

**Meeting Minutes for March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010**  
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 Public Works  
Tammy Frank, Beaver County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Commission\*
- Kevin Gray, Greene County
- Jeff Raykes, Indiana County Planning Commission
- Amy McKinney, Lawrence County Planning Department
- Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning Department
- Patrick Hassett, Pittsburgh Department of Public Works  
Patrick Roberts, Pittsburgh Department of City Planning  
Deborah Suci-Smith, FHWA
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office  
Dave Cook, PennDOT District 10-0  
Doug Dupnock, PennDOT District 10-0  
Dan Cessna, PennDOT District 11-0  
Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0  
Stephanie Spang, PennDOT District 11-0  
Cassie Lloyd, PennDOT District 11-0  
Stacey Rabatin, PennDOT District 12-0  
Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0  
J.D. Fogarty, Port of Pittsburgh Commission  
Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association  
Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Management Association  
Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership  
Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group  
Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff  
Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff  
Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff  
Tom Klevan, SPC Staff  
Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff  
David Totten, SPC Staff  
Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff

• (Indicates Voting Member)

\* Indicates participation via conference call

**1. February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 TTC Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)**

Chuck DiPietro called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Chuck asked everyone to introduce themselves. The February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 meeting minutes were approved with no changes.

**2. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

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

a). PCTI Project Status

Kevin McCullough reported that Secretary Biehler has established the PCTI program as a high priority within PennDOT and that monthly status reports are held on these projects with each District. Kevin noted that letters have gone out to all the project sponsors from PennDOT indicating intention to let these projects before the end of the calendar year. Kevin stated that there are a lot of unique projects underway and overall they are going smoothly. Dan Cessna noted that the Secretary has directed that the District Executives be directly involved in meeting with project sponsors. Dan reported that he has met with several of the PCTI project sponsors in District 11-0. Both Kevin and Dan commented on the fact that the future of the PCTI program is unknown at this time as to whether it will be a focus of the next PA Secretary of Transportation; therefore there is a push to obligate these projects this calendar year. Kevin noted that the concept was to also fund nontraditional projects. Kevin noted that SPC is investigating starting up and administering a similar program on a regional level.

b.) State and Federal Budget Updates

Deborah Suciu-Smith reported that the extension of SAFETEA-LU is awaiting the President's signature. When signed, this law will extend the current federal funding levels for transportation until December 31, 2010. Kevin McCullough noted that the rescissions that were part of the previous SAFETEA-LU extensions have been reversed in this extension, covering a potential 30% short fall in funds. Dan Cessna stated that this is a good result, which allows obligations to continue through the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2010. Deborah Suciu-Smith noted that work on an overall transportation authorization bill is still continuing. Kevin noted that U.S. Secretary of Transportation LaHood is planning to release a concept paper that will set the policy direction of the Administration's policy priorities for Authorization in June. However, this concept paper

(Attachment A)

is anticipated to only focus on policy and not propose new funding mechanisms.

Both Kevin and Deborah reported that there is no clarity on if or when a second stimulus, or “Jobs Creation Two” bill, will emerge from Congress. Kevin noted that the big jobs bill that was being discussed in Congress a month ago got broken up into several smaller bills including the one extending SAFETEA-LU that is awaiting the President’s signature. Other debates in Congress on issues such as health care seem to have pushed back the passage of a second stimulus that would provide additional funds to transportation infrastructure. Dave Cook noted that the media is calling the extension of SAFETEA-LU a jobs bill, which is going to make it confusing with the second stimulus because everyone has been referring to this as “Jobs Creation.” Dan Cessna stated that the extension of SAFETEA-LU is being called an employment bill; however it contains no new stimulus funds for transportation. Kevin concurred stating that it is just the way the SAFETEA-LU extension is being marketed. Kevin noted the extension of SAFETEA-LU is significant because it allows for the obligation of funds through the end of the 2010 federal fiscal year and reverses previous rescissions. Lynn Heckman noted that it is going to be confusing tracking this through Congress since there is no consistent name or bill number right now.

Kevin McCullough reported there is no new information about the PA Turnpike Commission application to U.S. DOT to toll I-80. Kevin noted that there is a lot of speculation in the media on when an announcement will be made. Kevin stated that at this point it is unlikely that any Act 44 funds will show up in the 2011-2014 TIP at the time of adoption.

Deborah Suci-Smith stated that the TIGER grants were announced last month and in this part of Pennsylvania will benefit from the multi-state Gateway Rail Project. Chuck noted that the TIGER grant project list was previously distributed to the TTC.

c.) DCNR Community Conservation Partnership Program (Attachment B)

Chuck DiPietro briefly explained the recent release of project grants from DCNR and referred everyone to Attachment B, which was a list detailing the grant awards by project and county. Several community conservation projects in the region have been granted funding.

d). 2010 Consolidated Appropriations Act Earmarks (Attachment C)

Kevin McCullough reviewed Attachment C, which displayed the Consolidated Appropriations Act earmarks for Pennsylvania. Kevin noted that the funding provided for each project has been reduced by a small amount because Congress chose to earmark slightly more funds than was available. Chuck DiPietro added that this resulted in a very minor reduction on funds coming into the region (less than \$300 across three projects).

#### **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.*

Chuck DiPietro stated that each district will be presenting two sets of amendments and administrative actions this month; explaining that the first set would be the typical amendments and administrative actions to the current TIP and the second set would be proposed amendments to the current TIP in anticipation of the second round of stimulus (finding coded as JC2 on the fiscal constraint charts). Secretary Biehler has directed all PennDOT Districts to make preparations in advance of an anticipated second Federal stimulus package. It is anticipated that the new stimulus package will be more restrictive in terms of time frame for obligation and therefore require expedited procedures. To comply with the expected requirements, the U.S. DOT has provided positive guidance on MPOs approving projects prior to the passage of the second stimulus bill. Chuck added that Pennsylvania has been the most successful big state in terms of project delivery from the first stimulus and the actions the TTC makes today will put the region in a good position to capitalize on a possible second stimulus bill. Chuck explained that in the last round of TIP work sessions, candidate projects for the second stimulus (JC2) were discussed; today the TTC will be asked to take an action to recommend these projects as candidates for JC2 funds.

Dan Cessna stated that at this point the second stimulus package is all very speculative, we really have no idea what types of guidelines/restrictions may be included in the legislation, but the Secretary wants to be aggressive in preparing for the second stimulus. Dan stated that District 11-0 has proposed as candidates some projects to assist with cash flow on the draft TIP. Dan explained that District 11-0 will be advancing projects and if any funds from a second stimulus are available the project will tap into these funds. If there is not a second stimulus the projects will utilize typical TIP funding.

Kevin McCullough noted that the longer it takes Congress to pass the second stimulus, the more likely fluctuations and changes could occur in the candidate project list.

a.) PennDOT District 10-0 (Attachment D and Handout 1)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 pointed to the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2009-2012 TIP. District 10-0 had four amendment requests this month:

- o Three deficient bridges in Butler County –Adding the PE phase for Myoma Bridge 1, the Kittanning Street Bridge 2, and the Mushroom Farm Road Bridge. Dave described that the department has advanced construction on a number of

(Attachment A)

bridges in the past few months and they are adding these PE phases so that they do not have a void in programming.

- 2010 Bridge preservation projects – utilizing surplus bridge funds to do preventative maintenance projects on bridges.

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

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 presented the second stimulus (JC2) proposed project list. Dave summarized that all these projects are on the shelf and ready to go if a second stimulus would be passed. Dave said there were only three changes from the candidate list based on the recent District work session. Dave noted the three changes in the list since the recent work session: two TE projects in Indiana County and a micro sealing project on US 422.

Karen Franks requested estimated construction costs for the three bridges being added to the current TIP.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 10-0 **special JC2** proposed project list as amendment requests to the TIP. Chuck noted that these candidate projects will not be submitted to Central Office and FHWA until a second stimulus bill is passed by Congress.

b.) PennDOT District 11-0 (Attachment E and Handout 2)

Rob Miskanic District 11-0 reported the District had no regular amendment requests to the 2009-2012 TIP.

TTC approved the District 11-0 **regular** administrative actions that were over \$1 million.

Rob Miskanic reviewed the second stimulus (JC2) candidate project list. Rob noted each of the 18 projects listed. Rob also reviewed 11 proposed interstate maintenance projects on the JC2 proposed list. Dan Cessna noted the importance of the six interstate bridge reconstructions in Beaver County.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 11-0 **special JC2** candidate project list as amendment requests to the TIP. Chuck again noted that these will not be submitted to Central Office or FHWA until a second stimulus bill is passed by Congress.

c.) PennDOT District 12-0 (Attachment F and Handout 3)

Stacey Rabatin of PennDOT District 12-0 pointed to the amendment requests and administrative actions to the 2009-2012 TIP. District 12-0 had one regular amendment request this month:

- o I-70 & I-79 ITS Project – Adding construction phase of the project to the current TIP.

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

Stacey Rabatin reviewed the second stimulus (JC2) proposed project list. Stacey noted each of the 22 projects listed. Kevin McCullough asked if the Canonsburg project was a TE project and Stacey replied that it was. Karen Franks noted that Jeff Leithauser from Washington County was not able to attend today's TTC meeting, but wanted to investigate adding the Panhandle Trail to the candidate JC2 project list in District 12-0.

The TTC motioned and unanimously approved the PennDOT District 12-0 **special JC2** candidate project list as amendment requests to the TIP. Chuck noted again that these will not be submitted to Central Office or FHWA until a second stimulus bill is passed by Congress.

Chuck noted that the TOC will be looking to approve also a list of candidate JC2 transit projects at their March 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.\

## 5. Advance 2011-2014 TIP Update

a.) Recap of Round 4 work Sessions

Chuck DiPietro highlighted several key unknowns with regard to the development of the 2011-2014 TIP: 1) awaiting Central Office approval on the Draft TIP; 2) awaiting spike funding decisions; 3) uncertainty of if and when a second stimulus will be passed; and 4) uncertainty related to the tolling of I-80 and Act 44 funding. Chuck stated that with these unknowns and potential changes it is possible that another round of work sessions may need to quickly be organized in a tight time frame.

b.) Final Draft TIP Program of Projects (Title I and III)

Chuck stated that we are awaiting Central Office concurrence on the Draft TIP.

c.) Draft Amendment Procedures (Attachment G and Handout 4)

Karen Franks reviewed the draft 2011 TIP amendment procedures focusing on the proposed changes made since the last TTC meeting. Karen reviewed the proposed criteria for determining a major TIP amendment and the special expedited approval procedures. Chuck DiPietro summarized that these draft amendment procedures allow for more flexibility in terms of what projects require a public comment period. Pat Hasset asked for clarification on the definition of a “major” TIP amendment. Karen referred everyone to page 3 that provides the criteria for being considered a major TIP amendment. Dan Cessna stated that the additional flexibility with regard to what projects require a public comment period is a good improvement.

Lucinda Beattie asked for clarification on the Turnpike Expansion Act. Chuck DiPietro responded that this 1987 legislation directed the Turnpike Commission to advance Turnpike Expansion projects and listed the projects in priority order. Chuck added that these tend to be large and highly visible projects such as the Southern Beltway and the Mon/Fayette Expressway.

Chris Sandvig asked if the term “controversy” was going to be further defined. Chuck DiPietro stated that we would like to have this further defined, but an acceptable definition has not been developed to date.

Dave Cook asked if it was necessary to have the Commission approval after the TTC has approved amendments as described in the expedited procedures. Kevin McCullough stated that this might be used in cases where there were a lot of unknowns at the time that the TTC took action and further clarification was then provided to the board (Kevin cited JC2 project amendments as an example).

Chuck DiPietro noted that the amendment procedures still have to be consistent with the STIP amendment procedures under development between PennDOT and FHWA. Deborah Suci-Smith stated the draft STIP amendment procedures are in to FHWA for review and there are only minor changes from the previous version of these procedures. Deborah left a copy of the draft STIP amendment procedures with SPC staff for use in developing closure on the 2011 TIP amendment procedures.

d). Public Involvement (Jobs Creation 2 proposed project lists) (Attachment H)

Matt Pavlosky reviewed how the public involvement activities related to the JC2 proposed projects are progressing. Matt reviewed Attachment H, which was a public notice announcement with detailed information about the three upcoming public meetings. Matt stated that he will be providing information about what is known on the

(Attachment A)

proposed JC2 legislation, the associated candidate projects, and proposed amendments to the current TIP. Matt added that there is one public meeting per District on the second stimulus projects.

Matt briefly recapped the Fayette County PPP meeting for the TIP update and noted the Butler County PPP will be meeting to discuss the TIP update on March 30.

## 6. Other Business

### a.) TE/HTS/SRTS Progress Reports (Attachment I)

Chuck DiPietro referred everyone to Attachment I, which was the regional compilation of the TE/HTS/SRTS recent progress reports submitted by individual project sponsors. Chuck added that any additional information to add to these status reports should be directly shared with Doug Smith of the SPC staff.

### b.) CMAQ Evaluation Committee Debriefing

Chuck Imbrogno briefly reported on the CMAQ Evaluation Committee debriefing that was held. Chuck stated that the session focused on an open discussion of the recently conducted process of developing the 2011 CMAQ program. A lot of feedback was provided at this debriefing and Chuck Imbrogno stated that in general the Committee feels the process and procedures for CMAQ program development continue to improve.

### c.) March 2<sup>nd</sup> – Freight Forum

Chuck DiPietro provided a brief recap of the March 2<sup>nd</sup> Freight Forum. The forum included a presentation by Chuck Imbrogno on the Global Insight freight data that SPC has purchased and is utilizing in freight analysis.

### d.) March 10 - Pedestrian/Bike Committee

Chuck DiPietro provided a brief recap of the March 10<sup>th</sup> Pedestrian and Bicycle Committee. The meeting included a presentation on the studies being initiated for the Active Allegheny Plan, a PCTI funded project to develop a comprehensive plan supplemental document on pedestrian and bicycle use and infrastructure in the county.

### e.) Transit Operators Committee

Tom Klevan reviewed the agenda for the upcoming TOC meeting. Agenda highlights include: amendments and administrative actions to the current transit TIP, refining the

draft transit TIP amendment procedures, and discussing/taking action on the proposed JC2 transit projects.

f.) Joint TTC/TOC Meeting

Chuck DiPietro asked for input from the TTC on possible topics for a potential joint TTC/TOC session in May. Chuck provided several potential topics for the session. Kevin McCullough stated that the session could review any projects of joint interests on the Draft TIPs at that time and could also include discussions on the previous collaboration on park and ride lot projects. Tom Klevan suggested an update of the PCTI projects in the region focusing on how they are progressing. Kevin suggested another good topic would be lessons learned with programming, managing, and developing nontraditional projects from the CMAQ or PCTI. Chuck DiPietro inquired about the availability of the TTC members for such a meeting in May.

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for March 29<sup>th</sup> and the next TTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 15<sup>th</sup>.

**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.