

**Meeting Minutes for September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011**  
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting  
Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

Attendees:

- Lynn Heckman, Allegheny County Economic Development
- Bernie Rossman, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission
- Tammy Frank, Beaver County
- Joel McKay, Butler County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Department
- Kelly Shroads, Greene County Planning Department
- Amy McKinney Lawrence County Planning Department
- William Deguffroy, Indiana County Office of Planning and Development
- Pat Hassett, Pittsburgh Department of Public Works
- Jeff Leithauser, Washington County Planning Commission
- Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning Department
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office
- Matt Smoker, FHWA
- Brian Allen, PennDOT District 10-0
- Dave Cook, PennDOT District 10-0
- Tim Jablunovsky, PennDOT District 10-0
- Dan Cessna, PennDOT District 11-0
- Cheryl Moon-Sirianni, PennDOT District 11-0
- Victor Defazio, PennDOT District 11-0
- Joe Szczur, PennDOT District 12-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association\*
- Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- David Totten, SPC Staff
- Karen Franks, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
  
- (Indicates Voting Member)
- \* via phone

**1. July 14, 2011 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 July 14<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

**2. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

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

a.) Surface Transportation Reauthorization (Handout 1)

Matt Smoker gave an update on the legislative status of the efforts to extend SAFETEA-LU. Matt reported that action has taken place in the House of Representatives on an extension through the end of March and the Senate is expected to pass a similar measure, possibly this week. Matt noted that also the annual appropriation bill still needs to be passed. Matt added that progress on the transportation reauthorization has two different proposals in development. One proposal coming out of the House is for a five to six year bill that amounts to a 30 % cut in federal funds. Another proposal coming out of the Senate is a two-year extension, with a \$12 billion shortfall.

Chuck DiPietro emphasized concern about the direction the federal activities noting that the House six month extension of SAFETEA-LU reduces the highway trust fund to its lowest levels ever.

Kevin McCullough asked if there is any collaboration on the recent stimulus proposals made by the president and the reauthorization proposals. Matt Smoker noted that the division level administrators are meeting this week to discuss the administration's stimulus proposal.

b.) Governor's Transportation Funding Advisory Commission (TFAC)

Kevin McCullough discussed the status of the Transportation Funding Advisory Commission recommendations. Kevin noted that a spending proposal scenario called the "Decade of Investment" is part of the TFAC proposal delivery strategy. Kevin explained that there has been no official statement coming out of the Governor's office on the TFAC recommendations. The Program Center is working to map the Decade of Investment projects and provide information on the plan to legislators. Kevin noted that

hopefully the TFAC findings recommendations will gain some traction in the upcoming legislative session. Dan Cessna asked if the Secretary has a feel for when the Governor might come out with an announcement. Dan noted that in his meetings with legislative members they are waiting for the Governor to take the lead on action on the recommendations. Kevin concurred that everyone is looking to the Governor for action.

- All the TFAC agendas, handouts, minutes, and final report are available at <http://www.tfac.pa.gov/>.

c.) August 25<sup>th</sup> STC Public Hearings

The State Transportation Commission's public testimony session for the 2013 Twelve Year Program was held on August 25<sup>th</sup> at the Marriot in Cranberry Township. Chuck DiPietro provided an overview of the meeting saying that there were a lot of positive interactions between the testifiers and the STC members. Chuck noted that most presenters expressed support for implementation of the TFAC recommendations. Chuck noted that the session included testimony from other regions in western PA including Northwest PA Regional Planning Commission, Erie County, and Mercer County. SPC also presented testimony (State of the Region; 2040 Plan ties to TFAC; Support for Advancing TFAC Recommendations). Chuck noted that there was a visible lack of transit presenters.

Dan Cessna noted that SPC's presentation at the STC hearing did a good job of summarizing the funding crisis and the presentation had an impact with the Commission. Lynn Heckman noted that while the speakers were interesting, she believes overall there is little outside interest in these hearings.

d.) TIGER III funds

Matt Smoker noted some facts about the US DOT TIGER Grants:

- USDOT is authorized to award \$527 million in TIGER Discretionary Grants.
- The final applications are due in October 31; Pre-applications due October 3
- There is no planning money available in this round of TIGER funding.
- Chuck DiPietro highlighted some of the eligibility requirements for the grants.

e.) Scenic Byways (Handout 2)

Chuck DiPietro pointed to Handout 2 pertaining to the recent national Scenic Byways Program fiscal year 2011 grand announcements. A total of 123 projects have been selected and the amounts funded for each project can be found at <http://bywaysonline.org/news/2011/3215>.

**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 B and Handout 3)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 reviewed the amendment requests and administrative actions. District 10-0 had one amendment request to the current TIP.

- Myoma Bridge #1 – adding the construction phase of the project to 3013 in the amount of \$6,365,400
- Dave highlighted one administrative action - Dime Road Bridge, advancing construction two years early to address the seriously deficient bridge.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 10-0 administrative action requests to the TIP.

b.) PennDOT District 11-0 (Attachment C & Handout 4)

Cheryl Moon-Sirianni of PennDOT District 11-0 reviewed the amendments and administrative actions. District 11-0 had two amendment requests:

- Rainbow Run Bridge – Add \$330,000 to construction phase of the project.
- Fifth Ave Sidewalk – add accrued unbilled costs in 2011.

Cheryl noted the prevalence of slides that occurred in District 11-0 so far this year and the fact that District 11-0 received additional funding for the slides on federal eligible roadways. Cheryl does not expect any more additional funds from state emergency sources.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 11-0 amendment requests and administrative action requests to the TIP.

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

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

- Grant Street 40 – add construction phase to the TIP in 2011
- Pigeon Creek Bridge – add construction phase of the project to the current TIP

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

d.) Recap of August 17<sup>th</sup> electronic actions (Attachment E)

Karen Franks reviewed the TIP amendments and administrative actions that were approved via the electronic procedures in August.

e.) Local Project Delivery

Chuck DiPietro recapped a meeting that took place directly prior to the TTC meeting on the local project delivery process. PennDOT Central Office has asked each of the Districts to review the local project delivery. Chuck applauded Central Office for the initiative on local project delivery. Chuck noted that the session produced a very productive discussion that generated a lot of good feedback. Chuck noted that the discussions on this topic will continue in each District at the end of September as part of the District project development work groups. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni stated that local project delivery has direct impacts into the TIP and the design and construction schedules. She added that Central Office and the Districts are working to provide better solutions and assistance to locals regarding project delivery. Cheryl noted that if the TFAC funding recommendations becomes a reality there is likely to be funding for local projects in some form through the Decade of Investment program of projects.

Jeff Leithauser asked if the consultants involved in local projects have been involved in this initiative regarding local project delivery. Brian Allen noted that the consulting industry is a part of the statewide initiative through ACEC. It was acknowledged that some of the smaller firms doing municipal work may not be members of ACEC. Angela Saunders noted that District 12-0 will be inviting some of the local project consultants to their local project District meeting. Chuck DiPietro added that Cheryl Moon-Sirianni will be distributing the notes from today's meeting to all participants.

## 5. 2013 – 2016 TIP Update & LPN Response (Attachment F)

### a). CMAQ: Call for Projects and Evaluation Committee

Chuck Imbrogno reported on the activities going on related to the CMAQ Program that were displayed in Attachment F:

- The CMAQ application period is currently open and the deadline is October 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- The dates of the CMAQ Evaluation Committee meetings are set and members have been notified of these firm dates.
- An information session in conjunction with Sustainable Pittsburgh will be held on September 19<sup>th</sup> on the 31<sup>st</sup> floor of the Regional Enterprise Tower. Chuck Imbrogno noted that the session is geared as an orientation to new applicants that may have questions about the application process. Chuck noted that the session will also be available as a webinar on the SPC website.

Lynn Heckman stated that the CMAQ program is filled with carry over projects for the next two years and the first available place to slot new projects is likely in 2015, which limits the feasibility of any funding for new projects. Lynn stated that it is difficult for new project applicants to have ready-to-go projects, yet have to wait three years until funding becomes available. Lynn suggested that applicants be made aware of this situation. Jeff Leithauser and Lucinda Beattie made similar comments, as they concurred with Lynn. Chuck Imbrogno commented that the first two years of the CMAQ program are booked with the first available funding for new CMAQ projects in 2015 and that the program is expecting less funds in the future, which may exacerbate this carryover problem.

### b). STP Urban Update

Karen Franks reviewed the status of the STP Urban TIP update work. She noted that parallel work to identify the carry over projects and amounts is ongoing and there should be a much clearer picture of the STP Urban funds by the next TIP work sessions in the Districts, the last week of September.

### c). PPP upcoming meetings (Handout 5)

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the preliminary calendar (Handout 5) and draft agenda for the upcoming PPP meetings. Matt noted that the preliminary content includes topics such as: a status report of the TIP development, latest on TFAC recommendations, recap of the STC hearing, Linking Planning and NEPA screening forms primer, Federal outlook (SAFETEA-LU/Reauthorization), and updates from our regions transit properties.

(Attachment A)

Matt asked for TTC feedback on the design of the upcoming PPP meetings. Lynn Heckman offered her preference for afternoon meetings versus evening meetings. Matt noted that at this point times have not been established, but that certain panels work better in the evening. Joe Szczur noted that more communication may be required to increase attendance at the PPP meetings. Matt noted that the last few PPP meetings have had the same message, funding is down, and our focus must first be on asset management.

Chuck DiPietro had two suggestions for the PPP meeting content.

- Give the PPPs a realistic picture of the draft TIP so that they can see the funding shortfalls and the tough project decisions that will be required to put together the program. Chuck noted that it might help the PPPs to see the Draft TIP as an evolving program of projects related to the fiscal constraint.
- Educate the public on the critical need to act on the TFAC recommendations now. Chuck noted that perhaps advocacy groups like the Keystone Coalition could be invited to participate.

d). LPN/screening forms update (Attachment G)

Chuck DiPietro pointed to Attachment G and noted the dates of the training webinars on the LPN screening forms. Angela Saunders asked if anyone is checking the level 2 forms that are submitted for new projects being added to the current TIP. Kevin McCullough responded that he is not sure about this check of level 2 forms. Ryan Gordon noted that he and Karen Franks have initiated and assisted on several level 2 forms for local projects being added to the current TIP as amendments.

e). District LPN/TIP Update

Chuck reviewed the schedule and anticipated content for the upcoming District work sessions.

\*District 10-0 – September 29th, 1PM at 10-0

\*District 11-0 – September 28th, 1PM at SPC

\*District 12-0 – September 27th, 9:30AM at 12-0

Chuck noted that the upcoming sessions will again provide an update on carryover projects (including local projects), continued monitoring of new PE phase projects, continued local project discussion, and, as available, an update on the TFAC/Decade of Investment. Chuck DiPietro suggested that one of the upcoming rounds of work sessions include a presentation, by Chuck Imbrogno, on the air quality conformity process and the classification of project codes and the exempt nonexempt status. Discussion followed that this air quality primer may be more effective as an SPC WebEx, or as a linked video conference with the three Districts and Central Office.

## 6. Other Business

a). September 14<sup>th</sup> TOC

Tom Klevan and David Totten reviewed the proceedings of the recent Transit Operators Committee. The meeting included:

- Current TIP Amendments
- Updates on the Draft TIP
- Regional Park and Ride meeting preparation
- Presentation on the Rochester Roundabout. Tom Klevan emphasized that the Rochester Roundabout (including its project delivery process) is really a model PCTI project. Tom pointed to the extensive transit agency and District collaboration on the project. Dan Cessna noted that the Beaver County Regional Transit Authority was a model sponsor, a key to the delivery success.
- Presentation and discussion lead by Brian Wall from Central Office Program Center on the Transit elements of the Linking Planning and NEPA screening forms. Tom noted that it was a good discussion on the differences of the transit process and Brian received a lot of productive and timely feedback. Other opportunities to discuss the process with the transit interests were recommended. Tom noted that there was also discussion of the transit asset management capital planning tool.
- A presentation on the TIRIMISU transit bus information application.

Kevin McCullough noted that the deadline on the draft transit TIP has been moved up so it can provide information on the flexed projects sooner. These projects have an impact on the Highway TIP component. In the past, a late discovery of a flex project caused issues. Work continues to avoid this with the 2013 TIP update.

- b.) Commission – September 26th & October 24th
- c.) Operations & Safety Committee – September 20th
- d.) Freight Forum – October 4th
- e.) Ped/Bike Committee – October 12th (Handout 6)
- f.) Next TTC – October 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.