

**Meeting Minutes for April 19, 2012**  
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting  
Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

Attendees:

- Lynn Heckman, Allegheny County Dept of Economic Development
- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Dept of Public Works
- James Camp, Beaver County
- Tammy Frank, Beaver County
- Joel McKay, Butler County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Department
- Kelly Shroads, Greene County
- Jeff Grim, Indiana County Planning Department
- Doniele Russell, Lawrence County
- Pat Hassett, City of Pittsburgh
- 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
- Doug Dupnock, PennDOT District 10-0
- H. Dan Cessna, PennDOT District 11-0
- Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0
- Michael Grumley, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stephanie Spang, PennDOT District 11-0
- Rachel Duda, PennDOT District 12-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Management Association
- Mavis Rainey, SPC Staff
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Sara Walfoort, SPC Staff
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- Doug Smith, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- David Totten, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
- Darin Alviano, SPC Staff
- (Indicates Voting Member)

**1. March 22, 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 March meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

**2. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

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

a.) Federal & State Update

Chuck DiPietro provided a brief summary of the efforts to pass a new federal transportation authorization bill. Chuck explained that the U.S. House of Representatives passed a SAFETEA-LU extension bill yesterday. The bill would extend SAFETEA-LU through September. The bill is not expected to be passed in the Senate and faces the threat of a presidential veto due to the inclusion of the Keystone Pipeline. Secretary Ray LaHood announced that this move by the House demonstrates that there is minimal hope that a reauthorization can be passed before the fall elections. Senate has passed a bill (MAP-21) that would span two years at an estimated \$109 billion. Matt Smoker commented that the Federal reauthorization is in a stalled status and it is widely believed that a new transportation act is not expected to pass until well after the elections in November.

Lynn Heckman noted that the reauthorization proposal from the House included provisions for the elimination of smaller sized MPOs. Chuck DiPietro noted that the National Association of Regional Councils has launched a major campaign to eliminate this type of language from the reauthorization proposals. Both Chuck DiPietro and Matt Smoker also noted that the results coming out from the 2010 census will have implications for the formation of new MPOs.

Chuck noted that this winter the Statewide Financial Workgroup will be meeting to establish financial assumptions for 2015 TIP Update. Both Chuck and Dan Cessna noted that without any Federal direction on a new transportation act or any action on the state TFAC recommendations, the Financial Guidance Work Group will again have a real challenge to project revenue levels for the next TIP update.

Lynn Heckman asked what the outlook is for the legislation assisting public private partnerships for transportation projects. Chuck DiPietro noted that Representative Geist

has advanced a bill in the State House to improve enabling of public private partnerships. Chuck noted a similar bill is awaiting consideration in the State Senate.

b.) 2010 PCTI Project Sponsors Status Report

Kevin McCullough noted that in an effort to get the 2010 PCTI funds obligated, the Program Center is asking individual sponsors of the 2010 PCTI projects to provide a progress report. Chuck DiPietro reviewed a list of the sponsors who received the letter from the Program Center regarding this progress report request. Mavis Rainey asked if this progress report was for round one or round two of the PCTI program. Chuck noted that this status report request is for round one funded projects.

c.) Planning and Programming Primer (Attachment B)

Kevin McCullough explained the purpose for Attachment B was to identify some topics for continuing professional education on planning and programming topics. Kevin asked the TTC to look over Attachment B and let him know what topics are of interest for a series of continuing education sessions as part of future TTC meetings. Chuck noted that for years Kevin has taught a series of courses both for Central Office staff and civil engineering trainees. Lynn Heckman noted that she thinks it is a good idea and is interested in the continuing education modules. Kevin noted that anyone with subject matter suggestions e-mail him.

d.) Quarterly Program Report

Chuck DiPietro pointed to a handout containing the second quarter program report. Chuck highlighted some of the fund categories and how the SPC region is doing compared to the state. In general, the region is ahead of the rest of the state in delivering the 2012 program. Dan Cessna noted that District 11-0 has significant lettings on highway projects upcoming in the third quarter.

**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 C)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 highlighted the administrative actions. District 10-0 had no amendment request to the current TIP.

Dave noted two administrative actions:

- Germany Bridges – construction phased advanced from 2014 to 2012.
- Blacks Creek Bridge – add project and \$295,000 for Preliminary Engineering to the current TIP in 2012.

No TTC Action was required.

b.) PennDOT District 11-0 (Attachment D)

Rob Miskanic of PennDOT District 11-0 reviewed the requested amendments and administrative actions to the current TIP. District 11-0 had one amendment request:

- Brooks McCormick Sidewalk – Add construction phase of to the current TIP in 2012.

Rob highlighted one of the administrative actions:

- SR 422, PA Ave to Hoover Road – adding \$1.4 million to the construction phase. Rob noted that funds to cover this increase are from low-bid savings on other projects.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 11-0 Amendment request to the current TIP.

c.) PennDOT District 12-0 (Attachment E & Handout 1)

Angela Saunders of PennDOT District 12-0 reviewed the requested amendments and administrative actions to the current TIP. District 12-0 had two amendment requests this month:

- Fayette, Greene, Washington Slides – adding two projects to the TIP with \$1 million construction funds for 2012.
- HSIP Rumble Strips on SR 51 – adding the project \$75,000 for PE and \$825,000 for construction.

Angela noted one of the administrative actions (PA 119 to Georges Station) had a late addition of \$30,000 to the Con phase in 2012.

The TTC unanimously approved the PennDOT District 12-0 Amendment requests to the TIP.

## 5. 2013 – 2016 TIP Update

### a.) Modifications to TIP Procedures (Attachment F & Handout 2)

Chuck DiPietro pointed to Handout 2, the draft TIP amendment procedures for the 2013 TIP. Darin Alviano noted the change in the new project language on page one is consistent with the language in the STIP MOU. Kevin noted that even with the STIP amendment procedures, occasionally a case by case approach is needed to determine if something should be an amendment. For example, a project may be several years old and inactive even though there were previous obligations and technically it is not a new project, but it still may warrant being added to the current TIP as an amendment. Both Chris Bova and Sara Walfort noted that timing and dollar amount may factor into this determination. Matt Smoker agreed stating that common sense will still need to be applied once in a while to determine if a request is a TIP amendment. Dave Cook noted that in the definition of a new project, the term obligations should be obligations/encumbrances.

Chuck DiPietro noted that the proposed revisions to the amendment procedures will be included in the Draft TIP document out to public comment period in May/June.

### b.) Public Comment Period & PPP Meetings (Handout 3)

Matt Pavlosky reviewed Handout 3 on the public participation elements of the draft TIP update. The public comment period is anticipated to begin as early as May 7<sup>th</sup> and run through June 18<sup>th</sup>. Matt reviewed the advertisement strategy and the locations for public review. Matt reviewed the schedule for the public meetings. Matt noted that there is new location for the Allegheny County PPP meeting (the Pittsburgh Trust Arts Education Building). Matt covered the format of the PPP meetings, which include presentations by SPC and PennDOT. Dan Cessna noted that District 11-0's presentation will focus generally on what is being accomplished with reduced funding levels.

Chuck DiPietro noted that it will be really tight to meet the May 7<sup>th</sup> possible public comment start date due to extensive technical analysis required for the air quality and EJ reports. Sara Walfort added that the EJ report will be more challenging this time due to the data release schedule of the 2010 census outputs.

Matt Pavlosky thanked TTC members who helped to organize the recent meeting of the Beaver County PPP.

c.) CMAQ Program Status

Chuck Imbrogno provided a summary of the activities of the CMAQ Program Management Committee. SPC staff has sent out forms to all of the CMAQ sponsors requesting project status.

d.) Air Quality Conformity Review Status

Chuck Imbrogno provided a summary of the activities associated with the review of TIP project list for air quality conformity coding. Chuck noted that the Inter-governmental Coordination Group has reviewed the project list and had only minor questions and comments. Matt Smoker commended the Districts and SPC in preparing high-quality project narratives. Chuck Imbrogno agreed, adding that the project narratives were much improved and helped to streamline the review process by the Inter-Governmental Coordination Group. Chuck noted that the air quality conformity analysis on SPC's Draft TIP is underway.

Chuck Imbrogno noted that a number of regions have had no changes in their Draft TIPs that would require air quality conformity. This should result in time savings in air quality analysis and review time by Central Office/FHWA. The SPC region still has to conduct air quality conformity, but Central Office/FHWA review time should be faster due to their reduced statewide work load.

e.) LPN Screening Forms/Project Evaluation/Environmental Justice

Chuck DiPietro noted that these three items as several check-off items that are in various stages of completion for TIP Update.

## **6. SPC Public Participation Plan Update**

Chuck DiPietro noted that the Commission will soon be taking an action on the update to the SPC Public Participation Plan.

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the background of the SPC Public Participation Plan update. A full overhaul of the SPC Public Participation Plan was done just one year ago and public comment at that time included over 40 comments. Matt noted that the current update to the Public Participation Plan is relatively minor, and most of the comments received did not pertain to the SPC Public Participation Plan. Chuck DiPietro added that the updated language was requested by the Federal Transit Agency related to public display ads. Matt reviewed two public meetings, which were held on March 28<sup>th</sup> at the Regional Enterprise Tower.

The TTC motioned and approved a recommendation of the updated SPC Public Participation Plan to the full Commission for adoption on April 30th.

## **7. SPC Regional Signal Program**

Chuck DiPietro introduced Domenic D'Andrea and the SPC Regional Traffic Program. Chuck DiPietro stated that the SPC Regional Signal Program recently won the 2012 Governor's Award for Environmental Excellence.

Domenic provided a half hour presentation on the progress of the SPC Regional Signal Program. The presentation focused on the S.R. 228 corridor in Butler County and U.S. Route 30 corridor in Westmoreland County. Domenic provided a detailed overview of the corridors and the before and after conditions. The signal upgrade projects on both corridors resulted in reduced number of stops, reduced travel times, reduced fuel consumption, and reduced air pollution. Domenic noted that a conservative estimate of the cost/benefit ratio is 187 to 1 on the S.R. 228 project and 54 to 1 on the U.S. Route 30 corridor. Domenic showed videos of side-by-side before and after videos each of the projects.

Chuck DiPietro asked Domenic to review some of the ongoing coordination that the program provides after the projects are installed. Domenic cited two examples of ongoing coordination one in Forest Hills Borough related to coordinating signals for emergency vehicles and one on Route 65 at the Sewickley Bridge changing signal operations to deal with the closure of the nearby Ambridge-Aliquippa Bridge and associated increased detour traffic.

## **8. Other Business**

### **a.) 2010 Census Urbanized Areas and Clusters**

Chuck Imbrogno reviewed a map illustrating the 2000 census urban areas and urban clusters to the 2010 census urban areas and urban clusters. Chuck highlighted that the region did not gain or lose any urban areas, however there was significant modification to the areas. Chuck provided a brief background on why the urban areas are significant in transportation planning, including:

- Establishes the urban areas eligibility for use of STU funds
- Establishes the basis for the functional class determinations
- Establishes one factor in the formulas used to calculate various types of transportation and transit funding distribution.

Chuck Imbrogno noted that several new urban areas were created within Pennsylvania. There is an increased urban population from the 2000 Census to the 2010 Census, which means that with no other change in funding amounts, the same funds will be allocated to a wider area.

Chuck Imbrogno noted that assuming no change in Federal Law, the 2010 urban boundaries would begin to be used in the formula allocations in FFY 2013 for FHWA and FTA.

b.) Regional Functional Classification Update

Chuck DiPietro provided some background on update of the functional class designations for the region's road network. Chuck noted that the process is substantially aided now by GIS support. Doug Smith noted that last time the functional class was updated, they held a meeting in each county to review and discuss maps and adjust particular segments. Chuck DiPietro noted that the functional class of the roadway is important because it establishes both federal funding eligibility and which federal funds can be used. Rachel Duda noted that the functional class of the roadway also determines the standards that the highway engineers apply in design of new or upgraded facilities.

c.) SPC Regional Freight Conference

Sara Walfoort provided a recap of the SPC Regional Freight Conference. Sara noted that the conference was a success with attendees from all across the region, Ohio, and West Virginia. Sara thanked all the presenters and attendees for making the conference a success. Sara noted that the event is likely to become an annual event.

d.) Linking Planning and NEPA – PennDOT District 12-0 refresher session.

Ryan Gordon provided a report on the LPN refresher training that was held on April 4<sup>th</sup> in PennDOT District 12-0.

Ryan noted the participants included several of the PennDOT Program Center staff, PennDOT District personnel, county planners, and SPC staff. The refresher build on previous trainings on the topic. Ryan reviewed the content of the training, noting it was a good opportunity for LPN website users to suggest improvements and upgrades in the system. Angela Saunders and Ryan both agreed that the best part of the session was the opportunity to talk about the LPN process leading into the next TIP update. Kevin McCullough agreed and added that the session gave the developers an opportunity to hear some suggestions from the users. Chuck DiPietro asked if the planning department participants to comment on the session. Both Kelly Shroads and Chris Bova responded that the session was useful. Chuck DiPietro noted that perhaps the other Districts would be interested in hosting the something similar. Ryan noted that the Program Center staff is willing to conduct additional sessions if the individual Districts request it. Ryan noted that the session on April 4<sup>th</sup> was requested and organized by District 12-0 staff.

e.) Other

Art Cappella notified members of the TTC that the Fayette County Commissioners are looking for additional funds for the Bruceton Road Project in Henry Clay Township. The roadway is in dire need of repair, and it is expected to see a substantial increase in traffic with the casinos opening at Nemacolin Woodlands Resort, as well as expansion in Marcellus Shale exploration. Chuck DiPietro asked Art to please forward information about this project to SPC and PennDOT District 12-0.

f.) Next Meeting May 17<sup>th</sup>

Chuck DiPietro stated that he is looking for meeting space for the May, June, and July TTC meetings. After some discussion it appeared that District 11-0 could accommodate the meetings either at the Heidelberg Fire Hall or at the District Office. Chuck stated that SPC will work with Dan's staff to schedule the meeting dates and locations.

g.) Next Commission Meeting - June 25<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.