

**LACKAWANNA-LUZERNE TRANSPORTATION STUDY**  
**COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**April 18, 2018**

Members of the Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study Committees:

Attached is a copy of the minutes of the Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study Coordinating Committee meeting, held on April 18, 2018 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 233 at the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Engineering District 4-0 Office, Dunmore, Pennsylvania.

Please check for errors or omissions.

Thank you.

A meeting of the Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study (LLTS) Coordinating Committee was held on Wednesday, April 18, 2018, in Conference Room 233 of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation District Office in Dunmore, Pennsylvania.

Mr. James Arey, Co-Chairman of the Coordinating Committee, called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. and asked for self-introductions. Mr. Arey received a letter of proxy from Mr. George Roberts stating that Ms. Susan Hazelton will serve as his proxy and a letter of proxy from Mr. George Kelly stating that Mr. Steve Pitoniak will serve as his proxy. (All permanent proxies are listed in the committee member list attached to these minutes.)

Mr. Arey stated for the record that in accordance with the provisions of the Sunshine Law and Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, that Steve Pitoniak submitted the required public meeting notice, which appeared in local papers.

### **ITEM #1 – FEBRUARY 14, 2018 LLTS COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Copies of the February 14, 2018 Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study Coordinating Committee meeting minutes were sent out to all committee members and are available on the LLTS website. Mr. Pitoniak asked for additions, deletions, or corrections. Hearing none, a motion to approve the February 14, 2018 Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study Coordinating Committee meeting minutes with the noted change was made by John Pocius, seconded by David Pedri, and carried.

### **ITEM #2 – 2017-2020 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) MODIFICATIONS**

Mr. Pitoniak noted that the LLTS Committee meeting format is being updated and changes include pre-meetings two weeks prior to the Technical Committee meetings. Attendees will include PennDOT and the County Planning Commissions. The meetings are to get more delineation and explanations in the agenda that are provided for the meetings. One of the items that will be covered in the pre-meetings are the TIP modifications. TIP modifications do not require action by the LLTS Committees. Rather than viewing each line item, Mr. Fisher will review the highlights of the actions and detail why they are needed.

Mr. Fisher noted that there have been several discussions on reading the reports and putting them in an easier format to read. Mr. Fisher noted that the Department is working with Central Office to make these reports easier to read. Mr. Fisher made a presentation regarding TIP modifications and how the report shows not only what has changed but also where changes are made to maintain the fiscal constraint requirements. Mr. Fisher reviewed three examples of modifications for project funding adjustments and actions to maintain a fiscal constraint balance of zero, which was illustrated in a presentation and included:

- Advancing Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase from FFY 2020 to FFY 2018 and increase to \$350,000. For MPMS 8312 SR 307 over Green Run in Lackawanna County, the advance was to begin design ahead of schedule. The report showed where the adjustment was taken to maintain the fiscal constraint balance of zero.

- Increasing the Construction (CON) in FFY 2018 for MPMS 8239 and MPMS 110384 to the PS&E (Plan Specification & Estimate) in FFY 2018. Funds coming from a cash flow of MPMS 106618 and MPMS 105115 and the reserve line item - again, showing where the fiscal constraint balance is maintained at zero.
- A corrective action to the TIP - to reduce the local reserve line items to fund a Luzerne County Local Project (MPMS 8605 - Chase Road). Those funds are returned to the regional reserve line items to pay for other projects and/or phases. Again, showing where the fiscal constraint balance is maintained at zero.

Mr. Pitoniak noted that the purpose of the modifications is to give the Department the flexibility to move funding without going back to the committee for approvals while maintaining fiscal constraints and making time sensitive adjustments. It was noted that major modifications (greater than \$3 million dollars) are considered amendments and would require a vote. One of the best ways to see the adjustments is to review the TIPs from meeting to meeting. Mr. Arey reiterated that PennDOT recognizes, across the state, the reports generated to explain the fiscal constraints mandated by federal law to be kept in order by the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) can be confusing to someone who does not interact with them daily. Mr. Arey also encouraged the committee members to ask questions for clarification whenever needed. Mr. Pitoniak added that these documents go out about two weeks prior to each meeting and if anyone has a question on a specific project they can get it to himself, Mr. Ferry, Mr. Chapman, or Mr. Fisher to ensure it is addressed at the meeting. Mr. Arey noted that other MPOs also ask committee members if they have any specific projects they would like to know more about as part of the outgoing meeting packages.

Mr. Arey asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, the committee moved to the next order of business – Upcoming TIP Projects.

### **ITEM #3 – UPCOMING TIP PROJECTS**

Mr. Butch noted that the upcoming projects are projects being let April through June in 2018, noting the Luzerne County projects.

#### Luzerne

- SR 4024 over Huntington Creek (Talcott Hill Road) Bridge Rehab - let May 24, 2018
- SR 4016 over Shickshinny Creek (Hunlock-Harveyville Road) Bridge Replacement - let May 24, 2018
- SR 309 over SR 1013 (Union Street) - Bridge Preservation projects on SR 309 (North Cross Valley Expressway) over SR 1013 and over Evans Street - let date June 7, 2018
- SR115 (Bear Creek Boulevard) Retaining Wall Repair - let date May 24, 2018

Mr. Chapman reviewed the projects in Lackawanna County.

#### Lackawanna

- SR 11 (Joseph M. McDade Expressway) Retaining Wall Repair - let date May 24, 2018
- Cable Median Barrier Installation on I-380 and I-81 - Safety Improvement - let date May 10, 2018

- SR 3020 (Linden Street) Emergency Bridge Repairs - let date April 26, 2018
- SR 307 (Moosic Street) over I-81 - Bridge Rehab - let date April 26, 2018
- SR 3022 (Central Scranton Expressway) Resurfacing - let date April 26, 2018

Mr. Pedri asked on the status of Chase Road. Ms. Hazelton noted the District is working with the county's designer to meet the June let date. A meeting was held with the consultant regarding what is needed on constructability, design, and the final package. The District is waiting on the consultant for the items that are still outstanding in order to bid the project. Mr. Pedri asked that if the District needs anything from the county to move the project forward, please contact him directly.

Mr. Arey asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, the committee moved to the next order of business – Scranton and Wilkes-Barre Downtown Bicycle Network Study.

#### **ITEM #4 – SCRANTON AND WILKES-BARRE DOWNTOWN BICYCLE NETWORK STUDY**

Mr. Butch noted that the Department for Community and Economic Development (DCED) awarded the MPO \$54,400.00 for the Scranton and Wilkes-Barre Downtown Bicycle Network Study. It was also noted that the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) has also awarded the MPO \$75,000.00 for the Scranton and Wilkes-Barre Downtown Bicycle Network Study. The MPO has received the official contracts and will be providing a summary of what the study will cover for both Wilkes-Barre and Scranton for the Request for Proposal (RFP) process to DCNR (DCNR has a three-week window for review). Currently, Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties are in the process of forming a steering committee to be comprised of members from both counties, local community, recreational trail users, and others for diversity.

Mr. Chapman noted that a kick-off meeting was held after the Technical Committee meeting two weeks ago because the MPO had received official notice the grant awards; just prior to the Technical Committee meeting. The steering committee will be comprised of approximately 15 members who fulfill the requirements of DCED and DCNR.

Ms. Sweeney asked where the RFP will be advertised. It was noted that the RFP will be advertised on both county websites, and it will be advertised through DCNR and DCED. It was also noted that the MPO has already received requests from consultants for copies.

Mr. Patrick Williams asked if the bike routes for Scranton will be strictly downtown. Mr. Chapman noted that initially the study will only include Scranton and Wilkes-Barre but the overall goal is for the study to be county wide. Mr. Butch noted that the study will cover connectivity and networking of existing trails through the city. Mr. Pitoniak noted that in Scranton the study will go as far as Marywood, which is in the city but outside the CBD. The study will look at connecting the Heritage Trail with Nay Aug Park, the downtown hospitals, downtown office buildings, museums, etc. Similarly, the study will be looking at these types of connections on the D&L Trail. It was noted that if everything goes well, the MPO will apply for more grants to expand the study.

Mr. Pocius asked who from the City of Scranton is on the committee. Mr. Chapman noted that the MPO has not yet reached out for representatives from the cities, but for Scranton they would reach out to Mr. Don King, the City Planner. It was reiterated that the committee will be formed following the DCNR and DCED requirements.

Mr. Arey asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, the committee moved to the next order of business – Transit Consolidation Study.

### **ITEM #5 – TRANSIT CONSOLIDATION STUDY**

Mr. Gavlick noted that the Transit Consolidation Task Force started last year with the intent to utilize a cost saving analysis study funded by PennDOT. PennDOT will not be funding the study and had asked the Transit Authorities to complete the study internally and independently.

Mr. Fiume, County of Lackawanna Transit System (COLTS), Mr. Gavlick, Luzerne County Transit Authority (LCTA) along with their finance directors, met and did an exercise to find realistic potential savings on a full consolidation model. The previous study in 2010 and the current discussions mainly revolve around the savings in administration and management. It was noted that the operational considerations (busses, mechanics, drivers, and dispatchers) would not change regardless of consolidation. The transit authorities did look at three other areas for cost savings through consolidation: Fixed Ride Operations, Shared Ride Operations, and Administrative/Management Operations. It was noted that the Shared Ride Operation's savings were not part of the county match funding for transit and would only be realized by the transit authorities. Only savings through the Fixed Ride Operation and Administration / Management Operations would be realized by the counties in the match funds.

LCTA and COLTS looked at each division and drew up what it would look like if they were consolidated. Items of consideration on the administrative / management operations were that even though one office would be created, the size of the organization being managed would be doubled. The reductions in positions would not be clean cut, because the support staff would still be required as well as salary adjustments. A shared ride consolidation could result in significant cost savings, and it was reiterated that this savings would not affect the counties' match funding. Areas where the number of employees could be reduced in a consolidation would be the call center and the administration. Here, the workforce could be cut in half. Staffing reductions could not be made in the Operations and Fixed Ride arenas since these needs would remain the same or expand.

The first year in savings, an estimate of \$200,000 could be realized that would be available in offsetting the county match funds. Mr. Fiume noted that this first-year savings would not be a carryover savings in the next five years, but whatever savings the transit authorities are able to provide to the local governments would be considered the local match requirement by PennDOT. For example, if COLTS saving \$100,000 would translate into Lackawanna County providing a match of \$500,000 instead of \$600,000 with the proper justifications. Moving forward it will be difficult to match the savings in that first year. The bulk of the estimated savings is from staffing. The transit authorities will look at other areas where they could realize additional savings. The savings does not carry through every year over the five years, and it will be

difficult to save an equal amount of savings from the first year in the following years because of increasing expenses and there would not be a repeat in personnel changes made in the first year. Working with their legal department and auditors, they will be looking at other areas for savings and will follow up with a formal submission to PennDOT with their findings.

It was noted that items like fuel, which are bought through a consortium, are already below market price so it would not be a viable cost savings source to review. Both transit agencies are also getting compressed natural gas stations. Looking at health care and insurance; LCTA is self-insured and COLTS has a state program for workers' compensation.

It was noted that the counties generate \$1.2 million per year in match funds to the transit authorities and it does not seem possible to have those types of savings to lessen those match fund needs each year. All facets of transit need to be reviewed and considered for consolidation and cost savings. It was noted that the Hazleton Public Transit (HPT) is not part of the consolidation cost saving conversation because the HPT is a city entity and not an authority. The option to include HPT in transit consolidation remains open for review in the future. Concerns include the union contracts. HPT owns the busses but contracts all other work. COLTS and LCTA operations are union drivers, union mechanics, and union dispatchers. If HPT merged into LCTA, the unions would not allow their non-union drivers to drive without union status for long. Also, another factor on cost saving taken from the 2010 transit consolidation study was that the cost of consolidation would be approximately \$675,000 which may again negatively affect the counties match fund balances.

Mr. Ferry asked for clarification on the first-year savings that would help with the county match funds of \$200,000. Would the transit authorities have to show savings of other monies in the subsequent years? It was noted that the authorities would have to show that those funds are still being saved and if there was any change in amount. Mr. Ferry asked if over the next five years if the savings was \$200,000 per year with the consolidation costs, would that come to only \$400,000 in savings? It was noted that the amount of savings depends on what PennDOT can contribute to pay for the study, and what actual adjustments would be needed for the consolidation as well as the saving type changes if the transit authorities are merged.

Mr. Arey asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, the committee moved to the next order of business – Equitable Transit Planning Council.

#### **ITEM #6 – EQUITABLE TRANSIT PLANNING COUNCIL**

Mr. Ferry noted that the Equitable Transit Planning Council was originally created through a partnership of the Scranton Area Community Foundation and the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. It was formed to address transportation inequities between Scranton and Wilkes-Barre. The council is looking at ways to analyze where adjustments can be made to the public transit system as well as other modes of transportation to match routes to job areas and employee access.

Mr. Pitoniak noted that, originally there were about 10 groups involved and now there are about 80 groups. It is a consortium of people that use the transit systems, people who are a part of the

transit network agencies. In October 2017 a workshop was held with over 200 attendees and from that workshop a transit model was built. One of the concerns found with transportation equity is night services for ridership for second and third shift workers. Another concern is missed medical appointments. Recently, Geisinger Health System has begun working on the latter and has two pilot projects, one in the Danville area and one in the Scranton / Wilkes-Barre area to transport their clients to and from appointments. This is a public / private partnership that has come out of the Equitable Transit Planning Council. The Council meets about every two or three months. The group chairperson and director will be making a presentation for funding through a national funding organization. This has been worked on concurrently with the transit consolidation effort. COLTS and LCTA have been a part of these efforts.

Mr. Ferry noted that some of the council partners were the chambers of commerce for Scranton and Wilkes-Barre along with COLTS and LCTA. The concern is that the City of Hazleton is being excluded from the council. There has been no resistance from the council to reaching out to the Hazleton Chamber and Transit Authority, which would be a positive resource for the industrial park employees to benefit through equitable transit.

It was noted that one of the pilot projects from the Equitable Transit Planning Council is a partnership with Geisinger Health Care. Geisinger is working with Rabbit Transit out of York to ensure patients make their appointments. It was noted that Geisinger patients were missing approximately 60,000 appointments per year, mostly because they needed transportation. The Rabbit Transit is a type of ride broker for Geisinger. Geisinger set up funding through the Scranton Foundation. Rabbit Transit will be managing the program and working with COLTS and LCTA to handle transporting patients to appointments or from the ER. It was noted that Rabbit Transit has a system in place that requires a general information form to be filled out. Geisinger connects the client with Rabbit Transit who in turn determines the client services eligibility from the information collected. If the client is not eligible for the program, Geisinger will fund the trip. Geisinger is running this pilot with two of its facilities (within a 50-mile radius in Danville and within a 25-mile radius in Scranton). The process starts with Geisinger and goes to Rabbit Transit who then contacts the share ride provider (COLTS or LCTA) who then schedules and dispatches the ride for that client. Again, this comes from the Equitable Transit Planning Council in which Geisinger, COLTS, and LCTA participate. Mr. Fiume noted that the pilot was running smoothly in Lackawanna County. There are not many private employers currently represented on this council. One of the areas of potential growth in the use of public transit is with employees. That is where the push is to get the industrial parks and private employers involved in the use of public transit.

It was noted that members are sharing information from previous transportation studies and ensuring duplicate work is not being done. The transit authorities provide information on the internal workings and operations that delay or stop changes like getting routes and equipment to the different industrial hubs and creating the dedicated routes for employees to employers for start and end times. Currently, LCTA is working with the developer and current / future businesses in Center Pointe. Ridership is up for the recent designated route to the industrial park and meetings continue as coordination and growth expands. Also, plans are being reviewed for transfer points for employees on jobs where they need to travel from home to a project staging area.

Mr. Ferry asked about grant availability to provide bus routes to the industrial parks. It was noted that DCED does have 70/30 match grants for non-profit organizations. It was noted that more private industry members are needed on the council.

Mr. Chapman noted on a side note that the Secretary of Transportation will be part of an event called Women Moving forward. The event is this coming Monday, at 12:30 p.m. at the University of Scranton.

Mr. Arey asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, the committee moved to the next order of business – PennDOT Connects Update.

### **ITEM #7 – PENNDOT CONNECTS UPDATE**

Mr. Fisher gave a brief update on the status of PennDOT Connects in the regions. It was noted that the Lackawanna County regional meetings for the 2017 TYP updates are nearly complete (meaning this round as the program is a cyclical program and will continue to be ongoing). There were five regional meetings for municipalities to attend, and Mr. Fisher has been available for individual municipal meetings. Luzerne County is two-thirds of the way through the first wave of the 2017 TYP. In addition to the regional meetings being held, Central Office has offered module trainings for municipalities and they will continue to be offered to ensure all municipalities have been reached and are able to participate. Soon the 2019 TYP updates will begin. Projects not necessarily hit on the 2017 program will be hit on the 2019 program. Moving forward, it has been determined that 409 maintenance operation projects will be limited. If the municipality does have a 409-maintenance project, they will meet on it, but the scope of work on these types of projects do not fit into the PennDOT Connects initiatives. Currently, there are twenty new projects to be introduced (9 in Lackawanna County and 11 in Luzerne County). The first wave of PennDOT Connects has been significant in the LLTS region. It was noted that next time a large space would be needed, places like the EMA building could be available free of charge. It was noted that workshops for the municipalities may require room for over 100 people and the MPO is looking at other venues to hold these meetings. It was also noted that the PennDOT Engineering District 4-0 Office is set for renovations and the MPO will have to find another place to hold the LLTS committee meetings in the near future.

Mr. Pocius noted that a recent meeting on the Greenridge Street Bridge project was held and there was a lot of good coordination as PennDOT owned the structure but the levees, detour route streets, etc. are owned by the City of Scranton. The City had the chance to give input and provide coordination for the traffic control up front. The letter to the Corps of Engineers will be provided by the City, giving permissions for the consultant to apply and obtain permits for the work on behalf of the City. This is a good program because you are aware of the projects and it gives the municipality the opportunity to provide input, which is a good step moving forward on all projects. Mr. Ferry noted that Luzerne County also has good collaboration with the program. Mr. Pitoniak noted that one suggestion from the meetings, since there is a lot of maintenance work discussed, was to have the local PennDOT foreman meet with the local DPWs of the municipalities that he covers and have open discussions and provide guidance to address issues.



Mr. Arey asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, the committee moved to the next order of business – Interstate Steering Committee Presentation.

### **ITEM #8 – INTERSTATE STEERING COMMITTEE PRESENTATION**

Ms. Hazelton noted that back in 2005 a statewide interstate program was formed. Prior to that time all interstate funding was funded from each individual RPO and MPO. Ms. Hazelton is on the Interstate Steering Committee and gave a presentation on the Interstate Steering Committee and the funding requirements to maintain the interstate statewide and regionally. The committee is comprised of PennDOT personnel from across the state, two District Executives, three Assistant District Executives (one from Design, one from Maintenance and one from Construction) and representatives from the Bureau of Project Delivery (BOPD), the Bureau of Maintenance Operations (BOMO), and the Planning Management Center of Central Office.

The committee evaluates the interstate as a statewide system. The goal is not to look at projects ending at district or county boundaries but to collaborate with adjoining districts as projects are going out the door. Monthly PMC (Program Management Committee) meetings are held so the Secretary and Deputy Secretaries meet to review and approve projects submitted for the interstate program.

Statewide there are 2,747 miles of interstate with 2,191 bridges. The interstates are 6% of the total state-owned miles and holds about 24% of the traffic volumes across the state. The combined average age of the interstate highways is about 36 years. The combined average age of the interstate bridges is about 44 years. The oldest sections of the interstate were formed in 1956. Pennsylvania's interstate system is the fourth largest in the country. Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties hold 237 miles of interstate roadways which is approximately 8% of the total statewide. The region also holds 195 bridges which is approximately 9% of the total statewide. The LLTS region has the largest amount of interstate miles in the state. The average age of the interstate highways in the region is 33 years and the average age of the region's interstate bridges is 45 years. The oldest interstate in the LLTS is I-81 in Lackawanna County near the mall. It is over 55 years old. IRI (Interstate Roughness Index) pavement conditions - the rideability of a roadway by simulating a vehicle's response to the roadway stresses from a passenger's viewpoint. Statewide the average IRI is 77 which is good, and the median IRI is 70 which is excellent. The lower number in this measure is better. In LLTS the average IRI is 91 which is good and the median IRI is 86 which is good. The worst and best locations have been identified. The OPI (Overall Pavement Index) is a more comprehensive measure of rideability which includes roughness and paving distress on a scale of zero to 100 with 100 being perfect condition. In LLTS the average OPI is 90 which is good and the median OPI is 90 which is also good. Looking at the age of the interstate charted with the years the sections were constructed starting in 1956. Roadways listed prior to the interstate construction date are roadways that were already built and became part of the interstate. In 1960 Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties had 75 miles of interstate constructed. In 2010 the chart showed where the region has 73 segment miles of interstate reconstructed. Along with the statewide boom in 1990, the region had 177 segment miles reconstructed.

Pennsylvania has 25,000 state-owned bridges (third largest in the nation). Interstate bridges make 8.8% of that total. The interstate bridges as well as all bridges are inspected and given a NBI (Nation Bridge Index) rating. The NBI rating scale is from 1 to 10. A zero rating on a bridge inspection report would indicate a closed bridge, and the lower ratings (1 through 4) require bridge posting. It was noted that interstate bridges do not get posted. The state strives to ensure that the interstate bridges are maintained or its components are maintained in order have a rating of 5 or better.

The presentation included a chart showing the percentages of the levels of bridge ratings across the region, noting that the state has 559 bridges one step away from rating 4. LLTS makes up for 35% of the state owned structurally deficient (SD) bridge count. Bridges are measured for structural deficiency on the deck area as well as for a structure's support components. LLTS has approximately 15% of the statewide SD deck area. The interstate bridge construction follows the same timeline as the interstate roadways with the 1960 boom in construction and the subsequent reconstructions.

The presentation included information denoting the AADT (Average Annual Daily Traffic) for each of the interstates. In the region, the AADT for I-81 is 76000. The high volume of traffic shows the purpose of entities like Focus 81. Managing the Interstate Program has been ongoing since the first 5-year program in 1959. Statewide, each District has developed priority lists of projects including: preservation, replacement, rehabilitation, or reconstruction type projects. In May/June of last year, all the interstates were driven and assessed. Each District presented their priorities, challenges, best practices, capacity needs, and safety needs to Central Office.

Ms. Hazelton reviewed several issues across the interstates noting some of the needs statewide. For example, a map of the Bellefonte area plan to make a better connection between I-80 and I-99; this project was stopped in 1999 and the District (D-2) has been unable to get the project started again. This project is not a high priority. It is a capacity adding project and capacity adding projects are not funded on the Interstate Program. District 4 has the I-84 Twin Bridges that are currently under design and they are programmed. They are structurally deficient and it is a \$110 million project. Ms. Hazelton noted other structures statewide that are in need of funding like pavement failures in District 1 where a recently paved section of the interstate is failing and repairs will be precast slab placement, I-95 in District 6 with utilizes \$200 million per year to maintain this project on the interstate program; and District 8 has \$187 million project to reconstruct I-83; District 9 has slab failures on I-99; District 10 a structure on I79 with deck failures and patching needs; District 11 has Commercial Street Bridge that has been funded and received multiple grant applications over the years for preservation; and in District 12 has non-standard interstate ramps (stop signs).

Some interstates have no money on the TIP. Some SD bridges are unfunded. Critical preservation is not funded or critical preservation is not lasting because reconstruction is what is needed in that area. Capacity and freight issues are unfunded and rest areas are unfunded. The statewide interstate priority meetings (that take under consideration the Districts' priorities) show that the statewide needs are \$13.8 billion. Approximately \$7.3 billion of that is funded. The funding on the program is \$5.5 billion which comes to about \$415 million per year and most of that allocation is being used by I-95 as previously stated.

Priority needs address most of the needs, but not all needs because capacity adding needs are not being funded through the program. Asset management funding needs cyclically are approximately \$1.1 billion per year. This does not include calculations for capacity expansion or year-end expenditure. Most of the region project spending would be on interstate reconstruction. The presentation included interstate priority needs by corridor and it was noted that shortfalls in the region are \$1.3 billion on the I-81 corridor alone. The reconstruction projects (in total) in the LLTS region have a shortfall of \$1.5 billion.

The next steps for the Interstate Steering Committee is to update and finalize the draft Interstate Management (IM) TIP. These steps have been taken. It was noted that the LLTS region fared well in attaining funding for its interstate asset priorities. Projects include I-81 from the blacktop section to the Luzerne County line. Bidding for resurfacing will be later this year. This is the same section that will be designed for full reconstruction of six miles each way. It is currently estimated at \$377 million. Additional funding was received for the I-81 northbound concrete section in Luzerne County - diamond grinding to be bid early next year. Ongoing in design is the I-81 interchange area (Scranton/Dunmore). There are pavement failures that will get slab replacements in the interim for the permanent repairs.

The Interstate Steering Committee will continue to meet and review the statewide needs and priorities. The committee will be rewriting interstate guidelines policy. Currently, they are looking at funding options for the shortfalls. The options include: P3 options, toll options, bond funding, and best practices across the state.

The presentation showed additional funding, available through PennDOT and federal allocations, is needed to properly maintain the interstates. Funding needs at the local level are just as bad as they are at the state level. The public doesn't realize the needs because they do not get to see the issues as presented here. Mr. Wufsus asked if the additional funding need was a result of green cars, and if PennDOT is looking for other sources since funds are not being generated consistently through the gas tax. Ms. Hazelton noted that the states are waiting to see where the federal funding will go, and reiterated that they are looking at statewide options to make up the funding shortfall (P3, tolling, or bonding). Preservation of interstate traffic miles is only as good as the underlying pavement. When you have a 60-year old underlying pavement, you can put a mill fill treatment on top of it, but that will deteriorate rapidly. Also, preservation projects are being completed on the aging bridges in the interim of permanent repairs. LLTS has received \$735 million on the new program but there are still needs and a lack of funding on the interstate. Across the state, in the interstate presentations, almost all other planning regions support the interstate program with additional funding. The District is looking at bidding a contract at the end of year; a joint contract to remove approach slabs, improving the joints on the structure, and improving approach slabs of the structure. The District is seeking assistance from LLTS to fund that contract. The need is there to preserve these structures and these structures do not have funding available in the current years. The interstate program provided funding on I-81 and I-80 to work on 15 structures that originally were unreachable prior to the 2019 TIP, but now design can begin on these structures.

Mr. Rick Williams asked that future presentations include a long-range intermodal approach to include big box warehouse needs and the rail system use as well as land development sub-ordinances concerning transportation.

Mr. Arey noted that PennDOT is doing this presentation statewide for every MPO and RPO. Even if they do not have interstate in their region, they need to be aware of the monumental dollar need. Even though there is a lot of good work being done on the interstates, the interstate system is in bad shape because needs surpass the resources. As previously mentioned, preservation with interim repairs is not working because of the age and deterioration of the underlying roadway base.

Mr. Pitoniak noted that, as discussed at the Technical Committee meeting, the MPO needs to vote to support funding interstate projects from the TIP line item for asset management. Mr. Arey added that in the future as interstate projects are developed and seeing that there is a greater need than the capacity of Interstate Management Program, the MPO will be asked to entertain a motion to provide and support those interstate projects identified. Ms. Hazelton noted that specifically from the Technical Committee meeting; on the local transportation program there is a bridge preservation line item that would allow the District to fund a contract for repairs on six bridges on I-81 in the Chinchilla area. The Department would like to utilize the LLTS TIP funding to support that needed work through a contract to be bid later this year. The Technical Committee concurred that this was an acceptable use of LLTS funding and recommended the Coordinating Committee support using LLTS funding for the upcoming bridge preservation contract work for approximately \$5.4 million.

Mr. Ferry asked if there are bridge projects on the current plan that won't be funded by transferring the funding to the interstate. Ms. Hazelton noted that this project has been on the program for a couple years and that funding is available for the interstate need, and LLTS still has off interstate funding for the local programmed bridge preservation needs. Moving forward, all bridge preservation will be prioritized. This is a line item that did not have a project attached to it.

Mr. Arey asked for further questions or comments. Hearing none, a motion for the Coordinating Committee provide interstate funding from the LLTS TIP asset management line item for upcoming bridge preservation contract on Interstate 81 in Lackawanna County was made by Steve Pitoniak, seconded by Bob Fiume and carried.

#### **ITEM #9 – TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEMBERS**

Mr. Pitoniak noted that at the last meeting the request was for bolstering the membership to the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). There have been a couple inquiries from both Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties, but there is still room, and the LLTS is soliciting to fill the opening. Mr. Ferry noted that an alternative may be to have the TAC move into and become a part of the Tech Committee which may bring more stakeholders to the table and keep members more engaged. Mr. Pitoniak noted that the MPO's memorandums of understanding and organizational agreements date back to the late 60's. Federal Highways has asked the MPO to update the bylaws which still have the Department of Housing and Community Development as

a member. That federal agency disappeared 30 years ago. Mr. Pitoniak, Mr. Ferry, Central Office, and District Office personnel have been looking at updating the bylaws. It was noted that there is no federal mandate for an advisory committee, a tech committee, and a coordinating committee. Some MPOs have just a coordinating committee. Currently, the MPO is looking to revise its organizational structure and combining the TAC and Tech into one committee. In doing so, this would increase the membership and subcommittees would be formed including, freight, trails, etc. Mr. Pitoniak asked that both committees keep the update needs in mind to help with an organizational chart that would be beneficial as the MPO moves forward. The MPO is looking to have an outline or updated committee changes for the committees to review at the October meeting.

Mr. Pitoniak asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, the committee moved to the next order of business – Other Business.

## **ITEM #10 – OTHER BUSINESS**

### **2017 Annual Obligation Report**

The Annual Obligation Report for 2017 was originally sent out a few months ago and is on the LLTS website. This version contains the transit authorities as requested by Federal Highways and PennDOT. This will continue yearly to include transit and it may one day expand to include aviation and rails.

### **Focus 81**

Mr. Baranski noted that originally the focal point of Focus 81 on the interstate was the urban area from Nanticoke to Clarks Summit. Being cognizant of the impacts and the pressures in the I-81 corridor, motion was made at the Focus 81 Committee meeting that it covers the entire stretch of I-81 in the MPO limits from the Susquehanna County line to the Schuylkill County line. Focus 81 approved that motion enthusiastically. In broadening its area of coverage Focus 81 will be able to capture the safety, freight demands and interests out of the Humboldt Park to High Ridge which is on I-81 in Schuylkill County. Schuylkill County is within the NEPA MPO which includes Schuylkill, Carbon, Monroe and Pike. If the NEPA MPO agreed, Focus I-81 would encompass Schuylkill County. Also, NEPA approved Focus 81 to cover Schuylkill County. Focus 81 has now expanded to cover two MPOs (NEPA and LLTS), and two PennDOT Districts (District 4 and District 5). Focus 81 is a formidable sounding board to address the interstate needs as presented by Ms. Hazelton.

### **Passenger Rail Service**

Mr. Pitoniak mentioned the rail studies of the past to extend passenger rail service from Scranton to Hoboken. A number of studies have been done over the last 25 to 30 years. Congressman Cartwright's office has obtained an Appalachia Regional Grant to undertake a new updated study of the corridor. The MPO and Lackawanna County provided some funding to look at and get the last study extended and improved. Originally, the study was to go from Scranton to Hoboken. Currently discussions of a first phase of the study are looking at passenger rail from the

Stroudsburg / Mount Pocono area to Hoboken because of ridership. A committee is being put together with the Northeast Rail Authority, the Lackawanna / Monroe County Rail Authority, Lackawanna County, the Congressman's office and PennDOT. The steering committee will produce the RFP / RFQ for updating the study. Concerns was that there was not enough funding available for the full engineering study. It was noted that this will be a feasibility study with a cursory look at the engineering that would be required. Engineering would be funding under a different grant sometime in the future. As regional project this would be run through the MPO. There is only 17 miles of track that needs to be put back from Port Jervis, New Jersey to the Delaware River Bridge.

### **\$5 Registration Fee**

Mr. Pitoniak noted that Lackawanna County was voting on implementing the \$5 Registration Fee. It could conceivably generate approximately \$1.6 million in funding, between the registration fee itself and the match from PennDOT. This would be phenomenal for funding the local road system. It was noted that this was not passed in Lackawanna County.

### **Draft Transit TIP and Draft Highway Bridge TIP**

Mr. Chapman noted the availability to review the Draft Transit TIP and Draft Highway Bridge TIP (hardcopies were handed out at the meeting). Mr. Roberts asked the committee to provide any comments by next Monday so these can be put out for public comment and then be adopted at the July meetings and forwarded to the Statewide Transportation Commission for approvals.

### **Meeting Schedule**

The next committee meeting is a combined Technical and Coordinating Committee meeting scheduled for July 18, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Pitoniak asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, a motion to adjourn the LLTS Technical Committee meeting was made by John Pocius, seconded by Susan Hazelton and the meeting adjourned at 11:54 a.m.

LACKAWANNA-LUZERNE TRANSPORTATION  
STUDY MEETING - COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
April 18, 2018

<u>COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS</u>	<u>MEMBER PRESENT</u>	<u>ABSENT &amp; NO PROXY</u>	<u>PROXY PRESENT</u>
<u>PENNDOT</u>			
George J. Roberts, P.E., Chairman			X
James Arey, Central Office	X		
<u>LACKAWANNA COUNTY</u>			
George Kelly			X
Patrick O'Malley		X	
<u>LUZERNE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION</u>			
C. David Pedri, County Manager – (James Ferry – Permanent Proxy)	X		
<u>CITY OF HAZLETON</u>			
Jeffrey L. Cusat, Mayor - (Alan Wufsus – Permanent Proxy)			X
<u>CITY OF SCRANTON</u>			
William Courtright, Mayor – (John Pocius – Permanent Proxy)			X
<u>CITY OF WILKES-BARRE</u>			
Anthony George, Mayor – (Attilio “Butch” Frati – Permanent Proxy)			X
<u>TRANSIT REPRESENTATIVE – LACKAWANNA COUNTY</u>			
Robert Fiume	X		
<u>TRANSIT REPRESENTATIVE – LUZERNE COUNTY</u>			
Norm Gavlick – (Kathy Bednarek – Permanent Proxy)	X		
<u>AVIATION REPRESENTATIVE</u>			
Carl Beardsley		X	
<u>*FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION</u>			
Matthew Smoker		X	
<u>*FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA)</u>			
Timothy Lidiak		X	
<u>*FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION</u>			
Lori Pagnanelli		X	
<u>*SENATOR BLAKE’S OFFICE (LACKAWANNA)</u>			
Larry West, Regional Director		X	

\*Non-Voting Members

Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study Technical Committee Members Present:

Steve Pitoniak, Lackawanna County Regional Planning Commission, Tech. Comm. Chair  
Susan Hazelton, P.E., PennDOT District 4-0 Design  
Dean Roberts, PennDOT Central Office Planning  
Alan Baranski, Northeast Pennsylvania Alliance (NEPA), Permanent Proxy for Jeff Box  
James Ferry, Luzerne County Planning Commission  
Tanis Manseau, Luzerne County Planning and Zoning  
Daniel Butch, Luzerne County Planning and Zoning

Lackawanna-Luzerne Transportation Study Meeting Transportation Advisory Committee Members Present:

Patrick Williams, Clarks Summit Council  
Aaron Whitney, SLIBCO  
Janet Sweeney, Pennsylvania Environmental Council

Non-Members Present:

Chris Chapman, Lackawanna County Regional Planning Commission  
Joe Corcoran, Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority  
Rick Williams, Kingston Township  
John Petrini, Lackawanna County Regional Planning Commission  
Anthony Sansone, PennDOT Central Office Planning  
Julianne Lawson, PennDOT District 4-0 Design  
Marie Bishop, PennDOT District 4-0 Planning and Programming  
Steve Fisher, PennDOT District 4-0 Planning and Programming  
John Frankosky, PennDOT District 4-0 Planning and Programming  
Sandy Sherotski, PennDOT District 4-0 Design  
Anna Fuhr, PennDOT District 4-0 Administration