



Pittsburgh Regional Transit

TO: Planning & Stakeholder Relations Committee
Rep. Aerion Abney
Thomas Burgunder
Ali Doyle
Bobbie Fan

FROM: Stephanie Turman, Committee Chair

DATE: June 13, 2025

SUBJECT: Planning & Stakeholder Relations Committee – June 18, 2025

The next meeting of the Planning & Stakeholder Relations Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, June 18, 2025, at 8:30 a.m., in the fifth-floor boardroom at PRT's offices. The agenda is as follows:

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes of the May 15, 2025 Planning & Stakeholder Relations Committee Meeting
3. Summary of Public Comment Period for FY 2026 Funding Crisis and Related Service Reduction Plans (Amy Silbermann)
4. Proposed Resolution:
 - a) Authorization to Enter into Agreements with a Pool of Firms for General Planning Services (Amy Silbermann)
5. Adjourn

cc: Other PRT Board Members



Pittsburgh Regional Transit

DRAFT

Planning & Stakeholder Relations Committee

May 15, 2025

Committee Members

Stephanie Turman (Chair)
Tom Burgunder
Ali Doyle
Bobbie Fan

Other Board Members

Jennifer Liptak
Joe Totten

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the April 17, 2025, Planning & Stakeholder Relations Committee were approved.

2. University Line BRT Project Quarterly Update (Amy Silbermann)

Downtown:

- 5 stations are currently being installed
- Red bus lanes will be implemented in phases from May-June, subject to weather conditions
 - Phase 1: Liberty Avenue, Fifth Avenue to Sixth Avenue (Starting May 19)
 - Phase 2: Sixth Avenue, Grant Street to Centre Avenue (Starting May 20)
 - Phase 3: Sixth Avenue, Wood Street to Grant Street (Starting May 21)
 - Phase 4: Fifth Avenue, Grant Street to Liberty Avenue (Starting May 27)
 - Phase 5: Fifth Avenue, Sixth Avenue to Grant Street (Starting May 28)
- Bus routings will be updated with the June 22 service change
- The Downtown Loop will be completed this summer

Uptown and Oakland:

- Construction began in January 2025
- Contraflow bus lane on Fifth Avenue in Oakland likely to be removed sometime in 2026

Phase 1 Economic Impact

Downtown Pittsburgh is the first of two phases of construction for the University Line Project. This project is saving PRT money in annual operating costs and additional savings are expected after bus lanes and transit signal priority are completed Phase 2.

- Phase 1 is a \$28M construction project - \$17.1 million Federal, \$4.2 million other sources, including approximately \$6.7 million PRT capital funds

- Phase 1 has approximately 136 construction industry jobs actively working on the project (outside of PRT staff)

Leveraging Federal Dollars for Local Benefit

- The University Line BRT cost \$291 million. PRT's capital budget contributed about 27% of the project's total cost between 2020 and 2023.
- Local and State spending totaling \$112.4 million brought in \$178.6 million in Federal funding from competitive grants that would have gone to another city had PRT not applied.
- The 4 routes serving this project currently comprise about 17,000 daily rides, or about 1/6th of PRT's bus riders, and over 40% of PRT's bus riders ride a route that will benefit from the University Line's infrastructure.
- On-time performance:
 - Bus on-time performance decreased from 67% to 66% due to ongoing construction and unavoidable detours
 - Rail on-time performance decreased from 87% to 83% largely due to planned capital construction projects.

Bus Platform Installations

- The University Line BRT project will impact many other bus routes in downtown in late June
- Six modular curb extensions (bus platforms) are to be installed adjacent to the sidewalk
- These will provide more space for waiting riders at larger volume stops or in areas with small sidewalks
- There will also be some changes to signage and pavement markings to support these platforms and some bus turning movements

3. Presentation of June 2025 Service Changes (Philip St. Pierre)

Routing changes: 8, 51L, 61A, 61B, 61C, 71A, 71B, 77, 81, 82, 83, G2, P1, P7, P17, P69, P76, P78, Y1, Y45

NEXTransit downtown stop changes: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19L, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28X, 29, 31, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 48, 51, 65, 67, 69, 86, 87, 88, G3, O1, O5, O12, P13, Y46, Y47, Y49

Run time changes:

- Weekday: 19L, 58, 65, 77
- Sunday: 15, 67

Frequency Changes:

- Route 54 – Weekday peak improved to 20 minutes
- Route 77 – Weekday peak improved to 40 minutes; off peak improved to 50 minutes
- Route 86 – Weekday peak changed to 31 minutes from 30 minutes; off peak to 43 minutes from 40 minutes

Trip Adjustments:

- 6 (Sunday) two outbound trips eliminated and times adjusted
- 15 (Saturday) one inbound trip eliminated and times adjusted
- 29 (weekday) one outbound AM trip added
- 55 (weekday) one inbound and outbound trip added late PM
- G3 (weekday) one inbound and one outbound reverse trips eliminated; PM outbound trips shifted earlier 30 minutes
- G31 (weekday) two inbound and two outbound reverse commute trips eliminated; PM outbound trips shifted earlier 30 minutes
- O1 (weekday) two inbound and four outbound trips eliminated, and trip times adjusted
- O12 (weekday) three inbound and two outbound reverse commute trips eliminated
- P12 (weekday) two trips after PM peak eliminated and trip times adjusted
- Times adjusted for Route 1 (weekday), 19L (weekday), 58 (weekday), 67 (daily), 79 (weekday), 81 (daily), 83 (daily), 93 (daily), O5 (weekday), P10 (weekday), P16 (weekday), P68 (Saturday), P71 (weekday), Y1 (weekday), Y45 (weekday)

4. Resolution to Enter into Manchester TRID Agreement

- Esplanade is seeking TRID funding to support development of public infrastructure, including necessary utilities and site connectivity, planning, predevelopment and soft costs for the project.
- The Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA), in concert with City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pittsburgh Public Schools, and PRT, undertook a TRID planning study to develop a TRID plan for the Manchester-Chateau neighborhood.
- The MC TRID Phase I Implementation Plan was then developed by URA to identify projects to be funded through the incremental tax brought by the creation of the TRID.
- PRT has two projects identified to be funded with \$1.5 million of the tax increment; an Allegheny Station Area Plan and a Rapid Transit Study of the corridor north of the station along Rt. 65 corridor.
- PRT must enter into a Cooperation Agreement to formalize the adoption of the TRID plan along with the URA and 3 taxing bodies.
- This authorizes PRT to enter into said Agreement once finalized and approved by PRT legal counsel.
- This resolution was sent to the full board for consideration.

With no further business, the Planning & Stakeholder Relations Committee meeting was adjourned.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 18, 2025, in the fifth floor Board Room at Pittsburgh Regional Transit offices.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTION

Authorization to Enter into Agreements with a Pool of Firms for General Planning Services

Description:

Port Authority of Allegheny County d/b/a Pittsburgh Regional Transit (PRT) requires consultants to provide General Planning Services for Professional and Technical Development (Services). Services under the proposed agreements (Agreements) consist of assisting in obtaining contractors to perform services, including, but not necessarily limited to, providing PRT with planning services in the following categories:

1. General Planning Services
2. Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Support
3. Equity Support
4. Sustainability Support
5. Public Art Implementation and Conservation
6. Service and Infrastructure Planning

Agreements will be for a three-year period with the option to extend the term up to two additional one-year periods at the sole discretion of PRT.

Schedule

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 24-06 for Services was publicly advertised and available for download on November 13, 2024, and an informational meeting for potential proposers was held on December 5, 2024. On February 7, 2025, eight proposals were received across all categories; category one had four submissions, category two had six submissions, category three had three submissions, category four had four submissions, category five had one submission, and category six had four submissions.

Evaluation Committee

Consistent with PRT's Board-adopted Procurement Policy and Procedures for Competitive Negotiations for Professional and Technical Services, an Evaluation Committee (Committee) was assembled to evaluate the proposals and recommend the top-rated proposers to perform Services. Committee was comprised of six members and represented the Planning, Engineering, and Diverse Business/Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE/DB) Program Departments and Finance Division.

Evaluation Process

Committee met to discuss and evaluate the proposals. A summation of the submitted proposals is set forth below:

Evolve EA

Evolve EA was interviewed for Category 4 and is a DB/DBE firm that is a subcontractor for other firms that have provided services to PRT in the past. Evolve EA is a smaller firm, but they demonstrated diversification to allow them to have a more direct and substantial impact in the requested categories. Evolve EA presented themselves as having familiarity with developing Capital Investment Grants (CIGs), both through themselves and through their proposed subcontractor, Parametrix. Additionally, Evolve EA spoke to taking a broader approach to projects, considering the overall goal of PRT and the grant opportunity rather than isolating portions. Various members of the Committee already had experience with Evolve EA's skillset, from being a local firm, acting as a subcontractor to existing PRT contracts, or working directly on portions of PRT projects. Being a local firm also aided in Evolve EA's scoring as the Committee felt their local presence and context would be key to good delivery, with projects that would benefit the region. Evolve EA ranked second highest in Category 4, Sustainability Support. They also submitted for Category 5, Public Art Implementation and Conservation, in which they ranked first.

Gensler

Gensler was interviewed for Categories 1 and 2. The Gensler team discussed their ability to adapt to different market sizes. Gensler highlighted projects primarily in the Baltimore area, which is a larger market; however, they discussed scaling to the Pittsburgh region's needs and have an understanding of scaling and planning for different market sizes. Gensler explained that there needs to be scaling priorities and communications on the changing needs of the project and that said scaling will also have to adjust with funding needs. Gensler had many projects they discussed with the Committee using low finance feasibility scores. Gensler feels there are things PRT can do in our smaller areas, such as Dormont Station, with the right project implementation plan. There are a lot of things to take into consideration to attract other funding sources and alternative funding. Gensler also discussed designs and evolving plans to projects. They were successfully able to meld the civic face and residential face of Baltimore's Penn Station to show flow transfers with bike, pedestrian and regional rail, merging the duality to fit the aesthetic of the two with that area. Gensler also mentioned that in the New Carroll project, they were integral in the design and the decision-making process furthering progress of the project by working closely with leadership allowing faster changes, which lead to its multi-use design. Gensler was ranked highest in Category 2, Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Support and third in Category 1, General Planning Services.

Hatch

Hatch was interviewed for Categories 2 and 4. They are a locally owned practice that has worked on other PRT contracts and projects. Hatch works with energy groups and conducts a lot of different transit agency work. Relevant to the categories for which they submitted a proposal, Hatch discussed ways to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of using traditional diesel fuel versus hydrogen-based fuel. They said it is

important to compare the markets and topography for the correct applications to assist in determining if the project is worth funding. Hatch expressed alternative fuel studies could support different revenue streams and create hubs for additional revenue, and they are dedicated if awarded a contract to moving forward with PRT to assist in finding funding streams to aid in this development. When Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) was inquiring about hydrogen buses and choice of fuels, Hatch supplemented work efforts as the initial study neared completion. The SEPTA project goal was to shift transit to green alternatives. Hatch also considers the ability to add on-route chargers which will allow for General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) files and new network designs. The steps suggested by Hatch include Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as rating locations, the number of routes to include, design of the service platforms, and spatial constraints. Hatch also recognized that PRT is a legacy transit system with established real estate, and Hatch has written and won grants that were available for similar projects and therefore has experience. Hatch was ranked highest in Category 4, Sustainability Support and second highest in Category 2, Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Support.

HDR, Inc.

HDR, Inc. (HDR) was interviewed for Categories 1 and 3. The firm interviewed well, bringing the group that would be assigned to the contract if awarded to HDR by PRT, along with some of their subcontracting team. The HDR team discussed the importance of public engagement and using community advice and input within the context of general planning. As an incumbent firm, they understand the way PRT does business and can learn and grow within the category. The firm explained how they were able to build off established connections to better serve PRT's needs. HDR addressed alternatives in funding as the current climate is more difficult to estimate how much funding is going to be available. HDR answered questions about self-critique by saying communication is the key. They believe that with the newly developed team in HDR and their subcontractors, they will have the ability to integrate better communication methods, thus improving the communications between PRT and HDR, and allowing both to more easily achieve milestones. HDR stated changing people on projects is a way to keep the project on schedule and on budget. HDR also stated that looking for funding outside traditional methods would help with PRT's potential critical funding issues. HDR explained that looking at other avenues, such as micro transit solutions, could help with some shortfalls internally, and HDR feels that they can help "do a lot with a little". HDR was ranked highest in Category 1, General Planning Services.

Michael Baker International

Michael Baker International (MBI) interviewed in Categories 1 and 6 and also submitted a proposal for Category 3, but no interviews were granted for Category 3. MBI interviewed well with the Committee. MBI is an incumbent firm holding one of the current contracts for general planning services with PRT. MBI believes they have grown since working with PRT, that they are continuing to learn how transit works in the region, and feel they have a strong presence in Pittsburgh and the surrounding region to continue to provide

effective services to PRT. MBI feels that planning requires community engagement. They also have experience with environmental studies, such as the archeological study for the Dormont Station project. MBI believes that they are able to adjust the planning aspects, from the usual 10-20%, to 10 to 30% of the projects, moving from the planning phase into the engineering phase. Models will continue to need adjustments, and they feel they can plan accordingly. MBI stressed that learning and developing realistic milestones allow for measurable KPIs. When developing these milestones, MBI's described approach is to narrow the focus, to keep the projects within feasible expectations, be able to clarify or pivot as necessary, and finally keep within the financial plan. They also discussed working backwards to achieve goals, such as planning an end date and then working back to the present. MBI was ranked highest in Category 3, Equity Support, and second in Category 6, Service and Infrastructure Planning.

WSP

WSP interviewed for Categories 1 and 6 and also submitted a proposal for Category 3, but no interviews were granted for Category 3. The WSP team discussed with the Committee that Pittsburgh has a lot of different solutions that would work with PRT's legacy system as WSP has worked in other similar markets and systems. WSP understands that PRT is a legacy system with aging lines and the expectations will be different with changes. WSP believes they can help PRT with community outreach initiatives. They also believe that any toolkits developed would have to be flexible, with the ability to change for the different audiences that would view them. WSP stated that this flexibility and community input allows for a better understanding of information gathered and better long-term use. Capital Investment Grants (CIGs) can be sought and WSP has both won, and worked on, such initiatives. These federal grants are used for the new starts, small starts, and core capacity improvements within the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants program. WSP was ranked second in Categories 1, General Planning Services and 3, Equity Support. WSP was ranked highest in Category 6, Service and Infrastructure Planning. Category 3 was not interviewed but evaluated based upon proposal submissions for that category.

As a result of the review and evaluation of the proposals submitted, including interviews for certain categories of services, the Committee identified the following firms as the proposers with the highest rated proposals to perform the respective services:

Category One	General Planning Services	1 st	HDR
		2 nd	WSP
		3 rd	Gensler
Category Two	Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Support	1 st	Gensler
		2 nd	Hatch
Category Three	Equity Support	1 st	MBI
		2 nd	WSP
Category Four	Sustainability Support	1 st	Hatch
		2 nd	Evolve EA
Category Five	Public Art Implementation and Conservation	1 st	Evolve EA
Category Six	Service and Infrastructure Planning	1 st	WSP
		2 nd	MBI

Negotiations

A total not-to-exceed amount of \$22,000,000 is recommended for approval for all Agreements. Agreements will be awarded to each successful proposer for their recommended service categories and work will be issued via task-specific work orders as work is deemed necessary by PRT to be completed. The division of the monies is across all categories for the proposers for a three-year period with the option to extend the term of Agreements up to an additional two one-year terms at the sole discretion of PRT.

6/27/25
S. Turman

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Port Authority of Allegheny County d/b/a Pittsburgh Regional Transit (PRT), requires a pool of firms to provide General Planning Services in the categories of General Planning Services, Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Support, Equity Support, Sustainability Support, Public Art Implementation and Conservation, and Infrastructure Planning (Services); and

WHEREAS, in order to obtain firms to perform Services, Request for Proposals No. 24-06 detailing the required Services was prepared and publicly advertised; and

WHEREAS, on February 7, 2025, eight proposals were received for all categories of Services; and

WHEREAS, the proposals were reviewed and evaluated by PRT's appointed Evaluation Committee (Committee) pursuant to PRT's Board-adopted Procurement Policy and Procedures for Competitive Negotiations for Professional and Technical Services; and

WHEREAS, based upon Committee's evaluation, including interviews for certain categories of Services, Committee identified the firms set forth on the attached Exhibit "A" as the highest rated for the designated category or categories of Services; and

WHEREAS, a total not-to-exceed amount of \$22,000,000.00 is recommended for approval for award of agreements to the pool of firms, with assignments to be issued via task-specific work orders (Agreements).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the chief executive officer, chief development officer, chief innovation officer, chief financial officer and/or controller be, and hereby are, authorized to enter into Agreements with the firms identified on Exhibit "A" to this resolution, all in agreement forms approved by counsel, to provide Services in the designated categories for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$22,000,000 for the initial three-year period with the option to extend the term of Agreements up to an additional two one-year periods at the sole discretion of PRT, and also to take all such other actions as may be necessary and proper to carry out the purpose and intent of this resolution.

EXHIBIT "A"

RFP No. 24-06
General Planning Services
Highest Rated Proposers in Services Categories

Category One	General Planning Services	1 st	HDR
		2 nd	WSP
		3 rd	Gensler
Category Two	Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Support	1 st	Gensler
		2 nd	Hatch
Category Three	Equity Support	1 st	MBI
		2 nd	WSP
Category Four	Sustainability Support	1 st	Hatch
		2 nd	Evolve EA
Category Five	Public Art Implementation and Conservation	1 st	Evolve EA
Category Six	Service and Infrastructure Planning	1 st	WSP
		2 nd	MBI