

Meeting Minutes for January 20th, 2011
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting
Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

Attendees:

- Lynn Heckman, Allegheny County Economic Development
- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission
- James Camp, Beaver County
- Dave Johnston, Butler County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Commission
- Amy McKinney, Lawrence County
- Pat Hassett, Pittsburgh Department of Public Works
- Patrick Roberts, Pittsburgh Department of City Planning
- 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
- Dan Cessna, PennDOT District 11-0
- Cheryl Moon Sirianni, PennDOT District 11-0
- Jeff Skalican, PennDOT District 11-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0*
- Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Association
- Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Sara Walfoort, SPC Staff
- Ken Flack, SPC Staff
- Karen Franks, SPC Staff
- Doug Smith, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- Dave Totten, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff

- (Indicates Voting Member)

* Via Conference Call

1. December 9th, 2010 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 9th, 2010 meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. FHWA/PennDOT Central Office Reports

Matt Smoker stated that the rumors at the federal level are that it could be two more years before a new transportation authorization act; however Secretary LaHood recently came out and stated that he would like to see something done this fiscal year.

a.) PennDOT Smart Transportation Quarterly – Fall 2010 (Attachment B)

Kevin McCullough reviewed the fall 2010 PennDOT Smart Transportation Quarterly (Attachment B). Kevin noted the spotlight article on the PCTI project.

b.) PCTI Implementation Status Report Round 1

Kevin stated that there is a website under development that will provide the status of PCTI projects; most of the study projects and many of the construction projects throughout the state from the first round of the program are completed. Kevin noted that there are four more round 1 PCTI projects to be let and then all the projects from the first round of PCTI in the region will be let. The Rochester Roundabout and the Ohiopyle project are among those round 1 PCTI projects still to be let.

c.) PCTI Round 2 Awards (Attachment C)

Kevin reviewed Attachment C, which was a table with information on the PCTI Round 2 awards for the region. The region was awarded seven projects in the amount of \$5,945,517; three are in Allegheny County and one in each of Armstrong, Butler, Indiana, and Washington counties. The total statewide award of PCTI Round 2 funds was \$44,390,711. SPC region award amounted to 13.3% of the statewide total awards, which was the highest in the state by planning partner region.

d.) Automated Red Light Enforcement (ARLE) Transportation Enhancement Grants Program (Attachment D)

(Attachment A)

Chuck DiPietro noted that SPC has submitted two applications to the ARLE program for funds to support the distressed communities doing signal projects through the SPC signal program, and for the LED technology component of the SPC signal program. Kevin noted that he has no update on the status of the applications to this program.

Kevin noted that the Acting Secretary of Transportation is currently Scott Christy. With the administration change at the Governor level, a nominee for the position of Secretary of Transportation has been proposed and must be confirmed by the PA Senate. Governor Corbett's nominee for Secretary of Transportation is Barry Schoch. Dan Cessna noted that Barry brings a lot of experience in the Transportation sector and has been integrally involved in the linking planning and NEPA and solutions to the transportation funding crisis. Kevin noted that Central Office is currently reviewing everything with the new Governor and the Secretary of Transportation nominee.

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 E)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 pointed to the amendments and administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 10-0 had five amendment request this month. Three of the amendments were as a result of new funds to the region in the form of the Round 2 PCTI awards. Dave reviewed the amendments:

- Putneyville Bridge – adding construction phase to the TIP.
- Freedom Road Transportation Improvement – adding construction phase to the TIP, Dave noted that the design has been done at the expense of Cranberry Township.
- Kittanning Borough Traffic Study – Project received a PCTI project, adding project to the TIP.
- Saxonburg Transportation Enhancement – Project received a PCTI award, adding project to the TIP.
- Indiana Economic Development, Phase 1 - Project received a PCTI award, adding project to the TIP.

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 F & Handout 1)

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

- PA 51/Pennsylvania Ave Bridge – add \$1.2 million in construction funds.
- SR60 –L06 – Add earmark funds to construction phase.
- District wide bridge maintenance – add \$200,000 to construction phase.
- Fairview-Scholl Rd over Hell Run – add funds to the right of way phase.
- Campbell’s Run Road – add \$1.2 million to the PE phase.
- Strip District Study – add project to the TIP (new PCTI award).
- SR 8 & Ewalt Rd – add project to the TIP (new PCTI award).
- Airport Corridor mobility – add project to TIP (new PCTI award).
- Core Area Streetscape Lawrence County – add funds to construction phase

Cheryl Moon-Sirianni thanked the sponsors of the new PCTI projects for coming to the table with design work that was already completed at the sponsor’s expense and in some cases, construction fund participation. These aspects will help to advance and deliver the projects and the District appreciates the preparation.

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 G)

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

- PA 19 I-70 to Conklin Rd – additional construction funds added to the construction phase.
- PA 51 Randall’s to Westmoreland County Line – adding project to the current TIP.
- Panhandle Trail – adding funds to construction phase from the Statewide TE line item.
- Panhandle Trail – adding funds to the construction phase from the PCTI award.

The administrative actions were all straight forward and there were no questions.

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

5. Long Range Plan Update

a.) Financial Plan Update (Attachment H and Handout 2)

Chuck DiPietro introduced the financial planning aspects of the region's long range transportation plan update. Ken Flack reviewed Attachment H and Handout 2, which were projection tables for the proposed funding through 2040. Ken noted that one key to these projections is that they are the result of the same framework and methodology that was utilized for the last long-range plan update. The resulting total revenue projection for the 30 year period is \$1 billion lower than the total projection from the last long range plan. Ken explained that the reduction in projected revenue was due to the Act 44 funds tied to the tolling of I-80 that were part of the last plans projections are not currently anticipated to exist. Ken noted that the projections were developed by applying a three percent increase for the 29 year period of the plan. Dan Cessna noted that there is a sense from the reauthorization discussions in Washington that the SAFETEA-LU funding levels may not be increased and that a three percent increase may be an overly optimistic assumption. Ken noted that this rate of increase is more conservative than the last plan. Ken noted that a new financial guidance document will be coming out in association with the 2013 TIP update; the new financial guidance will have an influence on the projections for the long-range plan. Chuck DiPietro noted that Ken has been coordinating with both Matt Smoker and Kevin McCullough in the development of these projections. Ken will be updating these tables as new financial guidance for the 2013 TIP update emerges.

b.) Asset Management/Needs Assessment

Chuck DiPietro pointed to the work being done on the asset management needs assessment for the long range transportation plan.

c.) Environmental Aspects

Chuck DiPietro reviewed some of the environmental aspects being incorporated into the long range transportation plan update. Chuck noted that the increased emphasis on these aspects is due to the initiatives at both FHWA and PennDOT Central Office to increase planning and environmental (NEPA) linkage. Chuck reviewed the environmental aspects: agency consultations, environmental inventory, a preliminary environmental screening of some of the long range plan projects, and a discussion of potential mitigation measures. Ryan noted that a section of the SPC website will be developed to assist in the agency consultations.

d.) Revisit the 2035 Project Tables

Chuck DiPietro pointed to the line item and transportation project lists from the last long range plan. Chuck stated that all of these tables will be updated as part of the long range plan update. Chuck specifically noted that the line items will be calibrated to the financial projections that Ken presented to the TTC. Chuck noted that he will be seeking TTC input on high profile projects to list. Dan Cessna asked if Interstates should be part of the project lists provided in the long range plan, considering possible duplication with the Interstate program being assembled by Central Office. Doug Smith noted that it may be necessary to show Interstate projects if it is possible that they may compete for TIP funds if the Interstate needs of the region are not met with the statewide Interstate Maintenance Program. Kevin McCullough added that an approach to include the Central Office Interstate program and a supplemental list of other Interstate projects in the region may be the way to approach it. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni noted that the Interstate program and the project list in the LRTP must be consistent and identify which projects are proposed to be funded with statewide funds versus regional TIP funds.

e.) Illustrative List (Attachment I)

Chuck DiPietro reviewed the illustrative list of projects from the last long range plan and stated that SPC staff will be seeking feedback from the TTC as well as Commission members.

f). Develop list of Draft Plan Studies

Chuck noted that in the past the LRTP has included recommendations of potential studies between plan updates. Chuck reviewed several of the studies that have been recommended in the past and some potential ideas for the 2040 long range plan. Lynn Heckman noted that she agreed with the idea for a PCTI implementation plan.

g.) Input from TOC

Dave Totten reviewed the January 19th input received on the long range plan update from the Transit Operators Committee. Dave noted the wiki-coordination site that has been used to generate discussion amongst the TOC members. David summarized that most of the discussion has centered on transit survival in the current funding climate. Chuck DiPietro noted that it is potentially a cycle of service cuts resulting in lower ridership resulting in cuts in funding that is tied to ridership numbers. Both Pat Hassett and Cheryl Moon-Sirianni brought up the possibility of doing a study of the economic impact of the cuts imposed by the Port Authority.

6. Linking Planning and NEPA (Attachments L, M, N & K)

Chuck DiPietro stated that PennDOT Central Office has been working to redefine the program and project development process in an initiative named “Linking Planning and NEPA” (LPN). The initiative has included new editions of the PennDOT Design Manuals (including DM1-A: PreTIP and TIP program Development Procedures). One aspect of the new process is the use of proposal screening forms in the project planning stage. Chuck briefly reviewed Attachment L, which presents paper versions of the screening forms. Chuck noted that these forms will be completed on an interactive web version that automates some of the data population. A discussion surfaced on the applicability of the screening forms to earmarks. Dan Cessna stated that in the past earmarks have been initiated without this type of review and it has been a problem for project delivery.

Chuck reviewed a preliminary draft schedule for the 2013 TIP development (Attachment M) to illustrate new tasks required with the new LPN process for new projects. Chuck noted that the statewide financial workgroup will be meeting in the spring to discuss the financial guidance for the 2013 TIP.

Chuck reviewed Attachment N that detailed the coordinating committees needed to carry out the LPN process. Chuck discussed the new concept of a District Project Development Workgroup and Programming Advisory Committee and the anticipated roles under the new LPN process. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni noted that the new workgroups will include a little different dynamic for example including the District Environmental Managers. Chuck proposed that after the Design Manual 1A trainings have been conducted that an LPN implementation session be held in each District including SPC staff, District staff, and county planning department staff. Dan Cessna stated that there is an opportunity to make that happen if it gets scheduled in advance. Dan agreed with Chuck that the challenge is before the Districts and SPCs to take the initiative to implement the process in individual regions. Kevin McCullough agreed with Chuck and Dan that there is not a predetermined process to be followed rather the Districts and the regions have flexibility to adapt the process to regional preferences. Kevin noted that he would like to work towards implementing a similar process for all three Districts in the SPC region.

Chuck noted that trainings are being conducted across the state. Two of the trainings are in our region: at District 12-0, Uniontown (March 1-3) and at District 11-0, Bridgeville (April 25-27). Cheryl Moon-Sirianni noted that the District 11-0’s sessions are full, but that if anyone is interested she can coordinate opening up some additional seats. Matt Smoker stated that he sat through the training recently and noted that familiarity with the design manuals are needed prior to the training. Dan Cessna noted that the PennDOT design manuals are available to anyone via the PennDOT web site.

7.) Public Participation Plan

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the activities underway to update the SPC Public Participation Plan.

Matt stated that there will be a 45-day public review period prior to the adoption of the Public Participation Plan. Matt also reviewed some of the goals and initiatives driving the update of the Public Participation Plan. The goal is to make a document that is more accessible and easier to interpret, while still maintaining legal standards. Matt stressed some new visual elements to the plan and some of the planned use of flexible meeting times and Face Book or electronic meetings. Matt thanked Matt Smoker for the review he conducted on the draft document. Sara Walfoort noted that where the public participation plan calls for library copies of documents for review they will be provided electronic copies or provided internet web address to access the electronic versions. Chuck DiPietro anticipated that request for SPC approval of the Public Participation Plan will be at the April 25th Commission meeting and that it will be in place for the public comment period on the long range plan update.

8. Business/Status Reports

a.) Transit Operators Committee

Tom Klevan provided a summary of the recent Transit Operators Committee meeting. The committee discussion included:

- Port Authority of Allegheny County's 15% cut in services in order to meet financial obligations. Tom noted that the Port Authority is stretching the funds that recently passed through the Commission to assist with operations for 18 months.
- Regional Smart Card progress report
- TIP amendments and administrative action approval
- Pilot project on regional trip planning capabilities
- New TOD Report "making the Case for Transit Oriented Development"

b.) Transportation Operations and Safety

Doug Smith reminded the TTC that the next Transportation and Operations Safety Committee meeting is scheduled for February 24th. It will primarily focus on the update of the regional operations plan.

c.) Freight Forum and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Committee Meeting

Sara Walfoort reminded the TTC that the next Freight Forum is scheduled for March 1 and the next Pedestrian and Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for March 9.

Next Transportation Technical Committee – February 17th

Next Commission Meeting – February 28th

(Attachment A)

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.