

**Meeting Minutes for June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011**  
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
- Joel MacKay, Butler County Planning Department
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Planning Department
- William Deguffroy, Indiana County Office of Planning and Development  
Jeff Raykes, Indiana County Office of Planning and Development
- Amy McKinney, Lawrence County Planning Department
- 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  
Kathy Reeger, PennDOT District 10-0  
Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0  
Jeff Skalican, PennDOT District 11-0  
Michael Adams, PennDOT District 11-0  
Joe Szczur, PennDOT District 12-0  
J.D. Fogarty, Port of Pittsburgh  
Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Association  
Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association  
Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff  
Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff  
David Totten, SPC Staff  
Karen Franks, SPC Staff  
Doug Smith, SPC Staff  
Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff  
Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Staff  
Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff  
Rebecca Stark, SPC Intern
- (Indicates Voting Member)

**1. May 19<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 May 19<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.) Governor's Transportation Funding Advisory Commission (TFAC)

- Kevin McCullough noted that the Commission has had three meetings and is expected to develop a 10-12 year plan or "Decade of Investment" that will include detailed funding strategies and ideas for "modernization." The next meeting is scheduled for June 27<sup>th</sup>. All the TFAC Agendas, Handouts and minutes are available at <http://www.tfac.pa.gov/>. The Commission is required to submit a final report to the Governor on or before August 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Jeff Leithauser asked if the Commission has discussed any revenue options related to the current gas bill that the state legislature is debating. Kevin responded that he did not see any revenue options coming out of the Commission that were related to the gas bill. Chuck DiPietro noted that even though it is not one of the 46 revenue strategies presented at an earlier meeting of the TFAC, he is certain that the Commission is considering all available options including any possible revenue from gas drilling.
- Chuck DiPietro noted that the Commission is an impressive group of 36 transportation industry experts, including former PennDOT Secretary of Transportation Brad Mallory.

b.) Interstate 12 Year Capital Plan (Attachment B)

Kevin McCullough pointed to Attachment B, which presented the Statewide Twelve-Year Capital Plan for Interstates. Kevin noted that the portion of this plan for the SPC region will be included in the SPC 2040 Long-Range Plan. Kevin noted that Interstate needs far outweigh the anticipated available funding, which resulted in some significant projects being left off of the Interstate program. Therefore, Kevin stated that the possibility exists that other critical Interstate projects may need to compete for funding through the regional TIP. Both Lynn Heckman and Chuck DiPietro added that including

any such additional Interstate projects on the regional TIP with non-Interstate funding would have to be negotiated in the individual TIP development District work sessions. Kevin acknowledged that the anticipated funds for the 2013 TIP are also down significantly. Kevin speculated that some additional Interstate projects may be included in the “decade of investment” scenario being discussed by the Governor’s Transportation Funding Advisory Committee.

c.) Status of ARLE Program

Kevin reminded everyone that the Automatic Red Light Enforcement Program recently announced \$8.4 million in grants for 106 transportation projects paid with fines collected from red light enforcement cameras in the city of Philadelphia. Kevin stated that guidance had just been released this morning on the programming of these funds. Kevin noted that the TTC can expect several administrative actions related to this program at the July TTC as ARLE funds make their way onto the TIP. Kevin said if anyone has any questions about the ARLE program to talk to him.

Chuck DiPietro noted that a second round of funding through this program has already been announced and that applications are being accepted through July 31st. Kevin cautioned that round two will not have as much funding as the first round.

d.) State Transportation Commission Public Hearings (Handout 1)

Kevin McCullough directed all attendees to Handout 1 on the State Transportation Commission’s upcoming public testimony session for the 2013 Twelve Year Program. Chuck DiPietro noted that the session in western PA will be held on August 25<sup>th</sup> in the Cranberry area. Lynn Heckman expressed concern over the testimony time constraints related to the consolidation of the testimony from the SPC region with Northwest PA Regional Planning Commission, Erie County, and Mercer County. Chuck DiPietro noted that given the continuing funding crisis, that the hearings have been shifting away from project specific requests to more presentation of infrastructure condition by the MPOs and PennDOT District Executives.

Joe Szczur emphasized the continuing and extensive maintenance needs and that the revenue projections going into this TIP update fall well short of acceptable levels of investment. Joe suggested a coordinated approach between SPC and the three District DEs on the presentation at the STC hearing. Joe also expressed concern that time will be crunched due to the addition of the other western Pennsylvania planning regions at the hearing. Kevin McCullough noted that the “Decade of Investment” scenario may include discussion of both some capacity adding projects and possible dedicated local funds. Lynn Heckman noted that the TTC members may have some input to provide to the STC hearing preparations.

e.) The Link Newsletter (Handout 2)

Kevin McCullough pointed to Handout 2, which was the June 10<sup>th</sup> edition of “The Link” newsletter.

#### **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 C and Handout 3)

Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 pointed to their four amendment requests this month. Dave provided additional information on each amendment request:

- PA 228 Mars West PM – add the project and \$1,200,000 to the construction phase to the TIP in 2011
- PA 68 Evans City West PM – add the project and \$1,100,000 to the construction phase to the TIP in 2011.
- US 119 over US 422 bridge – add the project and \$7,622,000 to the construction phase to the TIP in 2012.
- Cunningham Street Bridge – add the preliminary engineering phase of this project and \$219,000 to the TIP in 2011.

Dave discussed one of the administrative actions:

- PA 228 / I-79 Ramps – Dave noted that delays occurred in the production of the land use plan which, subsequently, affected the Department’s project development schedule. The resulting delays from incorporating the Township’s plan culminated to the point where the original concept of phased construction was lost. Dave explained that the District now proposes to combine the construction phases of the Route 228 Northbound onramp and the Route 228 Southbound Loop Ramp projects into the PA 228/I-79 Ramps project and add its construction phase to the TIP in the amount of \$13,225,200 (80% Federal and 20% State) in FFY 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 D & Handout 4)

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

administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 11-0 had four amendments requests:

- Point of View Bluff – add the project and \$30,000 to the PE phase in 2011.
- Bates Street / Second Avenue – Increase Construction funds \$5,300,000.
- District Wide Bridge Repair – add \$400,000 in construction funds in 2012.
- Mansfield Bridge Rehab – add a total of \$9 million in construction funds to the 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)

Joe Szczur of PennDOT District 12-0 pointed to the amendments and administrative actions to the 2011-2014 TIP. District 12-0 had no amendment requests this month. Joe highlighted the next phase of the District 12-0 small bridge pilot project.

No TTC action was required.

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

a.) Public Period Comment Summary (Handout 6)

Chuck DiPietro thanked everyone for their assistance during the public comment period and PPP meetings for the SPC LRP update. The documents were available at 68 libraries throughout the region, at SPC's eleven member planning departments, and on the SPC website.

Matt Pavlosky reviewed information related to the public comment period for the plan. Matt noted that there were 10 public meetings held (one in each of the SPC member counties). Matt stated that 142 members of the public attended these meetings and press coverage included two newspaper articles. Matt noted that the public comment period ran from May 18<sup>th</sup> to June 17<sup>th</sup>. Chuck DiPietro noted that next week staff will be assembling all the comments received and developing responses. This summary public comment document will be shared with all SPC members in advance of the June 27<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting.

Lynn Heckman suggested that the presentation to the Commission include more information on the intermodal initiatives, including consistency with the Active Allegheny Plan, and linking planning and NEPA activities. Lynn questioned if her comment to add the Active Allegheny plan to the SPC LRP will be accommodated.

Chuck DiPietro noted that Active Allegheny will be added to the SPC LRP.

b.) TTC Action on recommendation to the Commission for June 27<sup>th</sup> adoption of Plan Update and companion documents

Chuck DiPietro noted that on June 15<sup>th</sup> the Transit Operators Committee recommended the 2040 plan adoption by the full commission at their Jun 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The TTC also motioned and unanimously recommended 2040 Plan adoption by of the full Commission (contingent on the close of the public comment period) for adoption on June 27<sup>th</sup>.

## **6. Road Safety Audits**

Doug Smith conducted a presentation on SPC's Road Safety Audits. The presentation included:

- Summary of the road safety process,
- Explanation of how the RSA locations get selected,
- Typical schedule of an RSA,
- Products produced, including a report and formal response from the facility owner;
- Before and after look at some of the previous RSA locations;
- Sample of the common hazards identified by the RSAs;
- Sample of the recommendations made by the RSA reports

Chuck DiPietro noted that in some cases, RSAs may be a tool to respond to some of the public comments at the recent round of PPP meetings. He noted the Route 228 Y intersection in Butler County's Clinton Township as an example.

Lynn Heckman questioned the liability issues raised by the municipalities in regards to individual decision to not accept sidewalks as part of a project. Lynn stated that something has to change on the policies regarding this. If PennDOT is willing to install sidewalks, then accommodations need to be made for pedestrians.

Lynn Heckman asked if the location in the North Hills that was discussed at the Allegheny County public meeting was a candidate for an RSA. Doug responded that the he is coordinating with PennDOT District 11-0 safety staff on this location.

Bill Deguffroy asked how the locations for the RSAs are selected. Doug responded that there is an RSA application that can be filled out and submitted. Doug noted that the owner of the roadway must agree with the location; without the agreement of the owner, the RSA cannot be initiated. Art Cappella stated that he thinks the RSA program is a worthwhile program that continues to result in positive returns. Joel MacKay concurred that the RSA that he was involved in was successful. Dave Cook noted that in regard to some of the challenges in dealing

with municipalities, perhaps there are some trade-offs on maintenance that could be offered by PennDOT Districts and working through the Agility Program Coordinators. Lynn Heckman stated that there should be a mechanism to provide funds for low cost improvements identified in the RSAs.

## **7. 2013 – 2016 TIP Update & LPN Response**

### **a). LPN Screening Forms Training**

Chuck reviewed the dates for the LPN screening forms training schedule listed in the agenda.

### **b). CMAQ: Evaluation Committee & Program Management Committee**

Chuck Imbrogno reported on the activities going on related to the CMAQ program in two committees:

- The CMAQ Evaluation Committee – Chuck noted that this Committee is set with 23 members and will be issuing a CMAQ call for projects and subsequent evaluation process. Chuck stated that the application period for new applicants will be early September thru early October, with an expected list of projects by the end of December.
- CMAQ Program Management 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. Chuck noted that the Committee consists of 11 members. Chuck noted that there is an opening for one of the rural county planners to be on the PMAC. Art Cappella from Fayette County expressed interest in the opening.

### **c). Statewide Final General and Procedural Guidance (Attachment F)**

Chuck DiPietro pointed to Attachment F, which was the Statewide Final General and Procedural Guidance for the 2013 TIP update.

### **d). Statewide Final Financial Guidance (Attachment G)**

Chuck DiPietro also pointed to Attachment G, which was the Statewide Final Financial Guidance for the 2013 TIP update. Chuck noted, that as he presented at the last TTC meeting, the revenue in the TIP is significantly down for each District. Overall the 2013 TIP update target is down 18 percent for the SPC region.

e). Stakeholder Access to the Level 1 LPN Screening Forms (Attachment H)

Chuck DiPietro reviewed Attachment H regarding the approach to the PennDOT LPN level 1 screening forms. Chuck reiterated the reasoning for possibly keeping this list of stakeholders lean. Chuck cited a lack of funding to add new projects to the TIP and not wanting to raise expectations that advancing a lot of new projects is realistic. Chuck reviewed the approach detailed in Attachment H of utilizing the PPP members as stakeholders. Chuck noted that the level 1 forms submitted by the PPP members will be brought into the District TIP work sessions to assign a status and utilize as a planning tool. Karen asked if there was any problem providing the STC hearing testimony to the PPPs for use in level 1 form submissions. Kevin McCullough responded that this should not be a problem.

Karen stated that the STC hearing is open to the public and will serve as open public comment to kick-off the TIP update; the PPPs will have the opportunity to review this testimony as they consider transportation problems to submit as level 1 forms.

Darrin Alviano stated that Armstrong County plans on utilizing the PPP members as “stakeholders” in the screening forms process. Jeff Leithauser noted that limiting to the PPP members may not limit the number of level 1 forms submitted. Jeff also noted a concern with PPP members that may not have use of a computer.

Chuck DiPietro noted that Matt Pavlosky of the SPC staff will work with the PPPs in each county to accommodate any minor adjustments in the level 1 process if needed. Chuck also suggested that the next round of PPP meetings associated with the TIP update could include sharing the current TIP status (after carry over analysis from next round of District work sessions) versus the financial guidance assumptions to illustrate the constraints and challenges of this TIP update.

f). District LPN Project Development/TIP Update work Group Meetings

Chuck DiPietro reviewed the schedule for the upcoming District work sessions (as listed in the agenda) for Linking Planning and NEPA and the TIP update. Chuck pointed to the schedule in the agenda packet for screening forms training dates in each District.

**8. Other Business**

a). Local Asset Management

Doug Smith noted the start of several interns working for SPC in collecting small local bridge data within the region. Both Pat Hassett and Steve Shanley stated that they have



bridge data that they can share with SPC in the local asset management inventory.

b). Joint TTC/TOC Meeting (Handout 6)

Chuck DiPietro noted that at the previous TTC meeting he had suggested that an early joint TOC/TTC meeting focus on the August 25<sup>th</sup> STC hearing to discuss recommendations anticipated to be available at that time from the Governor's Transportation Funding Task Force. Chuck stated that joint meeting options continue to be discussed.

Lynn Heckman stated that some of the planning initiatives that Gil Penalosa (Executive Director of 8-80 Cities) recently presented at the Heinz Foundation may be of interest to design of a future joint TOC/TTC meeting. Lynn noted that perhaps she, Sara Walfoort, and Todd Kravitz might be available to present.

b). Transit Operators Committee

David Totten reviewed a few items of interest from the June 15<sup>th</sup> TOC:

- TOC recommendation of the SPC Long-Range Plan to the Commission
- Adopted the TOC meeting schedule for fiscal year 2012
- Discussed future presentations on Alternative Fuels and Transit Oriented Development.

c). Other

Chuck DiPietro noted that Jeff Raykes is leaving his position at Indiana County Planning to become the Indiana Borough Manager. Jeff stated that he has enjoyed working with everyone on the TTC.

## **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.