

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Minutes of the Meeting
June 24, 2019 – 4:30 p.m.
Two Chatham Center • Suite 400 • 112 Washington Place • Pittsburgh, PA 15219

The one hundred thirty-fifth meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission was called to order by Chairman Larry Maggi.

Members present: Darin Alviano, Tony Amadio, Kevin Boozel, Scott Bricker, Tom Ceraso, Dave Coder, Steve Craig, Sandie Egley, Rich Fitzgerald, Kimberly Geyer, Sheila Gombita, Mark Gordon, Kelly Gray, Dick Hadley, Lynn Heckman, Charles Jones, Clifford Levine, Dave Lohr, Bob Macey, Larry Maggi, Jeff Marshall, Kevin McCullough, David Miller, Cheryl Moon-Sirianni, Leslie Osche, Johnna Pro, Mavis Rainey (on phone), Aurora Sharrard, Byron Stauffer, Jr., Diana Irely Vaughan, Jessica Walls-Lavelle, and Blair Zimmerman.

Others present: Ann Ogoreuc, Allegheny County Department of Economic Development; Jim Price, Sustainable Pittsburgh; Matthew Mehalik, Breathe Project; Michelle Naccarati-Chapkis, Women for a Healthy Environment; Rachel Belloma-Bonnet, Representative Sara Innamorato's Office; Brian Rhindress, CMU Student; Sue Sappi, Group Against Smog and Pollution (GASP); Erica Jackson, FracTracker Alliance; Flynn Pollard, Climate Reality Project Pittsburgh and SWPA; Ned Williams, Montour Trail Council.

Staff: Jim Hassinger, Kirk Brethauer, Erika Eagan, Chuck Imbrogno, Tom Klevan, Vince Massaro, Shannon O'Connell, Dee Pamplin, Abby Stark, Kay Tomko, Lew Villotti, Sara Walfoort, and Andy Waple.

Before starting the meeting, Chairman Maggi introduced and welcomed new member Sheila Gombita from Washington County, representing SPC's Transit Operators' Committee.

1. Chairman Maggi called to order the June 24, 2019 meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
 - a. Quorum – There being a quorum present the meeting proceeded
 - b. Conflict of Interest Declarations on Action Items – None.
2. Action on Minutes of the April 29, 2019 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the April 29, 2019 meeting by Commissioner Robert Macey which was seconded by Commissioner Kevin Boozel. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

3. Public Comment –

Today, because SPC will act on the Draft **SmartMoves for a Changing Region** long-range plan and Companion Documents there will be more than the usual amount of public comments.

Chairman Maggi informed everyone that this is a time for the public to address the Commission. For those that are speaking, please keep your comments to three (3) minutes.

Matthew Mahalik, Executive of the Breathe Project, submitting comments on behalf of 20 regional organizations.

We want to congratulate SPC for many excellent new ideas and principles that have been incorporated into the goals and framing for the draft of this plan. We also wish to express our extreme levels of concern about a portion of this plan that appears to endorse the build out of the petrochemical industry in our region in the form of an Appalachian Storage Hub (ASH). We want to point out how your including the ASH in this plan undercuts the vision, credibility, and effectiveness of what otherwise could be a plan that we would otherwise endorse.

There are many positive aspects of the *SmartMoves* plan for which we wish to express **our** support. The transportation sector is the second largest contributor to our region's particulate pollution, so this plan's focus on improving regional air quality is laudable. Aiming for a health protective standard for air pollution should be kept in focus as a framework as decisions from this plan are moved forward.

The plan should also be commended for its willingness to recognize that the earth sustains us, as well as prioritizing tackling climate change, improving air quality, taking care of our water, and pursuing a sustainable and resilient community approach to planning.

The plan's inclusion of an endorsement of an Appalachian Storage Hub is dissonant with the rest of the *SmartMoves* Plan. After 62 pages of thoughtful and laudable ideas in this report, the plan introduces a concept that sticks out like a sore thumb because of how dissonant it is with the rest of the report. In a text box that features a 19th century incandescent light bulb as an icon, the report identifies an Energy Resources Strategy, articulated as: "Support the identification and development of an "Appalachian Storage Hub" to promote the local use of locally-derived ethane feedstock." This idea of an ASH is an endorsement of a slow-moving, long-lasting recipe for harm for our region. The ASH idea stands in contrast with the ideas of sustainability, improvements in air quality, protecting our water, and supporting prosperity in our communities.

The ASH concept is a direct threat to improving our region's air quality, in contradiction to the air quality goals spelled out elsewhere in the *SmartMoves* plan. The construction of the Shell Petrochemical Plant will erase 30 years worth of regional air quality improvements. The ASH calls for at least three of these plants like the Shell facility to be built.

In order to achieve Mayor Bill Peduto's commitment of reducing Pittsburgh's greenhouse gas emissions by 20% by 2023 and achieving 100% renewable energy by 2035, we must slow and stop the expansion of petrochemical plants, pipelines, compressor stations and ancillary industries in our region. The Shell plant will emit 2.2 million tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalents, a climate change gas, which is equivalent to putting an additional 430,800 cars on the highway. Thank you. We ask that this be struck from the plan.

Jim Price, Community Manager, Sustainable Pittsburgh.

Thank you for allowing us to make a public comment today. SPC's Draft *SmartMoves* Plan has many commendable goals. The process to create the Plan was inclusive and transparent with staff actively seeking the advice of stake holders from throughout the region. Sustainable Pittsburgh works with hundreds of businesses and local governments around the region and the Commonwealth to measure and access the impact of decisions on the environment, social equity and economic prosperity. Sustainable Pittsburgh is glad to see that the Plan states a desire to prioritize investment based on similar performance criteria. This Draft Plan covers strategies for revitalizing neighborhoods, towns across the region, creating attractive transit friendly communities with complete streets and affordable housing options.

Moreover, the Plan addresses the need to tackle climate change, air and water quality, and specifically calls for investment in renewable energy sources. Sustainable Pittsburgh commends SPC for including these important issues in the Plan. All of these strategies contribute to a more resilient and attractive region benefitting people, planet, and prosperity. Sustainable Pittsburgh supports growing and training our region's workforce and partnering and deploying technology to advance our region's economy. We are highly supportive of work that would move us into a position as a global leader in a more attractive economy. However, under the theme of prioritizing, improving and supporting, within the section of creating a global competitive economy; the Plan suggests a strategy for identifying and developing a storage hub for natural gas liquids and petrochemical products, as well as supporting a pipeline distribution network and infrastructure for the petrochemical industry. Because of the impacts on health and the environment, this strategy would make it difficult for SPC and its partners around the region to achieve the goals found in this Long-Range Plan, several of which I've just mentioned. Smart long term investments and alternatives to fossil fuels, single use plastics, and carbon-intensive manufacturing will build economic prosperity now and into the future. Sustainable Pittsburgh is looking forward to continuing to work with

SPC. Our hope is that the Commissioners will prioritize for execution the parts of the Plan that can achieve the goals we share for a prosperous and healthy region.

Rachel Belloma-Bonnet, representing Representative Sara Innamorato.

We commend the Commission on climate change and specifically projects that would sustain and meet or exceed national air quality standards. Our concerns are that this Plan would offer enthusiastic unfettered support for the identification and development of a storage hub for NGLs and petrochemical products, as well as a pipeline distribution network and other petrochemical plastics energy infrastructure and manufacturing throughout the region. This is predicated on a massive long-term economic development strategy that includes attracting additional petrochemical investment expanding the plastics and advance manufacturing sectors. You cannot address climate change and court petrochemical investment simultaneously. These are inherently contradictory goals.

At a time when the eye of the nation's Intergovernmental Panel on climate change is warning that we only have 12 years to address our climate tri-crisis. This strategy supported by the SPC would move our region in precisely the wrong direction. The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies studied DEP on the Shell Cracker Plants report in March of this year that "in 2017 the City of Pittsburgh unveiled an ambitious plan to slash greenhouse gas emissions in half by 2030, which would equate to a reduction of 2.1M tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year". Shell's ethane cracker which needs to burn natural gas to create the high temperatures needed to crack ethane is expected to emit 2.2M tons of greenhouse gases annually. In other words, all of Pittsburgh's work on combating climate change through 2030 would be negated by a single plant. Despite all the public dollars and human ingenuity invested locally into efforts to improve our environment, we will be at a net loss once Shell's plastic plant comes on line.

I ask that the members of this Commission understand that this, along with the increase and emissions and pollution exacerbated by the extractive oil and gas industry will lead to real public health and safety concerns. We cannot begin to address these concerns if we do not first bring them to the public's attention. I am in favor of family sustaining union jobs, but they should never be at the expense of vulnerable and historically marginalized communities. This tension between environmental concerns and developing vibrant local economies must be debated in a public setting so we can create the political will and political courage to devise legislative solutions, not continue putting communities against one another. Thank you for your time. I encourage your commitment to building a region that centers economic and environmental justice in your Long-Range Plan.

Susan Seppi, Group Against Smog and Pollution.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. The second major goal in *SmartMoves for a Changing Region* is "Resilient Communities" and the theme for this goal is "Tackle Climate Change, Air and Water, the Earth Sustains Us." (pg. 37) GASP certainly agrees that consideration for our air, water and climate change is a solid base for any economic and associated transportation plan. *SmartMoves* on (p.44) notes that the "The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the City of Pittsburgh both have recently developed Climate Action Plans which could serve as a foundation for a regional plan". This is a great and helpful idea. Please work to develop and implement such a regional plan.

The present development of the region and the natural gas industry relates in a huge way to the *SmartMoves Plan*, especially because the Plan proposes on page 63 to support the Appalachian Storage Hub (ASH) and its pipeline distribution network, other petrochemical, plastics, and energy infrastructure and manufacturing throughout the quad-state area (Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia).

This proposal to support the Appalachian Storage Hub and extended infrastructure will naturally draw in the Shell Cracker Plant under construction in Beaver County. Cracker plants perform the first step in transforming ethane, a component of natural gas into ethylene, the building block of plastics. Other cracker plants and chemical plants are in development or being proposed. To feed all of these facilities, natural gas and wet natural gas liquids production will be ever growing and spreading in the region along

with its impacts on the land, water, health and quality of life (only briefly discussed) but also add on its effect on global warming.

Support for the Appalachian Storage Hub, infrastructure and associated facilities is not a smart move in the longer term, it is a step backward holding us in a less sustainable place than what could have been. We urge you to avoid or at least minimize involvement in this initiative.

Erica Jackson, FracTraker Alliance.

Thank you for giving me the time to talk today, and for your time in putting together this plan for the region. I'm here to express my concern over SPC's support of the natural gas liquid and petrochemical hub. A plan that is anything but a smart move for the region. At a time when we have more understanding than ever the risks of climate change, we're investing in an industry that releases hundreds of millions of green house gases each year, ignoring the warnings of the world's top climate scientists. Just 38 of the 128 existing or planned petrochemical facilities in the Ohio River Valley release almost 22M tons of CO₂ per year. At a time when we have more understanding than ever of the destruction that single use plastic has on green life, our health, and communities. When 12.7M tons of plastic waste go into the ocean every year and when countries around the world are phasing out the product and when our countries' recycling system has proven to be a failure, the petrochemical industry will result in millions more tons of single use plastic every year.

At a time when we have more evidence than ever that fracking is impacting our health, leading to pre-term birth, respiratory illnesses, and adverse mental health impacts. Costing billions in health care and damaged infrastructure and lost home values. The petrochemical industry will rely on fracking thousands more unconventional wells. At a time when we know the oil and gas industry is not profitable, when companies are spending billions more on drilling than they are generating in product. And when just last week in Pittsburgh the EQT's former CEO called the industry self-destructive and an unmitigated disaster for investors. The ability of the petrochemical industry requires giving billions more in taxpayer dollars to an industry that is likely to burst, leaving behind a toxic legacy just like coal did. At a time when wind and solar are already cheaper to build and operate than most markets, and battery storage is increasing the resiliency of the industry. When there are more jobs, and clean energy, energy efficiency and alternative vehicles than fossil fuels the Appalachian Storage Hub suppresses the growth of these clean energy alternatives by choosing instead the increasing automated industry of oil and gas.

As a young person living in southwestern Pennsylvania, I'm deeply concerned about the direction this region is heading, and if the petrochemical build out continues in its direction, this will not be a place I would want to stay to advance my career or to raise a family. I'm not alone in this opinion, and I urge the SPC to listen to the voices of residents instead of the industry's propoganda and retract its support for the Appalachian Storage Hub and petrochemical build out.

Michelle Narccarty-Chakis, Executive Director, Women For A Healthy Environment.

We want to congratulate SPC for many excellent new ideas and principles that have been incorporated into the goals and framing for the draft of this plan. We also wish to express our extreme levels of concern about a portion of this plan that appears to endorse the build out of the petrochemical industry in our region in the form of an Appalachian Storage Hub (ASH). We want to point out how your including the ASH in this plan undercuts the vision, credibility, and effectiveness of what otherwise could be a plan that we would otherwise endorse.

Flynn Pollard, Citizen and organizer working with the Climate Reality Project.

Thank you for giving me this time to speak today. I came today to demonstrate my interest in public transport and infrastructure that improves the quality of life for citizens in this area while keeping vital resources such as air and water safe for visitors and residents. I want to believe those interests are shared by this Commission and all public officials and representatives of Allegheny County. I also want to believe that the *SmartMoves* Plan, which you are discussing today, is built on a commitment to those interests. There are parts of this Plan which are laudable; and I thank all those that have contributed to those parts. The clean air strategy which attempts to improve air quality in this region over the next 25

years is obviously a great idea. Building resiliency to climate change and planning for its effects including rural and underdeveloped communities in those plans, makes my heart sing. So, thank you for your stated commitments to those goals that are important just as your commitments to public service in this county are important.

I have to question, however, as many others have, the endorsement of Appalachian Storage Hub imbedded on page 62 of this Plan. What may seem like a small iniquitous detail in *SmartMoves*, feels to me and many other concerned residents in this county like a one way ticket toward undermining each of those goals, which have already been lauded in this discussion. The ASH development which is part of a broader petrochemical invasion of our region will contribute to degradation over all public health and sustainability as we discussed. The industry that the ASH would support is a proven net drain not only on public health but on actual economic development about which I'm sure you're concerned. The oil and gas industry has been consistently reporting negative cash flow for about 10 years. Promises of job growth and tax revenue growth at the county level from this industry have been continually under-performed in reality and what jobs are produced are temporary and filled by workers from out-of-state. Indirect and induced jobs from these industries are minimal at best. Long-Term Development from this endorsement will not occur, so just remove it. One iniquitous detail from page 62 cut from the paper and we can move forward with an actually good Plan.

4. Report on Public Engagement for the Draft *SmartMoves for a Changing Region*, and Companion Documents Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment and Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area – Abby Stark

After a short video on the *SmartMoves* Plan, Ms. Stark will update the Commission on the public comment period which started May 6th and concluded June 7th, but includes some comments which were received today. Ms. Stark summarized the Plan timeline and public engagement. The Plan started in July 2017 with two Long Range Plan Task Force meetings, a Commissioners' Workshop, two Expert Resource Panel meetings, a Regional Plan Workshop, two rounds of surveys and three rounds of PPP meetings and the public comment period. These are the multiple avenues we have been employing for public outreach. It is important to us, working with your planners, to learn of the concerns and needs of the communities throughout the region.

- Expert Resource Panels
- Forces of Change Survey & Comments
- *Smart Moves* Webpage and Videos
- Public Meetings:
 - Regional Plan Workshop
 - PPP & Public Engagement
- SPC Committees
- Emails & Media
 - Email Contacts
 - Social Media
 - TV/Radio
 - Newspaper

At the last Commission Meeting we were at 15,000 points of engagement, and now we are at 22,600 points of engagement. These are people who actually engaged in the process. Through the comment period we had over 2,000 people go to our web page and download the document. The final document will have more information on the exact number of people we reached.

Mr. Waple continued by showing artistic renderings of projects that include strategies found in the plan. The renderings depict example projects and the ways that we envision the strategies will be used to enhance the transportation projects over the next 25 years of this plan.

Mr. Waple then discussed the investments to the region's transportation system made by the plan, on the

highway and bridge side there is \$16B of state and transportation funds over the next 25 years. Over the past year PennDOT has encouraged all planning partners from across the state to include their maintenance funding within our fiscal capacity just for illustrative purposes. Individual investment categories throughout the Plan are \$5B for bridge reconstruction and preservation, \$4.3B for highway reconstruction, \$1.8B for operations and safety, \$603M for new capacity with half of that being consumed by I-79 widening. Also, we have \$940M set aside for projects that increase air quality as well as active transportation projects and projects that enhance communities and livability. That number is significantly higher than in past plans as a result of the processes we undertook with livability through Smart Transportation Program and increased the funding 200 percent through the life of the Plan. Another first for a long-range plan, we set aside \$275M for resiliency for landslide and flood remediation. Lastly, there is \$2.4B in District Maintenance funds. These funds are used by each PennDOT District for routine maintenance activities such as plowing snow, trimming trees, drainage work and fixing guide rails.

On the public transit side about \$14B in federal and state funds will be invested, the vast majority, about \$9.8B, going towards operations and operating assistance. Capital maintenance and rolling stock purchases account for the remainder of the \$14B.

Environmental Justice is a requirement set up by the Federal government where we have to examine the way and locations in which we're investing our funds in regard to low income and minority populations. Approximately 72 percent of the investments of mapable projects are in low income EJ blocks; which is 65 percent of the projects. Approximately 56 percent of the investments are in the minority environmental justice census blocks which are about 49 percent of the projects. Once each project starts the development process, during the preliminary engineering phase, they have to get environmental clearance as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. This data acts as early input into that process.

Mr. Waple then discussed the results of the Air Quality Conformity Determination. Mr. Waple noted that MPOs are required to test the program of projects funded through the plan against emission budgets set forth by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The test results for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley Non-Attainment Area were displayed and discussed. The results of the program of projects clearly show that the on-road emissions are significantly lower and trending downward when compared to the allowable budgets for VOC, NOx and PM 2.5.

Mr. Waple then asked the Commission to consider taking action to approve Resolution 5-19 Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.

5. Action on Resolution 5-19 to Make a Finding of Air Quality Conformity for *SmartMoves for a Changing Region* and its companion documents – Chuck Imbrogno

Questions:

Mr. Scott Bricker asked what would happen if you added point source pollution to the map? Chuck Imbrogno responded that the State Department of Environmental Protection and the Allegheny County Health Department produce and submit to EPA a State Implementation Plan and an Inventory of Emissions which are required by EPA. Those reports include inventories and budgets for the emissions from other sources (point, area, transportation, etc.). Other entities are responsible for addressing the budgets for the non-transportation emissions. SPC is responsible for demonstrating transportation conformity. EPA regulations require that the transportation conformity assessment demonstrate that future transportation sector emissions from the long range plan will not exceed the transportation emission budgets. Which is what our assessment shows.

Mr. Bricker asked if we could add three new cracker plants to the region and still be in attainment for our budget for transportation. Chuck Imbrogno responded that we don't know. The cracker plant under construction in Beaver County has permits from the DEP, so DEP has determined that emissions from the plant will not cause violations of air quality standards.

Mr. Bricker asked Mr. Waple to talk more about the \$5B for new capacity that's in the Plan. Mr. Waple said that the \$5B is for bridge preservation and reconstruction and the \$4.3B is for highway preservation and reconstruction. There is \$603M for new highway capacity. Projects included in that category include: I-79 widening in Washington, Allegheny, and Butler Counties, some capacity on Rt. 28 near the Highland Park Bridge, Rt. 21 in Fayette County, Rt. 286 on the Allegheny, Westmoreland border and also Rt. 228 in Butler County.

Commissioner Boozel asked will the change in the particulates expected take into account the growth trends for the area or is it based on what is now and adding nothing. Andy responded that it takes into account future employment and population projections.

Commissioner Craig said, from your map, Lawrence County is in compliance with air quality. What are the chances due to the cracker plant that we would no longer be in compliance because of transportation across that border? Chuck Imbrogno responded that he does not believe that Lawrence County would spike in the emissions and become non-attainment. We can assume Lawrence County will remain in attainment after the cracker plant is in operation..

Dr. Sharrard asked are air quality models and the projections for reductions despite increased vehicle trips and miles and increased population due to CAFE standards? Chuck responded yes, most of the emissions reductions have been the result of improvements in vehicle technologies and fuel formulations. Current federal regulations reflect the CAFE standards set by the Obama administration, not the standards recently proposed by the Trump administration. If new standards are imposed, we will reflect them in our modeling. Dr. Sharrard asked if we could model that ahead of adopting a 25-year plan that could be affected by a policy change that might put us out of compliance? Chuck said the model we get from EPA has all the current regulations built in; to change it, we would have to work with EPA to change their model. Dr. Sharrard comments that it seems concerning to her as a commissioner that I'm being asked to adopt a 25-year plan knowing that there might be a policy change that we're counting on to change. Andy said it is a 25-year plan, but it's updated every four years and the Air Quality Conformity gets updated every two years with the TIP.

Dr. Sharrard asked is vehicle electrification any part of these assumptions? Chuck said no. Dr. Sharrard said we don't call out vehicle electrification in any part of our Long Range Plan. Mr. Imbrogno responded that it's in the Plan, but not modeled in the Plan. There is no real trend of electric vehicle ownership in the region. There are a few, but we have no data for them. Mr. Imbrogno stated that if a significant amount of the fleet is converted to battery electric or hybrid plug-ins, those would help our air quality emissions by reducing it further.

Dr. Sharrard said that she thinks not calling them out at all in our Plan is an oversight. Dr. Sharrard continued - I'm ninety-five percent in support of this Long Range Plan. A lot of great work has been done, and we've talked to a lot of people in a new and different way than I've seen in my ten years on the Commission. Kudos to you, Abby. But when looking at the outline, one of these things is not like the other. And that is our support of the Appalachian Storage Hub. No other economic sectors have been picked. We are not picking winners and I'm curious to know why it's in there.

Mr. Villotti responded he can speak to the specifics of how it got there. The plan process went through the Expert Resource Panels. In the discussion in the Economy Expert Resource Panel the energy industry was brought up as an issue that could change the region. Some people were in favor, and some were worried about the environmental consequences. They went through the first survey and the first survey results showed the things that were important to continue to discuss. That was brought back to the second resource panel meeting. At that second resource panel meeting there was lengthy discussion about the importance of an Appalachian Storage Hub would be to optimizing the gas industry in the region. It was a discussion of the Team PA Foundation and DCED's IHS Global Insight Study on the industry that talked about taking advantage of the industry in Pennsylvania it needed to be somewhere in the quad-state area an Appalachia Storage Hub. DCED said that was extremely important. I have asked at every meeting

were I have presented the draft plan and strategies does everyone know what an Appalachian Storage Hub is, to make sure they understood the discussion.

Mr. Levine said what does it mean to identify one particular industry, a controversial one at that, in terms of the implications for the Plan? What's the difference between having this language in the Plan and having it removed, or if not removed supplementing it with robotics, AI, and other sorts of industries?

Mr. Villotti responded that the choices were made through the process and there is mention of AI and advanced manufacturing in the plan this specific point was just given greater emphasis. What it means in terms of what transpires with the Commission is that you are recognizing its importance. It is the will of the Commission how they wish to handle that. What we presented to you was what transpired through the plan process, panels and discussions. This is the Commission's plan.

Mr. Levine said I'm trying to see if there is an implication of highlighting one particular industry when we are really a more diverse economy.

Mr. Villotti said I don't know that there is an implication to it. At that point and time the Commission said this was an important sector. This came out under the infrastructure portion. It was important that we invest in infrastructure that promotes the economy and this was a specific strategy that came out.

Mr. Levine – should we as a Commission be concerned with upgrading and having the highest levels of technology as we move forward. Do we propose that in a forceful manner so we're not recreating Louisiana, and we are really taking it to the next level.

Mr. Villotti – Yes, I would suggest so. I was hoping that was inherent in the discussion when looking at the whole of the plan. This is what we heard from the panels.

Mr. Bricker – On the Environmental Resource Panel we were never presented with this. That's why we ended up with we want to better our air quality and water quality and address climate change in a real way. This is so very incongruous with that part of it, and that's my biggest concern. How do we have this enormously extractive and polluting industry and at the same time, we're saying we're a 21st Century region that wants clean air and address climate change. I don't think we can do that.

Commissioner Zimmerman commented that Greene County has been an industry county forever. Coal has been the life line for our area, now it's gas. From meetings I've attended, Greene County is not thought about; your focus is on where you live, Allegheny County. We see this as important to our county and the region. As Commissioners our priority is to try to bring jobs and productivity to Greene County. Think outside of this area, think in the region.

Dr. Miller said that this is the first time he has heard any discussion about a storage hub. As I understand the air quality conformity, we are envisioning an improvement in air quality. My question, Andy. How do we know that the Plan we are putting forward is contributing to that reduction in air quality? How much of what we're doing is contributing to the improvement in air quality?

Mr. Waple said we are in an asset management state so aside from the limited new capacity included in the Plan, which has been tied to increased emissions and VMT; this is maintaining what we have, not building anything new. Also, we are making significant operational improvements, making the existing system more efficient. And, we are investing significantly in CMAQ eligible projects that improve air quality, as well as improving active transportation networks. We heard through our project development work groups and the public that build out of the region's trails, build out of local active transportation networks, improving efficiency among our system with technology from smart traffic signals and expanding transit is a priority. It is incumbent upon, the project sponsors, the infrastructure owners, the transit agencies, the counties, the municipalities, and PennDOT to bring forward projects. There are over 200 individual projects in the Plan within fiscal capacity. We did a GIS analysis looking at which of those projects are

likely to have active transportation components of them. Over half of those 200 projects that are contained within fiscal capacity are very likely to have some type of transit or active transportation component within them. Those things will further drive down the emissions reduction we're seeing with the investments in this Plan.

Dr. Miller said we don't have a comparison. Doing that \$16B Plan here's the effect we would have on improving air quality. Having another \$16B Plan it might have a different impact. So we really don't have a good sense of yes, we know we're doing smart investment but we are not able to quantify that at this point. Mr. Waple said the program of projects we have identified through our designed process have identified a further set of projects that are priorities for everyone, but have no funding and they would very likely have a positive effect on air quality, as they contain many transit and active transportation related projects. Dr. Miller said thank you for explanation and it seems to me that would be one of the quantitative measures that we would want to look at in the future. To present to the Commission two or three big plans that will affect air quality more than economic development and we can be in a position to balance what's good for Greene County and Allegheny County. This is the best presentation I have seen on air quality conformity in my 20 years, I think we're going in the right direction.

Commissioner Fitzgerald asked if we have taken into account that we're working locally with the Southwest Partnership for Mobility as far as will there be funding for state transportation when Act 89 and Act 44 coming to an end. Secondly, there hasn't been a federal transportation plan in years. There's talk of one, and there maybe one. How do you factor in those two things that we're not sure of at the state level and federal level in highway, transit, road, and bridge. And, is there any state or public money going into pipelines, storage facilities, that type of infrastructure?

Mr. Waple responded to the first question saying within the Plan we are required by US code (23 CFR 450.324) to use existing state and federal legislation to project our transportation revenues over the next 25 years in the Long-Range Plan. We are using the FAST Act at the federal level about \$305B over the five years it was authorized which expires in 2020, and, Act 89 at the state level which expires in 2022. We have to use that legislation to project our revenues. As allowable by code, we do put a 2% compounded growth rate to account for inflation to calculate the revenue projections. We are beginning our 2021-2024 TIP development process, so we will be amending the revenue projections based on legislations in place at that time. The Commission will be asked to adopt the 2021-2024 TIP next June.

Mr. Villotti responded to the second question saying no, there are no federal funds at this time that will go into the pipelines, or storage facilities infrastructure.

Ms. Sirianni said that if we were lucky to get that federal transportation bill, we would have a laundry list of asset management needs. Bridges on the Parkway East, improvements needed in Carnegie, Green Tree and Banksville that are not funded. There are improvements needed at I-79 and S.R. 910. So, speaking from PennDOT District 11, there would be so many safety improvements and congestion management, internal improvement and asset management, that money would be spent rapidly on a lot of those projects. Mr. Waple stated that during the Plan development process, we have identified nearly \$3B in unfunded Interstate Needs over the life of the Plan.

Commissioner Craig motioned to approve Resolution 5-19 to Make a Finding of Air Quality Conformity for "*SmartMoves for a Changing Region*" which was seconded by Commissioner Coder.

Mr. Bricker commented that cars are getting less efficient and there are car companies phasing entire lines of fuel efficient cars in order to build bigger less fuel efficient cars. Plants are closing so, how is that being integrated into your model, before we vote on the air quality conformity.

The motion passed, Mr. Bricker abstained.

6. Action on Resolution 6-19 to Adopt "*SmartMoves for a Changing Region*" and Companion Documents – Andy Waple

Mr. Waple said we have taken some early implementation activities in preparation for implementing the Plan. We saw some opportunities to secure additional funding. The SmartMoves Connections - Regional Transit Vision Study will help to provide seamless connections between the nine other transit providers and the Port Authority. We're also working with the Northwest Regional Commission in Oil City, and the North Central Regional Planning Commission in Ridgeway, at the request of the counties in their regions and our region; we will be taking a look at Rt. 28 to improve safety and operations from Kittanning to Brookville where it connects with I-80. We'll be working closely with the Local Government Academy to provide municipal education. We're almost finished with a Regional Predictive Landslide Model that looks at hydrology and soil types that will better predict areas prone to landslides. In testing the model we looked at the Rt. 30 landslide and it identified that area up as high susceptibility, so we're excited to use the model in our planning more broadly and share it with our partners and local governments. Mr. Villotti's group is working with the county partners to pursue a vertical asset study for broadband infrastructure. He is also in discussions with the US Army Corps of Engineers to develop a regional integrative water resource planning framework.

Ms. Pro asked what vertical asset broadband study is. Mr. Villotti explained when you're trying to get broadband out in rural areas you want to get the antennas as high as you can. One of the things you do is a vertical asset study to see what's out there, who owns it, is there electricity, is there cable, etc. Places like Greene County where line of sight becomes difficult for broadband, you have to do a vertical asset study to find the highest points.

The last bullet point is Integrated Water Resource Management Planning is an idea looking at multiple sides of your water resources and planning for them together. It rains, flooding is an issue, it has an impact on your sewage. Instead of looking at those individually, you're looking at them as a whole. Working with the US Army Corps of Engineers we seek developed a framework for a regional One Water approach.

Commissioner Craig asked why we are including the Appalachian Storage Hub in a plan that has such impact on transportation and economic development if it doesn't need to be there. And can we agree if we exclude it from the Plan it doesn't hurt the Plan's structure, funding, and future as a document we can all be proud of and stand behind.

Commissioner Geyer commented that when we did the Economy Forces of Change Strategies, one heading of the five strategies was energy. The energy sector was buoyed by the Marcellus Shale Development. It has become a driving force in all the regional economies of the counties surrounding Allegheny County. It has become a priority, and that's why we have put it onto the platform. We also went as far to develop strategies to address the energy scenario. Support the identification and development of an Appalachian Storage Hub. The regional vision of SPC is transportation and land use that supports and enhances the regional economy and the communities within it. That's what we're doing. By storing these raw materials in these storage facilities, we're pooling raw materials together before they are cracked down to their various hydrocarbon forms. We will not be burning off gas. There will be less emissions overall because we will be storing it; then transporting it more economically at lower risk, by rail and pipelines. We reduce cost, risk and make our region more attractive. One of our second strategies was to promote common sense regulations that protect the environment but allow the energy industry to prosper. I think we can do both. The ASH was initially put on as a plank and a strategy for the overall heading of energy. The Pittsburgh region is an energy region. For us not to utilize it and store it to save some of it instead of exporting it globally would be wrong for us.

Dr. Sharrard commented that this Commission should not be having this debate. The economic strategy for the region is not set by our MPO and the fact that we are having this debate in this room, about a certain aspect of the Plan indicates that it is not a fit for those of us in this room. We are talking about transportation and mobility and strengthening communities and resiliency and managing stormwater. All of these things the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission actively funds. We approve all of these things. I would propose that this aspect on page 21 of the summary which came out of a single sub-committee and

morphed into something that it is today, that picks a specific strategy and report an approach, doesn't belong in SPC's Long Range Plan.

Mr. Villotti said remember that yes, we are the MPO, but we are also the Economic Development District and as such and develop the official Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy.

Dr. Miller, making a point of order, suggested that we entertain a motion to accept the Plan. Have it seconded and then I would like to offer an amendment to the Plan. That might make it easier to process through this issue. Commissioner Coder motioned to adopt Resolution 6-19 "*SmartMoves for a Changing Region*". Ms. Pro seconded.

Dr. Miller said that at the last Commission meeting we talked about the engagement of county and local governments in the region. We talk about potential partners in the Plan, and on 29 occasions as potential partners we mention county and municipal governments. My amendment is to modify those 29 instances where county and municipal governments is referenced to read county and municipal governments in or intergovernmental organizations of those governments such as CONNECT The Congress of Neighboring Communities or area local councils of governments. With that amendment we would be increasing our awareness that municipalities work more and more through cross boundary institutions and that SPC and those institutions could become additional potential partners in implementation of the Plan. There are four instances where we refer to county governments and it would be reasonable to replace that with county governments and or intergovernmental organizations of those county governments. I so move that amendment to the Plan.

Chairman Maggi said we will move on the amendment first. Dr. Miller having moved on the amendment which was seconded by Mr. Levine. The first amendment is: to replace county and municipal governments with county and municipal governments and or intergovernmental organizations such as CONNECT The Congress of Neighboring Communities or area local COGs.

Commissioner Geyer said she is opposed to the amendments because the SPC is made up of counties, we pay dues, and we are elected people that come here on behalf of our counties. I don't see this as a good thing. I think it sets a precedent moving forward for the Commission. I don't feel that it's right. I am for working with the COGs and other entities, partnerships and collaborations, but we're voted by the people in our counties to make decisions and advocate on their behalf.

Ms. Pro asked Dr. Miller is this language to be inserted into the summary or the main document. Dr. Miller said it should be replaced in the main document. Basically it is to implement what we are now doing and also to recognize that these cross boundary organizations are becoming more important as a way that we communicate across our fragmented region with so many local governments. It's not attempting to modify the importance of county and municipal governments and their officials, but to recognize that those officials now work with each other across their boundaries and this is a way of articulating that. It's an effort to say let's also be working with the COGs.

Commissioner Fitzgerald said when you say working with, do you mean advisory as opposed to having veto power, those types of things. Dr. Miller said yes, the list of potential partners is a list of people we would simple work with, but they would not be making decisions for SPC.

Ms. Heckman commented that you have to see the context in every replacement to make sure it's doing what Dr. Miller says. And, also you can just say multi-municipal organizations if it's part of a long list that we work with.

Ms. Pro said why do we have to say anything. We are saying potential partners which could be anybody in the future and it could change at any given time. Dr. Miller said articulating that doesn't seem to me to be any stretch at all in terms of recognizing that we are becoming a region where municipalities have to work closer with each other, and this is one way of doing it.

Chairman Maggi asked for a show of hands of those in favor of the amendments. Amendment 1 – 4 yea votes, and 27 nay votes. The Amendment does not pass.

Amendment 2. Mr. Bricker motioned for an amendment that strikes mention of the Appalachian Storage Hub from the Long Range Plan. Dr. Miller seconded.

Chairman Maggi asked for a show of hands of those in favor of the amendment. Amendment 2 – 4 yea votes, and 27 nay votes. The Amendment does not pass.

The original motion on Resolution 6-19 which approves and adopts the plan as presented was unanimously approved.

7. Action on Resolution 7-19 to Revise Highway Functional Classification and National Highway System Designation – Andy Waple

Mr. Waple said as part of our Long-Range Plan update and in anticipation of the 2020 Census, we've been working with PennDOT and our county planning departments to take a look at our national highway system designations and propose minor revisions to those designations. NHS is made of high level roadways, Interstates, other principal arterials, intermodal connectors that connect major population centers, border crossings, ports, airports, and public transit facilities. There are two types of revisions, there is an actual revision that is adding or subtracting a route that isn't present or has no end point connecting to another NHS point. We also have clean-ups, which are small missing segments or, technical map revisions. The current NHS system in the United States about 162,000 miles is capped nationally at 178,250 miles. Within that 162,000 miles, about 7,100 are in Pennsylvania and almost 1,600 in the SPC region. We are proposing today minor revisions to the counties, total added miles about 51.3, total miles deleted from the system via revisions leaves 27.5 miles added to the national highway system or almost 1,600 throughout the region.

SPC Region NHS Network Revisions by County

Allegheny

- **Additions – 6 (6.9 mi)**
- **Deletions – 4 (10.8 mi)**

Beaver

- **Additions – 3 (18.3 mi)**

Butler

- **Additions – 1 (2.8 mi)**

Fayette

- **Additions – 1 (3.3 mi)**

Indiana

- **Deletion – 1 (0.34 mi)**

Lawrence

- **Additions – 5 (19.8 mi)**
- **Deletions – 2 (5.2 mi)**

Washington

- **Additions – 1 (0.2 mi)**
- **Deletions – 1 (.2 mi)**

Westmoreland

- **Deletions – 1 (7.0 mi)**

Total Added Miles = 51.3

Total Deleted Miles = 23.8

27.5 Miles added to NHS

SPC Region NHS = 1,599.5

If there are no questions, we ask you to consider Resolution 7-19 to allow us to revise and submit these revisions to PennDOT and the Federal Highway Administration for approval.

Commissioner Macey motioned to approve Resolution 7-19 to Revise Highway Functional Classification and National Highway System Designation which was seconded by Commissioner Craig. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

8. Financial Report – Vince Massaro

Commissioner Coder motioned that we dispense with the financial report which was seconded by Mr. Bricker. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

9. Action of Resolution 8-19 to Adopt a Meeting Schedule for 2019-2020 – Jim Hassinger

Mr. Levine motioned to approve Resolution 8-19 to adopt a Meeting Schedule for 2019-2020 which was seconded by Commissioner Craig. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

10. Action on Resolution 9-19 to honor the Services of Retiring PennDOT Representative James D. Ritzman

Mr. Hassinger said we want to recognize James Ritzman's service who is not able to be with us today. Mr. Fitzgerald motioned to approve Resolution 9-19 honoring the services of PennDOT Representative James D. Ritzman which was seconded by Ms. Heckman. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

11. Other Business/Announcements

Next Meeting Date – July 29th

12. New Business – None

13. Adjourn

Commissioner Craig moved to adjourn the meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission and Ms. Pro seconded. The affirmative vote was unanimous. The meeting ended at 6:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tony Amadio
Secretary-Treasurer