

Meeting Minutes for November 15th, 2012
Transportation Technical Committee Meeting
SPC Offices
Two Chatham Center
Downtown Pittsburgh

Attendees:

- Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Dept of Public Works
- James Camp, Beaver County
- Tammy Frank, Beaver County
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County
- Jeremy Kelly, Greene County
- Jeff Grimm, Indiana County
- Amy McKinney, Lawrence County
- Pat Hassett, City of Pittsburgh
- Jeff Leithauser, Washington County Planning Commission
- Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning Department
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office
- Matt Smoker, FHWA
- Dave Cook, PennDOT District 10-0
- Doug Dupnock, PennDOT District 10-0
- Rob Miskanic, PennDOT District 11-0
- John Quatman, PennDOT District 11-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Jeremy Shaneyfelt, PennDOT District 12-0
- Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Management Association
- Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
- Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh
- Darin Alviano, SPC Staff
- Dan Bernazzoli, SPC Staff
- Chuck DiPietro, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
- Chuck Imbrogno, SPC Staff
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- Matt Pavlosky, SPC Staff
- Doug Smith, SPC Staff
- (Indicates Voting Member)

1. October 2012 TTC Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)

Chuck DiPietro called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The October meeting minutes were approved with no revisions.

2. Public Comment

Scott Bricker of Bike Pittsburgh provided public comment. Scott stated that Bike Pittsburgh has been following the developments of MAP-21 and the new Federal Transportation Alternatives Program. Scott asked for an update of where SPC is in developing the process by which the TA Program will operate in the region. Scott noted that Bike Pittsburgh supports the Transportation Alternatives Program and offered their expertise to SPC staff. Chuck DiPietro thanked Scott while noting stated that SPC is still in the early development stage of our response to the TA Program. Chuck noted that this particular program was the focus of a lot of discussion at the recent Annual Planning Partners meeting in State College. Chuck noted that the MPO/RPOs formally submitted a list of questions to PennDOT pertaining to the administration of this program. The FHWA interim guidance on the TA Program was included in the advance agenda for the meeting.

3. Action on Amendments and Modifications to the 2011 to 2014 TIP

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

a.) PennDOT District 10-0 (Attachment B)

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

- o 2013 All Weather Pavement Markings – Add project and \$330,000 for construction in 2013.

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

b.) PennDOT District 11-0 (Attachment B and Handout 1)

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

Rob reviewed the amendments:

- o Liberty Tunnel Rehab, Ph 4 – Increase Construction phase in FFY 2013 by \$9 million and by \$2 million in FFY 2014.

- West Carson Street Viaduct –Increase in Construction phase by \$10.3 million in FFY 2013 and by \$2.025 million in FFY 2014.

Rob noted one 2013 betterment project being added from a line item and some CMAQ funding shifts to the bike share project. Chuck Imbrogno noted that he has reviewed the CMAQ moves with Kevin McCullough and both agree with the adjustments. Kevin noted that since the CMAQ Committee pre-approves the scopes for the CMAQ program, however, when there are potential changes in the scope of a project, the SPC CMAQ staff need to have an upfront review, before presentation of the request to the TTC.

Pat Hassett noted that there is an upcoming scoping field-view for the City's CMAQ signal project, which will clarify the scope of the project. Pat noted that he will provide scoping details to Chuck Imbrogno. Both Kevin and Chuck Imbrogno added that the detailed scope should be provided when the project sponsor requests a 4232 form submission.

Steve Shanley noted that Allegheny County will be advancing several county bridge rehabilitations and will soon coordinate with Rob Miskanic.

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

c.) PennDOT District 12-0 (Attachment D and Handout 2)

Angela Saunders of PennDOT District 12-0 reviewed the requested amendments and administrative actions to the current TIP. District 12-0 had two amendment requests this month.

- All Weather Pavement Markings – Add construction phase for \$300,000 in 2013.
- D12 Small Bridge Rehab – Add \$1.75 million in preliminary engineering in 2013.

Angela explained that Washington County in District 12-0 was selected for a pilot project on packaging small bridge rehabilitations. The funds for these projects are additional funds to the region coming out of a Central Office line item. Art Cappella asked Angela what is the total amount of this pilot project. Angela replied approximately \$10 million.

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

4. 2015-2018 TIP Update Development Process (Handout 3)

Chuck DiPietro presented several PowerPoint slides pertaining to planning the next TIP update. The content of the presentation built on the handouts and discussions on the topic

from previous TTC meetings since June 2012 TIP adoption. SPC staff requested TTC feedback and comment on the material presented.

Chuck presented the three key focus areas SPC has targeted for enhancement in the next TIP update.

- Increasing planning activities and engagement within the District Project Development Work Groups
- Improving key stakeholder/partner communication
- Further Integrating Public Involvement

The PowerPoint presentation elaborated on each of the three key points and provided expected outcomes for each of the three focus areas. Chuck concluded with presenting the next steps in planning the 2015 TIP update. The next TTC in December will include continued TTC discussion of the proposed process for the 2015 TIP update with more detailed information and timeline.

Pat Hassett concurred that the TIP update process could use some new insights like the ones presented in the series of PowerPoint slides. Pat added that many key stakeholders and decision makers still view the TIP process as a black box that is not clear. Pat noted that many of the items presented under stakeholder communication and integrating public involvement seem like good improvements. Lucinda Beattie added that she is particularly interested in the enhancements pertaining to the early consideration of new candidates by each work group. Lucinda noted that it will be important to establish discipline in considering new candidates and to provide accountability and meaningful feedback back to proposal sponsors. Kevin McCullough added that many of the proposed communication enhancements should eliminate the last minute questions from Commissioners that occurred last June (2012) with TIP adoption. Kevin also noted that the new workgroup format should provide more perspectives on individual projects under consideration. Chuck DiPietro added that the enhanced process will require more prep and follow-up activities for both TTC members and staff. Jeff Leithauser noted that the approach should also include closer coordination with the Districts on individual candidate projects under consideration.

5. Highlights from the October 22-24 Statewide Planning Partners Meeting (Handout 4)

Chuck DiPietro reviewed several presentations from the recent PennDOT Annual Planning Partners Meeting. Chuck noted that these are some of the highlights from the three-day conference most relevant to the TTC. Chuck reviewed portions of five presentations (Local Program Delivery Initiative, Local Bridge Program Management Pilot, Network Modernization without Isolation, MAP-21 Overview, and MPO/RPO report). As part of the Local Program Delivery Initiative review, Steve Shanley noted that both the City and

Allegheny County have their own processes for developing local projects. Art Cappella asked where would funds for the closure of any bridges come from, Chuck DiPietro noted they would most likely be TIP funds. Kevin added that studies to determine which bridges should not be reinvested in is a serious strategy that has already been employed in some counties. Jeff Leithauser asked if there are any standards to guide these decisions to not reinvest in certain bridges. Kevin noted there are some triggers such as ADT, detour length, and context, but it is typically done on a case by case basis.

Chuck also reviewed the content from the closed MPO/RPO session and the list of comments/questions that was reported back to PennDOT as part of the Planning Partners Meeting. These included communication issues, MAP-21, the Transportation Alternatives Program, local bridges, and general issues. Chuck noted that PennDOT has committed to providing responses to all the questions submitted by the MPO/RPOs.

6. Other Business

a.) FHWA/PennDOT Central Office Reports

Kevin McCullough noted that discussions at the state level in Harrisburg have picked up regarding Turnpike Commission debt, Act 44 reform, and TFAC funding package. Kevin stated that the feeling is that there is a four to five month window where there is an opportunity for State Legislature/Governor action on these issues. Kevin added that the Program Center is watching this closely and will keep SPC informed.

b.) Fourth Quarter Reports (Handout 5)

Kevin and Chuck DiPietro highlighted the Fourth Quarter Program Report. Kevin noted that the region was right on target with the base funding and slightly below target on the additional funding.

c.) MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program Interim Guidance

Chuck DiPietro noted the link to the Transportation Alternatives Program interim guidance from FHWA. Kevin McCullough noted that the TA Program was the topic of a lot of conversations at the Planning Partners Meetings in State College. The Program Center's focus is to first deliver the old TE projects that are moving. Kevin noted that a hard look at the projects that are not moving will be required. Kevin elaborated that we cannot afford to have old projects that are not moving hold up the ability to select new projects under MAP-21 new TA program direction.

Doug Smith noted that one of the most important questions regarding the TE program is whether PennDOT will consider funding construction at a 100% level. Kevin responded that this has not yet been determined. Doug noted that in the past PennDOT has coordinated a meeting with all the District and MPO staff involved in the TE program, and that this might be a good time to advance a TA Program coordination meeting. Kevin noted that this was a good idea, but was unaware that such a meeting is being planned.

d.) Initiative to Help Local Public Agencies Manage Federal Aid Projects.

Chuck DiPietro noted the link in the advanced e-mail material that led to a new page of the FHWA website that provides tools to both educate and assist local agencies in managing Federal-aid projects.

e.) Urban Boundary/Functional Class Update

Doug Smith recapped the progress to-date on the mandatory review and update of the regional urban boundary and regional functional classification. Doug noted that about 6-8 weeks ago a series of work sessions and meetings around the region was held to go over the urban boundary data that resulted from the most recent Census. Doug had one-on-one work sessions with each county where the smoothed out urban boundaries from 10 years ago, the urban boundaries that the Census data gave us this time around were reviewed. During the work sessions participants marked up the maps with the proposed smoothed out urban boundaries for this cycle. In those same work sessions, the functional classification of federal-aid roadways within each county was reviewed and roads identified where it might be logical to either upgrade them to a higher functional class, or downgrade them to a lower functional class.

Doug noted that following these steps he held a meeting with each PennDOT District to go over the marked up maps and gather their input on the urban boundaries and functional classifications. Doug noted that he has emailed everyone electronic map(s) and other materials summarizing all the information that was compiled on this for review and additional feedback.

Doug stated that prior to recommendation to TTC in January and the Commission request for approval on January 28, one more coordination meeting is needed in each District to finalize the urban boundaries and proposed functional classification modifications. Doug asked that everyone coordinate with him following the meeting to coordinate these final District work sessions. Doug noted that the goal is to have the TTC and Commission act on in January (the 17th and 28th respectively). Matt Smoker asked if the coordination on these updates has included surrounding MPO/RPOs. Doug noted that it is planned, but has not yet occurred.

f.) Public Involvement Coordination

Matt Pavlosky highlighted some recent public involvement activities. Matt noted that SPC is currently in a comment period, until December 4th, for the TIGER IV East Liberty Transit Center TIP/LRP amendment; Matt noted that the public meeting on the amendment was held on November 13th. Tom Klevan noted that the presentation that was given at this meeting will be available soon on the SPC website. Matt highlighted the five SPC public meeting's for the Mon Valley TOD prototype project. Matt noted that work continues on new PPP appointments.

g.) Other

Chris Bova asked if there was going to be an updated bridge bill. Kevin McCullough responded that he has no update to report today, but will find out and alert SPC if there is a call for bridge bill projects upcoming.

h.) December 5th – TOC – at Chatham 2

i.) December 6th – TTC – at Chatham 2

j.) December 10th - SPC Commission Meeting – at Chatham 2



GUIDANCE FOR PROCESSING TIP MODIFICATIONS AT SPC TTC (TITLE 1)

There are four ways a TIP modification request can be processed in the SPC region:

1. Major TIP Amendment; 2. Amendment; 3. TTC Administrative Action; and 4. Administrative Action.

Ask the following procedural questions, in order, as guidance to determine how the modification request will be processed.

Procedural Questions Follow order:	PROCESS AS: 3. TTC Administrative Action (Requiring TTC Approval)*	PROCESS AS: 2. TIP Amendment (Requiring TTC Approval)	PROCESS AS: 1. Major TIP Amendment (Requiring SPC Commission Approval)
<p>Does the Action affect air quality conformity status of a project?</p> <p><small>For questions on exempt/nonexempt air quality status or related to project conformity ramifications of scope, schedule, and/or design changes, contact SPC's Air Quality Conformity department.</small></p>	Yes →		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30-day Public Comment Period and Public Meeting Required After AQ testing, analysis, and conformity determination
↓ No			
<p>Can the project be defined as a "Major TIP Amendment" ? ◆</p> <p><small>In the past the following actions have been deemed "Major":</small></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flex of highway funds to Turnpike - Flex of highway funds to Transit - Highly visible projects deemed potentially controversial - New funding initiative/program such as ARRA 	Yes →		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30-day Public Comment Period and Public Meeting Required Due to high visibility and potential for controversy
↓ No			
<p>Does the action involve adding a project to the TIP that has had no previous obligations/encumbrances?</p> <p><small>Exception 1: 100% state funded project(s) added from approved line item</small></p> <p><small>Exception 2: An emergency project(s) ●</small></p>	Yes → <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount added to the TIP is >\$10 Million Amount added to the TIP is ≤ \$10 Million 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30-day Public Comment Period and Public Meeting Required
↓ No or Exception Case			
<p>Does the action involve creating a new line item?</p>	Yes →	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
↓ No			
<p>Does the action involve deleting a project from the TIP?</p>	Yes → <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount deleted is >\$10 Million Amount deleted is ≤ \$10 Million 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30-day Public Comment Period and Public Meeting Required
↓ No			
<p>Does the action involve adding or deleting a project phase?</p>	Yes → <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount is >\$10 Million Amount ≤ 10 \$ Million and > \$5 Million Amount ≤ \$5 Million <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30-day Public Comment Period and Public Meeting Required
↓ No			
<p>Does the action involve a cost change > \$1 Million?</p>	Yes → <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount is >\$10 Million Amount is ≤ 10 \$ Million and > \$5 Million Amount is >\$1 Million ≤ \$5 Million <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
↓ No			
<p>Does the action involve a major change in scope or schedule?</p> <p><small>Determination of a "Major Change in Scope or Schedule" is made at the discretion of the TTC.</small></p>	Yes →	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
↓ No			
<p>PROCESS AS: 4. Administrative Action Not Requiring TTC Approval presented for information only</p>			

TTC= SPC's Transportation Technical Committee

The term "action" refers to all the project adjustments included in the request.

* Administrative Action requests that require TTC approval are to be indicated on the monthly modification narratives contained in the TTC meeting agenda.

◆ Determination of a "Major TIP Amendment" action is made at the reasonable discretion of the TTC.

● Expedited procedures may be utilized in emergency situations and may differ from normal procedures detailed above.