

**Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Transportation Technical Committee (TTC)
Meeting Minutes via Webex
June 16, 2022, 10:00 a.m.**

Two Chatham Center • Suite 500 • 112 Washington Place • Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Attendees:

- Ann Ogoreuc, Allegheny County Department of Economic Development
- Darin Alviano, Armstrong County Planning Commission
- Joe West, Beaver County Planning Commission
- Joel MacKay, Butler County Planning Commission
- Arthur Cappella, Fayette County Zoning, Planning and Community Development
- Jeremy L. Kelly, Greene County Planning and Community Development
- Josh Krug, Indiana County Office of Planning and Development
- Jason Theakston, Washington County Planning
- Daniel Carpenter, Westmoreland County Planning
- Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office
- Jeff Skalican, City of Pittsburgh
- Steven Shanley, Allegheny County Department of Public Works
- Brendan Coticchia, City of Pittsburgh
- Kyle Lamb, Greene County Planning and Community Development
- Austin McDaniel, Washington County Planning
- David Wohlwill, Pittsburgh Regional Transit
- Scott Harshman, Port of Pittsburgh
- Matt Pavlosky, Port of Pittsburgh
- Brandon Leach, PennDOT Central Office
- Matthew Crea, PennDOT Central Office
- Kathryn Schlesinger, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
- Lynn Manion, Airport Corridor Transportation Association
- Mavis Rainey, Oakland Transportation Management Association
- Harold Swan, PennDOT District 10-0
- Cheryl Moon-Sirianni, PennDOT District 11-0
- Dina Salemi, PennDOT District 11-0
- Stephanie Spang, PennDOT District 11-0
- Jordan Bergamasco, PennDOT District 11-0
- Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12-0
- Josh Theakston, PennDOT District 12-0
- Jessica Setmire, PennDOT District 12-0
- Rachel Duda, PennDOT District 12-0
- Matthew Kelley, CDR Maguire
- Dave Hollahan,
- Domenic D'Andrea, SPC Transportation Director
- Tom Klevan, SPC Staff
- Ryan Gordon, SPC Staff
- Josh Spano, SPC Staff
- Dan Alwine, SPC Staff
- Dan Bernazzoli, SPC Staff
- Ronda Craig, SPC Staff
- Leann Chaney, SPC Staff
- Erica Eagan, SPC Staff
- Anthony Hickton, SPC Staff

Attendees cont'd:

Stephanie Kambic, SPC Staff
Caleb Knudsen, SPC Staff
Dave Totten, SPC Staff
Sara Walfoort, SPC Staff
John Weber, SPC Staff

- **Indicates TTC voting member**

1. **Call to Order**

Domenic D'Andrea called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. with a roll call for the TTC members.

2. **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

3. **Action on May 12th TTC Meeting Minutes**

A motion was made by Ann Ogoreuc to approve the minutes of the May 12th TTC meeting, and was seconded by Joe West. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. **FHWA/PennDOT Central Office, Program Center Report from Kevin McCullough, PennDOT Central Office**

Kevin McCullough first discussed the safe streets and roads for all notice of funding opportunity, mentioning that applications are due for the program on September 15th. More details on the program will be discussed later in the meeting, however Kevin wanted to mention the 3 webinars for the program, of which two have passed. The third webinar will be on June 23rd, and all three webinars will be recoded and available on PennDOT's website. Kevin then discussed the 2020 Census Update, in which the census bureau has finalized the criteria for defining urban areas, based on their 2020 census notes. An area will classify as urban if it contains at least 2,000 housing units, or has a population of 5,000. More information will be coming out on this, as well as an updated timeline, which will be put out on the Federal register in Fall 2022 to announce these qualified urban areas. Kevin next discussed the other IJJA/Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) information. On June 1st 2022, the FHWA BIL website posted the implementation guidance memos for NHPP and STBG programs (which is typically programmed as STP funds, as well as TAP and other programs). There is also a bridge investment program (BIP) notice of funding opportunity, which was published on June 10th. This BIP is for planning projects, large bridge projects over \$100 million in total cost and large bridge projects up to \$100 million in costs. The planning grant application is due on July 25th, the large bridge projects over \$100 million applications are due August 9th, and the bridge projects up to \$100 million applications are due September 8th. All of these programs are listed on the grants.gov website, and more information can be found there.

Next, Kevin McCullough spoke on the ARLE grant, opening up on June 1st and running through June 30th. Information on the grant is online at the PennDOT website, as well as some additional changes to the application and how they will be accepted this year. Any questions on the application can be sent to the email arle@pa.gov. Kevin also discussed 2022 rail freight grants, which will be accepting applications in early August 2022 for rail and freight projects. This program will go through the recently updated E-grant public portal interface, which will replace the old PennDOT grant system. There will be a web-based training program on this process, which will be announced prior to the opening of the application window. Additional information on this will be discussed next TTC meeting. Kevin then discussed the draft 2023

statewide transportation improvement program, which is out for public comment. The public comment period will be open from June 15th to June 30th. This TIP contains all the programs that are not contained on the regional TIPs, which includes interstate projects, various rail projects, and statewide HSIP safety projects, among others. Kevin next mentioned inflation, taking note that bid process have increased recently, as much as 3% higher than before. Some bid items and materials have increased as much as 30% in the first quarter, and increases are expected through the second quarter as well. PennDOT still has a let goal of \$2.5 billion in projects for 2022, and while inflation will eat into how many projects they are able to do, the target is still set at that number for the year. Kevin noted that increases on these bids will be seen on the modifications, as more recently high bids have been coming in on projects.

David Wohlwill made a comment on the bridge investment program, noting that while transit only bridges were not eligible for the program, bridges over which transit service is operated would be rated higher in the evaluation, and for everyone submitting a project to be aware of this. He also mentioned that any applicants in Allegheny County, Pittsburgh Regional Transit would be happy to provide a letter of support for those projects. Kevin mentioned that they will be seeking input from PennDOT planning partners on applications for the bridge investment program, and there will be an opportunity to look over these applications and discuss possible projects before the application period. Arthur Cappella asked a question about revenue splits on projects when there is a cost increase after the fact, would the municipality be responsible for the increase or would the cost split remain the same. Angela Saunders answered that if the project was split 80/20, the split would remain the same after the increase. Kevin clarified information about the bidding process, mentioning that the consultant will take an educated guess on the initial pricing of the project, and as they go through the bidding process PennDOT checks those prices. If they find that the bids are higher than expected, those costs must be covered up front. After a project is bid, usually in construction, there could be cost increases due to inflation, such as with oil prices, mobility and asphalt costs, which all have to be added in to close out the project. These inflation impacts are what we usually see in the modifications with the three districts, and is what is being impacted currently. Angela also added that she is speaking about road/bridge projects, and that PennDOT does not cover for any overages, such as the addition of items after bid has been accepted.

Domenic D'Andrea also made a note about the bridge investment program that while usually the instinct is to look at existing bridges with needs to apply for, there is also planning funds available. Domenic asked the programming department if there has been any update on a bridge planning package to apply for in the future. Kevin responded that currently there hasn't been any discussion on creating a planning grant program for bridges, but it is something that should be discussed and will be discussed with additional planning partners across the state on whether that would be a good idea. Domenic also mentioned that the ARLE grant is an extremely competitive grant, with 100% state funds and no local match, used mostly for signal improvements in areas, so anyone with signalization needs should apply. Joe West asked the question if a feasibility study on replacing full bridges could be made to educate the public on a realistic approach to replacing bridges in the region. Kevin mentioned that there have been some discussions with higher level people on education tactics for the public on the costs to bridge reconstruction, and all the costs and expenses that go into that. He mentioned that in other districts, during local competitive bridge programs, there is usually an education aspect that goes into the criteria for the program to give the public an idea of how and why some of the bridges are so expensive to replace and reconstruct. Kevin said that some of these education tactics could possibly be used in educating the public here on bridges in this region as well. Domenic mentioned previous feasibility studies on the removal and replacement of bridges, called pipe size location studies, and also brought up the recent District 11-0 bridge workshop that was held, stating that

more of these education topics are needed in the region. Josh Krug asked if a bridge workshop could also be held in District 10-0, which was noted by Domenic as a good idea for the future, as well as in District 12-0.

Lastly, Sara Walfoort asked a question about a change in policy at the statewide level which came out recently, about business locations adjacent to rail lines, and whether eligible applicants for rail spurs must be an already served rail business or whether businesses could be considered rail served if they are adjacent to a rail line. Kevin McCullough said he was not aware of any policy change, but would take up the question with other members of staff.

5. Action on Modifications to the 2021-2024 TIP

A. PennDOT District 10-0

Harold Swan went over the two administrative action for PennDOT District 10-0. The first administrative action was for a bridge replacement project which carries US 422 over Curry Run and a tributary to Curry Run in Armstrong Township, Indiana County. The District requests to increase construction and add \$260,000 (80% Federal and 20% State) in FFY 2022 due to the need to utilize a slider system for utility clearances, the unexpected replacement of 280 feet of drainage pipe, and additional pavement materials for revised cross sections. The source of funds will come from surplus construction funds from the Spaces Corners Resurfacing project, and the SPC District 10 Highway/Bridge Line Item. The second administrative action was for the D10 4c SINC-UP project, a safety improvement project which includes traffic signal retiming and coordination with equipment upgrades in various locations in Adams Township and Seven Fields Borough, Butler County, and West Franklin Township and Worthington Borough, Armstrong County. The district is requesting to change the construction funding from 100% Federal to 80% Federal and 20% Local, in order to match the reimbursement agreement.

Josh Krug made a motion to approve the administrative action from PennDOT District 10-0, which was seconded by Joe West. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. PennDOT District 11-0

Stephanie Spang went over the one amendment and six administrative actions for PennDOT District 11-0. The one amendment was for a feasibility study for the removal of the I-279 HOV lanes and make them general purpose reversible lanes, located in the City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County. The district requests the addition of \$500,000 in study funds to investigate I-279 HOV lane restriction, with the source of funds coming from the Kenmawr Ave Ramp project. The first administrative action was for a bridge replacement project, located on SR 4059 (segment 10/offset 590 of Mars Valencia Road) 590' north of intersection with SR 4031, over branch of Breakneck Creek in Pine Township, Allegheny County. The district is requesting the increase of funds in the planning and engineering phase in order to initiate design, with the source of funding coming from the PA 28: Harmarville Russelton 28-A62 project. The second administrative action was for a bridge replacement project, located on SR 0837, Eighth Avenue over Homestead Run in Munhall Borough, Allegheny County. The district is requesting to increase the final design phase in order to initiate design, with the source of funding coming from the Millers Run over Dolphin Run 978-A17 project and the Bridge- Allegheny County line item. The third administrative action was for a safety improvement project, looking to address congestion and safety issues for pedestrian, bike and motor vehicle, signal upgrade, signing updated and milling and resurfacing, located on SR 837 from Station Square to Steelers Practice Field

(UPMC Sports Performance Complex, after South 33rd Street) in the City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County. The district is requesting to increase the construction phase for additional contract work, and the source of funding will come from the District 11 IJA Line-item reserve and SPC CMAQ line item.

The fourth administrative action was for a mill and overlay project, located on SR 588 in Chippewa Township in Beaver County. The district is requesting to increase the construction phase due to the low bid received, with the source of funding coming from construction phases of Kenmawr Ave Ramp and 2040/Ceco Dr to Brownsville Road projects and numerous available deobligations. The fifth administrative action was for a safety improvement project, adding intelligent transportation system (ITS) improvements intended to improve traffic safety and operations, located on I-376 between the Grant Street interchange (MP 70.5) and the eastern terminus of I 376 at the Pennsylvania Turnpike and US 22 (MP 84.5) in Allegheny County. The district is requesting to increase the planning and engineering phase for updated tasks, with the source of funding coming from the final design and construction phases of same project. The sixth administrative action was for a superstructure replacement, located on the bridge that carries Cochran's Mill Road over the north branch of Licks Run and is located 50' southeast of Cochran's Mill Road and Wilson Road in Jefferson Hills Borough, Allegheny County. The district is requesting the addition of a final design, right-of-way, utilities, and construction phases to cover final design tasks and to initiate utility and right of way work. The source of funding will come from the Allegheny County Local Bridge (S/L) Line item.

Ann Ogoreuc made a motion to approve the amendment and administrative actions from PennDOT District 11-0, which was seconded by Joe West. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. PennDOT District 12-0

Angela Saunders went over the ten administrative actions for PennDOT District 12-0. The first administrative action was for the rehabilitation/replacement to the structure carrying State Route 1010 (River Road) over Pumpkin Run, located in Rice Landings Borough, Greene County. The district is requesting to move funds for the Construction phase from FFY 2022 to FFY 2023 to adjust the cash flow to correspond with the project schedule, as well as to increase the Preliminary Engineering phase in FFY 2022. The source of funding will come from the D12 Highway/Bridge Line Item (MPMS#76508). The second administrative action was for the replacement and or removal of 15 traffic signals at various intersections along PA 88 NB (McKean Avenue) and PA 88 SB (Fallowfield Avenue), along with other miscellaneous improvements, located in Charleroi and North Charleroi Boroughs, Washington County. The district is requesting to adjust the cash flow for CON phase in FFY 2022 to correspond with project schedule, with the source of funding coming from the SPC CMAQ Line Item (MPMS# 84078). The third administrative action was for signal enhancements and miscellaneous roadwork at various intersections in Fayette County; work to be performed includes signal replacements, modifications, and the addition of ADA/pedestrian facilities at most locations. The district is requesting to increase the Construction phase in FFY 2022 and advance FFY 2023 funding to FFY 2022, with the source of funding coming from the SPC CMAQ Line Item (MPMS# 84078).

The fourth administrative action was for Traffic signal upgrades at six intersections on US 119; the project will upgrade traffic signal controllers and other equipment as well as include hardware, upgrade existing ADA and pedestrian facilities at the signalized intersections, and replace signing & pavement markings, located in the City of Connellsville and Connellsville Township, Fayette County. The district is requesting to add the Preliminary Engineering phase to the TIP to increase the phase in FFY 2022, with the source of funding coming from the SPC CMAQ Line Item (MPMS# 84078). The fifth administrative action was for

replacing three traffic signals and upgrading two traffic signals along CMAQ Corridors 85 and 86, located in the City of Washington, Washington County, as well as installing communication between all five signals to facilitate implementation of coordination. Signal enhancements may include new controller cabinets, pedestrian upgrades, GPS units, signing and pavement markings. The district is requesting to add the Preliminary Engineering phase to the TIP in FFY 2022, with the source of funding coming from the SPC CMAQ Line Item (MPMS# 84078). The sixth administrative action was for upgrading 1 traffic signal and replacing 3 traffic signals, 2 in Hempfield Township and 1 in Unity Township, Westmoreland County along CMAQ Corridor 95. The new traffic signals will include improved vehicle detection and controller capabilities, ADA accommodations, generator adapter plug, and GPS. The district is requesting to add the Preliminary Engineering phase to the TIP in FFY 2022, with the source of funding coming from the SPC CMAQ Line Item (MPMS# 84078).

The seventh administrative action was for includes the replacement of 1 traffic signal and minor improvements to 7 traffic signals located on Congestion Management Corridor 88 in Westmoreland County. The new traffic signal will include improved vehicle detection and controller capabilities, ADA accommodations, and GPS, with Railroad warning systems and existing railroad preemption updates. The other intersections would have signal enhancements and miscellaneous roadway work including new controller cabinets with GPS units, signal head replacement, pedestrian accommodations, signing upgrades and other minor enhancements as required. The district is requesting to add the Preliminary Engineering phase to the TIP in FFY 2022, with the source of funding coming from the SPC CMAQ Line Item (MPMS# 84078). The eighth administrative action was for projects that would update and modernize US 30; this first section is from the County Line to Malts Lane, located in North Huntingdon, Westmoreland County and North Versailles, Allegheny County. The district is requesting to supplement final design with CMAQ funds, and the source of funding coming from the SPC CMAQ Line Item (MPMS# 84078). The ninth administrative action was for the replacement of three existing traffic signals located in the City of Washington, Washington County, along with two signals located at PA 18 (Jefferson Avenue) at SR 8014 (I-70 Ramps) and SR 4022 (Wylie Avenue) at SR 8014 (I-70 Ramps). The installation of the new signals will include queue preemption for I-70 ramp approaches, detection on all approaches, LED signal heads, pedestrian accommodations, and spread spectrum radio system. The project also includes various roadway improvements (such as ADA ramps and additional lanes as necessary). The district is requesting to advance the FFY 2023 funds to FFY 2022 for the Construction phase and increase in the same year, with the source of funding coming from the SPC CMAQ Line Item (MPMS# 84078). The tenth administrative action was for the reconstruction of US 119 from Burton Avenue to Stouts Carpet (where the 4-lane divided highway begins) located in Hempfield Township, Youngwood Borough, and New Stanton Borough, Westmoreland County. The district is requesting to increase the Construction phase in FFY 2022, with the source of funding coming from MPMS#94698- SPC Smart Transportation Initiative.

Daniel Carpenter made a motion to approve the administrative actions from PennDOT District 12-0, which was seconded by Jeremy Kelly. The motion was approved unanimously.

D. Transit TIP Amendment Summary

Tom Klevan gave an update in the Transit Operators Committee (TOC) TIP Amendments, mentioning there was one administrative action during last weeks TOC meeting. This administrative action was from Pittsburgh Regional Transit, in which they made a modification to add a new project to the Title 3 part of the TIP. This project is the purchase of park and ride space availability information system for Route 19 that

would handle dynamic messaging for the regional transit network. The project itself is already funded under Title 1, however that funding will be flexed into an FTA grant, which will be under Title 3. The funding will stretch between this fiscal year and the next fiscal year, and was approved during the TOC meeting.

Tom Klevan also discussed the presentation from the last TOC from the bureau chief of public transportation from PennDOT about the statewide shared ride program. Ridership for this program is currently very low, to the point where it is “alarming”, and ridership has steadily decreased every year, even before COVID-19. At the same time, costs for the program have increased dramatically over the last few years, with the statewide numbers being mirrored in the region for the program as well. Currently, the shared ride program is unsustainable in its current condition, unless radical changes are made to the program. Many county transit providers are struggling to keep programs like these viable and provide necessary rides for people who have no other options. SPC staff is working to try and help do something about this, and currently they feel an even greater sense of urgency to try and help attract different types of funding to keep these programs available for the people who greatly need them. Tom urged the county planners to try and find help for these programs, and to urge the higher-ups at the county level to find ways to help out with these programs as well. Mavis Rainey asked the question of any identification of new funding opportunities or a collaborative study that could be made to implement specific initiatives to help implement funding towards this program. Tom mentioned that some of the existing funding sources need to be utilized differently moving forward, specifically towards transit operating. The bureau is actively engaging in testing out new subsidization methods for trips in the middle part of the state. Lastly, there could be federal sources, both new discretionary and existing funding sources, that could be utilized to help the program. Dave Totten also mentioned a new program that just begun, called Find My Ride, which recently won an award from the Governor for excellence. The program is piloting some new technology, including allowing riders to register for subsidies directly from the state. This program is not available currently in Pittsburgh or Philadelphia, however it could end up being a game changer for people who need rides to be able to get them and get rides paid and properly subsidized without the hassle and expense of public call centers. There are also pilots beginning for same day ride service, which could eliminate the hassle of having to call days ahead to schedule a ride to pick people up.

6. **Smart Transportation Program Update**

Domenic D’Andrea gave an opening overview to the Smart program, mentioning that SPC received 16 applications, requesting approximately \$10.5 million. With only \$6 million available, an evaluation process was conducted by SPC staff and others. Ryan Gordon covered this evaluation process, starting with the application process, which opened up in the spring. Smart guidance was approved back in February by the TTC. During the April TTC meeting, the applications were reviewed, with the project descriptions and requested project amounts added. Ryan went over the 16 projects once again, which includes in District 10-0, the Downtown Kittanning Revitalization Project from Armstrong County, and the SR 4005-PA954 to Oakland Ave Pedestrian Improvements, which was submitted by the District. The Smart projects in District 11-0 are the Homestead Eighth Avenue Transit and Pedestrian Improvements from Allegheny County, the Phase 1 Brodhead road Safety and Intermodal Improvement project from Beaver County, the Mitchell Road Multimodal Project Phase 1 from Lawrence County, and the West End Trolley Trail from the City of Pittsburgh. District 11-0 also submitted the SR 51 Section 12A Clairton Blvd in Allegheny County, PA 65 Country Club Bridge in Beaver County, and the Liberty St, Jefferson St, and Wilmington Ave betterment project in Lawrence County. The Smart projects in District 12-0 are the Sheepskin Trail City of Uniontown Section in Fayette County, the SR 19 SE2 Project Supplemental Pedestrian Facilities project in Washington County, the WHT West of SR 66 to Ball Park Court – Design Bid project from Westmoreland County, and the

district submitted projects of the Fayette County Sheepskin Trail Southern Extension, the Waynesburg Betterment project in Greene County, the Delmont Borough sidewalks project in Westmoreland County, and the Valleybrook/Bebout Road Intersection project in Washington County. These projects totaled \$10,406,156, with only \$6 million in Smart program funding available over the net two years. The quality of the applications was very good this time around and the program is getting more competitive, which made the process to selecting projects difficult.

Ryan Gordon went over the evaluation process, which includes three criteria areas: Smart Transportation Themes, Ancillary Factors, and Deliverability. The Smart Themes included evaluating the candidate projects on the five SMART transportation goals, which are linkages with land use planning, support of community goals, project takes a multi-modal approach, project includes collaboration and partnerships, and the project fosters sustainability, health, vitality, preserves the environment, increases resiliency in the transportation system, reduces emissions and increases air quality, as well as promotes equity among all residents in the community. Staff also evaluated the candidate projects on five ancillary factors, which includes consistency with the regions long-range plan, consistency with the region's active transportation plan, safety and crash reduction, environmental justice and Title VI, and non-Federal and non-traditional funding. The third criteria, deliverability, was a major factor since there have been previous issues in the deliverability of previous projects, and SPC did not want to add to the logjam of projects that have previously added up due to a lack of deliverability. A five-member nonpartisan deliverability committee was formed to evaluate each project in terms of its ability to be delivered on time and within budget., This was consistent with the process SPC implements in evaluating the CMAQ projects and the TA projects this cycle in the fall of 2021. The deliverability committee included experts in project management and project deliverability, and each member individually rated the projects and then held two meetings to deliberate and establish the final deliverability ratings. Candidate projects that clearly demonstrate that the project is free of significant deliverability issues and can be delivered within the proposed budget and schedule resulted in high deliverability ratings. Deliverability of legacy projects continues to be an issue and will likely constrain our ability to perform Smart projects in the future.

Ryan Gordon continued with the project selection process, noting that Decision Lens evaluation software was used to compile and analyze the criteria scoring, resulting in unweighted and weighted project scoring. The weighted scenario that was used to calculate the scores was 50% Smart Themes, 10% Ancillary Factors, and 40% Deliverability. This is the same weighing scenario that was used to select Smart projects on the 2021 TIP, and the same that was approved and applied in selecting the 2023 TA projects as well. Ryan reviewed the weighed scores for the candidate projects and noted the different tiers of ranked projects. The two top projects were the Sheepskin Trail City of Uniontown Section, and the SR4005-PA954 to Oakland Ave Pedestrian Improvements. For the recommended funding scenario, SPC took the available Smart funds and drew them down based on the rankings, with both the top tier projects (Sheepskin Trail City of Uniontown, SR4005-PA954 to Oakland Ave Pedestrian Improvements) receiving funding, and the Downtown Kittanning Revitalization Project, Delmont Borough Sidewalks, Homestead Eighth Avenue Transit and Pedestrian Improvements, West End Trolley Trail, SR19 SE2 Project Supplemental Pedestrian Facilities Project, Waynesburg Betterment, and Phase 1 Brodhead Safety and Intermodal Improvements (only \$504,000 of the \$700,000 requested) receiving funding from the middle tier of projects. With these 9 projects selected for the Smart program, a total of just under \$50,000 will be left in the Smart line item for additional needs. These 9 projects will be able to begin work as soon as they are able to begin moving, and will not have to wait for the 2021 Smart projects to be completed.

Ann Ogoreuc asked a question about the Waynesburg and Oakland Avenue Pedestrian Improvement project, since the funds for those projects would be used for ADA facility upgrades. Ann asked if these upgrades are requirements to projects, not supplemental work, as those are usually things that are added regardless of whether you are working on a betterment project. Ryan mentioned that many of these projects have additional enhancements, including signal work or crosswalk work, that were beyond what was required. Many of the projects that were selected were due to their ability to be delivered efficiently, and these betterments were in places that were heavily travelled by pedestrians and would need funding soon anyways, so awarding these project Smart funds would help to move these projects along quicker to be delivered. Ann asked for further clarification on what makes parts of the projects supplemental. Angela Saunders answered on the District 12-0 projects, that the SR 19 Supplemental Pedestrian Facilities Project was for a diverging diamond project to the county line, which did not require the ADA and pedestrian upgrades, and with these Smart funds, they will be able to add the additional ADA and pedestrian upgrades to the project. Angela also mentioned the Waynesburg Betterment project, which they were not required to add sidewalk enhancements, however with the Smart funds they will be able to add sidewalk improvements as well. Harold Swan added that for the Oakland Ave Pedestrian Improvement project, there was a last second cost increase in the project, which made it difficult to add the pedestrian improvements, so the Smart grant for that project will help to fully fund the pedestrian improvements along that network of roads as well.

Joe West asked the question on the eligibility of the Brodhead Road project, which was mentioned as still being under review. Ryan mentioned that on the Brodhead Road project, there is a section that the bulk of the work will be on a side road, which is a road that is not in the federal aid system, which makes it difficult for this safety funding. Ryan mentioned that focusing on the Brodhead Road part, where the transit exists, is probably where the Smart funding will go, and since that project was already trimmed slightly for funding, we might have to look at the scope of the project and see where in the project the funding will be located. Daniel Carpenter asked for an elaboration on the timeframe for when these projects will be added to the TIP. Ryan Gordon mentioned that all the elected projects will receive the Smart funds, but not all the projects would be added right away, due to some larger Smart projects which were selected on previous TIPs. Ryan mentioned that there is probably another half dozen or so projects over previous Smart selections that still need to be programmed, and as he mentioned previously, the deliverability of these projects has constrained the ability to program projects, making it very important that deliverability was a key factor in this Smart selection process. Ryan then mentioned that there are multimodal and TA grants that are upcoming as well, as well as other discretionary programs on the horizon, which will help to fund more of these types of projects. Daniel asked if there a project from a Smart funding period that received funding, but isn't progressing, could it be pulled from the line so another project from the list could fill its place. Ryan answered that while we do retain the list of projects, they would have to go through the process next Smart cycle to receive the funding. However, Ryan mentioned that if something happens such as a sponsor pulls the funding from a project, this list can be used as a criteria to select another project to use those Smart funds for, and SPC would come back to TTC to inform everyone of that decision and to vote again on the updated Smart funds.

Domenic D'Andrea asked for a motion to recommend the nine Smart projects for the Commission. Arthur Cappella made the motion, which was seconded by Josh Krug, and the motion was passed unanimously.

7. **2023 TIP Update**

Domenic D’Andrea introduced the 2023 TIP update, mentioning that himself and Ryan Gordon have been to three virtual meetings and one in-person meeting in Fayette County over the past month for the TIP update. Ryan Gordon continued that this should be the final update for the 2023 TIP, and thanked everyone at TTC and everyone who has been involved with the process over the past year. Ryan mentioned that there was either 23 or 24 TIP work group meetings which went into the 2023 TIP, and we are entering the final steps. The last steps include finishing up the public comment period, and having the commission act to approve the 2023 TIP at the end of the month. Ryan mentioned that the actual resolutions to pass the TIP were a part of the agenda packet this month.

The public comment period was held from May 9th to June 7th, with everything available for public review on the SPC website. As Domenic mentioned, there were three public meetings, and one in-person meeting which was held in Uniontown. All the meetings were recorded and made available on the SPC website. During the public comment period, there were 102 comments made; 73 comments were on projects programmed on the draft TIP, 29 specifically where on the I-376/Parkway East entrance ramps project. Cheryl Moon-Sirianni mentioned that there was a newspaper article with incorrect information on that project which came out during the comment period, which is why a number of comments were made about it. There were also 29 comments related to bridges, 33 comments related to bike and pedestrian infrastructure, 47 comments related to operations and safety projects, and 7 comments related to transit. Ryan Gordon also went over the resolutions in the packet, mentioning that the first resolution was for the air quality conformity report, certifying that we are still within EPA standards, with the second resolution being a self-certification that we followed all Federal requirements and regulations. Arthur Cappella also thanked SPC for coming out and doing the in-person meeting in Uniontown.

Domenic D’Andrea asked for a motion to recommend to the commission the endorsement of the air quality conformity and self-certification, and the endorsement of the 2023-2026 TIP. Joe West made the motion, which was seconded by Jeff Skalican, and the motion was passed unanimously.

8. **Safe Streets and Roads for All Grant Program**

Dan Alwine gave a presentation on the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program, which is a new grant program created from the new Federal infrastructure bill, was released at the start of May. Funding for this program supports the National Highway Safety Strategy, which supports local initiatives to prevent death and serious injury on roads and streets, commonly referred to a “Vision Zero” or “Toward Zero Deaths” initiatives. The notice of funding opportunity for the project is currently open, with any technical questions needed to be submitted by August 15th, 2022, and all applications submitted by September 125, 2022. Additional resources on the program can be found at www.transportation.gov/SS4A. Josh Spano continued with the presentation, discussing the basics of road way safety. He mentioned that effective roadway safety practices and strategies included Vision Zero, Towards Zero Deaths, Complete Streets, Proven Safety Strategies (such as roundabouts), Countermeasures the Work, and Innovative practices and technologies. Dan mentioned the eligible recipients for the grant, which includes MPO’s, local governments, transit districts and authorities, federally recognized tribal governments and multijurisdictional groups comprised of these entities. He mentioned that PennDOT is pushing for joint applications for projects, and noted that State DOT’s are not eligible for the grant application, however PennDOT plans can be used as background.

Dan Alwine discussed that SPC will be pursuing one of these types of grants, and are willing to enter into either a joint application or partner with another organization for it. Joint applicants are each independently eligible entities, while partners may include additional non-eligible entities, such as States and Private companies. Projects will have a 20% local match, with in-kind contributions allowed. The expected action plan grant size for MPO or joint applications is between \$200,000-\$5 million, with an implementation grant size between \$5 million and \$50 million. The program has been appropriated \$1 billion each fiscal year from FY2022 to FY2026, so we have a few years to have a project approved. Josh Spano went over the two types of projects, mentioning that the Action Plan is for developing or completing a comprehensive safety action plan or conducting supplemental action planning activities in support of a safety action plan. Implementation projects include implementing projects and strategies, conducting planning and design, and conducting supplemental action planning activities in support of an existing comprehensive safety plan. Applicants must already have an established Action Plan in place and activities must be tied directly to projects and strategies identified in their Action Plan. Since SPC completed an Action Plan in 2020, SPC will be able to apply directly for implementation grants. Josh mentioned that SPC is currently looking at identifying betterment projects within our region, which includes first and last mile trips, past road safety audit locations, main street projects, priority locations and projects from the 2020 Safety Action Plan, and projects from the 2021 Highway Safety Network Screening Segments and Intersections. Dan Alwine also mentioned that Dave Totten is highlighting Transit areas which could be highlighted for safety and pedestrian improvements.

Dan Alwine also noted the evaluation approach for the Action Plan grants, noting that they are to be developed to be accessible to all communities, with a low barrier to entry. The three major criteria for the Action Plan grant evaluation include the safety impact, the equity, and the safety considerations. There will be a quantitative criteria which relies on public information and to give options to meet community needs, which includes the county of roadway fatalities, the fatality rate average of the past 5 years, and a percent of population underserved within the jurisdiction. There will also be additional consideration based on budget. Dave Totten made the comment that this grant does also help with supplemental activities related to planning, which could include things such as equity plans, or first and last mile serve on projects, and can be very helpful in adding finishing pieces of planning which may be missing. The implementation grants evaluation approach will draw upon a similar foundation of the Action Plan, which is built on safety and equity as principal components. The selection criteria for the implementation grants include four criteria, which are safety impact, equity engagement collaboration, effective practices and strategies, and climate, sustainability and economic competitiveness. It will also consider project readiness and funding to underserved communities. Dan Alwine mentioned again that any technical questions are due by August 15th, 2022, and the SS4A program will only consider one application per applicant. Applicants can only submit to one type of grant, and must have an eligible Action Plan to apply for implementation grants. Action Plan grants which cover the same geographic areas will be flagged as duplicative and may not be funded, and thus DOT is encouraging joint applications and partnerships so such things do not happen.

Domenic D'Andrea added that a successful application will be multi-pronged, with enhancements to bike and pedestrian, transit, and highway travel. SPC and our PennDOT partners will be looking betterment projects with pedestrian and bicycle improvements, road safety audit locations, main street projects, and others in that realm which take care of safety. Potential areas could include the Butler Business District, the Indiana Borough Business District, Downtown McKeesport, a number of City of Pittsburgh corridors, Greensburg Business District, City of Washington Business District, among other possibilities. Jason Theakston asked the question if the roundabout screening study would be able to be tied into these grant

opportunities. Domenic answered that those projects could definitely be strong potential projects for implementation, and SPC already has detailed reports outlining benefit costs on those projects, either for these grants or HSIP grants.

9. **Other Business/Status Reports**

There was no other business or status reports to update.

10. **Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by Joe West. The motion was passed unanimously and Domenic D'Andrea called for the adjournment of the meeting at 12:15 PM.