

## Meeting Minutes for August 25, 2009

### Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

#### Attendees:

- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission
- Joel MacKay, Butler County Planning Commission
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Commission
- Sara Rosiek, Fayette County Planning Commission
- Kevin Gray, Greene County Planning Commission
- Jeff Raykes, Indiana County Office of Planning and Development
- Amy McKinney, Lawrence County Planning Commission
- Jeffrey Leithauser, Washington County Planning Commission
- Bill Piper, Westmoreland County Consultant
- Patrick Hassett, Pittsburgh Department of Public Works
- Patrick Roberts, Pittsburgh City Planning
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office
- J.D. Fogarty, Port of Pittsburgh
- Dave Cook, PennDOT District 10-0
- Cheryl Moon-Sirianni, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stephanie Spang, PennDOT District 11-0
- Alan Bailey, PennDOT District 12-0
- Stacey Rabatin, PennDOT District 12-0
- Adam Smith, PennDOT District 12-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Amy Mathieson, ACTA
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Dan Bernazzoli, SPC Staff
- Doug Smith, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- Karen Franks, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
- (Indicates Voting Member)

**1. July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009 TTC Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)**

Chuck DiPietro called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Chuck asked everyone to introduce themselves. The July 16<sup>th</sup> 2009 meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

**2. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

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

Kevin McCullough from PennDOT Central Office gave a report on several Central Office activities.

- a.) Review of August 6th- 7th U.S. DOT Visit: Certification Review of Pittsburgh Metropolitan Planning Process

Chuck DiPietro thanked all those who attended and participated in the Federal Certification Review of the Pittsburgh Metropolitan Planning Process. Chuck DiPietro noted that it was not solely a review of SPC's process, but a review of the collective regional transportation planning process with all SPC partners. Matt Smoker of FHWA submitted a written statement to Chuck DiPietro to provide a brief summary of the certification teams findings Matt highlighted numerous activities and processes as "exemplary" including: Project Region, innovative public outreach, use of visualization, the CMP program, and the regional signal program. Chuck DiPietro stated that the certification team will release a full report of the certification findings by the end of the calendar year. Chuck briefly reviewed some focus areas that the certification team noted in their verbal recommendations, which included continued joint activities between the TTC and TOC, continued consideration of transit/bicycling in planning, and moving forward on linking planning and NEPA initiatives. Chuck DiPietro highlighted discussions held during certification review with relevance to the TTC.

- b.) STC Public Hearing on 12-year Program Development Process

Kevin McCullough stated that the STC public hearings for Erie, SPC, and State College regions were cancelled due to members concerns about being away from Harrisburg during the ongoing state budget negotiations. Kevin noted that the STC hearings will continue with Philadelphia, Wilkes-Berra, and Lebanon regions scheduled for early September. It is anticipated that the Erie, SPC, and State College will be rescheduled for late September or early October. Kevin will pass along information on the date of the STC hearing for the SPC region as soon as it becomes available. Bill Piper asked if PPP meetings would be held prior to the STC meeting. Chuck stated that the TIP update

(Attachment A)

schedule will be discussed in detail later in the meeting. Cheryl Moon Sirianni asked how interested participants were being notified of the STC hearings. Chuck DiPietro stated that Nolan Ritchie is coordinating the STC hearings out of Central Office, but Matt Pavlosky is also involved in notifying interested parties. Cheryl confirmed with Matt that the municipalities are being notified and added that the District has municipal contacts through its municipal services department that may be of use to Matt.

c.) Pennsylvania Community Transportation Initiative (PCTI)

Kevin McCullough informed everyone that seven of the eight Pennsylvania Community Transportation Initiative (PCTI) projects continue to be under review by the FHWA. Kevin stated that this means we cannot yet obligate funds on these seven projects. Kevin reported that the PCTI projects are being approved in small batches and he does not expect any issues with these seven projects and that they will be approved shortly. The Oakland/Carnegie Mellon University Pedestrian/Safety Mobility Study is the only PCTI project that has FHWA full approval at this time.

d.) Third Quarter Progress Report (Attachment B)

Chuck DiPietro reviewed the third quarter progress reports noting that we are keeping pace with or ahead of the statewide average in most categories. Kevin McCullough noted that some large ARRA funded projects were let in July so that will make the numbers look even better by the year-end report. Cheryl Moon Sirianni noted that it is possible that the infusion of ARRA funds into many projects may contribute to some unusual obligation reports for some funding sources that ARRA replaced.

e.) Other Items

Kevin McCullough stated that the FHWA imposed deadline for submitting a request for federal funds on a TIP project is August 30<sup>th</sup>. Kevin noted that the Districts are submitting their 4232 forms for these obligations. The next opportunity to request federal funds will be in October. Cheryl Moon Sirianni asked about the obligation authority repercussions and impact on year end reports of the ARRA backfill projects that will now be obligated in 2010 instead of 2009. Kevin responded that the backfill obligation authority may be an issue and he will discuss this at Central Office.

Kevin McCullough stated that there has been a lot of discussion and interest in the TIGER grants associated with the economic stimulus legislation. PennDOT will not be issuing any letters of support for projects in pursuit of these grants. Kevin added that it is possible the Governor may issue a letter of support for a project seeking these TIGER funds.

(Attachment A)

Kevin McCullough stated that the release of PennDOT crash information has been a sensitive issue for some time due to legal concerns. The issue has resurfaced and the Districts will be releasing to the MPOs/RPOs a list of the top 25 worst crash locations. However, this crash information will be accompanied by detailed guidance and restrictions pertaining to the use of this information. Pat Hassett asked if the information was going to be accessible on the internet. Kevin replied no, this is not anticipated. Chuck DiPietro stated that the information would likely be used to support SPC programs and shared with the SPC operations and safety committee. Kevin elaborated that he can envision this information being useful in the signal program, the road safety audits, and for TIP project justification.

The annual PennDOT planning partners (MPOs and RPOs) meetings will be held in October in State College. Kevin McCullough stated that the format is going to be more interactive this year with presentations and open discussions of many issues including: Freight, performance measures, decision lens software, TIP financial guidance, and UPWP development and funding levels. On Monday afternoon the planning partners will hold their own session without PennDOT.

The PennDOT Program Center is now issuing a quarterly newsletter to planning partners describing recent activities at the Program Center.

Kevin McCullough noted that the development the Interstate Maintenance TIP has begun and will be advancing on a very condensed schedule.

Kevin McCullough stated that due to the pessimistic financial projections, especially with state funds, PennDOT is developing an 8-year TIP for 2011 update. Kevin stated that the years five through eight will allow project specific programming in these outer years. From the District standpoint, this is a tremendous amount of work in an already tight time frame. Cheryl Moon Sirianni stated without a current state budget, it is difficult to have good estimates of the future available revenues, particularly eight years out. Cheryl also noted that Act 44 and bonding funding will be dramatically reduced in the next TIP. Kevin stated that the Final TIP procedural and financial guidance will be coming out on August 26<sup>th</sup>.

**4. Action on Amendments and Modifications to the 2009 to 2012 TIP**

The current administrative action and amendment procedures are attached following these meeting minutes.

a.) PennDOT District 10-0 (**Attachment C & Handout 1**)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 reviewed the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2009-2012 TIP. District 10-0 had one amendment request this month.

- 1<sup>st</sup> 112<sup>th</sup> Infantry Alpha Company Bridge: amendment to the TIP to add the construction phase of the project.

Dave had some extra clarification on one of the Administrative Actions:

- Kimmel School Bridge low bid cost increase of \$1.5 million. Dave explained the circumstances that resulted in the need to modify the request to include the addition of FFY 2010 funds to fully fund the construction phase of Kimmel School Bridge. This administrative action was approved contingent on PMC approval and fiscal constraint chart review.

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 D & Handout 2**)

Stephanie Spang of PennDOT District 11-0 reviewed the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2009-2012 TIP. District 11-0 had one amendment request

- Forbes Ave and Market Street Reconstruction – Add construction phase to TIP.

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

c.) PennDOT District 12-0 (**Attachment E**)

Adam Smith of PennDOT District 12-0 reviewed the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2009-2012 TIP. District 12-0 had four amendment requests this month:

- Donora Webster Bridge – add final design phase in 2010 to the current TIP.
- SR 21 High Street Streetscape – add Construction phase of the project to current TIP.
- Upgrade Fare Collection – Add construction phase from Transit Flex Reserve.
- SR 119 Bridge over SR 119 and SR3091 – add emergency repairs to the TIP.

Kevin McCullough added some additional detail on the actions regarding the 2011 TE funds. The regional and statewide TE line items are both used up for 2009 and 2010, therefore we are already into 2011 statewide TE funds to allow PennDOT to advance

ready to deliver TE projects. Kevin stated that this illustrates that TE funds at the state are getting low. He added that the future of this program at the federal level is unknown at this time.

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

## **5. Advance 2011-2014 TIP Update**

a.) August 21<sup>st</sup> STC hearings postponed.

b.) August 18<sup>th</sup> Statewide Planning Partners Conference Call Update (Handout 3)

Karen Franks reviewed handout 3, which was the agenda from the August 18<sup>th</sup> Planning Partners Conference Call on August 18<sup>th</sup>. The discussion centered on the procedural and financial guidance for the upcoming TIP update. Chuck Imbrogno added that the Transit Bureau had only average numbers that had to be further broken down into firmer yearly estimates. Kevin expects both the final Financial Guidance and General and Procedural Guidance to be released on August 26<sup>th</sup>.

c.) Statewide Financial Guidance Work Group (Handout 4)

Karen Franks reviewed Handout 4, which detailed the 2011 TIP Update Funding Allocations and compared them to the previous and current TIP. Karen noted the CMAQ, Urban, and Enhancement funds are distributed by region and not yet broken out by District. Karen also highlighted two main areas that funding is dramatically reduced; Act 44 and the State Highway match. Chuck Imbrogno and Chuck DiPietro clarified that this Handout covers only “Base” funds not anything listed on the quarterly report as “Additional.” Alan Bailey pointed out several significant differences of note between current TIP and the TIP update in District 12-0, particularly the bridge funds. Kevin McCullough elaborated on the significance of not having the I-80 toll revenue assumptions in the TIP update. Kevin acknowledged the District 12-0 bridge funds may need to be looked at closer.

d.) Proposed Schedule of Activities (Handout 5)

Chuck DiPietro reviewed the proposed schedule (Handout 5) asking for input from the TTC members. Chuck pointed out that during the last TIP update there were six rounds of work sessions held in each district. Due to the time constraints only two or three work

session will be possible for this TIP update. Chuck also suggested that the TTC consider incorporating both transit component discussion and representation into the TIP work sessions. Chuck highlighted September 25<sup>th</sup> as the deadline for the PennDOT Districts to provide SPC with the updated scopes, costs, and schedules for carryover and candidate projects. Karen Franks added that as soon as possible before September 25<sup>th</sup> the Districts will also need a similar updated detail for all locally programmed projects on the current TIP from the City of Pittsburgh and the counties.

e.) 2011 TIP Update Work Sessions

f.) Public Involvement/PPP Activities

Chuck DiPietro proposed holding the TIP work sessions in the county planning offices on a rotating basis in order to give more access to each county's commission members. Chuck also proposed that the transit operators be invited to the TIP work sessions. Chuck also raised the possibility of holding a county PPP meeting in the same location following the work session.

Cheryl Moon Sirianni stated that whatever strategies can be utilized to minimize PennDOT District staff's time commitment for off-site meetings would be appreciated. Jeff Leithauser stated that he is not in favor of the county planning offices as the host site for the TIP development work sessions due to the high level PennDOT staff and resources that are readily available when at the PennDOT District offices. Joel MacKay stated that he would prefer the work sessions be held at the PennDOT District Offices because holding them in the county offices may make it seem like they are going to focus on just one county (Butler County projects for example) not the entire District. Joel also felt that County Commissioners may not be interested in attending a long work session about all the projects in the District, many outside of their county. Bill Piper stated that Westmoreland County would prefer to host a work session especially if meeting resources were available in advance for review. Jeff Leithauser raised the possibility of offering to brief each county's commissioners at some point following the District work sessions prior to public outreach. These briefings would include TTC members including counties, SPC, and PennDOT District officials. Pat Hassett stated that this is a valid model because the City often has technical work sessions and then later conducts public official's briefings for the policymakers in advance of public meetings. Pat added that briefings to the commissioners and policymakers should not focus only on that particular county, but rather a full discussion of all county's projects due to the interrelated nature of the TIP. Darin Alviano agreed with the points made by Jeff Leithauser and Joel MacKay and stated his preference for the work sessions to be located in the District office. Amy McKinney stated that Lawrence County prefers a work session in the county. Arthur Cappella stated that Fayette County Planning has always had a positive experience holding the TIP work sessions in the District Office. Kevin Gray stated his agreement with Jeff Leithauser and Arthur Cappella about holding the work sessions in the District Office.

Kevin McCullough stated that a hybrid design of work sessions may be the optimal solution. Chuck DiPietro summarized what he has heard from the TTC on the matter, stating it seems that there is a preference amongst the TTC to hold the TIP work sessions in the District office, with the exception of one session in Westmoreland and one session in Lawrence. The TTC was in agreement with this statement.

Chuck DiPietro stated that the first TIP work sessions should be scheduled between September 28<sup>th</sup> and October 9<sup>th</sup>. SPC staff will work to coordinate the date and times for the first round of work sessions.

Cheryl Moon Sirianni stated that the SPC Commissioners need to be alerted to the dramatic drop in funding that the next TIP will contain compared to the current TIP. Chuck DiPietro responded that a presentation of the realities of the TIP update and the reduced funding available will be presented to the SPC board at their next meeting.

Matt Pavlosky asked if there was any problem inviting the PPP chairs to the first work session, which would eliminate the need for the kick-off PPP meeting since the chairs could then report back to their respective county panel. It was agreed that the PPP chairs could be invited to the first work session.

- g.) CMAQ Program Management Process Implementation
- h.) CMAQ Application Period – Call for Candidates (Handout 6)
- i.) CMAQ Selection Committee - Appointments

Chuck Imbrogno reviewed the development schedule for the 2011-2014 CMAQ program. SPC staff is currently working to develop CMAQ program guidance, application instructions, and project application forms. On September 14<sup>th</sup>, SPC and Sustainable Pittsburgh will hold a joint information session for project sponsors. Chuck Imbrogno elaborated that this session will be predominately to provide information to new applicants, but it will also include an overview of the new CMAQ Program Management Process. The deadline to submit CMAQ applications for new projects to SPC is October 5, 2009. As part of the new CMAQ Program Management Process, the sponsors of projects that are already on the TIP for CMAQ funding will be contacted to request an updated status report. SPC staff will complete the CMAQ technical evaluation by November 13<sup>th</sup>. The CMAQ Evaluation Committee (CEC) will be convened to assist with evaluation and ranking of the candidate CMAQ projects. Chuck briefly reviewed Handout 6, which included basic information about the CMAQ Evaluation Committee and the CMAQ Evaluation Committee Volunteer/Nomination Form. Chuck stated that the evaluation committee will be very active with a very condensed schedule in October and November to make recommendations for the preliminary 2011-2014 Draft TIP. The preliminary Draft TIP recommendations need to be presented to the TTC on December 10 to be consistent with the statewide schedule deadlines.

## 6. Other Business

a). Next TOC meeting

Chuck DiPietro noted that the next TOC meeting is September 16<sup>th</sup>.

b). Ped Bike Committee Update

Ryan Gordon provided a brief summary of the August 12 Ped/Bike Committee meeting.

c.) The next TTC meeting

The next TTC is scheduled for Thursday September 17<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM.

Bill Piper asked about the status of candidate locations submitted by Westmoreland County for Road Safety Audits. Doug Smith responded that he has not yet received feedback on these candidates from PennDOT District 12-0. Doug added that Road Safety Audits on state routes must be agreed to by PennDOT.

Chuck DiPietro noted that Rick Packer from Beaver County Planning Office is retired.

**Attachment: Current 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 or delete an existing project
- 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
- Correction of a misprint or data entry error
- Addition or correction of local match funds
- Schedule change, for projects or phases in any of the first three years of the TIP
- Incidental ROW changes
- Change in the funding source
- Exempt projects

**New or Deleted Phase**

The technical committee can approve an administrative action to add a new phase or delete a phase if the phase cost is \$5 million or less for a highway project or \$2 million for a transit project.

**Line Items**

The recognition/programming on the TIP of specific projects within an approved line item (i.e., betterments, rail-highway crossings, Transit Section 5310 Program, transportation enhancements, 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 technical committee

approval.

For a betterment line item or a rail-highway crossing line item there are no restrictions based on project cost; identification of projects of any amount can be considered as an administrative action. It is also permitted as an administrative action to remove funding from a “line item” project (betterment or rail-highway only) as long as the funds are returned to the respective line item.

### **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 \$1 million or less by reporting the change to the technical committee for informational purposes only. The technical committee must approve a cost change greater than \$1 million but less than \$5 million for a highway project. The action becomes effective when it is forwarded by the technical committee to PennDOT and FHWA or FTA.

Administrative actions do not require Federal approval but FHWA and FTA reserve the right to disallow an administrative action if it is not consistent with federal regulations or the MOU. The project sponsor must provide full documentation prior to SPC acceptance of the requested change and reflecting it on the TIP. SPC and PennDOT will work cooperatively to address and respond to any FHWA and/or FTA comments on these actions.

### **TIP Amendments**

Any project change that cannot be processed within the rules governing administrative actions must be handled as a TIP amendment. 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 that are considered administrative actions)
- Adds a new project phase or deletes a phase that exceeds \$5 million for a highway project or \$2 million for a transit project
- Creates a new line item
- Involves a major change in the project scope of work or design concept
- Changes the project selection status

**New or Deleted Project**

The technical 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 project or \$2 million for a 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 technical committee. Changes that exceed \$10 million require approval by the Commission.

**Air Quality**

Amendments with an air quality impact require air quality testing and a 30-day public comment period including a public meeting before they can be presented to the Commission.

**Major Fiscal Impact**

Amendments with a fiscal impact that exceeds \$10 million are subject to a 30-day public comment period before they can be presented to the Commission.