

Meeting Minutes for July 19, 2012
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting
Koppers Building
Downtown Pittsburgh

Attendees:

- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Dept of Public Works
- James Camp, Beaver County
- Tammy Frank, Beaver County
- Joel MacKay, Butler County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County
- Kelly Shroads, Greene County
- Jeff Grim, Indiana County
- Amy McKinney, 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
- Jessica Rizzilli, PennDOT District 10-0
- H. Dan Cessna, PennDOT District 11-0
- Cheryl Moon-Sirianni, PennDOT District 11-0
- Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stephanie Spang, PennDOT District 11-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Jeremy Shaneyfelt, PennDOT District 12-0
- Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Management Association
- Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
- Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Sara Walfoort, SPC Staff
- Doug Smith, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- Dave Totten, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
- Darin Alviano, SPC Staff
- (Indicates Voting Member)

1. June 20th, 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 June meeting minutes were approved with the addition of one item provided by Art Cappella. Art wanted the minutes to reflect his question regarding the handling of projects that received comments during the comment period for the draft TIP to be reflected in the minutes.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. FHWA/PennDOT Central Office Reports

a.) Federal & State Update (Attachment B, Handout 1 & Handout 2)

Reviewing Handout 1, Matt Smoker discussed the recent passage of a new transportation authorization law named Moving Ahead for the 21st Century (MAP-21). Chuck DiPietro noted that there have been several good summaries of the new law including some provided in the agenda package. Matt Smoker noted that the new law passed with bipartisan support and extends funding for federal transportation for 27 months, it also extends the gas tax and the highway trust fund till 2016. It funds surface transportation programs at over \$105 billion for fiscal 2013 and 2014. Matt noted the overall funding is the same as SAFETEA-LU in 2013 and increased in 2014 for inflation. Matt noted that the one of the main differences in this law is the consolidation of programs, going from over 100 in SAFETEA-LU to 18 in MAP-21. Matt noted that under MAP-21 there will be only six core highway formula programs:

- National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)
- Surface Transportation Program (STP)
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
- Railway-Highway Crossings (set-aside from HSIP)
- Metropolitan Planning

Matt Smoker noted that CMAQ is remaining a program, however many of the discretionary programs in SAFETEA-LU will be discontinued under MAP-21. Matt noted that a new program entitled Transportation Alternatives (TA) has been created with funding derived from the NHPP, STP, HSIP, CMAQ and Metropolitan Planning programs, encompassing most activities funded under SAFETEA-LU in the Transportation Enhancements, Recreational Trails, and Safe Routes to School programs.

Matt stated that MAP-21 does not include the current TIGER grant program, but similar type projects will likely be funded through the new Projects of National and Regional Significance Program.

Matt Smoker explained that MAP-21 requires performance measures for pavement conditions and performance for the Interstate and NHS, bridge conditions, injuries and fatalities, traffic congestion, on-road mobile source emissions, and freight movement on the Interstate System. States (and MPOs, where applicable) will set performance targets in support of those measures, and State and metropolitan plans will describe how program and project selection will help achieve the targets.

Matt Smoker noted that after a lot of debate in earlier versions of the bill, there was no change to the population thresholds for MPOs. Matt stated that MPOs will have to develop performance targets in their LRPs and demonstrate in the TIP how the project mix is progressing to achieve the performance targets. Other performance targets are included in MAP-21 for the freight system.

Matt stated that FHWA will continue to put out new information via its MAP-21 website.

Sara Walfoort had some initial questions in the areas of bicycle planning and freight planning. Matt responded that FHWA is putting together both a more detailed PowerPoint presentation and a question and answer document. Matt noted that if anyone has questions about MAP-21 to submit them to him and he will forward them to FHWA headquarters.

Chuck DiPietro noted that MAP-21 is generally consistent with the overall level of funding assumptions made in June 2011 by the Statewide Financial Guidance Work Group as the basis for the recent 2013-2016 TIP update. Matt Smoker concurred with Chuck that assumptions were consistent. Chuck noted that with the act only lasting two years, it will not provide any clear direction to the next Statewide Financial Guidance Work Group when they meet late winter/early spring of 2013 in preparation of the fiscal guidance for the next TIP update (2015-2018).

Kevin McCullough noted that PennDOT will continue to support Enhancement/Transportation Alternative projects, but meeting some of the required national performance measures may, in the extreme, force PennDOT to opt out of some of the Transportation Alternatives Program funds.

Kevin noted there will be a lot of data file design work behind the scenes with FHWA and the Planning Partners to update funding codes to be in compliance with MAP-21. TTC members may see some changes in coding on future fiscal constraint charts.

Sara Walfoort asked if there was an immediate deadline associated with freight priorities and the identification of multi-modal connectors. Kevin noted that he is not aware of any immediate significant deadlines, noting that at this point everyone is still digesting the summaries of the law.

Cheryl Moon-Sirianni questioned if there may be issues with starting some of the currently approved CMAQ projects since there may have been changes in CMAQ eligibility criteria. Matt Smoker noted he does not believe there will be any issues with the current CMAQ projects or process in the SPC region. As FHWA headquarters works out the details in MAP-21, he will keep everyone updated through TTC reports.

Kevin McCullough noted that one of the programs with altered eligibility is the Transportation Alternatives Program. The old Transportation Enhancements Program had eligibility for some project types that were not continued under MAP-21. Kevin mentioned that museums are no longer eligible for federal transportation funds under the new Transportation Alternatives program. Matt Smoker noted that there is an approximate 30% overall cut in funding going towards these types of projects under MAP-21. Kevin highlighted that the funding cut makes it even more important to clear out the old TE projects to improve the region's position to compete for and capture new TA funding.

Dave Cook asked a question pertaining to projects on the National Highway Performance System. Matt Smoker added that the targets and performance measures will likely be established a system wide basis without specific project measures. Kevin McCullough added that there are a lot of unanswered questions regarding the new performance based federal program, such as are the targets and goals specific to PA or will we be competing with other states.

Pat Hasset requested a resource that would show National Highway System in Pittsburgh. Matt Smoker noted that he could supply Pat with the link to the online map of the NHS. Pat asked if SPC has a role in identifying this system. Chuck DiPietro noted that periodically SPC is consulted, and provides suggested revisions of the NHS to FHWA.

b). Introduction to Planning and Programming

Kevin McCullough conducted the third in a series of professional development trainings on planning and programming. The 30 minute training module focused on financing tools. The training covered the following financial tools and strategies:

- Advance Construct Strategy
- Donation Credits
- Toll Credits
- State Infrastructure Bank

Kevin noted that these are all nontraditional methods for financing transportation improvement projects and that they have become increasingly popular over the last ten years. PennDOT utilizes all four of these tools and strategies on projects throughout the state.

Chuck DiPietro added that Kevin will continue doing some training modules on various topics related to transportation funding on future TTC agendas. Kevin noted that planning and programming will be the next topic.

c). PennDOT Strategic Plan (Attachment C)

Kevin McCullough reviewed Attachment C on the PennDOT Strategic Plan.

d). TIGER 2012 Awards

Chuck DiPietro stated that 47 transportation projects in 34 states and the District of Columbia will receive a total of almost \$500 million from the U.S. Department of Transportation's TIGER 2012 program. Chuck noted that the TIGER program is a highly competitive program that looks to fund innovative projects that are not able to be funded through other federal programs. Chuck noted that one project in the region was selected: the East Liberty Transit Center.

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 D & Handout 3)

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

- Eddyville Bridge #2 – Add the project and PE phase for \$375,000 to the current TIP.

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

b.) PennDOT District 11-0 (Attachment E and Handout 4)

Chuck DiPietro first directed attention to the new TIGER funded project, the East Liberty Transit Center. Pat Hassett noted that he became aware of this project just recently and does not have all of the details on the project. Pat reported that a recent FTA conference call about the project generated an FTA concern that the project was not yet on the TIP and that this could be an immediate hold up; that's why there is a request to add it to the TIP is before the TTC this month. Pat stated that now there is a larger concern with the City becoming a qualified FTA grantee. Chuck DiPietro suggested that given the circumstances, the issue be brought up at the next TOC meeting in September. Chuck stated that will allow time for the grantee status to be clarified and for more details of the project to be shared.

Chuck DiPietro noted that the exempt or non-exempt status for the project must be determined. Chuck Imbrogno stated that he does not have a clear description of what exactly is to be funded by the TIGER grant and at this point cannot make an air quality conformity determination. Pat Hassett stated that Chuck Imbrogno should talk with Pat Roberts at City Planning for a detailed project description. It was agreed to not include the East Liberty Transit Center project with the District 11-0 amendments and administrative action requests. Questions of scope of work, project sponsor, air quality status, and public comment check will be further screened before presenting it to the transit operators committee in September.

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

- Allegheny Reedsdale Bridge – Add project and final design phase of \$400,000 to the current TIP in 2012.
- I-376 Ramp Metering – Add project and preliminary design phase of 690,000 to current TIP in 2012.

Pat Hassett questioned the use of the city's line item for advancement of the PennDOT ramp metering project. Rob responded that this move was made to expend unobligated funds and that the city's line item remains fully funded on the new 2013-2016 TIP.

Cheryl Moon-Sirianni thanked Rob and Stephanie for their efforts in finding projects for all funds requiring obligation in 2012.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 11-0 amendment and administrative action requests to the current TIP, excluding the East Liberty Transit Center Project that was referred to the next meeting of the Transit Operators Committee (September 12th).

c.) PennDOT District 12-0 (Attachment F & Handout 5)

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:

- o Greene County Bridge #85 – Addition of \$40,000 in construction funds to the current TIP
- o Scottdale Safe Routes to School – Add project and \$182,500 of preliminary engineering funds to the current TIP.

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

5. SPC Regional Signal Program Update

Domenic D’Andrea provided a half hour presentation on the near complete round 1 of the SPC Regional Signal Program in District 11-0. The presentation also focused on the Turtle Creek Valley Route 30 Corridor as a high visibility example. Domenic provided a detailed overview of the corridor and the before and after conditions. The signal upgrade projects in the corridor 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 84 to 1 on U.S. Route 30 corridor from Route 48 to the Parkway. Domenic showed videos of side-by-side before and after videos of the project. Domenic also highlighted round two of the program. Domenic indicated that, cumulatively, the benefit-cost ratio for the first cycle of the Regional Traffic Signal Program was approximately 90:1

6. Debrief of 2013 TIP Update Process (Handout 6)

Chuck DiPietro reviewed Handout 6, which provided a summary of Commission member feedback on the 2013 TIP update process and some points to consider going into the next TIP update (2015-2018). Chuck highlighted the Commissioners two main concerns of increasing

communication during the TIP update and allowing time for some changes in the Draft TIP after the public comment period prior to adoption. Chuck suggested that one strategy may be to have a work session after the end of the comment period in case any minor changes need to be made in response to public comment. Kevin noted that in some regions of the state there is an additional work session with MPO or RPO and PennDOT, following the close of the public comment period.

Chuck suggested that utilizing the PennDOT level 1 screening form can be an option to formally bring some of the candidate projects discussed/submitted during the comment period into the District Project Development Work Groups during the 2015 update work sessions.

Chuck noted that in order to more completely implement the LPN pre-TIP activities, TIP work sessions with the District Project Development Work Groups will have to be held much earlier in the TIP development process and involve significant LPN screening form work. Kevin McCullough agreed, noted that starting the work sessions earlier last TIP update was a good development for the 2013 update and that earlier work sessions for the 2015 TIP update will further assist implementing the LPN aspects of the TIP development.

7. Other Business

a.) Urban Boundaries and Functional Classification updates: Scheduling Individual County Meetings

Doug Smith explained the background on the urban boundaries and functional class updates. The last time these boundaries were adjusted following the 2000 census, Doug met individually with each county followed by a District-wide meeting with PennDOT. Doug proposed utilizing the same approach this time around in updating the boundaries utilizing the 2010 census outputs. Chuck DiPietro emphasized that county planning staff participation in this process is critical. Doug asked the county planning staff in attendance to coordinate with him following the TTC meeting to schedule a work session.

Doug stated that District work sessions will also be scheduled, to follow at the conclusion of the individual county planning department meetings.

b.) Traffic Incident Management Updated

Doug Smith provided a report on the SPC Regional Traffic Incident Management Steering Committee. Doug explained that SPC has taken the lead in establishing a Regional Steering Committee for TIM. The Committee has had several meetings and will next be meeting on July 25th. Doug noted one of the challenges is filling vacant and critical State Police representation on the Committee. Doug noted that a local TIM team has been established in the Warrendale area working with first responders on education

and trainings. This local TIM team is having an upcoming training on procedures with cable medium barrier. Doug noted that SPC is closely watching the development of the statewide TIM guidance.

c.) Upcoming Commute-Info Meetings

Chuck DiPietro pointed to the date of the next Commute-Info Program meeting, which is scheduled for September 13th.

d.) Ped-Bike Meeting - August 8th

e.) Next TOC Meeting – September 12th at Koppers Building

f.) Next TTC Meeting – September 6th at Koppers Building

g.) Next Commission Meeting – September 17th at Koppers Building

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.