



Washington County Transit Study Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

Date: Friday, June 8, 2007
Time: 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Location: South Strabane Volunteer Fire Department

Those in attendance included the following individuals:

Affiliation	Name	Organization
Stakeholder Committee	Cathy Frey	Cokeburg Borough
	Tim Thomassy	McDonald Borough
	Pam Church	Burgettstown Borough
	Michael Silvestri	Peters Township
	Chris Hardie	Greene County Economic Development
	J. Bracken Burns	Washington County Commissioner
	Nicholas Gerek	State Representative Jesse White's office
	Diane Irely	Washington County Commissioner
	Sharon Russell	Senator Barry Stout's office
	Robin Cornell	Achieva
	Harlan Shober	Chartiers Township
	Samuel Stockton	City of Washington
	The Honorable J. Barry Stout	Senate of Pennsylvania
	David Stragar	Access to Work Interagency Cooperative
	Norm Hasbrouck	California University of Pennsylvania
	Terry Wigle	California University of Pennsylvania
	Fred Mergner	Port Authority of Allegheny County
	John Lenzner	City of Washington/GG&C Bus Company
	Pat Milioto	State Representative Tim Solobay's office
	Kevin Powers	City of Washington/GG&C Bus Company
Colleen McCloskey (intern)	Washington County Planning Commission	
Steven Fabio (intern)	Washington County Planning Commission	
Technical Advisory Team	Sheila Gombita	Washington County Transportation Authority
	Dave Good	City of Washington/GG&C Bus Company
	Chuck Imbrogno	Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
	Marc Roncone	Mid Mon Valley Transit Authority
	Jeff Leithauser	Washington County Planning
	Carol Uminski	Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Consultant Team	Ed Abrams	Abrams-Cherwony & Associates
	Phil Brown	Gannett Fleming
	Amy L. Hrivnak	Olszak Management Consulting

Press: Barbara Miller from the Observer Reporter was also present at the meeting.





Washington County Transit Study Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

►► Introductory Comments

Phil Brown began the meeting with a review of the agenda and a review of stakeholder comments from previous meetings.

►► Service Improvement Alternatives

Ed Abrams gave a detailed presentation of the transit service improvement alternatives for Washington County, which are organized into two categories: no/low-cost alternatives that could be implemented right away with current resources, and service expansion alternatives that would require additional funding.

Meeting participants asked the following questions:

Regarding the proposed modification to the existing local bus routes in Washington City:

- How long will it take to go from the southwestern terminus to the northwestern terminus on the new route?
• *Response:* One hour
- Did you match the route to the major paratransit destinations?
• *Response:* Yes. We looked at data provided by Washington Rides to identify the major areas of demand for paratransit service. The current proposed route serves those areas.
- With the mall – often a source of congestion - located in the middle of the route, how will on-time performance be affected?
• *Response:* The existing route has not had a problem with on-time performance around the mall.
- Wouldn't two routes meeting in the middle provide more timely service?
• *Response:* It might, but it would require more buses to do so. Also, this alternative represents a low-cost alternative. The study might ultimately identify a range of service levels based on possible future funding.

Regarding the possibility of having the regional service from Washington City ending at the PAAC Light Rail Station at South Hills Village instead of downtown Pittsburgh:

- How will that change affect the overall trip time?
• *Response:* It should save about fifteen minutes, depending on the time of arrival in relation to the arrival/departure of the trains.

Regarding shifting some paratransit users from existing paratransit service to the revised local Washington City route, operated on a route-deviation basis:



Washington County Transit Study Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

- Did you consider the fact that some users of paratransit service won't be able to walk to a bus stop?
- *Response:* We don't expect to capture all of the current paratransit riders with this new option. Paratransit service will still be available to people who need it, but some would benefit from the option of more regular fixed route service.

General questions:

- Have you looked into light-rail alternatives?
- *Response:* Washington County just doesn't meet the thresholds of population density and concentration to warrant light-rail service.

- Employers and shopping centers are looking to get employees/shoppers to their destination. Are there any models that involve private sector support for transit service?
- *Response:* *Club Bus Service*, which is the next step up from shared van service, is one such alternative that works in a lot of places.

- We talked in previous meetings about trying to survey large employers and their employees. Have you done anything along those lines?
- *Response:* We haven't organized such a survey effort yet. It may require more resources than the project will allow. However, we are planning to conduct a business leaders' focus group and a survey of business leaders to obtain input from the business community.

Other Comments:

- Consider extending the Washington-Peters Township route alternative up to the T Station at South Hills Village.

►► Funding

Possible funding opportunities for implementing the preliminary service improvement alternatives were discussed. Some of those included:

- New state funding
- County funding
- Local municipal funding
- Federal funding (new pot for rural service)
- Casino revenue

Senator Barry Stout also spoke briefly on his work with the transportation committee and his observations regarding the status of funding for transportation work in Pennsylvania.

►► Next Steps





Washington County Transit Study Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

The following information regarding next project steps was shared with the stakeholders present:

- Alternatives will be refined based on stakeholder input
- Public comments will be sought during summer outreach using public meetings, public officials meetings, intercept surveys, etc.
- Stakeholder committee member participation is encouraged at all outreach activities
- All comments will be reviewed and considered in preparing more detailed alternatives
- Recommendations for institutional changes/improvements are also being completed
- Final recommendations will be prepared after all outreach and stakeholder input has been collected and analyzed
- A final stakeholders meeting is anticipated to be held during September 2007

▶▶ Meeting Adjournment

A final opportunity for questions and/or comments was provided and then the meeting was adjourned.

▶▶ Comment Form Summary

A total of four (4) comment forms were received following the meeting. A recap of the comments is provided below.

The Project

1. Please indicate your interest in the *Washington County Transit Study*.

Response	Number of Responses
Public / Municipal Official	3
Other : California University of PA	1
Total	4

2. Do you have any suggestions for the Study Team for expanding outreach and communications about the Study to the public?

Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post on county website, flyers/brochures in local businesses and senior centers, attend Burgettstown Community Day – July 21, 2007
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there are needs to survey target populations, industrial parks, malls, attractions, or corporations, CalU



Washington County Transit Study Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

could develop unique URL addresses to survey and unique populations

3. Which of the service improvement alternatives presented do you most prefer, and why?

Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rural routes – Burgettstown area and service to Foundry
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The T transfer and busway would be a help• Marketing is a key especially with local cable ads and webpages• The Peters Township routes are a good idea but be sure to consider the busiest area – East McMurray Road



Washington County Transit Study Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

4. Which of the service improvement alternatives do you least prefer, and why?

No responses.

5. What are your overall thoughts on the service improvement alternatives presented?

Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burgettstown area has many opportunities and increasing rural routes will definitely help growth, both residential and commercial.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of good ideas but many were suggested in the past and never implemented.

The Stakeholder Meeting

6. Was the format of the meeting suitable for you?

Response	Number of Responses
Yes	3
No	0
No Response	1
Total	4



Washington County Transit Study Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

7. Were the maps and information presented easy to understand?

Response	Number of Responses
Yes	2
No	1 Using a symbols box on the maps would be helpful
No Response	1
Total	4

8. Were the maps and information presented useful to your understanding of current situation in Washington County?

Response	Number of Responses
Yes	3
No	0
No Response	1
Total	4

9. Were you able to express your concerns or opinions on the project?

Response	Number of Responses
Yes	3
No	0
No Response	1
Total	4



Washington County Transit Study Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

10. Were your questions and/or concerns addressed?

Response	Number of Responses
Yes	3
No	0
No Response	1
Total	4

12. Please share any additional comments you have for the Study Team:

Additional Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We need to find a way to get the Federal government involved – these programs are necessary for growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Study Team is welcome to survey at the Peters Township Community Day – June 30, 2007, expect big crowds