

Meeting Minutes for October 14th, 2010
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting
Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

Attendees:

- Bernie Rossman, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Commission
- Jeff Raykes, Indiana County Planning Department
- Pat Hassett, Pittsburgh Department of Public Works
- Brian Lawrence, Westmoreland County Planning Department*
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office
- Matt Smoker, FHWA
- Dave Cook, PennDOT District 10-0
- Doug Dupnock, PennDOT District 10-0
- Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0
- Jeff Skalican, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stacy Rabatin, PennDOT District 12-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Edmund Beidle, PennDOT District 12-0
- Cristin Lundy, PennDOT District 12-0
- Ed Typanski, Port Authority
- Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Sara Walfoort, SPC Staff
- Karen Franks, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff

- (Indicates Voting Member)

* Indicates participation via conference call

1. September 16th, 2010 TTC Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)

Chuck DiPietro called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The September 16th, 2010 meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. FHWA/PennDOT Central Office Reports

a.) Summary PCTI Round 2 Candidates (Attachment B)

Kevin McCullough reviewed Attachment B, which summarized the PCTI Applications received from the SPC region. The region submitted 52 project applications that requested a total of \$44,560,711 in PCTI funding. In this second round of PCTI funding only \$24 million will be available statewide for the first two years of the TIP. Kevin reported that there have been over 230 applications received on a wide range of projects submitted to the program. A committee of diverse PennDOT Central Office personnel and other state agencies will be conducting the evaluation and ranking of the project candidates with input from the districts and planning partners. A key component to the evaluation will be the eligibility and constructability of the project. The Districts are providing input in the form of a feasibility and constructability analysis because they have experience with managing these types of projects and have experience with aspects that may result in delayed delivery. Kevin noted that he has seen some pretty interesting planning study proposals with reasonable costs associated with them. Kevin hopes that there will be an announcement in December as to which applications have been selected.

b.) PennDOT Statewide Planning Partner Meeting – “Transportation in Crisis”

Kevin McCullough reported that the PennDOT Planning Partners Meeting will be held on October 18th through 20th in Grantville, PA. Kevin noted that the three days of meetings and presentations include a mix of the PennDOT Central Office personnel, PennDOT Districts, MPOs/RPOs, and FHWA personnel. Chuck DiPietro highlighted the anticipated agenda for the three days beginning with separate PennDOT Central Office/District sessions and MPO/RPO session in the afternoon of the 18th. Chuck noted that on the second day some interesting sessions will be held on impacts of Marcellus Shale Gas Drilling, Linking Planning and NEPA, MPO/RPO Presentations and Future Challenges and Opportunities. Chuck explained that the third day includes remarks by Renee Sigel of FHWA, Jack Basso of AASHTO, and PA Secretary of Transportation Allen Biehler. Chuck noted he hopes to learn more about the STC’s TAC Local

(Attachment A)

Infrastructure Needs Study. Chuck stated that he expects to share the highlights and some materials from the conference at the next TTC meeting.

c.) Linking Planning and NEPA Status Report (Attachment C)

Chuck DiPietro pointed to three newsletters (Attachment C) related to the PennDOT initiative to link planning and NEPA called “The Link.” Chuck stated that the newsletters provide weekly communication regarding the Linking Planning and NEPA initiative. Kevin McCullough noted that with this initiative, Central Office is focusing now on the electronic screening forms. The goal is to have a demo of the electronic screening forms next week at the annual Statewide Planning Partners Meeting. Chuck DiPietro noted that a recent webinar was held with planning partners around the state to get a preview of the screening form development. Kevin expects that the next step will be to begin planning the work sessions held in the Districts regarding the implementation of the Linking Planning and NEPA process. Chuck DiPietro noted that these work sessions will include District staff, MPO staff, County Planning/City of Pittsburgh staff, and TMAs. Chuck acknowledged that the sessions are critical to determining how the process will work by region. Kevin noted that the statewide Linking Planning and NEPA process allows administrative flexibility and opportunities for regional customization of the process. Kevin expects that more formalized roles will emerge after the work sessions. Chuck noted that Central Office is working to establish some preliminary guidance on the process, or rules of engagement, to assist discussions at the Planning Partners Meeting.

Kevin McCullough stated that one challenge has been integrating the screening forms with the STC outreach documentation. It seems to make sense to integrate these two forms of documentation, however in development it is proving difficult to integrate. Chuck acknowledged that, considering the realistic financial crisis, there has been concern among many statewide partners about these forms being misinterpreted by the public as a call for projects.

Matt Smoker noted that one of the products to come out of this initiative has been the new PennDOT Design Manual 1 and 1A. FHWA has recently reviewed these new design manuals and they are available on PennDOT's website. Matt noted that even with the upcoming change in administration, key components of the Linking Planning and NEPA process are embedded in the design manuals and will not be changing.

Dave Cook asked if there was also a new PennDOT manual on preparing long range plans. Chuck DiPietro responded that PennDOT, as part of the Linking Planning and NEPA initiative, has released a new guidance document for preparing long range plans.

d.) 2011-2014 STIP/TIP/Air Quality Conformity Documentation – Planning Process and

Observations. (Attachment D)

Matt Smoker reported that FHWA has approved the STIP package including all the regional TIPs. Along with the approval of the STIP, FHWA issues a “Planning Finding,” which offers observations and recommendations to the planning process. Matt pointed to the Finding (Attachment D) and noted that these are recommendations to the state DOT, but MPOs can also be proactive in utilizing the recommendations. Matt noted that one of the recommendations to the state was better CMAQ program administration, such as the measures that have been put in place over the last two cycles by SPC. Chuck DiPietro noted that the TTC should be aware of the need for enhancement in the areas spelled out by the Planning Finding prior to next TIP cycle.

e.) FHWA PA Division, Program Development Team Updated Assignments
(Attachment E)

Matt Smoker reviewed Attachment E noting that Keith Lynch is the new Director of Program Development and that the team is now fully staffed. Matt noted that he is the FHWA staff person assigned to SPC for planning and will also be the environmental contact for Districts 11-0 and 12-0. Ross Manton is the environmental advisor for District 10-0.

f.) Governor’s 2011-2012 Draft Capital Budget List of Highway and Bridge Projects

Kevin McCullough explained the background of Capital Budget Authority, which is required for a project prior to the expenditure of state funds. Periodically, the Governor calls for a list of projects from PennDOT that need Capital Budget Authority in order to submit a project list to the State legislature for approval. Central Office always submits all projects on the current STIP. The concern that a project may lack capital budget authority pertains primarily to local bridge projects that will utilize state funds. Kevin stated that in the past some projects have been delayed due to lack of capital budget authority. Karen Franks noted that there are two Westmoreland County Bridges that need to be tracked for capital budget authority: the Beatty Bridge and the Baldrige Bridge. Stacey Rabatin replied that Beatty Bridge has Capital Budget Authority and Baldrige was submitted for approval. Karen Franks asked where to go to find the approved list of projects with Capital Budget Authority. Both Kevin and Stacey acknowledged that it is easier to just search on an individual project basis rather than work with the entire list. Kevin made the distinction that obtaining Capital Budget Authority is just one of many checks a project must satisfy before expending state funds, it does not of itself provide state funding to a project.

g.) PennDOT’s Website link for new information on the 2011-2014 TIP (Attachment F)

(Attachment A)

Kevin pointed to the web link in Attachment F that accesses that new TIP visualization tool using Google Maps as the base. Karen Franks noted that SPC TIP web page that provides the TIP information will likely soon link to this site. Kevin noted this is another way to get TIP information out using a familiar visualization tool in Google maps. Chuck DiPietro noted also related to TIP information that the project monitoring workgroup involving several MPO representatives and Central Office expects to return to continuing work on this initiative by the end of the year to provide even more project tracking information.

h. PennDOT Webinar on Airport Hazard Training (Handout 1)

Sara Walfoort summarized Handout 1, which explained the upcoming webinar on Airport Hazard Zoning Ordinances. The webinar is hosted by the PennDOT Bureau of Aviation and will be held on October 27th. The webinar is intended to assist municipalities in the development of an effective airport zoning ordinance. Airport zoning requirements and available tools will be the focus of the webinar.

g. Other

Matt Smoker reported that the announcement of the TIGER 2 grant awardees is expected at the end of October. Matt also noted that the administration is pushing a \$50 billion proposal called “Three Rs” (Rails, Runways, and Roads) that they hope will initiate reauthorization discussions.

Kevin McCullough noted that over \$200 million on 96 local bridge projects will be let or programmed by the end of the year including bridge replacements and rehabilitations.

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 G and Handout 2)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 pointed to the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 10-0 had one amendment request this month. The amendment was adding the Kiski Railroad Logansport Spur Project to the TIP. Kevin explained that this project’s administration has not yet been fully resolved. Kevin stated we are adding the project to the TIP in case the issues are resolved and the project moves.

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 H & Handout 3)

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

- Route 51, Section B29 – Removal from the TIP. Rob explained that there were concerns during TIP development that this project would not be let prior to the end of the fiscal year, therefore it was placed on the 2011 TIP. The project was bid and funds obligated in the previous TIP.
- Route 30, Five Points intersection – addition of earmark funds to construction phase.
- Duquesne Fly-over Bridges – addition of earmark funds to cover extra right-of-way costs.
- Osbourne Borough RR crossing – Adding earmark funds to initiate a study phase at the railroad crossing location in Osbourne Borough.
- Camp Meeting Road Bridge – four amendments swapping funds from one bridge to another on the same route due to the fact that repairs to the intended bridge removed it from SD status.
- Project Management Services – switching MPMS number on the project management service project.

The administrative actions were all straight forward and there were no questions. Rob made a note on the Route 19 project the bids came in high because the District required more expensive accelerated concrete provisions that were not originally in the project scope.

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 I)

Stacy Rabatin of PennDOT District 12-0 pointed to the administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 12-0 had no amendments this month. The administrative actions were all straight forward and there were no questions. Administrative actions required approval by the TTC due to the dollar threshold exceeded.

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

5. Business/Status Reports

a.) Regional Signal Program

Chuck DiPietro noted that project proposal evaluation is underway for the 29 submissions to round two of SPCs signal program. The project selection committee meets on October 18th. Chuck noted that we are also working through consultant selection procedures to hire a consultant to support round two activities of the program. Consultant interviews are scheduled for November 3rd. Chuck noted he anticipates a full report at next month's TTC meeting with regard to the Regional Signal Program.

b.) October 5th Freight Forum

Sara Walfoort reviewed the proceedings of the SPC Freight Forum, which met on October 5th. Sara stated that there was a lot of discussion about the freight elements of the Long Range Plan update. Sara noted that the regional needs are more likely a group of specific locations that need upgraded. The forum also included a presentation on the Regional Operations Plan and discussion of freight integration.

c.) October 12th ATIC Accessible Transportation Forum – HSCTP update

Tom Klevan reviewed the background of ATWIC, which is the local forum that administers two programs in the urban areas of the region: the New Freedoms Program and Jobs Access Reverse Commute Program. Tom explained that the two programs administer approximately \$2.5 million in federal funding to assist low-income residents and disabled residents with transportation options. Tom reviewed the October 12th stakeholder forum that was held as a kick-off to the update of the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan (HSCTP). The HSCTP is a federally required plan that administers the funds for these two programs. Tom noted the process collects data in different ways on where people live and where they need to go as an input into the process of determining which projects should be funded through the HSCTP.

d.) October 13th Pedestrian/Bicycle Committee

Sara Walfoort provided a brief recap of the recent Pedestrian/Bicycle Committee. At the committee meeting, PennDOT District 11-0 presented the status of the design for the West Carson Street Viaduct project. West Carson Street is one of the routes utilized by cyclists to access downtown from west and southwest of the city. The committee responded favorably to the pedestrian and bicycle aspects of the design and offered design considerations in some locations. Sara thanked PennDOT District 11-0 for attending the committee meeting and providing an update on the project.

Sara reported on other topics discussed at the meeting including the second round of the PCTI funding, Active Allegheny status report, bike count program status report, the Regional Operations Plan development, and various trail development reports. Sara

(Attachment A)

noted that the DCNR trail funding grants are going to be announced today. Sara also reminded the TTC of the upcoming regional trail symposium to be held on October 22 at the Regional Learning Center in Cranberry.

e.) Operations and Safety Committee Meeting, October 19th

Chuck DiPietro reminded everyone of the upcoming Operations and Safety Committee Meeting scheduled for October 19th. Chuck noted the meeting will continue to work on the development of the Regional Operations Plan. Chuck noted some exciting potential synergy between the Carnegie Mellon University Traffic 21 research and some elements of the ROP.

f.) Transit Operators Committee, October 20th

Tom Klevan reviewed the agenda for the upcoming Transit Operators Committee scheduled for October 20th. The agenda includes a discussion on transit service integration in Washington County and a related PennDOT technical assistance grant, the updated transit report cards, transit TIP amendments and administrative actions, the transit workgroup for the Long Range Plan update, a demonstration of a regional transit route finding software, and a presentation on the SPC Transit Oriented Development workbook. Tom noted that the TIP amendments will include a major amendment by the Port Authority for the purchase of buses and an amendment for funding a study of bus rapid transit from Oakland to Downtown. Tom noted that the transit workgroup for the update of the long-range Plan update will be coordinating heavily through a wiki-style website for collaboration.

Next Transportation Technical Committee – November 18th

Next Commission Meeting – October 25th and December 13th

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.