



**Penn Avenue Corridor
Phasing Plan Committee (PACPPC)
Thursday, June 4, 2009 @ 9:00 a.m.
BGC Activity Center**

MEETING MINUTES

In Attendance:

Aggie Brose (AgB)/BGC; Deadra Keener (DK)/BGC; Lindsay Myers (LM)/City of Pgh., DPW; Patrick Roberts (PR)/City of Pittsburgh; Maya Haptas (MH)/LV; Ken Stiles (KS)/FDA & FPG; Ryan Sheran (RS) Kimball; Brian Krul (BK)/Kimball; Keith Halas (KH)/Kimball; Patrick Hassett (PH)/City of Pittsburgh, DPW; Grady Roberts Jr. (GR)/BGC Board; Matt Galluzzo (MG)/PAAI & FDA; Sean Capperis (SC)/Councilman Dowd's Office; Melissa Rubin (MR)/PWSA; Shelly Martz (SM)/DCP

I. AgB called the meeting to order, and introductions were made.

II. Motion to Approve the May Meeting Minutes

- PH: Had some minor clarifications, which gave to DK. One was regarding Doyle's office on page 2. The next regarding Ferlo's office—trading phone calls with Lloyd Wright, so not yet completed. Last was on page 3—it is very likely that there will be future public meetings.
- KS moved to approve with changes above, GR seconded.
- PR: Would like to comment on right sizing. Right sizing was developed in a vacuum at PennDOT. Now it is more of a funding strategy approach rather than dropping elements.

III. Updated Timeline & Monthly Status report

Monthly Status Report

- BK passed out and went through monthly status report handout.
- BK: Kimball is responsible for one more newsletter. Should we wait until after Phase 1 approval?
- PH: Yes, but get started now. Should include: 1) recap of the second public meeting; 2) the needs analysis and how it was translated to recommendations; and 3) next steps.
- AB: What is the time frame for approval clear up to the Mayor?
- PH: We'll talk about that in a bit, as it's the main discussion for today.
- BK: We are working on the final report.
- PH: Which will take some time, as it includes everything we've done so far.
- KS: On the transit report, is the issue on Penn Avenue the number of stops?
- BK: Yes, and also possibly moving some stops. We had to wait on the Port Authority's decisions so that any of their changes did not make our report inaccurate.
- PH: So the three outstanding items are: 1) the final report; 2) Phase 1 approval, and 3) the 4th newsletter.

IV. Old/New Business

- AB (to MR): Anything you want to bring to the table from PWSA?

- MR: Her director filled her in on the public meeting. They know about low water pressure in the corridor. There are ways now to address that, and they know what needs to be done. The issue is funding.

Streetscape Design

- MG: There is a meeting today at 11:00 a.m. at Loysen + Kreuthmeier's office. Are a little off schedule because did not have a meeting two weeks ago. Should wrap up in a couple of weeks. Met with the county about bond financing, and found out it is not appropriate for this project. Also, met with Kim Graziani regarding the Streetscape Design Plan. She gave some great feedback on the Mayor's priorities regarding streetscape.
- AB: Sorry that I can't make the 11:00 a.m. meeting due to a conflict, but DK will be there.
- BK: So we will have the final plan in two weeks?
- MG: Yes approximately—will let everyone know when it is done.
- AB: Do you want to mention the Friday event?
- MG: Yes. This Friday there is a ceremony announcing the uplighting of the cemetery trees along Penn Ave. Starts at 5:30 p.m. Then at 6:00 p.m., there is a ribbon cutting ceremony for 500 Penn. Immediate afterwards, there is a reception at Envy to mingle. All of you are invited. The Mayor and Councilman Dowd will be there.

V. Phasing Plan Recommendations

- BK: Draft statements for recommendations were sent to the committee, emailed by KH for your review.
- Draft statement projected onto the wall for committee to see.
- PH: The total project is at least \$30 million from end to end (Negley to Doughboy Square). We had to divide up into affordable phases. We were to identify priorities based on: 1) need; 2) community priorities; and 3) funding constraints. Kimball put together a bar chart/table to identify needs, quantifiable and qualitative. They then translated the needs into costs by block and intersection. The master plan was always kept in the forefront when deciding the recommendation. Kimball mainly relied on the quantifiable to make their recommendation, which they brought back to the committee. The committee then looked at that as well as the qualitative and how the master plan shaped the recommendation. A subcommittee then met and had a detailed discussion regarding the boundaries relative to needs and priorities. A draft of the recommendation was sent to the entire committee, and now would like to get the committee's approval so can begin "running it up the flag pole"—getting the appropriate approvals and sign-offs that we need to move forward.
- PH passed out a handout with a list of people that need to be contacted regarding the recommendation. A customized letter will be sent to each of them along with a copy of the recommendation statement.
- PH: Am very comfortable with the recommendation from the PennDOT and Federal Highway aspect. Went through the recommendation with the committee.
- PH: Have been talking to PR regarding other possible funding sources and will continue to do so. May want to add some of those in there.
- PR: My reasoning for that is to get a better understanding of other available funds out there. We want to make sure we identify every potential source for maximum flexibility, and to show that we have been fiscally responsible in trying not to rely

- just on federal money. There is a lot to learn from this project to apply the knowledge elsewhere. So we need to create a list of possible alternative funding opportunities.
- PH went through the chart to describe Phase 1 and 2 boundaries, the reasoning for the decision and the cost involved. Phase 2 currently totals \$4.2 million, but with inflation the cost will easily be \$5 by the time ready for Phase 2.
 - PH: Moving forward with Phase 1, but can move forward with Phase 2 planning. Do not have all of the money for Phase 2, just for the planning portion. Still need \$3-3.5 million in construction funds to complete Phase 1. Have a couple of funding options out there. TIP funding opportunity on hold for right now. Do have some construction money in place (\$1.5 million) and to keep Kimball going. There is \$400,000 for preliminary Phase 2 planning in TIP, so everything is in place to continue along; but our efforts really need to focus on fundraising.
 - AB: If all goes along, when will we get the definite funding to start construction.
 - BK: Likely the earliest start date for construction is fall 2011.
 - PH: The statement of recommendation is in front of you all.
 - AB: At this point, we need a motion to approve in order to move forward with the approval process. LU representative not here, but Cleo Zell advised at the subcommittee meeting that the LU Board approved. Sen. Ferlo advised that if Aggie and Tony (Ceoffe) were in agreement, then he will support.
 - AB: Motion to accept? MH moved to accept. MG seconded. Show of hands for those who approve. None opposed. SC abstained because Councilman Dowd will be part of the decision process once it reached City Council. Kimball abstained.
 - PH requested that the meetings reflect that the following community groups were present: Bloomfield-Garfield Corporation, Friendship Development, Inc., Penn Avenue Arts Initiative, Friendship Preservation Group, Lawrenceville Corporation.
 - AB: The phasing recommendation is approved.
 - **ACTION:** Connect with Lawrenceville United right away to let them know the outcome.

VI. **Approval Process**

- PH: Met with the Mayor's Office yesterday to fill them in. **ACTION:** The Mayor's Office asked that the original group reconvene with the Mayor to brief him on the recommendation.
- PH: You'll see in the handout the letter that would make this recommendation public. Aggie and I plan to sign the letter, but maybe it would be better for the Mayor to sign it. The letter will go to funding stakeholders—those who will in some way or another impact approvals.. Please take a look at the contact list. It is likely not complete, so we're open to additions to the list. Also open to discussion on the letter content, though it shouldn't be too long.
- BK: Add Victor DeFazio to the PennDOT list. He is the Design Services Engineer.
- BK: Will this go to PennDOT's Central Office?
- PR: The flow would go from Bo Glinka to Jeff Bucher at the Central Office. Does the letter include the MPMS number?
- PH: Yes, it does include the number at the top.

- **ACTION:** Should go to the head of Bureau Design. Find out who that is and let Lindsay Myers know.
- BK: What about Gov. Rendell?
- PH: This is far off of his radar.
- AB: Should we include Peduto?
- Discussion ensued on Peduto's district boundaries. **ACTION:** It was decided that the letter should be sent to all of City Council as they will have to vote on it.
- SC: Councilman Dowd should also be briefed, but we can set that up outside of this meeting. **ACTION:** PH requested that SC contact Jeannie, PH's secretary, to set up the meeting, and that AB also be included in the meeting.
- AB: PWSA?
- PH: Yes, Michael Kenney.
- PH: We will also need to pay attention to cc's.
- PH: Each letter will be tailored to each recipient regarding what their stake in the project is.
- AB: Should we submit a funding application to Altmeyer (for transportation funds).
- PH: No, because this was previously submitted under a separate application and will not further help our cause. So just sending it to Doyle, and he can serve as the foothold. Are making sure that Senators Casey and Specter are aware.
- AB: It is a lot of money to just get off of Doyle. Would like to see us first on his priority list. It works. **ACTION:** AB and PH will have a conversation with Congressman Doyle.
- PH: That is a good idea, please set something up.
- BK: What about Altmeyer?
- PH: That is a low chance opportunity, so don't spend a lot of time that we do not have.
- MG: What about Rep. Dom Costa?
- SC: And Don Walko.
- AB: No, it's Costa and Preston's area.
- MG: Any DCED people who should be made aware of this?
- AB: What about Ferlo?
- PH: Pursuing with Lloyd Wright.
- PH: Other state departments?
- PR: There is a good reason for that, as we're talking about other funding sources and so we want to let them know as soon as possible how we are pursuing complementary funding. We need to identify who we need to be talking to for this new model.
- PH: The purpose of this letter is to make immediate stake holders aware—basically federal and state folks.
- PR: Realize that this letter is for approval. There could be a different letter—a funding letter, which would build on the approval letter.
- KS: What is the window of opportunity for letting them know?
- PR: How long to get the Federal T Bill approved? It could take months, but maybe only a couple of months. We can make our case stronger by accounting the magnitude of development and projected development along the roadway. The state Transportation Commission is coming to the area in August. We should be organized to present at that meeting.

- KS: When do we hope to have this letter signed by the Mayor?
- PH: Within the month. The Federal Highway recognizes the Mayor as speaking for the City.
- KS: Should we include the entire project projected amount in the letter?
- PH: That is a double-edged sword, as it could scare folks off. May include that info for the district level.
- PR: Could be good to let those know who are involved in the funding strategy, to let them know why we are doing this in phases.
- BK: Do you see any reason that we should hold up on the scope?
- PH: No. The scope will be generic enough that we can move forward. The newsletter would be good to send out with the letter.
- BK: **ACTION:** We'll move forward with the newsletter then and get you a draft next week.
- AB: When will this go to Council for approval?
- PH: When we get to construction funding, so not for a while.
- AB: So just going to the Mayor for now?
- PH: Yes, so will speak just with involved Council members for now.

VII. Preliminary Engineering

- BK: At the May 12 meeting everyone thought it was a good idea to go ahead and get environmental approval for the entire corridor, 34th to Negley. 34th to Main will need to get PennDOT field view. The environmental documentation is anticipated to be a CE level 1B. There should be a scoping field view meeting scheduled with the PennDOT - Bureau of Design.
- BK: Next step is to get the City a draft copy of the scope next week and finish the final report. May need to have John Clark take the meeting notes at future meetings (preliminary engineering and final design) to fulfill the DBE requirements.
- DK (to PR): Is there a PennDOT replacement to attend these meetings?
- PR: Will bring that up at the status meeting in July. Phil Mannarelli is the Streetside/Roadside Coordinator and Victor DeFazio is in Design Services Engineering, but not sure who would attend. **ACTION:** PH will contact Victor DeFazio.
- PR: Should there be a subcommittee for funding?
- PH: Yes, would like to keep this forum focused on the engineering aspects.
- DK: Are we going to the bi-monthly meetings soon?
- PH: Maybe start in September.
- BK: Due to the July 4 holiday, should we move the next meeting to Thursday, July 9 at 11:00 a.m. at Kimball's office?
- All approved moving the meeting date/time per BK's suggestion.
- BK: Kimball will supply the pizza (*referencing May's meeting minutes—debt fulfilled!*).

VIII. Adjourn

- **Next Meeting Date:** Thursday, July 9 @ 11:00 a.m. ***Changed to 11:30 a.m.