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


1. Chairman Maggi called to order the September 24, 2018 meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
   a. Quorum – There being a quorum present the meeting proceeded
   b. Any Conflict of Interest Declarations on Action Items – None.

2. Action on Minutes of the June 25, 2018 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the June 25, 2018 meeting by Commissioner Steve Craig which was seconded by Rich Fitzgerald. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

3. Public Comment – None

4. Staff Profile – Shannon O’Connell/Jeremy Papay

Ms. O’Connell introduced Jeremy Papay, the new Multimedia Developer for the SPC Office of Communications & Public Engagement. He has been at SPC as a temp for a while and in June he came on board as permanent staff bringing a unique set of skills.

Jeremy has a M.S. in Multimedia Technology; a B.M. in Music Technology/Performance from Duquesne University. Before SPC he traveled fulltime with the Ringling Brothers & Barnum and Bailey Circus as a drummer for 8 years.

Bringing multimedia to SPC, I wanted to move more on high quality audio in our deliverables. Last Friday’s YouTube live stream of SPC’s Forces of Change and the Future of the Region; we really raised the bar on crystal clear audio. We were using technology that is barely a year old which allows me to have multiple cameras. By using an iPad its like using a mini production studio where I can drag and drop at different angles, put titles on and it goes directly live to anybody viewing anywhere in the world. We are really making that move to open up to a wider audience, telling the story of SPC, but reaching the casual observer or citizen who is interested in what we actually do.

During my years on the road with the Ringling Brothers Circus, we did 350+ performances a year; on the road about 47 weeks a year driving 30,000 miles in my RV. I learned on the road how to change tires and make repairs. Now I try to bring that to any issues that come up here at SPC. I’ve played in 48 states including Canada and Mexico.
I returned to Pittsburgh to see about my dad who was diagnosed with cancer. He is still rocking; but that changed his plans to go out west. Back in Pittsburgh I became active in the music scene and began performing with Swank Opera doing festivals and session drum recordings. He also plays with his dad again having played his first gig with him in first grade.

In this job I am able to take both of my worlds and do both at the same using my multimedia background which overlaps into my music background. It’s really neat just to see what can come out of that. It’s really a cool environment and I’m enjoying the job and hope to for a good while.

5. **Financial Report – Vince Massaro**

Mr. Massaro reported on the financials for the period ending June 30, 2018 which is an unaudited report. The total project revenues $11.3M actual encumbered revenues to date versus the budget of $13.9M. The same numbers on the expenditures. We have carryover funding on the PennDOT Planning and the Economic Development Planning. Those planning funds will carry over into the fiscal year 2018-2019. The audit for fiscal year 2017-2018 is taking place now. With no reported findings the draft report will be ready for the Audit Committee review and the final report will be presented to the Commission for approval at the December meeting. There being no questions, the Commission accepted the financial report as presented.

6. **Action on Resolution 7-18 to Establish Regional Performance Targets for PM2 Asset Condition on NHS – Andy Waple**

Mr. Waple summarized Resolution 7-18 to accept PennDOT’s statewide National Highway System (NHS) pavement and bridge condition (PM2) performance targets for the Commission’s consideration and approval.

**PM1-Safety Measures**
- **Five Measures:**
  - Number of Fatalities
  - Rate of Fatalities
  - Number of Serious Injuries
  - Rate of Serious Injuries
  - Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries
  - Annual Reduction of 2 percent (all measures)
  - Established by PennDOT on August 27, 2017
  - Adopted by SPC on December 11, 2017

**SPC Region NHS Network**

**PM2 – Pavement/Bridge Condition**
- **Six Measures aimed at the National Highway System (NHS):**
  - Percent of Interstate pavements in Good condition
  - Percent of Interstate pavements in Poor condition
  - Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good condition
  - Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition
  - Percent of NHS bridges by deck area classified in Good condition
  - Percent of NHS bridges by deck area classified in Poor condition
 Targets based on State Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP)
Targets established by PennDOT on May 20, 2018
SPC to establish targets by November 16, 2018

This being the last Commission meeting until December we are seeking Commission consideration and approval today.

**PM2 – Pavement Condition**

- PennDOT’s targets mirror the federal standard.
  - 23CFR 490.315(a), Subpart C requires that no more than 5 percent of a state’s NHS Interstate lane-miles be in poor pavement condition.

**PM2 – Bridge Condition**

- PennDOT’s bridge condition targets are consistent with its asset management objectives of maintaining the system at the desired state of good repair, and achieving national and state transportation goals.
  - 23 CFR 490.411(a) requires that no more than 10 percent of a state’s total NHS bridges by deck area are in poor condition.

Ms. Moon-Sirianni commented that the word structurally deficient is no longer being used. Andy said correct, the new reporting terms are good, fair, and poor.

Commissioner Craig asked why Lawrence County was not on the map presented of the Pittsburgh region. Mr. Waple said we poached the map from the Federal Highway Administration, but the data is included, it’s just not shown.

Commissioner Craig asked the NHS system is in good condition, but what about the rest of the system? Is it being monitored? Lawrence County was told that it has the worst bridges in Pennsylvania and the nation. Looking at these numbers I don’t find them in these numbers. Secondly, why start to move your goals backwards from where we are now, saying 2 percent is good. Mr. Waple responded that yes, PennDOT does collect data on all bridges on both the statewide and local systems of 20 feet and over. We get annual performance reports yearly; broken down by PennDOT District and by the region and statewide. Your first point speaks to your second and in answer to your second point. We have to be cognizant of not setting really aggressive targets for any one piece of the system; because the rest of the system is going to suffer. We have spent all of our NHPP Funds on the NHS System as we are required to by law. If we start setting more aggressive targets for bridges and pavements on the NHS, that will come from the STP funding and the state funding that we and PennDOT use to enhance and manage the lower level system. If we keep it at .4 percent, the rest of the system will suffer.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that since Act 89’s passage and all the work that’s been done, the numbers have improved. Mr. Waple said that’s correct. They have improved vastly.

Ms. Moon-Sirianni said with Act 89 and the P3 Bridge Conditions, the structurally deficient bridges would have gone down significantly in this region, including Lawrence County. There was a lot of love thrown at Lawrence County with the P3s. But, your point is very valid in that we have to focus on the main networks and the cost of doing business is getting more expensive.

Mr. Miller said presently 67.2 percent of our interstate pavement is in good condition according to PennDOT.
And we’re going to target that to go to 60 percent? So, our target is to go from 60 percent to 48 percent and then 4 percent is in poor condition, that means that 52 percent is in good or poor condition. So, we’re saying in the next four years, the quality of our interstate pavement is going to deteriorate. If that is the case, this isn’t a good way to present that information because it’s confusing. We should say our infrastructure dollars are so limited and the deterioration of our system is so bad, the best we’re able to do is to go from 60 percent to 48 percent. You’re asking us to adopt a set of goals that will deteriorate the system, and I just don’t see that as the best way to present the information.

The Commission continued discussion on the wording of Resolution 7-18. Chairman Maggi stated that Mr. Levine is going to restructure the wording in the resolution and then we can discuss and vote on it.

Mr. Waple continued with his presentation.

**PM3 – System Performance**

- Four measures aimed at the National Highway System (NHS):
  - Percent of Person-miles Traveled on the Interstate System that are Reliable
  - Percent of Person-miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable
  - Interstate System Truck Travel Time Reliability Index
  - Annual Hours of Peak-Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) per Capita

- Two measures aimed at traffic congestion and on-road mobile source emissions
  - Percent Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) Travel
  - On-Road Mobile Source Emissions Reduction for CMAQ Funded Projects
    - Targets established by PennDOT on May 20, 2018
    - SPC to establish targets by November 16, 2018

**Interstate Reliability** – SPC Region’s interstate reliability is 92 percent. An explanation of reliability in this context is if it takes you half an hour to get to work every day, then 92 percent of the time it’s considered as reliable. The higher the travel time reliability, the better and more consistent the system when compared to the statewide number and to other regions.

**Non-Interstate NHS Reliability** - Below the statewide average, well below the Harrisburg region and Milwaukee region, but better than Baltimore and DVRPC.

**Interstate Truck Reliability Index** – The SPC Region fairs favorably against other urban areas in Philadelphia and Baltimore and slightly higher than the statewide number, and higher than Harrisburg.

**Annual Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita** – Better than Baltimore and DVRPC. This is a regional measure and is not measured at the statewide level.

**PM3 – Travel Time and Peak Hour Excessive Delay** – The way these are measured has changed over the last few years. When these rules came out the segment lengths were half a mile in length or longer; now they’re required to be measured at a 10th of a mile. Prior to 2016 we have limited historic information of this data. We took our baseline and held a status quo until we could get better data and an historical backlog of data. The tool used to measure this is called the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) developed at the University of Maryland.
PM3 – Non-SOV Travel Measure
• Non-SOV Travel Measure data is provided by the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). We use this data because we don’t have any better data.

Ms. Sharrard said this also seems like a measure that is going in the wrong direction. It’s based on a small national sample that’s not that great and not necessarily representative of the region. Is there a way in the future to reference more specific local data including over twenty thousand from the 2015 Make My Trip Count Commuter Survey and other efforts going on to make sure that we know this is the right answer, that it’s collecting multiple modes. Mr. Waple said we would discuss that with PennDOT Central office to see if there are provisions in the statewide reporting that we can pull those things out.

Ms. Pro asked who says we have to vote on this. What kind of demerit do we get if we take no action? The Feds will set the standard as they see fit. Ms. Moon-Sirianni said the state would set the standards. Ms. Pro asked is non-action an action in this case? Mr. Waple responded if we don’t take action it would come up in our next federal certification review that we are not complying and we would receive a corrective action. Receiving a corrective action and again not complying they can decertify the MPO and we would not be able to make TIP amendments or program funds. Ms. Pro said so your answer is the feds are saying this Commission must take a vote.

Commissioner Craig asked if we set a standard that’s different for this and we stay where we are at the baseline rather than go backwards, would that trigger some type of an enforcement action?

Mr. Waple said it would be different for different measures. It’s reported at the statewide level, but the targets for the region are listed as to what our regional targets would be to contribute to the state reaching its target. If that would happen, the Feds may require PennDOT to invest more money to be able to reach that target.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if they didn’t would there be a financial penalty from the Feds that we would get less money?

Ms. Moon-Sirianni said yes I believe if we don’t meet the metrics we would take a significant hit.

Commissioner Craig asked if we don’t lower the bar for these numbers, we get penalized because we set our bar too high and didn’t reach it.

Ms. Moon-Sirianni replied yes, this bar was set based upon the amount of funds we have and where we invest and plan to invest in the next four years. If we set the bar too high and we know we don’t have those funds, we will get penalized.

Mr. Waple continued with his presentation.

PM3 – CMAQ Emission Measures
• On-Road Mobile Source Emission Travel Measure data is provided by the FHWA CMAQ annual reporting system.

Considerations for PM2 and PM3 Target Setting
• Due to reporting requirements, new data collection methodologies, and improving analysis tools, historical data is limited.
• A holistic approach to performance management needs to be employed across the system.
• Too much emphasis on one specific area will negatively impact other aspects of the system.

Mr. Grata commented about why the Turnpike Commission doesn’t have a seat on this Commission. They are the major traffic carriers to our national highway system and our non- turnpike interstates. This Commission
should look at giving a representative from the Turnpike Commission a seat on this Commission, voting or non-voting.

Ms. Sharrard asked why there is no mention of person powered commuting? Mr. Waple responded that there were no projects submitted to the CMAQ Program for bicyclist and pedestrians. The 2019-2022 Program are not factored into this. This is the 2014-2017 Program of CMAQ projects that we selected.

Mr. Levine read the WHEREAS provisions in the original Resolution 7-18.

WHEREAS, Metropolitan Long-Range Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs adopted or amended after May 27, 2018, must include a description of how the Plans or TIPs support and contribute to achieving the established performance targets;

He read his restructured wording with two additional WHEREAS provisions:

WHEREAS, the SPC has expressed concern about the shortfall of funds required to address adequately the needs of the region and the opportunity to improve our transportation infrastructure;

WHEREAS, the SPC is diligently working to establish appropriate targets recognizing the funding shortfalls, and work with PennDOT to allocate the available resources within the region; and

A motion was made by Ms. Pro to adopt Resolution 7-18 with the revisions restructured by Mr. Levine. Mr. Grata seconded and the affirmative vote was unanimous.

7. Action on Resolution 8-18 to Establish Regional Performance Targets for PM3 NHS System Performance and CMAQ program

Before approval of this resolution, Ms. Sharrard asked if edits could be made to it especially related to non-single occupancy vehicle travel. Commissioner Craig said that we also need to include something about the discussion that we’re not happy with the data used to come to these numbers. That in the future we need something that gives us a better handle on single occupancy vehicles look like.

Mr. Levine worked on restructuring the wording for Resolution 8-18 to be returned to for discussion and approval by the Commission.

8. Committee Reports

Mr. Fitzgerald reported on the Regional Policy Advisory Committee’s meeting where Mr. Villotti summarized the SPC Workshop held at the Sheraton Station Square. There was good discussion about how we plan for the future around the economy, technology, funding, environment, and demographics; to make sure we’re not just doing things for today, but also planning on the future.

9. Staff Report/Other Business/Announcements – Jim Hassinger

Next Meeting Date – December 10, 2018

Mr. Hassinger asked for a brief from Lew Villotti on materials presented at the Regional Policy Advisory Committee by Mr. Villotti. Mr. Villotti briefed the Commission on what transpired at the Policy Meeting. As you are aware, we have a live survey on MetroQuest and as of September 13th, there have been over 1,000 participants and 1,300 comments.
At the start of the workshop where we had over 300 participants, we reviewed the five forces of change: economy, demographics, technology, funding and the environment. This was the results of the beginning of the survey that we shared with the participants of the Workshop. When the on-line survey participants looked at it, aging infrastructure, jobs, and workforce technology, and vacant properties were the most urgent. We also asked the Workshop participants to rank the five forces from most urgent to lease urgent. With the workshop participants it went from aging infrastructure to jobs and workforce.

The second part of the Workshop we asked the participants to invest in one of the five forces $100 in increments of $5 in which ones they would primarily want to invest. The entire table had to come to consensus. Most of their money was invested in infrastructure and then spread the money in specific sectors across the topics. This was done for the Five Forces of Change. Two things that came out of the Workshop were broadband under technology, and jobs and workforce under economic development; these topics people wanted to discuss and thought needed to have strategies that were important to drive the planning as we move forward.

The Regional Policy Advisory Committee recommended looking at these strategies, and how they’re integrated and come up with three summary statements that help energize the planning process with a positive vision. We are working on that now.

Chairman Maggi indicated that the Commission was now ready to discuss Resolution 8-18.

Mr. Levine read the original WHEREAS provision addressing Commission members concerns about SOV and the restructured WHEREAS rewording.

WHEREAS, the SPC expressed concern that future sample sizes be expanded for Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV) data to better ascertain trends in transportation use to allow for the setting of more informed goals;

WHEREAS, the SPC expressed concern that future sample sizes be expanded for Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV) data to better ascertain trends in transportation use to allow for a more informed goal;

A motion was made by Commissioner Craig to approve Resolution 8-18. It was seconded Ms. Sharrard and the affirmative vote was unanimous.

10. **New Business** - None

11. **Adjourn**

Commissioner Craig moved to adjourn the meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission and Commissioner Coder seconded. The affirmative vote was unanimous.

Respectfully Submitted

Tony Amadio
Secretary-Treasurer