

# **PART ONE**

## **Summary of Public Comments and the Response to Comments**

for the

**DRAFT**  
2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
for Southwestern Pennsylvania

2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
 Summary of Public Testimony and the Response to Comments

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Alle-Kiski Bridge	New Alle-Kiski bridge	Westmoreland County	<p><i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative</i></p> <p>Testified in support of funding for the Patriot Bridge (aka Alle-Kiski Bridge) between Westmoreland and Allegheny Counties. This project was removed by the Secretary of Transportation. It is important for improved access to the Alcoa Research Center and Allegheny Ludlum as well as economic development for the greater Leechburg area. With earmarks in hand, we need to provide additional funding to advance the bridge project. Westmoreland and Allegheny Counties have offered to share the local match. But the State needs to put up its portion.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This project is in the Future Resources Element of the SPC 2030 Long Range Plan. The Future Resources Element consists of projects considered important to the region but that do not currently have sufficient funding.</p>		
Copeland Road Bridge	The existing structure was washed out by a flood on July 17, 2004 and this is the replacement.	Westmoreland County	<p><i>Dave Soboslay, Allegheny Township, District 54</i></p> <p>Requests full funding for in the TIP because the bridge was washed out in 2004 but is not funded through construction on the TIP.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This project is partially budgeted on the draft TIP through the right-of-way phase in 2009, but there is no construction funding. To complete the project, remaining funding will have to be identified in the next TIP Update cycle which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Copeland Road Bridge	The existing structure was washed out by a flood on July 17, 2004 and this is the replacement.	Westmoreland County	<i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative</i> Requests full funding for in the TIP because the bridge was washed out in 2004 but is not funded through construction on the TIP.
<i>Response:</i>	This project is partially budgeted on the draft TIP through the right-of-way phase in 2009, but there is no construction funding. To complete the project, remaining funding will have to be identified in the next TIP Update cycle which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.		
County Bridge Replacement Program	County Bridge Replacement Program	Greene County	<i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i> Supports the completion of the current county bridge projects with the desire to see at least a minimum of 5 county bridge projects completed annually.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC, Greene County and PennDOT continue to give high priority in the TIP to funding county bridge needs.		
Finnan Road Bridge	Bridge Replacement due to deck collapse.	Westmoreland County	<i>Dave Soboslay, Allegheny Township, District 54</i> This bridge collapsed last week and services more than 400 homes and needs to be replaced.
<i>Response:</i>	This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because SPC has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to the project. The current TIP was amended to address this emergency.		
Finnan Road Bridge	Bridge Replacement due to deck collapse.	Westmoreland County	<i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative, District 54</i> This bridge collapsed last week and services more than 400 homes and needs to be replaced.
<i>Response:</i>	This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because SPC has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to the project. The current TIP was amended to address this emergency.		

<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Harmony Road Bridge	Endorsed the Harmony Road bridge	Butler County	<i>Ken Brennan, Seneca Valley School District</i> Supports Project
	<i>Response:</i> This project, known as the Harmony Junction Bridge, is currently in preliminary engineering. Final design, right-of-way, and utilities are programmed on the Draft 2007-2010 TIP. It is intended to fund construction in the next Program update.		
Lobaugh (Freeport) Bridge	Bridge rehabilitation of the infrastructure, surface, and piers. A Bike/pedestrian walkway on the bridge and across Buffalo Creek to the Butler to Freeport Trail and a possible relocation of the ramp system on the Freeport end of the bridge.	Armstrong County	<i>James Seagriff, Freeport Borough</i> Supports the Lobaugh (Freeport) Bridge Rehab project, on SR 356 across the Allegheny River. Mr. Seagriff provided a history since 1987 of the State's intent to improve this bridge, and he emphasized the importance of proceeding with this rehab, including pedestrian improvements and possible ramp relocations on the Freeport end.
	<i>Response:</i> In addition to being a major vehicular crossing over the Allegheny River, the Freeport Bridge is located in the immediate vicinity of two regional bicycle trails. As such, at the request of planning partners in both PennDOT District 12 on the south side of the river, and PennDOT District 10 on the north side of the river, SPC has confirmed that the rehabilitation of this bridge will include pedestrian and bicycle accommodation.		
Masontown Bridge	Bridge Replacement	Greene County	<i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i> This project is a major priority for Greene County and needs to be funded.
	<i>Response:</i> This project is partially budgeted on the draft TIP with the utilities and right-of-way phase in 2007 but no construction funding. To complete the project, remaining funding will have to be identified in the next TIP Update cycle which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
McFann Bridge (T-384)	Bridge Preservation	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1923 248"><i>Commissioner Jim Kennedy, Butler County Board of Commissioners, Commissioner</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1955 521">The Butler County Board of Commissioners is requesting that the preliminary engineering phase for this project in the amount of \$350,000 be added to the 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program. The Federal (80%) funds will be covered by the earmark received for this project. The State match (20%) would come from State funds the District would receive from the APD match.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT and Butler County have agreed to re-prioritize the scheduled completion dates of the McFann Bridge versus the PA 528/US 422 Bridge. The noted changes will be included in the Final 2007 TIP.		
New Bridge on SR 19 at Racetrack Road Intersection	The construction of a bridge on SR 19 where it currently intersects with Racetrack Road.	Washington County	<p data-bbox="1241 688 1822 716"><i>Demo Agoris, Houston Borough, Councilman</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 729 1955 781">The construction of a bridge on SR 19 where it currently intersects with Racetrack Road.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed new intersection/bridge for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		
NINEVEH BRIDGE	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	Greene County	<p data-bbox="1241 954 1539 982"><i>Greg Hopkins, Director</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 995 1955 1122">Supports the project on the TIP but is concerned that the detour posted will adversely affect the business's and residents of Nineveh. Also concerned that the widened bridge would create a speed control issue for the town.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	This project is fully budgeted on the draft TIP with the construction phase scheduled for 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
PT MARION BRIDGE	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	Greene County	<p><i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development</i></p> <p>Supports the right sizing and speedy completion of this project.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This project is fully budgeted on the draft TIP with a three year construction phase beginning in 2008. The project will have to maintain its priority funding status through the 2009 TIP Update which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.</p>		
Rankintown Road, Widen One Lane Bridge	Widen one-lane bridge on Rankintown Road, connecting Union Township, Nottingham and Peters Township	Washington County	<p><i>Monica Cunningham</i></p> <p>Is the one-lane bridge on Rankintown Road scheduled to be widened?</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>SPC will retain this comment on a proposed new two-lane bridge for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.</p>		
Advance Planning for future highway needs	Consideration of future needs at Warren Road and Indian Springs Road	Indiana County	<p><i>John Somonick</i></p> <p>There is currently a signalized intersection at Warren Road and Indiana Springs Road (near Trader Horn). Warren Road is already busy, and is getting busier. The land that would be needed to make this a four lane road is available (for sale) now. Someone should buy it, in anticipation of future highway development needs, thereby preventing another Rose Street Extension situation.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>PennDOT is not permitted by the state to buy land in advance of when it is actually needed for a number of reasons.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Aleppo Road Guiderails and Line Painting	Basic maintenance - guiderails and line painting. 12 miles of Aleppo Road between SR21 and SR18 with half of this distance completed with guiderails.	Greene County	<p><i>Jerome Murphy, Manager</i></p> <p>Thanked PennDOT for listening to his comment in 2004 and placing guiderails over half of the distance but asked that they complete the job and cover the entire distance of the road. In addition, requested that they reconsider repainting the lines on the road to help in foggy conditions despite their conclusion that the road was not wide enough to have lines.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT has reaffirmed that the road is too narrow for a painted centerline, but suggests continued contact with the PennDOT Maintenance Unit in Greene County to determine if other visibility-enhancing treatments might be feasible.		
Blairsville Sensitive Design Solutions	Consider context sensitive design/solutions in all transportation projects in the Blairsville.	Indiana County	<p><i>John Turack, BIG, Washington Township, Westmoreland County</i></p> <p>Consider context sensitive design/solutions in all transportation projects in the Blairsville zip code area, especially in areas where the Pennsylvania Mainline Canal Greenway intersects with Highway, Rail, and other transit/transportation routes.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Your comment has been shared with the PennDOT District Engineers for consideration during project design and implementation.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Blairsville Truck Traffic	Need to reduce the Blairsville truck traffic.	Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1381 220"><i>Kelly Pape</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1976 493">First, the number of large coal trucks and other "big rigs" that pass by my shop daily is outrageous. At times, I can look out and see a string of 8 or more. This contributes to dust and dirt and excessive noise just feet away from my front entrance and outside seating. Customers are deterred from enjoying the porched area and often leave earlier than planned because their conversations are often interrupted by truck traffic. Further, it is virtually impossible to keep the front of my store clean due to dirt and ash-like debris that coats the windows, flooring, tables and signs. Secondly, the truck traffic is dangerous to pedestrians wishing to cross the street or attempting to get out of their vehicles. In hopes to create a more pedestrian-friendly atmosphere and stimulate downtown business, a solution needs to be found for the ongoing traffic problem.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Funds have been included in FFY 2007 of the Draft TIP for a study of the SR 217 Railroad underpass. The study is intended to partly address the truck traffic issue in downtown Blairsville by identifying an improvement that will allow truck traffic to use SR 217 rather than traveling on Main Street in Blairsville.		
Blairsville Truck Traffic	Need to reduce the Blairsville truck traffic.	Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 992 1381 1024"><i>Lisa Duffy</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1032 1976 1268">I am a business owner at 60 west market street in Blairsville. The truck traffic through our area is a problem to businesses, as well as the welfare of our pedestrians. My main concern is the majority of trucks that do not stop at the red light at West Market and Spring St. The change needs to be made before a child is killed or seriously injured.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Funds have been included in FFY 2007 of the Draft TIP for a study of the SR 217 Railroad underpass. The study is intended to partly address the truck traffic issue in downtown Blairsville by identifying an improvement that will allow truck traffic to use SR 217 rather than traveling on Main Street in Blairsville.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
CRIDERS CORNER EAST(228 Improvements)	Route 228 needs to be widened to four lanes! This is obvious. But better planning for traffic lights also has to be considered.	Butler County	<p><i>Steve Pieszak</i></p> <p>The addition of too many lights in the Adams Twp., Seven Fields and Cranberry Twp. areas have caused massive traffic jams during rush hour. This is mostly due to the new traffic light at the intersection of Route 228 and Seven Fields Blvd. It is only a few feet (maybe 60) from the traffic light at the intersection of Route 228 and the entrance to the Adams Ridge development. Traffic gets backed up now and new development is on the way. It will become a worse nightmare than it already is.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This project is currently in preliminary engineering. A four/five-lane concept is currently under design. It should be noted that PennDOT is currently working with the communities along the corridor in an assessment of the transportation and land use needs of this corridor. Among the proposed actions being discussed is the implementation of an access management program that would limit future driveways along the corridor and identify the possible location of future traffic signals in the corridor.</p>		
CRIDERS CORNER EAST/228 Improvement	Reconstruction and Realignment - 4 travel lanes except in Cranberry Township to Franklin Road will be 6 lanes. The length of project is 8 miles. Phase 1 is anticipated to be completed in 2012 with Additional 3 phases to follow	Butler County	<p><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p>We support the continued design and construction funding of the Route 228 project, in addition to improving movement along the 228 corridor this project will also address local access needs in the area. Our support, however, is contingent upon funding of the Route 19 Corridor Study. If the Route 19 Corridor Study is not funded then it is the position of Cranberry Township that the Rt. 228 Improvement Project must address the failing levels of service at the Rt. 19/228/Freedom road intersection or in the alternative abandon the project.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This project is currently in preliminary engineering. A four/five-lane concept is currently under design. It should be noted that PennDOT is currently working with the communities along the corridor in an assessment of the transportation and land use needs of this corridor. Among the proposed actions being discussed is the implementation of an access management program that would limit future driveways along the corridor and identify the possible location of future traffic signals in the corridor.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Curve on SR 18 in Morris Twp.	SR 18 Curve located approximately 4 miles from Bucktown and halfway to Nineveh.	Greene County	<p><i>Heather &amp; Martin Reynolds</i></p> <p>We are asking that this project be placed on the TIP due to safety concerns. We live on the corner near the curve and there is not enough space for two large vehicles to fit around when approaching each other. The site has been the scene of many accidents.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Addressing the identified accident location is complicated by the status of the adjacent property on the National Historic Registry. This comment will be referred to the PennDOT District to identify the feasibility and process for possible action on this request.		
Curve on SR 18 in Morris Twp.	SR 18 Curve located approximately 4 miles from Bucktown and halfway to Nineveh.	Greene County	<p><i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i></p> <p>Greene County supports placing this project on the TIP due to safety concerns.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Addressing the identified accident location is complicated by the status of the adjacent property on the National Historic Registry. This comment will be referred to the PennDOT District to identify the feasibility and process for possible action on this request.		
Curve on SR 18 in Morris Twp.	SR 18 Curve located approximately 4 miles from Bucktown and halfway to Nineveh.	Greene County	<p><i>Tim Mankey, Manager</i></p> <p>Requested that this project be placed on the TIP due to safety concerns. The site has been the scene of many accidents due to a 5 foot wall and zero horizontal sight distance at a 90 degree hairpin turn. There are no guiderails because of a local road intersecting the curve. For approximately \$200,000 PennDOT could purchase the property right of way and protect the area.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Addressing the identified accident location is complicated by the status of the adjacent property on the National Historic Registry. This comment will be referred to the PennDOT District to identify the feasibility and process for possible action on this request.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
East Brady Street Repairs	E. Brady Street In Butler PA (the main access route to the Butler Memorial Hospital)	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 186 1430 214"><i>Keith Boucher</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1976 456">I request that the road listed above be placed at the top of your list for repair. Even though I have been well aware that Pennsylvania has serious difficulties with maintaining their roads and highways, the above road is well beyond needed repair. I would described it as rubble. In fact, I have been on dirt roads in remote areas in West Virginia that are in better condition.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 496 1976 927">There are only two explanations as too how the condition of these roads could has gotten so bad. Either the money for repair has been squandered and stolen, or the ones in charge are really stupid and just don't care. The folks who use these roads have been let down big time by the ones responsible for road maintained. Why is it that Maryland and West Virginia can have smooth roads but Pennsylvania can't? For the life of me, I can't understand why the hospital or any government official tolerates such poor quality roads. Especially the one that is needed by the hospital. When I have friends and relatives visit, I am both embarrassed and ashamed when I take them on these roads.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Due to federally-mandated fiscal constraints limiting the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 Program, this project would need to be considered in future TIPs.		
Finley Road	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (UNDER 20 FT). ROSTRAVER TOWNSHIP BRIDGE. (Project Completed)	Westmoreland County	<p data-bbox="1241 1089 1896 1117"><i>Nick Lorenzo, Rostraver Township, Commissioner</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1131 1913 1185">Concerned about projects that appear to have been dropped on the draft TIP.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because SPC has already committed funding to accomplish the needed bridge replacement.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Fix Existing Highways/Bridges	SPC needs to focus on fixing our existing crumbling/poorly maintained infrastructure needs.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1549 215"><i>Peter Wray, Sierra Club</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1881 290">SPC needs to focus on fixing our existing crumbling/poorly maintained infrastructure needs.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 342 1976 469">First priority in the Draft TIP is directed at maintaining the existing transportation system. SPC has attained in the Draft TIP its stated policy of investing at least 80% of TIP dollars in preservation of the existing transportation system. The SPC and PennDOT policy of giving top priority to maintaining the existing transportation system does not prohibit projects that increase the capacity of the system.</p>		
Freedom Rd Turnpike Bridge	Replace structure carrying SR 3020 (FREEDOM ROAD) , located west of the intersection SR 3020 with US 19.	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 492 1871 553"><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 566 1976 826">We continue to support the funding of this project as well as the effort to improve the entire Freedom Road corridor. Freedom Road is a priority for Cranberry Township. The volume of traffic in this corridor currently exceeds capacity which generates significant delay and congestion. The proposed TIP provides for final design and utility work only, we believe that construction dollars should also be programmed for in the current TIP.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 878 1944 972">This project is partially budgeted on the Draft TIP, which includes funding for the final design phase in 2008 and utility relocation in 2009. Due to fiscal constraint it was not possible to include construction funding in the program. Additional funding will have to be included in future TIPs to complete this project.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Freedom Road West Phase 2	Major reconstruction with additional travel lanes. Includes major intersection reconstruction, drainage, signage, and traffic signals. Widening of existing structure over the Turnpike.	Butler County	<p><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p>This project was included in the 2005-2008 TIP but, is not included in the 2007-2010 TIP. The funding of design and construction of this project should be added back into the 2007 - 2010 TIP. Freedom Road is a priority for Cranberry Township. The volume of traffic in this corridor currently exceeds capacity which generates significant delay and congestion.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Due to fiscal constraint limiting the amount of projects that could be programmed on the 2007-2010 TIP, it was not possible to include this project in the program. The Butler County Draft 2007-2010 TIP, already weighted with two large transportation projects (Route 228 Improvement project and the I-79/SR 3025 Seneca Missing Ramps) does not at this time contain the capacity to accept another large highway project. The Freedom Road West Phase 2 project will have to look toward future TIPs for continued funding.		
Harrison City/ Export Road	RESTORATION	Westmoreland County	<p><i>Charles Horvat, Penn Township</i></p> <p>Concerned about no apparent funding for right-of-way acquisition and utility relocation for this project despite construction being funded on the TIP Update.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	These funds were obligate in June 2005, therefore they do not need to be programmed at this time.		
I-70 and SR 201 Upgrades	Interchange improvements, bridge repairs, widening and turning lanes. Project Completed)	Westmoreland County	<p><i>Nick Lorenzo, Rostraver Township</i></p> <p>Concerned about projects that appear to have been dropped on the draft TIP.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The project study for this federal earmark project is under review by PennDOT. The earmark funding can be added to the TIP once the scope of work has been determined.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
I-79 MEADOWLANDS INTERCHANGE	Upgrade of I-79/Meadowlands Interchange (Exit 40) to provide for two additional ramps.	Washington County	<i>John J. Stickle, South Strabane Township, Township Manager</i> Provide better access to Locust Avenue and Manifold Road from I-79.
<i>Response:</i>	This project is fully budgeted on the draft TIP with a three year construction phase beginning in 2008. The project will have to maintain its priority funding status through the 2009 TIP Update which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.		
I-79 Missing Ramps (Seneca Valley HS)	Complete Interchange (Near Seneca High School)	Butler County	<i>Jeffrey Smith, Harmony Borough</i> Because there are no northbound exit or southbound entrance ramps onto 1-79 from SR 3025, the majority of the school's bus and automobile traffic is forced to either wind its way through Harmony Borough or traverse a winding and dangerous back road. This is a significant safety risk for our students. Following afternoon dismissal, bus traffic is so heavy that fire and ambulance response times to Harmony's residents is increased substantially. These ramps will alleviate both of these problems. It is critical that funding for utilities and ROW work be completed by 2008 so that construction can begin in 2009 and be completed in 2010. If possible, the pace of this project should be escalated so that they can be completed sooner.
<i>Response:</i>	This project is currently under design. Right-of-way and utilities are programmed in the first two years of the Draft 2007-2010 TIP. Construction is partially budgeted on the Draft TIP in 2009 and 2010 but not fully funded. Work is to begin in 2009. To complete the project, remaining funding will have to be identified in the next TIP Update cycle which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule, and funding availability.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
I-79 South from I-279 (Parkway North)	I-79 South from I-279 (Parkway North) cutoff to the Ohio River bridge	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1236 188 1430 220"><i>Keith Boucher</i></p> <p data-bbox="1236 228 1976 464">I request that the road listed above be placed at the top of your list for repair. Even though I have been well aware that Pennsylvania has serious difficulties with maintaining their roads and highways, the above road is well beyond needed repair. I would described it as rubble. In fact, I have been on dirt roads in remote areas in West Virginia that are in better condition.</p> <p data-bbox="1236 496 1976 935">There are only two explanations as too how the condition of these roads could has gotten so bad. Either the money for repair has been squandered and stolen, or the ones in charge are really stupid and just don't care. The folks who use these roads have been let down big time by the ones responsible for road maintained. Why is it that Maryland and West Virginia can have smooth roads but Pennsylvania can't? For the life of me, I can't understand why the hospital or any government official tolerates such poor quality roads. Especially the one that is needed by the hospital. When I have friends and relatives visit, I am both embarrassed and ashamed when I take them on these roads.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The Transportation Funding and Reform Commission has been tasked at the state level to recommend solutions to the funding crisis in both highways and transit. The Transportation Funding and Reform Commission is expected to report its findings by Fall 2006.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
I-79/SR 3025 - MISSING RAMPS	Complete Interchange (Near Seneca High School)	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 186 1866 248"><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1980 423">Cranberry Township supports the construction of the missing ramps to 179 near the Seneca Valley School Campus. The school campus serves multiple municipalities including Cranberry Township and this project will greatly improve safety and access in the area.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 472 1944 638">This project is currently under design. Right-of-way and utilities are programmed in the first two years of the Draft 2007-2010 TIP. Construction is partially budgeted on the Draft TIP in 2009 and 2010 but not fully funded. Work is to begin in 2009. To complete the project, remaining funding will have to be identified in the next TIP Update cycle which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule, and funding availability.</p>		
Independence Road	I do believe that Independence Rd. in Independence Twp. needs to be repaired.	Beaver County	<p data-bbox="1241 657 1545 685"><i>Corey &amp; Cathy Sellman</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 698 1980 1196">I just think its a shame, that somebody might lose their life because of a road that you people don't want to fix. I realize you think that we are nothing but a little county bumpkin township, but we are real people, just like everybody else. You people need to open your eyes to this matter. It is very important for the people of Independence Twp. and surrounding communities! How would you people feel if it was one of your family members having a heart attack or somebody was breaking into their home, and the police department, firemen, or emergency vehicles couldn't get there on time to save their life? Think about it! Because of a few extra minutes to go around, somebody lost their life. So I am asking you, as a resident of Independence twp. to please fix this road.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1245 1980 1310">This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because PennDOT has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to accomplish the needed repairs.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Independence Road	Repair roadway due to a landslide on Independence Road, SR 3013 caused by Hurricane Ivan in September of 2004.	Beaver County	<p><i>Winona</i></p> <p>I am very concerned about the closing of Independence Road, Independence Township. I live on the end of the road towards Rt 151. This is in the valley and if we get a lot of rain and the water rises the only way that we could get out would be a dirt road which is narrow and not in the best shape. In wet weather this could be washed out. This road has been the best way for us to go to the Doctor, the store, and the safest way for us to evacuate in the event of flooding. My daughter who assists my husband and I when we are in ill health lives on the other end of the closed road. We were 1 mile apart now we are traveling 5 miles farther. As the slide continues it could take part of the upper road which is Gringo Independence. Police and Ambulance Service takes longer and lives and homes and to protect our property. There are those who have been driving vehicles over private property and destroying the banks of a stream of water. We often say that we feel like 2nd class citizens, who pay our Taxes the same as others but get less service for them. Health, security, and financial reasons are important to us.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because PennDOT has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to accomplish the needed repairs. The current 2005-2008 TIP was amended to address this emergency.		
Independence Road (SR 3013)	Repair roadway due to a landslide on Independence Road, SR 3013 caused by Hurricane Ivan in September of 2004.	Beaver County	<p><i>Dean Felgar, Independence Township Resident</i></p> <p>Expressed concern about closure of Independence Road.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because PennDOT has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to accomplish the needed repairs. The current 2005-2008 TIP was amended to address this emergency.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Independence Road (SR 3013)	Repair roadway due to a landslide on Independence Road, SR 3013 caused by Hurricane Ivan in September of 2004.	Beaver County	<i>Fred Schmidt, Independence Township Resident</i> Expressed concern about closure of Independence Road.
<i>Response:</i>	This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because PennDOT has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to accomplish the needed repairs. The current 2005-2008 TIP was amended to address this emergency.		
Independence Road (SR 3013)	Repair roadway due to a landslide on Independence Road, SR 3013 caused by Hurricane Ivan in September of 2004.	Beaver County	<i>Gene Fleegal, Independence Township</i> Independence Road (SR 3013) has been shut down because the roadway collapsed. Repair of this roadway is not on the TIP. It is a safety problem for residents who now have to drive the long way around and for access by fire, police and medical rescue vehicles.
<i>Response:</i>	This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because PennDOT has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to accomplish the needed repairs. The current 2005-2008 TIP was amended to address this emergency.		
Independence Road (SR 3013)	Repair roadway due to a landslide on Independence Road, SR 3013 caused by Hurricane Ivan in September of 2004.	Beaver County	<i>Larry Thomas, Independence Township Resident</i> Residents along Independence Road are cut off from their usual access. This can become a safety problem.
<i>Response:</i>	This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because PennDOT has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to accomplish the needed repairs. The current 2005-2008 TIP was amended to address this emergency.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Independence Road Landslide	Repair roadway due to a landslide on Independence Road, SR 3013 caused by Hurricane Ivan in September of 2004.	Beaver County	<p><i>Dolores and Thomas McCoy, US Citizen</i></p> <p>This landslide occurred during Hurricane Ivan in September of 2004. We are still waiting for repairs to be made and this road to be opened for traffic. While other projects mentioned seem necessary, we in Independence Township also feel that Independence Road should be included in your list of projects. What is taking so long? Your list goes to 2010 and no mention is made of this repair.</p>
<p><i>Response:</i> This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because PennDOT has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to accomplish the needed repairs.</p>			
Independence Road Landslide	Repair roadway due to a landslide on Independence Road, SR 3013 caused by Hurricane Ivan in September of 2004.	Beaver County	<p><i>Margaret Hayes</i></p> <p>What about Independence Road? How long before it is reopened? We built our home 51 years ago on a State Rd. Road now closed, what do you think this does to property value? If I or anyone on 151 wants to go to Green Garden, this adds quite a few miles coming &amp; going. If there is a police or fire call from people past the blocked portion the extra time could be a lost home or life. If we have another flood we have only one way out, up a dirt &amp; gravel road, real narrow. This road has had nothing done to it since the slip on the 151 end. No mowing, ditches cleaned, or sewers cleaned. They do cinder it in the winter. So why isn't this part being taken care of? I pay my taxes but seems like we are treated like 3 class citizens. You pay but you get nothing in return.</p>
<p><i>Response:</i> This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because PennDOT has already recognized it as a priority and committed funding to accomplish the needed repairs. The current 2005-2008 TIP was amended to address this emergency.</p>			

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Indiana County Economic Development Project	Improve existing infrastructure within the Philadelphia Street public right of way from Papermill Ave. to Fourth Street and Seventh Street from Philadelphia Street to Water Street.	Indiana County	<i>Hastie Kinter</i> Specific Improvements include infrastructure replacement, overhead utilities, street lighting, and enhancements.
<i>Response:</i>	Due to fiscal constraint limiting the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 Program, this project will have to look for possible inclusion on future TIPs.		
Install traffic signals Rt. 19/ Fischer Road	Installation of traffic signals at Route19/Fischer Road/Davis School Road intersection. Including turning lanes on Fischer Road and Davis School Road.	Washington County	<i>John J. Stickle, South Strabane Township, Township Manager</i> Increase traffic volume as a result of development on Fischer Road (Stonecreek and Strabane Manor). Overall increase in traffic on Rt. 19.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed intersection improvement for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Interstate Access using Route 422		Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1866 248"><i>Michael Rempel, Gorell Enterprises, Inc &amp; INCO Manufacturing Conso, President</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1980 792">Indiana County is a wonderful place to live and work. The biggest challenge for manufacturers like Gorell and others that do significant business outside of the county, state, region and country, is the challenges in getting our raw materials into the county and shipping our products outside the county. The improvements to Route 119 South will help to get to the Pittsburgh area once Route 22 is completed, but what we and others need is access to interstates - I-79, I-80 &amp; I-99, which can only be efficiently reached via route 422. The current section of 422 between Kittanning and Ebensburg is not only inefficient, but extremely unsafe in many sections. I strongly encourage you to continue the funding of this project to its completion, not only for the benefits of companies in this region but also for the safety of those that travel that route regularly.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT is currently developing a needs analysis report to identify the Route 422 improvement needs within the corridor between Indiana and Kittanning. Design and environmental clearance for improvements will be advanced with funds on the current and Draft proposed TIPs. Funding for the construction of any improvement will need to be obtained in future program updates.		
Interstate Maintenance Funding	Butler County and District 10-0 have focused significant funding from the regional TIP on Interstates in recent years in order to adequately maintain those roads.	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 995 1829 1055"><i>Comm. Jim Kennedy, Butler County Board of Commissioners, Commissioner</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1068 1965 1230">With Interstate Maintenance funds now being controlled by PennDOT Central Office, Butler County feels that they are being unfairly penalized because Interstate money is now being focused in areas that have not adequately maintained their Interstate mileage.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT Central Office programs Interstate Maintenance funds statewide.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Jackson Run Crossing	Construction of an at-grade crossing at the railroad tracks which cross Jackson Run.	Greene County	<i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development</i> Greene County supports the funding of this project due to safety concerns.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed at-grade crossing for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		
Leechburg Road connector	Connector road between Leechburg Road in Lower Burrell and Route 56 bypass	Westmoreland County	<i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative, District 54</i> This project will be beneficial to the area.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on proposed new connector road for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		
Lessen Truck Traffic	Too much truck traffic through Blairsville.	Indiana County	<i>John Turack, BIG, Washington Township, Westmoreland County</i> Please use whatever means necessary to lessen truck traffic through Blairsville and especially on Market Street, the site of a current Home Town Streets Project.
<i>Response:</i>	Funds have been included in FFY 2007 of the Draft TIP for a study of the SR 217 Railroad underpass. The study is intended to partly address the truck traffic issue in downtown Blairsville by, hopefully, finding an improvement that will allow truck traffic to use SR 217 rather than traveling on Main Street in Blairsville.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Missing Ramps at Intersection 79/SR 3025	Complete Interchange (Near Seneca High School)	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 186 1896 248"><i>Marnie Repasky, Zellenople Harmony Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1980 492">The Zellenople-Harmony Area Chamber of Commerce is extremely appreciative for the recognition of the need from past funding for this project. We are requesting that the construction phase be fully funded and completed in this Transportation Improvement Program. We would hope that every effort will be made, as soon as possible, to advance this project to completion.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 540 1980 703">This project is currently under design. Right-of-way and utilities are programmed in the first two years of the Draft 2007-2010 Program. Construction is partially budgeted on the Draft TIP in 2009 and 2010 but not fully funded. Work is to begin in 2009. To complete the project, remaining funding will have to be identified in the next TIP Update cycle which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule, and funding availability.</p>		
Moraine Point Plaza Traffic Flow	Traffic Flow Congestion - Redesign the traffic flow system at the highly stressed Hindman Road area through the Moraine Point Park Plaza area.	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 724 1938 751"><i>Frank Weigle, 360 New Castle Road Butler PA 16001</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 764 1980 1060">I own commercial property at 360 New Castle Road and the traffic control design in the area from 351 New Castle Road and Hindman Road west past the Moraine Point Park Plaza through the access ramp to the 422 bypass has been designed to the benefit of other commercial interests by Butler Township, Butler County and the State of Pennsylvania to arbitrarily exclude the property at 360 New Castle Road from normal ingress and egress traffic flow in both directions.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1114 1980 1276">Continuing development in the area where your business is located is likely to make the challenges even greater in the future as traffic continues to increase. Types of highway facilities like New Castle Road / Route 356 by necessity are designed primarily to support the movement of traffic and have limited ability to provide access to adjacent properties. One possibility might be requesting township improvements (a K-L Lane to Hindman Road local connector road) to get to a signalized intersection on Rt 356.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Morrisville Corridor	TRANSPORTATION STUDY. RECONSTRUCTION, WIDENING, LANE ADDITIONS	Greene County	<i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i> Continues to support the full funding and right sizing of this project.
<i>Response:</i>	This project is partially budgeted on the draft TIP through the final design phase in 2008. To complete the project, remaining funding will have to be identified in the next TIP Update cycle which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.		
Mt Morris Interchange Upgrades	Mt Morris Interchange Upgrades	Greene County	<i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development</i> Due to various safety issues, Greene County supports the necessary upgrades to this interchange.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed interchange improvement for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
N Benbrook Rd/Route 8/S Benbrook Rd Intersection	Center Township requests that the Butler County Public Participation Panel place the North Benbrook Road / Route 8 / South Benbrook Road intersection on the Transportation Improvement Program.	Butler County	<p><i>Ronald Flatt, Center Township, Supervisor Chairman</i></p> <p>For some time, Center Township has been aware that this dangerous intersection needed improvement. Early this decade the Township commissioned engineering and design studies for the improvement but concluded that the cost was too high for the resources of a single municipality of our size. Of the roads involved, only North Benbrook is a Township road, the others being state roads.</p> <p>The growth in western Butler Township near the Benbrook / Evans City Road intersection has underscored the need to improve our intersection. And, as recently pointed out in the local media, Interstates 79 and 279 have had a "ripple" effect on local traffic, reaching northward to the Benbrook / Route 8 intersection.</p> <p>Center Township stands ready to assist in the planning and funding of this project. The Center Township Supervisors have voted to pledge \$250,000 toward the costs involved in this project, and hope that this request will quickly be considered and approved.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Benbrook Road (SR 3007) is on the Department's 2007 Surface Improvement Program for widening and resurfacing. The Department is aware of the township's concerns and will contact the township as plans for the project develop to determine what improvements might be incorporated in the resurfacing project.		
Need Additional Funds to Subsidize Transportation	Supports Additional Funds to Subsidize Transportation Projects	Butler County	<p><i>Bill Woods</i></p> <p>Supports Additional Funds to Subsidize Transportation Projects</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The Transportation Funding and Reform Commission has been tasked at the state level to recommend solutions to the funding crisis in both highways and transit. The Transportation Funding and Reform Commission is expected to report its findings by Fall 2006.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
New I-70 Interchange (Zediker Station Rd)	Construction of a new Interchange on I-70 at Zediker Station Road to be used to access proposed residential/business park development by Consol, Inc.	Washington County	<i>John J. Stickle, South Strabane Township, Township Manager</i> New interchange would provide access to new development and relieve congestion on local Township roads not designed for high volume traffic.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed new interchange for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		
New Interchange at Rt 528 and Rt 68	A new interchange at the intersection of rt. 528 and rt. 68. by continuing rt. 528 northward at this junction, spanning over the existing RR tracks and proceeding northward in a northeast sweeping curve and intersecting with the present rt. 528 going north out of evans city, thus relieving a large portion of the present traffic.	Butler County	<i>old putter bob@</i> The residents of evans city have been subjected to a toxic cloud of carbon monoxide every morning and evening, due to long traffic delays. this bottleneck can and should be taken and eliminated. This situation has gone on for too many years with nothing being done.
<i>Response:</i>	Due to fiscal constraint limiting the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 Program, this project will have to look for possible inclusion on future TIPs.		
New Interchange I-79 (Between SR519- Racetrack Rd)	There needs to be a new interchange constructed on I-79 between the existing Racetrack Road Interchange and the SR 519/Canonsburg Hospital Interchange.	Washington County	<i>Demo Agoris, Houston Borough, Councilman</i> Even a partial interchange would be acceptable.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed new interchange for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Off-On Ramp from I 79 in Cranberry @ Boundry Road	Construction of a new interchange off/on I-79 in Cranberry Township at Boundry Road.	Butler County	<p><i>Kathleen Ligday</i></p> <p>I feel an off-on ramp from I 79 in Cranberry @ Boundry Road would save congestion on Rt 19 from Crideca Corner to Zelig – EC ramp. One can't get to north Cranberry 228 and use Rt 19 N. Now, before Boundry gets built up, land should be purchased for a ramp.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Funding for the Route 19 corridor study is included on the Draft TIP for 2007 and will include this area.		
On-Off Ramp @ Little Creek and I 79	COMPLETE INTERCHANGE (NEAR SENECA HIGH SCHOOL)	Butler County	<p><i>Kathleen Ligday</i></p> <p>Growth is coming at a fast pace to Lancaster Twp despite efforts to keep the rural simplicity. However, the on-off ramp @ Little Creek and I 79 is a necessity to access the Seneca Valley Campus from the south. This would help eliminate traffic through Zelig and so many school busses through Harmony which is trying to recover from Ivan flood of '04.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	This project is currently under design. Right-of-way and utilities are programmed in the first two years of the Draft 2007-2010 Program. Construction is partially budgeted on the Draft TIP in 2009 and 2010 but not fully funded. Work is to begin in 2009. To complete the project, remaining funding will have to be identified in the next TIP Update cycle which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule, and funding availability.		
PARNASSUS TRIANGLE	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	Westmoreland County	<p><i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative, District 54</i></p> <p>Project is important and must proceed on schedule.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The Phase I project is in construction. The Phase II project will begin after Phase I has been completed.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Pedestrian Safety@Grant/State/Sampson St Intersect	Expressed concerns about pedestrian safety issues at the intersection of Grant Street, State Street, and Sampson Street in the City of New Castle.	Lawrence County	<p><i>Christine Sands, City of New Castle</i></p> <p>Questioned whether improvements at this location were part of the scope of work for the Grant Street Bridge project (MPMS#29340), which has construction funding on the draft TIP.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	SPC staff will contact the PennDOT project manager for the Grant Street Bridge project to get an answer to this question and relay the information back to Ms. Sands.		
Poor Regional Land Use		Allegheny County	<p><i>Kate St. John</i></p> <p>Comments: Poor regional land use is messing up your transportation planning. SPC needs to take the view from 30,000 feet. Here's what I mean... (from the Hartford Courant July 9, 2006 By PARRIS N. GLENDENING, and CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN) "You can spend all the money in the world on transportation infrastructure, whether on roads or rails, but that money will be wasted if it is not coordinated with the pace and form of development. If you build communities so every activity requires a long car trip, no amount of pavement will cure congestion. At the same time, there is no point in building a rail system if destinations are not clustered at stations. Remember, if you design communities for automobiles, you get more automobiles."</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Comment noted.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Reducing Blairsville Truck Traffic	Reduce the heavy truck traffic using Blairsville as part of their route to and from Route's 22, 30 and Rt. 119.	Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1812 215"><i>Linda Gwinn, Blairsville Improvement Group</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1969 589">I believe there are some design opportunities that can be employed in Blairsville to alleviate some of this traffic. When scoping, designing, enhancing or constructing roads in the Blairsville area, bike/ped access will be a key element for some commercial and tourist related businesses. Proactively addressing these needs could have a favorable impact on the bike tourism/economy/health of the area/region. Failure to address these needs will permit continued vehicular centric conditions to remain...to the further detriment of the area.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 602 1969 792">In the immediate future, I feel that the signs on the entrances into Blairsville from Rt. 217 south and north, and from Rt. 22 from the west and from the east, the signage needs to be changed so that truck traffic is not directed to come through our central business district needlessly.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Funds have been included in FFY 2007 of the Draft TIP for a study of the SR 217 Railroad underpass. The study is intended to partly address the truck traffic issue in downtown Blairsville.		
Route 119 North	Safety concerns on Route 119 North in Marion Center	Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 959 1944 1019"><i>Commissioner Smith, Indiana County Commissioners, County Commissioner</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1032 1969 1222">Has safety concerns on Route 119 North in Marion Center. Turning buses create roadblocks, other vehicles try to pass, and accidents occur. The Township of East Mahoning, the Route 119 Improvement Association and the Marion Center School District have been working to find a solution to this problem..</p>
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT reported that state Surface Improvement Program funds will be used in the coming year to address the safety issues on this roadway.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Route 21 Re-alignment	Re-alignment Improvements	Greene County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1948 248"><i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1948 354">Greene County supports this project and would like for an Earmark from Senator Murtha to be placed on the TIP.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The earmark funding for this project will be added to the TIP once the project scope has been identified through meetings between PennDOT and the project sponsor.		
Route 217/ Route 22 Intersection	Design of intersection of Route 217 and Route 22 results in heavy truck traffic in downtown Blairsville	Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 518 1780 578"><i>John Turack, BIG, Washington Township, Westmoreland County</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 591 1976 1089">As manager of the Blairsville Main Street program, has a goal of reducing the number of trucks traveling through downtown Blairsville. The intersection of Route 217 and Route 22 East and West are poorly designed to accommodate truck movements. In addition, a low railroad underpass requires that trucks in excess of 13 ft. make a sharp turn from Route 217 onto Market Street in the heart of downtown Blairsville. In addition, the community encourages the use of Context Sensitive design in the Route 22 corridor due to the presence of the Conemaugh River, and the presence of bicycle trails on both sides of Route 22 in this area. It was noted that in order to link the bicycle trails on either side of Route 22, it will probably be necessary to have the trails cross Route 22 in two different locations.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	This project, funded for preliminary engineering on a previous Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), is in the early stages of design. Due to fiscal constraints limiting the amount of available funding, preliminary engineering will be partially completed and design will stop. No further work will occur on this project until funding is available. Due to continuing fiscal constraints, the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 TIP is limited. This project will have to look toward future TIPs for possible inclusion. SPC will retain this comment for the upgrade of this interchange for consideration as part of the SPC 2030 Long-Range Plan Update, which will be occurring during the next 12 months.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Route 217/Route 22 Intersection	Intersection Improvement needed	Indiana County	<p><i>Commissioner Ruddock, Indiana County Commissioners, County Commissioner</i></p> <p>The intersection of Route 217 and Route 22 near Blairsville is in need of attention. The enhancements that are proposed for the nearby Sewage Treatment Plant will worsen conditions at an already problematic intersection</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Due to fiscal constraints limiting the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 Program, this project will have to look for possible inclusion on future TIPs.		
Route 422/Harmony Road	Safety concern at Route 22 at North and South Harmony Roads (an offset intersection.)	Indiana County	<p><i>Terry Stiffler, Supervisor, Cherry Hill Township, Supervisor</i></p> <p>In the vicinity of North and South Harmony Roads, Route 422 passes a plant nursery, an ice cream stand and a golf course. There is limited horizontal separation at this intersection, and four types of traffic trying to use the intersection: traffic turning through the offset interchange on North and South Harmony Roads; through traffic moving at speed along Route 422; traffic slowing to access the ice cream stand and golf course; and the plant nursery's vehicles, which cross 422 in moving between plant operations on the north and south sides of Route 422. This mixing of high speed and low speed traffic, and unexpected movements, such as those of vehicles turning from Harmony Road into the right lane on Route 422, then moving immediately into the left lane to complete the offset turn to resume travel on Harmony Road, makes this a dangerous intersection. There is a light nearby at Diehl/Deal Road, but traffic speed is still an issue at Harmony Road.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Due to fiscal constraints limiting the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 Program, this project will have to look for possible inclusion on future TIPs.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
RT 19 Corridor Study	Traffic Study on SR 19	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1871 253"><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1976 797">We support the funding of this study. The Rt. 19 corridor is a major corridor that serves northern Allegheny and southern Butler Counties. Growth along the corridor has led to an increase in traffic volumes and congestion. The Route 228 project identified the intersection of Rt. 19/228/Freedom Rd. as a significant problem with degradation in LOS in the near future. The proposed corridor study will identify and address potential solutions and is proposed to be a multi-municipal effort that will address long term transportation and land use needs and issues within the region. Cranberry Township has focused on local solutions in addition to the proposed study to reduce congestion in this priority corridor. The Township has and will continue to focus local financial resources in addition to those provided through the normal TIP process.</p>

*Response:* This study is fully budgeted on the Draft TIP and is anticipated to begin in 2007.

Rt 22 Westinghouse-County Line	Four-lane Widening	Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 954 1814 987"><i>John Turack, Blairsville Improvement Group</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 995 1976 1128">Because this segment of the project intersects the Penna. Mainline Canal Greenway, the aesthetic value of the Greenway should be considered as the guide rails and berm treatments are design.</p>
--------------------------------	--------------------	----------------	---

*Response:* This comment will be forwarded to PennDOT District 12-0 for consideration by the project design team.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Rt 380 Corridor Study	From Route 366 in Washington Twp to the intersection with Route 286 near Saltsburg	Indiana County	<i>John Turack, Blairsville Improvement Group</i> Major metropolitan spoke from Indiana County to Downtown Pittsburgh. The route is ripe for increased sprawl and development and believe now is the time for this study to address access issues.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed Route 380 Corridor Study for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		
Rt. 40 & Rt. 19 Upgrade	Upgrade of traffic signal and intersection at Rt. 40 / Rt. 19 / Sanitarium Road / Lacock Hill. To include new traffic signals and removal of traffic island.	Washington County	<i>John J. Stickle, South Strabane Township, Township Manager</i> Increase traffic volumes and safety concerns for motorists. Existing traffic signals and intersection are antiquated and in need of upgrade.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed intersection improvement for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		
RUFF CREEK PARK-N-RIDE	Project is currently held up in the right of way acquisition stage.	Greene County	<i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i> Greene County supports the completion of this project.
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT is exploring an alternate site because of difficulties encountered at the original site. Coordination with the District will be needed to ensure a satisfactory resolution of the right-of-way issue.		
Seneca Valley missing ramps project	Complete Interchange (Near Seneca High School)	Butler County	<i>Ken Brennan, Seneca Valley School District</i> Feels that the bridge over I-79 that will be part of the Seneca Valley missing ramps project should be a 4-lane bridge.
<i>Response:</i>	It is likely the design of the structure will be able to accommodate an additional lane should it be needed in the future.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Slate Lick Interchange Rehabilitation (77640)	This proposed project is for the partial reconfiguration of the interchange of PA 128 with PA 28 in South Buffalo Township, Armstrong County.	Armstrong County	<p><i>T.L. Ralston, Armstrong County Planning Commission, Planner</i></p> <p>The County has requested that funds be allocated in FFY 2006 for the completion of a study phase. District 10 has submitted a program amendment for the amount of \$50,000 (80% Federal and 20% State) be programmed in FFY 2006 for the completion of a study phase for this project. The Federal funds will come from an earmark that this project received in SAFETEA-LU. The State match will be covered by the additional FFY 2006 State Appropriation 581 revenue received by the SPC region. The amendment will be considered for approval by the TTC on July 20, 2006.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	A portion of the SAFETEA-LU earmark will be programmed for preliminary engineering in FFY 2007 of the Draft Program and will be included in the final TIP.		
Slippery Rock University Road Improvements	Highlighted need for operational improvements in and around Slippery Rock Borough in order to accommodate growth and University related traffic.	Butler County	<p><i>Ken Harris, Slippery Rock Borough, Borough Mayor</i></p> <p>Indicated that Slippery Rock has a very active and dynamic group of community partners interested in preserving and enhancing the quality of life in the community.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	SPC has worked with Slippery Rock and several other communities in recent years to assess their walkability and continues to work with individual communities on the development of sidewalk and streetscape plans that enhance the vitality of the community. In coming months, SPC will be participating in the North Butler County Multi-Municipal Plan development process, with an eye towards reducing truck congestion on local roadways and enhancing the pedestrian experience in Slippery Rock and several adjacent communities.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
SR 228 and SR 356 Corridor Upgrades	Highlighted additional needs in the Route 228 and Route 356 corridors including the addition of turning lanes and traffic signals to more effectively manage traffic.	Butler County	<p><i>Al Roenigh, Buffalo Township, Supervisor</i></p> <p>Praised PennDOT for the work that has been done along Route 28, Route 228, Route 356 and other roadways in the area, including an expedited bridge replacement necessitated by Hurricane Ivan flooding. These improvements were an excellent beginning but we still need signals added to the Route 28 north exit 17 ramp and the intersection of Silverville Road and SR 356. In addition, the SR 356 corridor needs turning lanes at all of the intersections and the Route 28/356 intersections needs appropriate lighting.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> Future TIPs will continue to work to advance improvements in the 228/356 corridor as funding permits.</p>
SR 130 Improvements	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	Westmoreland County	<p><i>Charles Horvat, Penn Township</i></p> <p>SR 130 Improvements (MPMS 32117) – requests funding for right-of-way acquisition in 2009 and 2010 for improvement of four intersections just east of the project described above.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> The initial design of this TIP project would require taking right-of-way from more than 100 separate properties. The township and PennDOT need to reach an agreement on an acceptable scope before this project will be able to proceed.</p>
SR 130/Sandy Hill Intersection Improvement	Project involves relocating and reconstruction, including left turn lanes, SR 130/Pleasant Valley Road/Sandy Hill Road Intersections east of the present location and install new traffic signal, drainage upgrade, & guide rail.	Westmoreland County	<p><i>Jeffrey Baird, Route 130 Citizens in Motion, District 54</i></p> <p>Supports advancing the SR 130/Sandy Hill intersection improvement project (MPMS 72703).</p> <p><i>Response:</i> The scope of work for this federal earmark project has changed since the designation of the earmark. Discussions between PennDOT and the sponsor need to continue to determine the scope of work. TIP eligibility will need to be evaluated for the revised scope, and the legal description of the earmark may need to be addressed before TIP action can occur.</p>

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
SR 19/PINE CREEK-WALLACE	Widen/resurface/median/drain/signals Widening from 42' to 55'. Signaled intersections will be widened to 66'. Drainage will be improved to accommodate widening. Concrete median the length of the job will be installed and signals will be added.	Allegheny County	<i>Sen. Jane Clare Orié, Pennsylvania Legislature, State Senator</i> Supports the completion of this project.
<i>Response:</i>	This project is fully budgeted on the Draft TIP for construction in 2009. The project will have to maintain its priority funding status through the 2009 TIP Update which is due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.		
SR 201 and Vance Dei Cas Highway	Improve traffic patterns, create access entrance to proposed business park and existing business. Install two new traffic signals, left turning lane and upgrade existing traffic signals.	Westmoreland County	<i>Nick Lorenzo, Rostraver Township, District 54</i> There is a huge bottleneck problem interfering with economic development. Proposed intersection improvements to SR 201 and SR 1099 costing approximately \$1.1 million.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on proposed intersection improvements for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		
SR 218 STRUCTURE	Construction of an at-grade crossing at the railroad tracks which cross Route 218 South.	Greene County	<i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i> Local citizens are frustrated that this project has been on the TIP for many years but is not complete. Concerns are safety and community well-being. Fire and emergency vehicles cannot make timely responses when trains are in the area. Average is 17 trains per day.
<i>Response:</i>	The design for this project started as an at-grade crossing but changed to a grade-separation project (bridge over the railroad) to address the significant increase in train traffic that has occurred during the life of this project.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
SR 22 @ SR 217 Intersection	Lack of a eastbound merge lane at intersection SR 22 @ SR 217 creating hazardous conditions.	Indiana County	<p><i>James Carmo</i></p> <p>I have had numerous conversations with trucking people, that the lack of a eastbound merge lane at the intersection of #217 and SR 22 has created an extremely dangerous condition for east bound drivers. This is a tragedy in the making and should be a top priority.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This project, funded for preliminary engineering on a previous Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), is in the early stages of design. Due to fiscal constraint limiting the amount of available funding, preliminary engineering will be partially completed and design will stop. No further work will occur on this project until funding is available. Due to continuing fiscal constraint, the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 TIP is limited. This project will have to look toward future TIPs for possible inclusion. SPC will retain this comment for the upgrade of this interchange for consideration as part of the SPC 2030 Long-Range Plan Update, which will be occurring during the next 12 months.</p>		
SR 3022 Rochester Road	Partnership Project with Cranberry Township to widen 19/Rochester Road Intersection to improve traffic flow and safety. (Separate project from the Glen Eden Road South 3R)	Butler County	<p><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p>The Rochester Road corridor continues to be developed and is becoming more congested. The Turnpike bridge crossing over Rochester Road is deteriorating and creates a hazardous condition on Rochester due to a narrowing of the roadway. Cranberry Township has focused sustainable development efforts in recent years to this corridor which includes compact mixed use development and pedestrian improvements. Sustainable development alone will not provide the ultimate solution for the corridor and additional capacity is necessary. We are focused on providing for an efficient use of the transportation infrastructure which should ultimately include public transportation. The preliminary and final design and engineering should be placed on the 2007 - 2010 TIP to help carry this sustainable approach forward. The Township is committed to providing local funding to support this project.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>Due to fiscal constraint limiting the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 Program, this project will have to look for possible inclusion on future TIPs.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
SR 3027/SR 68 intersection improvements	Safety Improvement and intersection upgrade	Butler County	<i>Ken Brennan, Seneca Valley School District</i> Supports Project
<i>Response:</i>	The identified project is fully budgeted on the draft TIP for construction in 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.		
SR 356 IMPROVEMENTS	Road improvement	Westmoreland County	<i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative, District 54</i> Needed for easier access to Alle-Kiski Valley
<i>Response:</i>	This project is included in SPC Long Range Plan and will be advanced into the TIP as funding is available.		
SR 56 Improvements	Widening of 2-lane section of 56 between Lower Burrell and Vandergrift	Westmoreland County	<i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative</i> This project will be beneficial to the area.
<i>Response:</i>	This project is included in SPC Long Range Plan and will be advanced into the TIP as funding is available.		
SR 711 Escape Ramp	Truck escape ramp on Route 711 east of Connellsville	Fayette County	<i>Joseph P Arnold</i> Does not make sense to disturb all those properties on the bottom of Springfield Pike to make a turn-off for trucks, and the money that would be spent to widen the road. If trucks used McCoy Hollow Road as a truck route they would save time, gas and increase safety by taking the trucks off Route 711.
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT will take these concerns and suggestions into consideration as they investigate alternate locations for an Escape Ramp on SR 711 and develop future plans.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
SR 910 at Babcock Boulevard	Widening and realignment of intersection; provide left turn lanes; install a traffic signal.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 185 1940 248"><i>Sen. Jane Clare Orié, Pennsylvania Legislature, State Senator</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1940 386">Project in the planning stages since 1994 without securing funding from the TIP despite the Township offering matching funds from impact fees that they will soon lose due to the three year rule of the MPC.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT and Allegheny County will continue to work with Pine Township through SPC to prioritize and seek funding for this project. However, there wasn't enough funding available in the draft 2007-2010 TIP to add this project. It will be retained as a candidate project and SPC will continue to seek funding opportunities to advance this project.		
SR 910 at Pearce Mill Road	Widening and realignment of intersection, left turn lanes, traffic signals.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 557 1940 620"><i>Sen. Jane Clare Orié, Pennsylvania Legislature, State Senator</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 631 1940 758">Project in the planning stages since 1994 without securing funding from the TIP despite the Township offering matching funds from impact fees that they will soon lose due to the three year rule of the MPC.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT and Allegheny County will continue to work with Pine Township through SPC to prioritize and seek funding for this project. However, there wasn't enough funding available in the draft 2007-2010 TIP to add this project. It will be retained as a candidate project and SPC will continue to seek funding opportunities to advance this project.		
SR130 Intersection/Sandy Hill & Pleasant Valley Rd	Project involves relocating and reconstruction, including left turn lanes, SR 130/Pleasant Valley Road/Sandy Hill Road Intersections east of the present location and install new traffic signal, drainage upgrade, & guide rail.	Westmoreland County	<p data-bbox="1241 924 1654 951"><i>Charles Horvat, Penn Township</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 963 1955 1157">Requests advancing funding to 2008 for right-of-way acquisition, final design and environmental work, and utilities. This work is closely related to replacement of the nearby PA Turnpike bridge and relocation of Nike Site Road. In addition, requests \$939,000 federal funds for the relocation of the Nike Site Road.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The scope of work for this federal earmark project has changed since the designation of the earmark. Discussions between PennDOT and the sponsor need to continue to determine the scope of work. TIP eligibility will need to be evaluated for the revised scope, and the legal description of the earmark may need to be addressed before TIP action can occur.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
SR3008/SR3013 Intersection	Appreciates the inclusion of this intersection improvement on 2007-2010 TIP.	Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 186 1436 214"><i>Angela Coulter</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1976 592">Has been testifying before SPC since 1995 on need for remediation of dangerous vertical site distance at intersection of SR3008 and SR3013. The road drops off quickly on one leg of the intersection, and the coal trucks and other vehicles approaching the intersection from that direction are often moving at speed, yet are invisible to cars waiting to enter the roadway. The Project is fully funded on the 2007-2010 TIP and she is appreciative. However, she will continue to testify on the need for the project until the intersection improvements are fully implemented.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	This project is fully funded on the draft TIP for construction in 2009. The project will have to retain its priority status through the 2009 TIP Update, due in June 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.		
TARENTUM BRIDGE ROAD	Road widening	Westmoreland County	<p data-bbox="1241 758 1919 786"><i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative, District 54</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 800 1766 826">This project will be beneficial to the area.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	This project is included in SPC Long Range Plan and will be advanced into the TIP as funding is available.		
TIP Priorities	TIP Priorities need to emphasize Fix it First	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 989 1881 1049"><i>Heather Sage, Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future (PennFuture), Director of Outreach</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1063 1976 1256">While SPC has worked to maintain an 80%-20% maintenance vs. new capacity prioritization that is to be commended, the need to continue to emphasize fixing-it-first is critical. To that end, an even more strict policy aimed at critical maintenance and safety measures must be implemented.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	First priority in the Draft TIP is directed at maintaining the existing transportation system. SPC has attained in the Draft TIP its stated policy of investing at least 80% of TIP dollars in preservation of the existing transportation system. The SPC and PennDOT policy of giving top priority to maintaining the existing transportation system does not prohibit projects that increase the capacity of the system.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Upgrade of Murtland Avenue/I-70 to79 Interchange	Upgrade Murtland Avenue / I-70 79 Interchange (Exit 19A and B) in Connection with widening of Rt. 19 from Manifold Road to Exit 19A and B.	Washington County	<i>John J. Stickle, South Strabane Township, Township Manager</i> Increased traffic volume as a result of new commercial development. Safety for motorists would improve with widening and additional lanes.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed capacity improvement project for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		
Warrendale Road and Babcock Boulevard	Reconstruct this intersection, realigning roadways to permit proper sight distance; improve drainage; install traffic signal.	Allegheny County	<i>Sen. Jane Clare Orie, Pennsylvania Legislature, State Senator</i> Project in the planning stages since 1994 without securing funding from the TIP despite the Township offering matching funds from impact fees that they will soon lose due to the three year rule of the MPC.
<i>Response:</i>	PennDOT and Allegheny County will continue to work with Pine Township through SPC to prioritize and seek funding for this project. However, there wasn't enough funding available in the draft 2007-2010 TIP to add this project. It will be retained as a candidate project and SPC will continue to seek funding opportunities to advance this project.		
Widening of Rt 19 from I-70 to Manifold Road	Widening of Rt 19 (Washington Road) from current 4 lanes to 6 lanes; included turning lanes to commercial developments; include turning lanes from Manifold Road.	Washington County	<i>John J. Stickle, South Strabane Township, Township Manager</i> Increased traffic volume as a result of new commercial development. Safety for motorists would improve with widening and additional lanes.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC will retain this comment on a proposed capacity improvement project for consideration as part of the SPC update of the 2030 Long Range Plan, which will be developed during the next 12 months.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
North/South Mass Transit Corridor	Need to develop a Mass Transit Corridor (North/South) from Butler County to Oakland to Washington County.	Allegheny County	<i>Jon Smith</i> The old B&O rail property is currently up for sale and presents a unique opportunity for a bus way/short commuter rail/trail development.
<i>Response:</i>	The rail corridor referenced is not currently for sale, to the best of our knowledge. This corridor serves as a vital rail freight link between Pittsburgh and points north, and is currently in use by the Buffalo and Pittsburgh Railroad who has plans to expand their service on this line. It is not anticipated that this rail corridor will be available for redevelopment as a commuter rail, busway or trail during the 2007-2010 TIP program.		
Allegheny Valley Commuter Railroad	Transit railway to Pittsburgh	Westmoreland County	<i>Rep. John Pallone, State Representative</i> This project would be beneficial to the area as an alternative to SR 28.
<i>Response:</i>	This project is one of the recommendations from the Eastern Corridor Transit Study. A Transitional Analysis to receive additional public comment on the study recommendations has recently been completed. The final report from that analysis is not yet available. This project did receive strong public support during the Transitional Analysis and is one of the alternatives selected for further study. Once the final report is complete, the next step would be a request to amend the Long Range Plan to include the findings from the Transitional Analysis.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Allegheny Valley Rail Plan	A train on the eastern side of the Allegheny River would lessen traffic on the bridges and on Route 28, while providing an alternate and even perhaps a safety evacuation route for people in the city, in case of an emergency situation.	Allegheny County	<p><i>Michael W. Contes D.M.D., Business Owner/Resident</i></p> <p>I am writing this email in support of the Allegheny Valley Rail Initiative which is by far the best plan of the four and deserving of implementation in the not too distant future. Firstly, it is the least costly of the four proposals having an existing rail bed with an owner who will be very accommodating. Secondly, there is a very real need for access to and from Pittsburgh from the Northeast, up the Allegheny River specifically, especially from the eastern side of the river which has no expressway or other direct access to Pittsburgh. Buses must follow a tortured route through many small towns making the trip lengthy and impractical as an effective transportation venue. My daughter used the buses to commute to her job in Pittsburgh from New Kensington and vouches for the unpleasantness of the journey, as well as the significant number of business people who would get on the bus from many points up and down the river and would certainly relish the opportunity to get on a quicker, more direct train with limited stops.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This project is one of the recommendations from the Eastern Corridor Transit Study. A Transitional Analysis to receive additional public comment on the study recommendations has recently been completed. The final report from that analysis is not yet available. This project did receive strong public support during the Transitional Analysis and is one of the alternatives selected for further study. Once the final report is complete, the next step would be a request to amend the Long Range Plan to include the findings from the Transitional Analysis.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Cranberry Transfer Center	Construction of a 400 vehicle Park and Ride Garage/Intermodal Transfer Facility with the potential to expand to 1,200 vehicle Park and Ride Garage.	Butler County	<p><i>Jeffrey Smith, Harmony Borough</i></p> <p>Mass transit is an issue of growing importance along the I-79 corridor. Recently, Harmony agreed to provide local support for the new Butler County Transportation Initiative and will be home to one of the proposed Park and Ride sites. Like the missing ramps. Harmony hopes that the Transfer Center can be advanced from its current 2010 construction date.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>One of the recommendations of the Cranberry Area Transit Study (completed in December 2003) was to expand park-n-ride capacity in the I-79 corridor within Butler County. The Butler Township City Joint Municipal Transit Authority has been working to implement the study recommendations. One result of those efforts is the proposed Intermodal Center on Route 228, just east of the I-79 Interchange. \$7,750,000 is programmed on the draft TIP for this facility. Planning and design phases of the project are programmed through 2009. Construction is programmed for 2010. The Transit Authority believes that is a realistic timeframe for completing the project.</p>		
Cranberry Transfer Center	Park and Ride Expansion	Butler County	<p><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p>We support the expansion of this park-n-ride facility. There is a significant shortage in park-n-ride spaces in the Northern Allegheny and Southern Butler County area. Added spaces along with increased public transportation service will reduce congestion in the area.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>One of the recommendations of the Cranberry Area Transit Study (completed in December 2003) was to expand park-n-ride capacity in the I-79 corridor within Butler County. The Butler Township City Joint Municipal Transit Authority has been working to implement the study recommendations. One result of those efforts is the proposed Intermodal Center on Route 228, just east of the I-79 Interchange. \$7,750,000 is programmed on the TIP for this facility. Planning and design phases of the project are programmed through 2009. Construction is programmed for 2010.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Expand the "T" Subway System in the Downtown Area	There is a need to expand the existing Subway System in the City of Pittsburgh to link the South Side near the new Steelers training facility and the Oakland area's top downtown.	Washington County	<p data-bbox="1241 185 1976 250"><i>Philip A. Fiumara Jr., Washington County Transportation Authority</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 256 1976 386">There is a need to expand the existing Subway System in the City of Pittsburgh to link the South Side near the new Steelers training facility and the Oakland area's top downtown.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 440 1976 605">This project is one of the recommendations from the Eastern Corridor Transit Study. A Transitional Analysis to receive additional public comment on the study recommendations has recently been completed. The final report from that analysis is not yet available. This project did receive strong public support during the Transitional Analysis and is one of the alternatives selected for further study. Once the final report is complete, the next step would be a request to amend the Long Range Plan to include the findings from the Transitional Analysis.</p>		
Fare Reduction for Public Transportation	Greater subsidization of public transportation to allow a fare reduction of a dollar or more.	Pittsburgh City	<p data-bbox="1241 623 1451 651"><i>Douglas Placais</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 657 1955 927">Pittsburgh's poorest citizens, unable to afford cars and not seeing bicycling as a possibility, are forced to take buses every day to work and back. The amount of money we must pay as bus fare has steadily increased of late and is becoming prohibitive. Public transit is essential to support all citizens of urban areas and the rates must not be so damaging to those who have the lowest incomes.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 976 1976 1141">The draft TIP has programmed all available transit funding, over \$430 million, for transit projects throughout the region. The transit funding available in the draft TIP will sustain current transit operations, maintain vehicles and other facilities in a reasonable state of repair, and in some cases provide for minor service increases. Currently, fares pay for less than half of the cost to operate transit services, and none of the capital costs. Governor Rendell has convened a Transportation Funding and Reform Commission that is studying transit funding issues. The Commission is expected to report in the fall.</p>		
Global Warming	Transportation plays a large role in the global warming problem and funding for mass transit could help this issue.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 1159 1549 1187"><i>Peter Wray, Sierra Club</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1193 1944 1295">Transportation plays a large role in the global warming problem and funding for mass transit could help this issue.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1344 1976 1445">The draft TIP has programmed all available transit funding, over \$430 million, for transit projects throughout the region. The transit funding available in the draft TIP will sustain current transit operations, maintain vehicles and other facilities in a reasonable state of repair, and in some cases provide for minor service increases.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Lack of Public Trans. to & from Pittsburgh/Suburbs	A severe lack in public transportation from Washington County to Pittsburgh and the Northern Suburbs of Washington County.	Washington County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1465 215"><i>Sonya J. Sonson</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1974 594">Buses are not allowed to pick up anyone outside of the county that they originate in. A current lack of security at park and ride lots and bus stops along with unsafe traffic conditions at existing bus stops. Unclear directions on where to catch a bus with very few official stops marked. No public transportation to and from Pittsburgh and within the Washington County limits in the evening hours. No Taxi service unless you call one day in advance. A lack of air condition on most public buses. A severe lack of advertising for what transportation services are offered in Washington County.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Both the City of Washington and the Mid-Mon Valley Transit Authority provide fixed-route bus service from points in Washington County to Pittsburgh. They also provide service to points within Washington County. Combined, these two transit operators have programmed over \$22 million on the draft TIP. This funding will sustain existing levels of service. The Washington County Transit Study is scheduled to begin in the fall.		
Let Get Serious About Mass Transit	Mass transit is the answer to conserving fuel on a large basis and cleaning-up the sickening air pollution.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 792 1423 820"><i>Mary I. Kientz</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 833 1955 959">The most urgent change that is needed to control all problems of oil use is to get serious about mass transit. One person per one automobile is devastating to all of us.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The draft TIP has programmed all available transit funding, over \$430 million, for transit projects throughout the region. The transit funding available in the draft TIP will sustain current transit operations, maintain vehicles and other facilities in a reasonable state of repair, and in some cases provide for service increases.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Light Rail Service from Pitts to East Communities	Light Rail Service from City of Pittsburgh to East Communities	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1514 215"><i>Jonathan B. Robison</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1961 321">We need to extend the light rail service from the downtown areas to Greenfield, Homestead, Hazelwood, and other communities in the East.</p>
<p data-bbox="191 375 331 402"><i>Response:</i></p> <p data-bbox="390 375 1980 537">This project is one of the recommendations from the Eastern Corridor Transit Study. A Transitional Analysis to receive additional public comment on the study recommendations has recently been completed. The final report from that analysis is not yet available. This project did receive strong public support during the Transitional Analysis and is one of the alternatives selected for further study. Once the final report is complete, the next step would be a request to amend the Long Range Plan to include the findings from the Transitional Analysis.</p>			
Maglev System Parallel to Major Highway Corridors	The construction of a high speed maglev type of commuter transportation system that could parallel major highway corridors throughout the region.	Washington County	<p data-bbox="1241 558 1976 618"><i>Philip A. Fiumara Jr., Washington County Transportation Authority</i></p>
<p data-bbox="191 769 331 797"><i>Response:</i></p> <p data-bbox="390 769 1934 829">The High Speed Maglev project is continuing through the planning process. A Final Environmental Impact Statement is being prepared. Funding for this project, estimated at nearly \$4.0 billion, has not been identified.</p>			
Marshall Twp Park and Ride	Park and Ride Expansion	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 883 1864 943"><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 956 1969 1117">We support the expansion of this park and ride facility. There is a significant shortage in park-n-ride spaces in the Northern Allegheny and Southern Butler County area. Added spaces along with increased public transportation service will reduce congestion in the area.</p>
<p data-bbox="191 1170 331 1198"><i>Response:</i></p> <p data-bbox="390 1170 1948 1263">One of the recommendations of the Cranberry Area Transit Study (completed in December 2003) was to expand park-n-ride capacity in the I-79 corridor within Butler County. Due to fiscal constraint limiting the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2007-2010 Program, this project could not be included on the 2007-2010 TIP.</p>			

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
More Regional Equity with Mass Transit	We need to promote more livable communities through public funding of mass transit.	Allegheny County	<i>Wallace Watson, Pgh. Interfaith Impact Network</i> His group hopes to cooperate and get movement from the state legislature for sufficient mass transit funding.
<i>Response:</i>	The draft TIP has programmed all available transit funding, over \$430 million, for transit projects throughout the region. The transit funding available in the draft TIP will sustain current transit operations, maintain vehicles and other facilities in a reasonable state of repair, and in some cases provide for minor service increases. Governor Rendell has convened a Transportation Funding and Reform Commission that is studying transit funding issues. The Commission is expected to report in the fall.		
Need A Commuter Bus From Cranberry to Butler	I would like to suggest a commuter bus from Cranberry Township to Butler, or at least from the Evans City park and ride to Butler.	Butler County	<i>Jane McDonald, Butler County Employee</i> I have spoken to the Planning Director numerous times about a commuter bus, and have put my suggestion in at the Cranberry Municipal building when they were asking for suggestions. I see many of the same vehicles on my daily ride into Butler and feel there is a need for this service. In addition to County employees, I am sure the hospital and the mall would benefit from public transportation. Car pools can be a little sticky, due to personality or scheduling conflicts and I would much prefer public transportation.
<i>Response:</i>	The Cranberry Area Transit Study was completed in December 2003. One of the recommendations was to initiate bus service between Cranberry Township and the City of Butler. The Butler Township City Joint Municipal Transit Authority has been working to implement the recommendations in the study. Municipal, county, state and federal funding is needed in addition to fares to operate the recommended service. While some funding commitments have been received, there are insufficient resources available to start-up the service at this time. The draft TIP does include \$4,650,000 in 2009 for buses and equipment for this service.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
PA 528 P-n-R Expansion	Expansion of existing Park-N-Ride facility with 75 parking spaces and currently operating at 100% capacity. An additional 40 spaces are proposed to be added to this facility. Transit service is currently provided at this facility.	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1864 248"><i>Jerry A. Andree, Cranberry Township, Township Manager</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1969 423">We support the expansion of this park and ride facility. There is a significant shortage in park-n-ride spaces in the Northern Allegheny and Southern Butler County area. Added spaces along with increased public transportation service will reduce congestion in the area.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 469 1969 634">One of the recommendations of the Cranberry Area Transit Study (completed in December 2003) was to expand park-n-ride capacity in the I-79 corridor within Butler County. One result is a proposal by PennDOT District 10-0 to expand this facility which serves carpools, vanpools and bus service provided by the New Castle Area Transit Authority. This project is fully budgeted on the draft TIP at a total cost of \$600,000 with the construction funded in 2008. Project delivery for this and other TIP projects remains subject to changes in project priority, cost, schedule and funding availability.</p>		
Port Authority of Allegheny County Expanding Serv.	The Port Authority of Allegheny County should consider crossing county boundaries into neighboring areas to provide public transportation services.	Washington County	<p data-bbox="1241 654 1969 714"><i>Philip A. Fiumara Jr., Washington County Transportation Authority</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 727 1969 821">The Port Authority of Allegheny County should consider crossing county boundaries into neighboring areas to provide public transportation services.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 870 1969 1036">The Port Authority's budget for the current fiscal year projects a deficit of over \$35 million. The Port Authority is not currently in a position to consider expanding service. The Governor's Transportation Funding and Reform Commission may recommend, and the state legislature may enact, increased funding for the state's transit providers. If additional funding, sufficient to support service expansion in the region, is approved, then the details of where to expand, and which agency would operate it can be discussed.</p>		
Public Transit	SPC should plan for the long term success of public transit.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 1055 1419 1083"><i>Kate St. John</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1096 1969 1325">Because of congestion, air quality and gasoline prices, SPC should plan for the long term success of public transit. Provide both capital and operating funds to make public transit a high quality, convenient and desirable form of transportation. When people use it - and they won't unless it's good - you solve congestion &amp; air quality problems and save wear &amp; tear on roads.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	Comment noted.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Reliable Funding Stream for Allegheny County PAT	I think a reliable funding stream must be allocated to Port Authority of Allegheny County.	Allegheny County	<i>Joanna Beres, Catholic Univ Of America, Architecture Student</i> Investing in public transportation is essential, especially amidst escalating petrol prices.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC does not set the amount of funding available for the TIP. That is the role of federal, state, and local governments. SPC's role is to work with local officials and transit operators to prioritize use of available funds. The transit funding available in the draft TIP will sustain current transit operations, maintain vehicles and other facilities in a reasonable state of repair, and in some cases provide for minor service increases.		
Support the Regional Transit Vision	We are writing to throw (with vigor) our support toward the Focused Growth scenario developed in your Regional Transit Vision.	Allegheny County	<i>John &amp; Diane Inserra</i> You have presented two well articulated views of the future. The Trend Scenario continues the slide down an unstable slope. We can not afford, nor should we accept further movement in this socially and economically inferior direction. Please do everything in your power to see that the region heads in the right direction toward Focused Growth.
<i>Response:</i>	The report "A Regional Strategic Vision for Public Transportation Serving Southwestern Pennsylvania" was released on May 19, 2006. A draft report was available during development of the current Long Range Plan in 2003 and elements of the Transit Vision were included in the current Long Range Plan at that time. Projects on the TIP must be drawn from, and consistent with, the Plan. Projects on the draft TIP support the elements of the Transit Vision contained in the Plan, within the limits of fiscal constraint. SPC is now beginning to develop an updated Long Range Plan. The Focused Growth Transit Vision will be one of several scenarios evaluated during Plan development.		
Supports Pedestrian/Transit Friendly Solutions	Supports Pedestrian/Transit Friendly Solutions	Allegheny County	<i>April Clisura, Eastside Neighborhood Employment Center</i> The overall trend in public comments seems to be towards a pedestrian/transit friendly atmosphere with focus on self preservation.
<i>Response:</i>	The recently released Regional Transit Vision recognizes the link between pedestrian friendly communities and communities that are well served by transit. SPC has worked with several communities in recent years to assess their walkability and continues to work with individual communities on the development of sidewalk and streetscape plans that enhance the vitality of the community.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Transit Vision (Focused Growth Project Review)	Support Transit Vision (Focused Growth Project Review)	Allegheny County	<p><i>Court Gould, Sustainable Pittsburgh, Exec. Director</i></p> <p>Sustainable Pittsburgh recommends that the projects currently being considered on the Draft 2007-2010 TIP be evaluated, qualitatively and quantitatively, for the extent in which they advance the Focused Growth Scenario. We urge that this assessment be made publicly available and used by the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission as a means to program and prioritize projects on the TIP in step with the Transit Vision.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>The report "A Regional Strategic Vision for Public Transportation Serving Southwestern Pennsylvania" was released on May 19, 2006. A draft report was available during development of the current Long Range Plan in 2003 and elements of the Transit Vision were included in the current Long Range Plan at that time. Projects on the TIP must be drawn from, and consistent with, the Plan. Projects on the draft TIP support the elements of the Transit Vision contained in the Plan, within the limits of fiscal constraint. SPC is now beginning to develop an updated Long Range Plan. The Focused Growth Transit Vision will be one of several scenarios evaluated during Plan development.</p>		
Transit/Paratransit solutions for Elderly needed	Existing transit/paratransit options in Indiana County are not meeting the current or future needs of the elderly population of Indiana County.	Indiana County	<p><i>Dreama VanCise</i></p> <p>As a visiting Home Health Nurse, she frequently encounters residents who have lost their right to drive due to age, illness or infirmity. Indigo provides good service, but still does not meet the needs of these patients to get to medical appointments, etc. That often forces patients to make poor decisions, and drive when perhaps they should not, or to travel high speed roads when their driving abilities are better suited to only low speed roads. Fatalities have occurred as a result of such decisions. When the available options are risk taking or isolation, all options are bad.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This has been recognized as a national issue, and a process has been outlined to assist local communities and MPOs in their assessment of the needs of the elderly and other non-drivers, and to identify potential solutions.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Additional Funding For Cycling	Please allocate much more additional funding for cycling in your short- and long-term transportation plans for the region.	Allegheny County	<p><i>Dave Wheitner, Resident</i></p> <p>One of the very interesting things I've noted about Pittsburgh is that there is an exceptional number of outdoor attractions here, including beautiful trails with camping facilities, but many residents and visitors—including us—often have no idea because of the lack of connectivity to them from urban areas. Last year, for example, my wife and I did a bicycle camping trip along the Yough River trail, but we drove down past Boston to get on the trail because I new the route from Squirrel Hill to get down there was somewhat dangerous, without bike-friendly signage, etc. It had taken us a few years to even discover how close we were to this attraction. Additionally, we have hosted or helped to coordinate arrivals of four different cross-country cycling groups over the last several years. The comments I've heard include, "Pittsburgh is very difficult to get into and out of by bicycle," "Yes, we were aware of some of the trails, but they don't really connect to the city," or "After looking at the maps for some time, we decided it was easier just to pass north or south of the city." I must admit that we've considered moving to a more bike-friendly town a few times since 2001, especially after being struck by a car in broad daylight downtown and being shouted at to "get on the sidewalk" a few times. In Baltimore, I used to bicycle to work every day, and had fewer issues with irate drivers than I do here—even though I now ride with many more lights and reflective clothing. However, it is largely because I have seen some small but positive changes recently that we have decided to say. Among them are the "share the road" and "watch for cyclists" signs along the route between our home and the East End Food Coop, alongside increased attention to trails and more bicycle racks. While we've had temptations to sell our house and move elsewhere, I am very hopeful that positive change will continue to occur, and that SPC and our region will increasingly understand what is needed to</p>

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
<p><i>Response:</i></p>	<p>The regional trail network is a regional asset, and one that SPC strives to support through the Transportation Enhancements and other similar programs. SPC works with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		<p>compete with other cities.</p>
<p>Attention to Bicycle Lanes &amp; Parking Needs</p>	<p>Need Clear attention to safe bicycling lanes and bicycle parking needs.</p>	<p>Allegheny County</p>	<p><i>Julia Brooks</i>  I am a long-time bicycle commuter. I live in regent square, and commute to downtown Pittsburgh at least four times a week. As a past resident of Madison, Wisconsin--a wonderfully bike-friendly city--I have remained befuddled by the lack of inclusion of bicyclists' needs in the city and county infrastructure planning over the years. Please, in your redevelopment of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Long Range Plan (LRP) called the 2030 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania, I implore you to consider the benefits for the city and county of expanding those documents to include clear attention to safe bicycling lanes and bicycle parking needs. This city really is a wonder to be enjoyed, and has great potential, I believe, to become a town that supports bicyclists and their allies.</p>
<p><i>Response:</i></p>	<p>Pedestrian and bicycle are key elements of a multimodal regional transportation system. In recent years, SPC has worked with Bike Pittsburgh, PennDOT and other regional partners in the establishment of policy and practices that result in the consideration of pedestrian and bicycle transportation needs into every transportation project during project development. We continue to advance the region's non-motorized transportation options.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Visioning	SPC's Long Rang Plan is in need of better bicycle and pedestrian transportation visioning and more performance metrics.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1228 186 1627 219"><i>Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh</i></p> <p data-bbox="1228 227 2001 1000">We wish to go on record stating that SPC's Long Rang Plan, as it currently exists, is in earnest need of better bicycle and pedestrian transportation visioning and more performance metrics by which SPC can track its goal of supplying more bike facilities throughout the region. In a region where traffic congestion, health (both environmental and personal), and quality of life are paramount concerns, bicycling must be viewed as an asset for its cost-effective way of addressing all of these issues. Bicycle and pedestrian movements should no longer take a back seat in terms of transportation planning and infrastructure in our region. Bikes are useful modes of transportation, not merely toys for recreation (although recreational bicycling should not be disregarded either). Bike Pittsburgh is very proud of the regional trail system that SPC has supported, however without proper maintenance throughout the year, all-hour access, lighting, and multiple and convenient access points, the trails cannot be viewed as commuting solutions. More resources must be allocated in order to provide bicycle commuters with safe facilities such as bike lanes and paths that can be used regardless of hour of the day or time of year.</p>

*Response:* The 2030 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania will be updated over the coming year.

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Bicycle Improvements		Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1976 248"><i>Andrew Grieshop, Carnegie Mellon University, Research Assistant</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 261 1976 760">Only \$32,000 of \$550,000,000 of transportation improvements project funds for Allegheny County (or 0.006%) in the Transportation Improvement Plan for 2007-2010 are slated for any kind of bicycle-related improvements, and these funds are for a MAP on how to better navigate between woefully inadequate bicycle facilities. If the region is genuinely interested in improving liveability, addressing congestion, improving some of the nations" poorest air quality and making Pittsburgh the broadly-attractive city it could be, it would do well to be more forward-looking in making transportation improvements that allow alternatives. Cities such as Portland, Chicago, Minneapolis and Seattle have done this and have flourished. Maybe it's time for Pittsburgh to try something different.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 802 1976 1065">A start would be bicycle lanes and paths that are completed in a timely fashion (Hot Metal Ped. bridge, when will it be finished?), pleasant (the Eliza Furnace Trail is sandwiched between two large arterial roads and is saturated with vehicle exhaust) and useable (most ped/bike paths have no lights and are thus often more dangerous to use than streets without markings or bicycle lanes).</p> <p data-bbox="1241 1107 1976 1300">Defining bicycle boulevards, increasing signage and lighting for bicycle routes, improving access to public transit for bicyclists and finishing the Hot Metal bridge are all examples of projects that could be completed for a fraction of the cost of other transportation improvements.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 1343 1976 1403">1% for bicycles and pedestrians seems like a reasonable goal...</p>

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
<i>Response:</i>	<p>Pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects appear in both Appendix 1 and Appendix 5 to the Transportation Improvement Program. More than 100 individual pedestrian and bicycle projects are identified. In addition, SPC is working with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		
Bike Transportation for Commuting	<p>These documents fail to address the true potential for bike transportation to be a major force in commuting. Bikes can be a transportation tool, not just recreational equipment.</p>	Allegheny County	<p><i>Andrew Twigg</i></p> <p>In Chicago, there has been a major commitment to making the city very bike friendly. It is easy to use a bicycle as a way to commute to and from work. There are ample bike trails and bike lanes. The mayor recently unveiled a plan to make Chicago the most bike-friendly city in the US by 2015 ( <a href="http://www.chibikefed.org/content.php?id=878_0_16_0_C">http://www.chibikefed.org/content.php?id=878_0_16_0_C</a> )While it is probably not realistic for the Pittsburgh metro area to have similar ambitions, it is a real possibility that the region can make bike transportation a more viable option for more people. Please consider the potential for bike transport while reviewing these plans and making any revisions.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>SPC, local planning partners and bicycling groups are working cooperatively to enhance the bicycling experience in the region, for both bicycle commuters and recreational riders.</p>		
Bike/Ped Coordinator	<p>The city/county needs to hire a Ped/Bike Coordinator.</p>	Allegheny County	<p><i>Lou Fineberg</i></p> <p>Most other cities have this position and it is not a coincidence that there ped/bike programs are superior. If the city/county is interested in promoting a high quality of life then they need to take ped/bike issues seriously.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>This comment will be shared with the City of Pittsburgh and the County of Allegheny for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Bike/Pedestrian Trails	Bike/Pedestrian Trails on Roads Near Trailheads	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1640 215"><i>Roy Weil, Free Wheeling Easy</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1927 358">I suggest a PennDOT/SPC policy that any road work, within one mile of a bicycle trail head, include serious consideration of a bike path to connect trails in the region.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 407 1944 605">The regional trail network is a regional asset, and one that SPC strives to support through the Transportation Enhancements and other similar programs. SPC works with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		
Butler-Freeport Community Trail/Butler Connection	The Butler-Freeport Community Trail is a 20 mile long rails-to-trail project located in southeastern Butler County. Since the inception of the trail in 1991, a total of 16 miles have been completed from Freeport Borough in Armstrong County to the Village of Herman in Summit Township, Butler County.	Butler County	<p data-bbox="1241 626 1881 686"><i>Ronald Bennett, Butler-Freeport Community Trail Council, President</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 699 1976 1268">Completion of this important project was delayed for 10 years due to a protracted legal dispute that ultimately was decided in favor of the trail. Past portions of this project were funded by ISTEPA and TEA-21. Local governments and our all-volunteer organization have continued with maintenance and minor improvements over the years. We currently have a DCNR grant for the planning of the final segment from Herman in Summit Township into the Butler City- We are also in the planning stages of a capital campaign to raise funds that would be used to provide the local match. Inclusion of this final segment in your program would provide the connectivity of alternate transportation and recreational opportunities for over eight municipalities plus the surrounding region. Additional planning is being discussed to further extend the trail into the heart of the City of Butler as part of the city's revitalization plans.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1317 1934 1409">Projects funded under the DCNR Recreational Trail program are generally not included in the regional Transportation Improvement Program. The Butler-Freeport Community Trail is included in our regional trail network, and is included in SPC's multimodal transportation plan.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
City/County Bicycle Transit Improvements	More funding for projects that improve bike transit.	Pittsburgh City	<p data-bbox="1228 186 1459 219"><i>Douglas Placais</i></p> <p data-bbox="1228 227 1992 633">I wish to see money allocated for projects that increase the number of bikeways (especially on road bike-lanes - of which Pittsburgh has exceedingly few, as well as off road trails such as the Montour Trail). I would also appreciate increased signage to raise awareness of bicyclists. In addition I believe that an expansion of existing road shoulders (perhaps by changing streetside parking) would facilitate bicycle movement. Funding would also be well allocated for advertising suggesting bicycle transportation in urban areas through out the area. With more people on bicycles, the air quality (which is currently dismal) will improve.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="367 673 1992 846">The establishment of safe pedestrian and bicycle accommodation across the Monongahela River and the connection of the South Side and the Eliza Furnace Trail have been among the region's top bicycle priorities in recent years. The "LET" that you refer to indicates that the adequate funding for this project has been secured, and that a construction contract has been issued. Construction on a pedestrian/bicycle only bridge cantilevered off the existing Hot Metal Bridge, is scheduled to be underway in 2006. As such, the project is not included in the 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Focus on Ped/Bike Projects	Focus effectively on pedestrians and cyclists on all projects.	SPC Region	<p data-bbox="1241 186 1436 214"><i>Edward Engler</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1978 625">I'd like to encourage the organizations involved in this TIP to focus effectively on pedestrians and cyclists on all projects. With the heavy burden cars put on our environment and economy, we need to make every effort to make walking and cycling safe and easy for all Pennsylvanians. Such activities reduce the traffic burden on the existing roads, reduce air pollution and improve the health of our citizens. Please be sure to weigh the needs of existing and potential walkers and cyclers in our infrastructure. If it is easier and safer to ride or walk, more people would do it. Thanks for your attention!</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 678 1978 808">Pedestrian and bicycle are key elements of a multimodal regional transportation system. In recent years, SPC has worked with Bike Pittsburgh, PennDOT and other regional partners in the establishment of policy and practices that result in the consideration of pedestrian and bicycle transportation needs into every transportation project during project development. We continue to advance the region's non-motorized transportation options.</p>		
Glenwood Bridge Ped/Bike Crossing	Trails exist to the north and south sides of the Glenwood Bridge and a bikeway on the bridge would greatly enhance the use of these trails.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 824 1428 852"><i>Lois Liberman</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 867 1978 930">Would you please reallocate funds to create the planned Glenwood Bridge bike/pedestrian crossing.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1003 1978 1133">The funds for the planned Glenwood Bridge bicycle and pedestrian crossing were reallocated to another important project in the region. The programming of funds for the installation of such access on the Glenwood Bridge is inadvisable at this time, due to the impeding construction activities associated with the construction of the Mon-Fayette Expressway in this vicinity.</p>		
Greene Trail Phase 3	Phase 3 of the Greene River Trail, which follows the Mon River from Washington County line through Cumberland Township.	Greene County	<p data-bbox="1241 1154 1978 1216"><i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1230 1766 1260">Phase 2 is on the TIP but phase 3 is not.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1333 1978 1432">Phase IB was completed in the 2005-2008 TIP, and will therefore not be included in the 2007-2010 TIP. Phase II and Phase III of the Greene River Trail are both included in Appendix 5 of the 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program, in which projects eligible for the newly established Transportation Enhancements Line Item are identified.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Hot Metal Bridge	Convert the bridge to a pedestrian/bicycle connector along the northern banks of the Monongahela River.	Pittsburgh City	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1451 215"><i>Douglas Placais</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1976 558">Although I noticed an allocation for the Hot Metal Bridge with the LET designation, I don't know if this refers to the development of a bike and pedestrian addition or what "LET" means. I believe it is important to provide a safe crossing area over the Hot Metal Bridge for both bicycles and pedestrians, as this is one of the best ways into the South Side from Oakland and other nearby areas and the current bridge layout provides no room for bicyclists or pedestrians to cross safely without the threat of being clipped or hit by cars.</p> <p data-bbox="191 610 1976 672"><i>Response:</i> This project does not need to appear on the draft 2007-2010 TIP because the City of Pittsburgh has already committed the funding to accommodate construction of a pedestrian/bicycle facility using the bridge.</p>
Lack of Pedestrian Safety on SR 21 in Waynesburg	Main concern is for pedestrian safety in Waynesburg.	Greene County	<p data-bbox="1241 721 1545 748"><i>Janna Kisner, Resident</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 761 1976 1029">There is no place for pedestrians to safely cross Route 21 at the intersection by the McDonalds in Waynesburg. Personally, I live within an easy walk or bicycle ride to these same businesses. I would enjoy the opportunity to get there safely without using my car. At the present time it is not safe. There is actually a sign there that says no pedestrian crossing. That is so ridiculous and shameful.</p> <p data-bbox="191 1075 1976 1136"><i>Response:</i> SPC will contact the County of Greene and the PennDOT District 12 Pedestrian-Bicycle Coordinator to determine if this intersection, or one near it, can be better designed to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles.</p>

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Lack of quality bicycle planning	<p>By my count, there are only 3 TIP projects aimed towards improving bike access between Allegheny County and City of Pittsburgh draft recommendations (Bike Racks in City of PGH, SPC Bike Suitability Map, and Montour Trail Phase 1). For 2007, the total money allocated is a paltry \$72,520. As an avid bike commuter from the South Hills, this is a woeful amount of money and solves zero problems facing those willing to commute more frequently and enjoy the beauty of the city from something other than an auto but hesitate because of lack of reasonably SAFE road access much less bike lines, wider and better quality shoulders, better route and safety signage. There is nothing in this plan that makes progress towards providing safe access in and around the city much less moving Pittsburgh up from the bottom of the ranks for biking support and access.</p>	Allegheny County	<p><i>Chuck Schardong</i>  <i>Chuck Schardong</i>  For the SPC Bike Suitability Map project, you really ought to look into partnering with those already performing similar projects. I'd recommend that you take a look at the group developing MapHub (<a href="http://www.maphub.org/">http://www.maphub.org/</a>) if you haven't already. They have an application that is being used by Bike PGH! to collect information from cyclists about where they were hit or injured around the City of Pittsburgh. It shouldn't be too difficult to use the mapping capabilities to extend to identifying suitable bicycle routes [including the enhancements I'm recommending to the West End ;)].</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>Pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects appear in both Appendix 1 and Appendix 5 to the Transportation Improvement Program. More than 100 individual pedestrian and bicycle projects are identified. In addition, SPC is working with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Need Better Access for Ped/Bike	Supports Pedestrian/Bicycle project solutions to ease in access from here to there.	Allegheny County	<p><i>Mary Shaw, Free Wheeling Easy</i></p> <p>These type of projects seem to get placed on a shelf somewhere and rarely completed.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>The continuing development of the regional trail network illustrates that not all projects end up on a shelf, but are, in fact, implemented, and then used as stepping stones for further development. The region has typically provided on-road bicycle accommodation in conjunction with more comprehensive roadway rehabilitation or construction projects. As such, the timeline of the larger, more comprehensive roadway rehabilitation project is the controlling factor in project implementation.</p>		
Need More Community Trails	Need More Community Trails	Allegheny County	<p><i>Joy Sabl</i></p> <p>When driving to Philadelphia, there is a noticeable change to a more biking friendly than car travel atmosphere in the city. Could we use the demise of the Mon-Fayette Expressway Project to help revitalize our communities by focusing on trail connections to connect neighborhoods?</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>The regional trail network is a regional asset, and one that SPC strives to support through the Transportation Enhancements and other similar programs. SPC works with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		
Needs of Commuter and Recreational Bicyclists	More signage and better travel lanes in the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.	Allegheny County	<p><i>Alida Schleyer</i></p> <p>Take bicyclists into consideration in planning TIP projects by including more signage and better travel lanes.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>SPC is working with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Needs of Commuter and Recreational Bicyclists	More signage and better travel lanes in the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1430 220"><i>Titus Schleyer</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1913 326">Take bicyclists into consideration in planning TIP projects by including more signage and better travel lanes.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 375 1955 537">SPC is working with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		
Ped/Bike Elements	Ped/Bike elements should be included in the Long Range Plan.	Indiana County	<p data-bbox="1241 561 1808 594"><i>Linda Gwinn, Blairsville Improvement Group</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 602 1976 967">With the West Penn Trail and the Hoodlebug Trail, both funded and designed, and merging in Downtown Blairsville, the Bike/Ped Training manual addresses the fact that bike/ped elements should be included in some type of long range transportation plan. Especially if the bike/ped component has been identified in a Master Site Plan. The Southern Indiana County Comprehensive Multi-municipal Plan and the DCNR funded Blairsville Greenspace Master Site Plan both identify the strong bike/ped component of the Borough of Blairsville and the surrounding Township.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1016 1976 1211">The 2030 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania has a pedestrian-bicycle component, and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is a critical component in the regional multimodal transportation system. SPC has worked closely with PennDOT to encourage the adoption and implementation of the Pedestrian-Bicycle checklists, and has worked with community groups to increase their awareness of this planning tool. SPC will work with BIG, the Counties of Indiana and Westmoreland, and PennDOT Districts 10 and 12 to ensure that highway projects in the vicinity of the local nexus of regional trails accommodates pedestrian and bicycle transportation needs.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Ped/Bike Focus on TIP/LRP Projects	Ped/Bike Focus on TIP/LRP Projects	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 186 1415 214"><i>Lou Fineberg</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1955 391">There do not seem to be a whole lot of projects on the TIP or LRP that focus on the Ped/Bike Transportation needs. These needs should be taken into consideration for any road projects including shoulder paving and routine maintenance, with ped/bike signage notices.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 440 1955 670">Pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects appear in both Appendix 1 and Appendix 5 to the Transportation Improvement Program. More than 100 individual pedestrian and bicycle projects are identified. In addition, SPC is working with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		
Ped/Bike Issues	Ped/Bike issues need to be reviewed/taken into account on all TIP projects and not just an after thought.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 691 1623 719"><i>Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 732 1919 797">Our priority is to connect neighborhoods and trails to change the way people think and act.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 846 1955 974">Pedestrian and bicycle are key elements of a multimodal regional transportation system. In recent years, SPC has worked with Bike Pittsburgh, PennDOT and other regional partners in the establishment of policy and practices that result in the consideration of pedestrian and bicycle transportation needs into every transportation project during project development. We continue to advance the region's non-motorized transportation options.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Please Make Bikes/Biking A Priority	Please Make Bikes/Biking A Priority	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1423 215"><i>Melody Farrin</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1976 594">There is no better way to improve the quality of life in the region than to make bike riding safe, accessible, and a viable mode of transportation in the Pittsburgh area. It is cost-effective, healthy, attractive to young people and especially new-comers to the area, good for the environment, a great form of transportation, and fun! Please help make bikes and bike riding a priority. We need more bike lanes and routes, wider bike paths and shoulders, areas for locking bikes safely--to name just a few. It's about time the Pittsburgh region took biking seriously, and included it in transportation plans.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 646 1948 841">The regional trail network is a regional asset, and one that SPC strives to support through the Transportation Enhancements and other similar programs. SPC works with PennDOT, city and county planning partners, and local bicycle groups to assess the need for bicycle amenities on roadways throughout the region. As highway and bridge projects advance through the Transportation Improvement Program, they are routinely evaluated for the need for bicycle accommodation. Where such improvements are warranted, PennDOT and local planning partners work diligently to include bicycle accommodations in the roadway design.</p>		
Waynesburg Streetscape Phase II	Waynesburg Streetscape Phase II	Greene County	<p data-bbox="1241 862 1948 922"><i>Robbie Matesic, Greene County Dept. of Planning and Development, Director</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 935 1923 997">Phase I of this project has been funded and they are looking to fund Phase II.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1049 1392 1076">Phase I of this project has been funded and they are looking to fund Phase II.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Chicora Bridge Safety Improvements	Six wooden railroad bridges are in need of replacement. The old wooden structures sit on mud sills and are not built to handle modern, heavy 286,000-pound rail cars. The request for funding includes replacement of wooden bridge No. 433 on the Petrolia Branch. The 529-foot bridge, located at MP 52.9, crosses a township road.	Butler County	<p><i>Jerry Vest, Buffalo &amp; Pittsburgh Railroad, Vice President</i></p> <p>These bridges are located along the Buffalo &amp; Pittsburgh Railroad Petrolia Branch, which extends 15 miles north out of Butler, Pennsylvania in Butler County. This branch line serves three plants owned by Sonneborn (formerly Crompton Corp.), Indspec Chemical and Penreco. The Sonneborn and Penreco plants are oil refineries. The Indspec plant is one of only several in the world that produces a product called Resorcinol, which is an industrial adhesive. These three companies heavily depend on continued rail service. They are major employers in northern Butler County, employing approximately 1,000 people. The BPRR moves chemicals and petroleum products into and out of these facilities each day.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The SPC region is home to 1,500 miles of active rail line, and the region's rail freight network is a key component of the region's multimodal transportation system. SPC is working with PennDOT and others in the identification of rail infrastructure needs and funding options to ensure the continued viability of these important regional assets. A Rail Freight Utilization Study will be completed by SPC in the coming year to identify and prioritize regional rail assets.		
Rail Traffic Safety Improvements	Complete rehabilitation of approximately 24 miles of railroad in Indiana County necessary to service the Edison Mission Energy Homer City generating station.	Indiana County	<p><i>Jerry Vest, Buffalo &amp; Pittsburgh Railroad, Vice President</i></p> <p>This project is very important to maintain efficient and safe delivery of coal to this very important generating station. Approximately 1 million tons of coal annual can be converted from highway to rail delivery, removing approximately 40,000 truck shipments per year from the regional highway network. This will dramatically improve highway safety and air quality. Also, reconstruction of the line will result in significant improvements to numerous highway grade crossings on the line.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The SPC region is home to 1,500 miles of active rail line, and the region's rail freight network is a key component of the region's multimodal transportation system. SPC is working with PennDOT and others in the identification of rail infrastructure needs and funding options to ensure the continued viability of these important regional assets. A Rail Freight Utilization Study will be completed by SPC in the coming year to identify and prioritize regional rail assets.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Regenerate the River Corridors	Regenerate the River Corridors	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1703 220"><i>Bud Paulding, Guyasuta Fellowship</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1961 253">We need to revitalize the existing rail lines on the rivers.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 310 1961 407">The SPC region is home to 1,500 miles of active rail line, two Class I (national) and approximately 20 shortline and regional railroads. As such, many of the region's rail lines are in active use for freight operations. Anticipated demand for freight movement is expected to rise sharply over the next 20 years.</p>		
Trains and Railway Systems Re-instated	Trains and Railway Systems Re-instated	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 423 1423 456"><i>Doris D. Loud</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 464 1976 699">I would like to go on record as saying and join with those that want to see the trains and railway systems re-instated. Yes, a lot of money would be involved in putting them back, but they should never have been dismantled and we should be using this mode of transportation. It's hard to believe it would cost more than the "Mon-Fayette boondoggle."</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 740 1961 837">The SPC region is home to 1,500 miles of active rail line, two Class I (national) and approximately 20 shortline and regional railroads. As such, many of the region's rail lines are in active use for freight operations. Anticipated demand for freight movement is expected to rise sharply over the next 20 years.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
MFE Phase Changes and Logical Termini	D. The last M/F and S/B Financial Plan submitted to SPC and endorsed by SPC in the 2030 LRP reported the M/F'S Uniontown to Brownsville Segment at \$446 million. This 2007-2010 TIP reports a cost of \$276 million including construction costs of \$216 million for Phase I. Joe Brimmier from the PTC stated, during the Urban Land Institute May 2006 PTC Presentation, that the PTC only has funds for the next three years for the M/F and S/B.	Allegheny County	<p><i>Dave McGuirk, Citizens for Alternatives to New Toll Roads</i></p> <p>How can the TIP list only partial construction funding costs for this phase? Isn't Logical Termini under NEPA a requirement? How is ending a four lane expressway at a two lane road Logical Termini? How can the ROW costs listed in the TIP only total \$6.2 million? Is this Phase only partially funded? How can the ROW costs on the previous 2005-2008 TIP list ROW costs at \$7.6 million vs. \$6.2 million in this TIP?</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>The MFE Uniontown to Brownsville section will be constructed as Phase One and Phase Two projects. Phase One is anticipated to be completed within the TIP period. Phase Two is scheduled beyond the TIP period. The PTC met the NEPA standard for Logical Termini in the approved project EIS, which includes both project phases and a planned four lane expressway extending the entire corridor. The listed ROW costs includes only the costs remaining in the Draft TIP period after initial ROW purchases in the current TIP period. The ROW phase (Phase I) is fully funded. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon Fayette Expressway Total Costs	<p>II. Appendix 4 in the TIP. Turnpike Project List. A. The Mon/Fayette and Southern Beltway in this TIP report total costs of \$601 to \$608 million. B. During a phone conversation with FHWA'S Tony Mento the week of July 16, he stated the projects total cost was listed in the 2007-2010 TIP. This is not the case. The Turnpike TIP sheets are attached. C. Please reference the attached March 23, 2006 letter to Mr. Gary Hoffman at PennDot from FHWA's David Cough, the third paragraph. Summarizing: The Mon/Fayette to Pgh's Y.O.E. (Year of Expenditure) cost of \$3.65 billion must be accurately portrayed on all documents in all meetings with decision makers and others (the public) during updates to all TIPS, LRP'S, Programs and general correspondence.</p>	Allegheny County	<p><i>Dave McGuirk, Citizens for Alternatives to New Toll Roads</i></p> <p>Since TIPs precede LRP's, why wasn't this Y.O.E. cost of \$3.65 billion for the Mon/Fayette to Pgh portrayed in the 2007-2010 TIP? When I requested a Mon/Fayette and Southern Beltway cost update from SPC in April, May and July of 2006, was I told it will be in the 2007-2010 TIP.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>The 2007-2010 TIP includes \$601 million in estimated MFE/SB project expenditures and \$608 million in remaining available PTC funds for the projects. SPC has been consistent in presenting the MFE/SB Financial Plan / Total Costs in its 2030 Long Range Plan. The PTC includes by reference the MFE/SB Total Costs in their presentation of information in Appendix 4 of the Draft TIP. SPC's LRP update and the PTC's next revision of the MFE/SB Financial Plan will each have to comply with the SAFETEA-LU requirement to calculate project costs in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars, but the current project financial plan is not affected by the YOE provision. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1236 186 1703 219"><i>Bud Paulding, Guyasuta Fellowship</i></p> <p data-bbox="1236 228 1917 326">Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="388 375 1948 576">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1478 220"><i>Christina Duranko</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1976 423">While the toll road may cost three billion dollars in 2006, the cost escalation by the time of its completion will be substantially increased. I am not willing to have gasoline tax increases, nor am I willing to sacrifice other regional transportation projects to fund this outmoded method of commuting.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 431 1976 902">I would like for the PTC to abandon this project and stop the waste of money going to the Southern Beltway as well. Their current plan to acquire property with no money to build is unconscionable. With no predictable increase in population in the region, there ' is no reason to promote sprawl to outlying areas. Invest in local infrastructure and upgrade existing problem areas. These PTC toll roads contribute to sprawl, divide neighborhoods, negatively impact riverfronts for the public, overwhelm trail and wildlife corridor development, and degrade air and water quality. Money spent promoting neighborhood businesses does more for economic development than adding additional PTC paving.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 951 1948 1146">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1218 178 1449 219"><i>David Hamburg</i></p> <p data-bbox="1218 219 1995 462">As indicated in your long range Planning and TIP reports, funding for the toll road is very elusive or onexistent. The Pa transportation infrastructure is in dire need of repair and improvement. The safety of our highways and bridges are suspect. Public transportation is constantly in need of additional funds to meet escalating operation costs.</p> <p data-bbox="1218 462 1995 592">Please terminate these costly and frivolous design studies, property acquisitions, and strategic political positioning for the Mon-Fayette Toll Road, boondoggle "Pipe Dream".</p> <p data-bbox="1218 592 1995 665">The Commonwealth should focus on its needs rather than intangible aspirations.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="378 706 1995 912">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1409 220"><i>Irv Liberman</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1969 561">SPC must focus on our highest priority endeavor of maintaining and upgrading our roads, bridges and mass transit system. As I understand it, we are many billions short of the funds needed. To even consider building new roads, such as the multi-billion dollar Mon-Fayette Expressway Tollroad is financially irresponsible. In addition, the Mon-Fayette should not be built as it removes riverfront utility, removes property from the tax base of cities, destroys communities through which it passes, and encourages sprawl.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 570 1969 829">In learning of Boston's devastating road construction problems, there is a parallel between their Big Dig (now costing \$14.6 B and climbing) and the Mon-Fayette and Southern Beltway. There is little doubt in my mind that the cost of the remainder of the Mon-Fayette (estimated to be more expensive than the initial estimate for the Big Dig of \$2.6 B) will also mushroom, and that many "unforeseen" problems will also occur.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 837 1969 935">It is time to say the end to the Mon-Fayette a-nd remove this Damocles Sword from the head of the communities along its path.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1514 215"><i>Jonathan B. Robison</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1969 423">Concerned about the ability of the Turnpike Commission to fully fund the project that is currently \$4 billion in total cost and still counting. There is no Tooth Fairy that will show up to fully fund this project. The TIP should not contain any funding from Allegheny County to support this project.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 475 1948 672">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 695 1419 722"><i>Kate St. John</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 735 1969 1166">The Mon-Fayette is in the TIP because of (1) Federal requirements (2) regional planning &amp; (3) air quality conformity. CONSAD 's 5/10/06 report demonstrates there is no money to complete the Mon-Fayette but as long as it's in the TIP/plan and "assumed" to be going forward, the Mon Valley will never get any real transportation improvements from SPC. SPC does not include projects in its basic TIP for which there is no money. The Mon-Fayette and Southern Beltway should be removed from all parts of the TIP until it has money for completion. And the Turnpike Commission should not be allowed to acquire land until they have the money to complete the road</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1214 1948 1378">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1409 220"><i>L.A. Graham</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1980 967">Please fix the region's infrastructure first. Make certain that pedestrian routes connect, hiking trails connect, and that habitat corridors are enhanced and incorporated into the fabric of a system for wildlife connectivity. Please do not destroy habitat corridors. I am sure someone on your staff recalls the bear that found and used the habitat corridor from Highland Park to Whitaker. The Mon-Fayette Toll Road is a bad idea from the 1950s that can't seem to die a natural death. As the Pittsburgh region clamors for increased transit options; bridges without gaping holes; increased bicycling, pedestrian, and trail amenities; and a system that works, the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and elected officials like Senator Barry Stout continue to push the \$3.5 billion Toll Road. According to a recent report from the Urban Land institute, the money to build the Mon Fayette and Southern Beltways is not there. The difference now is that the Turnpike Commission is admitting the money isn't there. They don't know where to get the money either. Gas tax increase? Not likely. Federal earmarks? Not realistic. Sell off the road to a private organization? Far-fetched.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 976 1980 1170">Residents of the region as well as tourists throughout the United States will welcome fiscal accountability. SPC's emphasis needs to be transportation that works: biking, pedestrians, no new roads, habitat corridor connectivity. In other words, fix it first while enhancing quality of life.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 186 1423 214"><i>Lois Liberman</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1965 488">SPC needs to emphasize a fix-it-first mentality over new construction and remove the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the Plans and focus on mass transit issues and re-development of the water front areas. The MFE would severely impact the Jewish Home for the Aged in Squirrel Hill and will reduce the City of Pittsburgh's population and destroy the walk able/livable communities concept.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 542 1948 737">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 760 1392 787"><i>M. A. Sivak</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 802 1948 1094">Please put the Mon Fayette and Southern Beltway toll roads to rest. There is no money to build and there are other transportation issues that are more needed such as: fix infrastructure first; upgrade and expand public mass transit; establish and maintain trails and continuous habitat corridors, which would attract knowledge workers to Pittsburgh. These needs and amenities promote economic development, not more new roads.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 1148 1948 1343">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1713 220"><i>Marilyn Skolnick, PPP &amp; Sierra Club</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1955 391">The remainder of the Mon/Fayette plan should be removed. After reading the CONSAD REPORT, it is abundantly clear the there will never be enough money to complete the project. Now is the time for SPC to consider and plan for realistic alternatives.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 440 1955 643">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 659 1671 691"><i>Mary Shaw, Free Wheeling Easy</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 699 1919 797">Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 846 1955 1049">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1465 215"><i>Nathan Melamed</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1934 423">I am opposed to building of this toll road as too expensive and not worth the presumed and highly questionable benefits of limited value and doubtful economic benefit to the effected communities. Will more likely result in a redistribution of business rather than a stimulant for new business.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 475 1948 672">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		
Mon-Fayette Toll Road and Southern Beltway	Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 695 1549 722"><i>Peter Wray, Sierra Club</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 735 1913 829">Stop any additional construction of the new tolled expressway in Mon Valley and northern Washington County.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="390 878 1948 1075">The State Legislature provides the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission with the authority and funding to build new tolled expressways through state law; Act 61 of 1985 provided for the Mon/Fayette Project and Act 26 of 1991 added the Southern Beltway. This is independent from SPC's authority under federal law, SAFETEA-LU, which relates to federal funding and process-related transportation planning issues. The MFE/SB projects comply with every federal requirement that SPC has the authority to review. The Federal Highway Administration concurs with this assessment. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Southern Beltway Project Cost Changes	E. The Southern Beltway Projects are listed on the TIP as follows: US 22 to I-79: Engineering - \$35 million. ROW - \$20 million. Total - \$55 million. I-79 to Mon/Fayette: Engineering - \$36 million. ROW - \$3 million. Total - \$39 million. However the 2005-2008 TIP lists the following for these Projects: US 22 to I-79: Total - \$76 million. I-79 to Mon/Fayette: Total - \$65 million.	Allegheny County	<i>Dave McGuirk, Citizens for Alternatives to New Toll Roads</i> Why have the costs gone down?
<i>Response:</i>	The 2005-2008 TIP provided information on estimated project phase expenditures anticipated within the four year period. The project cost estimates in the 2007-2010 TIP do not include expended costs from previous TIP periods. The project cost estimates in the 2007-2010 TIP represent the distribution of remaining revenues available to the PTC to expend on these project phases. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.		
Southern Beltway Right-of-Way Costs	The 2005-2008 TIP reports the ROW costs are only "partially funded".	Allegheny County	<i>Dave McGuirk, Citizens for Alternatives to New Toll Roads</i> Why doesn't this Draft TIP include this explanation? Don't the impacted citizens of Washington County and key decisions makers need to know if these listed ROW costs on the 2007-2010 TIP are only partially or fully funded? How can a phase only be partially funded and allowed to be on the TIP? Please reference the attached FHWA/DOT Regulations: Page 112-Section (E): Only Projects for which construction and operating funds may be included. Projects included on the TIP'S first two years shall be limited to those with available or committed funds.
<i>Response:</i>	The estimated expenditures for the project phases of the Southern Beltway Projects within the 2007-2010 TIP period are not fully funded. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Southern Beltway Total Cost	<p><i>Response:</i> The PTC includes in the Draft TIP by reference the PTC's MFE/SB Financial Plan as provided in the SPC 2030 Long Range Plan. The PTC TIP submission is presented in Appendix 4 of the Draft TIP. The next update to the PTC MFE/SB Financial Plan required by the planning regulations would be a revised financial plan required as part of the SPC Long Range Plan update, which is scheduled for completion by June 2007. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>	Allegheny County	<p><i>Dave McGuirk, Citizens for Alternatives to New Toll Roads</i></p> <p>What are the Southern Beltway's total cost including all phases?</p>
Total TIP Cost including Turnpike Projects	<p>I. The 2007-2010 TIP is out of compliance. SPC doesn't have the software to provide a project's total cost that includes all project phases. Please reference the attached FHWA/DOT Regulations: Page 112-113. Paragraph G (2). Paragraph G: "with respect to each project under paragraph G - (F) of this section, the TIP shall include: (2) estimated total cost." The 2007-2010 TIP is programmed at an estimated \$1.376 Billion. (TIP Appendix 1-Page 1).</p>	Allegheny County	<p><i>Dave McGuirk, Citizens for Alternatives to New Toll Roads</i></p> <p>What is the total TIP cost if all the projects including the Turnpike Projects are completed?</p>
	<p><i>Response:</i> As stated in the comment, the TIP Cost for the Highway Program for projects and phases programmed during the four year TIP period is \$1.376 billion which includes only those projects funded with SPC's allocation of federal and state formula funds. In the same table (Appendix I of the Draft TIP) the Total TIP Cost is \$1.579 billion, the higher number including several additional categories of federal and PennDOT funds that the federal law, SAFETEA-LU provides SPC with the authority to program in the TIP. These totals are fiscally constrained to the anticipated amount of available federal revenue and required matching funds that SPC proposes to program on TIP projects between 2007 and 2010. An estimated \$820 million in additional federal funds and the required match will be needed in future TIPs to complete the TIP projects. The additional federal and matching funds that will be needed are identified in the SPC 2030 Long Range Plan, and meet federal requirements for fiscal constraint. The PTC includes in the Draft TIP by reference the PTC's MFE/SB Financial Plan as provided in the SPC 2030 Long Range Plan. The PTC TIP submission is presented in Appendix 4 of the Draft TIP. The next update to the PTC MFE/SB Financial Plan required by the planning regulations would be a revised financial plan required as part of the SPC Long Range Plan update, which is scheduled for completion by June 2007. Your comment has been forwarded to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for their consideration.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Public Comment Process A Waste of Time	Public Comment Process A Waste of Time	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1228 186 1501 219"><i>Andrea Boykowycz</i></p> <p data-bbox="1228 227 2001 462">The documents are hard to understand and the website is hard to use. Also, there has been no time at all to review the document making it difficult to comment in a meaningful way. SPC has not demonstrated that the collection of public comments will in any way change the Draft TIP making this a waste of time. The Panels need to develop direct lines of input into this process.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="367 503 2001 745">SPC continues to commit extensive resources to making the TIP materials understandable and widely available. SPC staff, PennDOT staff, transit agency staff and county planning department staff were available at each of the ten public meetings and made every effort to address questions that were raised and assist the public in their review of the transportation program. The June-July public meetings were just the latest element of an extensive public participation process that solicited public input in developing the TIP as early as July 2005. SPC's public comment process does not rely on oral testimony at a single meeting alone; rather, it provides at least 10 meetings as well as many other ways of accessing technical assistance from staff, reviewing the TIP, and submitting comments.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
2030 Long Range Plan Comments	2030 Long Range Plan Comments	Pittsburgh City	<p data-bbox="1236 188 1451 220"><i>Douglas Placais</i></p> <p data-bbox="1236 228 1976 1166">In regard to the 2030 Long Range Plan I have some comments. In Part 3 Transportation under Chapter 8, there are many excellent ideas for improving alternative transportation including walking and bicycling. However, unlike some of the other sections, there are no concrete goals, projects, or funding provisions. It states things like "SPC will work with volunteer groups, municipalities, counties, and PENNDOT to identify roadway deficiencies and address them promptly. Establishing an Internet-based system of links for the prompt identification of unsafe roadway conditions should be investigated, as should the establishment of a Spot Improvement Program fund. PENNDOT will be encouraged to provide staff support for bicycle/pedestrian coordinator functions at the district level. At the state level, PENNDOT will be encouraged to provide greater support for regional pedestrian and bicycle coordination efforts." but fails to propose actual initiatives to do so, meanwhile in Chapter 4 Highways for the City of Pittsburgh, details, progress and funding in millions of dollars are given. We need a similar formatting for alternative transportation initiatives. It's not good enough to say SPC will work with PENNDOT to try to improve roads. The improvements must be listed and funds allocated. Perhaps I misunderstand the role of the LRP, but it seems to me that it would be appropriate to devise actual bicycle and pedestrian projects, then fund and implement them.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p data-bbox="388 1214 1976 1414">SPC Pedestrian-Bicycle Committee helps staff set and achieve pedestrian and bicycle goals. The SPC website has a roadway/trail condition reporting mechanism (<a href="http://www.spcregion.org/trans_pedbike.shtml">http://www.spcregion.org/trans_pedbike.shtml</a>) and a link to that tool from the Bike Pittsburgh website is currently under development. There is a Pedestrian-Bicycle Coordinator at each PennDOT District, and SPC staff works closely with them. The Long Range Plan sets the 20 year vision for the region, and as such, is not necessarily the proper vehicle for the specific types of recommendations that you note. Pedestrian and bicycle projects are included in the Enhancements Line Item in the Draft TIP.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Consider Elderly When Planning TIP Projects	Please consider the special needs of the older population groups when prioritizing projects.	Allegheny County	<i>Evelyn Parker</i> We are more dependant on public transportation and safety considerations to access that transportation.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC continues to consider the special needs of the elderly, as evidenced by four Commission actions since December 2003 to flex highway funds to regional transit service providers to address the needs of the elderly and other special needs populations.		
Fix It First Policy	A FIX IT FIRST guiding principal until all the roads and bridges are fixed first.	Allegheny County	<i>Marilyn Skolnick, PPP &amp; Sierra Club</i> It is obvious that there is not enough money to even maintain the existing system in a good working condition. Then why is not FIX IT FIRST the guiding principal until all the roads and bridges are fixed first?
<i>Response:</i>	First priority in the Draft TIP is directed at maintaining the existing transportation system. SPC has attained in the Draft TIP its stated policy of investing at least 80% of TIP dollars in preservation of the existing transportation system. The SPC and PennDOT policy of giving top priority to maintaining the existing transportation system does not prohibit projects that increase the capacity of the system.		
Lack of Notice Concerning Public Comment	Lack of Notice Concerning Public Comment	Allegheny County	<i>Bud Paulding, Guyasuta Fellowship</i> Due to a lack of notice concerning the Public Comment, I suggest that there be another meeting held to accept testimony after sufficient time is provided to read the documents.
<i>Response:</i>	SPC continues to commit extensive resources to making the TIP materials understandable and widely available. SPC staff, PennDOT staff, transit agency staff and county planning department staff were available at each of the ten public meetings and made every effort to address questions that were raised and assist the public in their review of the transportation program. The June-July public meetings were just the latest element of an extensive public participation process that solicited public input in developing the TIP as early as July 2005. SPC's public comment process does not rely on oral testimony at a single meeting alone; rather, it provides at least 10 meetings as well as many other ways of accessing technical assistance from staff, reviewing the TIP, and submitting comments.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Land Use/Environmental Justice Impacts	What are the Land Use/Environmental Justice impacts to these projects?	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 188 1709 215"><i>Marilyn Skolnick, PPP &amp; Sierra Club</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1980 488">As a regular observer of the Technical Committee, it is apparent that all the representatives try very hard to present projects that they believe to be necessary for their county ( and Pittsburgh). However, we, never at these meetings, hear about the land use impacts or the environmental justice impacts for each project. Are these not just as important as the engineering and funding issues?</p>
<i>Response:</i>	On a project level basis, consideration of land use and environmental justice impacts are conducted in the Environmental Impact Assessment. SPC conducts comprehensive assessments of the benefits and burdens of the regional transportation program and the planning processes that drive the program in association with each update of the TIP and the Long Range Plan. This effort culminates in the preparation of an Environmental Justice Report for the region.		
Major Urban Sprawl Problem	SPC's Long Range Plan must consider land use plans to try and control the urban sprawl problem.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 691 1551 719"><i>Peter Wray, Sierra Club</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 732 1980 794">SPC's Long Range Plan must consider land use plans to try and control the urban sprawl problem.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	While land use controls are a municipal government function, SPC continues to work with member governments to promote the interconnection of transportation and land use in studies such as the Rt. 30 Master Plan Study.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Point-to-Point Transfer Company		Butler County	<p><i>Sonya Lenz, Airport Orbit, Inc.</i></p> <p>I would like to inform you that AIRPORT ORBIT, INC., my transportation service in Butler County (operating throughout Butler, Clarion, Lawrence, Mercer, Venango, and Crawford counties) which provides transport to/from these counties to/from the Pittsburgh International Airport, and Pittsburgh Downtown Rail and Bus Stations has received authorization and full approval from the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission to begin operation as a point-to-point transfer company. Upon my return to the States next month, operation will begin! This new and exciting service will provide transport to any one, any time, to go anywhere within the State of Pennsylvania for a set fee (approx. \$30 per half hour) on a pre-reserved, pre-paid basis. It is not a taxi service, but rather a car service - point to point. I would be pleased to provide you with additional information upon my return. NOTE: Airport Orbit, Inc. was formally LENZ TRAVEL AIRPORT SHUTTLE, has been operating in the community since 1983, is fully licensed and authorized by the PA P.U.C. Please inform those at the meeting that this new service will be referred to as SPROCKET POINT-2-POINT TRANSFERS...and we are very much looking forward to serving the public in Bulter County! Senior Citizens needing to run errands and go to doctors appointments, College Students wanting to go to the Prime Outlets, People needing to get to work...etc. we are ready to serve!</p>

*Response:* Comment noted.

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Public Comment Process Flawed	There is no excuse for having a public meeting , the only one in Allegheny County, on the same day as when the documents were released to the public. If the purpose was to elicit comments, then the documents should have been available sometime BEFORE the public meeting.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 185 1709 212"><i>Marilyn Skolnick, PPP &amp; Sierra Club</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 228 1980 623">When you consider that Allegheny County is the largest in the SPC region and only a handful of people attended the meeting, it is very apparent that the communication system is flawed as it now exists. Compare this meeting with the one that Allegheny County had for the Comprehensive Plan. There were two meetings each with a filled auditorium. What is the purpose of the Public Participation Panels? They appear to be window dressing just to fulfill a Federal requirement. They could have served , at the very least, to get people to the meeting. SPC ought to be ashamed to have sponsored such a dismal failure.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	SPC continues to commit extensive resources to making the TIP materials understandable and widely available. SPC staff, PennDOT staff, transit agency staff and county planning department staff were available at each of the ten public meetings and made every effort to address questions that were raised and assist the public in their review of the transportation program. The June-July public meetings were just the latest element of an extensive public participation process that solicited public input in developing the TIP as early as July 2005. SPC's public comment process does not rely on oral testimony at a single meeting alone; rather, it provides at least 10 meetings as well as many other ways of accessing technical assistance from staff, reviewing the TIP, and submitting comments.		
Public Participation and Comment Review Inadequate	The highly technical nature of the three documents limits the general public's ability to understand the issues presented. The documents are not "user-friendly" – they employ jargon and do not adequately explain, in plain English, the methodologies used in the review process.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="1241 927 1860 987"><i>Michael Parker, Esq., Group Against Smog and Pollution, Inc., Policy and Outreach Coordinator</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 1003 1944 1193">GASP recommends two solutions. First, an extended comment period will afford interested members of the public the opportunity to research the technical questions left unanswered in the drafts. Second, the documents should be withdrawn and reissued after editing has cured their technical and unwieldy natures.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	SPC continues to commit extensive resources to making the TIP materials understandable and widely available. SPC staff, PennDOT staff, transit agency staff and county planning department staff were available at each of the ten public meetings and made every effort to address questions that were raised and assist the public in their review of the transportation program. The June-July public meetings were just the latest element of an extensive public participation process that solicited public input in developing the TIP as early as July 2005. SPC's public comment process does not rely on oral testimony at a single meeting alone; rather, it provides at least 10 meetings as well as many other ways of accessing technical assistance from staff, reviewing the TIP, and submitting comments.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Public Participation and Comment Review Inadequate	<p>The public comment period closes July 27th, and the SPC is scheduled to make a final decision regarding the TIP, the Air Quality Conformity Determination, and the proposed amendment to the LRP on July 31, 2006. This allows only a four day review of the public's input, and two of those days are not work-days. The SPC has indicated that they will prepare a response to all comments, but it seems highly unlikely that such a response will be completed before July 31st. The four day review of public comments is entirely inadequate. In fact it is so short that all comments will likely not even be considered or even viewed prior to the decision. This makes the public comment period meaningless.</p>	Allegheny County	<p><i>Michael Parker, Esq., Group Against Smog and Pollution, Inc., Policy and Outreach Coordinator</i></p> <p>GASP strongly recommends that the SPC postpone their final decision on these documents, review and consider all comments, and prepare a publicly available response to all comments prior to their final decision.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	<p>SPC has coordinated a review and response to the public comments during the entire 30-day period as comments have been received.</p>		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Public Participation and Comment Review Inadequate	Given the size and technical complexity of the documents subject to the public comment period, GASP believes that 30-days are an inadequate amount of review time. There are three large documents...combined, these documents consist of approximately 891 pages of highly technical material. Thirty days is not enough time to digest these materials and then compose a detailed comment letter.	Allegheny County	<p><i>Michael Parker, Esq., Group Against Smog and Pollution, Inc., Policy and Outreach Coordinator</i></p> <p>GASP recommends that the SPC extend the comment period for at least an additional 60-days. This extension will ensure that the public has an adequate opportunity to read, comprehend, and comment on nearly 900 pages of technical data, methods and the resulting conclusions.</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The 30-day public comment period is consistent with SPC's adopted Public Involvement Policy and complies with federal planning regulations.		
SPC Commission Role	Comments on SPC Commission's Role in the TIP	Allegheny County	<p><i>Kate St. John, G.A.S.P. Board</i></p> <p>Questioned if it is the Commission that ratify's the TIP? Wanted more information on how many and who represents the SPC Commission members and are any present at the Allegheny County Public Meeting?</p>
<i>Response:</i>	The Commission will be asked to vote on the Draft 2007 TIP at its July 31, 2006 meeting. If approved, the program would be forwarded by PennDOT for action by the State Transportation Commission and Governor, then sent to the U.S. Department of Transportation for final approval. The program would become effective on October 1, 2006. SPC staff captures all the public comments, oral testimony at the ten public meetings as well as all written and electronic submissions received during the public comment period, summarizes the comments and presents them to the Commission. The Commissioners or their representatives attended each of the public meetings.		

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
SPC Public Comment Process	<p>The Public Comment Process for this TIP is hypocrisy. Please reference the attached FHWA/DOT Regulations: Section 450:316 - Section (B) - Parts I thru VII. Pages 106 and 107. The TIP, Conformity and 2030 LRP Amendment Documents were available on SPC'S web site on June 27. Yet the Public Meeting Schedules were the following:  Washington County — June 27.  Armstrong County — June 28.  Allegheny County - June 29.  Attached is SPRPC'S (SPC) 1998 Allegheny County Public Comment advertisement for the LRP. Notice the following key points:  1. The Allegheny Public Meeting is scheduled 24 days after the LRP Document -was placed in area libraries for public review.  2. The Public Comment goes from July 18 thru August 25; a five and a half week Comment Period.  Compare these to the Public Meeting Schedule Process listed above for this 2007-2010 TIP.  SPC'S Public Involvement Guidelines provide no time frame for the scheduling of Public Meetings after document availability on their web sites.</p>		<p><i>Dave McGuirk, Citizens for Alternatives to New Toll Roads</i></p> <p>Why doesn't SPC provide three weeks to review Documents before scheduling a Public Meeting on Transportation Plans etc.?  Why can't SPC schedule multiple Public Meetings for Allegheny and Pittsburgh which has almost half the SPC Region's population?  How can the disabled, under-privileged and those that need transit be expected to attend outer county public meetings? There are no transit connections to attend outlying county Public Meetings when their County's Public Meeting was scheduled the evening of document availability or 24 to 48 hours later as took place with the 2007-2010 TIP Process?  Does SPC represent the voice for the people or the interests of project sponsors and supporters?  SPC must re-do their Public Involvement Guidelines to address these issues.</p>

*Response:* SPC continues to commit extensive resources to making the TIP materials understandable and widely available. SPC staff, PennDOT staff, transit agency staff and county planning department staff were available at each of the ten public meetings and made every effort to address questions that were raised and assist the public in their review of the transportation program. The June-July public meetings were just the latest element of an extensive public participation process that solicited public input in developing the TIP as early as July 2005. SPC's public comment process does not rely on oral

Project	Project Description	Location	Comment Summary
Stop Subsidizing Suburban/Rural Development	Gov't Should Stop Subsidizing suburban/rural development.	Allegheny County	<p data-bbox="390 188 1898 253">testimony at a single meeting alone; rather, it provides at least 10 meetings as well as many other ways of accessing technical assistance from staff, reviewing the TIP, and submitting comments.</p> <p data-bbox="1241 269 1398 302"><i>Nick Kyriazi</i></p> <p data-bbox="1241 310 1976 1146">I support public transportation and bike trails, and oppose new road building, however, pursuing those goals while government continues to subsidize suburban and rural development is futile. It is like attempting to walk up a down escalator. Government subsidizes suburban and rural development in many ways. Obvious ones: - Our federal government goes to war to protect cheap sources of oil; - The Postal Service charges the same rate for mailing a letter no matter the distance or location; - It costs utility companies (electric, gas, water, sewer) more to provide service for spread-out suburban development than for row-house and high-rise development, yet they charge the same rates; - Rural Electrification Project and Tennessee Valley Authority; Subtle ones: - Federal funding to rural fire departments was \$750,000,000 in 2004 (Tribune Review of 4 Sept 2004, B-2); - In the Tribune-Review (14 April 2005, page B9), there was a tiny, inconspicuous item in the In Brief column of the Business section. It read: (See Remainder of Comment Below) Verizon Communications Inc., the biggest U.S. local-telephone company, will add \$2 to \$3 to monthly high-speed Internet-service bills to cover costs for a federal program that brings phone service to remote areas;</p>
<i>Response:</i>	First priority in the Draft TIP is directed at maintaining the existing transportation system. SPC has attained in the Draft TIP its stated policy of investing at least 80% of TIP dollars in preservation of the existing transportation system. The SPC and PennDOT policy of giving top priority to maintaining the existing transportation system does not prohibit projects that increase the capacity of the system.		

<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Supports the Efforts of SPC	Supports the Efforts of SPC	Allegheny County	<i>Matthew Craig</i> Noted that sometimes we can lose sight when things are going well but expressed his happiness that it has never been easier to move around the region.
<i>Response:</i>	Comment noted.		