

**Meeting Minutes for April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2011**  
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting  
Regional Enterprise Tower - Pittsburgh, PA

Attendees:

- Bernie Rossman, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission
- James Camp, Beaver County
- Dave Johnston, Butler County Planning Department
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Commission
- William Deguffroy, Indiana County Office of Planning and Development
- Doniele Andrus, Lawrence County
- Pat Hassett, Pittsburgh Department of Public Works
- Jeff Leithauser, Washington County Planning Commission
- Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning Department
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office
- Dave Cook, PennDOT District 10-0
- Doug Dupnock, PennDOT District 10-0
- Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stephanie Spang, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stacey Rabatin, PennDOT District 12-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Liberty Hill, PennDOT, District 12-0
- Jeremy Shaneyfelt, PennDOT District 12-0
- Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Association
- Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association
- Jon Smith, Allegheny County Transit Council
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Sara Walfoort, SPC Staff
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- Ken Flack, SPC Staff
- Karen Franks, SPC Staff
- Doug Smith, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff
- Dave Totten, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
  
- (Indicates Voting Member)
- \* Via Conference Call

**1. March 17<sup>th</sup>, 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 March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

**2. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

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

a). Act 26 Eligible Counties –Annual Update (Attachment B)

Kevin McCullough pointed to Attachment B, part C, the state Program Management Committee March meeting minutes that provides the latest on Act 26 Eligible Counties. Kevin reviewed Act 26 eligibility and how it is used to assist eligible counties with funding for county-owned bridge projects. County eligibility is determined through using unemployment data. Kevin noted that he can provide a list of approved county owned bridge projects that are eligible to receive Act 26 funding. Kevin noted that the Department is trying to honor the Act 26 commitments to previously approved county bridge projects.

Chuck DiPietro noted that 5 of the 10 counties in the SPC region have Act 26 eligibility. Pat Hassett asked if there is any eligibility for distressed cities. Kevin replied not to his knowledge. Kevin added that if anyone has any questions pertaining to Act 26 eligibility or the approved projects to receive Act 26 funds to contact him or the local project manager at the District.

b). Transportation Enhancements (Attachment C)

Kevin McCullough reviewed background on the Transportation Enhancements program. Kevin explained that in the SPC region, there is still a backlog of Transportation Enhancement projects, but in some Districts all the TE projects have been completed. In these regions they are now asking for new TE project applicants. Kevin noted that Attachment C contains the Department's contact information for any inquiries into the TE Program. Kevin noted that everyone should be taking a conservative view of the funding for TE projects; the program could be eliminated or severely streamlined in the next federal transportation authorization. Kevin noted that the goal of the Department is to continue work on the approved TE projects, but at some point some hard decisions may need to be made about eliminating some projects because the TE funds will not be available forever.

c). April 12<sup>th</sup> Statewide Planning Partners Meeting in Harrisburg (Handouts 1&2)

Chuck DiPietro highlighted of the recent Statewide Planning Partners Meeting in Harrisburg. Chuck reported that Acting-Transportation Secretary Barry Schoch made the opening remarks and conducted a question and answer session. The Acting-Secretary cited the challenges of the position and why he agreed to take the position. Chuck noted the opportunity to solve the transit and highway funding crisis was the key factor in his decision to take the position. Chuck reported that the Acting Secretary discussed the Governor's Transportation Funding Advisory Taskforce. The taskforce has been charged with putting funding options on the table and providing a direct recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on solving the funding crisis. The taskforce recommendations are expected in June and Chuck expects that discussions on these recommendations will be a central aspect of the STC hearings this summer. Acting Secretary Schoch noted that the recommendations are expected to include a broad range of solutions. Chuck also noted that the Acting-Secretary mentioned looking at projects beyond asset management may be required to build the case for implementation of the taskforce's recommendations. Chuck noted that the Acting-Secretary emphasized the important role MPOs/RPOs will play in solving Pennsylvania's transportation funding crisis.

Chuck reviewed Handout 1 on the MPMS IQ, which is a web-based GIS mapping application developed by PennDOT and includes many data fields on TIP projects, highway data, and bridge data.

Chuck DiPietro mentioned that there will be upcoming training sessions on the Linking Planning and NEPA screening forms. Chuck noted that the first training on the level 1 screening forms is expected be a web-based training module and the second round of training for the level 2 screening forms will be a half day training in each District.

Chuck reported that Dan Cessna presented the status on the development of District Asset Management reports at the Planning Partners Meeting. These reports are under development, but will soon be providing detailed information on the conditions of bridge and highway infrastructure within each District. Chuck stated that he expects that the TTC will be asked to provide feedback on our asset management reports. Chuck noted the local bridge data collection activity that is just getting underway at SPC. SPC interns will be out this summer collecting data on local bridges. Dave Johnston asked if the county planning departments could provide input into the data collection on local bridges. Doug Smith asked that Dave get in touch with him about his ideas on the data collection and they can work together to determine if any additional elements can be incorporated into the data collection plan.

Chuck DiPietro reviewed the draft 2013 TIP General and Procedural Guidance that was

distributed at the planning partners meeting. Chuck added that the guidance is still in draft form and that if anyone has any feedback it can be provided to him or Kevin.

Kevin McCullough added a few of his insights from the Acting Secretary's remarks and the planning partners meeting. Kevin reiterated the Acting-Secretary's comments on looking beyond the TIP to longer range projects or corridors in order to build the momentum for tackling the funding crisis; proposing transportation solutions that could be achieved with additional funds. With the climate at the federal level, it is even more important for the State to come up with innovative new funding mechanisms. Kevin noted that there were discussions on how to precede with the STC hearings and whether they should take a longer term view.

Kevin noted the Acting-Secretary touched on performance and management measures that will be used to evaluate the investments. He cited the continuing concern of the impact of shifting significant investments to bridges and the resultant potential deterioration of highway condition.

Kevin noted that the LPN level 1 forms and the STC project abstracts will remain separate in the short-term, but may eventually be combined into one public process.

#### **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 & Walk-in Handout)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 pointed to the administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 10-0 had three amendment requests this month. Dave provided additional information on the three amendments.

- o Cherry Run Road Railroad Crossing – Adding project and construction phase to the current TIP
- o 11<sup>th</sup> Street Railroad Crossing - Adding project and construction phase to the current TIP
- o Keister Road Bridge – Advance construction funding from 2013 to 2012.

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

b.) PennDOT District 11-0 (Attachment E & Walk-in Handout)

Rob Miskanic of PennDOT District 11-0 pointed to the amendment requests and

(Attachment A)

administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 11-0 had three amendment requests:

- 22/30/60 Interchange – adding \$300,000 in Construction funds to the current TIP in 2011
- Butler Street Bridge – adding \$25,000 in Final Design funds to the current TIP
- Center Township Safe Routes to School – adding \$200,000 in PE funds to the current TIP.

Rob noted that the one difference between Attachment E and the walk-in handout was the removal of the Pearce Mill Rd Slide project, which is currently pending PMC approval to use maintenance funds to repair. At this time the District is not requesting the use of TIP funds for this project.

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

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

Stacey Rabatin of PennDOT District 12-0 pointed to the amendments and administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 12-0 had three amendments this month.

- PA 519 at PA 980 and I-79 – adding the PE phase to the current TIP
- US 40 I-70 to PA 18 – adding \$400,000 to Construction
- US 19 Safety Improvements – increasing the Final Design phase and advancing the Utility and ROW phases.

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

## **5. Long Range Plan Update**

a.) Updated Project Tables (Attachment G)

Chuck DiPietro pointed to Attachment G, which were the final project tables for the draft LRTP. Chuck thanked everyone for their involvement and assistance in closing on the project list for the draft LRTP. Chuck noted that the project list must now advance into air quality conformity testing conducted by Chuck Imbrogno's staff. Project information needed for conformity must include project scope and design concept in sufficient detail to determine whether or not the project is regionally significant. SPC conformity runs should not be started until the Inter-governmental Review Committee (including DEP, FHWA, FTA, PennDOT, EPA) concurs with the air quality status of each project.

(Attachment A)

Jeff Leithauser asked if air quality testing is also required for the Interstate interchange improvement projects that are being planned. Chuck Imbrogno stated that it would depend on the project scope of work and the determination made by the inter-governmental group that reviews the LRTP project list and determines the air quality exempt status. Chuck Imbrogno again emphasized that he and his staff will be requesting additional information on most of the new projects listed. A detailed project description and project scope is required to provide as support data to the inter-governmental group reviewing the LRTP list for air quality conformity.

b.) Final Draft Illustrative List of Projects & Studies (Handout 3)

Sara Walfoort reviewed the Illustrative list of projects and studies. Chuck DiPietro noted the difference between the mail-out version and the handout version was an updated transit project list approved by the TOC. Sara asked Kevin McCullough what the status of the Interstate portion of the project list was with the anticipated release of the statewide Interstate Maintenance plan. Chuck suggested that a conversation on this topic occur between Sara and Kevin McCullough after today's meeting.

c.) REMI/MERLAM

Chuck Imbrogno presented a brief summary of the work SPC staff have been completing with REMI/MERLAM population and employment projections. Chuck noted that the assumptions of the new projections were presented at the January and February TTC meetings. Chuck showed charts displaying the projections by the models for both employment and population. Chuck noted that the next step will be to allocate these projections to the municipal and TAZ level. Once that level of data work has been completed it will be available to the member planning departments.

d.) Endorsement

Chuck DiPietro noted that he is not currently seeking a TTC formal vote regarding the LRTP project lists at this time, but wanted to concur TTC agreement as on the project list as we advance air quality conformity analysis.

## **6. Public Participation Plan Update (Handout 4)**

Matt Pavlosky presented the SPC Public Participation Plan. Matt stated that the draft public participation plan has been completed and there is a public review/comment period ongoing through April 15<sup>th</sup>. Matt noted that the public review period has included a web training for the

PPP members and a public meeting. Matt discussed the enhanced areas of the plan:

- Expanded content on underserved and disability and SPC discrimination policy
- Guidelines on social media
- Public Participation Panel details
- SPC Resource Center
- FAQs
- Increasing targeted outreach meetings
- Going with paperless documents for library network

Matt noted some user statistics from the public participation plan website and attendance numbers from the public meeting. Kevin McCullough asked if there were any comments received from federal agencies on the public participation plan. Matt replied that there were no comments receive so far from any federal agencies.

The TTC motioned and approved an action to recommend the SPC draft Public Participation Plan to the full Commission for approval.

## **7. Linking Planning and NEPA (Attachment I & Handout 5)**

Chuck DiPietro stated that PennDOT Central Office has been working to redefine the program and project development process in a statewide “Linking Planning and NEPA” (LPN) initiative. The initiative has included new editions of the PennDOT Design Manuals (including DM1-A: PreTIP and TIP program Development Procedures). Chuck reviewed the recent LPN implementation meetings that have been held in District 10-0 and District 12-0. Chuck noted a more restricted approach to the level 1 screening forms due to the April 1 letter from the PennDOT Program Center. Chuck pointed everyone to the letter (Attachment I), which detailed the different roles in the LPN screening form process. Chuck noted that as required in the letter SPC has put together a preliminary list of screening form users, which currently consists of the TTC members including county/city planners, PennDOT District staff, and SPC staff. Chuck referred the TTC to Handout 5, which detailed the identified LPN screening form users. Chuck asked the TTC for their feedback on identifying stakeholders (those with permission to fill out level 1 forms). Chuck noted that he will be seeking input also from Sara Walfoort and Matt Pavlosky of the SPC staff on the stakeholder identification. Kevin McCullough urged everyone to read through Attachment I closely and noted that identification of stakeholders is an important next step. Kevin noted that the prototype forms website is currently undergoing testing right now. Kevin asked everyone to remember the larger view of the LPN process as a part of both the TIP and LRP. Chuck DiPietro reiterated that there will be upcoming training sessions on the Linking Planning and NEPA screening forms and as soon as we have any information on these trainings we will pass it along to the TTC.

## **8. 2013 TIP Update**

a). 2013 Statewide, General, and Procedural Guidance

Chuck DiPietro referred everyone to Handout 1, which contained the 2013 TIP General and Procedural Guidance that was distributed at the planning partners meeting. The guidance includes the purpose and objectives of the 2013 TIP update as well as notes on coordination, public involvement, financial plans, requirements, program development, program administration, program monitoring, and TIP checklist.

b). Statewide Financial Guidance Work Group

Chuck DiPietro noted that the Statewide Financial Guidance Work Group is scheduled to meet on April 28<sup>th</sup> in Harrisburg. The work group will be discussing the federal and state financial assumptions/targets as the basis for the 2013 TIP/STIP update. Chuck noted that it is anticipated that the group will also be discussing related components such as transportation enhancements, spike funds, and line items.

c). CMAQ Update/Evaluation (Handout 6)

Chuck Imbrogno reviewed Handout 6, which was the CMAQ Program Management Process. Chuck differentiated the Program Management Advisory Committee from the CMAQ Evaluation Technical Committee. The purpose of the Program Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) is to advise and assist SPC staff, PennDOT, and project sponsors with ongoing project monitoring; identifying needed amendments to the TIP's CMAQ Program; and, formulating amendment recommendations for consideration by the Transit Operators Committee (TOC), and Transportation Technical Committee (TTC). Chuck noted that currently nominations are being sought for individuals to serve on the PMAC and the first meeting is anticipated in June. Chuck also noted that the new CMAQ project selection process will begin with a conference call of the CMAQ Evaluation Committee in May. Pat Hassett asked if projects that are not carryover projects will need to resubmit an application. Chuck Imbrogno responded that new projects, even those submitted last round, will need to be resubmitted. Chuck DiPietro noted that if any TTC member has feedback on the CMAQ process to provide it to him or Chuck Imbrogno.

**9. Other Business/Status Reports**

Chuck DiPietro asked the TTC for input on the timing and content for scheduling the next joint TTC/TOC meeting. Chuck explained that it had been a while since the last joint TTC/TOC and reviewed some of the agenda items of past joint meetings. Chuck noted his preference to hold it in July or early August citing several timing issues such as possible input to the August 25<sup>th</sup> STC hearing and potential to discuss recommendations



(Attachment A)

from the Governor's Transportation Funding Taskforce (recommendations expected in June). Chuck highlighted some other potential agenda subjects such as local asset management, Regional Smart Transportation Program, CMAQ project delivery tracking, or park-n-ride lots. Chuck asked the TTC for any feedback on the timing and agenda for the next joint TTC/TOC meeting. Jeff Leithauser noted that his preference for the next agenda would be a discussion and information session surrounding the recommendations that come from the Governors Transportation Funding Taskforce. Kevin McCullough noted that we will be kicking off the 2013 TIP update and we may have a better idea regarding the federal and state funding by that time and a discussion may prove productive. Kevin also noted that discussing some potential synergies between highway side and the transit side for application to the Smart Transportation Program.

Sara Walfoort noted that the Energy Audit meeting for Airports that was being scheduled was being cancelled due to lack of interest; however several individual meetings with SPC staff and airport managers are being discussed.

Sara Walfoort noted that SPC's Executive Director Jim Hassinger conducted a presentation on freight planning recently at the APA national conference.

Tom Klevan briefly touched on the JARC/New Freedoms grant recommendations for projects that will be presented at the next TOC meeting.

## **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.