

Capital Region Transportation Council

TIP Task Force: Meeting #5

Meeting Minutes

Date: August 23, 2023

Time: 1:00 - 2:30 pm

Attendees:

Name	Organization
Jacob Beeman	The Transportation Council
Andrew Tracy	The Transportation Council
Andrew Kreshik	City of Troy
Greg Wichser	NYSDOT Region 1
Kim Lambert*	Saratoga County
John Scavo*	Town of Clifton Park
Megan Quirk*	CDTA
Lisa Ramundo*	Albany County
Steve Feeney*	Schenectady County

*Attended Virtually

1) Welcome and Introduction

Jacob began the meeting with introductions and a review of the meeting agenda. The primary purpose of this meeting was to discuss revisions to the TIP amendment guidelines.

2) TIP Amendment Guidelines Discussion

Jacob presented an overview of the current TIP amendment guidelines. Currently, changes to the TIP fall into one of three categories: 'Project Selection' changes, which require approval from the project sponsor, CRTC and NYSDOT; Amendments that require Planning Committee approval, and Amendments that require Planning Committee recommendation and Policy Board approval. Jacob proposed renaming 'Project Selection' to 'Administrative Modification' for clarity and to avoid ambiguity with TIP project selection. Amendments requiring only Planning Committee approval would be called 'Minor Amendments' and those requiring Policy Board action would be 'Major Amendments'. The Task Force concurred with these changes.

Jacob presented the current TIP Amendment Guidelines spreadsheet and reviewed areas that could use revisions. The current TIP amendment guidelines are grouped into four categories: Addition or Deletion (1), Scope and/or Cost Change (2), Fund Source Change (3), Schedule Change (4). Changes were numbers 1a through 4b. Please refer to the accompanying spreadsheet that will be referenced in these notes.

Section 1: Additions and Deletions

The first change discussed was to Addition of projects from regional set-asides (1a, 1b). These changes are typically only made by CDTA. Greg stated that NYSDOT used to use these, but no longer. Jacob proposed eliminating both as 1c or 1d would override them in nearly all cases. Greg suggested eliminating 1a and 1b but raising the cost thresholds in 1c and 1d. Steve Feeney asked if there is an example of a new project not coming

from a solicitation. Jacob responded that there wasn't, but that this could conceivably happen with HSIP or other set-asides. Steve suggested excluding CDTA from needing Policy Board approval for their set-aside use. Discussion moved to 1g, addition of a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) project after statewide TAP selection. Jacob stated that TAP projects (1g) over \$0.500 million always need to go to Policy Board due to 1d. Greg suggested that 1g could be updated to include TAP, CMAQ, and CRP (statewide solicitations), and could include language to exclude these (and set-asides) from the cost thresholds listed in 1c and 1d.

Steve Feeney suggested that deletion of a project could be Planning Committee approval only. Andrew Kreshik concurred and suggested 'sponsor-requested' deletion could be the language used. Greg stated that DOT project deletions may impact locals even when initiated by DOT (i.e., a project involving a state highway through a town) and should therefore be brought to the attention of the Policy Board. Also, if FHWA rescinds money, there would need to be a high-level conversation about what to delete.

Regarding 1c and 1d: Greg suggested doubling the thresholds used to \$1.0 million. Greg also suggested removing 1e and 1f (addition/deletion of a project phase) and rolling these into the Scope and/or Cost changes under Section 2. Jacob stated that 1e is most commonly used for the addition of a small ROW phase.

Further discussion resulted in concurrence that 1g should be reworked to cover any statewide solicitation or use of 5310 transit funds, and that 1c and 1d should be doubled to \$1.0 million.

Regarding combining projects (1h and 1i): Jacob suggested leaving these unchanged. Greg suggested that any project merge could be an Administrative Modification only. Jacob replied that in some cases, the merge may impact the project deliverability. Andrew Kreshik asked if we could continue to use the 'preservation' label. The group decided to make a note to discuss 1h and 1i further at a later time.

Section 2: Scope and Cost Changes

Regarding Section 2, Scope and/or Cost Changes: Jacob and Greg suggested dropping the percentages and reworking to the following cost thresholds:

- Under \$0.500 million -> Administrative Modification (Sponsor, NYSDOT, and MPO approval)
- \$0.500 to \$3.000 million -> Planning Committee approval (Minor Amendment)
- Over \$3.000 million -> Planning Committee recommendation, and Policy Board approval (Major Amendment)

Andrew Tracy suggested that these thresholds be made relative to the original programmed amount, so that projects that receive more than one cost change will need the higher level of approval if the sum of their changes goes over a threshold. The Task Force concurred.

Jacob suggested adding scope changes to their own category and will work to clarify the language used for minor vs. major scope changes. For example, a change in project limits could be an Administrative Modification only, but larger changes would require Planning Committee or Policy Board approval.

Regarding 2c, scope changes impacting air quality conformity: Jacob will work with Chris Bauer to clarify the language used here. Andrew T. cautioned that, although all current TIP projects are exempt from conformity, future projects that impact highway capacity such as the 378 and 787 redesigns will likely be non-exempt, so 2c would apply.

The group discussed if the addition of local funds could remain an Administrative Modification regardless of amount, as it would not impact federal funds. John Scavo cautioned that the Planning Committee/Policy Board approvals may be helpful to locals, as they offer an additional layer of checks to ensure that the project increases are on record.

Section 3: Fund Source Changes

Regarding Section 3, Fund Source Changes: 3a and 3b are proposed to remain the same. Changes between Title I funds (3c) needs to be clarified or removed. Changes from federal to non-federal (3d) can remain as-is. Jacob recommended removing 3e (changes from non-federal to federal), as the scope/cost change thresholds (2a and 2b) would always apply. The group determined that 3e would need to be clarified. Jacob also suggested clarifying or removing Changes between Title III fund sources (3f). The Title I changes (3c) and Title III changes (3f) would need to be researched further to determine what funding sources are involved and when these changes occur.

Section 4: Schedule Changes

Regarding Section 4, Schedule Changes: Jacob recommended no changes to this section.

3) TIP Fiscal Constraint Discussion

Time did not permit discussion for this agenda item; it will be discussed at a future Task Force meeting.

4) Construction Issues Facing Local Projects

Time did not permit discussion for this agenda item; it will be discussed at a future Task Force meeting.

5) Future Meetings

A revised version of the TIP Amendment Guidelines will be provided to the group prior to the next meeting, with the anticipation of Planning Committee and Policy Board approval by the end of the calendar year (2023).

6) Meeting Adjourned

- The meeting was adjourned at 2:40.
- The next meeting of the TIP Task Force will be scheduled for October 2023

Current Transportation Council Amendment Guidelines - August 2023

Type of Change	Action Required		
	Administrative Modification	Amendment	
	CDTA / NYSDOT / CRTC	Minor Amendment Planning Committee	Major Amendment Policy Board
1. Addition or Deletion			
a. Addition of project from regional placeholder set-asides		Approve	
b. Addition of project from regional set-asides as part of a project solicitation		Recommend	Approve
c. Addition or deletion of a project under or equal to \$0.500M		Approve	
d. Addition or deletion of a project over \$0.500M		Recommend	Approve
e. Addition/deletion of a project element less than or equal to \$0.250M	Approve		
f. Addition/deletion of a project element greater than \$0.250M		Approve	
g. Addition of Transportation alternatives project after approval by state advisory committee		Approve	
h. Combining two or more existing preservation projects	Approve		
i. Combining a non-preservation project with any other(s)		Approve	
j. Other		Recommend	Approve
2. Scope and /or Cost Change			
a. Over 25% (minimum \$250k) or over \$0.500M		Approve	
b. Over 50% (minimum \$1M) or over \$3.000M		Recommend	Approve
c. Scope change necessitating recalculation of system level air quality conformity of non-exempt project		Recommend	Approve
d. Other significant scope change		Approve	
e. Other		Recommend	Approve
3 Fund Source Change (a thru e refer to CDTC Funds)			
a. Change from any federal fund source to NHPP	Approve		
b. Change from one STP fund source to another	Approve		
c. Change between any other Title I federal fund sources		Approve	
d. Change from federal to non-federal fund source	Approve		
e. Change from non-federal to federal fund source		Recommend	Approve
f. Change between Title III federal fund sources		Approve	
g. Change from any CRTC to statewide federal fund source		Approve	
h. Any other federal fund source change		Recommend	Approve
4. Schedule Change			
a. All affected project elements are contained in the first four (4) years ofg the TIP before and after the change.	Approve		
b. Any other schedule change		Approve	

= Areas to consider revisions