Commission gave a round of applause for Mr. Schwartz's longevity at SPRPC/SPC.

Some of Bob's duties include:

- Creation/maintenance of databases/files
  - Respond to data requests
  - Represent SPC as Affiliate to the Pennsylvania State Data Center
- Administering Census Data**
- One of his major projects is acquiring and maintaining Census data
  - The American Community Survey (ACS) has been the major focus of his work since 2006
- American Community Survey (ACS)**
- The ACS replaced the "long form" questionnaire that was in the 2000 Census. That was a sample sent to one in six households nationwide
  - Monthly ACS questionnaires are sent to a sample of U.S. housing units and group-quarter facilities
  - The ACS was fully implemented beginning with the 2005 ACS that was released in 2006
- Compiling ACS 5-year Estimates**
- The Census Bureau releases 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year ACS estimates

- The 5-year estimates contain much more geographic detail than the 1-year and 3-year estimates
- SPC Data Library contains reports and files with 2010 Census and/or latest ACS 5-year estimates
- SPC website is <http://www.spcregion.org/>

5. Financial Report – Vince Massaro

Mr. Massaro reported on the financials for the Corporation and Commission for the period July 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013. This financial report is compared to the revised budget that was adopted at the February 2013 meeting. Total project related revenues on a revised budget of \$17.3M we have actual and encumbered to date \$15.4M or 88.89% of the budget. The carry-over revenue and those projects from the prior year carry-overs relate to the Regional Traffic Signal Project Phase I. Those projects are 100% complete. There was \$139,000 budgeted for those projects \$139,000 recognized to date or 100%. Total project related expenditures \$17M budgeted, \$15.4M on the actual revenues recognized and encumbered or 88.92%. The carry-over projects are 100% complete, \$99,000 budgeted and \$99,000 recognized to date.

6. Action on Resolution 8-13 to Proclaim May as CommuteInfo Commute Options Awareness Month – Lisa Kay Schweyer

Ms. Schweyer remarked that May is a month that we take to add a little more emphasizes to what we do year round, which is to promote commuting options throughout the region to allow commuters who travel to work or school different options on getting there. We're promoting alternatives to driving alone, including transit, vanpools, carpools, biking, as well as walking. From December 2011 until today, we've seen a 27% increase in our vanpool fleet and a 30% increase in ridership. We have an 80% occupancy among those vehicles.

Our customers are happy with the service, because it's saving them money and they are staying with the program.

Each person who participates in a carpool or vanpool is saving about \$1,000 a year in gas. Not in the total trip cost, just in gas.

CommuteInfo Commute Options Awareness Month was first celebrated in May 2004. We are here today to ask the Commission to approve Resolution 8-13.

Mr. Cohen motioned to approve Resolution 8-13.

WHEREAS, over 75 percent of the 1.2 million workers in the SPC region travel alone to work; and

WHEREAS, the region will have less traffic congestion and improved air quality if more commuters shared a ride to work; and

WHEREAS, sharing a ride to work will save commuters money; and

WHEREAS, the goal of SPC's CommuteInfo Program is for commuters within the 10-county SPC region to choose ridesharing at least twice a week; and

WHEREAS, 729 commuters already ride to work daily in CommuteInfo's 57 registered vanpools and 491 commuters ride to work daily in the 226 carpools registered with CommuteInfo; and

WHEREAS, to ensure that all employers and commuters in the region are aware of all available commuting options CommuteInfo, in addition to sponsoring volunteer vanpools and arranging carpools, provides information about transit, promotes biking and walking, provides commuter safety information, and provides information about the region's park-n-ride facilities through the program website [www.commuteinfo.org](http://www.commuteinfo.org) or by calling toll-free 1-888-819-6110; and

WHEREAS, several events are scheduled in May that independently promote alternatives to driving alone including National Transportation Week (as declared by Presidential proclamation), National Bike to Work Day (sponsored by the League of American Bicyclists), National Employee Health and Fitness Day (sponsored by the National Association for Health and Fitness), and National Clean Air Week (sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Weather Service); and

WHEREAS, CommuteInfo is planning a series of events in May to emphasize the value of ridesharing to the region, and to promote increased awareness of CommuteInfo and its services when national attention is being focused on alternatives to driving alone.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission encourages the citizens of the region to welcome and emphasize the value of ridesharing by choosing ridesharing at least twice a week, and offers its support by proclaiming May 2013 as "CommuteInfo Commute Options Awareness Month" in Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Rozzi seconded and the affirmative vote was unanimous.

7. Status Report on 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program- Chuck DiPietro

Mr. DiPietro summarized the process that is already underway moving toward requesting Commission adoption in June of 2014.

**2015 TIP Development**

Focus Areas for TIP Process Enhancement

- Increasing planning activities and engagement within Work Groups

- Improving Key Stakeholder/Partner Communication
- Integrating Public Involvement

### **2015 HIGHWAY TIP Update Procedural Framework**

Content:

- Background
- Timeline & Process Flow
- Work Group Meeting Outlines

### **2015 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION TIP Update Round 1 Work Sessions**

- Review Procedural Framework
- SharePoint Demo
- Approach to Public Involvement
- Next Steps/Action Items

Dates

- April 3<sup>rd</sup>, District 10-0
- April 8<sup>th</sup>, District 12-0
- April 9<sup>th</sup>, District 11-0

### **Why SharePoint**

Web-based collaboration tool which allows for information sharing and document collaboration

- Allow for a collaborative work space outside of the work groups
- Advance preparation allows for increased work group meeting productivity

### **2015 HIGHWAY TIP Update Round 2 Work Sessions**

- Revisit last TIP unaddressed public comments
- Review public input forms
- Advance candidate projects to further screening and evaluation

Dates

- June 20<sup>th</sup>, District 10-0
- July 1<sup>st</sup>, District 12-0
- July 9<sup>th</sup>, District 11-0

### **2015 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION TIP Update Round 1 Work Sessions**

- Revisit last TIP unaddressed public comments
- Review public input forms
- Review current TIP programs of projects and expected obligations
- Advance candidate projects to further screening and evaluation

Date: June/July 2013

### **2015 CMAQ Program Development**

- Mid-June: Evaluation Committee meeting
- August 1: Program Guidance

- Mid-August: Informational Forum for Project Sponsors
- September 3: **Deadline** for Submitting CMAQ Applications

**2015 TIP Update  
PA Statewide Financial Guidance &  
PA Statewide Procedural Guidance**

- Monthly Meetings: January - June
- Statewide Approval end of June 2013

**Approach to Public Involvement**

- April/May 2013: PPP Orientation
- Sept/Oct. 2013: 10 County Meetings
- Spring 2014: 10 County Meetings

8. Report on Regional Policy Advisory Committee Meeting

Mr. Hassinger reported that the Regional Policy Advisory Committee recently met and reviewed the summary and status of a regional freight plan and the statewide update of the transportation plan and freight plan for the State and CDM Smith who is a consultant for the State visited with the Committee and talked about meetings they have held not only with us at our Regional Freight Conference, but also with DVRPC.

9. Other Business/Announcements – Jim Hassinger

Next Meeting June 24, 2013

10. New Business      None

11. Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Charles Anderson  
Secretary-Treasurer