

**LACKAWANNA-LUZERNE TRANSPORTATION STUDY**  
**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**January 4, 2017**

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 January 4, 2017 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

January 4, 2017 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\*  
Julianne Lawson  
Peggy Voldenberg  
Mike Taluto  
John Frankosky  
Natalie Boyer  
Jordan Tracy  
Matt Pettinato  
James Weber\*

### 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  
PennDOT District 4-0  
PennDOT District 4-0  
Luzerne County Planning &  
Zoning

### Attendees:

Butch Frati\*  
Steve Pitoniak\*  
James Ferry\*  
Alan Baranski\*  
Chris Chapman  
Andrew Wallace\*  
Kate McMahon  
Daniel Butch\*  
John Pocius\*

### Organization:

City of Wilkes-Barre Permanent  
Proxy for Mayor George  
Lackawanna County Regional  
Planning Commission  
Luzerne County Commission Planning  
Northeastern PA Alliance Permanent  
Proxy for Jeff Box  
Lackawanna County, Department of  
Planning & Economic Development  
Lackawanna County Chief of Staff  
Northeastern PA Alliance  
Luzerne Co. Planning & Zoning  
City of Scranton Permanent Proxy  
for Mayor Courtright  
PennDOT Central Office  
Luzerne County Transit Authority  
Permanent Proxy for Norm Gavlick

Matt Smoker  
Gary Cavill\*

FHWA PA Division  
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.  
Permanent Proxy for Louis Norella  
County of Lackawanna Transit  
System (COLTS)

Dean Roberts\*  
Kathy Bednarek\*

Doug Hein\*

Stephen Mykulyn\*

Aviation Representative Lackawanna County

\*Committee members who voted at this meeting.

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

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

Action 1: Mr. Pitoniak called the meeting to order at 10:05am, he noted immediately after the meeting there will be a session on the Critical Rural Freight Corridors for anyone interested to attend. There are no new proxies; 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 October 5, 2016 Technical Committee Meeting minutes were distributed via email to all members of the committee. Mr. Pitoniak reported Mr. Baranski noted a correction under Item #3 MPO Coordination and Reform – the incorrect statement - He has glanced through the comments, noting there were a lot of support for the proposed regulations. Correction - He has glanced through the comments, noting there were not a lot of support for the proposed regulations. Mr. Pitoniak asked if there were any other additions, deletions, or corrections to the minutes; hearing none, Mr. Pitoniak entertained a motion to approve the January 4, 2017 minutes, Mr. Pocius made the motion, Mr. Cavill second it; motion carried.

### Meeting Minutes:

#### 1) **BUSINESS ITEMS:**

- a) **Approval of the Minutes from October 5, 2016 Meeting** – Mr. Pitoniak requested a motion from the Committee to approve the minutes from the October 5, 2016 meeting. Mr. Pocius made the motion, Mr. Cavill second it; motion carried with the corrections.

#### 2) **2017-2020 TIP MODIFICATIONS:**

- a) **District 4-0 TIP Modifications** – Mr. Pitoniak noted copies of the 2017-2020 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 passed out a packet of information and reviewed the following highlights.

Administrative Action(s):

- 1) MPMS# 89012, SR 309 over SR 2004, L & S RR, Susquehanna River Project, Luzerne County - adding a Construction Phase to the FFY 2017 TIP, and they're experiencing delays due to railroad coordination and additional deterioration. Dean Butch 10/19/16 – 1<sup>st</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup>.
- 2) MPMS# 7838, Harrison Avenue Bridge Project, Lackawanna County - increasing the Utility Phase for railroad and PPL pole relocation.
- 3) MPMS# 8776, Mary Street Bridge T-349 Fairview Project - increasing the Final Design and Utility Phase to process engineering agreement.
- 4) MPMS# 67344, SR 3021 over Nescopeck Creek Project - increasing the Construction Phase to low bid amount.
- 5) MPMS# 93002, SR 239 over Pine Creek Project - decreasing the Construction Phase to the FFY 2017 TIP due to partially obligated on the previous TIP, therefore, the money on this TIP is available for other projects.
- 6) MPMS# 84368, SR 6011 Greenridge Street Project - adding a Study Phase to the FFY 2017 TIP which was obligated on the previous TIP  
MPMS# 7924, T-309, Fourth Street over Lehigh River Project - adding a PE Phase to the FFY 2017 TIP which was also obligated on the previous TIP.
- 7) MPMS# 95435, Federal Aid Paving 4-16FP 2 Project - increasing the Construction Phase which was partially obligated on the previous TIP. The amendment was approved via email on November 16, 2016.
- 8) MPMS# 50800, Upper Demunds/Hildebrant Project -increasing the Construction Phase in the FFY 2017 TIP which was partially obligated on the previous TIP. Also, needs an AC conversion.  
MPMS# 70249, Dallas Intersection 5 Leg Project - increasing the Construction phase to low bid amount which was obligated on the previous TIP.
- 9) MPMS# 67343, SR 3021 over Nescopeck Creek Project - adding a ROW Phase to the FFY 2017 TIP per claim estimate.
- 10) MPMS# 93033, SR 2036 over Mill Creek Project – adding a Utility Phase to the FFY 2017 TIP.

**11) MPMS# 106372, Sanderson/Dunmore and Cypress Signal Project - adding a PE Phase to the FFY 2017 TIP to begin Design Phase.**

Mr. Fisher opened to any questions or concerns. Ms. Bishop questioned Mr. Roberts if they need to confirm the email vote; he confirmed.

Mr. Pitoniak questioned the Sanderson/Dunmore site - will it include turning lanes;

Ms. Hazelton confirmed.

Mr. Pitoniak noted no vote is required, however, the amendment for the Federal Aid Pavement needs to be confirmed and requires a motion to accept the email ballot.

Mr. Ferry commented on PennDOT having the authority to make administrative moves, but can it be part of the Planning Partners vote. To receive the information ahead a time as the process is ongoing, and have some input as opposed to just at the meeting. Ms. Hazelton noted TIP changes are in the MPMS system and can they be viewed in MPMS/MPMS IQ? Mr. Roberts believes they can be accessed, and can easily package those changes via email. He noted there is a way to download whatever changes are composed and view those in MPMS and MPMS IQ system. They have made a great deal of changes, and why the Department sets the thresholds on the amendments is for the committee to be aware of the level changes. They can send Mr. Ferry what the Department is working on for a short period, but he would need to decipher what is a priority. Mr. Ferry commented on what stood out was a bridge project over the Cross-Valley River, Luzerne County. Mr. Smoker noted thresholds for amendments usually comes up every two years when there is a TIP update, and it can be changed.

Mr. Pitoniak noted one of the items discussed during the website process was to create a page with a notification list containing any changes that were made to a project, and can go into the MPMS system for further details. Ms. Bishop noted the bridge project Mr. Ferry mentioned was voted on in the October 2016 meeting; it was a project that was fully funded on the 2015 TIP. It wasn't bid under the TIP or a new project or carried onto a new TIP. Mr. Ferry is looking for significant projects and a way to receive notification.

Mr. Pitoniak asked Mr. Fisher and Ms. Bishop if this is something that can be provided on a weekly basis; Ms. Bishop questioned Mr. Roberts if it can be added to the management action -automatic email that is generated containing all the information. Mr. Roberts will follow-up, and suggested to schedule a meeting to discuss a direction in accomplishing this request.

Mr. Pitoniak entertained a motion to accept the ratification of the email ballot for Federal Aid Pavement, Mr. Frati made the motion Mr. Pocius second it; motion carried.

Mr. Pitoniak noted he travels on the Scranton Expressway (Harrison Avenue Project) every morning and noticed it is getting warn down due to a one lane of traffic in each direction. He questioned if there are any plans for upgrades before the bridge is completed, and is uncertain if the road will even last until the bridge is finished. Ms. Hazelton noted there are no upgrades or overlay slated as part of that project for the areas of the normal traffic lanes, especially where the Department is using temporary ramps, but they will take it into consideration. The Department's issue is reviewing NHS routes and Federal Aid project selection for surface treatment in the upcoming year. Mr. Pitoniak questioned if it will take over a year before the traffic is restored to four lanes; he also noted, when the Department paved over the crossover where the median was located, it created a great deal of scaling and potholes. Ms. Hazelton confirmed the time frame, and there may be some restoration but she will need to follow-up.

**3) UPCOMING TIP PROJECTS:**

Mr. Pitoniak noted Mr. Chapman will give a power point presentation on the upcoming TIP projects.

Mr. Chapman reviewed the following twelve projects, seven in Lackawanna County and five in Luzerne County; all projects will be Let by March 23, 2017.

1. MPMS# 93027, SR 2035-351 over Meadow Run, Luzerne County – Bridge Replacement Project. Let Date January 12, 2017.

2. MPMS# 102002, SR 115-DOI, PA 115 Edge Line Rumble Strips, Luzerne County – Safety Improvement Project. Let date February 16, 2017.
3. MPMS# 97220, SR 11-FP1, SR 307, & SR 6006, Lackawanna County, Paving /Resurface Project. Let date March 9, 2017.
4. MPMS# 93000, SR 438-250, over Elm Brook, Lackawanna County - Bridge Replacement Project. Let date March 9, 2017
5. MPMS# 102114, SR 502, Lackawanna/Luzerne Counties SR 502; SR 3020, Lackawanna County, Resurface Project. Let date March 9, 2017.
6. MPMS# 91214, SR 92-F17, SR 11, SR 239, Paving /Resurface Project. Let date March 9, 2017.
7. MPMS# 93018, SR 437-350, SR 437 over Creasy Creek, Luzerne County, Bridge Replacement Project. Let Date March 9, 2017.
8. MPMS# 107727, SR 107-GRM, Benton Road, Group 4-17, Lackawanna County Guiderail Improvement Project. Let date March 23, 2017.
9. MPMS# 107660, SR 171-M17, Multiple State Routes – SR 171, 1005, 1008, 1012, 1014, 1023, 3025, Paving /Resurface Project. Let date March 23, 2017.
10. MPMS# 94465, I-80-310, Surface over ASR 2015, Interstate Reconstruction Project. Let date March 23, 2017.
11. MPMS# 107664, SR 93-M17, SR 93: Sr 3004, SR 92, Luzerne County, Paving / Resurface Projects. Let date March 23, 2017 Let Date.
12. MPMS# 93045, SR 4037-350, SR 4037 over Salem Creek Project, Luzerne County. Bridge Replacement Projects. Let date March 23, 2017.

Mr. Pitoniak noted Mr. Chapman and Mr. Butch have been working on upcoming TIP projects, and will review upcoming projects to the committee. He encouraged the committee for any suggestions and to email him with any ideas. All information is available on the MPMS website.

#### **4) UPDATING FUNCTIONAL CLASS MAPS:**

Mr. Pitoniak noted the Federal Highway Administration requests Functional Classification Maps be reviewed at every census, and most MPOs don't, the last time was after the 2000 census. The Functional Class Maps, due to traffic volume/traffic flows, should be reviewed periodically to see if a roadway needs to be upgraded, downgraded, or moved in classification. He noted a meeting was several weeks ago, at NEPA, and it was discussed to do it as a region basis; since NEPA has four counties in their region, LLTS has two, and Northern Tier has two, they're looking to update the functional class maps due to class does not change at the county line but follows through. He noted PennDOT wants the information submitted on a county basis, but they're considering as a regional basis, and will try to coordinate and see how it works.

Mr. Pitoniak noted Mr. Smoker will present a power point presentation on Functional Classification Maps. Mr. Smoker stated the Federal Highway Administration updated the Functional Classification criteria procedures back in 2013; he reviewed the following:

Overview of the New 2013 Guidelines:

- Acknowledges advances in mapping technologies and analysis capabilities; noting it reviews a little bit more about the relationships between the design of roadway or facility and its functional class.
- It is geared more towards everyday practitioners, professionals, and the general public.

Why Classify Roads?

- Vast network of roadways; approximately 4,000,000 miles of road in the U.S.
- Some roads are more important than others and the function of the roads helps determine what level of the government has responsibility to maintain or upkeep that roadway.
- Depending upon its functional classification, there are certain influences in that design such as how that roadway should look, feel, operate, widths, and shoulders etc.

- How they are funded and how it impacts the Federally Highway System? The bulk of the highway projects that is done with federal funds will be dictated by what kind of functional classification that roadway serves.

Mr. Smoker briefly reviewed the different Functional Classifications:

- Urban and Rural will be designated by the U.S. census in the urbanized area boundaries. The MPOs can enlarge those urbanized boundaries as deemed by the census, and is put in place by population and population density by the census every ten years. The MPOs, Counties, and State working together can expand those boundaries to include airports that might be in the rural area but operates more as a large industrial park.
- Principal Arterial of the Interstate System.
- Other Freeway and Expressway - the Interstate look alike. He noted Rte. 6 and Casey Highway are interstate look alike, where there is fully control access and capable of getting on an off that roadway at interchanges and on an off at ramps.
- Principal Arterial others – adding a great deal of mobility and less access.
- Minor Arterial
- Major Collectors
- Minor Collectors and Local – it is about how that road functions and the lowest level to providing access to resident’s homes and small businesses, etc.

What’s really changed between 1989 and the assurance of this new guidance document?

- They recognized they’re not adding to the federal aid system as back in the 1970’s and 80s, acknowledging a lot of coordination that needs to take place in that decision-making process with functional classification. If the State would adopt or change at the MPO level, it needs to coordinate and consult with PennDOT Central Office and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).
- GIS and technologies can be utilized to help update or review their existing Functional Classification.
- The methodology discussed in the guidance and the roadway design now have some influences and accommodations about the non-motorized travel such as public – pedestrians, bicycle etc.
- One of the changes in Urban and Rural, they have the exact same Functional Classification which gives a lot more flexibility and local influence on how to set up the federal aid system.
- Includes all roads, publicly owned roads by a municipality or an authority, and the turnpike is open for general use, but there are no private roads in their entire network
- Federal Functional Classification Decision Tree is designed to review your own roads to determine which are Arterial/Non-Arterial, etc. - roads that are providing the highest traffic volume and longer distances. He noted at one time in the previous guidance, a roadway was to provide access and mobility or a range in between.
- Collectors are providing the mobility to get to a region but also providing access.

Mr. Smoker noted this was the guidance that was put in place in 1989; the new guidance developed some other factors such as bicycle and pedestrian access, mobility getting on and off the system, looking at land use controls, contact sensitive solution, and design criteria on how that roadway could be built and operated. He noted the Interstate, can get on an off at interchanges, local roadway, and the cul-de-sac is a local road design to direct access to driveways to residents or businesses. The concept is higher the mobility the fewer the opportunities to get on and off the system, and providing large stretchers of roads, accessibility at the lower ends of functional classification system.

## Functional Class Influences

- He noted some ideas to keep in mind is trip length and access points – longer trips tend to be Principal Arterial use - moving a lot of people to major destination areas shorter trips between Local and Collectors use.
- Access points to be considered - trying to limit access to provide higher mobility,
- Speed limit.
- Route Spacing
- Usage/traffic volume
- Number of lanes
- Connections to activity centers.

Mr. Smoker noted every region is different; the guidelines provide ranges, and items to consider at the local level when your reviewing your Functional Classification. Roadway network – typically does not end up a higher network at one location.

He reviewed briefly characteristics of Principal Arterial – Urban and Rural.

### Urban:

- Serves major activity centers highest traffic volumes, and longest trip demands.
- Interconnect and provide continuity for major rural corridors to accommodate trips entering and leaving urban area and movements through the urban areas.
- Serve for intra-area travel between the central business district and outlying residential areas.

### Rural:

- Serve corridor movements having trip length and travel density characteristics.
- Connect nearly all urbanized areas and a large majority of the Urban Clusters with 25,000 and over population.
- Provide n network of continuous routes without dead ends.

Mr. Smoker asked Mr. Pitoniak if they smoothed their boundaries out for the 2010 census; he confirmed and noted they did find one glitch when looking at the critical freight corridors. They must smooth it little further in Jessup due to the industrial park. Mr. Smoker noted the existing Principal Arterials are only in the urbanized areas as they exist right now but it can happen in the rural areas. This is something the MPO and PennDOT can review when developing any changes to the existing functional class.

Mr. Baranski asked why does Arterials only exist outside the urban areas? Mr. Smoker noted there are characteristics for urban in there as well, and all functional classifications are equal in rural and urban with the new 2013 guidance. He noted some of the characteristics for the Minors Collectors in both urban and rural areas - where you start to add less mobility and adding more access and how that improves road function. They do distinguish Collectors between Major and Minor. Major Collectors provide more mobility and less access compared towards the Minor collectors. He noted some of the characteristics for the Minor Collectors provide direct access to the adjacent plan access to the higher systems, carry no through traffic movements. The distinction between funding and eligibility – Rural Minor Collectors and Rural Locals, Urban Local roadways are not on the federal aid system and they cannot use highway funds to do a highway project on those roadways. If an Urban Minor Collectors were developed, it will be considered on the federal aid system and still be eligible. Projects can still be done off the federal aid system, but if doing a typical highway project, highway restorations, or building a new roadway, they cannot be done on roadways that is classified as a Rural Minors Collectors. He noted everything else would be considered a local road from its functional classification providing access directly to the adjacent lands, residents, and independent businesses. He noted rural and urban designations, when reviewing boundaries set up by the US Census Bureau every ten years, they can smooth those boundaries out, cannot shrink boundaries of what the census gave but can expand out. The urban network is higher density land use, stronger land use, and higher traffic times; in the rural areas, it is less density with smaller business.

Federal Aid Highway and what is the major Funding Programs:

Mr. Smoker noted the definition for Federal Aid Highway - the public highway is eligible for assistance under Title 23 – Act of Congress sets up rules and regulations and created a set law passed by Congress. He noted other than a highway functional classification as a local road or Rural Minor Collector, some of the major funding programs currently under FHWA and how it relates back to functional class is as follows:

- National Highway Performance Program – Includes anything on the Interstate Highway System and all Principal Arterials.
- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP)– It is the new title given under the FAST Act; It has the most eligibility use it on all Arterials, Urban Major/Major Collectors, and Rural Major Collectors. It cannot be used on a highway project.
- STP Off-System Bridges – Used on bridges on Rural Minor Collectors and Local Roads, and bridge span length must be greater than 20 feet.

Mr. Smoker noted in the new guidance document there is a lot of flexibility and overlap, and to use professional judgement and local knowledge; the process is to have MPOs work closely with the State. The Functional Classification Trigger updates, the FHWA would like to see the MPOs/RPOs update, review, and to refresh their Functional Classification System every ten years. The bulk of the MPOs/RPOs across the state haven't done so since the early 1990's. They can update, add, or change roads at any time and don't have to review their entire network and how it works.

The use of GIS to generate some of the traffic numbers, and travel demand models should base their Functional Classification on the current existing traffic volume, and on their existing use, not futuristic anticipated use. How it is operated today - Functional Good Practice Steps/Schedule lays out some of the processes or schedule and gives a two-year window of what they may be looking at, and there is no time frame for FHWA to have the review completed.

He noted the website is on the FHWA site, and the entire Functional Classification presentation can be downloaded. He encouraged everyone to review their existing Functional Classification and to make any necessary changes such as add or take roads off.

Mr. Pitoniak noted it will be based on their experience and knowledge of roadways in their area. If they want to upgrade a roadway in Functional Classification, how critical is it to add traffic counts on that road? Mr. Smoker noted to upgrade a road in functional class, PennDOT Central Office will require traffic counts. Mr. Pitoniak noted January, February, and March isn't a suitable time for traffic counts, and may delay on some of their work on local municipalities.

Ms. Hazelton noted in the road selection, they would need to pinpoint those roads with a count for justification.

Mr. Baranski questioned the determination of the boundaries of the urbanized areas every ten years. They go through smoothing process to see what makes sense, does the FHWA recognize designated smooth areas that extend or widen out, and in the urbanized areas, does that change the functional classification. Mr. Smoker replied it would be the smooth areas to use for the urban rural distinction, and if they smooth their boundary out to hit industrial parks or airports, they can also smooth it out to the anticipated twenty-year onset of their Long Range Transportation Plan or what their population might expand in the next twenty years. Mr. Baranski confirmed what is captured is urban for federal highways, and the STP Funding – whatever population in those smooth areas are not considered.

Mr. Smoker noted the STP grant has a quantity of funds for those urbanized areas over a certain population threshold over 200,000, and they can use it anywhere in their MPO area of the two counties Lackawanna/Luzerne, and don't limit to just urbanized areas. It can be used anywhere in their MPO process unless they set rules upon themselves. Mr. Pitoniak noted they do not believe they have any criteria and have used some funding outside of the urbanized areas. This is the process they plan on doing as a region rather than one MPO, due to events not staying the same or change because it is county boundary, he is hopeful they will be working on it in the next several months.



## 5) UPDATING CRITICAL URBAN FREIGHT CORRIDORS (CUFC) AND CRITICAL RURAL FREIGHT CORRIDORS (CRFC) MAPS

Mr. Chapman noted the purpose for the designation of Freight Corridors will provide critical connectivity to the National Highway Freight Networks (NHFN) through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act that requires the FHWA Administrator to establish a NHFN, and within the NHFN there are four subdivisions.

- Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS)
- Non-Primary Highway Freight System Interstates
- Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs) miles and within PA their designated for 141.26 miles
- Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFCs) miles within PA their designated for 282.53 miles.

The purpose is for the designation captured by Planning Partners to recommend a priority list of freight carrying segments and corridors to expand the NHFN. He noted once submitted to PennDOT, they will establish a list of CUF CRFC segments with significant deficiencies and issue related to freight movement, truck traffic performance, and connectivity to the NHFN for submission to FHWA of the entire State.

Mr. Chapman noted PennDOT provided a freight analysis tool to help utilize the criteria that CRFCs or CUFCs must meet.

Criteria for the CRFCs:

- A rural principal arterial roadway
- Minimum of twenty five percent of the annual average daily traffic.
- Provides access to energy exploration, development, installation, or production areas.
- Connects the PHFS or the Interstate System to Intermodal Freight facilities that handle more than 50,000 20-foot equivalent units per year; or 4500,000 tons per year of bulk commodities,
- Provides access to a grain elevator, an agricultural facility, a mining facility, forestry facility, or an intermodal facility.
- Connects to an international post entry.
- Provides access to significance air, rail, water, or other freight facilities in the State.
- Is determined by the State to be vital to improving the efficient movement of freight of importance to the economy of the State.

For CUFC's:

- A public road within an urbanized area (UZA)
- Connects an intermodal facility to the PHFS, the Interstate System or an intermodal freight facility.
- Located within n a corridor of a route on the PHFS and provides an alternative highway option important to goods movement.
- Services a major freight generator, logistic center, or manufacturing and warehouse industrial land.
- Is important to the movement of freight within the region, as determined by the MPO or the State.

Mr. Chapman noted when submitting a segment, they need to provide justification within the following categories. An example would be to provide for CUFC – State Route would need start point, segment, and end point – length and feet; important factor is priority level. The functional class was changed throughout SR 924, and within the Urban Freight Corridor - SR 11 from the Columbian County line, and any neighboring counties for that MPO they will be collaborating. He noted an example they're considering is SR 11 up to the Luzerne County line, and identified five in Lackawanna County at a total of 13.8 miles, and may still add or take away. They only have 280 miles to live in rural corridor and 441

miles in the urban corridor. He noted there are two that stands out: the Pennsylvania Grade Generator in Lackawanna County located in Jessup, with two Industrial Parks – Mid-Valley and Valley View; PennDOT informed them of the ongoing truck activity in the area. They're considering the route from Valley View Business Park, Jessup PA where it enters McClane Trucking, and the closest Interstates or Interstate look a likes. He noted the Casey Highway is right there, and they're considering Valley View Drive to SR 247 down to the Casey Highway and back down through into Jessup, PA. He noted this was one of the first ones they considered, and will prioritize each one. There are two landfills throughout the county which are very close to the Interstate and considering them very highly. Also, Covington Township, Industrial Part, First Avenue; they're going to try either direction or both – SR 435 heads out towards Wayne County, and will contact them to let them know they're being considered as well as SR 435 to SR 307 - SR 380. He asked the committee for any feedback or comments of areas they would like considered, and to let him know; they will complete the background information, use the tool, and have it submitted.

Mr. Pitoniak noted they pushed for a deadline for the end of December, but the information and workshop was not released until mid-November, therefore, it allowed a little more flexibility to get them out by the end of February 2018. He is simply looking for information today from the committee.

Mr. Smoker noted this is all new with the FAST Act, the latest Federal Authorization. The Transportation Authorization set up the National Highway Freight Network due to funding programs making improvements to these facilities/roadways if their classified CUFC or CRFC, or both, would be potentially eligible for the national funds. Mr. Pitoniak noted they need to recognize and come up with justification for anything they might want to add, due to it is statewide. He is certain Philadelphia and Pittsburgh metropolitan areas will have a great deal of additions, and it might balance out for the Commonwealth. Mr. Cavill noted it appears it is the corridor to the industrial park, and does not include the industrial park. Mr. Pitonaik confirmed, it is the access points.

Mr. Pitoniak asked the committee for any questions or comments; hearing none he moved on to Planning and Engineering 360.

#### **6) PLANNING AND ENGINEERING 360:**

Mr. Pitoniak noted the Planning and Engineering 360 has gone by several different names such as PennDOT Connects. He noted they were to be one of the first MPO groups to meet in October 2016, Montoursville, PA, but due to flooding, they're currently the last group to meet on Friday, January 6, 2017. Mr. Roberts noted PennDOT Connects policy was issued December 19<sup>th</sup>, and the initiative is an all-inclusive transportation planning process with collaboration with locals that happens earlier in the project development process. To have discussions with the MPO, District Office, Central Office, and any Local government to address any projects or issues in a project area; it could be pedestrian, freight, safety, storm water, plan development, or transient events, etc. The projects they're looking to start on are any projects that does not have a phase on the current TIP, and any project that did not have preliminary scoping field view by July 1, 2016. They're looking to discuss this with the locals, and will consider their needs. The documentation is going forward with many projects programmed, and it is still evolving.

Mr. Roberts noted the Secretary is still trying to target other areas to visit to discuss the initiative and might visit District 4-0 and all Planning Partners in Spring 2017, a date has not been scheduled.

Mr. Pitoniak noted this was mention in the 2016 Fall Planning Partners meeting, and one of the issues the Department is looking at is to work with the locals on projects and get their input.

Mr. Pitoniak asked the committee for any questions or comments; hearing none he moved on to 2017 Meeting Schedule.

#### **7) 2017 MEETING SCHEDULE:**

Mr. Pitoniak noted the meeting schedules can be viewed on their website, and Ms. Bishop emailed him regarding the July 5, 2017 Technical Committee Meeting date. He asked the committee if they had a

conflict with the date due to the Holiday. He suggested to move the meeting back one week or a have a joint meeting on July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – Technical/Coordinating Committee Meeting.

Mr. Pitoniak requested a motion from the Committee to have a joint meeting on July 19, 2017; Mr. Frati made the motion, Mr. Cavill second it: motion carried.

### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

Mr. Pitoniak opened to other business; Mr. Smoker noted this past Summer, the MPOs/Federal Highways headquarters is working with USDOT, Secretary Anthony Fox. They came up with a code rule on MPO Coordination of Planning area of reform. It came out as a notice, the comment period was to end in September, but reopened and it was very controversial. There was a great deal of people with more negative comments than positive. The Secretary did issue the final rule published in Federal Register in Mid-December 2016; and they're still trying to figure it out what it all means. There are changes and some of the choices can consolidate the MPOs. Those MPOs that have overlapping urbanized areas from one planning area to another, can consolidate, making larger MPO's where they need to coordinate TIP and Plan development and have one plan for that urbanized area. He currently received an MPO meeting packet from the Reading area scheduled next week. It included a statement from US Congressman Charles Dent, expressing his concerns over the final rule. He intends to do everything in his power to try to stop the process. Mr. Smoker is aware of the controversy, and there isn't a lot of public support at the MPO, State, or the National Association MPOs. The final rule is out, and there may be some legislative affects in the works. They're still trying to figure out how to implement the new final rule and what it means to the Commonwealth.

Mr. Ferry commented on some of the slides that were presented earlier on identified urbanized areas, and some of the discussions he is concerned about is the proposal that they could be part of an urbanized area. He questioned the definition of urbanized area, and the proposal is looking different from some of the slides that were viewed today; how does it relate to the metropolitan planning area?

Mr. Smoker noted it is all related, and what the final rules reveals is the two rules; a lot states, the MPO planning boundaries, and their smooth boundaries are one of the same.

### **8. Adjournment:**

Mr. Pitoniak thanked everyone for attending; the next Technical Committee meeting will be on April 5, 2017, followed by the Coordinating Committee meeting on April 19, 2017. He confirmed the July's Technical Committee meeting will be a joint meeting - Technical/Coordinating Committee meeting. There being no further business, he entertained a motion to close the LLTS Technical Committee meeting; Ms. Hazelton made the motion; Mr. Cavill second it; motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.