

**LACKAWANNA-LUZERNE TRANSPORTATION STUDY**  
**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**July 6, 2016**

Members of the Technical Committee:

Attached is a copy of the minutes of the Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study Technical Committee meeting, which was held on July 6, 2016 at 10:05 a.m. in Conference Room 233 in the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Engineering District 4-0 Office, Dunmore, Pennsylvania.

Please check for errors or omissions.

Thank you.

# Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study

## Technical Committee Meeting

July 6, 2016 Technical Committee Meeting Summary and Minutes

10:00 a.m.

### Meeting Location:

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation  
Engineering District 4-0 Office  
55 Keystone Industrial Park  
Dunmore, PA 18512

### Attendees:

Susan Hazelton\*  
Marie Bishop  
Steven Fisher  
Gerard Babinski\*  
John Frankosky  
Susan Williams  
Peggy Voldenberg  
Gabrielle Alberigi  
Matthew Pettinato  
Matt Smoker  
Dean Roberts\*  
Daniel Butch\*  
Gary Cavill\*

### Organization:

PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
FHWA PA Division  
PennDOT Central Office  
Luzerne Co. Planning/Zoning  
Permanent Proxy for  
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.

### Attendees:

Butch Frati\*  
  
Doug Hein\*  
Stephen Mykulyn  
  
Steve Pitoniak\*  
  
James Ferry\*  
Alan Baranski\*  
  
Chris Chapman  
  
Michael Cera  
Jeff DeAngelo

### Organization:

City of Wilkes-Barre Permanent  
Proxy for Mayor George  
County of Lackawanna Transit System  
Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International  
Airport  
Lackawanna County Regional  
Planning Commission  
Luzerne County Commission Planning  
Northeastern PA Alliance Permanent  
Proxy for Jeff Box  
Lackawanna County, Department of  
Planning & Economic Development  
Alfred Benesch & Company  
Alfred Benesch & Company

\*Committee members who voted at this meeting.

### Summary of Actions Taken by the LLTS Technical Committee

During the course of this meeting the LLTS Technical Committee voted on the following actions:

Action 1: Mr. Pitoniak called the meeting to order at 10:05am; he asked for a self-introduction by each person in attendance. Mr. Pitoniak stated for the record that in accordance with the provisions of the Sunshine Law and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), Lackawanna County, submitted the required public meeting notice, which appeared in local papers for general circulation.

Action 2: Mr. Pitoniak noted copies of the April 6, 2016 Technical Committee Meeting minutes were distributed via email to all members of the committee. He asked if there were any additions, deletions, or corrections to the minutes. Mr. Smoker noted no corrections to the minutes but the attendance sheet, to delete Ms. Camille Otto, FHWA and add his name; Mr. Ferry noted on the attendance sheet his name is misspelled – Mr. Perry, and Luzerne County Redevelopment is vacant, currently there is no one appointed to the position. Mr. Pitoniak entertained a motion to approve the April 6, 2016 minutes, Mr. Baranski made the motion, Mr. Hein second it; motion carried.

## Meeting Minutes:

### 1) BUSINESS ITEMS:

- a) **Approval of the Minutes from April 6, 2016 Meeting** – Mr. Pitoniak requested a motion from the Committee to approve the minutes from the April 6, 2016 meeting. Mr. Baranski made the motion, Mr. Hein second it; motion carried with the corrections.

### 2) 2015-2018 TIP MODIFICATIONS:

- a) **District 4-0 TIP Modifications** – Mr. Pitoniak noted copies of the 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) modifications were sent out electronically to all committee members, and are administrative actions for information purposes only; no amendments. Mr. Fisher highlighted the modifications to the 2015-2018 TIP, which included:

Administrative Action(s):

- 1) MPMS # 102609 - I-81 off Ramp at Exit 175 - adding local funds for the reimbursement agreement; increase to low bid amount.
- 2) MPMS# 67363 - SR 2103 over I-81 Turnpike Bridge Removal – adding Construction Phase; bridge removal that was bid by PA Turnpike.
- 3) MPMS# 7924 - Bridge Replacement T-309 – adding PE Phase to begin design.
- 4) MPMS# 84565 - Addressed an AUC on SR 118 over Idetown Road – Construction Phase.
- 5) MPMS# 104227 – Resurface/Federal Aide Paving Project – SR 3023; advancing Construction Phase to bid early.
- 6) MPMS# 8400 - Birney Avenue Signal Improvement Project; addressed an AUC on the Construction Phase of that project.
- 7) MPMS# 93002 - Bridge Replacement- advanced the construction phase, State Route (S.R.) 239 over Pine Creek from the TYP to federal fiscal year 2016-2017 - advancing to bid early.
- 8) MPMS# 7838 - Harrison Avenue Bridge Project - increase the Construction Phase, process work order; Central Office PMC item that acquires approval.
- 9) MPMS# 57706 - Kennedy Drive Project – advanced the Construction Phase from Federal Fiscal Year 2016- 2018 to 2016-2017 and decreased the construction estimate. Safety Improvement/New Traffic Signal, and advancing construction to bid early.
- 10) MPMS# 74716 - Added Dunmore Borough Earmark Project to the TIP, and added Construction Phase to 2016.
- 11) MPMS# 104440 - Adjustments on the Safety Projects in Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties – I-81 Cable Median Barriers.
- 12) MPMS# 104444- Adjusting the Safety Projects – District Signal Projects/Signal Safety Improvements.
- 13) MPMS# 104439 - Adjusting the Safety Projects – S.R. 6 Cable Median Barriers.
- 14) MPMS# 105136- Streetscaping Project – added the construction phase to the Pittston Streetscape Project.

Mr. Pitoniak opened for comments or questions, hearing none; he asked if there are any transit modifications; hearing none, the committee moved to the 2017-2020 TIP Public Comment Period & Approval of the 2017-2020 TIP-Highway & Transit.

### 3) 2017-2020 TIP PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD & APPROVAL OF THE 2017-2020 TIP – HIGHWAY & TRANSIT

- a) Copies of the Draft FFY 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program included:
  - Lackawanna-Luzerne County (Scranton/Wilkes-Barre TIP) FFY 2017 State Transportation Improvement Program and TIP Modification Procedures.

- Lackawanna-Luzerne County (Scranton/Wilkes-Barre TIP) FFY 2017 Highway and Bridge Transportation Improvement Program with public narrative.
- Lackawanna-Luzerne County Interstate Transportation Improvement Program FFY (Scranton/Wilkes-Barre Area) with public narrative.
- Statewide Highway and Bridge Transportation Improvement Program with public narrative.
- Lackawanna-Luzerne County FFY 2017 (Scranton/Wilkes-Barre TIP) Public Transit Transportation Improvement Program.
- Lackawanna-Luzerne County (Scranton/Wilkes-Barre TIP) 2017 Public Transit Documents-County of Lackawanna Transit System (COLTS).
- Lackawanna-Luzerne County (Scranton/Wilkes-Barre TIP) FFY Public Transit Documents – Hazleton Public Transit.
- Lackawanna-Luzerne County (Scranton/Wilkes-Barre TIP) FFY Public Transit Documents – Luzerne County Transit Authority (LCTA).

Mr. Pitoniak noted over the last several weeks Mr. Roberts, Mr. Chapman, and himself put together the documents required for the TIP update process, including the STIP TIP modifications procedures, Highway & Bridge TIP, statewide TIP, and the three transit authorities. They were distributed to the following offices and put on public display June 17, 2016; the public review time-period ends July 20, 2016: PennDOT District 4-0 Office, Lackawanna County Regional Planning Commission, Luzerne County Planning Commission, Scranton Public Library, Carbondale Public Library, Hazleton Area Public Library, Osterhout Free Library, Pittston Memorial Library, Hazleton One Center, and LLTS MPO website. He noted there will be a meeting scheduled to take any comments; currently no comments have been received on the Lackawanna or Luzerne County side. They will distribute the documents and include a comment form with each of the packets of information, which consist of contact information for Mr. Ferry, the District office, and himself such as telephone numbers, mailing and email addresses.

Mr. Pitoniak noted Lackawanna County entered into a contract with Blackout Design to create an MPO website. He is hopeful within the next two months there will be an MPO website, at which time, they will migrate all documentation that was housed on the Luzerne County website to the new MPO website. There will be three administrators, one at each of the following offices - Luzerne County Planning office, Lackawanna County Planning office, and the District 4-0 Office.

Mr. Roberts noted Ray Green, Central Office was contacted by a resident from the city of Hazleton, and he will follow-up with Mr. Pitoniak at a later date. Mr. Pitoniak noted it for discussion at the next LLTS Coordinating Committee Meeting on July 20, 2016.

Mr. Pitoniak asked for any questions or comments, hearing none; he entertained a motion to forward a recommendation from the Tech Committee to approve the documents for the Coordinating Committee in the next two weeks; he noted there are still two weeks remaining that the public can make comments. Mr. Ferry made the motion, second it by Mr. Cavill, and the motion carried.

#### **4) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) – PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION’S STATEWIDE PROCEDURES FOR 2015-2018 STIP AND TIP MODIFICATIONS.**

Mr. Pitoniak noted the documentation was sent out to all committee members, asking if there were any questions. Mr. Roberts noted they kept the threshold at three million dollars and updated it to the changes that were made on a statewide level between PennDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Mr. Pitoniak noted over a number of years, the threshold was always set at the committee level to three million, and there are no thresholds mandated by FHWA or PennDOT. It is set up by each MPO that feel are the major projects. Mr. Roberts stated if it is agreed upon by FHWA and PennDOT, the max threshold is at three million, they cannot in advance report five million.

Mr. Pitoniak asked for any questions or comments; hearing none, entertained a motion to recommend to the Coordinating Committee the approval of the MOU; Mr. Baranski made the motion, Mr. Frati second it, and the motion carried.

#### **5) SELF-CERTIFICATION RESOLUTION.**

Mr. Pitoniak distributed the document just prior to the meeting; it needs to be updated at least every four years on the MPO level, which they try to do every two years when they update the TIPs. He spoke with Ms. Bishop yesterday concerning today's meeting, she noticed it wasn't on the agenda.

Mr. Pitoniak noted every MPO must be self-certified within every four years and follow all the mandates of the FHWA, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), all of the executive orders, and civil rights information – Title VI. The document reveals to perform to all those parameters. The federal certification review was over a month ago, and all the documentations were reviewed by FHWA & FTA. He noted everything is in good shape and should receive a final review in a few months.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Smoker for an update on the status; Mr. Smoker noted it is still in draft writing format, and the bulk of it is being written by FTA. Mr. Pitoniak noted FTA and FHWA will split up the workload on self-certification reviews. Mr. Smoker noted in the last couple weeks, they found some new citations for some of the new bills being passed with some of the new planning regulations that were finalized just a months ago; he will send him the most up to date copy.

Mr. Pitoniak asked for any questions or comments, hearing none; he entertained a motion to recommend to the Coordinating Committee the adoption of the Self-Certification Resolution. Mr. Hein made the motion, Mr. Babinski second it; motion carried.

#### **6) OTHER BUSINESS:**

Mr. Pitoniak noted there are a few items on the agenda; Mike Cera, Alfred Benesch & Company is present to give an update on S.R. 424, Section 390 Project, Hazleton area - to get the S.R. 424 extension added to the Federal Functional Classification System. Mr. Cera noted they're looking at the project to get the roadway on the Federal Classification Map in Luzerne County. He gave a brief presentation and overview of the project.

- The project is to extend from I-81, Exit 141 interchange to CANDO's Humboldt Industrial Park (HIP). The roadway will be approximately 1.1 miles long, four lane roadway from the interstate interchange to a township road in Humboldt Industrial Park. There will be turning lanes and traffic signals added to four intersections, and the extension will connect the Hazleton Beltway to S.R. 0924 just west of I-81 utilizing HIP's existing roadway network.
- The project purpose is to provide secondary and emergency access between I-81 and HIP, as well as additional incident management for local roadways.
- Project needs were split up between System Linkage, Transportation Demand, and Traffic Operations. The System Linkage and Transportation Demand find additional access for HIP and local traffic, direct continuous transportation facility, and accommodate regional growth. The Traffic Operations find additional access to HIP, additional route in case of an emergency, and incident management route for I-81.

He noted it is an overall map to give everyone an ideal of where the project stands; the project location will be an extension of S.R. 424 west of I-81. He noted HIP is the largest industrial park in Northeast Pennsylvania with over seven thousand employees and over two thousand acres. In addition, there are some other developments, and roughly eighty five thousand residents. As far as the project, one of the key project stake holders is the Hazleton City Authority, and they have been working with them closely throughout the project. The project timeline started several years ago; the design started 2007 and due to

funding constraints, the project stopped in 2010 and restarted in 2014. They're looking at two years of preliminary engineering and final design with anticipated start of construction 2019. He noted some of the work that is completed early on such as forming a task force for public involvement, cultural resources - provide all the environmental studies, and recently submitted the environmental assessment for the project. They have the traffic analysis report, and just received the Line and Grade submission. He noted as far as the existing beltway S.R. 424, it is currently considered rural arterial, posted speed of 50 MPH, two lanes constructed, four lanes graded, ten foot paved shoulders, and currently two existing bridges over I-81. He noted the proposed beltway is looking at a little different classification – suburban corridor, community collector, posted speed of 35 MPH, four lanes paved from Interstate/Interchange to Commerce Drive, ten foot paved shoulders with curbing to accommodate the city of Hazleton Authority, concrete overlay proposed on I-81 bridges, and bridges will be re-striped to accommodate four lanes. He noted the existing S.R. 424 has two lanes and ten foot shoulders; the proposed S.R. 424 will have four paved lanes and ten foot shoulders. At observing the traffic for the area at the proposed extension, it will be roughly nine thousand eight hundred vehicles in the year 2038. The existing beltway has around ten thousand vehicles per day; the Interstate in that area is looking at twenty to thirty five thousand vehicles, and S.R. 924 has twenty five thousand vehicles currently, which is a significant amount of traffic that will be using the roadway. As far as distribution of traffic, they distributed several thousand surveys to people in the HIP and surrounding communities, and received roughly two thousand back; therefore, based on the results, the highest percentage of traffic was actually coming from East-Hazleton area.

Emergency Management – Mr. Cera noted when an accident occurred in the past, there were some significant detours, and having the additional secondary access could accommodate accidents on S.R. 924 and on the Interstate. He noted the existing bridges on S.R. 424 over I-81 - the structures beltway were built in the late 1990's; existing are two consecutive single-span pre-stressed I-beam bridges, clear width between parapets of sixty feet, and striped for three lanes (40') and two shoulders (20'). The proposed structures are four lanes anticipated across the bridges, re-stripe for four lanes (48') and two shoulders (12'), and LMC overlay anticipated for cross slope adjustments. When they first started the project through public involvement and public meetings, they came up with several alternatives alignments were developed. When they focused on the projects Purpose & Need, there are six alternatives which they will continue forward with their analysis. He noted the alternative is for the recommended preferred. He brought a hard copy of the map and a set of plans if anyone has any additional questions on the project.

Mr. Ferry questioned if the existing S.R. 424 will be widened into four lanes; Mr. Cera noted only about 1500 feet from the Interchange-East will go from four lanes back down to two lanes, and there will be some widening from the Interchange to S.R. 309, remain mostly two lanes. Mr. Ferry asked if there will be access from north end / south of I-81, and is it designed to handle heavy truck traffic; Mr. Cerra confirmed. Mr. Ferry asked if there are any bike lanes; Mr. Cerra noted they did not factor bike lanes into the project based upon the location and use. Mr. Ferry noted the numbers projected to him seem low due to all the employees in HIP, they only have one way to get there, and from his perspective, it seems to be more traffic flow. Mr. Cera noted the information they received from the survey and the traffic analysis, currently anticipate ten thousand vehicles. Mr. Ferry asked where it is coming into the park, is the road suitable for truck traffic; Mr. Cera confirmed, noting most of the roadways are thirty to forty feet wide. Mr. Roberts questioned the estimate on the project; Mr. Cera noted the current estimate is 14.3 million. Mr. Pitoniak questioned the length and will it be four lanes with limited access; Mr. Cera noted approximate length is 1.1 miles, and confirmed the four lanes, and as far as limited access near the Interstate - it will be available to the public. Mr. Ferry noted with the limited access; there wouldn't be any side roads tapping into it; Mr. Cera noted there is no side roads, pedestrian traffic or anything similar. Mr. Ferry asked if it is one primarily property owner, and will there be railroad crossing.

Mr. Cera noted for the most part it will be Hazleton City Authority parcels; he confirmed there will be a railroad crossing at that location and they will need to go through the PUC process.

Mr. Smoker questioned if there will be any widening of Commerce Drive; Mr. Cera confirmed. Mr. Smoker asked if it will be signalized; Mr. Cera confirmed. Mr. Smoker asked if the new route will be marked through S.R. 424 with traffic as well; Ms. Hazelton noted they will need to make that determination if the District will turn it back over to Hazle Township. Mr. Smoker noted the mapping that they will be submitting, will it include adjusted urbanized boundaries. Ms. Hazelton asked if it is needed; Mr. Smoker confirmed and it will just be urban collector or rural minor collector.

Mr. Pitoniak reported they are going to be updating the Functional Classification and National Highway System maps, and they haven't been done in a number of years; they're currently having some preliminary discussions on getting one this year.

Mr. Pitoniak asked for any questions or comments; hearing none, entertain a motion to recommend to the Coordinating Committee the change to Functional Classification Map as presented; Mr. Smoker made the motion, Mr. Ferry second it; motion carried.

Mr. Pitoniak stated the next item on the agenda - Repurposing Earmarks. Mr. Fisher noted it is statewide initiative which was provided by the 2016 Appropriation Act. It allows the Department to take back some of federal monies that were provided by earmarks, and a lot of the earmarks that were provided during Safetea-Lu are just sitting out there stagnant. Central Office has committed to getting those earmarks repurposed and obligated prior to August 29, 2016; therefore, those projects that received earmarks that are not moving forward in any progressive fashion the money will be taken and provided back to the MPO to be used on other projects. If any of those project were determined to be valid, the Department can still use TIP money to construct the project. Mr. Smoker noted two categories of earmarks. Those that have less than 10% of the original funds obligated, and for those projects have to be completed/closed out and still monies left on the books. Mr. Pitoniak noted there is four projects in Lackawanna County and sixteen in Luzerne County, and if the dollar amount is viewed, most of the amounts are \$160,000.00 and \$230,000.00. Mr. Roberts noted Central Office recommended projects, but the District in coordination with MPO can make up a suitable substitute project, noting now would be a great time to let Central office know of improved ideas. Ms. Hazelton noted they already obligated the project that was suggested; they can go back and pull those funds - obligate the earmark money, noting they have the S.R. 309 projects and a bridge project that is coming out shortly. The rule is to spend within fifty miles of the original earmark and most that are not progressing are in Luzerne and Lackawanna counties, therefore, it falls within the fifty miles. She does not have the total value of the original earmark money, but the dollar value of what the Department is going to repurpose is nearly 3.4 million. There is a lot of municipalities when they were granted the funding, the Department works with them to get them to develop a project that will meet the criteria of the earmark and requiring matching funds. She noted some of them couldn't afford it or produce a project that would meet the criteria. The Department is now at a point many years later, they're not going to utilize those funds. Mr. Roberts noted it is statewide numbers; these are funds dedicated for a specific project for a total of 128 million dollars. Mr. Smoker noted some of the rules going along of repurposing - only repurpose funds once, and to repurpose a new project you only have three years then to obligate that project, and if you don't get to it, the funds are lost.

Mr. Pitoniak noted an informational item - once the District figures out how to allocate the funds; the TIP will have to be redone, amendments and modifications need to begin to get the new projects on the TIP, and both Technical and Coordinating committees will have a chance to review the projects further down the road. Mr. Roberts noted any time switching out money, it can be done administratively.

Mr. Pitoniak asked if there are any questions or comments on Repurposing Earmarks. Mr. Ferry noted a lot of them had zero obligation; questioning - is it from negligence due to insufficient funding.

Mr. Roberts noted when there is a 20% match from the locals that is a heavy load, and it is seen across the board on all projects and it is a constant struggle. Mr. Fisher noted with 20% match - could only do

what is listed in the script at the legislative earmark, therefore, all the other needs within the local municipality they may not want to spend their money. Mr. Smoker noted occasionally when a project is federal, it adds time and money to it as well. Mr. Ferry questioned repurpose title; he was unsure what it essentially means, and is it a composed assignment. Ms. Hazelton noted Central Office suggests what projects to repurpose the money to; the Department will obligate the project prior to making a decision on where to repurpose or which one needs to be repurposed; the Department will be selecting a different project.

Mr. Pitoniak asked for any other comments or questions; hearing none, he noted PennDOT had a Planning Partners Conference last week that was held at State College which expanded three days. He noted there were a lot of sessions that were conducted, both Secretaries were in attendance, and budgeting numbers came up, especially the State Police budget. The majority of Act 89 funds, the way the percentages are, the state police is receiving a large amount rather than construction projects. He noted other sessions that were held such as bridge, and many of the bridges were built back in 1900's-1920's are now obsolete and are problems now due to funds needed to rehab or build new bridges. Currently, Lackawanna County does not have any bridges that meet this category; Luzerne County has six to seven bridges that is in this situation which is an issue. He noted many of the bridges can be moved and used somewhere else for non-highway purposes, so the problem is to move them and not funding them. It has become an issue and if anyone knows of someone looking for a bridge to use for nonmotorized transit purposes, PennDOT has bridges available. Mr. Smoker noted some of the bridges are repurpose to lower functional class roads or local township roads, which can be repurposed for motorized vehicles. If the counties are doing trail planning, PennDOT has a list of what bridges are statewide and they might be able to match them up, but would still need to go through NEPA process.

Ms. Hazelton stated the Department's Secretary spoke and talked about the agenda to assure all of the planning is a committed collaborative effort. As many projects are in their final stage, primarily LPN system, all rails, trails, bikes, and pedestrian are considered comprehensive plans so that every project is truly comprehensive and addressing all moments.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Ferry what his thoughts were on the Planning Partner Meeting. He found the meeting an extremely useful exercise, and a tremendous value in the collaboration with colleagues. There were concrete ideas expressed and ideas shared –he found it to be a tremendous value.

Ms. Smoker noted there were many helpful presentations from other MPOs & RPOs; as well as some of the different bureaus or divisions from PennDOT Central Office. Mr. Pitoniak noted the first day all MPOs & RPOs met and discussed their relationships with their Districts; he noted we have a very good relationship with our District compared to other area regions. One of the items that did come out of the MPO/RPO session is more coordination with the Department, District offices within the Department, and the Department with the MPO/RPOs. Several comments that came up was concerning the twelve PennDOT offices; that each Districts does matters a little differently, especially with the LPN process; which is supposed to be revamped. Currently, it is undergoing changes with Central Office, and the different levels will probably be merged into one project; they're trying to get the environmental process in earlier.

Mr. Fisher has hard copies of 2015 current TIP for anyone to review.

Mr. Roberts asked when the public comment are due; so during the Coordinating Committee Meeting, they can officially make the motion to approve the TIP. Mr. Pitoniak noted it was advertised in the paper the morning of the Coordinating Committee Meeting as a special meeting for anyone wanting to present. The public will have their time then before the meeting convenes. The committee will address those concerns that may have come up, and will be able to take action on the entire package.

Mr. Smoker noted on May 27<sup>th</sup>, the Federal Highway and Federal Transit issued final planning rules based upon Map 21 and Fast Act. They made some revisions to Title 23 governed statewide, as well as, metropolitan and new rules recovering non-metropolitan rural areas of the state that was issued; it will be in effect as of June 27, 2017. He can do a power point presentation or send out information; there are



some webinars going on regarding Federal Highway/Bridge side of the new planning regulations, and he will share it with the MPO staff. If anyone is interested, to contact Mr. Pitoniak or Mr. Chapman. Mr. Pitoniak noted on July 27<sup>th</sup> there is a meeting on Environmental Justice, if anyone is interested in attending to let him know.

Mr. Smoker noted currently they're putting out a great deal of information and will be developing guidance material to answer some of the questions. He asked if they're going to share the power point put together on various TIP projects; noting from his perspective the current TIP was a great deal of work, effort, and coordination between the staff – MPO and the District. It was very useful, and he appreciated the effort. Ms. Hazelton noted they're trying to set a process across the state, and make it more efficient and user friendly on the Department and MPO efforts.

Mr. Pitoniak stated at the Planning Partners Meeting they questioned the status on the merging or coordination between all the MPOs; Mr. Smoker noted it's in draft - MPOs to improve coordination on all plans that goes on within the urbanized areas. They're still trying to figure it out, encouraging more coordination and collaboration, and if there is a large urbanized area it might impact more than one MPO. To have one TIP, one plan, and one overall planning document that will cover the entire urbanized area, which could cover portions of four different states. Mr. Pitoniak noted our MPO touches other MPOs – it can technically go from New York state line - south. Mr. Smoker noted there is a webinar upcoming to discuss what that involves, and a shorter public comment period of 60 days.

**7) Adjournment:**

Mr. Pitoniak thanked everyone for attending; the next Technical Coordinating Committee meeting will be on October 5, 2016, followed by the Coordinating Committee Meeting on October 19, 2016.

There being no further business, he entertained a motion to close the LLTS Technical Committee meeting; Mr. Baranski made the motion; Mr. Ferry second it; motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.