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I. Introduction

This document presents comments received and responses to comments for the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission's (SPC) public comment period from May 18 through June 17, 2011 on the following draft documents:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment for the 2040 Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan Update

All comments and responses in this Public Participation Report were distributed to members of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission for their review prior to the June 27, 2011 meeting for action to consider the above items.
II. Organization of Report

This report includes a Summary of Public Comments and the Response to Public Comments on the following documents:

- **2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania**
- **Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment for the 2040 Plan**
- **Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area**
- **Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan Update**

SPC staff has responded to each comment and shared both the comments and responses with the SPC Commissioners.

- **Part 1** includes the Summary of Public Comments and the Response to Public Comments.
- **Part 2** includes summaries of Public Participation Panel meetings that were held during the May 18 through June 17, 2011 public comment period.
- **Part 3** includes copies of the written and electronic comments that were received during May 18 through June 17, 2011 public comment period.
- **Part 4** includes documentation of the public outreach activities during the May 18 through June 17, 2011 public comment period.
Part One

Summary of Public Comments and the Response to Comments on:

2040 Transportation and Development Plan
for Southwestern Pennsylvania

Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment
for the 2040 Plan

Air Quality Conformity Determination for the
Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area

Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services
Coordinated Transportation Plan Update
# 2040 Transportation and Development Plan

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Active Allegheny Incorporation | Active Allegheny Incorporation     | Allegheny County  | *Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Regional Policy Manager*
|                              |                                    |                   | Incorporate Active Allegheny into the LRDP  
|                              |                                    |                   | We support Allegheny County’s comments regarding Active Allegheny and active transportation into the LRDP. You received these from Lynn Heckman, via email, on June 9. |
|                              |                                    |                   | *Response:* Additional mapping and more direct reference to the Active Allegheny Plan have been added to the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania in response to public comments. |
The Allegheny River Towns Enterprise Zone (ARTEZ) is a non-profit agency servicing the economic development needs of its seven member municipalities: Aspinwall, Blawnox, Etna, Millvale, O’Hara, Shaler, and Sharpsburg. The Councils of its member municipalities appoint its Board of Directors.

Our start-up efforts have been supported through Allegheny County Department of Economic Development and they are active partners in our program. There are many underutilized industrial and commercial sites within the Enterprise Zone and Route 8 Corridor and an infrastructure, albeit aging and in need of repair, exists to service new and expanding businesses. ARTEZ has developed and maintained programs to create jobs and promote economic activity through out the seven member municipalities.

ARTEZ generally supports the direction and strategies identified in the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan. In fact, the local economic development tools ARTEZ has to assist existing businesses and to attract new businesses to its member municipalities complement many of the policy priorities identified in the Economic Development chapter.

The following list identifies those regional economic development policies most relevant to ARTEZ’s in-fill strategy and describes our local implementing activity.

REGIONAL POLICY: Revitalization and redevelopment of the region’s existing communities is a priority. ARTEZ’s development priorities are to prepare “shovel-ready” opportunities for in-fill development in our member municipalities, concentrating on its inventory of mid-size brownfields sites and vacancies in existing industrial and commercial properties, to create and
POLICY: Investment in infrastructure improvements will be coordinated and targeted at the corridor level to optimize the impact of the investment. ARTEZ is promoting infrastructure improvements along the Route 28 and Route 8 corridors using innovative green design and technology tools; for instance, ARTEZ and the Town of Shaler completed a Brownfield Redevelopment workshop for the ‘Glenshaw Glass District’ and an engineering study to improve access to the underutilized industrial parcels in the District. ARTEZ and the Boroughs of Etna and Sharpsburg have formed a Task Force to improve the infrastructure, primarily a Freight Access Road, to better service industrial properties. POLICY: The region will focus on the identification and development of industrial sites with special attention given to well situated brownfield locations. ARTEZ has been a lead participant in the River Towns Brownfield Coalition, an EPA-funded brownfield assessment program managed by the Riverside Center for Innovation. The program has completed initial assessments on twelve different parcels, including the Ohio- Evergreen site in Millvale, the Henry Miller Spring Brownfield site in Sharpsburg, the former Tippins facility in Etna, and the Aspinwall Power Plant site. POLICY: The region will place a priority on business development with a focus on existing business retention and expansion. ARTEZ is participating in a community loan fund task force to design additional capital alternatives for small businesses and entrepreneurs active in our member municipalities. We have also provided enterprise zone loans to businesses that commit to creating or retaining jobs in our member municipalities; POLICY: The region will support identified strategic industry clusters. ARTEZ is implementing a green industry economic development policy to enhance the attractiveness of our communities to new technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>businesses and the green building material industry cluster; POLICY: The region will preserve, promote and develop the tourism and hospitality industries by capitalizing on historic, cultural, recreational and ecological assets. ARTEZ has financially supported the Allegheny Community Trails Study, its member municipalities have participated in a new River Towns Program, and has offered support to the Aspinwall Marina/Riverfront Park project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Comment noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on Plan Document</th>
<th>Smart Growth Hastens Prosperity</th>
<th>Allegheny County</th>
<th>Court Gould, Sustainable Pittsburgh, Executive Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We acknowledge through SPC's leadership, The Plan has been nationally recognized and locally embraced for its reckoning with the need to stem our region's voracious consumption of land for new growth in greenfields and reinvest in our existing and core communities around the ten counties. Sustainable Pittsburgh supports the focused growth practicalities of The Plan. For example, the commitment (5-2) to existing communities as well as emphasis on &quot;maintenance first&quot; (4-5) is noted and recognized for practicality in addressing the region's interests of economic, social, and economic prosperity. Just the same, it would be desirable to provide more insight on the successful TRID program (3-30) and (4-17) bike/ped priorities deserve more discussion especially with regard to what and where these investments should be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Section 4, page 41 includes a detailed discussion of the region's current and recent TRID and TOD projects. SPC supports efforts by other agencies to increase the chances of successful TOD outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments on Plan Document</td>
<td>Project Prioritization Transparency</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>Consistent with our past comments, we urge SPC to reinforce The Plan by acting now to transparently employ project evaluation criteria to assess local and regional impacts. By evaluating the comparative merits of proposed projects relative to the excellent goals and objectives articulated in The Plan, SPC can lift the region from a project by project perspective to focus on the larger regional strategy for change. In particular, it is suggested SPC provide more insight (4-24) as to the project evaluation criteria to assess local and regional impacts. What is the process, criteria, how is transparency and independent review accommodated? Also related, the statement (4-3) &quot;Corridor-sized projects are broken down into deliverable segments based on cash flow requirements,&quot; begs the comment that breaking down corridor projects into “manageable” segments would seem to defeat the need for a comprehensive picture of regional needs and SPC’s response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** SPC will continue to enhance the current technical project evaluation process to help in assessing candidate transportation projects. SPC's technical evaluation processes consider both qualitative and quantitative aspects of each project. Consistency with the long-range transportation plan is also a component in the evaluation process. In addition, consistency with 2040 Plan policies is major consideration in prioritizing and ranking projects in the Area Development Committee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comments on Plan Document       | Goals and Measures of Plan Performance           | Allegheny County | *Court Gould, Sustainable Pittsburgh, Executive Director*
We urge SPC to regularly assess the region's growth and development patterns per the goals and objectives of the plan and that SPC set quantified and qualified goals and targets for the region per key measures. For example, EPA's choice of SPC to host the “Sustainable Transportation Performance Measures Workshop” (8-11) emphasizes the timeliness for SPC to follow federal lead in tracking and reporting regional performance data. SPC is urged to identify the new measures that will be tracked and reported as result of this special EPA workshop. In this regard, SPC is urged to reference the Fall 2010 Smart Growth Conference which served as a formal public input session to The Plan and specifically acknowledge the public interest expressed during the event of SPC tracking and reporting routinely on key regional measures of success including priorities identified in the conference session SPC facilitated:
• Revenue & expenses for infrastructure
• Stable, predictable funding for transit
• Housing affordability
• Economic prosperity
• % of communities with sidewalk ordinances
• Population increase
• Reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
• Implementation of neighborhood/community cooperation programs
• Healthy population
• Decrease energy consumption
• Equity (in wealth & power), regional unity, local self-reliance, safety

Regarding data presented in The Plan that address regional growth and development patterns, while Section 6-9 gives an explanation about Figures 6.7 - 6.14, it does little to explain the significance of Figure 6.14 or any conclusions and/or consequences directly linked to that data. To an outside reader,
it is unclear if "no-build" means not executing any of the preferred scenario projects for The Plan found in Appendix B or something else. In addition, the conclusion drawn is that, overall, conditions are better for the "no-build" option, which raises the question of the impact of the projects that would be implemented under The Plan. For example how is it that delay increases by 144%? The obvious question is, can’t the plan be modified to yield improvements throughout? In Section 7, again, the discussion of the regulations and process does not reveal the bottom line; i.e. what are the impacts?

Response: SPC will continue to enhance and develop performance measures in consultation with others. We will reference recommendations from the Fall 2010 Smart Growth Conference and the EPA Workshop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments on Plan Document</td>
<td>Integration of Issues for Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>Court Gould, Sustainable Pittsburgh, Executive Director The Plan is urged to provide more insight to how SPC integrates targeting investments and aligning land use planning with: alternate transportation choices, housing and jobs, energy independence, mitigation of carbon dioxide emissions, employment growth, and improving the natural environment. For example, (8-17) &quot;FHWA, PennDOT, and SPC have embraced these LPN initiatives with the goal of improving project selection, increasing program predictability, and increasing the efficiency of the overall project development process; resulting in a transportation system that has less of an impact on the region's natural resources, cultural resources, and community&quot;. How is SPC accomplishing this? What steps are followed? What data is collected? What type of feedback loop is being used? How is this verified? Somewhat related, (4-6) The Governor’s Discretionary Economic Development Fund, as discussed, does not appear to engage DCED and DEP as appropriate to an integrated development transportation/development/environment approach. This maybe beyond SPC’s control but is a worthy subject for regional advocacy to improve integration. A well aligned program is evidenced in (4-18) regarding the Pennsylvania Community Transportation Initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: SPC continues to explore and pursue opportunities to promote regional livability in all its many facets as new opportunities in state and federal policy and programs present themselves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comments on Plan Document | Sustainability Issues on the Horizon | Allegheny County | Court Gould, Sustainable Pittsburgh, Executive Director

It is very positive that The Plan reports on Pennsylvania’s “Climate Change Act” which includes development of a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions inventory for the Commonwealth and a Climate Change Action Plan. We recommend inclusion in The Plan delineation of SPC’s role and intent to create a CO2 inventory and mitigation plan for the region, including tracking and reporting region CO2 data and trends. Under Regional Conditions and Trends (3-1) SPC is urged to include review of impacts of global warming and climate change. Resources and precedent include: The West Coast Climate and Materials Management Forum, a partnership of the US EPA and numerous cities and states (mostly located in the Western U.S.), has produced an information resource, primarily for state and local governments, to help them better integrate materials/products into climate inventories and action plans.

http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/ECOCOMM.NSF/climate+change/wccmmf The National Academy of Sciences also has helpful materials: http://dels.nas.edu/Report/Americas-Climate-Choices/12781 The Union of Concerned Scientists produced a report on anticipated consequences of climate change on PA:

http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/science_and_impacts/impacts/climate-change-pa.html Further with regard to regional conditions SPC is urged to include reference to SPC’s commitment to conduct an assessment of the impacts of Marcellus in order to use the plan to mitigate the negative and accentuate the positive. Related to the Emerging Energy Cluster (5-10) SPC is urged to add commitment to the Emerging Water Industry Cluster per the recently released report, Pittsburgh’s H2Opportunity: An Assessment of Southwestern Pennsylvania’s Water Sector

### Response:
The development of a CO2 inventory and mitigation Plan for the region is the legislated responsibility of the Pennsylvania DEP and the Allegheny County Health Department. The statewide inventory of greenhouse gas emissions has been developed. The mitigation measures in the state's Climate Action Plan are working their way through the state's legislative process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments related to Climate Change</td>
<td>Comments related to Climate Change</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td><strong>Tim Kelly, Citizen, Citizen</strong> I was just alerted to the comment deadline by an email from Sustainable Pittsburgh, so I apologize for coming late to the process. I plan looks good, from what I saw in the video presentation. Not having been part of the decision process, I don't know to what extent the issues of climate change and ocean acidification played a part in the final product. My instinct, judging from the general lack of discussion of these threats on a national scale, is that it may not have played a large part in the discussions. However, if one takes a look at the projections being made by government entities such as the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), there are serious consequences to to overuse on fossil fuels on the horizon. Specifically, NCAR warns of killer droughts in the west by the 2030’s and JPL projects a foot of sea level rise by 2050. On the ocean acidification side, the polar oceans are projected to turn corrosive to calcium carbonate-dependent sea life if we top 450 PPM in the atmosphere. I would ask that those who constructed the plan take a serious look at the current research of the credible scientific community and see then apply that to the plan as it currently stands. Essentially, we have to look at how the region can de-carbonize its transportation system and its power generation over the next two decades or less. There is good news on the energy front with solar rapidly approaching grid parity with fossil fuels (see here: <a href="http://www.solarfeeds.com/climate-progress/17154-climate-progress-qsolar-is-ready-nowq">http://www.solarfeeds.com/climate-progress/17154-climate-progress-qsolar-is-ready-nowq</a>) Also, there are disruptive new electric car technologies on the horizon, such as Better Place (<a href="http://www.betterplace.com">www.betterplace.com</a>), that promise to give the electric car affordability and unlimited range. I am aware of the movement towards using natural gas for transportation, but this is, I am told, less efficient that using the gas for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>electrical generation and letting electric cars handle moving people around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have some of the best climate researchers in the world right here in Pennsylvania. One example is Mike Mann at Penn State. I would stress that his data and conclusions regarding global warming have stood up to numerous inquiries, both friendly and hostile. He warns us of disastrous warming and climate change if we stay on our current emissions path. I would request that those who have been doing the great work on the regional plan take the time to meet with him or other members of the scientific community to gain a thorough knowledge of what the research is telling us, prior to putting the finishing touches to the regional plan. Thanks for your kind attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: SPC addresses air quality during development of the Plan. The 2040 Plan references the state's Climate Action Plan, and summarizes its recommended mitigation measures for transportation and land use activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comments related to Public Transit | Allegheny County | Thomas Josephi, citizen

What is one of the biggest problems is to convince the General Assembly and Gov. Corbett the need to have well funded public transportation with dependable funding sources. Thousands of people depend on public transportation to get to work, to get school and training, to get to job interviews and many other activities including many business, cultural and sports venues. Transportation also includes roads and bridges that are kept in good condition, which effects everyone whether they need public transportation or not. It's a very big portion of what will increase the economic growth of Southwestern Pennsylvania and the rest of the state. Too long it's been allowed to deteriorate and put in a financial bind so That we end up with bad roads and bridges and transit systems that have been forced to cut service and raise fares when it should be convenient and available. Think how much worse our roads and bridges would be as well as more pollution if there were more cars on the roads. There needs to be an organized effort of communities, commuters, public officials, companies, our legislative delegations.Lobbyests and others to convince Gov. Corbett and the leadership of the General Assembly the need for more dependable funding sources for public transportation without having these constant battles and causing anxiety for those who need to use public transportation. This can be done with the creation of a bill that would provide funding for the repair of roads and bridges as well as dependable funding sources for public transportation. Public transportation has to stay public so the people have a say in how it's run. Everyone gets what they want. The funding source for public transportation will be a portion of the taxation of the Marcellus Shale oil that will be drilled in the state. The damage caused by the heavy trucks carrying drilling equipment and the tanker trucks taking oil to refineries will add to the damage of our roads so the companies need to pay for the damage their trucks will cause. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oil drilled and its refining will be a windfall of millions to our state and there should be more than enough to provide for public transportation and other sources. It should provide enough revenue to keep our public transportation systems well funded. A well organized and thorough effort to convince our general Assembly and Gov. Corbett the necessity to pass legislation to fund our complete transportation system. It can work and return Pennsylvania to having one of the best transportation systems in the country, I hope your organization will support this effort wholeheartedly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued Development of our Trails</td>
<td>Riverfront trails are an important part of the transportation system in this region and should be included as part of future transportation planning. Please consider continued development of our trail system as part of the 2040 Long Range Plan.</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>Hannah Hardy, PA Environmental Council The Pennsylvania Environmental Council has a partnership with Allegheny County and Friends of the Riverfront to develop riverfront trails within Allegheny County. We work with local municipalities and other stakeholders to implement projects. We have participated in several committees and planning efforts that assist our efforts including SPC’s Bike/Pedestrian Committee and the recently completed ActiveAllegheny Plan. The Allegheny County Trails &amp; Greenways Plan that was completed as part of Allegheny County’s Comprehensive Plan should also be referenced. Here is a link to the trail map that was included in that plan: <a href="http://www.alleghenyplaces.com/maps/ec/Trails.pdf">http://www.alleghenyplaces.com/maps/ec/Trails.pdf</a>. This shows the regional trail system that we are working together to build. Following are priorities for the next several years: Monongahela River South side: Complete the Great Allegheny Passage, which includes completion of the trail through Sandcastle and also the Mon Wharf ramp project. This is the number one priority. North side: Complete a trail connection to the Carrie Furnace site as this site develops. Potential also to connect the ALMONO site with the Carrie Furnace site. Allegheny River North side: Implement the feasibility study that is nearing completion to connect the trail from Millvale to Freeport. South side: Continue to work with rail interests to develop a rail with trail proposal that will connect into the Strip District. Ohio River South side: Currently initiating a feasibility study to connect to the Montour Trail in Coraopolis and also the developing trail system in Beaver &amp; Lawrence Counties. The Montour Trail provides an important transportation link to the Pittsburgh International Airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle amenities 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 at every stage of project development. We look forward to continuing to work together to further advance the region’s non-motorized transportation options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense Development</td>
<td>Dense Development</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td><strong>Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Regional Policy Manager</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tie projects to denser development and infill more strongly to maximize investment, even road investments make more sense in denser environments because the economic gain from the land use is much higher. It also improves the affordability of the region as residents can shorten trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Funding Crisis   | Funding Crisis      | Allegheny County | *Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Regional Policy Manager*
|                  |                     |                | More strongly emphasize the funding crisis and public appetite for new revenue – page 4-61
|                  |                     |                | We appreciate SPC’s leadership in highlighting new funding needs and opportunities at a time when government officials seem to think we are overtaxed.
|                  |                     |                | However, as has been demonstrated in SPC’s own public outreach regarding the plan, people are willing to pay for transportation and this must be more strongly communicated in the LRDP.
|                  |                     |                | We caution that P3 be better clarified as to what the opportunities might be. The private sector is not necessarily interested in operating a transit agency, for example, but it is definitely interested in leveraging private funds to create much more attractive transit assets at fixed guideway stations and high-use stops.
|                  |                     |                | Similar in highways and bridges, there can be opportunities for P3 in high-volume corridors. However, it must be known that this is not a panacea.
|                  |                     |                | To that end, even further, the LRDP should note that no one action is going to solve our funding crisis permanently. Only through a diversified portfolio of funding can we ensure that transportation is funded adequately. |

**Response:**
It is expected that raising significant amounts of general-purpose transportation revenues will continue to be a critical issue for southwestern Pennsylvania, the rest of the state and nationally based on the size of the current transportation funding gap and forecasts indicating extensive future needs. In discussing public-private partnerships as a means of addressing part of the funding gap, PPPs are typically limited by tangible economic benefits resulting from investments in specific transportation improvements. The economic benefits of PPPs can be related to either highway or transit-related improvements.
I think it is safe to say that if "peak oil" has not already happened -- and the experts say it HAS already happened -- then it certainly will by 2040. Combined with rapidly rising petroleum demand from China, India and other developing nations, chances are 100% that the cost of gasoline and diesel fuel will rise far beyond what it costs now, in that time, as measured in dollars constant to 2011. The actual pump price will be even higher, sooner, when fuel related costs in turn push up the cost of everything else.

In short, we are soon going to be at "peak car". The future is simple: fewer cars, less driving. If gas goes to $10 or $20 a gallon in 10 years, are we really going to be driving all that much? No, we're not. And yes, gas WILL cost that much by 2040.

With that as backdrop, I believe that any long range transportation plan has to reflect this simple mantra: Stop building roads, just fix what we have, and start making it easier to get around by anything other than an automobile. Bicycles, buses, pedestrians. There will be a lot more of that, and a lot less driving.

* Additional lanes to existing roads: Precious few.
* Fix what's broken. The money will come from NOT building major new roads and additional lanes.
* Start thinking about FEWER driving lanes, more room for cyclists. I think the buzz word is "road diets".
* Sidewalks: Yes. Anything that gets built or fixed, needs a sidewalk, or at least a walkable shoulder (free of washouts, poison ivy, 2" deep mud, etc.)
* Pedestrian crossings at intersections: Yes. Lots of these.

Have you ever heard of "The Popsicle Index"? Think of
yourself as a parent, allowing your 8-year-old child to walk to the store to buy a popsicle, and return, unassisted. What is your comfort level, as a percentage, that the kid will get there and back, safely? Aside from boogeymen jumping out from behind trees, the biggest fear is being hit by a car. That right there usually brings down The Popsicle Index in an area significantly, and that right there is squarely in the sights of long-range transportation planning. If we as a region cannot let our kids walk around without getting killed, then we as transportation planners are not doing our jobs.

I think I've said enough. Stop building roads! We need bicycle infrastructure, we need public transit infrastructure, we need to stop making it easy for cars to speed, and we need to be able to get around without needing a car in the first place.

OK, your move. Thank you for listening to my spiel.

Response: The current fiscal circumstance dictates a focus of 2040 Plan investments on maintenance of the existing transportation system rather than system expansion.
Include ActiveAllegheny plan in the SPC 2040 LRP

I continue to urge SPC to include the recently completed ActiveAllegheny plan, not just by reference, but also to feature ActiveAllegheny mapping just as SPC does for roads, bridges and other key facilities. And, you may wish to inquire if other counties have similar mapping to be displayed. I have requested that Baker forward both the Allegheny County System Improvements Maps for: Commuter Bicycle Routes, Pedestrian Corridors and Intersections, and City Bicycle Network.

I also strongly encourage SPC to add a regional line item for active transportation projects, and active elements of projects, for the future.

As you are aware, it is increasingly important that our region demonstrate exactly how we are now, and how we intend in the future, to link planning, NEPA and development. It is key to clearly show our progress in the areas of livability, sustainability, smart transportation and healthy lifestyle choices through multi-modal choice. Additionally, adding a regional line item will make all our applications for funds and grants much more competitive going forward. PCTI funds gave us a wonderful opportunity to formulate and advance our planning; the resultant product should be highlighted and positioned for implementation.

Response: Additional mapping and more direct reference to the Active Allegheny Plan have been added to the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania in response to public comments.

Incorporate Trail Plan Mapping into LRP

I am writing to strongly support the PA Environmental Council’s request to include Allegheny County trail mapping in the SPC 2040 LRP. This type of detail will greatly enrich the plan and demonstrate our region’s responsiveness to input from citizens.

Response: Additional mapping and more direct reference to the Active Allegheny Plan have been added to the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania in response to public comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mon Fayette Expressway | Please delete the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the Illustrative Project Listing in the 2040 Long Range Plan. | Allegheny County  | **Jon Robison, Allegheny County Transit Council, President**  
I urge that you delete the Mon-Fayette, one of the 21 interstate facilities in your 'Illustrative Project' List, page 4-58-59 of your draft 2040 plan. Extension of the Mon-Fayette toll-way is unneeded and unwanted. It is planned to terminate in Oakland, so it would spend (your estimate) $3,600,000,000 to subsidize and encourage more cars to come to Oakland. Believe me, we don't need more cars coming to Oakland. Why does it matter if the Mon-Fayette is on the Illustrative Project List? I know it's not on the actual long range plan, which is fiscally constrained. I know that no part of it will be built in the coming year. But inclusion on your Illustrative Project List matters for three reasons - priorities, credibility, and the need for sensible transportation and development investments. First, Oakland needs realistic transportation and development investments. Mere inclusion on SPC's Illustrative Project List is likely to discourage other investment in the target areas, especially private investment. Inclusion on an 'Illustrative Project List' is likely to perpetuate continued presence on maps of future development. This is planning by 'Magic Marker' at its worst. Second, is the question of priorities. Your 'Unfunded Needs' discussion on page 4-57 rightly emphasizes preventative maintenance of our roads and bridges. More and more people insist, “Fix it first!” The Mon-Fayette cost is greater than all the other 'new capacity' projects on the Illustrative Project List combined. Clean air, not to mention energy conservation, require investment in public transportation, as well as maintaining our existing bridges and roads. Finally, there is credibility – yours. Inclusion of the Mon-Fayette on the 'Illustrative Project List' in your 2040 plan will undermine public credibility when we have serious decisions ahead of us. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission to determine whether they have reconsidered their commitment to funding this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mon Fayette        | Mon Fayette Expressway | Allegheny County | Nathan Hart, Oakland Community Council, member  
On behalf of the Oakland Community Council, we request that the "Mon-Fayette Expressway" be removed from the Illustrative Project List of the draft 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania.  
In the decades in which this project has been proposed, but never built, many neighborhoods along the Monongahela have been unable to attract reinvestment because there has been little ability to predict if, when, and where the toll road will be built. This includes parts of Oakland including the lower Bates Street and South Oakland along the bluff above the river.  
In today's current fiscal, political, and environmental situation, the project will not be built. It cannot be funded and with the funding and debt crisis the federal and state governments both face, it cannot be built in the foreseeable future. It is past time to allow these blighted neighborhoods and municipalities along its proposed path to have some control and ability to attract reinvestment along this corridor by giving potential investors assurance that the Mon Fayette is not a threat to their development.  
Thank you for your consideration, |
<p>| Expressway         |                     |           |                                                                                 |
| Response:          | The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mon Fayette Expressway  | Please delete the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the Illustrative Project Listing in the 2040 Long Range Plan. | Allegheny County | Wanda Wilson, Oakland Planning & Development Corp. (OPDC), Director  
On behalf of Oakland Planning and Development Corporation (OPDC), I request that the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission remove the Mon-Fayette Turnpike Project from the “Illustrative Project List” in Section 4, pages 58-59 of the DRAFT 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania.  
As a community-based organization and a recognized leader in planning, OPDC believes the Mon-Fayette project is not consistent with the vision for the Oakland community, nor would it be good use of public funds. It would be detrimental to the Oakland community and to the quality of life in the City of Pittsburgh. |

Response: The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mon Fayette Expressway (51 to I-376)  | Mon Fayette Expressway (51 to I-376)       | Allegheny County | **Andrea Boykowycz, Citizen, Citizen**  
Please remove the PA51-I376 section of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the Illustrative Projects list of the Draft 2040 Long-Range Plan. Not only does this project have no realistic hope of ever finding the required funds to be built, but its scope and impact are in every particular diametrically opposed to the principles in the Regional Vision Scenario. In other words, this project is a big hindrance to realizing the sustainable future of our region's transportation plans. We deserve the opportunity to envision a future that does not include it. If it is impossible to remove the project for the same tired, unimaginative political reasons this project was inserted in the first place, please instruct the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission to submit an updated cost estimate for this 24-mile section. The $3.6 Billion figure cited in the Draft 2040 Plan is the same figure that was included in the 2035 Plan, and construction costs have measurably increased since then. By no means should the public or the SPC commissioners be permitted to delude themselves that this unaffordable project is any less unaffordable now, as a function of inflation, than it was four years ago. |

**Response:** The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.
I am addressing my comments to the Draft 2040 Transportation Plan:

I urge you to remove the PA 51 - I-376 section of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the illustrative projects list. As a resident of Hazelwood, in the City of Pittsburgh, and a member of the Design Advisory Team for the Glenwood to Bates section of the project, I have been active in discussions, meetings, and design planning for the project for the past 10 years. The public has been told throughout these years that funding for construction of the road was being pursued. At this point, with the State in a severe budget crisis, and transportation funding being hundreds of millions of dollars short of the amount needed for basic maintenance of our existing roads and bridges, it is ridiculous to think that any money will ever be available to fund this project.

I can only speculate that the reason for keeping the Expressway on the illustrative projects list is to placate those political leaders who have been supporting the project these many years. Why else would you continue to even consider a project that, even if construction were to start tomorrow, would cost roughly $5 billion?

You owe it to all of the communities which would be impacted by the toll road to let them know, once and for all, that it is time to move on and put their time and energy into creative solutions for the transportation problems in this region. Any other course will just serve to prolong the myth that this road can solve these problems, and forestall the necessary improvements and development that these communities need.

Thanks you for considering my input into this discussion.

Fran Bertonaschi, Citizen, Citizen
Allegheny County
Response: The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mon-Fayette (51 to I-376) | Mon-Fayette (51 to I-376) | Allegheny County | Chris Seymour, Citizen, Citizen  
As a current resident of Pittsburgh and future resident of Baldwin Borough, the SPC needs to remove the PA 51/I-376 section of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the illustrative projects list. This is not a prudent project for the money required ($3.6 Billion) and put nearby communities in development limbo. This is bad plan that sends the wrong message.  
Instead, infrastructure budgets need to be spent on "fix it first" projects. For example, the Route 51/Route 88 interchange needs a major overhaul. The section of Route 51 between the Mon-Fayette Expressway to the West End circle in Pittsburgh (at least 25 miles of road) needs a long range plan with vision for future growth. An example of money well spent is the Route 837 in Pittsburgh's South Side and the improvements to the Hot Metal Bridge, the bike trails, and the South Side Works development. Re-use of brownfields, investment in existing communities (as opposed to sprawl), and repairing our current transportation system makes a lot of sense.  
The future does not have to throw out the old and build all new. We know the construction lobby would rather build new, but they need to understand the new economic realities and toll roads aren't the answer.  

Response: The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mon-Fayette (51 to I-376) | Mon-Fayette (51 to I-376) | Allegheny County | *John Baillie, PennFuture, Sr. Attorney*
Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future ("PennFuture") offers the following comment to the Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania (the "Draft 2040 Long Range Plan").
PennFuture is a statewide, public interest, membership organization with offices in Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Wilkes-Barre. PennFuture's purposes include advocating and litigating on behalf of the environment and public health on a state-wide basis. We note that the 51 to I-376 portion on the 2040 plan, and that on its page 4-59, the Draft 2040 Long-Range Plan includes the Route 51 to the Mon-Fayette Expressway (the project^^) on its list of illustrative projects for estimates the cost of the Project at $3.6 billion. We believe the Project should be removed from the list for two reasons. First, there is little possibility that the Project will be constructed, ever, as the transportation benefits it would provide, if any, are dwarfed by its estimated cost. Second, there is no possibility that the Project can be constructed for $3.6 billion dollars, which is a years-old estimate that, by now, understates the Project's cost by at least several hundred million dollars.
Thanks for your attention to these comments.

*Response:* The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mon-Fayette (51 to I-376) | Mon-Fayette (51 to I-376)  | Allegheny County | Melissa McSwigan, Citizen, Citizen  
The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission has published a Draft Long-Range Plan for 2040 and included the Mon Fayette Expressway (PA 51 -I-376) on the illustrative projects list (at the cost of $3.6 Billion). The money is not available for such a project and even if it were, it is not where we should be putting our limited financial resources and tax payer money. Please remove the PA 51 -I-376 section of the Mon-Fayette expressway from the illustrative projects list. |

Response:  
The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.

| Mon-Fayette Expressway | Mon-Fayette Expressway      | Allegheny County | Chuck Alcorn, Citizen, Citizen  
I am writing to request you remove the PA 51 - I-376 section of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the illustrative projects list, part of the Draft Long-Range Plan for 2040. The project is completely not needed and for the amount of money it would cost for construction, you could repair hundreds of bridges. The real need in Southwestern PA is the continued maintenance of existing roads. Having the Mon-Fayette Expressway still on the drawing board also inhibits growth and progress in the planned path of the highway. These communities need to plan for the future and the MFX is a huge distraction. As a former resident of the Mon Valley (Charleroi, PA) I know that this section of road is not necessary and would not help any town along its route. Please finally put this issue to rest and remove it from the Draft Long-Range Plan for 2040. |

Response:  
The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mon-Fayette Expressway | Mon-Fayette Expressway    | Allegheny County | *Kathy Boykowycz, Citizen, Citizen*  
Please REMOVE the Mon-Fayette from the 2040 master plan. Any merits the original plan had 60 years ago are irrelevant now, as all the political, economic and environmental factors have radically changed. There is NO NEED, NO POPULAR DEMAND, and NO MONEY to build it -- and even if the money were in hand today, it would still be 15 years or so until it would be finished: 15 years during which, with the same money, we could invest in rapid transit and rebuild our existing crumbling roads, bridges, and sewers. This infrastructure will have to be fixed soon, Mon-Fay or no Mon-Fay! Our money should go to repair and reconstruction before new highway projects.  
No one needs this geriatric project, and we don't want to see its ugly face any more. Take it away! |

*Response:* The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Highway Capacity    | New Highway Capacity   | Allegheny County | *Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Regional Policy Manager*  
New highway capacity is too expensive to support and does nothing to further the vision of Project Region  
After 4 decades it should be clear that projects like the Mon-Fayette Expressway – and the final connection to Pittsburgh – have no place in the region. This multi-billion-dollar project has minimal elected official support and virtually no support from our membership or the residents they serve. As the price tag continues to climb – now in excess of $3 billion – and with no support from Federal sources or even the private sector – we must acknowledge that this project has no place in the region and it should be removed from the LRDP altogether. |

*Response:* The MFE SR-51 to I-376 project is identified in the 2040 Plan document on the Illustrative Projects list as one of a number of projects that is not currently funded. SPC has forwarded your comments to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, who is responsible for this project.
Passenger rail must be a priority in the plan and must be about realistic projects based in funding opportunities and public demand rather than multi-billion-dollar impossibilities that have outlived their relevance. MAGLEV is an outstanding technology and held a place of vision at a time when no one wanted to fund any passenger rail – let alone high-speed rail – in this country. However, even in countries that place higher priorities on HSR, MAGLEV is a waning technology. Further, it does not fit within the national picture for rail and we must integrate our region into that in order to compete. We must move toward projects that the federal government has an appetite for, are less capital and operational-intensive, and actually have a chance of being funded. This is not to say that MAGLEV’s planning does not have a place in the discussion – conventional steel track HSR requires very similar infrastructure – but it is time to move in another direction:

1) Prioritize intercity/commuter conventional passenger rail to re-start the market. This is a low-capital lift that should be made and includes passenger service between Cleveland and Harrisburg, encompassing both the Keystone West and Capitol Limited.

2) Push for a completion of the federal HSR vision map to fill in the gap between Cleveland and Pittsburgh. It makes no sense to for New York to stop here, Chicago to stop there, and we risk losing out to New York if we do not complete the map.

Response: Amtrak’s Pennsylvania Rail Feasibility Report (2010) estimates the need for a $6.7 million annual subsidy from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to provide additional passenger rail service between Pittsburgh, Harrisburg and New York. PennDOT is currently completing the Keystone West Feasibility Study to identify rail infrastructure and routing improvement needs on between Harrisburg and the Ohio State Line to determine physical impediments to passenger rail service enhancements. The State of Ohio is currently assessing rail infrastructure and routing options between Cleveland and Pittsburgh, with an eye toward the development of high(er) speed conventional passenger rail services between those two cities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Document Edits</td>
<td>Proposed Document Edits Section 4, pg 19, 5th paragraph:</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td><em>Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh</em> Section 4, pg 19, 5th paragraph: The figure listed for the TIGER II Planning Grant is incorrect. It's $1.5 Million. $825,000 is just DOT's slice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response:* Comment noted; text has been revised to indicate the DOT investment in this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed Document Edits       | Proposed Document Edits Section 4, pg 22:                                            | Allegheny County | **Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh**<br>Section 4, pg 22, under "Traffic Operations and Safety": Please edit Traffic Demand Management to read:<br>"Travel Demand Management - Projects such as carpooling, vanpooling, bikepooling, emergency ride home programs, telecommuting, commuter benefit strategies, parking incentives, park-n-ride lots, job access reverse commute programs, secure bicycle storage, bike-sharing, and other non-traditional types of projects that work to affect the demand side of transportation systems.<br><br>Section 4, pg 22, under "Traffic Operations and Safety": Please edit Safety to read: "Safety - While virtually every transportation project improves safety by bringing the transportation network up to current design standards, these are stand-alone projects to address specific safety issues. This includes projects to slow down speeding cars, eliminate sight distance problems at intersections, projects that improve at-grade highway-rail crossings, projects to improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and other projects that address areas with high accident rates or crash clusters.<br><br>Section 4, pg 22, under "Other modes": Pedestrian and Bicycle - Bicycle lanes, physically separated bike lanes, sidewalks, and shared use pathways that improve accessibility and mobility for bicycles and pedestrians. This includes rail-trails and other pathways that provide non-motorized links in the transportation network. It does not include trails and pathways that serve a purely recreational purpose, because federal transportation funds are not permitted to be spent on these types of projects.<br>Comment: What is "purely recreational?" Is a kid transporting herself on a bike to her recreational softball game along a trail transportation or recreation? Why is a mother dropping her son or daughter off in a minivan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transportation, and a bike ride to the ball game recreation? Most trail facilities are never &quot;purely recreational.&quot;</td>
<td>Comment noted; text revised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Proposed Document Edits | Proposed Document Edits Section 4, pg 53: | Allegheny County | \textit{Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh}  
Section 4, pg 53, seventh, eighth, and ninth paragraphs: Please edit to read: "The City of Pittsburgh in partnership with Bike Pittsburgh has recently embarked on a program of bike infrastructure development along roadway corridors demonstrating high bicycle utilization, which has resulted in a dramatic increase in the miles of bike lanes or sharrows where streets are either too narrow or when there is a lack of will to implement a road diet or eliminate car parking.

"This Shared Lane marking program, or "Sharrow" program, results in the placement of bicycle markings on the roadway pavement, but does not create an exclusive lane for use by bicyclists. Recently added to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) the utilization of Sharrow markings in Pittsburgh has been considered “experimental” to date due to PennDOT having not yet adopted the 2009 uniform traffic control standards as their own.

The City of Butler also recently implemented a Shared Lane marking program for bicyclists in that community, also in partnership with a non-profit environmental organization, and not by the municipality. Other communities are also considering their use. Meanwhile bicycle advocates and planners in Pittsburgh are looking to best practices in cities such as New York, Chicago, DC, Austin, San Francisco, Portland, Chattanooga, Berkeley, Philadelphia, Seattle, Davis, Boston, Columbus, Baltimore and foreign cities for innovative infrastructure; some of which are included in the National Association of City Transportation Officials' (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide. These innovations include bicycle boulevards, bike boxes, traffic-calming measures, green bike lanes, physically separated bike lanes, bike markings through intersections, peak-hour bike lanes (aka "floating bike lanes"), "one-way except
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;complete streets&quot; and bicycle signalization, shared bike/bus facilities, and even bike-sharing systems as cost-effective ways to improve safety for all users while coaxing the &quot;interested but concerned&quot; (the 1/3 of the population who wants to bike or walk but doesn't because it's perceived to be too dangerous) to get out of their cars and try these important non-motorized modes of transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: We have made progress with the trails and a handful of bike lanes/sharrows, but there is still so much to do. Let's reflect the vision of a safe, interconnected network of bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure in the 2040 LRP as critical to the region. It will alleviate congestion, reduce obesity, keep money in the local economy, and serve to boost tourism throughout the region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response:* Comment noted. This section of the 2040 Plan highlights accomplishments and current practices within the SPC region. The text has been revised to more fully reflect the policies of Active Allegheny, the County of Allegheny's non-motorized transportation component of their County Comprehensive Plan, which expands the regional vision for a safe, interconnected network of pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure in the most urban county in the region. Similar plans are in development for local jurisdictions and other counties in the region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed Document Edits | Proposed Document Edits Section 4, pg 53; | Allegheny County | *Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh*
| | | | Section 4, pg 53, under "Pedestrian and Bicycle Network:" First paragraph should read "Southwestern Pennsylvania has an extensive network of signed pedestrian and bicycle routes, including sidewalks, rail trails and designated bike routes with little to no additional safety enhancements such as wider shoulders, bike lanes, or physical separation from cars."

Comment: nearly five paragraphs are spent talking about our absolutely wonderful trail system which, at present, has been designed primarily to function as a recreational trail and not a transportation trail. Granted, it is not "purely recreational." However, most of our trails are not maintained throughout the winter, are not lighted, and are not even officially open past dusk or in the dimly lit early morning hours (which are the peak commuting hours). BikePGH is supportive of investing in the trails mentioned to make them more feasible for transportation activities, but as it stands now, they can only function for transportation part of the year. Unless it is made clear how these trail amenities serve commuters and people trying to run errands and use them as transportation, there should be less focus on them in the Transportation section of SPC's 2040 LRP.

*Response:* Comment noted. The text referenced was included the 2040 Plan to highlight the many trail connectivity efforts that are on-going in the region. As regional networks, these trails do provide intra-and inter-regional transportation access. Section 4 of the Plan has been revised to more fully reflect the commuter/transportation policies of Active Allegheny, the County of Allegheny's non-motorized transportation component of their County Comprehensive Plan. This plan identifies the impacts of seasonal trail maintenance on the usability of key urban trails as year round commuter routes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Document Edits</td>
<td>Proposed Document Edits Section 4, pg 4</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh Section 4, Transportation: Section 4, pg 4: Please edit &quot;Congestion Management and Air Quality&quot; ought to read &quot;Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td>Comment noted; text revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Document Edits</td>
<td>Proposed Document Edits Section 4, pg 46, fifth bullet</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh Section 4, pg 46, fifth bullet: &quot;Intermodal Connectivity – Enhance intermodal integration;&quot; please edit to read &quot;Intermodal Connectivity – Enhance intermodal integration and safety;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td>Comments noted; text has been revised to more clearly illustrate the importance of Safety to the Regional Operations Plan and the Transportation Operations and Safety Committee's efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Document Edits</td>
<td>Document Edits Section 1, pg 2, 8th paragraph</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh Section 1, pg 2, 8th paragraph - Current graph reads &quot;Based on this input a new scenario combining the positive attributes of the Compact/Infill/Transit Oriented and Corridor/Cluster Scenarios was developed.&quot; Please edit to read: Based on this input a new scenario combining the positive attributes of the Compact/Infill/Walkable/Bikeable/Transit Oriented and Corridor/Cluster Scenarios was developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td>The text referenced is a regional policy statement that was developed through the public outreach process used to develop the 2035 Transportation and Development Plan; the regional policies and regional vision of the 2035 Plan were reaffirmed for the 2040 Plan. The regional scenario includes bikeability and walkability as core tenets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Proposed Document Edits | Proposed Document Edits Section 4, pg 17 | Allegheny County | Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh
Section 4, pg 17, 5th paragraph: Please add CMAQ and HSIP to the funding programs available to bike/ped. Pedestrian and bicycle transportation projects qualify for these funding streams. In fact CMAQ paid for much of the Port Authority’s bike rack on buses program.

Response: Comment noted; text revised.

| Proposed Document Edits | Proposed Document Edits Section 1, pg 4, | Allegheny County | Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh
Section 1, pg 4, under "Regional Activities" - Please edit the fourth (4th) bullet point to read: "The region will place a priority on programs and services to attract and retain a diverse population with a particular focus on young adults and immigrants, who are more inclined toward transit, walking and biking to get around."

Response: Comment noted.

| Proposed Document Edits | Proposed Document Edits Section 1, pgs 3-4, | Allegheny County | Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh
Section 1, pgs 3-4, under "Regional Connections" - Currently there is mention of transit in its own bullet point. Bike Pittsburgh and our 1500 members who we represent would like a specific bullet point in this section: The region will place greater emphasis on safely connecting people who walk and bike to residential areas, parks, businesses, arts and culture, as well as other destinations throughout the region.

Response: The text referenced is a regional policy statement that was developed through the public outreach process used to develop the 2035 Transportation and Development Plan; the regional policies and regional vision of the 2035 Plan were reaffirmed for the 2040 Plan. The regional scenario includes bikeability and walkability as core tenets. Subsequent sections of the 2040 Plan provide additional detail as to the region’s objectives for bicycle and walking accessibility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed Document Edits         | Proposed Document Edits Section 1, pg 3, 2nd paragraph:                                | Allegheny County | *Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh*  
Section 1, pg 3, 2nd paragraph: Please edit to read:  
"There is a strong multimodal focus including transit, railways, bicycle and walking facilities, highways and waterways with an increasing emphasis on connecting the centers and clusters and promoting safe and attractive access to the urban core by all modes of transportation. This scenario promotes improved transportation options, operations and safety. This scenario emphasizes upgrading existing water and sewer, with limited expansion primarily to historically underserved communities." |
|                                 | **Response:** The text referenced is a regional policy statement that was developed through the public outreach process used to develop the 2035 Transportation and Development Plan; the regional policies and regional vision of the 2035 Plan were reaffirmed for the 2040 Plan. The regional scenario includes bikeability and walkability as core tenets. |              |                                                                                 |
| River Locks and Dams            | **Response:** Comment noted. The text on page 4-18 has been edited to more clearly indicate the current insufficiency of funding for lock and dam maintenance nationally. Page 4-53 includes a description of the role that our rivers play in removing trucks from local highways, and references a soon to be released Study that we expect will provide solid data in support of the "transportation role" of the three rivers. Page 4-52 has been revised to reflect a 1 barge to 70 trucks correlation. | Allegheny County | *Jim McCarville, Port of Pittsburgh, Executive Direc*  
The discussion on page 4-18 could lead one to believe that the situation on locks and dams is being addressed. No significant funding has been proposed since 2010 and that should be so indicated.  
Further the deterioration of the locks and dams will have very significant implications for roadway congestion. This should also be included.  
Page 4-51 should be updated to reflect one barge loads the equivalent of 70 trucks. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ross Township Traffic| We the residents of Perry Manor: Washington Blvd., Spruce Street, Lee Avenue Extension, and the residents of Highland Pines: Mayer Drive and Buck Hill Road, are asking Ross Township to permanently solve our traffic problems. The duality of the problem is both a high volume of non-neighborhood traffic and easy access to our roads. This traffic is trying to avoid the light at the intersection of Route 19 and Sewickley Oakmont Rd by cutting through our residential neighborhoods. | Allegheny County  | *Shirley Adams, Residents of Perry Manor/Highland Pines*
Our proposed short term plan is to have Ross Township erect signs with posted fines to discourage non-resident access to our streets and decrease traffic volume. Also, there are not enough speed limit signs posted, we require more 25mph signs posted. Our proposed long range plan is to work with Ross Township, Penn Dot, and SPC (Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission) TIP program to fix the dual lights at the intersection of Rt. 19 and Sewickley Oakmont. Adjusting timing of these lights is essential but will not impact the high volume of traffic from I-279 and I-79. We believe a dedicated right hand turning lane is needed at Manor Care on Route 19. We believe a dedicated left hand turning lane and right hand turning lane is needed at Willis on Sewickley Oakmont and the second light at Three Degree Road needs to be timed to allow Sewickley Oakmont traffic (more than five cars) to turn down Three Degree Road on a green light. We will try to impact our legislators but we need the township to take the lead with county and state agencies. We are certain that all of Ross Township residents will benefit from our long term plan.
In closing, as the editor of the New Traffic Plan, I offer an alternative plan, a simple and cost effective solution, to the speeding and cut through traffic in our neighborhoods. My permanent solution would be to close the roadway at the red zone, a cement barrier between Mayer Drive and Lee Ave Ext. at Point Vue. |

**Response:** Comment noted. Supporters of improvements to the intersection are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the need and to ensure consideration for future funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ross Township Traffic Petition</td>
<td>We the residents of Perry Manor: Washington Blvd., Spruce Street, Lee Avenue Extension, and the residents of Highland Pines: Mayer Drive and Buck Hill Road, are asking Ross Township to permanently solve our traffic problems. The duality of the problem is both a high volume of non-neighborhood traffic and easy access to our roads. This traffic is trying to avoid the light at the intersection of Route 19 and Sewickley Oakmont Rd by cutting through our residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>Shirley Adams (Petition), Residents of Perry Manor/Highland Pines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our proposed short term plan is to have Ross Township erect signs with posted fines to discourage non-resident access to our streets and decrease traffic volume. Also, there are not enough speed limit signs posted, we require more 25mph signs posted. Our proposed long range plan is to work with Ross Township, Penn Dot, and SPC (Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission) TIP program to fix the dual lights at the intersection of Rt. 19 and Sewickley Oakmont. Adjusting timing of these lights is essential but will not impact the high volume of traffic from I-279 and I-79. We believe a dedicated right hand turning lane is needed at Manor Care on Route 19. We believe a dedicated left hand turning lane and right hand turning lane is needed at Willis on Sewickley Oakmont and the second light at Three Degree Road needs to be timed to allow Sewickley Oakmont traffic (more than five cars) to turn down Three Degree Road on a green light. We will try to impact our legislators but we need the township to take the lead with county and state agencies. We are certain that all of Ross Township residents will benefit from our long term plan. In closing, as the editor of the New Traffic Plan, I offer an alternative plan, a simple and cost effective solution, to the speeding and cut through traffic in our neighborhoods. My permanent solution would be to close the roadway at the red zone, a cement barrier between Mayer Drive and Lee Ave Ext. at Point Vue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Comment noted. Supporters of improvements to the intersection are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the need and to ensure consideration for future funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Economic and Environmental</td>
<td>Transit is economic and environmental... The LRDP rightly calls out the vital role transit plays in achieving the vision of Project Region, but it falls short in only highlighting environmental concerns. The recent wild fluctuations in gas prices, which are clearly trending upward, must also be called out as a reason for transit’s vital role in our region’s future. Transportation affordability is paramount</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Regional Policy Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Comment noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Economic Role</th>
<th>Transit Economic Role</th>
<th>Allegheny County</th>
<th>Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Regional Policy Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize transit’s regional economic role by highlighting trip type rather than trips taken</td>
<td>Page 4-36 highlights the percentage of trips taken by transit in the region. However, from an economic perspective, transit’s footprint is much larger. With well over half of Downtown – and 1/3 of Oakland – commuters taking transit (well in excess of 140,000 jobs between those two alone), let alone improvements being made in places like Robinson and Beaver County, it is clear that transit is much more vital than this 1.5% suggests. We must highlight that fact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Comment noted. SPC and other entities engaged in transit planning across the country continue to look for better ways to measure the quantity and quality of transit services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transit Investments | Transit Investments | Allegheny County | *Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Regional Policy Manager*

Support existing transit investments like the North Shore Connector, East Busway, and park-and-ride facilities. Though very controversial, the North Shore Connector will not reach its full potential if we stop there. Airport rail, and possibly North Hills rail, must be added to the Illustrative List to maximize this expenditure. We also must ensure that the resulting North Shore development remains a high-density mixed-use development to maximize operation of the system.

A major economic and residential center to the east – Monroeville – is completely disconnected from the transit system. This must be re-connected through either a Busway extension or light rail. This also stands for the Robinson area.

**Response:** The current fiscal circumstance dictates a focus of 2040 Plan investments on maintenance of the existing transportation system rather than system expansion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td><em>Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, Regional Policy Manager</em>&lt;br&gt;Elevate transit-oriented development to a much higher priority within the LRDP for regional sustainability, public-private partnership (P3) opportunities. Rather than simply listing projects on 4-44, create a broader discussion about TOD’s opportunity within the region and the clear demand demonstrated for this by national groups like AARP and the National Association of Realtors. Through TOD, our region can better serve a broad range of residents and businesses. It’s already clear, from our development patterns, that the largest job centers of the region rely heavily on transit to deliver its workforce. We must better connect the other end – our residential and neighborhood business districts – to transit. Through TOD, we also provide one piece of the funding solution puzzle. P3s are ripe opportunities around transit stations and nodes throughout the region, and developers are very interested in these opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response:* The importance of TOD is recognized in the LRP as an implementation tool for several of the key Plan Policies (pgs 1-3) such as: "Revitalization and redevelopment of the region's existing communities is priority..." and "The region's transit system will connect people with resources throughout the entire region." SPC continues to monitor of developments at the state level over the use of Public-Private Partnerships to accomplish infrastructure funding goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dutch Ridge Road     | Dutch Ridge Road (S.R. 4020) is in need of upgrade for its entire length, from Fifth Street in Beaver Borough to its intersection with Tuscarawas Road (S.R. 4028) in Brighton Township. Needed improvements include shoulders, pavement, signage and storm drainage. The section of road between Tuscarawas Road (S.R. 4028) and Brighton Road (S.R. 4035) is very narrow, with uneven pavement and poor drainage. The section of roadway between Park Road (S.R. 4018) and Beaver Borough has rutted and uneven pavement. | Beaver County | **Bryan Dehart, Brighton Township, Township Manager**  
For these reasons Dutch Ridge Road should be added to the Roadway Capital Maintenance program for scheduled improvements. |

*Response:* Comment noted. Supporters of improvements to the roadway are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the need and to ensure consideration for future funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SR 151 and Kane Rd Intersection Improvement | SR 151 and Kane Rd Intersection Improvement- The 2-Lane Relocation of the Kane/Gringo Road RT 151 Intersection was previously considered since the 1990’s and listed on the 2005-08 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). | Beaver County | John Bates, Hopewell Twp Zoning Officer, Beaver Co. PPP member  
The SR 151 and Kane Road Intersection Improvement Project fits well within the structure of the coordinated regional development plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. The regional policy committee's goals and objectives and the task force emphasis on economic development, community development, quality of life and transportation safety are all very well illustrated in the SR 151/Kane Road Intersection improvement project. The "BIG PICTURE" relating to the future health, safety and welfare of the traveling public rests upon the foundation of the 151/Kane Road Intersection improvement. |
| U.S. Route 30 Upgrades                      | The U.S. Route 30 Upgrade from the West Virginia line (NOT Ohio-as shown on the TIP) to State Route 168, shown as project #43 on the 2040 TIP. The design for the Route 30 project calls for a re-alignment of the US 30/Red Dog Road Intersection with a turn lane. | Beaver County | Sandra Wright, Greene Township, Secretary/Treasurer  
The U.S. Route 30 Upgrade from the West Virginia line (NOT Ohio-as shown on the TIP) to State Route 168, shown as project #43 on the 2040 TIP should be considered as a priority project for driver safety reasons. |

Response: This project is in the early phases of project development but the amount of previous TIP funding was insufficient to complete the project. Regional support and cooperation will be important for the project to be placed back on the TIP.

Response: PennDOT has re-evaluated the existing design and is in the process of designing a new roadway template and project length to try to make the project more affordable. Currently, the Beaver County LRP and TIP’s do not have additional funds for a project of the original scope and length however, with the new design there may be an opportunity to add to the LRP in the future if the current funding stream does not reduce less than it is today. If the funding stream continues to decrease, we cannot comment if/when the project will ever be funded, regardless of scope and length. The project limit language will be changed to reflect that the Route 30 Upgrade is from the "West Virginia line to SR 168".
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 228 Southbound Loop Ramp        | The third project includes the new southbound on-ramp to I-79. As with the northbound ramp, traffic must now cross over 228 traffic to head southbound on I-79. The new ramp will flow directly from Route 228 to I-79 south without crossing traffic.                                                                                       | Butler County  | *David Johnston, Butler County Planning Department, Director*
Following the collapse of the integral project along this corridor in 2007, PennDOT worked closely with the Federal Highway Administration and local leaders to utilize the environmental work completed to date as a data bank for future projects. State, County, local leaders, and local businesses and the Chamber of Commerce spent considerable time to break projects into smaller fundable projects that would attempt to improve the flow of traffic along this corridor.

The third project includes the new southbound on-ramp to I-79. As with the northbound ramp, traffic must now cross over 228 traffic to head southbound on I-79. The new ramp will flow directly from Route 228 to I-79 south without crossing traffic.

We are seeking help in getting projects developed along this corridor that will provide a long-term sustained improvement to help to improve the flow of traffic. This area of Butler County serves as an economic catalyst for the entire region. It is critical that the State and Federal Government not abandon this corridor that has provided well-paying sustainable jobs.  

*Response:* This project is in design and is funded for construction on the current 2011-2014 TIP. Future projects along the Route 228 corridor will depend on numerous variables, including funding availability, highway and bridge needs, and transportation priorities in the County, District, and SPC region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Commuter Rail    | Commuter Rail from Evans City to Pittsburgh   | Butler County | *Paul Foster, Evans City Borough, Vice President of Council*
|                  |                                               |               | The Evans City area needs more mass transit solutions to Pittsburgh. This is evident, by the number of cars in the Park’n’Ride at 528 and 79. I believe part of the solution would be commuter rail service. The rail lines to Pittsburgh already exist. In fact less than 10 years ago, Amtrak came through Evans City. The commuter service could start in Butler or Zelienople and run through Harmony, Evans City, Mars and beyond. It would end at Penn Station in Pittsburgh, near the bus terminal, with a link to the PAT subway system. One major problem in Evans City would be where to put the train station or stop. Maybe such a station would be better outside of Evans City, such as in Jackson Township near Lindsay Rd. (528). |

*Response:* The Transit Illustrative Project Listing on page 4-58 contains a listing for "Rail: Southern Butler County to Pittsburgh North Shore - Passenger/Commuter Rail. Although funding has not been identified for the projects listed here, the list is an acknowledgement of the potential efficacy of such a project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA 228 Mars RR</td>
<td>Finally, design work is underway to replace the Mars Railroad Bridge along this</td>
<td>Butler County</td>
<td>Following the collapse of the integral project along this corridor in 2007, PennDOT worked closely with the Federal Highway Administration and local leaders to utilize the environmental work completed to date as a data bank for future projects. State, County, local leaders, and local businesses and the Chamber of Commerce spent considerable time to break projects into smaller fundable projects that would attempt to improve the flow of traffic along this corridor. Finally, design work is underway to replace the Mars Railroad Bridge along this corridor as well as improvements at the Mars intersection. We are grateful for funding provided by Representative Jason Altmire to make this $19 million dollar project a reality. We are seeking help in getting projects developed along this corridor that will provide a long-term sustained improvement to help to improve the flow of traffic. This area of Butler County serves as an economic catalyst for the entire region. It is critical that the State and Federal Government not abandon this corridor that has provided well-paying sustainable jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>replace the Mars Railroad Bridge along this corridor as well as improvements at the</td>
<td></td>
<td>This project is in design and is funded for construction on the current 2011-2014 TIP. Future projects along the Route 228 corridor will depend on numerous variables, including funding availability, highway and bridge needs, and transportation priorities in the County, District, and SPC region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**David Johnston, Butler County Planning Department, Director**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Route 228 Slip Ramp      | Break out ramp project from the main Route 228 Improvement Project to expedite the project. (The scope of work involves the same work that was to have been done as part of the original Route 228 Improvement Project.) | Butler County | *David Johnston, Butler County Planning Department, Director*
Following the collapse of the integral project along this corridor in 2007, PennDOT worked closely with the Federal Highway Administration and local leaders to utilize the environmental work completed to date as a data bank for future projects. State, County, local leaders, and local businesses and the Chamber of Commerce spent considerable time to break projects into smaller fundable projects that would attempt to improve the flow of traffic along this corridor.
The first project was the auxiliary lane that came off the northbound 1-79 ramp and extended in front of the Marriott Hotel to its terminus with Cranberry Woods Drive.  

*Response:* This project has been completed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rte 228 Northbound Onramp</td>
<td>The second project includes the northbound on-ramp of 1-79. Currently, traffic heading northbound from Route 228 crosses traffic. The new ramp will improve the flow of traffic by exiting directly from Route 228 to 1-79.</td>
<td>Butler County</td>
<td>Following the collapse of the integral project along this corridor in 2007, PennDOT worked closely with the Federal Highway Administration and local leaders to utilize the environmental work completed to date as a data bank for future projects. State, County, local leaders, and local businesses and the Chamber of Commerce spent considerable time to break projects into smaller fundable projects that would attempt to improve the flow of traffic along this corridor. The second project includes the northbound on-ramp of 1-79. Currently, traffic heading northbound from Route 228 crosses traffic. The new ramp will improve the flow of traffic by exiting directly from Route 228 to 1-79. We are seeking help in getting projects developed along this corridor that will provide a long-term sustained improvement to help to improve the flow of traffic. This area of Butler County serves as an economic catalyst for the entire region. It is critical that the State and Federal Government not abandon this corridor that has provided well-paying sustainable jobs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response:*Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SR 228 & SR 2005 Intersection Improvement | Improve the existing Y intersection of SR 228 and SR 2005 in Clinton Township, Butler County. Two concept plans for improving the Rt.228/Saxonburg Boulevard Intersection. Both concepts would require signalization and possibly additional turning lanes. Option No. 1 shows the existing intersection being moved to the northwest to provide a more 90° Tee intersection for safer traffic movements. A resulting extended separation between the main intersection and that of the Westminster Rd/Rt. 228 Ekastown Rd. intersection. This will provide operators of northbound vehicles on Westminster Road better visibility and more time to make their turning movements. A slight realignment of the Knoch Road/Saxonburg Boulevard to more closely conform to desirable 90° intersection angle. Option No. 2 shows a more ambitious concept which Converts Rt. 228 as a through road to Ekastown Road Results in Saxonburg Boulevard and Westminster Road connecting at a cross intersection with Rt. 228. Note, however, that radii of turns on the proposed new Saxonburg Blvd. alignment could possibly be disapproved by PaDOT as being too small for the posted 45 mph speed limit on Saxonburg Boulevard. | Butler County | Mary Zacherl, Clinton Township, Chairman of Supervisors
I request that your attention now be directed to another long-standing, difficult intersection- 228 and Saxonburg Boulevard, SR 2005. Thank you for the opportunity to state the case for the intersection in Clinton Township, Cox's Corner (SR 288/SR2005), that we, the Board of Supervisors, believe is a very dangerous situation waiting for a serious accident to happen. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 68 bypass</td>
<td>I am proposing the creation of a bypass route. This bypass would start at the intersection of Lindsay Rd. (528) and route 68, west of Evans City. The road would cross Likens Run and then over both the railroad and Breakneck Creek. From there the road would continue northeast to connect with Franklin Road (528), north of Evans City and on to reconnect with route 68 between Evans City and Brownsdale Road. North Washington Street in Evans City could be extended to connect with the bypass on the north side of Breakneck Creek. This would create a new business corridor within Evans City.</td>
<td>Butler County</td>
<td>Paul Foster, Evans City Borough, Vice President of Council&lt;br&gt;The SPC has done a traffic study as part of the SINC-UP project in 2008. This has improved the flow of traffic through Evans City. Yet, I expect the traffic volume on Route 68 through Evans City to increase. Route 68 is currently a two lane road. Within Evans City, there are portions of route 68 that are only wide enough for two lanes, edged with curbs. Other sections have space for parking. In order to increase the capacity of the road, it could be made 4 lanes with two main obstacles. The sections which have no parking, (curbed) would have to be widen. The bridge over the Breakneck Creek is three lanes wide. It would have to be replaced. Instead of making route 68 four lanes wide, I am proposing the creation of a bypass route. This bypass would start at the intersection of Lindsay Rd. (528) and route 68, west of Evans City. The road would cross Likens Run and then over both the railroad and Breakneck Creek. From there the road would continue northeast to connect with Franklin Road (528), north of Evans City and on to reconnect with route 68 between Evans City and Brownsdale Road. North Washington Street in Evans City could be extended to connect with the bypass on the north side of Breakneck Creek. This would create a new business corridor within Evans City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Due to continuing fiscal constraints, the amount of capacity adding projects that can be planned and programmed will be limited in the foreseeable future. SPC and PennDOT affirm the high priority of these local improvement projects and will continue support and seek additional funding to advance projects that incorporate smart transportation and congestion management principals in order to mitigate the congestion on corridors such as Route 68 in Evans City. As we have done in the past, SPC and PennDOT will continue to work with Evans City on future solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| State Route 3022 and Thompson Park Drive | permit to complete roadway improvements  | Butler County| *Eric Lamm, Citizen, Citizen*  
Eric Lamm, a citizen of Butler County, requested the following: Mr. Lamm is seeking assistance from PennDOT in the form of a permit to complete roadway improvements at the intersection of State Route 3022 and Thompson Park Drive. These improvements include widening, signal modifications, and other related improvements. Mr. Lamm stated that he had to submit additional documentation to PennDOT, which included a letter of credit, or he faced the risk of losing related funding by June 1, 2011. Mr. Lamm stated that he would accept any help available to expedite the process. |
|                            |                                          |              | *Response:* PennDOT District 10 staff took Mr. Lamm's request, and reviewed his situation with the appropriate staff internally. Mr. Lamm, with the assistance of Cranberry Township, who has now taken ownership of the project, has provided documentation for issuance of the permit. Mr. Lamm's request has since been resolved, as he has not lost his funding, and he is proceeding with his improvement project with the assistance of the PennDOT District and Cranberry Township. |
Edits/changes to project listings in the 2040 LRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested the following edits be made to the various PennDOT District 12 Project Listings in the 2040 LRP.</td>
<td>Fayette County</td>
<td>Angela Saunders, PennDOT District 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Change the project name:
  - US 19 Morrisville Phase I in Greene County, change to US 19 Safety Improvements Phase I (Morrisville).
  - Add 'Phase 2' to the title of the SR 21 Morrisville Corridor project in Greene County.
  - SR 19 Improvements in Washington County, change to US 19 Corridor Safety and Congestion Improvements.
  - SR 30 Intersection Improvements in Westmoreland County, change to US 30 Corridor Safety and Congestion Improvements.
  - SR 981 Laurel Valley Betterments in Westmoreland County, change to Laurel Valley Transportation Improvements.

- Update project costs and schedules:
  - US 19 Safety Improvements Phase I (Morrisville) in Greene County, change from $3.4 million in Stage 1 to $4.1 million; change from $22.1 million in Stage 2 to $24.6 million.
  - SR 119 Interchange Reconstruction @ SR 819 in Westmoreland County, change from $4.9 million in Stage 2 to $7.8 million.
  - SR 4038 Layton Bridge in Fayette County, change from $79.1 million in Stage 3 to $69.6 million in Stage 2.
  - SR 1022 Donora-Webster Bridge in Washington County, change from $58.6 million in Stage 3 to $33.4 million in Stage 2.
  - SR 1060 Salina Bridge in Westmoreland County, change from $27.0 million in Stage 3 to $14.6 million in Stage 2.

- Add highway restoration projects from the reserve line item:
  - SR 51 Reconstruction, Allegheny County Line to Uniontown, add to Stage 3 at $169.9 million and reduce Reserve Line Item.
  - SR 981 @ Kennametal in Westmoreland County, add to Stage 2 at $12.4 million.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 119 and McClure Road</td>
<td>SR 119 and McClure Road signal; Open to 4-way Traffic</td>
<td>Fayette County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Response:** Comment noted; text revised.  
John Konieczny, citizen  
Increased traffic on Township Road. Inconvenient for businesses on 119. Increased traffic at light at Bullskin Traffic light. I don't see any traffic hazards at this intersection with the traffic light and with access to and from 119.  

**Response:** Comment noted. Text revised.  

SR 119 and McClure Road | SR 119 and McClure Road signal; Open to 4-way Traffic   | Fayette County |  
**Petition - 353 signatures, Citizens**  
We the concerned residents, citizens, and business owners of Upper Tyrone Township, McClure Road, and Fayette County petition to have the intersection open, concrete island removed, and the 4-way intersection opened at the crossroads of McClure Road and Route 119, in Upper Tyrone Township, Fayette County.  

**Response:** Comment noted. Supporters of improvements to the intersection are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the need and to ensure consideration for future funding.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SR 119 and McClure Road  | SR 119 and McClure Road signal; Open to 4-way Traffic    | Fayette County    | *Robert Lewandowski, Citizen*
I am a resident of the Upper Side (East Side) of McClure Road & Route 119 with a 3 way red light. Why couldn't this have been made a 4 way red light when it was installed? We residents on the eastern side of Route 119 have to go at least 4 miles out of our way in either direction (North or South) to visit relatives & businesses of the lower side (Western Side), This 3 way light makes it very inconvenient for those of us Eastern Side of McClure Road & Route 119." How could a 4 way light be any more dangerous? |

**Response:** Comment noted. Supporters of improvements to the intersection are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the need and to ensure consideration for future funding.

| SR 119 and McClure Road  | SR 119 and McClure Road signal; Open to 4-way Traffic    | Fayette County    | *Tim & Linda Lewandowski, Business Owners, Citizens*
My business is loosing customers because they cannot come straight across. They have to go to the route 819 or where George's Trading post intersection to get on Route 119. There is more visibility at the intersection of 119 & McClure than the stop light at George's Trading Post. |

**Response:** Comment noted. Supporters of improvements to the intersection are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the need and to ensure consideration for future funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Light Fixes in Brownsville PA</td>
<td>Following is the breakdown of what is needed for the town to update our old and antiquated traffic light system. 1. High and Second Street - Replace four (4) traffic lights with LEDs. 2. High Street and Bridge - install a camera detection system to replace the existing malfunctioning system and replace four (4) traffic lights with LEDs. 3. Market and Brownsville Avenue - install a camera detection system to replace the existing malfunctioning system and replace four (4) traffic lights with LEDs. 4. Broadway and Marked Street - replace seven (7) traffic lights with LEDs. 5. Fifth and Marked Street - replace eight (8) traffic lights with LEDs.</td>
<td>Fayette County</td>
<td>Lester Ward, Brownsville Borough, Mayor We are requesting $25,000 which will update our systems, make our town safer and will allow us to better cope with the increasing traffic situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** SPC and PennDOT have continued to facilitate and encourage municipalities to make improvements to their traffic signal infrastructure. These projects yield high public benefits for relatively low costs. There are a number of options where formal application for this funding could be made by the municipality. Currently, PennDOT is making Automated Red Light Enforcement (ARLE) funding available for traffic signal improvements projects. Information can be found at: http://www.pabulletin.com/secure/data/vol41/41-22/919.html Other potential sources would be SPC's Regional Traffic Signal Program and CMAQ Program. Assuming that funding remains available, the next planned open application period for the Regional Traffic Signal Program will occur in mid-2012. The next planned open application period for the CMAQ program will occur in late Summer, 2011. Information on these programs can be found at www.spcregion.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Good Roads Necessary to Strengthen Communities | Supports improving the roads in Greene County | Greene County | *Paul Lagojda, Greene County Resident*

Mr. Lagojda stated that he has been attending these meetings for decades and feels strongly that good roads are necessary to promote quality of life and strong communities. He noted that the current cow and deer paths that we have now will not get us where we need to be. He also suggested that we need to consolidate the current Greene County School Districts together and stated that there are currently “4 leaky canoes and 1 flagship” for our school districts. In order for a combining of the districts to happen, the transportation system must be improved. He concluded by asking how this plan will get us there?

*Response:* Comment noted. The central vision of the 2040 Plan is to strengthen our core communities, and the corridors that connect them. To this end, the Plan is advancing the commenter’s goals of strong communities and quality of life through its focus on meeting the highway and bridge maintenance needs of the region, and through the implementation of cost effective operational improvements designed to promote highway safety.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoodlebug/West Penn Trail</td>
<td>Trail gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail, and the Hoodlebug Trail. In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Rt. 119 South Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail connecting 13 miles of trail from Indiana through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued just north of the 119&amp;22 Interchange near the Blairsville High School Campus within 2 miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. You can visit this site for more detailed information: <a href="http://www.indianacountyparks.org">www.indianacountyparks.org</a> Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and ends within a few miles of Blairsville Borough. DCNR, DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided cultural, historical and various environmental clearance funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville. This will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millennium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination. It will also mean a much needed economic stimulus to our Borough and...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana County</td>
<td>Anthony Distefano, Burrell Township Supervisors, Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing in support of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike &amp; pedestrian routes to connect the Hoodlebug Trail, the Ghost Town Trail and the West Penn Trail in to the Borough of Blairsville. As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are: A bike pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22. An alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000. Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Blairsville has been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued support in this matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the region. This Loop Trail will be under construction in 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** The 2040 Plan highlights the many trail connectivity efforts currently underway in the region. SPC has conducted a Roadway Safety Audit for Route 22 in the vicinity of Blairsville. The need for safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Blairsville, the West Penn Trail, and the schools, trails and business establishments located north of Route 22 was identified in the summary report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoodlebug/West Penn Trail</td>
<td>Trail gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail, and the Hoodlebug Trail. In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Rt. 119 South Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail connecting 13 miles of trail from Indiana through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued just north of the 119&amp;22 Interchange near the Blairsville High School Campus within 2 miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. You can visit this site for more detailed information: <a href="http://www.indianacountyparks.org">www.indianacountyparks.org</a> Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and ends within a few miles of Blairsville Borough. DCNR, DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided cultural, historical and various environmental clearance funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville. This will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millennium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination. It will also mean a much needed economic stimulus to our economic health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chuck Lydic  
I am writing in support of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike & pedestrian routes to connect the Hoodlebug Trail, the Ghost Town Trail and the West Penn Trail into the Borough of Blairsville. As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:  
A bike pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22. An alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000. Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Blairsville has been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borough and the region. This Loop Trail will be under construction in 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** The 2040 Plan highlights the many trail connectivity efforts currently underway in the region. SPC has conducted a Roadway Safety Audit for Route 22 in the vicinity of Blairsville. The need for safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Blairsville, the West Penn Trail, and the schools, trails and business establishments located north of Route 22 was identified in the summary report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoodlebug/West Penn Trail</td>
<td>Trail gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail, and the Hoodlebug Trail. In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Rt. 119 South Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail connecting 13 miles of trail from Indiana through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued just north of the 119&amp;22 Interchange near the Blairsville High School Campus within 2 miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. You can visit this site for more detailed information: <a href="http://www.indianacountyparks.org">www.indianacountyparks.org</a> Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and ends within a few miles of Blairsville Borough. DCNR, DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided cultural, historical and various environmental clearance funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville. This will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millennium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination. It will also mean a much needed economic stimulus to our community.</td>
<td>Indiana County</td>
<td>James Garvin Jr., Blairsville Community Development Authority, President I am writing in support of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike &amp; pedestrian routes to connect the Hoodlebug Trail, the Ghost Town Trail and the West Penn Trail in to the Borough of Blairsville. As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are: A bike pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22. An alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000. Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Blairsville has been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued support in this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borough and the region. This Loop Trail will be under construction in 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response:* The 2040 Plan highlights the many trail connectivity efforts currently underway in the region. SPC has conducted a Roadway Safety Audit for Route 22 in the vicinity of Blairsville. The need for safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Blairsville, the West Penn Trail, and the schools, trails and business establishments located north of Route 22 was identified in the summary report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoodlebug/West Penn Trail</td>
<td>Trail gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail, and the Hoodlebug Trail. In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Rt. 119 South Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail connecting 13 miles of trail from Indiana through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued just north of the 119&amp;22 Interchange near the Blairsville High School Campus within 2 miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. You can visit this site for more detailed information: <a href="http://www.indianacountyparks.org">www.indianacountyparks.org</a> Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and ends within a few miles of Blairsville Borough. DCNR, DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided cultural, historical and various environmental clearance funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville. This will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millennium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination. It will also mean a much needed economic stimulus to our community. I am writing in support of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike &amp; pedestrian routes to connect the Hoodlebug Trail, the Ghost Town Trail and the West Penn Trail into the Borough of Blairsville. As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are: A bike pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22. An alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000. Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Blairsville has been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued support in this matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana County</td>
<td>Timothy Evans, Blairsville Borough, Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borough and the region. This Loop Trail will be under construction in 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Response: The 2040 Plan highlights the many trail connectivity efforts currently underway in the region. SPC has conducted a Roadway Safety Audit for Route 22 in the vicinity of Blairsville. The need for safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Blairsville, the West Penn Trail, and the schools, trails and business establishments located north of Route 22 was identified in the summary report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study</td>
<td>Request that recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study be included in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identifies bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 11-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 36-mile Ghost Town Trail to the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.</td>
<td>Indiana County</td>
<td>Ed Patterson, Indiana County Parks &amp; Trails, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus to the traditional downtown and residential center, and to connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center. As described in the attached Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are: -A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22. -A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000. Please consider the outcomes of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: The 2040 Plan highlights the many trail connectivity efforts currently underway in the region. SPC has conducted a Roadway Safety Audit for Route 22 in the vicinity of Blairsville. The need for safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Blairsville, the West Penn Trail, and the schools, trails and business establishments located north of Route 22 was identified in the summary report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity   | Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study          | Indiana County | *Mark Reynolds, Wyotech, Director of Operations*

I am writing in support of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike & pedestrian routes to connect the Hoodlebug Trail, the Ghost Town Trail and the West Penn Trail into the Borough of Blairsville. As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:

- A bike pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.
- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000. Please consider the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2011-2014 TIP.

*Response:* The 2040 Plan highlights the many trail connectivity efforts currently underway in the region. SPC has conducted a Roadway Safety Audit for Route 22 in the vicinity of Blairsville. The need for safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Blairsville, the West Penn Trail, and the schools, trails and business establishments located north of Route 22 was identified in the summary report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study | Request that recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study be included in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identifies bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 11-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 36-mile Ghost Town Trail to the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville. | Indiana County | *Michael T. Burk, Conemaugh Valley Cons. & Cambria/Indiana Trail Cou, President*  
The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus to the traditional downtown and residential center, and to connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center. As described in the attached Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are: -A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22. -A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000. Please consider the outcomes of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. |

**Response:** The 2040 Plan highlights the many trail connectivity efforts currently underway in the region. SPC has conducted a Roadway Safety Audit for Route 22 in the vicinity of Blairsville. The need for safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Blairsville, the West Penn Trail, and the schools, trails and business establishments located north of Route 22 was identified in the summary report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Indiana County Regional Trail   | Request that recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study be included in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identifies bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 11-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 36-mile Ghost Town Trail to the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville. | Indiana County | Tammy Whitfield, Blairsville-Saltsburg School District, Administrative Assistant  
I am writing to support the inclusion of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 13-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 32-mile Ghost Town Trail to Ebensburg and the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville. The trail connections are essential to the Blairsville because of recreation, commuting and shopping trips, and for our youth to travel safely to the various youth activities, including school. Our community is poised to be a hub in the regional trail system. As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:  
• A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.  
• A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000. Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall.  
Blairsville has been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued help. |
| Connectivity Study              |                                                                                      |              |  

Response: The 2040 Plan highlights the many trail connectivity efforts currently underway in the region. SPC has conducted a Roadway Safety Audit for Route 22 in the vicinity of Blairsville. The need for safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Blairsville, the West Penn Trail, and the schools, trails and business establishments located north of Route 22 was identified in the summary report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ellwood City Main Street Project Revitalization  | Ellwood City Main Street Project Revitalization, Segment 1B, Segment 2, and Segment 3, infrastructure and streetscaping improvements to the core business district. The business district of Ellwood City is the regional downtown for over 25,000 residents in Lawrence and Beaver Counties. The Borough of Ellwood City's downtown is severely deteriorated due to aging systems and intensive use. The goal of the project is to implement a capital improvement that is conductive to economic development and the improved quality of life in the Ellwood City region. It would, through community involvement, rekindle a sense of pride and ownership in the region, provide the necessary conditions for new business opportunity, expansion and job creation. The business district is also the gateway to the Ellwood City Area High School and Hartman Elementary School. The projects would increase the safety of the area students K - 12. | Lawrence County | *Kevin Bowser, State Rep. Jaret Gibbon's Office, Chief of Staff*  
Segments 1B, 2, and 3 are the continuation of a comprehensive revitalization project that is in progress in the Borough. Ellwood City Borough completed a Core Area Streetscaping (MPMS# 77206). This project was fully funded and completed with Stimulus (ARRA) funds for a total project cost of $553,940. Segment 1A created a community plaza and farmer's market in the downtown district. The total cost for the project was $2.4 million dollars and was funded by private, state and federal dollars. Remaining funds needed to complete the rest of the revitalization are as follows: Segment 1B - $6,000,000  
Segment 2 - $6,000,000  
Segment 3 - $6,000,000 |

**Response:** Comment noted and shared with PennDOT District 11-0. However, due to continuing fiscal constraints, the amount of projects that can be programmed at this time is limited. This project will have to look toward future TIP/LRPs for possible inclusion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Active Allegheny plan should be incorporated into the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan in order to build upon the foundation that the County of Allegheny has created. This is also necessary in order to provide a tool for public and private stakeholders to identify how land use changes could impact (favorably or negatively) the continued development of that network into a complete multimodal system.</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City</td>
<td><em>Pat Roberts, City of Pittsburgh Planning Department, Transportation Planner</em> The County of Allegheny has produced this region’s first Active Transportation Plan. That is an historic achievement within the Region. The plan provides a framework for moving ahead with the creation of an active transportation system in Allegheny County. The MOVEPGH Multimodal Transportation Plan, Bike/Ped Plan, and Street Design Manual will soon integrate the Active Allegheny plan while addressing both regional commuter and local transportation and recreation uses of an active transportation system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Additional mapping and more direct reference to the Active Allegheny Plan have been added to the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania in response to public comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add the Allegheny Riverfront Development project and the SEA Lower Hill Development project to the illustrative list on page 4-59.</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City</td>
<td><em>Pat Roberts, City of Pittsburgh Planning Department, Transportation Planner</em> On Page 4-59 there is an illustrative list. The Urban Redevelopment Authority is coming up with an estimate for the Allegheny Riverfront Development project. The SEA Lower Hill Development project cost is estimated at $37M. The SEA briefing/cost estimate sheet has been submitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Comment noted; text revised.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Air Quality Improvements| The Plan needs to connect and discuss air quality improvements or other performance measures with specific alternative transportation modes. | Pittsburgh City | Pat Roberts, City of Pittsburgh Planning Department, Transportation Planner  
There are narrative portions of the plan that address active and alternative transportation modes, but do not discuss or correlate air quality improvements or other performance measures with specific transportation modes. For instance, the plan does not discuss how continuing to build upon the emerging active transportation network can fill the gaps left by changes in transit service while supporting healthier communities. No indication is given as to how the funding programs are to be managed in order to achieve specific goals, as they apply to specific modes. I was seeking information within the plan that supports the local and County efforts toward the development of active transportation networks as transportation systems, rather than being limited as recreational facilities. |

**Response:** Allegheny County's "Active Allegheny Plan" addresses many of the concerns and issues stated in the comment. The Active Allegheny Plan is consistent with SPC's regional Plan. The text will be modified to make the Active Allegheny Plan more visible in the regional 2040 Plan report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Busway Station in the Baum Centre Corridor</td>
<td>East Busway Station in the Baum Centre Corridor</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City</td>
<td>Pat Roberts, City of Pittsburgh Planning Department, Transportation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Page 4-38 of the document, there is a new East Busway Station in the Baum Centre Corridor proposed. I am familiar with some feasibility work being done in the area but did not realize that there was an approved station project. Is it possible that the feasibility study completed would impact the likelihood of the proposed station moving forward? If so, is there an opportunity to have the funds remain on the program as “New East Busway Station”? I suggest this so that there could be an added degree of flexibility in how the funds are applied. This would certainly require the consent of the Port Authority. I am only providing the suggestion in the form of a comment as a participant in this process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Port Authority, in partnership with URA and UPMC, conducted a feasibility assessment of a new East Busway station serving the Baum-Centre Corridor. A location was identified and necessary station elements were identified. The total capital cost was estimated to be $8,600,000. If other entities identify and secure funding for this project, Port Authority will advance the project forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLK East Busway Station at 21st Street</th>
<th>Addition of a MLK East Busway Station at 21st Street in the Strip District.</th>
<th>Pittsburgh City</th>
<th>Pat Roberts, City of Pittsburgh Planning Department, Transportation Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Page 4-40 there is a list of transit Facility Expansions/Stations/Transit Centers. We would like to support the addition of a MLK East Busway Station at 21st Street in the Strip District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** This project will be listed as a a Potential Future Investment transit project.
Referencing Text Edit

Edit changes to text on page 4-44.

Pittsburgh City

Pat Roberts, City of Pittsburgh Planning Department, Transportation Planner

On Page 4-44 there is reference to the City of Pittsburgh being part of an alliance entitled “Economic Development South”. That not-for-profit was created to service the municipalities along Route 51 outside of the City. It is not an entity that the City of Pittsburgh is specifically allied with. The City of Pittsburgh will be exploring Transit Oriented Development node opportunities within the MOVEPGH project, however there is no current pursuit of a TRID in the area of Routes 51 and 88. Economic Development South has proposed the pursuit of a TRID at that location. It is important to differentiate.

Response: Comment noted; text revised.
While I do see the inclusion of the policy statement "The region will preserve and develop its agricultural industry." that policy DOES NOT seem to be represented in any of the county’s or region’s specific plans that are outlined in the draft. Please consider adding language to include a preferred future statement for the Community Farm Alliance (CFA) as listed in my comments.

To strengthen regional agricultural and economic development through diverse programs aimed at improved marketing opportunities, urban connections and increased community awareness of the importance of agriculture for truly sustainable communities.

As part of the on-going evaluation process specific change objectives can be developed which offer a coherent strategy to support the creation and expansion of community-based food systems that are locally owned and controlled, environmentally sound and health-promoting.

Change Objective I: Strengthen community-based marketing opportunities that increase the economic viability of farmers using environmentally sound practices and technology.
Change Objective II: Strengthen link between rural and urban communities through increased consumer awareness of and support for locally produced farm products and enterprises.
Change Objective III: Replicate partnership development and collaboration process within each county in the region.
Change Objective IV: Promote the implementation of sustainable agricultural economic development strategies in local and regional planning and development processes.

Response: One of the 2040 Plan’s policy statements is “The region will preserve and develop its agricultural industry.” The specific economic development projects referenced in the 2040 Plan and its appendices are provided for informational purposes. Similarly, projects that reflect the “Change Objectives” and the goals of the Community Farm Alliance would be consistent with the policies of the 2040 Plan and its regional vision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2005 Multi-Municipal Plan Priorities | Supports adding the project listed in the 2005 Multi-Municipal Plan to the LRP/TIP. (City of Greensburg, Hempfield Twp., South Greensburg Borough, and Southwest Greensburg Borough) | Westmoreland County        | Barbara Ciampini, City Of Greensburg, Director  
Aware that the maintenance of existing infrastructure may take precedence but the list of projects in the 2005 Multi-Municipal Plan represents the priorities for the communities I am representing. Supports adding these project to the LRP/TIP. |
| Response:                     | Due to federally-mandated fiscal constraints limiting the amount of projects that can be programmed on the 2040 Long Range Plan, these project would need to be considered in future LRP and/or TIP Updates. |
| Barnes Lake Road Improvements | The traffic from existing and planned development warrants improvements of turning lanes at major intersections and reconstruction of the roadway which was never designed to handle the current and projected traffic. | Westmoreland County        | Mike Turley, North Huntingdon Township, Assistant Manager  
The Township has in the past provided testimony during the development of the TIP for improvements to Barnes Lake Road. The traffic from existing and planned development warrants improvements of turning lanes at major intersections and reconstruction of the roadway which was never designed to handle the current and projected traffic. It is a major State arterial route that connects to a principal arterial (Route 30) that also serves the areas primary commercial area. Please consider these recommendations for the Region’s long range planning. Each of these is an excellent project that meets the vision and goals that you established in the development of the 2040 Long Range Plan. They are each part of the regional highway system and directly serve the most vital economic activity center in the area. |
| Response:                     | Thank you for your comment. Supporters of improvements to Barnes Lake Road are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the specific roadway need and to ensure consideration for future funding. |
Westmoreland County supports the inclusion of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) into the SPC Long Range Plan. Intelligent Transportation Systems are proven methods to reduce congestion and improve safety, especially along heavily travelled corridors. Several current and future programs such as Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Surface Transportation Program – Urban/Livability Through Smart Transportation could potentially be an avenue to place ITS projects onto the TIP.

ITS, especially Traffic Signal Improvements, can provide a lower cost alternative for congestion management by utilizing “smart” traffic signals that reduce delay to motorists by sensing vehicles.

A regional, long-term commitment to ITS can help to address traffic congestion issues in applicable areas at a significantly reduced cost than by trying to solve congestion through building new and/or wider roads.

Although ITS cannot adequately address congestion in all areas and situations, we feel it is a reasonable and cost effective approach that could help lead to more efficient traffic signals and flow of traffic through heavily congested areas and feel it should be a priority (when applicable) in SPC’s Long Range Plan.

**Response:** SPC will continue to serve as a champion for ITS and other operational improvement strategies within the region. ITS is included as a strategy within the regional CMP and has been identified as a key implementation tool in the Regional Operations Plan. Stand alone ITS projects will continue to be considered for funding, as will the integration of ITS elements into capital maintenance projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jeannette Truck Route| The Jeannette Truck Route project is designed to improve vehicular access, alleviate congestion, and eliminate unsafe truck movements through the City of Jeannette from Route 30 to the Jeannette Industrial Park. The project consists of roadway realignment, drainage upgrades, walkway and curb reconstruction, a minor culvert to cross Brush Creek and new pavement markings and signing. | Westmoreland County | Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning, Deputy Director  
This project was on the previous TIP but was subsequently removed from the 2009-2013 TIP update. It is an important project to support urban renewal and economic development in the City of Jeannette. |

**Response:** This project was in the early phases of project development but the amount of previous TIP funding was insufficient to complete the project. Regional support and cooperation will be important for the project to advance to construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Valley Betterments</td>
<td>This project is designed to connect the manufacturing base and Arnold Palmer Regional Airport in the City of Latrobe/Derry Township/Unity Township area to the Pennsylvania Turnpike in the vicinity of New Stanton.</td>
<td>Westmoreland County</td>
<td>Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning, Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The completion of this project would reduce travel time between the two points from 45 minutes to an estimated 18 minutes. The reduction in travel time from the Latrobe/Derry/Unity Township area to the Turnpike would be a tremendous benefit to many businesses such as Kennametal, ATI, Chestnut Ridge Beverage Company, Latrobe Specialty Steel, Lehigh Specialty Melting, and many others. On the Turnpike end of the project, businesses such as UPS and Super Value would be well served to be able to connect to the Arnold Palmer Airport in approximately 20 minutes or less. Westmoreland County supports the inclusion of this project on SPC's Long Range Plan, however we feel it is necessary that this project be placed on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) during the during the 2013 TIP update. Westmoreland County will continue working with the PA Turnpike Commission to advance the slip ramps they committed to in 2005 so the projects advance simultaneously and the true benefits are finally realized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Comment noted. Supporters of this project are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the specific roadway need and to ensure consideration for future funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Local Bridge Line Item | Local Bridge Line Item  | Westmoreland County | Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning, Deputy Director  
Westmoreland County fully supports the Local Bridge Line Item. However, we feel the allocation to this line item has been far less than adequate to address the growing rehabilitation and replacement needs of locally owned bridges. We are suggesting an increase in the line item to $5 million dollars for each four-year TIP period. We feel this amount of funding could potentially be sufficient to start making a positive impact on locally owned bridges throughout the County. Furthermore, we feel decisions regarding the use of Local Bridge Line Item funds should be made primarily at the County level with the support of PennDOT District 12. Rehabilitating and replacing locally owned bridges is a long-term effort that is consistent with the intents of the Long Range Plan.  

*Response:* Comment noted; the suggested increase for the TIP Local Bridge Line Item has been noted and forwarded onto PennDOT District 12-0 for consideration during the 2013-2016 TIP Update.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 30 Improvements</td>
<td>Corridor wide improvements including turning lanes and access improvements.</td>
<td>Westmoreland County</td>
<td><strong>Mike Turley, North Huntingdon Township, Assistant Manager</strong>&lt;br&gt;There have been several studies conducted for Route 30. Recent studies have recommended corridor wide improvements including turning lanes and access improvements. These recommendations should be included in any long range planning. The current Route 30 configuration has capacity problems, safety concerns, and hinders development in the area. We request that improvements to Route 30 that provide for turning lanes and increase safety be included in SPC's long range planning. Please consider these recommendations for the Region's long range planning. Each of these is an excellent project that meets the vision and goals that you established in the development of the 2040 Long Range Plan. They are each part of the regional highway system and directly serve the most vital economic activity center in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Comment noted. SPC and PennDOT affirm the high priority of these local recommendations and will continue to seek additional funding to advance these projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Route 30 Intersections                      | Upgrading signal operations through the Route 30 Corridor and various intersection improvements.          | Westmoreland County | Mike Turley, North Huntingdon Township, Assistant Manager  
The Draft Long Range Plan includes a line item for Roadway Capital Maintenance for Westmoreland County. We are in the process of upgrading signal operations through the Route 30 Corridor and various intersection improvements are a logical next step. We will followup with several recommended intersection improvements along Route 30. These will be consistent with your vision and stated goals emphasizing maintenance of the existing transportation systems. Please consider these recommendations for the Region's long range planning. Each of these is an excellent project that meets the vision and goals that you established in the development of the 2040 Long Range Plan. They are each part of the regional highway system and directly serve the most vital economic activity center in the area.  
Response: Comment noted. Supporters of improvements to the intersection are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the need and to ensure consideration for future funding. |
| Route 30 Intersections ALCO to Westmoreland Mall | Route 30 Intersection Improvements between Allegheny County Line and Westmoreland Mall.                     | Westmoreland County | Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning, Deputy Director  
The next priority will focus on various intersection improvements and other upgrades along the Route 30 corridor from the Allegheny County line to the Westmoreland Mall in Hempfield Township.  
Response: Comment noted. Supporters of improvements to the various intersections are encouraged to continue their involvement in the transportation planning process to accurately identify the need and to ensure consideration for future funding. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 30 Jeannette to AK bypass</td>
<td>SR 30 Jeannette – Amos K Bypass project (MPMS 31872) to add a center turn lane</td>
<td>Westmoreland County</td>
<td>Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning, Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With the SR 22 Corridor reconstruction nearing completion, a top priority for Westmoreland County is to focus our efforts on upgrading the entire Route 30 corridor from the Allegheny County line to the Somerset County line (approximately 40 miles). Several years ago, the Route 30 study was completed and there were 42 highway candidate projects identified as needing improvements such as widening, interchange redesigns, safety improvements, etc.. In 2010, the SR 30 Jeannette – Amos K Bypass project (MPMS 31872) to add a center turn lane was scheduled to start construction. Once completed, this project will provide major safety improvements which will significantly reduce the number of accidents and improve traffic congestion throughout the Jeannette area of the Route 30 corridor. Unfortunately, the project has faced several delays and the let date has been pushed back to the end of 2011. Timely completion of this project is absolutely critical to safety and congestion management efforts along the Route 30 corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Comment noted; your comment concerning its timely completion has been shared with PennDOT District 12-0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 66 Improvements</td>
<td>Delmont to Armstrong Co line</td>
<td>Westmoreland County</td>
<td><em>Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning, Deputy Director</em> SR 66 is a major north/south corridor that originates at the turnpike in the New Stanton area and extends north to Armstrong County. Capacity limitations from the Delmont area to the Armstrong County line limit the efficiency of north/south travel in the County, with few other options for motorists to choose from. Improving north/south travel throughout the County is a long-term transportation priority as identified in the County’s Comprehensive Plan. As such, we feel it is appropriate for this project to be included in the Long Range Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response:* Due to continuing fiscal constraints, the amount of capacity adding projects that can be planned and programmed will be seriously limited in the foreseeable future. SPC and PennDOT affirm the high priority of these local recommendations and will continue to seek additional funding to advance these projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike Bridge over US 30</td>
<td>Widen Route 30 to address the bottlenecks in this area.</td>
<td>Westmoreland County</td>
<td><strong>Mike Turley, North Huntingdon Township, Assistant Manager</strong>&lt;br&gt;This is also in the major economic activity area in the Township and this area is congested during peak travel periods. Future plans to widen Route 30 to address the bottlenecks in this area are limited due to the location of the bridge abutments. Long term planning should include the need to replace the bridge and accommodate widening of Route 30. Please consider these recommendations for the Region's long range planning. Each of these is an excellent project that meets the vision and goals that you established in the development of the 2040 Long Range Plan. They are each part of the regional highway system and directly serve the most vital economic activity center in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Due to continuing fiscal constraints, the amount of capacity adding projects that can be planned and programmed will be limited in the foreseeable future. SPC and PennDOT affirm the high priority of these local recommendations and will continue to seek additional funding to advance these projects.
Part Two

Summary of Public Participation Panel Meetings
Allegeny County
Public Participation Panel

June 8, 2011  6:00 p.m.
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA
31st Floor

Public Meeting for Comment on the

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination Report

Attendance:

Dan Cessna, PennDOT District 11-0
Jeff Skalican, PennDOT District 11-0
Steve Shanley, Allegheny County Public Works
Ashley Sisca, Senator Jane C. Orie
Stan Caldwell, Carnegie Mellon University
David Wohlwill, Port Authority of Allegheny County
Patrick Roberts, Pittsburgh Dept of City Planning
Lynn Heckman, Allegheny County Community and Economic Development
Hannah Hardy, Pennsylvania Environmental Council
Vinh Ly, Allegheny County Community and Economic Development
Robert Johnson, Governor's Office
Maryann Eisenreich, Governor's Office
Chris Sandvig, Pittsburgh Community Redevelopment Group
Shirley Adams, Citizen
Mary Conturo, Sports and Exhibition Authority
Matt Pavlosky, SPC
Chuck DiPietro, SPC
Chuck Imbrogno, SPC
Sara Walford, SPC
Ryan Gordon, SPC
Rebecca Stark, SPC
1. **Opening Remarks and introductions**

Matt Pavlosky welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan, Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment, Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan, and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.

2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Matt also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan. Matt presented the current transportation funding crisis and discussed the upcoming STC hearing.

Matt noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Dan Cessna of PennDOT District 11-0 gave a brief presentation on the current highway and bridge program. He specifically reviewed three high profile projects in Allegheny County:

- Route 28 Improvements
- Route 51 and 88 Intersection and structures
- Marshall Avenue and Route 65 Interchange

3. **Public comments**

**Shirley Adams, Citizen, Ross Township**

Ms. Adams presented testimony on signal inefficiencies, congestion, and safety problems associated with Route 19 between Sewickley-Oakmont Road and Three Degrees Road. Ms. Adams stated that the intersection configuration and signal at Route 19 and Sewickley-Oakmont Road is creating congestion, backing up Sewickley-Oakmont Road. This congestion is causing motorists bound for southbound Route 19 to cut through the residential neighborhood of Highland Pines in order to bypass two signals on Route 19. Ms. Adams stated that the high-speed traffic through the residential area is a safety concern for the families of this neighborhood. Ms. Adams advocated for a right turn-lane on Sewickley-Oakmont Road at the Route 19 intersection. Shirley noted she has also submitted written testimony to Matt Pavlosky. Ms. Adams presented a petition signed by residents of the
area expressing their shared concerns over this neighborhood “bypass.”

Hanna Hardy, Pennsylvania Environmental Council

Ms. Hardy presented testimony supporting the aspects of the Long Range Transportation Plan that support riverfront trail development. Allegheny County, PEC, and Friends of the riverfront have made significant progress in the completion of the riverfront trail system in Allegheny County. Ms. Hardy stated support for the Active Allegheny Plan and urged incorporation of aspects of this plan in SPC’s long-range plan. Ms. Hardy stated support for the SPC Pedestrian and Bicycle Committee and its role in the continued development of the region’s riverfront trails. Ms. Hardy reviewed the priorities for trail development in Allegheny County. The top priority is the completion of the Great Allegheny Passage along the Monongahela River, including completion of the Mon-Wharf project, which is still in need of funding. Other priorities include the north shore of the Allegheny River from Millvale to Freeport. Ms. Hardy thanked the work of PennDOT for the construction of the portion of the trail in conjunction with the Route 28 project. Ms. Hardy noted the upcoming trail feasibility study for the Ohio River connection to the Montour Trail. Ms. Hardy noted the work that is ongoing to connect the Montour Trail to the Pittsburgh International Airport. Ms. Hardy noted that she would submit comments in writing as well.

4. Open Discussion

Chuck DiPietro responded to the comments made by Shirley Adams, stating that the problems that she has brought up tonight would appear to be a good match for some of the programs at SPC. Chuck discussed the Road Safety Audits that are typically quick assessments of a safety problem for any potential low-cost solutions. Chuck noted the CMAQ program, which is a competitive program for funding to address congestion and air quality. Chuck noted the upcoming SPC Smart Transportation Program.

Chuck DiPietro discussed the challenges of transportation planning during the transportation funding crisis. Chuck urged everyone to pay attention to the Governor’s Transportation advisory Committee. Chuck also announced the upcoming STC hearing that will take place for the region on August 25th in Cranberry

5. Closing Comments
Matt noted that in addition to taking public testimony today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. He thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Armstrong County
Public Participation Panel

June 7, 2011 6:00 p.m.
Commissioners Conference Room
Armstrong County Courthouse

Public Meeting for Comment for:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination Report

Attendance:

Patty Kirkpatrick, Armstrong County Commissioner
Richard Fink, Armstrong County Commissioner
Jean Ruffner, Public Participation Panel Member
Rich Palilla, Armstrong County Department of Planning and Development
Paul Duriancik, Parks Township
Doug Flanders, East Franklin Township
Patti Baker, Town and Country Transit
Gerry Miller, Town and Country Transit
Susan Torrance, PNAR
Chuck Pepper, Armstrong School District
Dave Cook, PennDOT District 10-0
Sara Walfoort, SPC
Chuck Imbrogno, SPC

1. Opening Remarks and introductions

Sara Walfoort welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan, Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment, Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan, and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.
2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Sara Walfoort reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Sara also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan.

Sara noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Next, Sara gave additional background regarding the Draft 2040 Plan, with highlights of upcoming events and initiatives, including the State Transportation Commission’s August 25\(^{th}\) public meeting for Southwestern Pennsylvania. The purpose and background of Governor Corbett’s Transportation Advisory Commission was also discussed, including the Commission’s acceptance of public comment. Lastly, DiPietro provided information regarding the Stage 1 Linking Planning and NEPA Project Evaluation form.

3. **Public comments**

No public comment was offered.

4. **General Discussion**

**Commissioner Kirkpatrick** commented on the impacts that additional truck traffic related to the Marcellus Shale Gas industry was having on roadways in their county, and asked if the SPC Commissioners had considered the issuance of a Policy Statement in support of the redirection of local impact fees to local communities, so that they may repair their roads. Sara and Chuck Imbrogno responded that the question of the impacts and opportunities of the Shale Gas industry in southwestern Pennsylvania had been discussed by the SPC Commissioners, but that to the best of our knowledge, no such policy statement was under consideration.

**Rich Palilla** asked Dave Cook of PennDOT District 10-0 why the projects on Route 422 in Armstrong County and the projects on Route 422 in adjoining Indiana County were displayed differently from one another on the Transportation Improvement Program for Southwestern Pennsylvania. In Armstrong County, three specific projects along Route 422 are listed. In Indiana County, the entire corridor is listed as a single project. Dave responded that he was not quite certain, but that he would get back to Rich Palilla on this question.

The question of the status of the PennDOT Agility program was raised by a local municipal representative. He stated that their Township had used the Agility Program very successfully in the past to design and erect a small bridge on a
local roadway. The use of Township materials and PennDOT design enabled the erection of the new bridge at a time and cost savings. The Township would like to see if additional projects could be completed under the Agility Program. Dave Cook indicated that he would look into the matter and get back to the Township in question.

A representative of another Township asked about the status of a bridge that was washed out in the aftermath of Hurricane Ivan, and has yet to be replaced. He stated that local residents are bypassing the bridge by driving through the creek. This bridge does not serve a large number of County residents, but he feels they have waited long enough for the bridge replacement.

5. **Closing Comments**

Sara noted that in addition to taking public testimony today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. She thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Beaver County
Public Participation Panel

May 31, 2011 5:00 p.m.
Public Meeting Room
Beaver County Courthouse

Public Meeting for Comment for:

- **2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,**
- **Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,**
- **Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan**
- **Air Quality Conformity Determination Report**

**Attendance:**

Charlie Camp, Beaver County Commissioner
Jim Marshall, PA State Representative
Kelly Shroads, SPC Commission Member
Tammy Frank, Beaver County Planning
Jim Camp, Beaver County DPW
Bryan Dehart, Brighton Township
Dennis Nicols, Brighton Township
Ken Rainey, Aliquippa
Sandy Wright, Greene Township
Jon Laughner, Penn State Extension
Joe West, Beaver County Planning Commission
Luke Taiclet, Penn State Beaver
Carl DeChellis, Beaver County Housing Authority
Don Wachter, Mayor, Big Beaver
Tom King, Beaver County Tourism
Debbie Giska-Rose, Mayor, Conway
Dan Cessna, PennDOT District 11-0
Chuck DiPietro, SPC
Chuck Imbrogno, SPC
Matt Pavlosky, SPC
David Totten, SPC

1. **Opening Remarks and Introductions**

Matt Pavlosky welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and

2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Matt also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan.

Matt noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Next, Chuck DiPietro gave additional background regarding the Draft 2040 Plan, with highlights of upcoming events and initiatives, including the State Transportation Commission’s August 25th public meeting for Southwestern Pennsylvania. The purpose and background of Governor Corbett’s Transportation Advisory Commission was also discussed, including the Commission’s acceptance of public comment. Lastly, DiPietro provided information regarding the Stage 1 Linking Planning and NEPA Project Evaluation form.

Dan Cessna delivered a presentation regarding the current construction projects for Beaver County, and provided information regarding the status and estimated completion time of those projects. In addition, Cessna gave background regarding the current funding shortfalls facing the region and the District, and gave examples of how funding dollars and the level of purchasing power vs. cost has significantly diminished in the past few years.

Cessna then took questions related to his presentation from those in attendance.

3. **Public comments**

**Sandy Wright** requested that the US Route 30 Upgrade from the West Virginia line (NOT Ohio-as shown on the TIP) to State Route 168, shown as project #43 on the 2040 TIP should be considered as a priority project for driver safety reasons.

**Bryan Dehart** spoke in regard to Dutch Ridge Road (S.R. 4020) being in need of upgrade, from Fifth Street in Beaver Borough to its intersection with Tuscarawas Road (S.R. 4028) in Brighton Township. Improvements include shoulders, pavement, signage and storm drainage. The section of road between Tuscarawas Road (S.R. 4028) and Brighton Road (S.R. 4035) is very narrow,
with uneven pavement and poor drainage. The section of roadway between Park Road (S.R. 4018) and Beaver Borough has rutted and uneven pavement.

4. **Closing Comments**

Matt noted that in addition to taking public comments today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. He thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Butler County
Public Participation Panel

May 26, 2011 6:00 p.m.
Public Meeting Room
Butler County Government Center

Public Meeting for Comment for:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Report

Attendance:

James Kennedy, Butler County Commissioner
Dale Pinkerton, Butler County Commissioner
Judy Snyder, Co-Chair, Butler PPP
David Johnston, Butler County Planning
Paul Foster, Evans City Borough
John McKinney, Evans City Borough
Gary Capella, Evans City Planning
Mary Zacherl, Clinton Township
Ray Steffler, Senator Mary Jo White
Ashley Sisca, Senator Jane Orie
Eric Lamm, Citizen
David Cook, PENNDOT District 10-0
Matt Pavlosky, SPC
Ken Flack, SPC
Chuck DiPietro, SPC

1. **Opening Remarks and introductions**

Matt Pavlosky welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan, Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment, Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan, and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.

1.
2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Matt also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan. Matt presented the current transportation funding crisis and discussed the upcoming STC hearing.

Matt noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Next, Chuck DiPietro gave addition background regarding the Draft 2040 Plan, with highlights of upcoming events and initiatives, including the State Transportation Commission’s August 25th public meeting for Southwestern Pennsylvania... The purpose and background of Governor Corbett’s Transportation Advisory Commission was also discussed, including the Commission’s acceptance of public comment. Lastly, DiPietro provided information regarding the Stage 1 Linking Planning and NEPA Project Evaluation form.

3. **Public comments**

**Mary Zacherl** spoke on behalf of Clinton Township, specific to Cox’s Corner (SR 228/SR2005), as an unsafe area in need of an intersection improvement. Congestion and sight distance have caused the “Y” shaped intersection to have safety issues. Two options for a “T” shaped intersection were offered as testimony.

**David Johnston** spoke on behalf of Butler County regarding the Route 228 upgrade in southern Butler County from Route 19 to Route 8. Citing traffic congestion and access to job centers, the project(s) have been delayed due to economic factors including limited funding and rising construction costs.

**Paul Foster** asked that a bypass be added for Route 68 between Cranberry and Butler, as a dangerous traffic bottleneck forms in this area.

**Eric Lamm** is seeking a permit from PennDOT to complete roadway improvements at the intersection of State Route 3022 and Thompson Park Drive. Mr. Lamm stated that he had to submit a letter of credit to PennDOT, or he faced the risk of losing related funding by June 1, 2011. Mr. Lamm stated that he would accept any help available to expedite the process.
4. **Closing Comments**

Matt noted that as well as taking public testimony today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. He thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Fayette County  
Public Participation Panel  

May 25, 2011, 3:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m.  
Public Meeting Room  
Fayette County Chamber of Commerce  

Public Meeting for Comment on the  

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,  
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,  
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan  
- Air Quality Conformity Determination Report  

Attendance:  

Tammy Stenson, Co-Chair, Fayette PPP  
Muriel Nuttall, Co-Chair, Fayette PPP  
Gary Gibson, Goodwill of Southwestern PA  
Kim A. Renzie, FACT  
Mark Wasler, Citizen  
Nena Kaminsky, School Director  
Lori Groover-Smith, FACT  
Andrew Kormanik, German-Masontown Library  
Andrew French, RACF  
Joe Grata, SPC Board  
Ron Sotta, Washington Twp.  
Ron Lewandowski, Citizen  
Len Lewandowski, Citizen  
Tim Lewandowski, Citizen  
Walter Krockwich, Citizen  
C. Lewandowski, Citizen  
Jim Marmol, K2 Engineering  
Lester Ward, Mayor of Brownsville  
Rachel Duda, PENNDOT District 12-0  
Bill Kovach, PENNDOT District 12-0  
Stacey Rabatin, PENNDOT District 12-0  
Angela Saunders, PENNDOT District 12-0  
Matt Pavlosky, SPC  
Ken Flack, SPC
1. Opening Remarks and introductions

Matt Pavlosky welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan, Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment, Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan, and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.

2. Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Matt also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan. Matt presented the current transportation funding crisis and discussed the upcoming STC hearing.

Matt noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Next, Rachel Duda of PennDOT District 12-0 gave a brief presentation on the current condition of the District's highway and bridge program.

3. Public comments

Ron Lewandowski commented regarding the congestion issues resulting from the addition of roadway islands and a no turning lane at the intersection of McClure and US119 in Fayette County. Lewandowski feels that the new area is unsafe due to inadequate signage, and due to the fact that the left-hand turn had been permitted for so long. Rachel Duda was aware of the area, and mentioned that improvements of this type are done in the interest of safety, and that the new safety numbers for this area would be interesting for review as proof of that fact. Additionally, the roadway islands installed are able to be crossed by emergency vehicles in the event of an emergency call.

Mayor Lester Ward read a statement requesting $25,000 for traffic light improvements in Brownsville with the use of traffic detections systems and LEDs. The improvements are for the following areas:

- High and Second Street (4 traffic signals)
- High Street and Bridge (camera detection system/4 traffic lights)
- Market and Brownsville (camera detection system/4 traffic lights)
- Broadway and Market (7 traffic signals)
4. **Discussion by Public Participation Panel**

*Lori Groover-Smith.* Made comments about the activities of FACT, regarding their outreach to connecting with the public in their service area.

5. **Closing Comments**

Matt noted that in addition to taking public comments today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. He thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Greene County
Public Participation Panel

June 9, 2011 6:00 p.m.
Stover Hall Meeting Room
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, PA

Public Meeting for Comment on the

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination Report

Attendance:

Paul Lagojda, Community Member
Phillip Chojnicki, Community Member
A.E. Chojnicki, Jr. Community Member
Ann Bargerstock, Greene County Department of Economic Development
Sharon Willison, PA State Senator Tim Solobay’s Office
Joe Szczur, PENNDOT District 12-0
Angela Saunders, PENNDOT District 12-0
Sara Walfoort, SPC
Karen Franks, SPC

1. **Opening Remarks and introductions**

Sara Walfoort welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan, Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment, Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan, and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.

2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Sara Walfoort reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Sara also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan. Sara presented the current transportation funding crisis and discussed the upcoming STC hearing.
Sara noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Next, Joe Szczur, PennDOT District 12-0 Executive, gave a brief presentation on the current condition of the Districts highway and bridge program.

3. Public comments

Paul Lagojda stated that he has been attending these meetings for decades and feels strongly that good roads are necessary to promote quality of life and strong communities. He noted that the current cow and deer paths that we have now will not get us where we need to be. He also suggested that we need to consolidate the current Greene County School Districts together and stated that there are currently “4 leaky canoes and 1 flagship” for our school districts. In order for a combining of the districts to happen, the transportation system must be improved. He concluded by asking how this plan will get us there?

4. Question and Answer Discussion

Philip Chojnicki asked PennDOT District 12 staff for more information on exactly what was going on in the Bailey Crossroads area of the County.

Joe Szczur stated that they are looking into changing the current traffic patterns for SR 21 to make it more of a continuous movement in that area. He noted that within the next three months, PennDOT will announce the schedule of a public meeting to discuss various alternative plans for the intersection. PennDOT District 12 Staff noted Mr. Chojnicki’s contact information so that the project manager can contact him with more related information to the project.

5. Closing Comments

Sara noted that in addition to taking public testimony today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. She thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Indiana County
Public Participation Panel

June 1, 2011 6:00 p.m.
Large Group Instruction Room
Indiana Area Junior High School

Public Meeting for Comment for:

- **2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,**
- **Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,**
- **Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan**
- **Air Quality Conformity Determination Report**

Attendance:

Dave Frick, Indiana County Commissioner
Patty Evancho, Indiana County Commissioner
Rod Ruddock, Indiana County Commissioner
Dana Henry, ICCOC, Co-Chair, Indiana County Public Participation Panel
Byron Stauffer, Jr., Indiana County Office of Planning and Development
Rob Barto, Municipal Official
JoAnn Hawk, ICW Vocational Services, Inc
Terry Stiffler, Cherry Hill Township
Bill Shane, Citizen
Joe LaVan, Rayne Township
Barb LaVan, Rayne Township
Jim Wiley, ICDC
Frank Garritano
Jeff Raykes, Indiana County Office of Planning and Development
Larry Garner, White Township
Ron Anderson, Indiana County Airport Authority
Ronald Evancho, Blairsville Borough
Jim Resh, Indiana County Conservation District
Laurie LaFontaine, C&I Trail Council
Sara Walfoort, SPC
Jeff Grim, SPC

1. **Opening Remarks and introductions**

Sara Walfoort welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and

2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Sara Walfoort reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Sara also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan.

Sara noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Next, Sara gave additional background regarding the Draft 2040 Plan, with highlights of upcoming events and initiatives, including the State Transportation Commission’s August 25th public meeting for Southwestern Pennsylvania. The purpose and background of Governor Corbett’s Transportation Advisory Commission was also discussed, including the Commission’s acceptance of public comment.

Tim Jablunovsky of PennDOT District 10 gave a brief summary of the current condition of the District’s highway and bridge program.

3. **Public comments**

No public comments were offered.

4. **Discussion by Public Participation Panel**

There was general discussion on the following topics: funding insufficiency for local roads and bridges; Marcellus shale and its impacts on local roadways; and current trail development activities in Indiana County.

5. **Closing Comments**

Sara noted that in addition to taking public testimony today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. She thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Lawrence County
Public Participation Panel

June 2, 2011 6:00 p.m.
Commissioner’s Meeting Room
Lawrence County Courthouse

Public Meeting for Comment for:

- **2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,**
- **Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,**
- **Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan**
- **Air Quality Conformity Determination Report**

Attendance:

Everette Bleakney, Co-Chair, Lawrence County PPP
Helen Jackson, Lawrence County PPP member
Amy McKinney, Lawrence County Planning
Stephanie Spang, PENNDOT District 11-0
Matt Pavlosky, SPC
Tom Klevan, SPC

1. **Opening Remarks and introductions**

Matt Pavlosky welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan, Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment, Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan, and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.

2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Matt also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan. Matt presented the current transportation funding crisis and discussed the upcoming STC hearing.

Matt noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.
Next, Tom Klevan gave additional background regarding the Human Services Coordinated Plan for SW PA. Helen Jackson asked Klevan about the possibilities of a new rail line linking New Castle and Pittsburgh, and the benefits which such a line provided in the past. Klevan proceeded to discuss the costs and track rights involved by adding a new service line. He also discussed "All Aboard Ohio", a rail advocacy group with a keen interest in adding a new line from Youngstown to Pittsburgh, with passage through New Castle.

3. Public comments

No public comments were offered.

4. Closing Comments

Matt noted that in addition to taking public testimony today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. He thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Washington County
Public Participation Panel

May 24, 2011  5:00 p.m.
Meeting Room 104,
Washington County Courthouse Square

Public Meeting for Comment on the

- **2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,**
- **Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,**
- **Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan**
- **Air Quality Conformity Determination Report**

**Attendance:**

Lu Ann Pawlick, Chair,
Joe Kirk, Mon Valley Progress Council
Mike Silvestri, Peters Township
Nancy Basile, City of Washington - Transit
Dan Reitz, Washington County Economic Development
Bill Sember, Washington County Authority
Harlan Shoher, Chartiers Township Supervisor
Dave Good, GG&C Bus Company
Deb Kees, Mon Valley Regional Chamber of Commerce
Ned Williams, Montour Trail Council
Lisa Cessa, Washington County Planning Department
Jeff Leithauser, Washington County Planning Department
Jason Theakston, Washington County Planning Department
Rachel Duda, PENNDOT District 12-0
Gary Barber, PENNDOT District 12-0
Stacey Rabatin, PENNDOT District 12-0
Angela Saunders, PENNDOT District 12-0
Matt Pavlosky, SPC
Karen Franks, SPC

1. **Opening Remarks and introductions**

Matt Pavlosky welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees and the draft documents available for review. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and

2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Matt also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan. Matt presented the current transportation funding crisis and discussed the upcoming STC hearing.

Matt noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Next, Rachel Duda of PennDOT District 12-0 gave a brief presentation on the current condition of the Districts highway and bridge program.

3. **Public comments**

No public comments were offered.

4. **Discussion by Public Participation Panel**

**Mike Silvestri** noted that the overall effects of the Marcellus Shale extraction activity on the SPC region were missing in the previous 2035 Transportation & Development Plan. **Matt Pavlosky** replied that there is a much greater discussion and review of this activity in the 2040 Plan version.

**Mike Silvestri** explained that because of a serious lack of transit options in the suburbs, population that is growing older is going to have a much harder time getting from place to place. He believes that eventually this lack of transit service is going to start effecting housing trends.

**Nancy Basile** noted that they are currently completing a feasibility study on the need for public transit in both downtown and rural settings to determine opportunities for growth. Publication and public comment for the study’s findings should be happening very soon.

**Harlan Shoher and Mike Silvestri** both expressed the need for comprehensive county and regional coordination of transportation infrastructure and programs.
Harlan Shober noted his concern related to the future of the Donora/Webster Bridge in the Mon-Valley area. He expressed a real need to complete a feasibility study on the project to identify the numerous benefits this connection will support besides just the obvious.

Harlan Shober discussed the need to explore increasing the bond amounts required by the Marcellus shale industry in our local communities. He noted that the current amounts are not covering the expenses associated with repairing the damage to our roads and bridges. He did however note that some of the operators have been very reliable and attentive to assisting our local municipalities with needed repairs.

5. Closing Comments

Matt noted that in addition to taking public testimony today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. He thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Westmoreland County
Public Participation Panel

June 7, 2011, 6:00 p.m.
Public Meeting Room
Westmoreland County Courthouse

Public Meeting for Comment on the

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania,
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment,
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination Report

Attendance:

Terry Daughenbaugh, Co-Chair, Westmoreland PPP
Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning
James Conte, Economic Growth Connection
Barb Ciampanini, City of Greensburg
Carol Billman, Seton Hill University
Hal Turkowski, HET Corp.
Jake Blank, Unity Township
Lori Brkovich, Westmoreland Transit
Alex Graziani, Smart Growth
Jim Smith, Economic Growth Connection
John Ventre, UPS
Lance Sokol, SW PA Human Services
Scott Sistek, Westmoreland County Commissioner, Balya
Noreen Turkowski, citizen
Chad Amond, PPP member
Brian Dombroske, PPP Member
Joe Szczur, PENNDOT District 12-0
Rachel Duda, PENNDOT District 12-0
Stacey Rabatin, PENNDOT District 12-0
Angela Saunders, PENNDOT District 12-0
Matt Pavlosky, SPC
Ken Flack, SPC

1. Opening Remarks and introductions

PPP Chairperson Terry Daughenbaugh welcomed everyone and began an introduction of the attendees. Matt Pavlosky then gave an overview and
presentation of the event’s purpose. The meeting is for the purpose of receiving public testimony on four draft documents: the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania; Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment; Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan; and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.

2. **Background information from SPC and PennDOT staff**

Matt Pavlosky reviewed the policy statements of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Matt also presented aspects of the Air Quality analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, and the Human Services Coordinated Plan. Matt presented the current transportation funding crisis and discussed the upcoming STC hearing.

Matt noted the development of the draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program will begin later this year, and meetings with the Public Participation Panel to begin looking at that process will be scheduled for Fall.

Next, Rachel Duda of PennDOT District 12-0 gave a brief presentation on the current condition of the Districts highway and bridge program.

3. **Public comments**

**Chris Bova** of Westmoreland County Planning delivered a statement of priorities for Westmoreland County

- SR 30, Westmoreland County Corridor
- Local Bridge Line Item (MPMS 77374)
- SR 981, Laurel Valley Betterments – Turnpike to Air Cargo Park
- Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Jeannette Truck Route
- SR 66 Improvements – Delmont Area to Armstrong County Line

**Jim Smith** of the Economic Growth Connection also discussed the importance of the SR 981 Laurel Valley Betterments project – Turnpike to Air Cargo Park project. Citing the need for priority, the promises of the completion of the project in the past, and the potential to create 40,000 new jobs in Westmoreland County, the project should be considered a county-wide priority. **Terry Daughenbaugh** reaffirmed this project as a priority

4. **Discussion by Public Participation Panel**

Chad Amond discussed priorities for funding sources to be realized in order to help advance the transportation system, here and throughout the state.
5. **Closing Comments**

Matt noted that in addition to taking public testimony today, SPC will accept written comments until June 17, by mail, fax, or e-mail. He thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
Part Three

Written and Electronic Comments
Subject: Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group: Public Comment on SPC's Long-Range Plan

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission,

Please find attached PCRG’s comments regarding the Draft 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Thank you.

Chris Sandvig
Regional Policy Manager
The Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group
1901 Centre Ave, Suite 200
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
T: 412-391-6732, x208
C: 412-728-3339
E: csandvig@pcrg.org
W: www.pcrg.org

Join the conversation! Follow us on...  🌐  🍀  🍂

⚠️ Please consider the environment before printing.
June 17, 2011

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Ave, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

ATTN: Public Comment Team
Ref: Draft 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

The Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, a membership-based coalition of over 30 community organizations and community development corporations within the City of Pittsburgh and surrounding municipalities – serving a regional population in excess of 300,000 – respectfully submits the following comments on behalf of them to SPC’s 2040 LRDP.

PCRG and its members believe that transportation investments within our region should follow the spirit and intent of the award-winning Project Region report – meaning: investments must be tied to maximizing existing land development uses, concentrating job and residential density around existing communities like our county seats, cities, and river towns, and maximizing access to all modes of transportation – particularly focusing on transit and ped/bike opportunities. To that end, our specific comments are as follow:

Elevate transit-oriented development to a much higher priority within the LRDP for regional sustainability, public-private partnership (P3) opportunities.

Rather than simply listing projects on 4-44, create a broader discussion about TOD’s opportunity within the region and the clear demand demonstrated for this by national groups like AARP and the National Association of Realtors.

Through TOD, our region can better serve a broad range of residents and businesses. It’s already clear, from our development patterns, that the largest job centers of the region rely heavily on transit to deliver its workforce. We must better connect the other end – our residential and neighborhood business districts – to transit.

Through TOD, we also provide one piece of the funding solution puzzle. P3s are ripe opportunities around transit stations and nodes throughout the region, and developers are very interested in these opportunities.
Emphasize transit's regional economic role by highlighting trip type rather than trips taken
Page 4-36 highlights the percentage of trips taken by transit in the region. However, from an economic perspective, transit's footprint is much larger. With well over half of Downtown – and 1/3 of Oakland – commuters taking transit (well in excess of 140,000 jobs between those two alone), let alone improvements being made in places like Robinson and Beaver County, it is clear that transit is much more vital than this 1.5% suggests. We must highlight that fact.

Transit is economic and environmental
The LRDP rightly calls out the vital role transit plays in achieving the vision of Project Region, but it falls short in only highlighting environmental concerns. The recent wild fluctuations in gas prices, which are clearly trending upward, must also be called out as a reason for transit's vital role in our region's future. Transportation affordability is paramount.

More strongly emphasize the funding crisis and public appetite for new revenue – page 4-61
We appreciate SPC's leadership in highlighting new funding needs and opportunities at a time when government officials seem to think we are overtaxed. However, as has been demonstrated in SPC's own public outreach regarding the plan, people are willing to pay for transportation and this must be more strongly communicated in the LRDP.

We caution that P3 be better clarified as to what the opportunities might be. The private sector is not necessarily interested in operating a transit agency, for example, but it is definitely interested in leveraging private funds to create much more attractive transit assets at fixed guideway stations and high-use stops. Similar in highways and bridges, there can be opportunities for P3 in high-volume corridors. However, it must be known that this is not a panacea.

To that end, even further, the LRDP should note that no one action is going to solve our funding crisis permanently. Only through a diversified portfolio of funding can we ensure that transportation is funded adequately.
Passenger rail must be a priority in the plan and must be about realistic projects based in funding opportunities and public demand rather than multi-billion-dollar impossibilities that have outlived their relevance.

MAGLEV is an outstanding technology and held a place of vision at a time when no one wanted to fund any passenger rail — let alone high-speed rail — in this country. However, even in countries that place higher priorities on HSR, MAGLEV is a waning technology. Further, it does not fit within the national picture for rail and we must integrate our region into that in order to compete. We must move toward projects that the federal government has an appetite for, are less capital and operational-intensive, and actually have a chance of being funded. This is not to say that MAGLEV’s planning does not have a place in the discussion — conventional steel track HSR requires very similar infrastructure — but it is time to move in another direction:

1) Prioritize intercity/commuter conventional passenger rail to re-start the market. This is a low-capital lift that should be made and includes passenger service between Cleveland and Harrisburg, encompassing both the Keystone West and Capitol Limited.

2) Push for a completion of the federal HSR vision map to fill in the gap between Cleveland and Pittsburgh. It makes no sense to for New York to stop here, Chicago to stop there, and we risk losing out to New York if we do not complete the map.

Incorporate Active Allegheny into the LRDP

We support Allegheny County’s comments regarding Active Allegheny and active transportation into the LRDP. You received these from Lynn Heckman, via email, on June 9.

Tie projects to denser development and infill more strongly to maximize investment

Even road investments make more sense in denser environments because the economic gain from the land use is much higher. It also improves the affordability of the region as residents can shorten trips.

Support existing transit investments like the North Shore Connector, East Busway, and park-and-ride facilities.

Though very controversial, the North Shore Connector will not reach its full potential if we stop there. Airport rail, and possibly North Hills rail, must be added to the Illustrative List to maximize this expenditure. We also must ensure that the
resulting North Shore development remains a high-density mixed-use development to maximize operation of the system.

A major economic and residential center to the east – Monroeville – is completely disconnected from the transit system. This must be re-connected through either a Busway extension or light rail. This also stands for the Robinson area.

New highway capacity is too expensive to support and does nothing to further the vision of Project Region
After 4 decades it should be clear that projects like the Mon-Fayette Expressway – and the final connection to Pittsburgh – have no place in the region. This multi-billion-dollar project has minimal elected official support and virtually no support from our membership or the residents they serve. As the price tag continues to climb – now in excess of $3 billion – and with no support from Federal sources or even the private sector – we must acknowledge that this project has no place in the region and it should be removed from the LRDP altogether.

We thank you for your consideration of our comments.
June 17, 2011

SPC Comments
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852

Email: comments@spcregion.org

Re: Comments on the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of the Directors of the Allegheny River Towns Enterprise Zone and its member municipalities this letter will provide comment to the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan in the context of our mission of job creation and economic development.

The Allegheny River Towns Enterprise Zone (ARTEZ) is a non-profit agency servicing the economic development needs of its seven member municipalities: Aspinwall, Blawnox, Etna, Millvale, O’Hara, Shaler, and Sharpsburg. The Councils of its member municipalities appoint its Board of Directors.
Our start-up efforts have been supported through Allegheny County Department of Economic Development and they are active partners in our program. There are many underutilized industrial and commercial sites within the Enterprise Zone and Route 8 Corridor and an infrastructure, albeit aging and in need of repair, exists to service new and expanding businesses. ARTEZ has developed and maintained programs to create jobs and promote economic activity through out the seven member municipalities.

ARTEZ generally supports the direction and strategies identified in the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan. In fact, the local economic development tools ARTEZ has to assist existing businesses and to attract new businesses to its member municipalities complement many of the policy priorities identified in the Economic Development chapter.

The following list identifies those regional economic development policies most relevant to ARTEZ’s in-fill strategy and describes our local implementing activity.

REGIONAL POLICY: Revitalization and redevelopment of the region’s existing communities is a priority –
ARTEZ’s development priorities are to prepare ‘shovel-ready’ opportunities for in-fill development in our member municipalities, concentrating on its inventory of mid-size brownfields sites and vacancies in existing industrial and commercial properties, to create and retain jobs;

POLICY: Investment in infrastructure improvements will be coordinated and targeted at the corridor level to optimize the impact of the investment –
ARTEZ is promoting infrastructure improvements along the Route 28 and Route 8 corridors using innovative green design and technology tools; for instance, ARTEZ and the Town of Shaler completed a Brownfield Redevelopment workshop for the ‘Glenshaw Glass District’ and an engineering study to improve access to the underutilized industrial parcels in the District. ARTEZ and the Boroughs of Etta and Sharpsburg have formed a Task Force to improve the infrastructure, primarily a Freight Access Road, to better service industrial properties

POLICY: The region will focus on the identification and development of industrial sites with special attention given to well situated brownfield locations –
ARTEZ has been a lead participant in the River Towns Brownfield Coalition, an EPA-funded brownfield assessment program managed by the Riverside Center for Innovation. The program has completed initial assessments on twelve different parcels, including the Ohio-Evergreen site in Millvale, the Henry Miller Spring Brownfield site in Sharpsburg, the former Tippins facility in Etna, and the Aspinwall Power Plant site.

POLICY: The region will place a priority on business development with a focus on existing business retention and expansion –
ARTEZ is participating in a community loan fund task force to design additional capital alternatives for small businesses and entrepreneurs active in our member municipalities. We have also provided enterprise zone loans to businesses that commit to creating or retaining jobs in our member municipalities;

POLICY: The region will support identified strategic industry clusters –
ARTEZ is implementing a green industry economic development policy to enhance the attractiveness of our communities to new technology businesses and the green building material industry cluster;

POLICY: The region will preserve, promote and develop the tourism and hospitality industries by capitalizing on historic, cultural, recreational and ecological assets –
ARTEZ has financially supported the Allegheny Community Trails Study, its member municipalities have participated in a new River Towns Program, and has offered support to the Aspinwall Marina/Riverfront Park project.

Sincerely,

John Stephen
Executive Director
Dee Pamplin  
Administrative Assistant  
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission  
Regional Enterprise Tower  
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852  
(P) 412-391-5590 x301  
(F) 412-391-5487  
www.spcregion.org

From: Ginette Walker Vinski  
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 8:54 AM  
To: Dee Pamplin  
Cc: Court Gould  
Subject: Sustainable Pgh comments for 2040 LRTDP

Hello:

Attached please find Sustainable Pittsburgh’s official comments on the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

Sincerely,

Ginette Walker Vinski, Communications Manager  
Sustainable Pittsburgh  
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1335  
(412) 258-3646  
fax (412) 258-6845  
gvinski@sustainablepittsburgh.org  
www.sustainablepittsburgh.org

Sustainable Pittsburgh affects decision-making in the Pittsburgh region to integrate economic prosperity, social equity, and environmental quality bringing sustainable solutions to communities and businesses.

Become a Sustainable Pittsburgh member and simultaneously become a member of Champions for Sustainability (C4S) and the Sustainable Community Development Network (SCDN). These networks build capacity around the region for sustainable business and community solutions. Visit www.sustainablepittsburgh.org for more information.

Stay abreast of sustainable development news and events by subscribing to 3E Links, Sustainable Pittsburgh’s weekly e-news. To subscribe, reply to info@sustainablepittsburgh.org.

Looking for something to do outside? Visit www.wallsarebad.com for a resource on outdoor recreation in southwestern PA.
June 16, 2010

Dr. Jim Hassinger
President & CEO
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852

RE: Sustainable Pittsburgh Comments: Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

Dear Dr. Hassinger,

On behalf of Sustainable Pittsburgh I am writing to provide comment on the draft 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania (The Plan).

Smart Growth Hastens Prosperity
We acknowledge through SPC's leadership, The Plan has been nationally recognized and locally embraced for its reckoning with the need to stem our region's voracious consumption of land for new growth in greenfields and reinvest in our existing and core communities around the ten counties. Sustainable Pittsburgh supports the focused growth practicalities of The Plan. For example, the commitment (5-2) to existing communities as well as emphasis on "maintenance first" (4-5) is noted and recognized for practicality in addressing the region's interests of economic, social, and economic prosperity. Just the same, it would be desirable to provide more insight on the successful TRID program (3-30) and (4-17) bike/ped priorities deserve more discussion especially with regard to what and where these investments should be made.

Project Prioritization Transparency
Consistent with our past comments, we urge SPC to reinforce The Plan by acting now to transparently employ project evaluation criteria to assess local and regional impacts. By evaluating the comparative merits of proposed projects relative to the excellent goals and objectives articulated in The Plan, SPC can lift the region from a project by project perspective to focus on the larger regional strategy for change. In particular, it is suggested SPC provide more insight (4-24) as to the project evaluation criteria to assess local and regional impacts. What is the process, criteria, how is transparency and independent review accommodated? Also related, the statement (4-3) "Corridor-sized projects are broken down into deliverable segments based on cash flow requirements," begs the comment that breaking down corridor projects into “manageable” segments would seem to defeat the need for a comprehensive picture of regional needs and SPC’s response.

Goals and Measures of Plan Performance
We urge SPC to regularly assess the region's growth and development patterns per the goals and objectives of the plan and that SPC set quantified and qualified goals and targets for the region per key measures. For example, EPA's choice of SPC to host the “Sustainable Transportation Performance Measures Workshop” (8-11) emphasizes the timeliness for SPC to follow federal lead in tracking and
reporting regional performance data. SPC is urged to identify the new measures that will be tracked and reported as result of this special EPA workshop. In this regard, SPC is urged to reference the Fall 2010 Smart Growth Conference which served as a formal public input session to The Plan and specifically acknowledge the public interest expressed during the event of SPC tracking and reporting routinely on key regional measures of success including priorities identified in the conference session SPC facilitated:

- Revenue & expenses for infrastructure
- Stable, predictable funding for transit
- Housing affordability
- Economic prosperity
- % of communities with sidewalk ordinances
- Population increase
- Reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- Implementation of neighborhood/community cooperation programs
- Healthy population
- Decrease energy consumption
- Equity (in wealth & power), regional unity, local self-reliance, safety

Regarding data presented in The Plan that address regional growth and development patterns, while Section 6-9 gives an explanation about Figures 6.7 - 6.14, it does little to explain the significance of Figure 6.14 or any conclusions and/or consequences directly linked to that data. To an outside reader, it is unclear if "no-build" means not executing any of the preferred scenario projects for The Plan found in Appendix B or something else. In addition, the conclusion drawn is that, overall, conditions are better for the "no-build" option, which raises the question of the impact of the projects that would be implemented under The Plan. For example how is it that delay increases by 144%? The obvious question is, can’t the plan be modified to yield improvements throughout? In Section 7, again, the discussion of the regulations and process does not reveal the bottom line; i.e. what are the impacts?

Integration of Issues for Comprehensive Planning
The Plan is urged to provide more insight to how SPC integrates targeting investments and aligning land use planning with: alternate transportation choices, housing and jobs, energy independence, mitigation of carbon dioxide emissions, employment growth, and improving the natural environment. For example, (8-17) "FHWA, PennDOT, and SPC have embraced these LPN initiatives with the goal of improving project selection, increasing program predictability, and increasing the efficiency of the overall project development process; resulting in a transportation system that has less of an impact on the region's natural resources, cultural resources, and community". How is SPC accomplishing this? What steps are followed? What data is collected? What type of feedback loop is being used? How is this verified? Somewhat related, (4-6) The Governor’s Discretionary Economic Development Fund, as discussed, does not appear to engage DCED and DEP as appropriate to an integrated development transportation/development/environment approach. This maybe beyond SPC’s control but is a worthy subject for regional advocacy to improve integration. A well aligned program is evidenced in (4-18) regarding the Pennsylvania Community Transportation Initiative.

Sustainability Issues on the Horizon
It is very positive that The Plan reports on Pennsylvania’s “Climate Change Act” which includes development of a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions inventory for the Commonwealth and a Climate Change Action Plan. We recommend inclusion in The Plan delineation of SPC’s role and intent to create a C02 inventory and mitigation plan for the region, including tracking and reporting region C02 data and trends.
Under Regional Conditions and Trends (3-1) SPC is urged to include review of impacts of global warming and climate change. Resources and precedent include:

The West Coast Climate and Materials Management Forum, a partnership of the US EPA and numerous cities and states (mostly located in the Western U.S.), has produced an information resource, primarily for state and local governments, to help them better integrate materials/products into climate inventories and action plans.
http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/ECOCOMM.NSF/climate+change/wccmmf

The National Academy of Sciences also has helpful materials:
http://dels.nas.edu/Report/Americas-Climate-Choices/12781

The Union of Concerned Scientists produced a report on anticipated consequences of climate change on PA:

Further with regard to regional conditions SPC is urged to include reference to SPC's commitment to conduct an assessment of the impacts of Marcellus in order to use the plan to mitigate the negative and accentuate the positive.

Related to the Emerging Energy Cluster (5-10) SPC is urged to add commitment to the Emerging Water Industry Cluster per the recently released report, Pittsburgh's H2Opportunity: An Assessment of Southwestern Pennsylvania's Water Sector

Please feel free to contact me if additional information would be helpful. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for the on-going collaboration in the interest of the region.

Sincerely,

Court Gould
Executive Director
To whom it may concern,

I was just alerted to the comment deadline by an email from Sustainable Pittsburgh, so I apologize for coming late to the process. I plan looks good, from what I saw in the video presentation. Not having been part of the decision process, I don’t know to what extent the issues of climate change and ocean acidification played a part in the final product. My instinct, judging from the general lack of discussion of these threats on a national scale, is that it may not have played a large part in the discussions. However, if one takes a look at the projections being made by government entities such as the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), there are serious consequences to overuse on fossil fuels on the horizon. Specifically, NCAR warns of killer droughts in the west by the 2030’s and JPL projects a foot of sea level rise by 2050. On the ocean acidification side, the polar oceans are projected to turn corrosive to calcium carbonate-dependent sea life if we top 450 PPM in the atmosphere. I would ask that those who constructed the plan take a serious look at the current research of the credible scientific community and see then apply that to the plan as it currently stands. Essentially, we have to look at how the region can decarbonize its transportation system and its power generation over the next two decades or less.

There is good news on the energy front with solar rapidly approaching grid parity with fossil fuels (see here: http://www.solarfeeds.com/climate-progress/17154-climate-progress-qsolar-is-ready-nowq)

Also, there are disruptive new electric car technologies on the horizon, such as Better Place (www.betterplace.com), that promise to give the electric car affordability and unlimited range. I am aware of the movement towards using natural gas for transportation, but this is, I am told, less efficient that using the gas for electrical generation and letting electric cars handle moving people around.

We have some of the best climate researchers in the world right here in Pennsylvania. One example is Mike Mann at Penn State. I would stress that his data and conclusions regarding global warming have stood up to numerous inquiries, both friendly and hostile. He warns us of disastrous warming and climate change if we
stay on our current emissions path. I would request that those who have been doing the great work on the regional plan take the time to meet with him or other members of the scientific community to gain a thorough knowledge of what the research is telling us, prior to putting the finishing touches to the regional plan. Thanks for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

Tim Kelly
Sewickley
412-259-8563
What is one of the biggest problems is to convince the General Assembly and Gov. Corbett the need to have well funded public transportation with dependable funding sources. Thousands of people depend on public transportation to get to work, to get school and training, to get to job interviews and many other activities including many business, cultural and sports venues. Transportation also includes roads and bridges that are kept in good condition, which effects everyone whether they need public transportation or not. It’s a very big portion of what will increase the economic growth of Southwestern Pennsylvania and the rest of the state. Too long it’s been allowed to deteriorate and put in a financial bind so That we end up with bad roads and bridges and transit systems that have been forced to cut service and raise fares when it should be convenient and available. Think how much worse our roads and bridges would be as well as more pollution if there were more cars on the roads. There needs to be an organized effort of communities, commuters, public officials, companies, our legislative delegations. Lobbyests and others to convince Gov. Corbett and the leadership of the General Assembly the need for more dependable funding sources for public transportation without having these constant battles and causing anxiety for those who need to use public transportation. This can be done with the creation of a bill that would provide funding for the repair of roads and bridges as well as dependable funding sources for public transportation. Public transportation has to stay public so the people have a say in how it’s run. Everyone gets what they want. The funding source for public transportation will be a portion of the taxation of the Marcellus Shale oil that will be drilled in the state. The damage caused by the heavy trucks carrying drilling equipment and the tanker trucks taking oil to refineries will add to the damage of our roads so the companies need to pay for the damage their trucks will cause. The oil drilled and its refining will be a windfall of millions to our state and there should be more than enough to provide for public transportation and other sources. It should provide enough revenue to keep our public transportation systems well funded. A well organized and thorough effort to convince our general Assembly and Gov. Corbett the necessity to
pass legislation to fund our complete transportation system. It can work and return Pennsylvania to having one of the best transportation systems in the country, I hope your organization will support this effort wholeheartedly.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide oral testimony at the DRAFT 2040 Long Range Plan meeting that was held last night. Following is written testimony to be included in the plan.

The Pennsylvania Environmental Council has a partnership with Allegheny County and Friends of the Riverfront to develop riverfront trails within Allegheny County. We work with local municipalities and other stakeholders to implement projects. Riverfront trails are an important part of the transportation system in this region and should be included as part of future transportation planning. Please consider continued development of our trail system as part of the 2040 Long Range Plan. We have participated in several committees and planning efforts that assist our efforts including SPC’s Bike/Pedestrian Committee and the recently completed ActiveAllegheny Plan. The Allegheny County Trails & Greenways Plan that was completed as part of Allegheny County’s Comprehensive Plan should also be referenced. Here is a link to the trail map that was included in that plan:
http://www.alleghenyplaces.com/maps/ec/Trails.pdf. This shows the regional trail system that we are working together to build.

Following are priorities for the next several years:

Monongahela River
South side: Complete the Great Allegheny Passage, which includes completion of the trail through Sandcastle and also the Mon Wharf ramp project. This is the number one priority.

North side: Complete a trail connection to the Carrie Furnace site as this site develops. Potential also to connect the ALMONO site with the Carrie Furnace site.

**Allegheny River**

North side: Implement the feasibility study that is nearing completion to connect the trail from Millvale to Freeport.

South side: Continue to work with rail interests to develop a rail with trail proposal that will connect into the Strip District.

**Ohio River**

South side: Currently initiating a feasibility study to connect to the Montour Trail in Coraopolis and also the developing trail system in Beaver & Lawrence Counties. The Montour Trail provides an important transportation link to the Pittsburgh International Airport.

Thank you.

Hannah E. Hardy
PA Environmental Council

---

**From:** Matt Pavlosky [mailto:mpavlosky@sprecregion.org]
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 10:16 AM
**To:** Heckman, Lynn; Roberts, Patrick; Stan Caldwell; Hannah Hardy; Vinh.Ly@AlleghenyCounty.US; Steven.shanley@alleghenycounty.us; DWohlwill@PortAuthority.org
**Subject:** Thank You: Allegheny County/City of Pittsburgh Public Participation Panel

SPC Panel Members and Partners:

Many thanks to all of you for turning out on a hot, balmy Spring evening to review the Draft 2040 Long Range Plan. Your participation and attendance are greatly appreciated. Moving forward, I’ll keep you updated regarding upcoming Statewide meeting sessions, and activity with the Governor’s Transportation Advisory Commission.

Please keep in mind the following:

- SPC’s Open Comment for the Draft 2040 Long Range Plan concludes Friday, June 17, 2011 at 4pm. Comments can be sent to: comments@sprecregion.org
- You may make comments to the Governor’s Transportation Advisory Commission here: tfac@state.pa.us
- And moving toward September 2011, we’ll look to have our next Panel meeting to address the beginning of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Update.

Thanks so much, and see you soon.

Matt

**Matthew S. Pavlosky**
Transportation Planner, Public Involvement/Outreach
**Southwestern PA Commission**
425 Sixth Ave. Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 391-5590 x361 (phone)
(412) 391-9160 (fax)
mpavlosky@sprecregion.org
www.sprecregion.org
Please refer to prior testimony submission for:

Chris Sandvig, PCRG
Dee Pamplin
Administrative Assistant
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
(P) 412-391-5590  x301
(F) 412-391-5487
www.spcregion.org

From: Stuart Strickland [mailto:stuartmstrickland@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 3:49 PM
To: Dee Pamplin
Subject: comments on draft 2040 Transportation and Development Plan

I think it is safe to say that if "peak oil" has not already happened -- and the experts say it HAS already happened -- then it certainly will by 2040. Combined with rapidly rising petroleum demand from China, India and other developing nations, chances are 100% that the cost of gasoline and diesel fuel will rise far beyond what it costs now, in that time, as measured in dollars constant to 2011. The actual pump price will be even higher, sooner, when fuel related costs in turn push up the cost of everything else.

In short, we are soon going to be at "peak car". The future is simple: fewer cars, less driving. If gas goes to $10 or $20 a gallon in 10 years, are we really going to be driving all that much? No, we're not. And yes, gas WILL cost that much by 2040.

With that as backdrop, I believe that any long range transportation plan has to reflect this simple mantra: Stop building roads, just fix what we have, and start making it easier to get around by anything other than an automobile. Bicycles, buses, pedestrians. There will be a lot more of that, and a lot less driving.

* Additional lanes to existing roads: Precious few.
* Fix what's broken. The money will come from NOT building major new roads and additional lanes.
* Start thinking about FEWER driving lanes, more room for cyclists. I think the buzz word is "road diets".
* Sidewalks: Yes. Anything that gets built or fixed, needs a sidewalk, or at least a walkable shoulder (free of washouts, poison ivy, 2" deep mud, etc.)
* Pedestrian crossings at intersections: Yes. Lots of these.

Have you ever heard of "The Popsicle Index"? Think of yourself as a parent, allowing your 8-year-old child to walk to the store to buy a popsicle, and return, unassisted. What is your comfort level, as a percentage, that the kid will get there and back, safely? Aside from boogeymen jumping out from behind trees, the biggest fear is being hit by a car. That right there usually brings down The Popsicle Index in an area significantly, and that right there is squarely in the sights of long-range transportation planning. If we as a region cannot let our kids
walk around without getting killed, then we as transportation planners are not doing our jobs.

I think I've said enough. Stop building roads! We need bicycle infrastructure, we need public transit infrastructure, we need to stop making it easy for cars to speed, and we need to be able to get around without needing a car in the first place.

OK, your move. Thank you for listening to my spiel.

Sincerely,

Stuart M. Strickland
8219 Eleanor Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15237-5219
(412) 366-5009 (home)
(412) 334-7078 (cell)
stuartmstrickland@gmail.com
Twitter @bus15237
RE: SPC Long Range Plan (LRP2040) Comment

ACTIVEALLEGHENY

As you are aware, it is increasingly important that our region demonstrate exactly how we are now, and how we intend in the future, to link planning, NEPA and development. It is key to clearly show our progress in the areas of livability, sustainability, smart transportation and healthy lifestyle choices through multi-modal choice.

I continue to urge SPC to include the recently completed ActiveAllegheny plan, not just by reference, but also to feature ActiveAllegheny mapping just as SPC does for roads, bridges and other key facilities. And, you may wish to inquire if other counties have similar mapping to be displayed.

I have requested that Baker forward both the Allegheny County System Improvements Maps for:

- Commuter Bicycle Routes
- Pedestrian Corridors and Intersections
- City Bicycle Network, (Unless City Planning has another map they prefer)

I am arranging to have Baker send these 3 maps to SPC in digital form, through me.

I also strongly encourage SPC to add a regional line item for active transportation projects, and active elements of projects, for the future. Doing so, will make all our applications for funds and grants much more competitive going forward. PCTI funds gave us a wonderful opportunity to formulate and advance our planning; the resultant product should be highlighted and positioned for implementation.

I appreciate the suggestion that I reinforce my input to SPC, in writing. Let me know if I can do anything further to assist SPC in getting active transportation elements included in the 2040 LRP.

Sincerely,

Lynn Heckman
Assistant Director-Transportation Initiatives
Allegheny County Economic Development
425 Sixth Ave, Suite 800, Pgh, PA 15219
412.350.4549
Lynn.Heckman@AlleghenyCounty.US
From: Matt Pavlosky
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 9:12 AM
To: Karen Franks; Ryan Gordon
Subject: FW: Long Range Plan Comments

From: Dee Pamplin
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 9:03 AM
To: Matt Pavlosky; Sara Walfoort
Subject: FW: Long Range Plan Comments

From: Patchan, Stephen [mailto:Stephen.Patchan@city.pittsburgh.pa.us]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2011 2:26 PM
To: Dee Pamplin
Subject: Long Range Plan Comments

SPC2014 LRP:

I am writing to strongly support the PA Environmental Council’s request to include Allegheny County trail mapping in the SPC 2040 LRP. This type of detail will greatly enrich the plan and demonstrate our region’s responsiveness to input from citizens.

Thanks!

Steve

Stephen Patchan
Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator
City of Pittsburgh
Department of City Planning
200 Ross St. 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Phone: (412) 393-0150
Fax: (412) 255-2838
stephen.patchan@city.pittsburgh.pa.us
I hope others will support this by Friday, despite the very short notice.

I am Jonathan Robison, of 154 N. Bellefield Av. #66, Pittsburgh, PA 15213. I am president of the Allegheny County Transit Council, the volunteer advisory body of the Port Authority of Allegheny County, which was established by the Pennsylvania Legislature in 1988. I am also a member of the Board of the Oakland Community Council and the Bellefield Area Citizens Association.

I appreciate that your 2040 Plan is a draft, open to comment until 4:30 pm Friday, June 17, 2011.

I urge that you delete the Mon-Fayette, one of the 21 interstate facilities in your ‘Illustrative Project’ List, page 4-58-59 of your draft 2040 plan. Extention of the Mon-Fayette toll-way is unneeded and unwanted. It is planned to terminate in Oakland, so it would spend (your estimate) $3,600,000,000 to subsidize and encourage more cars to come to Oakland. Believe me, we don’t need more cars coming to Oakland.

Why does it matter if the Mon-Fayette is on the Illustrative Project List? I know it’s not on the actual long range plan, which is fiscally constrained. I know that no part of it will be built in the coming year. But inclusion on your Illustrative Project List matters for three reasons – priorities, credibility, and the need for sensible transportation and development investments.

First, Oakland needs realistic transportation and development investments. Mere inclusion on SPC’s Illustrative Project List is likely to discourage other investment in the target areas, especially private investment. Inclusion on an ‘Illustrative Project List’ is likely to perpetuate continued presence on maps of future development. This is panning by ‘Magic Marker’ at its worst.

Second, is the question of priorities. Your ‘Unfunded Needs’ discussion on page 4-57 rightly emphasizes preventative maintenance of our roads and bridges. More and more people insist, “Fix it first!” The Mon-Fayette cost is greater than all the other ‘new capacity’ projects on the Illustrative Project List combined. Clean air, not to mention energy conservation, require investment in public transportation, as well as maintaining our existing bridges and roads.

Finally, there is credibility – yours. Inclusion of the Mon-Fayette on the ‘Illustrative Project List’ in your 2040 plan will undermine public credibility when we have serious decisions ahead of us.
To the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission,

On behalf of the Oakland Community Council, we request that the "Mon-Fayette Expressway" be removed from the Illustrative Project List of the draft 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania.

In the decades in which this project has been proposed, but never built, many neighborhoods along the Monongahela have been unable to attract reinvestment because there has been little ability to predict if, when, and where the toll road will be built. This includes parts of Oakland including the lower Bates Street and South Oakland along the bluff above the river.

In today's current fiscal, political, and environmental situation, the project will not be built. It cannot be funded and with the funding and debt crisis the federal and state governments both face, it cannot be built in the foreseeable future. It is past time to allow these blighted neighborhoods and municipalities along its proposed path to have some control and ability to attract reinvestment along this corridor by giving potential investors assurance that the Mon Fayette is not a threat to their development.

Thank you for your consideration,

Nathan Hart
Oakland Community Council
To whom it may concern
On behalf of Oakland Planning and Development Corporation (OPDC), I request that the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission remove the Mon-Fayette Turnpike Project from the “Illustrative Project List” in Section 4, pages 58-59 of the DRAFT 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania.

As a community-based organization and a recognized leader in planning, OPDC believes the Mon-Fayette project is not consistent with the vision for the Oakland community, nor would it be good use of public funds. It would be detrimental to the Oakland community and to the quality of life in the City of Pittsburgh.

Thank you for considering our recommendations.

Regards,

Wanda Wilson
Executive Director
Oakland Planning & Development Corp. (OPDC)
235 Atwood Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 621-7863 x 15  office
(412) 608-8735  mobile
www.oaklandplanning.org
www.facebook.com/OPDC.org
www.twitter.com/OaklandPlanning
Dee Pamlin
Administrative Assistant
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
(P) 412-391-5590 x301
(F) 412-391-5487
www.spcregion.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrea Boykowycz [mailto:andreaboykowycz@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 6:00 PM
To: Dee Pamlin
Subject: comments to the Draft 2040 LRP

Dear Commissioners:

Please remove the PA51-I376 section of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the Illustrative Projects list of the Draft 2040 Long-Range Plan. Not only does this project have no realistic hope of ever finding the required funds to be built, but its scope and impact are in every particular diametrically opposed to the principles in the Regional Vision Scenario. In other words, this project is a big hindrance to realizing the sustainable future of our region's transportation plans.

We deserve the opportunity to envision a future that does not include it.

If it is impossible to remove the project for the same tired, unimaginative political reasons this project was inserted in the first place, please instruct the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission to submit an updated cost estimate for this 24-mile section. The $3.6 Billion figure cited in the Draft 2040 Plan is the same figure that was included in the 2035 Plan, and construction costs have measurably increased since then. By no means should the public or the SPC commissioners be permitted to delude themselves that this unaffordable project is any less unaffordable now, as a function of inflation, than it was four years ago.

Sincerely,

Andrea Boykowycz
3440 Parkview Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 417-5568
andreaboykowycz@gmail.com
From: Fran Bertonaschi [mailto:fbertonaschi@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 8:49 PM
To: Dee Pamplin
Subject: Draft 2040 Transportation Plan

Hello,

I am addressing my comments to the Draft 2040 Transportation Plan:

I urge you to remove the PA 51 - I-376 section of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the illustrative projects list.

As a resident of Hazelwood, in the City of Pittsburgh, and a member of the Design Advisory Team for the Glenwood to Bates section of the project, I have been active in discussions, meetings, and design planning for the project for the past 10 years. The public has been told throughout these years that funding for construction of the road was being pursued. At this point, with the State in a severe budget crisis, and transportation funding being hundreds of millions of dollars short of the amount needed for basic maintenance of our existing roads and bridges, it is ridiculous to think that any money will ever be available to fund this project.

I can only speculate that the reason for keeping the Expressway on the illustrative projects list is to placate those political leaders who have been supporting the project these many years. Why else would you continue to even consider a project that, even if construction were to start tomorrow, would cost roughly $5 billion?

You owe it to all of the communities which would be impacted by the toll road to let them know, once and for all, that it is time to move on and put their time and energy into creative solutions for the transportation problems in this region. Any other course will just serve to prolong the myth that this road can solve these problems, and forestall the necessary improvements and development that these communities need.

Thanks you for considering my input into this discussion.
Sincerely,

Fran Bertonaschi
250 Hazelwood Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15207
Dear SPC,

As a current resident of Pittsburgh and future resident of Baldwin Borough, the SPC needs to remove the PA 51/I-376 section of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the illustrative projects list. This is not a prudent project for the money required ($3.6 Billion) and put nearby communities in development limbo. This is bad plan that sends the wrong message.

Instead, infrastructure budgets need to be spent on "fix it first" projects. For example, the Route 51/Route 88 interchange needs a major overhaul. The section of Route 51 between the Mon-Fayette Expressway to the West End circle in Pittsburgh (at least 25 miles of road) needs a long range plan with vision for future growth. An example of money well spent is the Route 837 in Pittsburgh’s South Side and the improvements to the Hot Metal Bridge, the bike trails, and the South Side Works development. Re-use of brownfields, investment in existing communities (as opposed to sprawl), and repairing our current transportation system makes a lot of sense.

The future does not have to throw out the old and build all new. We know the construction lobby would rather build new, but they need to understand the new economic relates and toll roads aren't the answer.

Sincerely,
Chris Seymour
2734 Cobden St.
Pittsburgh, PA 15203
412-559-9535
Dee Pamplin
Administrative Assistant
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
(P) 412-391-5590 x301
(F) 412-391-5487
www.spcregion.org

From: John Baillie [mailto:baillie@pennfuture.org]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 2:17 PM
To: Dee Pamplin
Subject: comments to draft 2040 LRP

Dear Sir or Madam: I have attached comments to the draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania that I am submitting on behalf of Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future. Thanks for your attention to this.

John K. Baillie, Senior Attorney
Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2770
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Office 412.258.6684
Fax 412.258.6685
baillie@pennfuture.org

This message and any attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information, and are intended only for the individual or entity identified above as the addressee. If you are not the addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are not authorized to read, copy, or distribute this message and any attachments. Please delete this message and attachments (including all copies) and notify the sender by return e-mail or by phone. Delivery of this message and any attachments to any person other than the intended recipient(s) is not intended in any way to waive confidentiality or a privilege.
June 17, 2011

VIA U.S. Mail and Email (comments@spcregion.org)
SPC Comments
245 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852

Re: Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

Dear Sir or Madam:

Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future (“PennFuture”) offers the following comment to the Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania (the “Draft 2040 Long Range Plan”).

PennFuture is a statewide, public interest, membership organization with offices in Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Wilkes-Barre. PennFuture’s purposes include advocating and litigating on behalf of the environment and public health on a state-wide basis.

We note that on its page 4-59, the Draft 2040 Long-Range Plan includes the Route 51 to I-376 portion of the Mon-Fayette Expressway (the “Project”) on its list of illustrative projects for 2011-2040, and estimates the cost of the Project at $3.6 billion. We believe the Project should be removed from the list for two reasons. First, there is little possibility that the Project will be constructed, ever, as the transportation benefits it would provide, if any, are dwarfed by its estimated cost. Second, there is no possibility that the Project can be constructed for $3.6 billion dollars, which is a years-old estimate that, by now, understates the Project’s cost by at least several hundred million dollars.

Thanks for your attention to these comments.

Very truly yours,

John K. Baillie
June 17, 2011

VIA U.S. Mail and Email (comments@spcregion.org)
SPC Comments
245 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852

Re: Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

Dear Sir or Madam:

Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future (“PennFuture”) offers the following comment to the Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania (the “Draft 2040 Long Range Plan”).

PennFuture is a statewide, public interest, membership organization with offices in Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Wilkes-Barre. PennFuture’s purposes include advocating and litigating on behalf of the environment and public health on a state-wide basis.

We note that on its page 4-59, the Draft 2040 Long-Range Plan includes the Route 51 to I-376 portion of the Mon-Fayette Expressway (the “Project”) on its list of illustrative projects for 2011-2040, and estimates the cost of the Project at $3.6 billion. We believe the Project should be removed from the list for two reasons. First, there is little possibility that the Project will be constructed, ever, as the transportation benefits it would provide, if any, are dwarfed by its estimated cost. Second, there is no possibility that the Project can be constructed for $3.6 billion dollars, which is a years-old estimate that, by now, understates the Project’s cost by at least several hundred million dollars.

Thanks for your attention to these comments.

Very truly yours,

John K. Baillie
Dee Pamlin

Administrative Assistant
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
(P) 412-391-5590 x301
(F) 412-391-5487
www.spcregion.org

From: Melissa McSwigan [mailto:melissamiller28@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 12:20 AM
To: Dee Pamlin
Subject: public comment regarding SPC long range plan for 2040

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission has published a Draft
Long-Range Plan for 2040 and included the Mon Fayette Expressway (PA 51 -
I-376) on the illustrative projects list (at the cost of $3.6 Billion).

The money is not available for such a project and even if it were, it is not where we should be putting our
limited financial resources and tax payer money. Please remove the PA 51 -I-376 section of the Mon-Fayette
Expressway from the illustrative
projects list.

Sincerely,

Melissa McSwigan
4131 Bigelow Blvd
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213
Hello,
I am writing to request you remove the PA 51 - I-376 section of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from the illustrative projects list, part of the Draft Long-Range Plan for 2040. The project is completely not needed and for the amount of money it would cost for construction, you could repair hundreds of bridges. The real need in Southwestern PA is the continued maintenance of existing roads. Having the Mon-Fayette Expressway still on the drawing board also inhibits growth and progress in the planned path of the highway. These communities need to plan for the future and the MFX is a huge distraction. As a former resident of the Mon Valley (Charleroi, PA) I know that this section of road is not necessary and would not help any town along its route.
Please finally put this issue to rest and remove it from the Draft Long-Range Plan for 2040.
Thank you
Chuck Alcorn
3927 Howley Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15224
Dee Pamplin
Administrative Assistant
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
(P) 412-391-5590 x301
(F) 412-391-5487
www.spcregion.org

From: kathy boykowycz [mailto:kathyboyk@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:25 PM
To: Dee Pamplin
Subject: Mon-Fayette expressway

Please REMOVE the Mon-Fayette from the 2040 master plan. Any merits the original plan had 60 years ago are irrelevant now, as all the political, economic and environmental factors have radically changed. There is NO NEED, NO POPULAR DEMAND, and NO MONEY to build it -- and even If the money were in hand today, it would still be 15 years or so until it would be finished: 15 years during which, with the same money, we could invest in rapid transit and rebuild our existing crumbling roads, bridges, and sewers. This infrastructure will have to be fixed soon, Mon-Fay or no Mon-Fay! Our money should go to repair and reconstruction before new highway projects.

No one needs this geriatric project, and we don’t want to see its ugly face any more. Take it away!

Kathy Boykowycz
Oakland
Please refer to prior testimony submission for:

Chris Sandvig, PCRG
Dear SPC,

As the executive director of Bike Pittsburgh, a 1500-member-strong nonprofit bicycle advocacy organization whose mission is to make the Pittsburgh region more bicycle friendly, it is with pleasure that I submit my comments to SPC on your long range vision for the 10-county region. Most of my comments are specific and in the form of edits that should be made to the plan in order to make it more inclusive. Some comments are more general.

Section 1, Introduction/Executive Summary:
Section 1, pg 2, 8th paragraph - Current graph reads "Based on this input a new scenario combining the positive attributes of the Compact/Infill/Transit Oriented and Corridor/Cluster Scenarios was developed." Please edit to read: Based on this input a new scenario combining the positive attributes of the Compact/Infill/Walkable/Bikeable/Transit Oriented and Corridor/Cluster Scenarios was developed.

Section 1, pg 3, 2nd paragraph: Please edit to read: "There is a strong multimodal focus including transit, railways, bicycle and walking facilities, highways and waterways with an increasing emphasis on connecting the centers and clusters and promoting safe and attractive access to the urban core by all modes of transportation. This scenario promotes improved transportation options, operations and safety. This scenario emphasizes upgrading existing water and sewer, with limited expansion primarily to historically underserved communities.

Section 1, pgs 3-4, under "Regional Connections" - Currently there is mention of transit in its own bullet point. Bike Pittsburgh and our 1500 members who we represent would like a specific bullet point in this section:

- The region will place greater emphasis on safely connecting people who walk and bike to residential areas, parks, businesses, arts and culture, as well as other destinations throughout the region.

Section 1, pg 4, under "Regional Activities" - Please edit the fourth (4th) bullet point to read: "The region will place a priority on programs and services to attract and retain a diverse population with a particular focus on young adults and immigrants, who are more inclined toward transit, walking and biking to get around."

Section 4, Transportation:
Section 4, pg 4: Please edit "Congestion Management and Air Quality" ought to read "Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality"

Section 4, pg 17, 5th paragraph: Please add CMAQ and HSIP to the funding programs available to bike/ped. Pedestrian and bicycle transportation projects qualify for these funding streams. In fact CMAQ paid for much of the Port Authority's bike rack on buses program.

Section 4, pg 19, 5th paragraph: The figure listed for the TIGER II Planning Grant is incorrect. It's $1.5
Million. $825,000 is just DOT's slice.

Section 4, pg 22, under "Traffic Operations and Safety": Please edit Traffic Demand Management to read: "Travel Demand Management - Projects such as carpooling, vanpooling, bikepooling, emergency ride home programs, telecommuting, commuter benefit strategies, parking incentives, park-n-ride lots, job access reverse commute programs, secure bicycle storage, bike-sharing, and other non-traditional types of projects that work to affect the demand side of transportation systems.

Section 4, pg 22, under "Traffic Operations and Safety": Please edit Safety to read: "Safety - While virtually every transportation project improves safety by bringing the transportation network up to current design standards, these are stand-alone projects to address specific safety issues. This includes projects to slow down speeding cars, eliminate sight distance problems at intersections, projects that improve at-grade highway-rail crossings, projects to improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and other projects that address areas with high accident rates or crash clusters.

Section 4, pg 22, under "Other modes": Pedestrian and Bicycle - Bicycle lanes, physically separated bike lanes, sidewalks, and shared use pathways that improve accessibility and mobility for bicycles and pedestrians. This includes rail-trails and other pathways that provide non-motorized links in the transportation network. It does not include trails and pathways that serve a purely recreational purpose, because federal transportation funds are not permitted to be spent on these types of projects.

Comment: What is "purely recreational?" Is a kid transporting herself on a bike to her recreational softball game along a trail transportation or recreation? Why is a mother dropping her son or daughter off in a minivan transportation, and a bike ride to the ball game recreation? Most trail facilities are never "purely recreational."

Section 4, pg 46, fifth bullet: "Intermodal Connectivity – Enhance intermodal integration;" please edit to read "Intermodal Connectivity – Enhance intermodal integration and safety;"

Section 4, pg 53, under "Pedestrian and Bicycle Network:" First paragraph should read "Southwestern Pennsylvania has an extensive network of signed pedestrian and bicycle routes, including sidewalks, rail trails and designated bike routes with little to no additional safety enhancements such as wider shoulders, bike lanes, or physical separation from cars."

Comment: nearly five paragraphs are spent talking about our absolutely wonderful trail system which, at present, has been designed primarily to function as a recreational trail and not a transportation trail. Granted, it is not "purely recreational." However, most of our trails are not maintained throughout the winter, are not lighted, and are not even officially open past dusk or in the dimly lit early morning hours (which are the peak commuting hours). BikePGH is supportive of investing in the trails mentioned to make them more feasible for transportation activities, but as it stands now, they can only function for transportation share of the year. Unless it is made clear how these trail amenities serve commuters and people trying to run errands and use them as transportation, there should be less focus on them in the Transportation section of SPC's 2040 LRP.

Section 4, pg 53, seventh, eighth, and ninth paragraphs: Please edit to read: "The City of Pittsburgh in partnership with Bike Pittsburgh has recently embarked on a program of bike infrastructure development along roadway corridors demonstrating high bicycle utilization, which has resulted in a dramatic increase in the miles of bike lanes or sharrows where streets are either too narrow or when there is a lack of will to implement a road diet or eliminate car parking."

"This Shared Lane marking program, or "Sharrow" program, results in the placement of bicycle markings on the two-way pavement, but does not create an exclusive lane for use by bicyclists. Recently added to the Manual of Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) the utilization of Sharrow markings in Pittsburgh has been
considered "experimental" to date due to PennDOT having not yet adopted the 2009 uniform traffic control standards as their own.

The City of Butler also recently implemented a Shared Lane marking program for bicyclists in that community, also in partnership with a non-profit environmental organization, and not by the municipality. Other communities are also considering their use. Meanwhile bicycle advocates and planners in Pittsburgh are looking to best practices in cities such as New York, Chicago, DC, Austin, San Francisco, Portland, Chattanooga, Berkeley, Philadelphia, Seattle, Davis, Boston, Columbus, Baltimore and foreign cities for innovative infrastructure; some of which are included in the National Association of City Transportation Officials' (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide. These innovations include bicycle boulevards, bike boxes, traffic-calming measures, green bike lanes, physically separated bike lanes, bike markings through intersections, peak-hour bike lanes (aka "floating bike lanes"), "one-way except bikes" designation, bike parking corrals, "complete streets" and bicycle signalization, shared bike/bus facilities, and even bike-sharing systems as cost-effective ways to improve safety for all users while coaxing the "interested but concerned" (the 1/3 of the population who wants to bike or walk but doesn't because it's perceived to be too dangerous) to get out of their cars and try these important non-motorized modes of transportation.

Comment: We have made progress with the trails and a handful of bike lanes/sharrows, but there is still so much to do. Let's reflect the vision of a safe, interconnected network of bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure in the 2040 LRP as critical to the region. It will alleviate congestion, reduce obesity, keep money in the local economy, and serve to boost tourism throughout the region.

Respectfully submitted on 6/17/11 at 3:30pm

Scott Bricker
Bike Pittsburgh
o: 412.325.4334
m: 412.726.5872

Advocacy Organization of the Year
http://bike-pgh.org/membership
http://facebook.com/bikepgh
http://twitter.com/bikepgh
2010 Annual Report
The discussion on page 4-18 could lead one to believe that the situation on locks and dams is being addressed. No significant funding has been proposed since 2010 and that should be so indicated.

Further the deterioration of the locks and dams will have very significant implications for roadway congestion. This should also be included.

Page 4-51 should be updated to reflect one barge loads the equivalent of 70 trucks.

Please contact me if more information is needed.

James R. McCarville, Executive Director
Port of Pittsburgh Commission
425 6th Avenue, Room 2990
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
412-201-7335
NEW TRAFFIC PLAN

Traffic Petition

RESIDENTS OF PERRY MANOR/HIGHLAND PINES

5/8/2011
Ross Township Traffic Petition

We the residents of Perry Manor: Washington Blvd., Spruce Street, Lee Avenue Extension, and the residents of Highland Pines: Mayer Drive and Buck Hill Road, are asking Ross Township to permanently solve our traffic problems. The duality of the problem is both a high volume of non-neighborhood traffic and easy access to our roads. This traffic is trying to avoid the light at the intersection of Route 19 and Sewickley Oakmont Rd by cutting through our residential neighborhoods.

These non-resident vehicles are ignoring stop signs and traveling at a high rate of speed, above the posted 25mph limit. We are afraid for our safety and the safety of our children. We have had property damage from these vehicles and many fear for their parked cars on our roads, as well as, backing out of our driveways. We do not want the daily noise and dirt pollution from these cars.

Our proposed short term plan is to have Ross Township erect signs with posted fines to discourage non-resident access to our streets and decrease traffic volume.

We need very large signs posted with the fines on the signs: signs #1 & 2 mounted on the same post and double sided to be seen by drivers in either direction at the four locations.

1. LOCAL TRAFFIC ONLY $500 FINE
2. NO THRU TRAFFIC $500 FINE
3. NO TRUCK TRAFFIC $500 FINE

We recommend placement of these signs at four locations:

#1 signs are needed at the very bottom of Buck Hill Rd on the right and left sides of road to discourage left hand turns from Sewickley Oakmont onto Buck Hill, #2 signs should be at the intersection of Mayer Drive and Lee Avenue Extension at Point Vue Drive—both sides of the road, #3 signs at the intersection of Washington and Spruce—at the stop sign, #4 signs at the top of Washington on both sides—at Perry Beer to discourage left hand turns and at Bollman Services to discourage right hand turns onto Washington from Route 19.
Speeding is the central issue with residents and Ross Township needs to erect stop signs in several locations to slow down traffic. Two stop signs are needed at Grace Drive on both sides of Buck Hill, two stops signs at Wally Drive on both sides of Buck Hill, one stop side at intersection of Buck Hill and Mayer Drive—making this a three-way stop sign intersection. Two stop signs are needed on both sides of Mayer Drive at Holiday Drive. Two stops signs on both sides of Mayer Drive at Point Vue—making this a three-way stop sign intersection.

Two stops signs are needed on both sides of Lee Ave Ext. at Cypress and two more on Lee Ave at Hemlock. Only one stop sign is needed on Lee Ave Ext. at the intersection of Spruce Street. Total number of stop signs requested are 5 stop signs for Buck Hill, 4 stop signs for Mayer Drive, 5 stop signs for Lee Ave. Ext, total = 14 signs. A total of 10 stop signs would be requested if Cypress and Hemlock are optional locations.

Also, there are not enough speed limit signs posted, we require more 25mph signs posted on the flats of Washington, top of Washington, intersection Spruce and Washington, at bend of Lee Ave Ext and Spruce, intersection Point View and Mayer, Mayer Hill and flats.

These signs are mostly ignored by drivers on Washington Blvd, Mayer Drive, and Buck Hill “speedways”. Many residents suggested painting two lines across the road, yellow night glow as white fades, and painting the speed limit of 25 mph in both directions between the lines. Suggested locations would be on Buck Hill at house #98, Mayer Drive on hill at house #168, on Mayer Hill between 124-128, Washington on flats at House 335-337, Washington flats 143-200. Total of five locations for painted speed lines.

We are asking Ross Township to work with the Ross Police to enforce these access signs and to slow traffic down to increase safety of our residents and children. We realize the police has limited manpower but we do not want just a temporary police presence for a few days. It is due to the failure of Ross Township and Penn DOT to solve the traffic intersection at Rt. 19 and Sewickley Oakmont which has created our daily neighborhood nightmare.
We ask for a ongoing, continuous, police presence in our neighborhoods—on the flats of Washington, at the intersection of Washington and Spruce, and on Mayer Drive to write speeding tickets and stop sign violations. We welcome the police to be stationed at bottom of Buck Hill and the top of Washington to discourage these drivers from turning onto our streets and to use radio contact and to fine these violators. These traffic problems have been occurring for many years due to the poor design of traffic flow to and from Camp Horne and Mt. Nebo, a failure again of Ross Township and Penn DOT. We need the township, police, and Penn Dot to assist in the solution.

Our proposed long range plan is to work with Ross Township, Penn Dot, and SPC (Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission) TIP program to fix the dual lights at the intersection of Rt. 19 and Sewickley Oakmont. Adjusting timing of these lights is essential but will not impact the high volume of traffic from I-279 and I-79. We believe a dedicated right hand turning lane is needed at Manor Care on Route 19. We believe a dedicated left hand turning lane and right hand turning lane is needed at Willis on Sewickley Oakmont and the second light at Three Degree Road needs to be timed to allow Sewickley Oakmont traffic (more than five cars) to turn down Three Degree Road on a green light.

We believe communication is essential to accomplish this goal, requiring Ross Township to deal with the SPC and Penn DOT to get our plan on the TIP agenda, Transportation Improvement Plan, for Allegheny County.

We will try to impact our legislators but we need the township to take the lead with county and state agencies. We are certain that all of Ross Township residents will benefit from our long term plan.

In closing, as the editor of the New Traffic Plan, I offer an alternative plan, a simple and cost effective solution, to the speeding and cut through traffic in our neighborhoods. My permanent solution would be to close the roadway at the red zone, a cement barrier between Mayer Drive and Lee Ave Ext. at Point Vue.

Highland Pines was built in 1960’s and these neighborhoods were disconnected until a Mayer Drive resident convinced the township to open the road. I was
surprised when I asked residents about closing the road, 14/15 questioned were in favor of closing the road.

Ross Township could erect a temporary closing barrier with flashing lights for a period time and see what is the residential feedback from our residents. My guess is the five petitioned streets would favor the reduction in traffic and offer no complaints. The complaints would come from residents on the peaceful side streets and non-residents driving the cut through pattern.

I met many wonderful neighbors but the most memorable was an elderly woman on Mayer Drive, using a cane for balance and needing oxygen, telling me she would be the first person to help put-up the cement blocks for a barrier at Point Vue Drive.

Thank-You for your assistance,

Shirley A. Adams
7925 Spruce Street
Cell: 412-366-7647
E-mail: saa12341@aol.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Adams</td>
<td>7925 Spurce St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Spaulk</td>
<td>7919 Spurce St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lane</td>
<td>7911 Spurce</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lameri</td>
<td>500 Washington Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lameri</td>
<td>411 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Volpert</td>
<td>407 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Hart</td>
<td>406 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Wiedlson</td>
<td>353 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D. Lawrence</td>
<td>337 Wash. Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. A. Sandliff</td>
<td>337 Wash. Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Weln-Corin</td>
<td>319 Wash. Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Corin</td>
<td>319 Washington Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Sloan</td>
<td>320 LWSU Dr. Bld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Connors</td>
<td>231 Washington Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Maurer</td>
<td>212 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Chappell</td>
<td>210 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Wilcox</td>
<td>201 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Mainey-Wood</td>
<td>148 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. F. Martin</td>
<td>142 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. D. Antos</td>
<td>136 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143 Washington Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Speed Bumps/1 Way Streets (25 mph sprayed road)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hayin</td>
<td>7910 Spruce St</td>
<td>5527</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollie Keen</td>
<td>7890 Spruce St</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Turek</td>
<td>7880 Spruce St</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Allen</td>
<td>550 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td>15237</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Heid</td>
<td>551 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td>15237</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Franck</td>
<td>605 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James West</td>
<td>605 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Wierzek</td>
<td>615 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wierzek</td>
<td>553 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hastings</td>
<td>555 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Grove</td>
<td>7698 Hilltop</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>715 Lee Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny L. Sadovetz</td>
<td>724 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie C.</td>
<td>727 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David R. Moore</td>
<td>746 Lee Ave Ext</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget M. Mahony Deasy</td>
<td>759 Lee Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Geist</td>
<td>165 Mayer Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peg Geist</td>
<td>145 Mayer Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Witherell</td>
<td>152 Mayer Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Sanders</td>
<td>153 Mayer Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Sanders</td>
<td>153 Mayer Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Green</td>
<td>148 Mayer Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Andrews</td>
<td>528 Lincoln Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tony Bresso 336 Holiday Dr  Yes
Pat Needham 141 Mayer Dr  Yes
Margaret Warren 139 Mayer Dr  Yes
Cheryl Cantu 137 Mayer Dr  Yes
Rude 139 Mayer Dr  Yes
140 Mayer Dr  Yes
Elmer Steiner 138 Mayer Dr  Yes
Earl Hartell 138 Mayer Dr  Yes
Karen McDowell 135 Mayer Dr  Yes
Susan Stock 128 Mayer Dr  Yes
Donna Fagin 123 Mayer Dr  Yes
Mary Rosewelt 116 Mayer Dr  Yes
A. M. Blasco 113 Mayer Dr  Yes
Dalene M. Black 118 Mayer Dr  Yes
Christine Mepo 109 Mayer Dr  Yes
Conni Talley 108 Mayer Dr  Yes
Roger Hey 107 Mayer Dr  Yes
Ella Schlie 149 Buckhill Rd  Yes
Tanner Bean 142 Buckhill Rd  Yes
Robert Zavies 113 Mayer  Yes
Leroy Young 148 Buckhill Rd  Yes
Elbert L. Watson 139 Buckhill Rd  Yes
Buckhill Rd  Yes
Barbara Pfister 132 Buckhill Rd  Yes
Dan Barter 133 Buckhill Rd  Yes
Dee Jaredd 133 Buckhill Rd  Yes
Denise Rivera
98 Buckhill Rd

MARIAN MUNSHOUR
160 MAYER D

Rebecca Bell
761 Lee Ave OH

Suhaila Alsharqes
554 Lee Ave East

Amen Beach
7780 Spruce St

= close two neighborhoods / Block Point Vue
New Plan

1. Turning to Buck Hill Rd from Sewickley Oakmont

2. 2 sets of signs both sides of road

- Local traffic only
- No truck traffic
- No thru traffic

- Fire $000 on these signs

Grace St.

- New stop signs down Buck Hill / up Buck Hill prior to the "Bad Bend"

- Yellow lines night glow
- Speed limit painted on road

98 Buckhill SLOW
1. Local Traffic
2. No Thru Traffic
3. No Trucks

**New Sign Needed**: Make 3-way stop

- Two new stop signs on Buck Hill each way

**Mayer Field**

- New stop sign needed at intersection Buck Hill & Mayer

**Mayer Drive**

- 134-150
- 25 mph slow
- Yellow lines on road speed limit

**Highland Pines St**

**Holiday Drive**

- Two new stop signs on Mayer Drive both directions at Holiday Drive

*Down the Hill!*
Mayer Speeding Hill

Yellow lines
25 mph speed limit
Painted on road

160
Mayer
Watch children

Flats

Paint View Dr
3 way stop signs

#2

Tree zones
Red Zone
Border
Highland Pines
9 Perry Manor

Lee Ave Extension
Cypress
Stop signs needed lee Ave Ext
Both directions

Jackson
Maple
No changes!

Hemlock
(existing)
Suggesting 2 Lee Ave Ext
Both ways!
New stop sign needed one direction
hee Ext @ Spruce St

WASHINGTON BLVD

Elm Street

Hill

337 SLOW 338
Flats 335 Yellow lines 25 mph painted on road

Washington Speeding

Flats 143 Yellow lines
200 SLOW 25 mph

Hill

Perry Booth

Boilman Science
at Bus Stop

R+ 19
Please refer to prior testimony submission for:

Chris Sandvig, PCRG
Matt Pavlosky,
Transportation Planner/Public Involvement
Southwestern PA Commission
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: Public Comment
2040 Long Range Plan

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

Thank you for conducting the May 31, 2011 Beaver County 2040 Long Range Plan Meeting to provide an overview of the 2040 Long Range Plan. Please enter this letter into the record as part of the public testimony on the 2040 Long Range Plan.

Dutch Ridge Road (S.R. 4020) is in need of upgrade for its entire length, from Fifth Street in Beaver Borough to its intersection with Tuscaraus Road (S.R. 4028) in Brighton Township. Needed improvements include shoulders, pavement, signage and storm drainage. The section of road between Tuscaraus Road (S.R. 4028) and Brighton Road (S.R. 4035) is very narrow, with uneven pavement and poor drainage. The section of roadway between Park Road (S.R. 4018) and Beaver Borough has rutted and uneven pavement.

Dutch Ridge Road provides access to two critical healthcare related facilities. Formerly known as the Medical Center Beaver, the Heritage Valley Beaver hospital is a 385 bed, comprehensive healthcare facility that is part of the Heritage Valley Health System. Friendship Ridge is a 589 bed, long & short tem skilled rehabilitation and nursing facility located on the 96-acre campus of the Beaver County Health and Welfare Complex. These facilities are two of the largest employment centers in Beaver County. Dutch Ridge Road also has two Brighton Township Fire Stations located upon its length, as well as the Dutch Ridge Elementary School of the Beaver Area School District.

The Veterans Memorial Bridge, currently under construction, will provide a new crossing over the Beaver River and will connect Route 51 with Route 18. This new crossing will direct more traffic onto Beanie Hollow Road (S.R. 4016) and, subsequently,
onto Dutch Ridge Road. Dutch Ridge Road is also a primary link for access to I376 at the Brighton Interchange No. 36 on Brighton Road. The anticipated increased traffic volume makes the improvements even more important for transportation safety.

For these reasons Dutch Ridge Road should be added to the Roadway Capital Maintenance program for scheduled improvements.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Feel free to contact me should you have any questions regarding this testimony.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Bryan K. Dehart
Township Manager

John Bates, Public Participation Panel Member
Hopewell Township Municipal Building
1700 Clark Blvd.
Aliquippa, Pa  15001

Comment Period, Public Meeting, Commissioners Conference Room, Beaver County Courthouse, 810 Third St., Beaver, Pa  15009
May 31, 2011
In order to forward public comment to the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) for the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania, Hopewell Township respectfully requests the Beaver County Participation Panel accept the submittal of this comment report, for the record, at its Beaver County Public Participation Panel testimony scheduled May 31, 2011, Beaver County Courthouse.

With that in mind, the consideration of the project contained herein, is critical to the safety and welfare of Hopewell Township and the general traveling public. The 2-Lane Relocation of the Kane/Gringo Road RT 151 Intersection was previously considered since the 1990’s and listed on the 2005-08 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The existing conditions of this intersection are dangerous and detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of motorists using this State Route. This traveling population includes School Bus Students and Emergency Response Personnel, as per the proximity to the Hopewell Volunteer Fire Department Station No. 2.

Moreover, Road reconstruction from Kane Road / RT 151 to Laurel Road / 5 PTS was also planned in the 1990’s and included the TIP’S during early 2000-05 along with the 2-Lane Relocation of the Kane/Gringo Road RT 151 Intersection. This planning was logical as per the proximity of the two projects and their heavy usage. These projects are not wish list considerations. They are projects that need to be accomplished for safety and congestion purposes. All the roads involved are State Routes with much recorded history. They are projects that have been considered in the past and were forwarded substantially before being terminated for what ever reason. On the plus side, the projects also include economic development rewards. These two projects need to be reintroduced to the planning of the SPC and seriously considered for inclusion in updated plans.

Finally, this report is intended to deliver the information necessary to consider the reintroduction of the aforementioned plans for the health, safety and welfare of the traveling public, along with the economic benefits that will outcome from the realization of these improvements.
SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA COMMISSION

PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA
MAY 31, 2011

Mr. / Madam Chairman, Beaver County Public Participation Panel, Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, Ladies and Gentleman,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Participation Panel and the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission by way of this comment period.

I would like to stress the importance of the two aforementioned projects.

Moreover, these projects are vital to Hopewell Township’s future public transportation safety and economic development.

The 2-lane Relocation of the Kane / Gringo Road RT 151 Intersection.

First, and most importantly, there is a serious safety consideration. The intersection is very dangerous to the traveling public. Both reportable and non-reportable accidents frequently occur. Recently, serious accidents have continued to occur and are a matter of record (PADOT). This stretch of RT 151 is bumper to bumper at peak daily work traffic hours because of its relationship to the Five Points Intersection. In order to turn right on to SR 151 from Kane Road, one must negotiate a greater than 90 degree turn and five foot elevation between the two roads when traveling east onto SR 151. Just before approaching the Kane Road Intersection there is a bend that blocks the view of approaching traffic. Often, near misses occur when cars are staged along 151 from the 5 pts signals or making turns onto Kane Road. Adding to the problem, motorists turning east on 151 from Kane Road have to pull out far into the intersection in order to see approaching 151 traffic because of the grade elevation difference. This, in turn makes the entrance onto KANE Road most difficult for 151 motorists.

Second, there is the economic development significance that an improvement to this intersection would afford to be realized. As you may or may not know, this improvement is vitally important to the further development of Hopewell Township’s “Other Industrial Park”, the Aliquippa Airport Industrial Park located on Airport Road. At present, trucks find it impossible to negotiate a right turn onto 151 from Kane Road to link with RT
376 (PA 60), because of the slope and degree of the turning radius that now exists, as mentioned.

The Beaver County Corporation for Economic Development has finished tenant space and infrastructure improvements at the former Mine Safety Building, and the Modern Glass Company is located there. Hopewell Township knows that what was done at that site can serve as an example of what can be done at the remainder of the park and that other industrial park businesses can locate and develop additional lands available, creating positive benefits for the Township including continued housing construction starts, an increase in wage tax collections and overall productivity throughout the community.

Previously, the long range plan draft of major highway candidates for Beaver County listed a major upgrade of 151 from Kane Road to Laurel Road at the Five Points Intersection. Without the intersection improvement being considered first, this upgrade will have little impact.

Finally, the project fits well within the structure of the coordinated regional development plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. The regional policy committee’s goals and objectives and the task force emphasis on economic development, community development, quality of life and transportation safety are all very well illustrated in the SR 151/Kane Road Intersection Improvement project. The “BIG PICTURE” relating to the future health, safety and welfare of the traveling public rests upon the foundation of the 151/Kane Road Intersection Improvement.

It is interesting and significant to note, that there is great interest throughout the community for this project to be realized. Several major groups, including utility companies, contractors, and engineering firms have already come forward and volunteered their expertise or services toward a “MATCHING FUNDS” compliment to the project.

In closing, I hope that you can feel the key to the “BIG PICTURE” relating to the future health, safety and welfare of the traveling public and the successful economic development of the Aliquippa Airport rests upon the foundation of the S.R. 151, Kane Road Intersection improvement.

Respectfully submitted,

John Bates
Hopewell Township Zoning Officer
Hopewell Township Emergency Management Coordinator
WRITTEN COMMENT FORM  
(Please Print Clearly)

Please use this form to submit your written comments on these draft documents:

- Proposed Amendments to the 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program

Comments:

The U.S. Route 30 Upgrade from the West Virginia line (NOT Ohio—as shown on the TIP) to State Route 168, shown as project #43 on the 2040 TIP should be considered as a priority project for driver safety reasons. This road is used heavily by truck traffic running to/from the Tri-State region to I-376, the Pittsburgh International Airport and beyond. Many of the trucks are carrying hazardous materials west to the WTI Hazardous Waste Incinerator in East Liverpool, Ohio. The incline and bends on this stretch of road are very deceiving, visibility is poor, and drivers assuming that their speed is safe suddenly round a bend heading downhill and encounter a truck left-of-center and have insufficient time to stop. There are many serious accidents on this segment of Route 30, and many more near-accidents.

First Energy has plans to construct a fly-ash depository off U.S. Route 30 on Red Dog Road. The design for the Route 30 project calls for a re-alignment of the US 30/Red Dog Road Intersection with a turn lane. If this project is not implemented, the eastbound trucks attempting to turn onto Red Dog Road, combined with the westbound hazardous material trucks, will surely be a recipe for disaster.

It’s about time that the “Gateway to Pennsylvania” on Route 30 become known as that, and not as “Accident Alley”.

(Please use reverse for additional space)

Optional Information

Name: Sandra J. Wright, Secretary/Treasurer

Organization: Greene Township County of Residence: Beaver

Address: P.O. Box 181 Hookstown PA 15050

Email: sandy@greenetwp.comcastbiz.net

Thank You! Please Feel free to take this form with you and send it back to us when you have a minute.

By Mail: SPC Comments
425 6th Avenue, Suite 2500 Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
By Fax: 412-391-9160 or By Email: comments@spcrregion.org   
All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on April 9, 2010.
Good Evening, my name is Dave Johnston and I serve as Planning Director for Butler County. I would like to take this opportunity to once again speak on behalf of a transportation project that is critical to the continued economic health and vitality of not only Butler County, but to the entire region of Southwestern Pennsylvania.

The project I would like to address is the Route 228 project located in southern Butler County. To understand where we are in the project we need to step back and review the history of this important corridor.

In 2001 design work on this corridor began by developing and evaluating various alternatives, with input from the public. The scope of the project included Route 228 from Route 19 to Route 8. In the middle of that effort several projects across the Commonwealth, including Route 228, were reevaluated and modified because some of the design options and features were just not economically feasible.

In 2007 a cost effective design was completed that balanced the needs of the roadway users and environment while garnering public support. In preparation for construction, the nine-mile corridor was broken into four independent projects that fit funding resources available at the time.

Significant financial progress was made in 2007 in putting together a critical phase of this Route 228 corridor project that extended from Route 19 to Myoma Road in Adams Township. 64.5 million in potential funding was established including 20 million from Pennsylvania Economic Development Funds and about 40 million was to be paid by an Indianapolis-based Simon Property Group. As usual, Cranberry Township played an integral part in this phase through the use of impact fees to also be dedicated to this vital project. Unfortunately, an $11 million dollar shortfall could not be met and Simon eventually pulled out of the project resulting in the entire project being shelved. Ironically, late last year Governor Rendell pulled unused transportation economic development funds including the $20 million
earmarked for Route 228 and flexed $45 million to the Port Authority of Allegheny County.

Two important events led to a lowering priority of capacity adding projects across the Commonwealth severely impacting this project. The state of the economy caused a rapid increase of 40% in construction costs. Then, a failure of bridges across the nation and Commonwealth placed a greater emphasis on redirecting funds to structurally deficient bridges.

Several factors including continued commercial expansion along this corridor as well as the Westinghouse Electric Company choosing to relocate its corporate headquarters from Monroeville to this area in Cranberry Township have resulted in severe gridlock along Route 228 from Route 19 to Route 8. Westinghouse has constructed new office space in excess of 1 million square feet for approximately 4,500 individuals.

Following the collapse of the integral project along this corridor in 2007, PennDOT worked closely with the Federal Highway Administration and local leaders to utilize the environmental work completed to date as a data bank for future projects. State, County, local leaders, and local businesses and the Chamber of Commerce spent considerable time to break projects into smaller fundable projects that would attempt to improve the flow of traffic along this corridor.

The first project was the auxiliary lane that came off the northbound I-79 ramp and extended in front of the Marriott Hotel to its terminus with Cranberry Woods Drive.

The second project includes the northbound on-ramp of I-79. Currently, traffic heading northbound from Route 228 crosses traffic. The new ramp will improve the flow of traffic by exiting directly from Route 228 to I-79.

The third project includes the new southbound on-ramp to I-79. As with the northbound ramp, traffic must now cross over 228 traffic to head southbound on I-79. The new ramp will flow directly from Route 228 to I-79 south without crossing traffic.

Finally, design work is underway to replace the Mars Railroad Bridge along this corridor as well as improvements at the Mars intersection. We are
grateful for funding provided by Representative Jason Altmire to make this $19 million dollar project a reality.

We are also grateful that these new ramp projects that will help to improve the flow of traffic along Route 228, but once again we are seeking help in getting projects developed along this corridor that will provide a long-term sustained improvement to help to improve the flow of traffic. This area of Butler County serves as an economic catalyst for the entire region. It is critical that the State and Federal Government not abandon this corridor that has provided well-paying sustainable jobs.

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Public Participation Panel on this important project for Butler County and the entire region.
Here are my comments. I added an idea on a commuter rail line.

On Wed 15/06/11 2:48 PM, "Matt Pavlosky" mpavlosky@spcregion.org sent:
Paul:

Please send your comments to me. Good talking with you today!

Matt

Matthew S. Pavlosky
Transportation Planner, Public Involvement/Outreach
Southwestern PA Commission
425 Sixth Ave. Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 391-5590 x361 (phone)
(412) 391-9160 (fax)
mpavlosky@spcregion.org
www.spcregion.org
Report to SPC
Paul Foster, Vice President of Evans City Borough Council
June 16, 2011

Evans City Traffic Congestion

I-79 is the major highway through Butler County with several major corridors into the heart of the county. These include 422, 68, 228 and the Turnpike/route 8. Route 228 is limited to 35 tons due to the bridge near Mars. Therefore, most heavy truck traffic into the southern Butler County, especially from Cranberry Township to Butler, goes through Evans City.

Communities north and east of Evans City are planning new home development. This will add to traffic through Evans City due to commuting and shopping in Cranberry Township, Pittsburgh, etc.

The SPC has done a traffic study as part of the SINC-UP project in 2008. This has improved the flow of traffic through Evans City. Yet, I expect the traffic volume on Route 68 through Evans City to increase. Route 68 is currently a two lane road. Within Evans City, there are portions of route 68 that are only wide enough for two lanes, edged with curbs. Other sections have space for parking. In order to increase the capacity of the road, it could be made 4 lanes with two main obstacles. The sections which have no parking, (curbed) would have to be widened. The bridge over the Breakneck Creek is three lanes wide. It would have to be replaced.

Instead of making route 68 four lanes wide, I am proposing the creation of a bypass route. This bypass would start at the intersection of Lindsay Rd.(528) and route 68, west of Evans City. The road would cross Likens Run and then over both the railroad and Breakneck Creek. From there the road would continue northeast to connect with Franklin Road (528), north of Evans City and on to reconnect with route 68 between Evans City and Brownsdale Road. North Washington Street in Evans City could be extended to connect with the bypass on the north side of Breakneck Creek. This would create a new business corridor within Evans City.

Commuter rail service

The Evans City area needs more mass transit solutions to Pittsburgh. This is evident, by the number of cars in the Park’n’Ride at 528 and 79. I believe part of the solution would be commuter rail service. The rail lines to Pittsburgh already exist. In fact less than 10 years ago, Amtrak came through Evans City. The commuter service could start in Butler or Zelienople and run through Harmony, Evans City, Mars and beyond. It would end at Penn Station in Pittsburgh, near the bus terminal, with a link to the PAT subway system. One major problem in Evans City would be where to put the train station or stop. Maybe such a station would be better outside of Evans City, such as in Jackson Township near Lindsay Rd. (528).
Please refer to prior testimony submission for:

David Johnston, Butler County Planning
Department, Director
May 26, 2011

SPC Comments  
425 Sixth Avenue Suite 2500  
Pittsburgh PA 15219-1852

Gentlemen:

Thank you for the opportunity to state the case for the intersection in Clinton Township, Cox’s Corner (SR 288/SR2005), that we, the Board of Supervisors, believe is a very dangerous situation waiting for a serious accident to happen.

Attached are several documents:

- Testimony of May 26, 2011
- Concept designs suggested by Township Engineer
- Google map of site
- Map of southern Butler County highlighting 228 and site

If there is more information needed at this time, please let us know. We are anxious to do all that we can to see this intersection improved.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Mary Zacherl, Chairman

James H. Halstead, Vice Chairman

Edward J. Boyd, Supervisor

Enclosures
Good Evening, Gentlemen.

I continue to sing the benefits of Route 228 as the northern Beltway. It’s use as a TRANSPORTATION AXIS continues TO GROW because 228 is a major connector from the Cranberry-North Pittsburgh area to the ALLEGHENY VALLEY region of Western PA.

In my southeast Butler County area there has been several improvements:
- Light stabilization at route 8 and 228E
- Road re-alignment and signalization at the Houseville intersection –228E at Victory Road
- Turning lanes and signals at 228E and 356

I request that your attention now be directed to another long-standing, difficult intersection—228E and Saxonburg Boulevard, SR 2005.

This is a Y-intersection, as opposed to the safer T-intersection, at a spot locally known as “cox’s corner.”
- In addition, the township road, Westminster Road, enters 228 not 500’ from the Y.

WHY is this intersection becoming more important?
- This confusing intersection is located in the area of the township designated as the highest development area
- We have the very successful Victory Road Business Park to the west with such businesses as Brayman Construction, MEDRAD and Aldi.
- Going northeast towards Saxonburg, Thrower cement and the largest employer in the township, II-VI are located
- All rely on trucking ... traveling 228
- There is an issue with sight distance
- There is a growing problem of congestion

There have been several traffic studies over the past ten years and they indicate a very poor rating for this intersection. Those of us who live in Clinton Township and use the intersection are well aware of how poor, and more and more dangerous it has become.

Cox’s Corner is a relic of our rural past. It can no longer function properly or safely in light of the substantial increase in use. Please help us improve this intersection.

We are asking that SPC and PENNDOT consider the Cox’s Corner intersection (228E/2005) for their list of projects as they proceed with their transportation planning for us.

Clinton Township
711 Saxonburg Boulevard
Saxonburg PA 16056
724.352-9000
Clinton@mvlclintontwp.net
Clinton Township  
711 Saxonburg Boulevard  
Saxonburg PA  16056  
724.352-9000  
Clinton@myclintontwp.net

Proposal for "Cox's Corner" (SR 228/SR2005) as proposed by Clinton Township Engineer, Olsen & Associates

Actual drawings available upon request.

Mary Zacherl  
Supervisor
March 19, 2009

Clinton Township Board of Supervisors
711 Saxonburg Boulevard
Saxonburg, PA 16056

Ref:  Rt. 228/Saxonburg Boulevard Intersection
      Clinton Township

Members of the Board:

Enclosed are two concept plans for improving the Rt.228/Saxonburg Boulevard Intersection. Both concepts would require signalization and possibly additional turning lanes.

Option No. 1 shows the existing intersection being moved to the northwest to provide
- A more 90° Tee intersection for safer traffic movements.
- A resulting extended separation between the main intersection and that of the Westminster Rd/Rt. 228 Ekastown Rd. intersection. This will provide operators of northbound vehicles on Westminster Road better visibility and more time to make their turning movements.
- A slight realignment of the Knoch Road/Saxonburg Boulevard to more closely conform to desirable 90° intersection angle.

Option No. 2 shows a more ambitious concept which
- Converts Rt. 228 as a through road to Ekastown Road
- Results in Saxonburg Boulevard and Westminster Road connecting at a cross intersection with Rt. 228. Note, however, that radii of turns on the proposed new Saxonburg Blvd. alignment could possibly be disapproved by PaDOT as being too small for the posted 45 mph speed limit on Saxonburg Boulevard.
If the Board wishes, we will forward both options to PennDOT for the preliminary comment with the stipulation that the Township is not committing to any improvement but is simply exploring potential ideas for improving the intersection.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Ronald Olsen, P.E., P.L.S.
Township Engineer

200911C
Please refer to prior testimony submission for:

Paul Foster, Evans City Borough,

Vice-President of Council
Matt Pavlosky

Subject: FW: Comment Received from District 10/ Butler Public Mtg/ 2040 Long Range Plan

From: Matt Pavlosky
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 9:50 AM
To: Ryan Gordon; Karen Franks; Sara Walfoort
Subject: FW: Comment Received from District 10/ Butler Public Mtg/ 2040 Long Range Plan

The item below was a comment taken from the Thursday, May 26th Public Meeting in Butler County. Eric Lamm, a citizen in Butler County made a request regarding a permit issue for a roadway improvement. With assistance from the permit department at PennDOT District 10-0, Mr. Lamm’s request has been completed, and his issue resolved. See below.

From: Matt Pavlosky
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 9:43 AM
To: ‘Snyder, Courtney E’
Cc: Mouser, Frank
Subject: RE: Comment Received from District 10/ Butler Public Mtg/ 2040 Long Range Plan

Comment: Eric Lamm, a citizen of Butler County, requested the following: Mr. Lamm is seeking assistance from PennDOT in the form of a permit to complete roadway improvements at the intersection of State Route 3022 and Thompson Park Drive. These improvements include widening, signal modifications, and other related improvements. Mr. Lamm stated that he had to submit additional documentation to PennDOT, which included a letter of credit, or he faced the risk of losing related funding by June 1, 2011. Mr. Lamm stated that he would accept any help available to expedite the process.

Answer: PennDOT District 10 staff took Mr. Lamm’s request, and reviewed his situation with the appropriate staff internally. Mr. Lamm, with the assistance of Cranberry Township, who has now taken ownership of the project, has provided to documentation for issuance of the permit. Mr. Lamm’s request has since been resolved, as he has not lost his funding, and he is proceeding with his improvement project with the assistance of the PennDOT District and Cranberry Township.

From: Matt Pavlosky [mailto:mpavlosky@spcregion.org]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 10:25 AM
To: Snyder, Courtney E
Cc: Mouser, Frank
Subject: Comment Received from District 10/ Butler Public Mtg/ 2040 Long Range Plan
Importance: High

Courtney & Frank:

My name is Matt Pavlosky, Outreach Coordinator for Southwestern PA Commission. On Thursday, May 26, we had our public review for our Draft 2040 Long Range Plan in Butler County. The meetings offer an open comment session for the public. During our open session, a gentleman named Eric Lamm asked to make a formal comment, without documentation or comments in hand, which is acceptable, but I’ll need some help with specifics since he’s working with your District office.
Mr. Lamm stated he was seeking a permit for some various improvements of Thompson Park Drive in Butler County, and was at risk of losing his letter of credit with PennDOT, if his situation wasn’t resolved by June 1st. Dave Cook, the event’s representative for District 10, nor myself, were aware of the specifics on this matter, and offered to help if possible. Mr. Lamm’s question was in regard to permits, and our open comment sessions are mostly regarding future or current programming of planning issues or improvements. So, I would appreciate your help.

Comment: Eric Lamm, a citizen of Butler County, requested the following: Mr. Lamm is seeking assistance from PennDOT or any related entity, to allow a permit to be processed in his attempt to complete road improvements to Thompson Park Drive in Cranberry Township, (near Route/Intersection?). These improvements include widening, signal modifications, and other related improvements. Mr. Lamm stated that he required additional documentation to PennDOT, or he faced the risk of losing his letter of credit, and related funding by June 1, 2011. Mr. Lamm stated that he would take any help available to resolve the matter.

Answer: PennDOT District 10 staff took Mr. Lamm’s request, and reviewed his situation with the appropriate staff. Requests for Mr. Lamm to provide additional support and credit information, with the assistance of Cranberry Township have been completed. Mr. Lamm’s issue has since been resolved, he has not lost his funding, and he is proceeding with his improvements with the assistance of the PennDOT District.

If there are any further specifics you wish to add (specifically, the route/intersection) or anything related to the resolution process, that would be greatly appreciated. You will receive the final version, and it will be made a formal comment for the record.

Thanks for helping me close the loop, and please contact me if you have any questions.

Matt

Matthew S. Pavlosky
Transportation Planner, Public Involvement/Outreach
Southwestern PA Commission
425 Sixth Ave. Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 391-5590 x361 (phone)
(412) 391-9160 (fax)
mpavlosky@spcregion.org
www.spcregion.org
From: Saunders, Angela [mailto:ansaunders@state.pa.us]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2011 12:54 PM
To: Ken Flack
Cc: Duda, Rachel
Subject: D12 LRP Changes

Ken-

After our meeting yesterday, we had the following changes:

We need to following project to be in period 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>2011 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salina Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$12,592,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donora Webster Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$28,790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 31 @ Donegal</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 981 @ Kennametal</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 356 Climbing Lane</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would like to add PA 51: Allegheny County Line to Uniontown Reconstruction @ $175 million in Period 3

Also:
SR 981 Laurel Valley Betterments, Turnpike to Air Cargo Park, the title needs changed to: “Laurel Valley Transportation Improvements
SR 30- Allegheny County Line to Westmoreland Mall, Intersection Improvements, the title needs changed to: “US 30 Corridor Safety & Congestion Improvements”
SR 19 Improvements I-70 to Allegheny County Line, the title needs changed to “US 19 Corridor Safety & Congestion Improvements”

And finally, can you check the PA 56 Pavement Restoration?- could this have been a “Reconstruction” rather than a preservation, and that’s why the dollar amount is so high?

Call me if you have any questions.
Thanks!
Angela

Angela Saunders | Transportation Planning Specialist
Department of Transportation
Engineering District 12-0
825 N.Gallatin Ave Ext | Uniontown, PA 15401
Phone: 724.439.1891 | Fax: 724.430.4401
www.dot.state.pa.us
Please use this form to submit your written comments on these draft documents:

- Proposed Amendments to the 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program

Comments:

Increased traffic on Toddig Road.
Inconvenient for business on I-9.
Increased traffic at right at Bullchin traffic light.
I don't see any traffic hazards at this intersection with the traffic light.
With access to and from I-9.

(Please use reverse for additional space)

Optional Information

Name: John Kowalski
Organization: Resident
Address: 187 Rose Rd. Mt. Pleasant, PA 15666
County of Residence: Fayette Co.

Email:

Thank You! Please feel free to take this form with you and send it back to us when you have a minute.

By Mail: SPC Comments
425 6th Avenue, Suite 2500 Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
By Fax: 412-391-9160 or By Email: comments@spcregion.org
All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on April 9, 2010.
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Krystyniak</td>
<td>506 Ridgeview Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>E.H. Westmoreland</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>10/9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Etling</td>
<td>189 Gimlet Hill</td>
<td>Bullskin Twp.</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>11-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Broughter</td>
<td>345C Country Club Road Scottsdale PA</td>
<td>Bullskin Fayette</td>
<td>Duane</td>
<td>11-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Broughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>11-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavee Barclay</td>
<td>1381 Mt Pleasant Rd. Mt Pleasant Pa</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone Twp, Fayette</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>11-17-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Krueckwich</td>
<td>181 McClure Road Mt Pleasant Mt. Pa</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone Twp. Fayette</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>11-17-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard Drubachi</td>
<td>118 Maynard Sr Scottsdale Pa</td>
<td>East Hunting PA</td>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td>11-17-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Cycle</td>
<td>206 Market Street Scottsdale PA</td>
<td>Westmoreland Co.</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>11-17-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Lewandowski</td>
<td>615 Walnut Grove Rd. Connellsville Pa</td>
<td>Fayette Co.</td>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>11/17/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josh Ourst</td>
<td>119 Zwanen Mt Pleasant Pa 15666</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Justin Ourshey</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee McKay</td>
<td>333 Hammondville St. Mt Pleasant Pa 15666</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Robert S McKay</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Myers</td>
<td>155 Hector Rd. Tel Pk 15688</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Chuck Myers</td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bobatch</td>
<td>Dillon Rd. Acmg Pa 15201</td>
<td>Mt Pleasant</td>
<td>Robert Bobatch</td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Butts</td>
<td>202 Broadford Rd Cville Pa</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Kenneth Butts</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Clark</td>
<td>151A Mt. Pleasant Cowell</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Wendy Clark</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Ferrer</td>
<td>400 E Smithfield St. Mt. Pleasant Pa 15666</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Tim Ferrer</td>
<td>9-18-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Ferrer</td>
<td>140 E Smithfield St. Mt. Pleasant Pa 15666</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Dick Ferrer</td>
<td>9-18-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Fox</td>
<td>1395 Mt. Pleasant Rd. Mt. Pleasant Pa 15666</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Stacy Fox</td>
<td>9-18-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe Passaga</td>
<td>123 Redback Rd. Ave, Mt. Pleasant Pa 15666</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Philippe Passaga</td>
<td>10-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Crosby</td>
<td>101 Rose Rd. Mt. Pleasant Pa</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Dennis Crosby</td>
<td>11-19-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF
UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION
TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4
WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND
ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donald Fox</td>
<td>1395 Mt Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone Fayette</td>
<td>Donald Fox</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Truxel</td>
<td>1355 Mt.Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone Fayette</td>
<td>Jo Truxel</td>
<td>9-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Truxel</td>
<td>1355 Mt.Pleasant Rd.</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone Fayette</td>
<td>Lawrence Truxel</td>
<td>9-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay A. Kramer</td>
<td>10 Trice Dr.</td>
<td>MP Twp/Westmoreland</td>
<td>Jay A. Kramer</td>
<td>9-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni L Kromer</td>
<td>10 Trice Dr</td>
<td>MP Twp/Westmoreland</td>
<td>Donald Kromer</td>
<td>9-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriah Kromer</td>
<td>10Trice Dr.</td>
<td>MP Twp/Westmoreland</td>
<td>Moriah Kromer</td>
<td>9/6/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Fox</td>
<td>1395 Mt. Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone Fayette</td>
<td>Lori Fox</td>
<td>9-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Fox</td>
<td>812 Spring St</td>
<td>Westmoreland County</td>
<td>Angela Fox</td>
<td>9-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald K Fox</td>
<td>812 Spring St</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Ronald K Fox</td>
<td>9-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Fox</td>
<td>1395 Mt Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone Fayette</td>
<td>Cory Fox</td>
<td>9-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayme Kromer</td>
<td>10Trice Dr</td>
<td>MP Twp/Westmoreland</td>
<td>Jayme Kromer</td>
<td>9/6/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF
UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION
TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4
WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND
ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Banker</td>
<td>Don Baar</td>
<td>Don Baar</td>
<td>Scott Bank</td>
<td>9-22-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Maras</td>
<td>Curille</td>
<td>Bullskin'</td>
<td>Dan Made</td>
<td>9-22-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Wagner</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>John Wagner</td>
<td>9-22-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Goodwin</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Bullshin</td>
<td>Mary Goodwin</td>
<td>9-22-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Greene</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>Lower Tyrone</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>9-22-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Richter</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>Westmore</td>
<td>Rose Richter</td>
<td>9-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Garmen</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Ted Garmen</td>
<td>11-18-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerahit Weikle</td>
<td>R. D. H.</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Gerahit Weikle</td>
<td>11-23-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Clark</td>
<td>111 Larnevue Dr. Mt. Pleasant, PA</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Andrea Clark</td>
<td>9-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hunker</td>
<td>303 Mountain View Rd, Connellsville</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Dan Hunker</td>
<td>9-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Ainsley</td>
<td>120 Spring St.</td>
<td>Dunbar Township</td>
<td>Ben Ainsley</td>
<td>9-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Heurbaugh</td>
<td>424 N. 100th Ed, Sherrill, PA</td>
<td>East H. West</td>
<td>Sandy Heurbaugh</td>
<td>9-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Jones</td>
<td>511 Delaunay Ave, Scottsdale, PA</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Tracey Jones</td>
<td>9-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette Nicola</td>
<td>226 Falls Ave, Cullen, PA</td>
<td>Dunbar Township</td>
<td>Fayette Nicola</td>
<td>9-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Williams</td>
<td>1229 Vine St., Conn. PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Karen Williams</td>
<td>9-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINA Cruzan</td>
<td>300 Box 343, New Stanton, PA</td>
<td>West's</td>
<td>MINA Cruzan</td>
<td>9-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Jorden</td>
<td>Craig Rd.</td>
<td>Dunbar</td>
<td>Cindy Jorden</td>
<td>9-22-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Eshelman</td>
<td>5610 Mill Rd.</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Barbara Eshelman</td>
<td>9-22-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME/PRINT</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>TWP/COUNTY</td>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall E. Hail Sr.</td>
<td>116 W Georgia Ave, Cabotville, AR 72025</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnie Marie</td>
<td>94 Priddy #429, McAlpine Rd., Cabotville, AR 71901</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Jones</td>
<td>#53 McAllister Ave, Cabotville, AR 72025</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Evans</td>
<td>111 Main St., Cassville, AR 72025</td>
<td>Cassville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Starks</td>
<td>107 Mill Rd., Cassville, AR 72025</td>
<td>MT Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Connors</td>
<td>120 Mill Rd., Cassville, AR 72025</td>
<td>Cassville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Fossington</td>
<td>104 Mill Rd., Cassville, AR 72025</td>
<td>Cassville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Parker</td>
<td>120 Main St., Cassville, AR 72025</td>
<td>Cassville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas L. Coffman</td>
<td>2726 Old Cr 429 East, Cassville, AR 72025</td>
<td>Cassville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Linderman</td>
<td>153 Fire Dept Rd TARRS. PA. 15688</td>
<td>west</td>
<td>Hazel Linderman</td>
<td>Sept 4, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Campbell</td>
<td>112 Church St Scottsdale Boro PA</td>
<td>Scottsdale Boro</td>
<td>JRG</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Keefer</td>
<td>3 POLE CAT R.R. MT. PLEASANT, PA.</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>MT. Pleasant WP.</td>
<td>9/7/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Henry</td>
<td>New Stanton PA 127 Aroma Rd.</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Steve Henry</td>
<td>9/8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Flack</td>
<td>176 Horseshoe Bend Rd Acme PA 15610</td>
<td>Bullskin/Fayette</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>9/8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald W. Trout</td>
<td>127 Pine Hill White PA 15312</td>
<td>Saletick</td>
<td>Gerald W. Trout</td>
<td>1-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Wiltzout</td>
<td>198 without Hollow Rd White PA 15490</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>fries</td>
<td>9-3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Tempay</td>
<td>399 C Smithfield</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Herbert Tempay</td>
<td>8-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Hill</td>
<td>323 Overseas</td>
<td>corinth ton</td>
<td>Kery Z K</td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ferrell</td>
<td>1370 Mt. Aetna Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyone</td>
<td>Michael Ferrell</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Huffine</td>
<td>PO Box 114 re:insering 1017 west Bondary</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Ronald Huffine</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF
UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION
TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND
ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kelly</td>
<td>114 Moore CH Rd.</td>
<td>Dune Boro Twp.</td>
<td>Mark Kelly</td>
<td>9/9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Minard</td>
<td>3376 County Club Rd.</td>
<td>Fayette Bulskin</td>
<td>Carl C Minard</td>
<td>9/9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Mowry</td>
<td>272 Keslar School Rd.</td>
<td>Saltlick Twp.</td>
<td>Leon Mowry</td>
<td>9/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnette Kisner</td>
<td>289 Midcove Rd.</td>
<td>Fayette Co.</td>
<td>Bennet Kisner</td>
<td>9/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Bougher</td>
<td>220 Johnson Cn. Connellsville Pk</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Donald Bougher</td>
<td>9/11/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Bukich</td>
<td>77 Herrick Rd. Connellsville Pk</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>ME DNR</td>
<td>9/11/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Peterson</td>
<td>284 McConnell Rd.</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Hardik</td>
<td>154 Rutledge Rd.</td>
<td>E. Hunt, westw.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Commins</td>
<td>230 Keeler Rd.</td>
<td>Bullskin/Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Henderson</td>
<td>195 Rice School Rd.</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>George Henderson</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul D. Sprick</td>
<td>601 Towne Springs Rd, Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kicher</td>
<td>704 Olive St, Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Tom Kicher</td>
<td>9/16/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harwood</td>
<td>588 Bradish Rd, Connellsville, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/18/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Suter</td>
<td>900 Franklin Ave, Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Roger Suter</td>
<td>9/20/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Pravlik</td>
<td>431 Mt. Pleasant Rd, S'bk PA 15683</td>
<td>West Mifflin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen McGillic</td>
<td>124 Pittstown Rd, Mt. Pleasant, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Colleen McGillic</td>
<td>9/21/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott McEnilash</td>
<td>124 Pittstown Rd, Mt Pleasant PA 15666</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Scott McEnilash</td>
<td>9/21/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Withrow</td>
<td>187 White Rd, White PA 15740</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis Kleinrock</td>
<td>RD 2 Gasland Rd</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/11/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Bartk</td>
<td>177 McClure Rd, Mt Pleasant, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Stan Bartk</td>
<td>10/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Lewandowski</td>
<td>143 McClure Rd, Mt Pleasant, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Ron Lewandowski</td>
<td>10/14/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harold Hart</td>
<td>209 Duncan Rd, Connellsville PA</td>
<td>FAY</td>
<td>Harold Hart</td>
<td>10-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Lichten</td>
<td>1000 Countryside Plz, Mt Pleasant PA</td>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>Lichten</td>
<td>10-21-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Calusky</td>
<td>111 Irene Rd, Mt Pleasant PA, 15616</td>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>Calusky</td>
<td>10-21-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Aenbret</td>
<td>702 Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aenbret</td>
<td>10-28-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Sheely</td>
<td>13 Stenton Pld</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheely</td>
<td>10-30/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Glowack</td>
<td>1298 Mt Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>MT PLEASANT</td>
<td>Glowack</td>
<td>10-30/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis L. Cook</td>
<td>315 Tanktop Hollow Rd</td>
<td>FAYETTE</td>
<td>Dennis L. Cook</td>
<td>11-1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Gillespie</td>
<td>361 Gillespie Dr</td>
<td>FAYETTE</td>
<td>Gillespie</td>
<td>11-1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Rosenberry</td>
<td>927 Pleasant Valley Rd</td>
<td>FAYETTE</td>
<td>Rosenberry</td>
<td>11-3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Smith</td>
<td>114 Regina St, Scottdale PA, 15683</td>
<td>FAYETTE</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>11-4-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Barnhart</td>
<td>20 Collins Ave. Scottdale, PA</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Karen Barnhart</td>
<td>9-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Martin</td>
<td>524 Spaul Rd., Curile</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Kevin Martin</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Henry</td>
<td>210 Van Drin Dr., Curile</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Donald Henry</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolly Schmuck</td>
<td>Curile, Pa. 15425</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Nolly Schmuck</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarissa Petersen</td>
<td>Curile</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Clarissa Petersen</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale R. Halff</td>
<td>Curile PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Dale R. Halff</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Shuler</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>FAYETE</td>
<td>AF Bushman</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Skowoneck</td>
<td>Curile</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Lisa Skowoneck</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Bushman</td>
<td>Scottville</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>AF Bushman</td>
<td>9/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich McConnell</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rich McConnell</td>
<td>9/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McKitrick</td>
<td>Curile, Pa. 15425</td>
<td>FAYETE</td>
<td>Mike McKitrick</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF URBAN TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN URBAN TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Hogan</td>
<td>423 Rose Lane</td>
<td>Bullskin, Fayette</td>
<td>Barbara Hogan</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Henderson</td>
<td>120 McClure Rd</td>
<td>McPleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy C Greenawalt</td>
<td>215 White Rd</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Randy C Greenawalt</td>
<td>9/16/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Martin</td>
<td>102 Cowrock Rd</td>
<td>Dunbar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Williams</td>
<td>203 Ruthridge Rd</td>
<td>Connellsville, PA</td>
<td>Danielle M Williams</td>
<td>9/17/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Stockton</td>
<td>C'ville, PA</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Stockton</td>
<td>C'ville, PA</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Donald Stockton</td>
<td>9/18/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Patel</td>
<td>Highfield</td>
<td>Mill Run</td>
<td>Jenny Patel</td>
<td>9/19/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Snowley</td>
<td>Mill Run</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>EC Snowley</td>
<td>9/20/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Lowry</td>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>Heidi Lowry</td>
<td>9/20/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Porterfield</td>
<td>218 Gault School Rd</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Jim Porterfield</td>
<td>9/20/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

We the concerned residents, citizens, and business owners of Upper Tyrone Township, McClure Road, and Fayette County petition to have the intersection open, concrete inland removed and the 4 way intersection opened at the crossroads of McClure Road and Route 119, in Upper Tyrone Township, Fayette County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynnlee Porterfield</td>
<td>318 (null School Rd)</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Lynnlee Porterfield</td>
<td>9-21-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrin Lynn</td>
<td>172 Shuberts Rd</td>
<td>South Huntingdon</td>
<td>Darrin Lynn</td>
<td>9-28-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Lambino</td>
<td>2413 Alvertor</td>
<td>East Huntingdon</td>
<td>Ed Lambino</td>
<td>9-28-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Berl</td>
<td>92 Converse</td>
<td>Hempfield</td>
<td>Holly Beale</td>
<td>9-28-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Osniar</td>
<td>101 Jones Eveson</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Rick Osniar</td>
<td>9-30-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Releandowski</td>
<td>180 McClure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Lisa Releandowski</td>
<td>9-30-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin Malott</td>
<td>225 Kingbird Road</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Melvin Malott</td>
<td>10-1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Vosey</td>
<td>203 9th Street</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>David Vosey</td>
<td>10-2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Littleton</td>
<td>106 Blackwell Ave</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Dave Littleton</td>
<td>10-2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Raylester</td>
<td>3280 Country Club Rd</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Kelly Raylester</td>
<td>10-3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Geary</td>
<td>399 Buchanan Rd</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Rodney Geary</td>
<td>10-3-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harold Baker</td>
<td>131 McClure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Harold Baker</td>
<td>9-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Kruckwich</td>
<td>181 McClure Rd</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>S. Kruckwich</td>
<td>9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lewandowski</td>
<td>1333 Mt. Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>P. Lewandowski</td>
<td>9/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lewandowski</td>
<td>545 Bessemer Rd</td>
<td>East Huntingdon</td>
<td>M. Lewandowski</td>
<td>9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lewandowski</td>
<td>545 Bessemer Rd</td>
<td>East Huntingdon</td>
<td>S. Lewandowski</td>
<td>9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lewandowski</td>
<td>545 Bessemer Rd</td>
<td>East Huntingdon</td>
<td>M. Lewandowski</td>
<td>9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lewandowski</td>
<td>545 Bessemer Rd</td>
<td>East Huntingdon</td>
<td>Julie Lewandowski</td>
<td>9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darla Lewandowski</td>
<td>130 McClure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Darla Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Lewandowski</td>
<td>Mt Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Lou Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruckwich Esther</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant, RD</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Kruckwich Esther</td>
<td>9-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lewandowski</td>
<td>135 Mc Clure</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Henry Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Lewandowski</td>
<td>135 Mc Clure</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Cecilia Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Lewandowski</td>
<td>Mc Clure</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Eugene Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Lewandowski</td>
<td>Mc Clure</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Louis Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Kruckwich</td>
<td>181 Mc Clure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Walter Kruckwich</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Kruckwich</td>
<td>181 Mc Clure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Ronald Kruckwich</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lewandowski</td>
<td>130 Mc Clure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>John Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J. Lewandowski</td>
<td>mt. Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Robert J. Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leona Lewandowski</td>
<td>125 Mc Clure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Leona Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Lewandowski</td>
<td>125 Mc Clure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Kimberly Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave A. Lewandowski</td>
<td>125 Mc Clure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Dave A. Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Ansell</td>
<td>174 Kendle Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Andrea Ansell</td>
<td>9/4/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Sandy Wilson</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Harshman</td>
<td>901 Mt Pleasant</td>
<td>Swestmore</td>
<td>Cindy Harshman</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Lemondavi</td>
<td>340 Punt Road</td>
<td>Bullskin Twp</td>
<td>Linda Lemondavi</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darl Mathison</td>
<td>3101 Hickory Rd</td>
<td>Bullskin Twp</td>
<td>Darl Mathison</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Stezak</td>
<td>161 Keefer Rd</td>
<td>Bullskin Twp</td>
<td>Bonnie Avezet</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Miller</td>
<td>151 Mck Rd</td>
<td>Connellville Twp</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew A. Neal</td>
<td>214 Tec Rd</td>
<td>East Huntington</td>
<td>Matt A. Neal</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Gajkowski</td>
<td>Mt. Pl</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Therind Gajkowski</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Henry</td>
<td>Mt. Pl</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Kevin Henry</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Gajkowski</td>
<td>C'ville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Irene Gajkowski</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Sutty</td>
<td>121 McClure Rd.</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Ed Sutty</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Sutley</td>
<td>122 41st Lane</td>
<td>MT June</td>
<td>Tom Sutley</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Crossland</td>
<td>111 Mt Pleasant Dr.</td>
<td>Scottville</td>
<td>Lee Crossland</td>
<td>9-15-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Kowalczyk</td>
<td>122 lilac lane</td>
<td>Mt Pleasant twp.</td>
<td>Linda Kowalczyk</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Lewandowski</td>
<td>184 McClure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Leonard Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Lewandowski</td>
<td>184 McClure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Bernard Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Lewandowski</td>
<td>139 McClure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Stanley Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Lewandowski</td>
<td>139 McClure Rd</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Patricia Lewandowski</td>
<td>9-5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Szwajczak</td>
<td>McClure</td>
<td>UPPER TURME</td>
<td>John Szwajczak</td>
<td>3-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Grynge</td>
<td>127 Primrose Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Grynge</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Cramer</td>
<td>204 Painter St.</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Mary Cramer</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF
UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION
TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4
WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND
ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terri Sue Snyder</td>
<td>513 West Cuming to Box 107 Wendel PA</td>
<td>Connellsville PA</td>
<td>Terri Sue Snyder</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayson Bent</td>
<td>103 Wendel PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wendel</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Rozicki</td>
<td>163 McClure Rd. PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Beth J.</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Craner</td>
<td>1205 Gunley Dr., Apt. 108, Scottsdale, PA, 15683</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Sandy Craner</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Z Bran</td>
<td>3107 Richley Rd. Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Ray Z Bran</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hendt</td>
<td>222 Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will Hendt</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Craner Jr.</td>
<td>EVerson</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Earl Craner Jr.</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Garry</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Jane Garry</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Guth</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Robert Guth</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kendi</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Paul Kendi</td>
<td>9-7-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF
UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, McCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION
TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4
WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND
ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim Shannon</td>
<td>209 Sedgwick St</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/7/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Snyder</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Kelley Snyder</td>
<td>9/7/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnna Sease</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Shawnna Sease</td>
<td>9/8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Johnson</td>
<td>Mt Pleasant</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Donna Johnson</td>
<td>9/9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Livingston</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Michele Livingston</td>
<td>9/8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Rozycki</td>
<td>Mcclure Rd Mt Pleasant</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Joe Rozycki</td>
<td>9/8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Wingrove</td>
<td>1032 Breakneck Rd</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Diane Wingrove</td>
<td>9/8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Thiefer</td>
<td>Mt Pleasant</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Buttermore</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Amanda Buttermore</td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Feggin</td>
<td>309 East End Rd</td>
<td>Bulls Win</td>
<td>Emily Feggin</td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Marsh</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Alvarado</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Connie Alvarado</td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudy Baker</td>
<td>Dickerson Run</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Trudy Baker</td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon McLean</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Sharon McLean</td>
<td>9-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Buckhart</td>
<td>Darwen</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Karl Buckhart</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Evancho</td>
<td>Acme</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Pam Evancho</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Brodzak</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Keith Brodzak</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Miller</td>
<td>Hunker</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Gelet</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Nicholson</td>
<td>Norмолville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Lori Nicholson</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalyn Schmidt</td>
<td>Scottdale</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Rosalyn Schmidt</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Leavandook</td>
<td>180 McClure Rd.</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Πριν Λεωνακάς</td>
<td>9-9-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Hart</td>
<td>McClure Rd.</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Φιλ Χάρτ</td>
<td>9-9-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hess</td>
<td>McClure Rd.</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Χρίστι Χέσση</td>
<td>9-9-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda Butler</td>
<td>186 Central Rd.</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Glenda Butler</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Floyd</td>
<td>333 Dewforth Rd.</td>
<td>Fayette County</td>
<td>Susan Floyd</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWA Matty</td>
<td>1190 Center St.</td>
<td>N. Huntingdon</td>
<td>TWA Matty</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol A. Cunningham</td>
<td>324 Evergreen Dr.</td>
<td>South Morland</td>
<td>Carol A. Cunningham</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Thomas</td>
<td>151 N Diamond Rd.</td>
<td>MT Pleasant</td>
<td>Linda Thomas</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold G. Baker</td>
<td>131 McClure Rd.</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone/Fayette</td>
<td>Ηράλντ Μπέικερ</td>
<td>9-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Dzwilnik</td>
<td>501 McCay Rd.</td>
<td>MT Pleasant</td>
<td>Brenda Dzwilnik</td>
<td>9-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Potosky</td>
<td>415 Midway Rd.</td>
<td>MT Pleasant</td>
<td>Julie Potosky</td>
<td>9-10-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tera Mills</td>
<td>409 Highland Ave West</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donay Stokes</td>
<td>320 7A E. Crawford Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Augustine</td>
<td>501 Englishman</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt C. Phillips</td>
<td>19 S Greenwood Ave</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Matt C. Phillips</td>
<td>9-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Nicholson</td>
<td>610 E. McCall Ave</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Griffen</td>
<td>1103 Saxon St, Cull</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Clendenin</td>
<td>001 East Ketter Rd.</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Justin Clendenin</td>
<td>9-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Cibulas</td>
<td>108 Wyandifield st, PLFA</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cammy Crosby</td>
<td>109 Rose Rd</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Cammy Crosby</td>
<td>9-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Lawrence</td>
<td>150 McClure Rd.</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Elizabeth Lawrence</td>
<td>9-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Dodd</td>
<td>105 Jones St, E cellphone PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Justin Dodd</td>
<td>9-11-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yzp Blaze Grendt</td>
<td>212 west km</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Lawrence B. Dobkin</td>
<td>10-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lowe</td>
<td>920 Boal 583</td>
<td>FAyette</td>
<td>John Loom</td>
<td>10-6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT Emergency</td>
<td>579 Front st. MT Pleasant, PA.1566</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Ray Conklin</td>
<td>10-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY OWADE</td>
<td>318 north diamond st</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Chad Gill</td>
<td>10-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Soders</td>
<td>MT Pleasant PA</td>
<td>FAyette</td>
<td>Mark Lehman</td>
<td>10-7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Lemmon</td>
<td>157 McClure RD MT Pleasant PA</td>
<td>FAyette</td>
<td>Cheryl Kestler</td>
<td>10-8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Kestler</td>
<td>417 Bear Rocks Rd Acme</td>
<td>Upper tyrone</td>
<td>Linda Benner</td>
<td>10-9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larna Benne</td>
<td>Hickory Rd Cville</td>
<td>Upper tyrone</td>
<td>Berenice</td>
<td>10-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Rozynski</td>
<td>335, East App St. Cnr Edmonsville PA 15125</td>
<td>Upper tyrone</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>10-12-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Raby</td>
<td>3281 CountryClub Rd Cville</td>
<td>FAyette</td>
<td>Amy Deitel</td>
<td>10-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroleyn Dressler</td>
<td>420 Morgantown Rd Smithfield</td>
<td>Springhill 11 FAyette</td>
<td>Caroleyn Dresler</td>
<td>10-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Saynes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rory Kujawa</td>
<td>Connellsville, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Rory Kujawa</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Jacobosky</td>
<td>Uiedi, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Helen Jacobosky</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Sladky</td>
<td>Connellsville, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Vera Sladky</td>
<td>10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Carnes</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Chris Carnes</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Shaw</td>
<td>Everson, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Thomas Shaw</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Firestone</td>
<td>Connellsville, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Harry Firestone</td>
<td>10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Wicker</td>
<td>Acme, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Gloria Wicker</td>
<td>10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald W. Highbinder</td>
<td>Connellsville, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Ronald W. Highbinder</td>
<td>10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Moughlin</td>
<td>Connellsville, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Chad Moughlin</td>
<td>10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Charley</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant, PA</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Judy Charley</td>
<td>10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deane Gamer</td>
<td>Cullen</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Deane Gamer</td>
<td>10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Irwin</td>
<td>Cullen</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Lloyd Irwin</td>
<td>10-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kylie Sage</td>
<td>677 N. Bellview Rd.</td>
<td>Bullskin/Fayette</td>
<td>Kylie Sage</td>
<td>9/11/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Staats</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Benjamin Staats</td>
<td>9/11/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Dukich</td>
<td>77 Sherrick Rd. Connellsville</td>
<td>Bullskin/Fayette</td>
<td>Jerry A Dukich</td>
<td>9/12/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Dukich</td>
<td>77 Sherrick Rd. Connellsville</td>
<td>Bullskin/Fayette</td>
<td>Deborah Dukich</td>
<td>9/12/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Dukich</td>
<td>120 Cindy Lane Latrobe PA 15650</td>
<td>Latrobe/Westmoreland</td>
<td>Anthony Dukich</td>
<td>9/12/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Dukich</td>
<td>120 Cindy Lane Latrobe PA 15650</td>
<td>Latrobe/Westmoreland</td>
<td>Kendall Dukich</td>
<td>9/12/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Weir</td>
<td>814 W Main St Mt. Pleasant Paintsville</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant/Westmoreland</td>
<td>Katie Weir</td>
<td>9-12-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Stencel</td>
<td>45 Slate Rock Rd Connellsville PA.</td>
<td>Bullskin/Fayette</td>
<td>Frank Stencel</td>
<td>9-12-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Albright</td>
<td>2461 Rt. 982 Mt. PLEASANT PA 15656</td>
<td>Mt. PLEASANT/Westmoreland</td>
<td>Peggy Albright</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Murphy</td>
<td>123 Patton St. Connellsville PA.</td>
<td>Connellsville PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF
UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION
TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND
ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Marchewha</td>
<td>506 Arthur Ave.</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>Udry Marchewha</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottsdale PA 15683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Hunker</td>
<td>303 Tanyard Hollow</td>
<td>Bullskin</td>
<td>Marlene Hunker</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connellsville PA 15425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERRK Hill</td>
<td>409 Johnson Ave.</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Eil Hill</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connellsville PA 15425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Meadows</td>
<td>2861/2 E Fairview Ave.</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Tracey Meadows</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connellsville PA 15425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin Lowery</td>
<td>409 Jefferson St.</td>
<td>Northwood</td>
<td>Bin Lowery</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Danto</td>
<td>202 W. Morton Ave</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>Danto</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connellsville PA 15425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Leopold</td>
<td>808 Farmec Hill Rd</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Julie Leopold</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duncar PA 15431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadie Drury</td>
<td>123 N. 10th Street</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Shadie Drury</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connellsville PA 15425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Sanfilippo</td>
<td>237A Hickory St.</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>James Sanfilippo</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittston PA 15672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Pryor</td>
<td>PO 47</td>
<td>Dunmore</td>
<td>Pat Pryor</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donegal PA 15608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Hausen</td>
<td>357 Pennew Rd.</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Mary Hausen</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

We the concerned residents, citizens, and business owners of Upper Tyrone Township, McClure Road, and Fayette County petition to have the intersection open, concrete inland removed and the 4 way intersection opened at the crossroads of McClure Road and Route 119, in Upper Tyrone Township, Fayette County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori Little</td>
<td>111 N. Prospect St. C'ville</td>
<td>C'ville</td>
<td>Ellen B. Fireman</td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Jones</td>
<td>104 Pine Lane, Alverton P. 15612</td>
<td>Alverton / Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Monroy</td>
<td>2907 E 7th St, PA</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Shultz</td>
<td>112 E 9th St, C'ville</td>
<td>C'ville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma D. Hall</td>
<td>153 Liberty St, Westmoreland</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>2123 Kingview Rd, Fayette</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adlene Rossart</td>
<td>209 Creek Rd, Westmoreland</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin Stevenson</td>
<td>Lebecing, Fayette</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shr. O'Roarke</td>
<td>406 Whigam Rd, Westmoreland</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Gaines</td>
<td>514 N. Belle Ave, Connellsville</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Sawandowski</td>
<td>1526 Oaklawn Ave, Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Leach</td>
<td>612 Arthur Ave, Scottsdale, PA</td>
<td>Southmorland</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Demaggio</td>
<td>175 Van Dr., Connellsville, PA 15425</td>
<td>Bellisn</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Graft</td>
<td>Box 78, 200 Dixon St</td>
<td>Boro</td>
<td>Debby</td>
<td>9/13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Black</td>
<td>316 W. Fayette St</td>
<td>Connellville</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Herrley</td>
<td>2274 Lough's Road, Scottsdale</td>
<td>East Huntingdon</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Kesar</td>
<td>340 Sweitzer Rd, Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rae Blount</td>
<td>P.O. Box 493, Mt. Pleasant 04 15604</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Rae</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Goodkin</td>
<td>3028 Connell Ave, Connellsville, PA 15425</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Heeder</td>
<td>108 Stafford St, Roberson, Dawson, PA 15428</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Santmyer</td>
<td>853 Ståle Road 31, Ruffs Dale, PA 15621</td>
<td>Southmoreland</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

We the concerned residents, citizens, and business owners of Upper Tyrone Township, McClure Road, and Fayette County petition to have the intersection open, concrete inland removed and the 4 way intersection opened at the crossroads of McClure Road and route 119, in Upper Tyrone Township, Fayette County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Jolly</td>
<td>PO Box 904 Connelsville PA 15422</td>
<td>Fayette Co.</td>
<td>Kevin Jolly</td>
<td>9-13-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Reagan Jr.</td>
<td>81 Garden St. Rear Connelsville, PA 15425</td>
<td>Fayette Co.</td>
<td>Jerry Reagan Jr.</td>
<td>9-13-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Kuhn</td>
<td>88 8th St. Hermine PA</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shara Gafter</td>
<td>1 Elm St. Dunbar PA 15431</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Shara Gafter</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeramy Wilks</td>
<td>207 E. N. 7th Czech Albach 1541</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Jeramy Wilks</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Floyd</td>
<td>PO Box 85 Dawson, PA 15428</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Katie Floyd</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Firestone</td>
<td>2332 Moyer Rd Connelsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Adam Firestone</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rance Nicklow</td>
<td>189 Owen Rd Uniontown 15401</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Rance Nicklow</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Shallenberger</td>
<td>115 3rd Ave Connelsville PA 15425</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Mike Shallenberger</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hallett</td>
<td>104 Cemetery Rd Vanderbuilt, PA 15422</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Mike Hallett</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Allshouse</td>
<td>706 Cribbs St Greensburg, PA</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Paul Allshouse</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPENED, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Miller</td>
<td>426 Bridgeport Rd</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Carl Miller</td>
<td>9-13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine West</td>
<td>329 Smithfield High House Rd</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Christine West</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Fishman</td>
<td>52 High H. Dunkin</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Tammy Fishman</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Will</td>
<td>123 Patton St. Connellsville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Tiffany Will</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April O'Connor</td>
<td>1214 Mt. Pleasant Rd</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>April O'Connor</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Grane</td>
<td>704 7th St. N. Charles St. 15622</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Adam Grane</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Saccooni</td>
<td>148 Chestnut Rd</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>James Saccooni</td>
<td>7-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Romanest</td>
<td>YML</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Minnie Romanest</td>
<td>8-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Kashauba</td>
<td>PO Box 275 Tarr PA 15685</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Charlene Kashauba</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Sisson</td>
<td>PO Box 275 Tarr PA 15688</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Matt Sisson</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Kern</td>
<td>60 A S 3rd St Youngwood</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Beth Kern</td>
<td>9-14-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME/PRINT</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>TWP/COUNTY</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonya E. Oser</td>
<td>1283 Second StFayetteville</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>10/21/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady L. Housely</td>
<td>194 Frink Rd Irwin</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>10/21/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Grubauer</td>
<td>1414 5th St St. George</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>10/30/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole L. Berno</td>
<td>2000 E. W. 31st St. Chicora</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>10/29/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd S. Kelley</td>
<td>1125 E. W. 31st St. Chicora</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>10/29/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda L. Shockey</td>
<td>1125 E. W. 31st St. Chicora</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>10/29/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Kelleher</td>
<td>1125 E. W. 31st St. Chicora</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>10/29/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamey Brown</td>
<td>1125 E. W. 31st St. Chicora</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>10/29/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy H. Morris</td>
<td>1125 E. W. 31st St. Chicora</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>10/29/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris H. Hart</td>
<td>1125 E. W. 31st St. Chicora</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>10/29/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PETITION - SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

WE THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, AND BUSINESS OWNERS OF UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, MCCLURE ROAD, AND FAYETTE COUNTY PETITION TO HAVE THE INTERSECTION OPEN, CONCRETE INLAND REMOVED AND THE 4 WAY INTERSECTION OPENED AT THE CROSSROADS OF MCCLURE ROAD AND ROUTE 119, IN UPPER TYRONE TOWNSHIP, FAYETTE COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/PRINT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TWNP/COUNTY</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Painter</td>
<td>198 Painter Rd. Smithton, PA</td>
<td>So. Huntingdon West</td>
<td>Scott Painter</td>
<td>10/22/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Smiley</td>
<td>Dunbar, PA</td>
<td>Dunbar Twp</td>
<td>Don Smiley</td>
<td>11/24/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian B. Corcoran</td>
<td>990 Scottsdale Rd. Scottsdale, PA</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Brian B. Corcoran</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Schmidt</td>
<td>2446 Kingview Rd. Scottsdale PA 15683</td>
<td>Upper Tyrone</td>
<td>Josh Malone</td>
<td>12/7/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Camens</td>
<td>333 Pitts Twp Rd. Mt. Pleasant PA 15666</td>
<td>Bullskin Twp</td>
<td>Chris Camens</td>
<td>12/7/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Carnes</td>
<td>333 Pitts Twp Rd. Mt. Pleasant PA 15666</td>
<td>Bullskin Twp</td>
<td>Rick Carnes</td>
<td>12/7/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Pierce</td>
<td>334 Main St. Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Mountpleasant</td>
<td>Don Pierce</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harvold</td>
<td>588 Bradish Rd Connellsville PA 15425</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Robert Harvold</td>
<td>12/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobe Sleazak</td>
<td>141 Keefer Rd. Connellsville PA 15425</td>
<td>Fayette Bullskin</td>
<td>Jobe Sleazak</td>
<td>12/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Ferris</td>
<td>300 Tower Rd. Dawson, PA 15428</td>
<td>Fayette Lower Tyrone</td>
<td>Sean Ferris</td>
<td>12/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Vecchaj</td>
<td>877 Mt. Pleasant Rd.</td>
<td>Westmore Township</td>
<td>O. Verh</td>
<td>12/14/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments: I am a resident of the Upper Side (East Side) of McClure Road & Route 119 with a 3 way red light. Why couldn't this have been made a 4 way red light when it was installed? We residents on the eastern side of Route 119 have to go at least 4 miles out of our way in either direction (North or South) to visit relatives & businesses of the lower side (Western Side). This 3 way light makes it very inconvenient for those of us Eastern Side of McClure Road & Route 119. How could a 4 way light be any more dangerous?

(Please use reverse for additional space)

Optional Information

Name: Robert J. Twardoski

Organization: _________________________ County of Residence: Fayette

Address: 1333 Mt. Pleasant Road, Mt. Pleasant, PA 15666

Email:

Thank You! Please feel free to take this form with you and send it back to us when you have a minute.

By Mail: SPC Comments
425 6th Avenue, Suite 2500 Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
By Fax: 412-391-9160 or By Email: comments@spcregion.org
All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on April 9, 2010.
WRITTEN COMMENT FORM  
(Please Print Clearly)

Please use this form to submit your written comments on these draft documents:

- Proposed Amendments to the 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program

Comments:

The light that Penn Dot installed at Route 119 & McClure road is more dangerous when entering 119 North if a vehicle runs the red light such as a large tractor trailer and if I am pulling into their path where as when the island was not there I could go straight across and get out of their path.

My business is loosing customers because they cannot come straight across. They have to go to the route 819 or where George's Trading post intersection to get on Route 119. There is more visibility at the intersection of 119 & McClure than the stop light at George's Trading Post.

(Please use reverse for additional space)

Optional Information

Name: Tim & Linda Lewandowski
Organization: Black & Gold Snacks & More Lewandowski Equipment Co., Inc.
Address: 1 Wedding Lane Mt. Pleasant, PA 15666
Email: lewequip@gmail.com

Thank You! Please Feel free to take this form with you and send it back to us when you have a minute.

By Mail: SPC Comments 425 6th Avenue, Suite 2500 Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852
By Fax: 412-391-9160 or By Email: comments@spcregion.org
All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on April 9, 2010.
May 25, 2011

Commissioner Vincent Vicites
Commissioners Office
Fayette County Courthouse
Uniontown, PA

Dear Commissioner Vicites,

This is in reference to my request for help on the traffic light situation in Brownsville, PA. We are requesting $25,000 which will update our systems, make our town safer and will allow us to better cope with the increasing traffic situation. Following is the breakdown of what is needed for the town to update our old and antiquated traffic light system.

1. High and Second Street – Replace four (4) traffic lights with LEDs.

2. High Street and Bridge - install a camera detection system to replace the existing malfunctioning system and replace four (4) traffic lights with LEDs.

3. Market and Brownsville Avenue – install a camera detection system to replace the existing malfunctioning system and replace four (4) traffic lights with LEDs.

4. Broadway and Marked Street – replace seven (7) traffic lights with LEDs.
5. Fifth and Marked Street – replace eight (8) traffic lights with LEDs.

We estimate that there are approximately 8,000 vehicles a day that pass through our main Brownsville corridor (High and Brown Streets) and over 12,000 vehicles a day that use the Route 40 (Broadway and Market Street) corridor.

Thank you for your help and please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

LESTER J. WARD, Mayor
Paul Ladoga

has been attending for decades
feels strongly that roads are necessary to promote strong sense of life and communities
Lowpath and area trails will not get us where we need to be
Written comments are hard to produce
send it to multiple addressers
rarely if ever gets a formal response
don’t think that anyone is truly listening
County has about 40,000 people, of whom 24k are adults
Stakeholders should play
strategy

don’t have to tell your hears on why projects are selected
GRC suffers economically a “crucial plum”
Waynesburg prosperous & wealthy
2 flags in (1 by canons)
for school districts
Can’t compete with high
prices, educated, systemic drug problem in County
Consolidate under one roof
need 4 grove Broadway

Waynesburg, Greene County, PA

Summary of Comments
June 9, 2011 at 7:30 PM
Waynesburg, Greene County, PA

Very disturbed that US 19 is identified frequently as SR 19
Morristown Bridge in floodplains
Is that societal engineering?
Bypass around Waynesburg & Morrisville failed years ago
Highway at Morris Park
accommodate traffic
Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500
Pittsburgh PA 15219
Email: <mpavlosky@spcregion.org>

June 14, 2011

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding, when Route 119 S. was being built to connect with U.S. Rt. 22, to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Rt. 119 S. Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA funding and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail, which connected 13 miles of trail from Indiana to and through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village and 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued almost to the 119/22 Interchange near the Blairsville School Campus within 2 miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. Here is a website you can visit for more information: www.indianacountyparks.org

Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and comes within a few miles of Blairsville Borough to the west.

DCNR and DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided cultural, historical and various environmental clearances and funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville, that will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millenium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination, bringing much needed economic stimulus to our Borough, the County and the region. This Loop Trail should be under construction in 2011.

What remains are gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail and the Hoodlebug Trail.

I am writing to support the inclusion of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Rang Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 13-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 32-mile Ghost Town Trail to Ebensburg and the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.
June 17, 2011

Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: 2040 LONG RANGE PLAN CONCURRENCE

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding, when Route 119 South was being built to connect with U.S. Route 22, to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Route 119 South Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA funding and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail, which connected 13 miles of trail from Indiana to and through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village and 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued almost to the Routes 119/22 Interchange near the Blairsville School Campus within two miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. Here is a website you can visit for more information: www.indianacountyarks.org

Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and comes within a few miles of Blairsville Borough to the west.

DCNR and DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided cultural, historical and various environmental clearances and funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville, that will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millennium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination, bringing much needed economic stimulus to our Borough, the County and the region. This Loop Trail should be under construction in 2011.

What remains are gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail and the Hoodlebug Trail. I am writing to support the inclusion of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 13-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 32-mile Ghost Town Trail to Ebensburg and the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.

The trail connections are essential to Blairsville because of recreation, commerce, and for our youth to travel safely to the various youth activities, including school. Our community is poised to be a hub in the regional trail system. A Home Town Streets project was recently completed, and an Elm Street program is currently underway, both of which are geared to cater to trail users once the trails are physically connected to downtown. The PCTI funding identified Blairsville as a “poster child” of planning and potential for
The trail connections are essential to the Blairsville because of recreation, commuting and shopping trips, and for our youth to travel safely to the various youth activities, including school. Our community is poised to be a hub in the regional trail system. A Home Town Streets project was recently completed, and an Elm Street program is currently underway, both of which are geared to cater to trail users once the trails are physically connected to downtown. The PCTI funding identified Blairsville as a “posterchild” of planning and potential for multi-modal connections. This program committed funds to make the connections from the trails into the central businesses seamless through street and sidewalk enhancements.

The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations that we want to make sure are on the radar screen for transportation planning over the next 4 years and beyond. The conditional recommendations also include efforts to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus and the post-secondary automotive technology school, Wyotech, to the traditional downtown and residential center, making this a textbook situation for “Safe Routes to School” type of funding. Additionally, this would connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center.

As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:

- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.
- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Burrell Township and Blairsville Borough have been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued help.

Sincerely,

Anthony Distefano, Chairman
Burrell Township Supervisors
Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500
Pittsburgh PA 15219
Email: <mpavlosky@spcregion.org>

June 14, 2011

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding, when Route 119 S. was being built to connect with U.S. Rt. 22, to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Rt. 119 S. Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA funding and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail, which connected 13 miles of trail from Indiana to and through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village and 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued almost to the 119/22 Interchange near the Blairsville School Campus within 2 miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. Here is a website you can visit for more information: www.indianacountyparks.org

Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and comes within a few miles of Blairsville Borough to the west.

DCNR and DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided cultural, historical and various environmental clearances and funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville, that will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millenium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination, bringing much needed economic stimulus to our Borough, the County and the region. This Loop Trail should be under construction in 2011.

What remains are gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail and the Hoodlebug Trail.

I am writing to support the inclusion of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Rang Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 13-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 32-mile Ghost Town Trail to Ebensburg and the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.
The trail connections are essential to the Blairsville because of recreation, commuting and shopping trips, and for our youth to travel safely to the various youth activities, including school. Our community is poised to be a hub in the regional trail system. A Home Town Streets project was recently completed, and an Elm Street program is currently underway, both of which are geared to cater to trail users once the trails are physically connected to downtown. The PCTI funding identified Blairsville as a “posterchild” of planning and potential for multi-modal connections. This program committed funds to make the connections from the trails into the central businesses seamless through street and sidewalk enhancements.

The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations that we want to make sure are on the radar screen for transportation planning over the next 4 years and beyond. The conditional recommendations also include efforts to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus and the post-secondary automotive technology school, Wyotech, to the traditional downtown and residential center, making this a textbook situation for “Safe Routes to School” type of funding. Additionally, this would connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center.

As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:

- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.
- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Burrell Township and Blairsville Borough have been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued help.

Sincerely,

Anthony Distefano, Chairman
Burrell Township Supervisors
June 17, 2011

Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission

RE:

multi-modal connections. This program committed funds to make the connections from the trails into the central businesses seamless through street and sidewalk enhancements.

The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations that we want to make sure are on the radar screen for transportation planning over the next four years and beyond. The conditional recommendations also include efforts to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus and the post-secondary automotive technology school, Wyotech, to the traditional downtown and residential center, making this a textbook situation for “Safe Routes to School” type of funding. Additionally, this would connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center.

As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:

- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.

- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Blairsville has been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued help.

Sincerely,

Blairsville Community Development Authority

[Signature]

James S. Carvin Jr., P.E.
President
Mr. Pavlosky:

Attached is a letter of support for the Blairsville Trail Connectivity Study.

Thanks you,

Timothy E. Evans, Manager
Borough of Blairsville
203 East Market Street
Blairsville, PA 15717
724-459-9100 Office
724-459-9012 Fax
Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500
Pittsburgh PA 15219
Email: mpavlosky@spcregion.org

June 17, 2011

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Rt. 119 South Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail connecting 13 miles of trail from Indiana through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued just north of the 119/22 Interchange near the Blairsville High School Campus within 2 miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. You can visit this site for more detailed information: www.indianacountyparks.org

Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and ends within a few miles of Blairsville Borough.

DCNR, DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided cultural, historical and various environmental clearance funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville. This will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millennium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination. It will also mean a much needed economic stimulus to our Borough and the region. This Loop Trail will be under construction in 2011.

What remains are gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail and the Hoodlebug Trail.
I am writing in support of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike/pedestrian routes to connect the Hoodlebug Trail, the Ghost Town Trail and the West Penn Trail in to the Borough of Blairsville.

The trail connections are essential to Blairsville because of recreation, commuting and shopping trips. It will also provide our youth a safe route to school and various community activities. Our community is poised to be a hub in the regional trail system. A Home Town Streets project was recently completed, and an Elm Street program is currently underway, both of which are geared to cater to trail users once the trails are physically connected to downtown. The PCTI funding identified Blairsville as a "posterchild" of planning for multi-modal connections. This program committed funds to make the connections from the trails into the central businesses district seamless through street and sidewalk enhancements.

The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations that we want to make sure are in the scope for transportation planning over the next 4 years and beyond. The conditional recommendations also include efforts to connect the Blairsville School campus and the post-secondary automotive technology school, Wyotech, to the traditional downtown and residential center, making this a textbook situation for "Safe Routes to School" funding. Additionally, this would connect the developing Indiana County Industrial Park to restaurants, lodging and services.

As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:

- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.
- An alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Blairsville has been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued support in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Timothy E. Evans
Borough of Blairsville
Blairsville Parks and Recreation
Indiana County Parks & Trails

1128 Blue Spruce Road
Indiana, PA 15701
(724) 463-8636
(724) 463-8740 (f)

Email: indparks@gmail.com
Web: www.indianacountyparks.org

June 14, 2011

Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500
Pittsburgh PA 15219

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

I am writing to request that recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study be included in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identifies bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 11-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 36-mile Ghost Town Trail to the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.

The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus to the traditional downtown and residential center, and to connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center.

As described in the attached Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:
- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.
- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please consider the outcomes of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Sincerely,

Ed Patterson

Ed Patterson, Director
Dee Pamplin  
Administrative Assistant  
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission  
Regional Enterprise Tower  
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852  
(P) 412-391-5590 x301  
(F) 412-391-5487  
www.spcregion.org

From: Friedline, James Walter - WyoTech [mailto:JFriedline@wyotechstaff.edu]  
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 8:47 AM  
To: Dee Pamplin  
Cc: Laura Hawkins  
Subject: letter

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it contains information from Corinthian Colleges, Inc. that is confidential. Employees are reminded of their obligations regarding confidentiality and trade secrets as stated in the Employee Handbook and CCI policies. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. We respectfully demand that you notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail in error and permanently delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited, will cause damage to CCI and may result in legal liability.
Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500
Pittsburgh PA 15219

June 14, 2011

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

I am writing to support the inclusion of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identifies bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 11-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 37-mile Ghost Town Trail to the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.

As described in the attached Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:

- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. A bike/pedestrian trail would provide our students and employees with a safe alternative to vehicular transportation to and from campus.

- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please consider the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2011-2014 TIP.

Sincerely,

Mark Reynolds
Director of Operations, WyoTech
Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500
Pittsburgh PA 15219

June 14, 2011

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

I am writing to support the inclusion of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identifies bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 11-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 37-mile Ghost Town Trail to the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.

The mission of the Cambria and Indiana Trail Council is to create “out my backdoor access” to trails and greenways. The Council was established in 1992 by interested citizens to support the creation of a regional trail system. We have worked to help establish the Ghost Town Trail, Hoodlebug Trail, and Path of the Flood Trail and continue to support efforts to connect these trails and other trail systems in the region.

The Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study represents an opportunity to close a Major Trail Gap, as identified in PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources’ 2009 Trail Gap Study Report. The Ghost Town Trail alone draws more than 75,000 annual users, according to the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy’s Ghost Town Trail 2009 User Survey and Economic Impact Analysis. Linking the trails into Blairsville is a significant component of the Pittsburgh-to-Harrisburg Main Line Canal Greenway™.

The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations that we want to make sure are on the radar screen for transportation planning over the next 4 years. The conditional recommendations include efforts to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus to the traditional downtown and residential center, and to connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center. As described in the attached Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:

- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.
- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please include the outcomes of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2011-2014 TIP.

Sincerely,

Mike Burk, President
Cambria and Indiana Trail Council
Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study
Hoodlebug, Ghost Town, and West Penn Trails
Blairsville Borough and Burrell Township, Indiana County

Executive Summary

Blairsville has the potential to serve as a major hub for trail users accessing area trails consisting of The Ghost Town and Hoodlebug Trails to the east, the West Penn and Westmoreland Heritage Trails to the west and the local Loop Trail within the Borough. These trails provide nearly 70 miles of trail separated by a roughly five mile gap through this more densely developed area, with Blairsville in the middle.

Although the existing trails occupy a network of abandoned railroads, no such facility of dedicated corridor is present through this gap. This Study has evaluated numerous alignments comprised of a mix of on-street and off-road routes to weave separate east and west corridors to connect to those adjoining networks. Primary obstacles to these connections consist of the crossing of US 22 to the east and terrain/owner approvals to the west. Mapping of the alignments considered is attached, with the recommended routes highlighted in yellow.

The recommended alignment for the eastern connection overcomes the physical obstacles through an overhead crossing of US 22 near the US 119 interchange. Implementation is subject to acquisition of 20 owner approvals, three of which are critical to the entire corridor, and funding acquisition in the estimated amount of $2.8M. The primary funding need is for a pedestrian bridge crossing US 22. The route will generally consist of mix of on-street routes on local roads and raw construction of dedicated off-road corridors through the commercial and undeveloped segments.

The recommended alignment for the western corridor overcomes the terrain issues primarily through the use of the service roads and adjacent areas owned by Norfolk Southern. While initial meetings indicated that the railroad was open to considering this configuration, a definitive review of the proposed alignments by the railroad has been elusive. Alternatives avoiding the railroad have been dismissed due to other technical or acquisition issues. Therefore the feasibility of connecting to the West Penn Trail is completely dependent upon the outstanding acquisition of a positive response from Norfolk Southern. If secured, this connection could be completed at an estimated cost of $725K.

In addition to Norfolk Southern approval, ongoing efforts must consist of acquisition of initial Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with the three critical property owners of the eastern corridor followed by MOU’s for the remaining impacted properties. The MOU’s would address the conceptual alignments with specific alignments and acquisition needs subject to final design. Funding will then need to be secured for both design and construction.

Acknowledgements

The Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study was produced with financial assistance from the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Bureau of Recreation and Conservation, Community
Conservation Partnerships Program, Keystone Recreation, Park and Conservation Fund. Financial support was also provided through an Indiana County Community Development Block Grant.

In-kind services were provided through Indiana University of Pennsylvania's Department of Geography and Planning Technical Issues in GIS course. Particular appreciation is extended to Dr. John Benhart and student interns Tye Desiderio, Devin Creighton, and Tom Angelo.

Special thanks are extended to Indiana County GIS Coordinator Dan Silvis.

Extensive in-kind support was also provided by Indiana County Parks and Trails through the services of their AmeriCorps member. Special thanks are extended to Ed Patterson and Patrick McKinney.

Allegheny Ridge Corporation provided project management services to Indiana County Office of Planning and Development through the Pittsburgh-to-Harrisburg Main Line Canal Greenway™ Kiski-Conemaugh Cluster Greenway Coordinator.
Matthew S. Pavlosk, Transportation Planner  
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission  
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500  
Pittsburgh PA 15219  

June 25, 2010

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

I am writing to support the inclusion of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identifies bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 11-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 37-mile Ghost Town Trail to the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.

As the developers, owners and operators of the West Penn Trail, the Conemaugh Valley Conservancy has a vested interest in the completion of this trail system. We will also take the lead in completing the trail link on the western end of Blairsville into town.

The Study represents an opportunity close a Major Trail Gap, as identified in PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources’ 2009 Trail Gap Study Report. Linking the trails into Blairsville is a significant component of the Pittsburgh-to-Harrisburg Main Line Canal Greenway™.

The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus to the traditional downtown and residential center, and to connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center.

As described in the attached Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:
- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.
- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please consider the outcomes of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2011-2014 TIP.

Sincerely,

Michael T. Burk
President

P.O. Box 502 Hollsopple PA 15935-0502
Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study
Hoodlebug, Ghost Town, and West Penn Trails
Blairsville Borough and Burrell Township, Indiana County

Executive Summary

Blairsville has the potential to serve as a major hub for trail users accessing area trails consisting of The Ghost Town and Hoodlebug Trails to the east, the West Penn and Westmoreland Heritage Trails to the west and the local Loop Trail within the Borough. These trails provide nearly 70 miles of trail separated by a roughly five mile gap through this more densely developed area, with Blairsville in the middle.

Although the existing trails occupy a network of abandoned railroads, no such facility of dedicated corridor is present through this gap. This Study has evaluated numerous alignments comprised of a mix of on-street and off-road routes to weave separate east and west corridors to connect to those adjoining networks. Primary obstacles to these connections consist of the crossing of US 22 to the east and terrain/owner approvals to the west. Mapping of the alignments considered is attached, with the recommended routes highlighted in yellow.

The recommended alignment for the eastern connection overcomes the physical obstacles through an overhead crossing of US 22 near the US 119 interchange. Implementation is subject to acquisition of 20 owner approvals, three of which are critical to the entire corridor, and funding acquisition in the estimated amount of $2.8M. The primary funding need is for a pedestrian bridge crossing US 22. The route will generally consist of a mix of on-street routes on local roads and raw construction of dedicated off-road corridors through the commercial and undeveloped segments.

The recommended alignment for the western corridor overcomes the terrain issues primarily through the use of the service roads and adjacent areas owned by Norfolk Southern. While initial meetings indicated that the railroad was open to considering this configuration, a definitive review of the proposed alignments by the railroad has been elusive. Alternatives avoiding the railroad have been dismissed due to other technical or acquisition issues. Therefore the feasibility of connecting to the West Penn Trail is completely dependent upon the outstanding acquisition of a positive response from Norfolk Southern. If secured, this connection could be completed at an estimated cost of $725K.

In addition to Norfolk Southern approval, ongoing efforts must consist of acquisition of initial Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with the three critical property owners of the eastern corridor followed by MOU’s for the remaining impacted properties. The MOU’s would address the conceptual alignments with specific alignments and acquisition needs subject to final design. Funding will then need to be secured for both design and construction.
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In-kind services were provided through Indiana University of Pennsylvania's Department of Geography and Planning Technical Issues in GIS course. Particular appreciation is extended to Dr. John Benhart and student interns Tye Desiderio, Devin Creighton, and Tom Angelo.

Special thanks are extended to Indiana County GIS Coordinator Dan Silvis.

Extensive in-kind support was also provided by Indiana County Parks and Trails through the services of their AmeriCorps member. Special thanks are extended to Ed Patterson and Patrick McKinney.
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Please find the attached letter of support.

Kathy Himes  
Administrative Assistant  
Office of the Superintendent  
Blairsville-Saltsburg School District  
102 School Lane  
Blairsville, PA 15717  
724-459-5500, 8 1101  
himes@b-ssd.org
June 16, 2011

Matthew S. Pavlosky, Transportation Planner  
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission  
425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500  
Pittsburgh PA 15219  
Email: <mpavlosky@spregion.org>

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

In 2001, through a regional effort, Blairsville Borough, Burrell Township and Indiana County applied for funding, when Route 119 S. was being built to connect with U.S. Rt. 22, to build the Hoodlebug Trail along with the Rt. 119 S. Project. Added to the TIP and brought to fruition through TEA funding and DCNR funding was a trail that connected the Hoodlebug Trail to the Ghost Town Trail, which connected 13 miles of trail from Indiana to and through Homer City Borough and Black Lick Village and 32 miles to Ebensburg. The Hoodlebug Trail continued almost to the 119/22 Interchange near the Blairsville School Campus within 2 miles of Blairsville Borough to the west. Here is a website you can visit for more information: www.indianacountyparks.org

Since then, the West Penn Trail from Saltsburg has criss-crossed the Conemaugh River over cut stone bridges and comes within a few miles of Blairsville Borough to the west.

DCNR and DCED, the ACOE, and PennDOT have provided Cultural, historical and various environmental clearances and funding to build a Blairsville Riverfront Loop Trail within the Borough of Blairsville, that will provide a trail along our Main Line Canal Millenium Legacy Trail, and connect to our central business district making us a Trail Town destination, bringing much needed economic stimulus to our Borough, the County and the region. This Loop Trail should be under construction in 2011.

What remains are gaps between Blairsville Borough, the West Penn Trail and the Hoodlebug Trail.

I am writing to support the inclusion of the recommendations from the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Rang Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This feasibility study identified bike/pedestrian routes to connect the 13-mile Hoodlebug Trail and 32-mile Ghost Town Trail to Ebensburg and the 17-mile West Penn Trail in the Borough of Blairsville.
The trail connections are essential to the Blairsville because of recreation, commuting and shopping trips, and for our youth to travel safely to the various youth activities, including school. Our community is poised to be a hub in the regional trail system. A Home Town Streets project was recently completed, and an Elm Street program is currently underway, both of which are geared to cater to trail users once the trails are physically connected to downtown. The PCTI funding identified Blairsville as a “posterchild” of planning and potential for multi-modal connections. This program committed funds to make the connections from the trails into the central businesses seamless through street and sidewalk enhancements.

The feasibility study has not yet been finalized by Indiana County, but the plan includes conditional recommendations that we want to make sure are on the radar screen for transportation planning over the next 4 years and beyond. The conditional recommendations also include efforts to connect the Blairsville High-Middle-Elementary School campus and the post-secondary automotive technology school, Wyotech, to the traditional downtown and residential center, making this a textbook situation for “Safe Routes to School” type of funding. Additionally, this would connect the developing Indiana County industrial park to restaurants, lodging and services in addition to the traditional downtown and residential center.

As described in the Executive Summary, the key components in the plan are:

- A bike/pedestrian bridge over Route 22 near the Route 119 interchange with a cost estimate of $1.2 million. The entire route to extend the Hoodlebug Trail into the borough has a cost estimate of $2.8 million. It should be noted that Wyotech and other partners are supportive of the pedestrian bridge over Route 22.

- A rail with trail alignment from the West Penn Trail into the borough with a cost estimate of $725,000.

Please include the conditional recommendations of the Indiana County Regional Trail Connectivity Study in the 2040 Long Range Plan and the 2011-2014 TIP this fall. Blairsville has been working on closing these gaps and building our River Loop Trail since 2001. We look forward to your continued help.

Sincerely,

Tammy Whitfield, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools
From: Bowser, Kevin [mailto:KBowser@pahouse.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 10:58 AM  
To: Dee Pamplin  
Subject: Written Comments, Public Participation  
Importance: High  

Name of Project(s): Ellwood City Main Street Project Revitalization, Segment 1B  
Ellwood City Main Street Project Revitalization, Segment 2  
Ellwood City Main Street Project Revitalization Segment 3  

Project Location(s): Borough of Ellwood City (map attached)  

Project Description(s): Infrastructure and streetscaping improvements to the core business district.  

The business district of Ellwood City is the regional downtown for over 25,000 residents in Lawrence and Beaver Counties. The Borough of Ellwood City’s downtown is severely deteriorated due to aging systems and intensive use. The goal of the project is to implement a capital improvement that is conductive to economic development and the improved quality of life in the Ellwood City region. It would, through community involvement, rekindle a sense of pride and ownership in the region, provide the necessary conditions for new business opportunity, expansion and job creation. The business district is also the gateway to the Ellwood City Area High School and Hartman Elementary School. The projects would increase the safety of the area students K - 12.  

Segments 1B, 2, and 3 are the continuation of a comprehensive revitalization project that is in progress in the Borough. Ellwood City Borough completed a Core Area Streetscaping (MPMS# 77206). This project was fully funded and completed with Stimulus (ARRA) funds for a total project cost of $553,940. Segment 1A created a community plaza and farmer’s market in the downtown district. The total cost for the project was $2.4 million dollars and was funded by private, state and federal dollars.  

Project Cost:  
Segment 1B - $6,000,000  
Segment 2 - $6,000,000  
Segment 3 - $6,000,000
Submitted by
Kevin Bowser
Chief of Staff
Office of State Rep. Jaret Gibbons
Here is/are Patrick's comment(s). By the nature of the submission, and the fact that Dave Wohlwill answered him, I looked at this as more of email chain. So, blame me for this one.

---

From: DWohlwill@PortAuthority.org [mailto:DWohlwill@PortAuthority.org]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 9:10 AM
To: Patrick.Roberts@city.pittsburgh.pa.us; Matt Pavlosky; Tom Klevan; David Totten
Cc: Pat.Hassett@city.pittsburgh.pa.us; Noor.Ismail@city.pittsburgh.pa.us; Joy.Abbott@city.pittsburgh.pa.us; Lynn.Heckman@AlleghenyCounty.US; WStem@PortAuthority.org
Subject: RE: SPC 2040 LRTP comments

All:

Port Authority, in partnership with URA and UPMC, conducted a feasibility assessment of a new East Busway station serving the Baum-Centre Corridor. A location was identified and necessary station elements were identified. The total capital cost was estimated to be $8,600,000.

If other entities identify and secure funding for this project, Port Authority will advance the project forward.

David E. Wohlwill, AICP
Program Manager, Longer Range Planning
Port Authority of Allegheny County
345 Sixth Avenue, Third Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-2527
412.566.5110
dwohlwill@port authority.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Roberts, Patrick [mailto:Patrick.Roberts@city.pittsburgh.pa.us]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Matt Pavlosky; comments@spc region.org
Cc: Hassett, Pat; Tom Klevan; David Totten; Wohlwill, Dave; Ismail, Noor; Abbott, Joy; Heckman, Lynn; Patchan, Stephen
Subject: SPC 2040 LRTP comments

Hello Matt –

On Page 4-38 there is a new East Busway Station in the Baum Centre Corridor proposed. I am familiar with some feasibility work being done in the area but did not realize that there was an approved station project. Is it possible that the feasibility study completed would impact the likelihood of the proposed station moving forward? If so, is there an opportunity to have the funds remain on the program as “New East Busway Station”? I suggest this so that there could be an added degree of flexibility in how the funds are applied. This would certainly require the consent of the Port Authority. I am only providing the suggestion in the form of a comment as a participant in this process.

On Page 4-40 there is a list of transit Facility Expansions/Stations/Transit Centers. We would like to support the addition of a MLK East Busway Station at 21st Street in the Strip District.
On Page 4-44 there is reference to the City of Pittsburgh being part of an alliance entitled “Economic Development South”. That not-for-profit was created to service the municipalities along Route 51 outside of the City. It is not an entity that the City of Pittsburgh is specifically allied with. The City of Pittsburgh will be exploring Transit Oriented Development node opportunities within the MOVEPGH project, however there is no current pursuit of a TRID in the area of Routes 51 and 88. Economic Development South has proposed the pursuit of a TRID at that location. It is important to differentiate

On Page 4-59 there is an illustrative list. The Urban Redevelopment Authority is coming up with an estimate for the Allegheny Riverfront Development project. The SEA Lower Hill Development project cost is estimated at $37M. The SEA briefing/cost estimate sheet is attached.

There are narrative portions of the plan that address active and alternative transportation modes, but do not discuss or correlate air quality improvements or other performance measures with specific transportation modes. For instance, the plan does not discuss how continuing to build upon the emerging active transportation network can fill the gaps left by changes in transit service while supporting healthier communities. No indication is given as to how the funding programs are to be managed in order to achieve specific goals, as they apply to specific modes. I was seeking information within the plan that supports the local and County efforts toward the development of active transportation networks as transportation systems, rather than being limited as recreational facilities.

The County of Allegheny has produced this region’s first Active Transportation Plan. That is an historic achievement within the Region. The plan provides a framework for moving ahead with the creation of an active transportation system in Allegheny County. The MOVEPGH Multimodal Transportation Plan, Bike/Ped Plan, and Street Design Manual will soon integrate the Active Allegheny plan while addressing both regional commuter and local transportation and recreation uses of an active transportation system. The Active Allegheny plan should be incorporated into the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan in order to build upon the foundation that the County of Allegheny has created. This is also necessary in order to provide a tool for public and private stakeholders to identify how land use changes could impact (favorably or negatively) the continued development of that network into a complete multimodal system.

Patrick D. Roberts
Principal Transportation Planner
Department of City Planning
200 Ross Street, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Phone: 412-255-2224
Fax: 412-255-2838
Patrick.Roberts@city.pittsburgh.pa.us

From: Douglas Straley [mailto:straeyd@pgh-sea.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 2:22 PM
To: Roberts, Patrick
Subject: FW: SPC forms

Patrick,

Attached is what we provided to SPC last year.

Douglas J. Straley
Project Executive
Sports & Exhibition Authority
From: Jason Kobeda
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 7:03 PM
To: Mazefsky, Gabe; jcolechel@spcregion.org; jbyers@spcregion.org
Cc: Douglas Straley; Rifat Qureshi; Jason Tigano; akamara@pittsburghpenguins.com; 'Hassett, Pat'
Subject: FW: SPC forms

Gabe:

As requested, please find the attached SPC project summary for the Mellon Arena Site Infrastructure project.

Thanks.

Jason Kobeda
Business Specialist
Sports & Exhibition Authority
425 Sixth Ave. Suite 2750
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
P: (412) 393-7106
F: (412) 393-7104
jkobeda@pgh-sea.com

From: Mazefsky, Gabe [mailto:Gabe.Mazefsky@city.pittsburgh.pa.us]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 11:34 AM
To: Douglas Straley
Cc: jtigano@ura.org
Subject: FW:

Doug,

We need a project summary for SPC.

Gabriel J. Mazefsky
Policy Manager
Office of Mayor Luke Ravenstahl
512 City-County Building
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
From: Jamie Colecchi [mailto:jcolecchi@spcregion.org]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 11:26 AM
To: Mazefsky, Gabe
Subject: FW:

Sorry about that....we need these 4 project sheets completed.

You can use the attached Blank Project Summary Sheet...we can use the "stock" map/picture for the sheets....just need the information/descriptions completed...

Again, sorry about that.

Let me know if there are any questions
Jamie

From: Jill Byers
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 11:21 AM
To: Jamie Colecchi
Subject: FW:

We need a form completed for all the other projects. The green up was the only one we had already. The following need the attached blank project summary completed

- Citywide Broadband Development
- Mellon Arena Site Development
- Davis Avenue Bridge
- Pump Station Rehabilitation Projects

From: Jill Byers
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 2:41 PM
To: Jamie Colecchi
Subject: FW:

From: Jill Byers
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 9:27 AM
To: Jamie Colecchi
Subject:

The Green up project is the only project from the City that we have a completed project summary for. Its attached. The will need to look it over for corrections and complete the attached blank summary form for the other projects.
This email and any files transmitted with it are Confidential and solely intended for the recipient(s). If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute, copy or alter this email. Any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and might not represent those of Port Authority. Warning: Although Port Authority has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this email, the Company cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage Arising from the use of this email or attachments.

If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.
Court and Ann,
I've looked over the draft of the 2040 plan at http://www.sporegion.org/trans_ppp_sched.shtml

While I do see the inclusion of the policy statement "The region will preserve and develop its agricultural industry." that policy DOES NOT seem to be represented in any of the county's or region's specific plans that are outlined in the draft.
Or did I miss something?

It is amazing to me that the Development portion of the regional plan still doesn't connect sustainable agriculture with economic development as a core sustainable development approach for the region.

I've attached some thoughts on goals and related objectives. How might these be promoted in a way that would include them within the economic development portion of the 2040 Regional Plan? (at least for discussion purposes)
Allen

Copy: Bracken Burns and Linda Duffy
Southwestern PA Community/Farm Alliance for Regional Markets

Input for SPC 2040 Plan

The Preferred Future Statement for this Community Farm Alliance (CFA) is:

To strengthen regional agricultural and economic development through diverse programs aimed at improved marketing opportunities, urban connections and increased community awareness of the importance of agriculture for truly sustainable communities.

As part of the on-going evaluation process specific change objectives can be developed which offer a coherent strategy to support the creation and expansion of community-based food systems that are locally owned and controlled, environmentally sound and health-promoting.

➢ Change Objective I: Strengthen community-based marketing opportunities that increase the economic viability of farmers using environmentally sound practices and technology.

➢ Change Objective II: Strengthen link between rural and urban communities through increased consumer awareness of and support for locally produced farm products and enterprises.

➢ Change Objective III: Replicate partnership development and collaboration process within each county in the region.

➢ Change Objective IV: Promote the implementation of sustainable agricultural economic development strategies in local and regional planning and development processes.

Goals established for CFA include:

1. Promote, enhance, and organize sustainable aggregation and distribution for local food through development of community food hubs and value-added production.

2. Support the development and creation of farmer owned businesses dedicated to marketing, as well as equipment and supply purchasing, lending and sharing.

3. Develop the “Buy Fresh Buy Local” identity for regional farmers, commodities, and markets.

4. Create a network that would link farmers with chefs/restaurants and consumers interested in promoting healthy, local food accessible to ALL.

5. Support the development of community based farm-scale value-added enterprises.
Tuesday, June 07, 2011

Matt Pavlosky, Public Involvement Coordinator
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852

RE: Public Participation for the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

Dear Matt,

On behalf of the City of Greensburg, Hempfield Township, South Greensburg Borough and Southwest Greensburg Borough I am providing you with a list of transportation initiatives that were developed by all aforementioned local governments in our Multi-Municipal Plan of 2005.

I’m aware that some of the projects on the listing may have been done and if so, I have indicated the project as completed. Most of the projects have not been completed and are still needed by the local government represented. While I realize that the focus of the past TIP was bridges that have left many of our roads and other infrastructure in a less than desirable state. So I am aware that maintenance of existing infrastructure may take precedence, but with that being said, this list of projects represents the priorities for the communities I am representing.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide you with our future transportation projects.

Sincerely,

Barbara J. Ciampini
Planning Director

Enc: Transportation Project list
## Transportation

Objective 1.0: Maintain and improve the transportation infrastructure to be safe and reliable through routine maintenance and corridor upgrades that address traffic issues through land use tools and traffic management systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Record of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1-1</td>
<td>Upgrade westbound left turn lane at US 30 and South Greengate Road to accommodate the queue that currently backs into the through lanes.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-2</td>
<td>Apply access management techniques to the major transportation corridors, especially US 30 and US 119, to reduce the number of curb cuts and manage site entry points located on high speed and/or high volume roadways. Changes can be made over time by incorporating design guidelines into municipal ordinances.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, Hempfield Township, City of Greensburg, Southwest Greensburg, South Greensburg, Westmoreland County</td>
<td>PennDOT Growing Smarter Transportation Initiative, DCED LUPTAP Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-3</td>
<td>Evaluate the impacts of a potential TND to Harvey Avenue (SR 819). Improve sharp horizontal and vertical curves north of the City of Greensburg and correct sight distance problem at Forbes Road.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township, City of Greensburg</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-4</td>
<td>Improve length of weaving and merging lanes at interchanges along limited access portion of US 30, especially at Mount Pleasant Road.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, Hempfield Twp, City of Greensburg, Southwest Greensburg Boro, South Greensburg Boro</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-5</td>
<td>Upgrade intersections along College Avenue (SR 130) between Jeannette City and downtown Greensburg by correcting sight distances and adding turning lanes where necessary.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Twp, City of Greensburg, Jeanette Boro</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italicized strategies are those that are listed on the current Transportation Improvements Plan.*
### Objective 1.0: Maintain and improve the transportation infrastructure to be safe and reliable through routine maintenance and corridor upgrades that address traffic issues through land use tools and traffic management systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Record of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Improve horizontal and vertical deficiencies along Greengate Road (SR 4002) and upgrade narrow, low-clearance underpass under Norfolk Southern Railroad.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township, Norfolk Southern Railroad</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Upgrade SR 136 (West Newton Road and Main Street) west of Turnpike 66 to correct pavement deficiencies, shoulder deterioration, and narrow lane widths.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Improve intersection of Slate Run Road (SR 2013) and Old US 30 to correct sharp horizontal curve on southern leg of intersection.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Study potential corridor improvements along Mount Pleasant Road from South Main Street to the University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Twp, City of Greensburg</td>
<td>Elm Street Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Initiate a study to examine transportation issues in the Huff Avenue corridor, including intersection improvements at US 119, bridge widening, sidewalks, and improvements in vertical alignment, pavement, drainage, and business access.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, South Greensburg Boro</td>
<td>Home Town Streets, Elm Street Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Develop a traffic calming policy and strategy to identify potential streets where traffic calming measures should be implemented. PennDOT recommends a system based on speed and cut-through studies and documentation. Need to improve education and enforcement of traffic laws to address problem areas prior to engineering studies.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, Municipalities, Huff Avenue Committee</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program, Elm Street Program, Home Town Streets, Safe Routes to School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Record of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-12</td>
<td>Upgrade roadway conditions to current PennDOT design standards with construction projects and new development.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP, Tax Increment Financing (TIF), Traffic Impact Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-13</td>
<td>Incorporate ADA standards into all transportation improvement projects to accommodate the handicapped and elderly population.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hempfield Twp, City of Greensburg, Southwest Greensburg Boro, South Greensburg Boro</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-14</td>
<td>Develop and adopt a Traffic Impact Fee Ordinance for new developments as well as redevelopments.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hempfield Twp, City of Greensburg, Southwest Greensburg Boro, South Greensburg Boro</td>
<td>DCED Planning Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-15</td>
<td>Coordinate upgrades to East Pittsburgh Street, Otterman and West Newton Road with Excela Westmoreland Regional Hospital</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Municipalities, Westmoreland County, PennDOT, Hospital</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-16</td>
<td>Improvement to the intersection of Gribbs Street and Route 119 North and South</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-17</td>
<td>Improve and upgrade the intersection of Humphrey Road and East Pittsburgh Street</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-18</td>
<td>Promote streetscape enhancements, where appropriate, to improve the visual aesthetics and safety of transportation corridors.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>Main Street &amp; Elm Street Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-19</td>
<td>Complete safety improvements along SR 136 from Willow Crossing Road to Toll 66</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-20</td>
<td>Replace Old Airport Road Bridge in Hempfield Township</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP - Bridge Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 1.0: Maintain and improve the transportation infrastructure to be safe and reliable through routine maintenance and corridor upgrades that address traffic issues through land use tools and traffic management systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Record of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 1-21</td>
<td>Replace Brookdale Drive Bridge in Hempfield Township</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP - Bridge Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-22</td>
<td>Replace Old Route 30 Bridge in Hempfield Township</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP - Bridge Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-23</td>
<td>Replace Brown Avenue bridge in Grapeville.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP - Bridge Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-24</td>
<td>Improve traffic signal operation and intersection design along US 30 throughout the multi-municipal planning area (and coordinate with adjacent municipalities) to improve operation of signalized intersections and relieve congestion throughout the corridor.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, Hempfield Twp, City of Greensburg, Southwest Greensburg Boro, South Greensburg Boro, North Huntingdon Twp, Unity Twp, Westmoreland County</td>
<td>4-Year TIP, Congestion Mitigation / Air Quality (CMAQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-25</td>
<td>Improve signalization to improve safety around Westmoreland Mall entrances and intersection of US 30 and Donohoe Road or using existing overpass to accommodate more movements to the Mall.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township, Westmoreland Mall</td>
<td>4-Year TIP, Private Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-26</td>
<td>Upgrade intersection of US 119 and Fairview Street to more safely accommodate left turning vehicles.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PennDOT, South Greensburg Borough</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-27</td>
<td>Upgrade Four Corners intersection at SR 819, Skidmore Road, and Reamer Avenue to improve safety concerns.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township, South Greensburg Borough</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-28</td>
<td>Maintain and improve the transportation infrastructure to be safe and reliable through routine maintenance and corridor upgrades that address traffic issues through land use tools and traffic management systems.</td>
<td>Upgrade or replace dangerous tunnel beneath the Norfolk Southern Railroad along Bovard Tunnel Road.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hempfield Township, Norfolk Southern Railroad</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program, 4-Year TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve sight distance deficiencies at the intersection of Mount Pleasant Road and Old Airport Road.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement the recommendations of the Lincoln Highway Heritage Corridor along with regional partners.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities, Lincoln Highway Committee, Regional Partners</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve horizontal and vertical deficiencies near the intersections of US 119 and Cameo Lane (SR 1053).</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Replace/upgrade existing two bridges, which are currently limited to 3 tons, across Brush Creek on SR 4003 (Oakford Park Road) to meet current PennDOT design standards. BRUSH CREEK BRIDGE #2 on TIP</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township, Penn Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP, Federal Critical Bridge Program, PennDOT Bridge Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve roadway pavement conditions and narrow lanes on Oakford Park Road (SR 4003) along the border of Hempfield and Penn Townships.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township, Penn Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade intersection of Harrison Avenue (SR 130) and Oakford Park Drive (SR 4003) to improve safety concerns and meet current PennDOT design standards.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township, Jeannette City</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve narrow roadway conditions, pavement deterioration problems, and sharp curves along Adamsburg Road (SR 3077).</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 1.0: Maintain and improve the transportation infrastructure to be safe and reliable through routine maintenance and corridor upgrades that address traffic issues through land use tools and traffic management systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Record of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 1-36</td>
<td>Upgrade Humphreys Road (SR 130) to correct horizontal curve problems and sight distance issues at residential cross streets.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-37</td>
<td>Upgrade Carbon Road (SR 3103) to correct sight distance concerns at the intersection with Willow Crossing Road, and improve narrow lane and shoulder widths and poor pavement conditions.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-38</td>
<td>Improve sharp horizontal and vertical curves and sight distance deficiencies at the intersections of SR 819 and Shady Lane and Brown Road.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-39</td>
<td>Improve sight distance deficiencies at the intersections of Luxor Road (SR 1028) and Cameo Lane/Georges Station Road (SR 1053) to meet PennDOT design standards.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-40</td>
<td>Upgrade Troutman, Mechling, and Depot Roads to correct narrow roadway widths and shoulders and sharp curves near SR 819, both to meet current PennDOT design standards and to better accommodate transit vehicles on this route.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP - Bridge Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-41</td>
<td>Upgrade Middletown Road (SR 3016) west of SR 2012 to correct sharp horizontal and vertical curves and meet current PennDOT design standards.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-42</td>
<td>Upgrade Arona Road (SR 3071) south of Arona Borough to correct sharp curves.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1-43</td>
<td>Improvements to Georges Station Road for County Industrial Park. Pre-Engineering on TIP</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Hempfield Township</td>
<td>4-Year TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 2.0: Encourage bicycle and pedestrian facilities in existing and new developments to create walkable neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Record of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Incorporate pedestrian and bicycle facilities as standard features in all transportation improvement projects.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities, SPC</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program, Safe Routes to School Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian and bicycle access between Seton Hill University and downtown Greensburg through design improvements to the College Ave. tunnel.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Seton Hill University, City of Greensburg</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Identify transportation projects that coincide with bicycle and pedestrian connections and identify corresponding agencies that should be involved.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities, SPC</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program, Safe Routes to School Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Review PennDOT Surface Treatment Program to identify possible pavement/shoulder widening projects.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP, PennDOT Highway Restoration Program, PennDOT County Maintenance Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Contact and discuss the strategies in this plan with PennDOT District 12-0 Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Coordinate with PennDOT and SPC to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities projects on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Develop Huff Avenue Corridor Improvements so as to provide a more pedestrian and bike friendly atmosphere with sidewalks, intersection improvements, streetscape amenities, etc.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, South Greensburg Boro</td>
<td>Hometown Streets Program, PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 2.0: Encourage bicycle and pedestrian facilities in existing and new developments to create walkable neighborhoods.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Record of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 2-8</td>
<td>In all roadway projects, provide a more pedestrian and bike-friendly atmosphere with sidewalks, widened shoulders, and/or other improvements.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP, PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2-9</td>
<td>Provide crosswalks for Lynch Field’s 2 entrances along Route 119 through coordination with PennDOT.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>4-Year TIP, PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2-10</td>
<td>Continue Hometown Streets Program coordination and development</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2-11</td>
<td>Update zoning ordinances to include standards that facilitate safe pedestrian movement through large parking lots (ex. Crosswalks) and promote pedestrian connections between various destinations within a development</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>LUPTAP DCED Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2-12</td>
<td>Provide a pedestrian/bicycle trail connection between South Greensburg and the University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg campus.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>South Greensburg Boro, University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2-13</td>
<td>Develop a plan and perform a feasibility study for pedestrian and bicycle pathways along primary corridors to promote access between individual sites from adjoining streets and neighborhoods (ex. access to schools, parks, churches, etc.). As part of the plan develop map of proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities and connections.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities, SPC</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program, Safe Routes to School Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2-14</td>
<td>Provide appropriate signage for identified bicycle routes.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PennDOT, Westmoreland County, Municipalities</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2-15</td>
<td>Improve the connection at the 5 Star Trail.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SPC, PennDOT, Municipalities</td>
<td>PennDOT Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2-16</td>
<td>Provide pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along SR 136 (a potential rail-trail) to improve safety and enhance access to Hempfield High School.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PennDOT, Hempfield Twp, SPC</td>
<td>Safe Routes to Schools Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 3.0: Develop a transportation and enhanced public transportation system that effectively facilitates the movement of people to and from neighborhoods, job centers, downtown Greensburg and higher education facilities in the entire region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Record of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3-1</td>
<td>Designate a Transit Revitalization Investment District (TRID) in downtown Greensburg to promote economic development and revitalization and encourage transit use.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, AMTRAK, Westmoreland County, Westmoreland Transit Authority, Hempfield Twp, City of Greensburg</td>
<td>LUPTAP Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-2</td>
<td>Pursue the recommendations of the Eastern Corridor Transit Study, along with regional partners, to continue to assess options for commuter rail and regional transit between Greensburg and Pittsburgh.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Allegheny County Port Authority, Westmoreland Transit Authority, SPC, PennDOT, Municipalities, Norfolk Southern</td>
<td>Federal Appropriation, 4-Year TIF, Private Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-3</td>
<td>Initiate a feasibility study for a transit loop connecting downtown Greensburg, local colleges and high schools, hospital, and park-and-ride lots within Hempfield Township and the downtown Greensburg area.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SPC, Westmoreland Transit Authority, PennDOT, Municipalities, Seton Hill University, University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg</td>
<td>Congestion Management/Air Quality (CMAQ) Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-4</td>
<td>Coordinate future development and redevelopment plans with the Westmoreland Transit Authority to identify potential route improvements and extensions to serve newly developed areas as well as currently developed</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Municipalities, Westmoreland County Transit Authority</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 4.0: Assess the parking needs of redevelopment efforts in downtown Greensburg to ensure adequate parking to accommodate offices, businesses, and major destinations in the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsible &amp; Participating Parties</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source or Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Record of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T4-1</td>
<td>Conduct a Parking Study of downtown Greensburg and identify alternatives to downtown surface parking, such as park and ride lots.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SPC, City of Greensburg</td>
<td>Congestion Management/Air Quality (CMAQ) Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4-2</td>
<td>Designate appropriate areas in the Downtown Redevelopment Area for future surface parking areas and develop a plan for acquisition.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>City of Greensburg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please consider the attached testimony during the finalization of the 2040 Long Range Plan. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Michael Turley
Assistant Township Manager
North Huntingdon Township
11279 Center Highway
North Huntingdon, PA 15642
724-863-3806 (x144)
724-863-9568
mturley@nhtpa.us

√
June 17, 2011

Matt Pavlosky
Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Commission
425 Sixth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1582

RE: Testimony for the Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan

Dear Commission Members:

Please give consideration to the following transportation initiatives during the development of the 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan. North Huntingdon Township is one of the fastest growing areas in the region and we have given careful consideration to our long term needs. These projects support transportation that enhances the regional economy. They would provide investment in infrastructure improvements that are coordinated and targeted at the corridor level to optimize the impact of the investment. All of our recommendations are focused at the corridor level for Route 30 and the primary economic and business activity center near Route 30, Norwin Avenue and Barnes Lake Road. It should be noted that additional development is under construction in this area including a Walmart store scheduled to open early next year and further development is also planned. The existing transportation system is in need of several improvements to support and accommodate this development.

1. Barnes Lake Road Improvements – The Township has in the past provided testimony during the development of the TIP for improvements to Barnes Lake Road. The traffic from existing and planned development warrants improvements of turning lanes at major intersections and reconstruction of the roadway which was never designed to handle the current and projected traffic. It is a major State arterial route that connects to a principal arterial (Route 30) that also serves the areas primary commercial area.

2. Turnpike Bridge over Route 30 – This is also in the major economic activity area in the Township and this area is congested during peak travel periods. Future plans to widen Route 30 to address the bottlenecks in this area are limited due to the location of the bridge abutments. Long term planning should include the need to replace the bridge and accommodate widening of Route 30.
3. Route 30 Improvements - There have been several studies conducted for Route 30. Recent studies have recommended corridor wide improvements including turning lanes and access improvements. These recommendations should be included in any long range planning. The current Route 30 configuration has capacity problems, safety concerns, and hinders development in the area. We request that improvements to Route 30 that provide for turning lanes and increase safety be included in SPC's long range planning.

4. Route 30 Intersections – The Draft Long Range Plan includes a line item for Roadway Capital Maintenance for Westmoreland County. We are in the process of upgrading signal operations through the Route 30 Corridor and various intersection improvements are a logical next step. We will follow up with several recommended intersection improvements along Route 30. These will be consistent with your vision and stated goals emphasizing maintenance of the existing transportation systems.

Please consider these recommendations for the Region’s long range planning. Each of these is an excellent project that meets the vision and goals that you established in the development of the 2040 Long Range Plan. They are each part of the regional highway system and directly serve the most vital economic activity center in the area.

Sincerely,

Michael Turley  
Assistant Manager

CC: Chris Bova, WCPD
Matt Pavlosky

From: Chris Bova [CBOVA@co.westmoreland.pa.us]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 2:25 PM
To: Matt Pavlosky
Subject: LRP Comment
Attachments: 2011 LRP Testimony.docx

Matt,

Here is our testimony regarding the LRP. If you have any questions, let me know. Thanks.

Christopher Bova
Deputy Director
Westmoreland County Department of Planning and Development
5th Floor, Suite 520
40 North Pennsylvania Avenue
Greensburg, PA 15601
724.830.3995

Go green and think before you print: do you need a paper copy of this e-mail?
WESTMORELAND COUNTY TESTIMONY

SUBMITTED BY

CHRISTOPHER BOVA, DEPUTY DIRECTOR
WESTMORELAND COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

JUNE 17, 2011

The Westmoreland County Department of Planning and Development is pleased to submit public comment for the Southwest Pennsylvania Commission’s Long Range Plan on behalf of the Westmoreland County Department of Planning and Development. The following projects include current and future projects that will help to achieve the vision set forth in the Westmoreland County Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2005 and are consistent with the long-term planning efforts of the Region.

1. **SR 30, Westmoreland County Corridor**

With the SR 22 Corridor reconstruction nearing completion, a top priority for Westmoreland County is to focus our efforts on upgrading the entire Route 30 corridor from the Allegheny County line to the Somerset County line (approximately 40 miles). Several years ago, the Route 30 study was completed and there were 42 highway candidate projects identified as needing improvements such as widening, interchange redesigns, safety improvements, etc.. In 2010, the SR 30 Jeannette – Amos K Bypass project (MPMS 31872) to add a center turn lane was scheduled to start construction. Once completed, this project will provide major safety improvements which will significantly reduce the number of accidents and improve traffic congestion throughout the Jeannette area of the Route 30 corridor. Unfortunately, the project has faced several delays and the let date has been pushed back to the end of 2011. Timely
completion of this project is absolutely critical to safety and congestion management efforts along the Route 30 corridor.

Following completion of this project, the next priority will focus on various intersection improvements and other upgrades along the Route 30 corridor from the Allegheny County line to the Westmoreland Mall in Hempfield Township.

2. **Local Bridge Line Item (MPMS 77374)**

   Westmoreland County fully supports the Local Bridge Line Item. However, we feel the allocation to this line item has been far less than adequate to address the growing rehabilitation and replacement needs of locally owned bridges. We are suggesting an increase in the line item to $5 million dollars for each four-year TIP period. We feel this amount of funding could potentially be sufficient to start making a positive impact on locally owned bridges throughout the County. Furthermore, we feel decisions regarding the use of Local Bridge Line Item funds should be made primarily at the County level with the support of PennDOT District 12. Rehabilitating and replacing locally owned bridges is a long-term effort that is consistent with the intents of the Long Range Plan.

3. **SR 981, Laurel Valley Betterments — Turnpike to Air Cargo Park**

   This project is designed to connect the manufacturing base and Arnold Palmer Regional Airport in the City of Latrobe/ Derry Township/Unity Township area to the Pennsylvania Turnpike in the vicinity of New Stanton.

   The current project consists of two turnpike slip ramps, one on SR 119 at the Sony complex below New Stanton and a second on the Turnpike in the vicinity of Carpenter Town where SR 981 crosses the Turnpike. With the slip ramps in place at the south end of SR 981 and the new SR 981/SR 30 intersection at the north end, all that would be needed to complete an efficient connect from the identified manufacturing base and the Arnold Palmer Airport to the Turnpike
would be a series of manageable upgrades to Route 981 between the two endpoints.

The completion of this project would reduce travel time between the two points from 45 minutes to an estimated 18 minutes. The reduction in travel time from the Latrobe/Derry/Unity Township area to the Turnpike would be a tremendous benefit to many businesses such as Kennametal, ATI, Chestnut Ridge Beverage Company, Latrobe Specialty Steel, Lehigh Specialty Melting, and many others. On the Turnpike end of the project, businesses such as UPS and Super Value would be well served to be able to connect to the Arnold Palmer Airport in approximately 20 minutes or less.

Westmoreland County supports the inclusion of this project on SPC’s Long Range Plan, however we feel it is necessary that this project be placed on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) during the during the 2013 TIP update. Westmoreland County will continue working with the PA Turnpike Commission to advance the slip ramps they committed to in 2005 so the projects advance simultaneously and the true benefits are finally realized.

4. **Intelligent Transportation Systems**

Westmoreland County supports the inclusion of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) into the SPC Long Range Plan. Intelligent Transportation Systems are proven methods to reduce congestion and improve safety, especially along heavily travelled corridors. Several current and future programs such as Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Surface Transportation Program – Urban/Livability Through Smart Transportation could potentially be an avenue to place ITS projects onto the TIP.

ITS, especially Traffic Signal Improvements, can provide a lower cost alternative for congestion management by utilizing “smart” traffic signals that reduce delay to motorists by sensing vehicles.
A regional, long-term commitment to ITS can help to address traffic congestion issues in applicable areas at a significantly reduced cost than by trying to solve congestion through building new and/or wider roads.

Although ITS cannot adequately address congestion in all areas and situations, we feel it is a reasonable and cost effective approach that could help lead to more efficient traffic signals and flow of traffic through heavily congested areas and feel it should be a priority (when applicable) in SPC's Long Range Plan.

5. **Jeannette Truck Route**

The Jeannette Truck Route project is designed to improve vehicular access, alleviate congestion, and eliminate unsafe truck movements through the City of Jeannette from Route 30 to the Jeannette Industrial Park.

The project consists of roadway realignment, drainage upgrades, walkway and curb reconstruction, a minor culvert to cross Brush Creek and new pavement markings and signing.

This project was on the previous TIP but was subsequently removed from the 2009-2013 TIP update. It is an important project to support urban renewal and economic development in the City of Jeannette.

6. **SR 66 Improvements – Delmont Area to Armstrong County Line**

SR 66 is a major north/south corridor that originates at the turnpike in the New Stanton area and extends north to Armstrong County. Capacity limitations from the Delmont area to the Armstrong County line limit the efficiency of north/south travel in the County, with few other options for motorists to choose from.
Improving north/south travel throughout the County is a long-term transportation priority as identified in the County's Comprehensive Plan. As such, we feel it is appropriate for this project to be included in the Long Range Plan.

In summary, the projects listed above are critical to achieving the long-term transportation vision as outlined in the Westmoreland County Comprehensive Plan. These projects are consistent with SPC's Long Range Plan and their inclusion into the Plan would help the SPC Region achieve the transportation strategy outlined in the Long Range Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Southwest Pennsylvania Commission's Long Range Plan.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Bova
Deputy Director
Please refer to prior testimony submission for:
Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning,
Deputy Director
Part Four

Documentation of Public Outreach Efforts
May and June 2011
NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission seeks comments from the public on important draft documents prior to their adoption:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment for the 2040 Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan Update

Starting May 18, 2011, these documents will be available for public review on the Internet at www.spcregion.org, at offices of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, at the Pittsburgh Department of City Planning, at County Planning offices, and at many public libraries around Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Attend a Public Participation Panel meeting to hear presentations, look at maps, ask questions, and submit your comments:

May 24, 5:00 p.m., Room 104, Courthouse Square
108 West Beaud Street, Washington

May 25, 5:00 p.m., Conference Room
Fayette Chamber of Commerce
65 West Main Street, Uniontown

May 26, 6:00 p.m., Public Meeting Room
County Government Center
124 W. Diamond Street, Butler

May 31, 5:00 p.m., Commissioners Conference Room
County Courthouse
819 Third Street, Beaver

June 1, 6:00 p.m., Large Group Instruction Room
Indiana Area Junior High
345 N. Fifth Street, Indiana

June 2, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Meeting Room
Lawrence County Courthouse
439 Court Street, New Castle

June 7, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Conference Room
Armstrong Courthouse Annex
459 Market Street, Kittanning

June 7, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Meeting Room
Courthouse Square
2 N. Main Street, Greensburg

June 8, 6:00 p.m., 31st floor, Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Downtown Pittsburgh

June 9, 6:00 p.m., Waynesburg University, Stover Hall
3rd Floor, Waynesburg

Oral and written comments will be taken by SPC representatives at each meeting. Written comments can also be submitted online at www.spcregion.org; by mail to: SPC Comments, 425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852; by fax to Comments, 412-391-9160, or by e-mail to comments@spcregion.org. All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on June 17, 2011.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission will consider these draft documents for action at their meeting on June 27, 2011 at 4:30 p.m., Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, 31st Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852.

SPC is committed to compliance with the non-discrimination requirements of applicable civil rights statutes, Executive Orders, regulations and policies. Meeting locations are accessible by persons with disabilities. Accommodations may be provided for those with special needs related to language, sight or hearing with 72 hours advance notice. If you have a request for special accommodations or desire additional information, please contact Matt Pavlosky at (412) 391-5590, Ext. 361, or mpavlosky@spcregion.org.

TRANSPORT SERVICE INFORMATION

For information regarding transit services in Allegheny County call Port Authority Customer Service at 412-442-2000. For transit information in other counties, please visit: www.commuterinfo.org/comm_trans.shtml or call 1-888-819-6110.

This notice satisfies the program-of-projects requirements of the Urbanized Area Formula Program of the Federal Transit Administration.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Member Planning Departments  
FROM: James R. Hassinger, Executive Director  
RE: Document for Public Review and Comment

Enclosed are the following draft documents, now available for public review and comment:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment for the 2040 Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan Update

We have advertised sites where the public can review these documents; therefore you may receive inquiries. Please make these documents easily accessible during the public comment period of May 18, 2011 through June 17, 2011; and inform your staff so they can direct the public to this material.

A notice is attached regarding public meetings and additional means by which the public can comment on these draft documents.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation. Please call Matt Pavlosky of my staff, at 412-391-5590, extension 361, if you have any questions.
May 16, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Libraries in our Document Review Network

FROM: James R. Hassinger, Executive Director

RE: Document for Public Review and Comment

Enclosed are the following draft documents, now available for public review and comment:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Durdens Assessment for the 2040 Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan Update

We have advertised sites where the public can review these documents; therefore you may receive inquiries. Please make these documents easily accessible during the public comment period of May 18, 2011 through June 17, 2011; and inform your staff so they can direct the public to this material.

A notice is attached regarding public meetings and additional means by which the public can comment on these draft documents.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation. Please call Matt Pavlosky of my staff, at 412-391-5590, extension 361, if you have any questions.
May 16, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Libraries in our Document Review Network

FROM: James R. Hassinger, Executive Director

RE: Online Documents for Public Review and Comment

Enclosed are instructions to access the following draft documents, using the SPC website. The following documents are now available for public review and comment:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment for the 2040 Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit-Human Services Coordinated Plan Update

We have advertised sites where the public can review these documents; therefore you may receive inquiries during the public comment period of May 18, 2011 through June 17, 2011. Please inform your staff so they can direct the public to this online material.

A notice is attached regarding public meetings and additional means by which the public can comment on these draft documents.

Thank you for participating in SPC’s Online Document Review Network! We appreciate your assistance and cooperation. Please call Matt Pavlosky of my staff, at 412-391-5590, extension 361, if you have any questions.
Thank you for using the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission’s Online Document Review Network. By utilizing this service, and through the assistance and cooperation of this library, SPC is working to enhance the availability and review experience of our transportation planning efforts, while reducing mailing and disposal expenses.

1. Ask a staff library professional to direct you to a computer terminal with access to the World Wide Web.

2. You may access the SPC website using a variety of web browsers. The SPC website is best viewed using Internet Explorer or Mozilla Firefox, but is designed to work with all browsers.

3. Type: www.spcregion.org into your web browser address line, or, your library’s terminal may offer a link to our site.

4. At the SPC Homepage, under the “Latest News” tab on the left side of the page, click on: “Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania”.

5. From here, you may review all associated materials related to the Draft 2040 Long Range Plan.

Note: Please ask your library professional regarding the availability and cost for copied or printed material. The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission and our partner libraries are not responsible for costs related to personal, printed material.
NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission seeks comments from the public on important draft documents prior to their adoption:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment for the 2040 Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan Update

Starting May 18, 2011, these documents will be available for public review on the internet at www.spcregion.org, at offices of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, at the Pittsburgh Department of City Planning, at County Planning offices, and at many public libraries around Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Attend a Public Participation Panel meeting to hear presentations, look at maps, ask questions, and submit your comments:

May 24, 5:00 p.m., Room 104, Courthouse Square, 100 West Beau Street, Washington

May 25, 5:00 p.m., Conference Room, Fayette Chamber of Commerce, 65 West Main Street, Uniontown

May 26, 6:00 p.m., Public Meeting Room, County Government Center, 124 W. Diamond Street, Butler

May 31, 5:00 p.m., Commissioners Conference Room, County Courthouse, 810 Third Street, Beaver

June 1, 6:00 p.m., Large Group Instruction Room, Indiana Area Junior High, 245 N. Fifth Street, Indiana

June 2, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Meeting Room, Lawrence County Courthouse, 430 Court Street, New Castle

June 7, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Conference Room, Armstrong Courthouse Annex, 450 Market Street, Kittanning

June 7, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Meeting Room, Courthouse Square, 2 N. Main Street, Greensburg

June 8, 6:00 p.m., 31st floor, Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, Downtown Pittsburgh

June 9, 6:00 p.m., Waynesburg University, Stover Hall, 3rd Floor, Waynesburg

Oral and written comments will be taken by SPC representatives at each meeting. Written comments can also be submitted online at www.spcregion.org; by mail to: SPC Comments, 425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1652; by fax to Comments, 412-391-9160; or by e-mail to comments@spcregion.org. All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on June 17, 2011.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission will consider these draft documents for action at their meeting on June 27, 2011 at 4:30 p.m., Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, 31st Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1652.

SPC is committed to compliance with the non-discrimination requirements of applicable civil rights statute, Executive Orders, regulations and policies. Meeting locations are accessible by persons with disabilities. Accommodations may be provided for those with special needs related to language, sight or hearing with 72 hours advance notice. If you have a request for special accommodations or desire additional information, please contact Matt Pavlosky at (412) 391-5590, Ext. 361, or mpavlosky@spcregion.org.

TRANSIT SERVICE INFORMATION

For information regarding transit services in Allegheny County call Port Authority Customer Service at 412-442-2000. For transit information in other counties, please visit: www.commuteinfo.org/comm_trans.shtml or call 1-888-819-6110.

This notice satisfies the program-of-projects requirements of the Urbanized Area Formula Program of the Federal Transit Administration.
Plan 2040 de transporte y desarrollo a largo plazo para el suroeste de Pensilvania

La Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (Comisión para el Suroeste de Pensilvania) busca recabar la opinión del público acerca de los borradores de diversos documentos relevantes, de forma previa a su aprobación:

- Plan 2040 de transporte y desarrollo para el suroeste de Pensilvania
- Evaluación de beneficios y cargas para la justicia medioambiental para el Plan 2040
- Determinación de la conformidad de la calidad del aire para el área de gestión del transporte de Pittsburgh
- Actualización del plan de transporte coordinado de servicios humanos de tránsito público para el suroeste de Pensilvania

A partir del 18 de mayo de 2011, estos documentos estarán disponibles para su revisión pública a través de internet, en la dirección www.spcregion.org, en las oficinas de la Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC), en el Departamento de Planificación Urbana de Pittsburgh, en las oficinas de planificación de los condados y en numerosas bibliotecas públicas del suroeste de Pensilvania.

Si desea acudir a las presentaciones, revisar los mapas, formular preguntas e indicarnos sus comentarios, puede asistir a cualquiera de las siguientes reuniones de participación pública:

24 de mayo, 17:00 horas – Sala 104, Courthouse Square, 100 West Beau Street, Washington
25 de mayo, 17:00 horas – Sala de Conferencias, Cámara de Comercio del Condado de Fayette, 65 West Main Street, Uniontown
26 de mayo, 18:00 horas – Sala de Audiencias Públicas, Centro del Gobierno del Condado, 124 W. Diamond Street, Butler
31 de mayo, 17:00 horas – Sala de Conferencias de los Comisarios, Juzgado del Condado, 810 Third Street, Beaver
1 de junio, 18:00 horas – Sala grande de instrucción para grupos, Escuela de Educación Secundaria del área de Indiana, 245 N. Fifth Street, Indiana
2 de junio, 18:00 horas – Sala de Reuniones de los Comisarios, Juzgado del Condado de Lawrence, 430 Court Street, New Castle
7 de junio, 18:00 horas – Sala de Conferencias de los Comisarios, edificio anexo al Juzgado del Condado de Armstrong, 450 Market Street, Kittanning
7 de junio, 18:00 horas – Sala de Reuniones de los Comisarios, Plaza del Juzgado, 2 N. Main Street, Greensburg
8 de junio, 18:00 horas – Regional Enterprise Tower (31ª planta), 425 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh (centro)
9 de junio, 18:00 horas – Universidad de Waynesburg, salón Stover (3ª planta), Waynesburg

Los representantes de la SPC recogerán los comentarios realizados por vía oral y escrita en cada una de las reuniones. Los comentarios por escrito también se pueden enviar a través de la dirección de internet www.spcregion.org; por correo postal, a la siguiente dirección: SPC Comments, 425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852; por fax al número de SPC Comments: 412-391-9160; o por correo electrónico a la dirección comments@spcregion.org. El plazo para la recepción de los comentarios concluye el día 17 de junio de 2011, a las 16:00 horas.

La Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) tomará las acciones oportunas en relación con los borradores de estos documentos en la reunión que se celebrará el día 27 de junio de 2011, a las 16:30 horas, en la siguiente dirección: Regional Enterprise Tower (31ª planta), 425 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852.

La SPC está comprometida con el cumplimiento de los requisitos antidiscriminatorios contenidos en el estatuto de derechos civiles, los mandatos ejecutivos, los reglamentos y las políticas que sean de aplicación. Los lugares en los que se celebrarán las reuniones cuentan con accesos para personas discapacitadas. Pueden efectuarse las adaptaciones oportunas para aquellas personas con necesidades especiales de comunicación, visuales o auditivas, siempre que esto se solicite por anticipado con una antelación mínima de 72 horas. Si necesita solicitar adaptaciones especiales o desea obtener información adicional, póngase en contacto con Matt Pavlosky a través del número de teléfono (412) 391-5590, ext. 361, o de la dirección de correo electrónico mpavlosky@spcregion.org.

INFORMACIÓN SOBRE SERVICIOS DE TRANSPORTE


Esta notificación cumple los requisitos del programa de proyectos del Programa Especial para áreas urbanizadas de la Administración Federal de Transporte.
BEKANNTMACHUNG DER PHASE ÖFFENTLICHER ANHÖRUNGEN UND VERSAMMLUNGEN

Langfristiger Transport- und Entwicklungsplan für Südwest-Pennsylvania 2040

Die Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission bittet die Öffentlichkeit vor der endgültigen Genehmigung einiger wichtiger Entwürfe um Stellungnahme:

- Langfristiger Transport- und Entwicklungsplan für Südwest-Pennsylvania 2040
- Bewertung der Vorteile und Belastungen des Plans für 2040 unter dem Gesichtspunkt der ökologischen Gerechtigkeit
- Feststellung der Konformität der Luftqualität im Bereich der Pittsburgh Verkehrsverwaltung
- Aktualisierung des koordinierten Verkehrplans der öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel von Südwest-Pennsylvania


Sie sind dazu eingeladen, an einer Podiumsdiskussion mit Bürgerbeteiligung teilzunehmen und sich Präsentationen anzu hören, Karten anzusehen, Fragen zu stellen und Ihre Kommentare abzugeben:

24. Mai, 17.00 Uhr, Raum 104, Courthouse Square, 100 West Beau Street, Washington
25. Mai, 17.00 Uhr, Konferenzzimmer, Fayette Chamber of Commerce, 65 West Main Street, Uniontown
26. Mai, 18.00 Uhr, örtlicher Sitzungssaal, County Government Center, 124 W. Diamond Street, Butler
31. Mai, 17.00 Uhr, Commissioners Conference Room, County Courthouse, 610 Third Street, Beaver
1. Juni, 18.00 Uhr, Large Group Instruction Room, Indiana Area Junior High, 245 N. Fifth Street, Indiana
2. Juni, 18.00 Uhr, Commissioners Meeting Room, Lawrence County Courthouse, 430 Court Street, New Castle
7. Juni, 18.00 Uhr, Commissioners Conference Room, Armstrong Courthouse Annex, 450 Market Street, Kittanning
7. Juni, 18.00 Uhr, Commissioners Meeting Room, Courthouse Square, 2 N. Main Street, Greensburg
8. Juni, 18.00 Uhr, 31. Etage, Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, Downtown Pittsburgh
9. Juni, 18.00 Uhr, Waynesburg University, Stover Hall, 3. Etage, Waynesburg


SPC hält alle Nicht-Diskriminierungsaufgaben der geltenden Bürgerrechtsbestimmung, Vollzugsanordnungen, Vorschriften und Richtlinien ein. Alle Versammlungsorte sind behindertengerecht. Unterstützung für Sprach-, Seh- oder Hörbehinderte ist erhältlich, ist jedoch 72 Stunden im Voraus zu beantragen. Sollten Sie diese Unterstützung in Anspruch nehmen wollen oder weitere Informationen wünschen, wenden Sie sich bitte unter (412) 391-5590, Durchwahl 361, oder unter mpavlosky@spcregion.org an Matt Pavlosky.

NAHVERKEHRSINFORMATIONEN

Piano 2040 di sviluppo e trasporti a lungo termine per la Pennsylvania Sud-Occidentale

La Commissione della Pennsylvania sudoccidentale (SPC) sollecita la discussione del pubblico su bozze di importanti documenti prima di renderli effettivi:

- Piano 2040 di sviluppo e trasporti per la Pennsylvania sudoccidentale
- Valutazione dei vantaggi e degli oneri di giustizia ambientale per il Piano 2040
- Determinazione di conformità della qualità dell’aria per la Zona di gestione trasporti di Pittsburgh
- Aggiornamento del Piano coordinato dei trasporti dei Servizi sociali di trasporto pubblico della Pennsylvania sudoccidentale


Si invita a presenziare a una riunione del Comitato di partecipazione pubblica per ascoltare le varie presentazioni, prendere visione delle mappe, ottenere risposte e comunicare eventuali osservazioni:

24 maggio, h 17:00, Sala 104, Courthouse Square, 100 West Beau Street, Washington
25 maggio, h 17:00, Sala conferenze, Camera di commercio Fayette, 65 West Main Street, Uniontown
26 maggio, h 18:00, Sala pubbliche riunioni, Government Center della contea, 124 W. Diamond Street, Butler
31 maggio, h 17:00, Sala conferenze della commissione, Tribunale di contea, 810 Third Street, Beaver
1° giugno, h 18:00, Aula grandi gruppi, Scuola media di zona dell’Indiana, 245 N. Fifth Street, Indiana
2 giugno, h 18:00, Sala conferenze della commissione, Tribunale di contea di Lawrence, 430 Court Street, New Castle
7 giugno, h 18:00, Sala conferenze della commissione, Dipendenza del tribunale di Armstrong, 450 Market Street, Kittanning
7 giugno, h 18:00, Sala conferenze della commissione, Courthouse Square, 2 N. Main Street, Greensburg
8 giugno, h 18:00, 31° piano, Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh centro
9 giugno, h 18:00, Università di Waynesburg, Stover Hall, 3° piano, Waynesburg

A ogni incontro un rappresentante della SPC raccoglierà i vostri commenti, a voce o in forma scritta. Commenti scritti possono anche essere presentati on-line al sito www.spcregion.org; via posta a: SPC Commenti, 425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852; o via fax a Comments, 412-391-9160; o via email a comments@spcregion.org. Tutti i commenti devono pervenire entro le ore 16:00 del 17 giugno 2011.

La Commissione della Pennsylvania sudoccidentale vaglierà queste bozze di documento durante l’incontro del 27 giugno 2011 alle h 16:30, presso la Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, 31° piano, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852.

La SPC si impegna a conformarsi alle prerogative di non-discriminazione dello statuto di diritti civili, dei Decreti legge, delle policy e normative vigenti. I luoghi delle riunioni sono accessibili alle persone diversamente abili. È possibile procurare sistemazioni per persone con particolari esigenze di parola, vista, udito, previa notifica con 72 ore d’anticipo. In caso di richiesta di sistemazioni particolari o se si desiderano ulteriori informazioni, si prega di contattare Matt Pavlosky al (412) 391-6590, Est. 361, o mpavlosky@spcregion.org.

INFORMAZIONI SUL SERVIZIO DI TRASPORTO


La presente comunicazione soddisfa i requisiti di programma di progetto per il Urbanized Area Formula Program della Federal Transit Administration.
From: Thomas P. Straw on behalf of Jim Hassinger  
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2011 1:37 PM  
To: comments@spcrregion.org  
Subject: SPC InBrief E-Newsletter For Commissioners, 05/19/2011 Edition

SPC InBrief E-Newsletter
For Commissioners

Concise updates for Commission members on current programs and projects. Learn about opportunities, deadlines, meetings/events, progress, and valuable news briefs.

May 19, 2011

Contents

- SPC News
- Events

SPC News: SPC Announces Public Participation Opportunities

As a reminder, the draft 2040 Plan and companion documents are now available for public comment. Below is information we released showing the dates and locations of your county Public Participation Panel meetings.

Involving the public in the regional planning processes is a high priority for the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission. As one means of receiving valuable public input, SPC maintains Public Participation Panels (PPPs) for each county in its transportation planning region. Citizens do not need to travel outside their own county to address SPC about anything in regional transportation planning, because through the PPPs, SPC comes to them. All PPP meetings are open to the public.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission seeks comments from the public on important draft documents prior their adoption:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment for the 2040 Plan
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit Human Services Coordinated Transportaion Plan Update

Attend a Public Participation Panel meeting to hear presentations, look at maps, ask questions, and submit your comments:

May 24, 5:00 p.m., Room 104, Courthouse Square, 100 West Beau Street, Washington

May 25, 5:00 p.m., Conference Room, Fayette Chamber of Commerce, 65 West Main Street, Uniontown

May 26, 6:00 p.m., Public Meeting Room, County Government Center, 124 W. Diamond Street, Butler

May 31, 5:00 p.m., Commissioners Conference Room, County Courthouse, 810 Third Street, Beaver

June 1, 6:00 p.m., Large Group Instruction Room, Indiana Area Junior High, 245 N. Fifth Street, Indiana

June 2, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Meeting Room, Lawrence County Courthouse, 430 Court Street, New Castle
June 7, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Conference Room, Armstrong Courthouse Annex, 450 Market Street, Kittanning

June 7, 6:00 p.m., Commissioners Meeting Room, Courthouse Square, 2 N. Main Street, Greensburg

June 8, 6:00 p.m., 31st floor, Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, Downtown Pittsburgh

June 9, 6:00 p.m., Waynesburg University, Slover Hall, 3rd Floor, Waynesburg

Oral and written comments will be taken by SPC representatives at each meeting. Written comments can also be submitted online at www.spcregion.org; by mail to: SPC Comments, 425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2500, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852; by fax to Comments, 412-391-9160; or by e-mail to comments@spcregion.org. All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on June 17, 2011.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission will consider these draft documents for action at their meeting on June 27, 2011 at 4:30 p.m., Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, 31st Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1852.

SPC is committed to compliance with the non-discrimination requirements of applicable civil rights statute, Executive Orders, regulations and policies. Meeting locations are accessible by persons with disabilities. Accommodations may be provided for those with special needs related to language, sight or hearing with 72 hours advance notice. If you have a request for special accommodations or desire additional information, please contact Matt Pavlosky at (412) 391-5590, Ext. 361, or mpavlosky@spcregion.org.

TRANSIT SERVICE INFORMATION

For information regarding transit services in Allegheny County call Port Authority Customer Service at 412-442-2000. For transit information in other counties, please visit: www.commuteinfo.org/comm_trans.shtml or call 1-888-819-6110.

This notice satisfies the program-of-projects requirements of the Urbanized Area Formula Program of the Federal Transit Administration.

May is CommuteInfo Commute Options Awareness Month

SPC wants all commuters and employers in southwestern PA to learn more about the commuting options available to them. To focus attention on available commuting alternatives, SPC has proclaimed May to be CommuteInfo Commute Options Awareness Month. SPC will be promoting the benefits of its CommuteInfo rideshare program during May. The goal of the CommuteInfo program is for commuters in southwestern Pennsylvania to choose ridesharing at least twice a week.

Gas prices are up over $1 per gallon since this time last year. The price of gas is now close to $4.00 a gallon and commuters are looking for ways to save money. Alternatives to driving alone, like vanpooling, carpooling, using public transit or biking to work, are just a few of the ways to lower the cost of commuting. Over 500 commuters already ride to work daily in CommuteInfo’s 43 registered vanpools and nearly 500 commuters ride to work daily in the 225 carpools registered with CommuteInfo.

Over 77% of the workers in the SPC region drive alone to work. More of the region’s commuters sharing a ride to work would help to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. In 2010, CommuteInfo’s vanpool and carpool participants helped to keep nearly 800 cars off the road each workday. For a typical 30-mile round trip to work based on an average fuel economy of about 25 miles per gallon, each CommuteInfo vanpool and carpool participant saves over a gallon of gas per day. At current prices, that adds up to over $1,000 per year.

Visit www.commuteinfo.org and take advantage of the CommuteInfo Commute Cost Calculator to estimate how much you could be saving!

For more information about CommuteInfo and commuter alternatives, please visit www.commuteinfo.org, or call toll free 1-888-819-6110.
Transportation: Public Participation Panels
Comment Period & Meeting Schedule

NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

2040 Long Range Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission seeks comments from the public on important draft documents prior to their adoption:

- 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burden Assessment for the 2040 Plan
- All Quality-Compliance Determination for the Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area
- Southwestern Pennsylvania Public Transit Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan Update

Starting May 10, 2011, these documents are available for public review. Visit our of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, at the Pittsburgh Department of City Planning, at County Planning offices, and at many public libraries around Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Attend a Public Participation Panel meeting to hear presentations, take part in question and answer sessions, and submit your comments:

May 10th
Washington County, 6:00 p.m., Washington County Courthouse, 100 West Main Street, Washington, PA 15301

May 24th
Fayette County, 6:00 p.m., Fayette Chamber of Commerce, 88 West Main Street, Uniontown, PA 15401

May 26th
Butler County, 6:00 p.m., Butler County Government Center, 124 West Diamond Street, Butler, PA 16001

May 31st
Beaver County, 6:00 p.m., Beaver County Courthouse, 810 Third Street, Beaver, PA 15009

June 2011

June 1st
Indiana County, 6:00 p.m., Indiana Junior High School, 801 East Pike Street, Indiana, PA 15701

June 2nd
Lawrence County, 6:00 p.m., Lawrence County Courthouse, 430 Court Street, New Castle, PA 16101

June 7th
Lawrence County, 6:00 p.m., Westmoreland County Courthouse, 3 West Main Street, Greensburg, PA 15601

June 9th
Allegheny County (City of Pittsburgh), 6:00 p.m., Regional Enterprise Tower, 31st Floor, 425 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222

June 9th
Greene County, 6:00 p.m., Waynesburg University, Stover Hall, 81 West College Street, Waynesburg, PA 15370

Oral and written comments will be taken by SPC representatives at each meeting. Written comments can also be submitted online at www.spcog.org, by mail to SPC Commission, 425 Sixth Ave., Suite 2600, Pittsburgh, PA 15222-1854, or by fax to Comments, (412) 393-6980; or by e-mail to Comments@spcog.org. All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on June 17, 2011.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission will consider these draft documents for action at their meeting on June 27, 2011 at 4:30 p.m., Regional Enterprise Tower, 425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2600, Pittsburgh, PA 15222-1854.

The SPC is committed to compliance with the non-discrimination requirements of applicable civil rights statute, Executive Orders, regulations and policies. Meeting locations are accessible to persons with disabilities. Accommodations may be provided for those with special needs related to language, sight or hearing with 72 hours advance notice. If you have a request for special accommodations or desire additional information, please contact Matt Peckavus at (412) 393-6980, ext. 361, or mpeckavus@spcog.org.

Español
AVISO SOBRE PERÍodos DE INFORMACIÓN PÚBLICA Y REUNIONES PÚBLICAS

Français
AVISO DE OUVERTURE AUX OBSERVATIONS DU PUBLIC ET DE RENCONTRES PUBLIQUES

Italiano
AVISSIONI IN DI BATTITTO PUBBLICO E PUBBLICHE RUOOGI

Deutsch
BEKÄNNUNG DER PHASE ÖFFENTLICHER ANHÖRUNGEN UND VEREINBARUNGEN

TRANSPORT SERVICE INFORMATION

For information regarding transit services in Allegheny County, please call Port Authority Customer Service at 412-440-2000. For transit information in other counties, please go here.
DRAFT 2040 Long-Range Transportation & Development Plan

Are you looking for the CURRENT (2035) Long-Range Transportation & Development Plan? If so, click here.

The 2040 Transportation and Development Plan is provided in Adobe Acrobat PDF format. In order to view it, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader installed. If you don’t have Acrobat Reader, it’s available as a free download from Adobe.

Complete Draft 2040 Plan Document
Cover
Table of Contents
Section 1: Introduction
Section 2: Public Participation
Section 3: Regional Conditions and Trends
Section 4: The Transportation Plan
Section 5: Economic Development
Section 6: Plan Technical Analysis and Performance
Section 7: Consideration of Environmental Mitigation
Section 8: Plan Implementation and Administration
Appendix A: Project Tables and Maps by PandoSt District
Appendix B: Economic Development Investments
Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

The 2035 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania is in Adobe Acrobat PDF format. In order to view it, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader installed. If you don’t have Acrobat Reader, it’s available as a free download from Adobe.

For more information on SPC’s transportation planning, contact Chuck DiPietro at dipietro@sporegion.org.
For more information about SPC’s Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy planning, contact Lew Villotti at lsvillotti@sporegion.org.

425 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA
15219-1052
(412) 391-5000 (F)
(412) 391-9100 (P)
comment@sporegion.org
Directions

Note: Babel Plan is a third-party resource and a computer translation of the original language. It is provided for general information only and should not be regarded as complete or accurate.
Transportation: DRAFT Air Quality Determination

Pittsburgh Transportation Management Area for the 8-Hour Ozone Standard
PM2.5 Air Quality Standards

Proposed Companion Document to the 2014-2016 Transportation Improvement Program and the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania


The Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment is provided in Adobe Acrobat PDF format. In order to view it, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader installed. If you don’t have Acrobat Reader, it is available as a free download from Adobe.

Table of Contents

Section I. Introduction
Section II. Regional Implications of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments and Overview of Conformity Criteria
Section III. Transportation Networks Developed for Conformity Assessment
Section IV. Travel Estimation Process
Section V. Development of Emission Factors
Section VI. Transportation Model Application and Results
Section VII. Conformity Determination
Section VIII. Public Review and Comment

Appendices
Appendix A. Conformity Determination: Johnstown PM2.5 Nonattainment Area
Appendix B. Identification of Exempt and Regionally Significant Projects Included in the 2011-2014 TIP
Appendix C. Identification of Exempt and Regionally Significant Projects Included in the 2040 Plan
Appendix D. Sample MOBILE6 Input Parameters
Appendix E. County and Facility Type Summaries VMT, Speed, Emissions
Appendix F. TDM Model Setup and Results
Appendix G. Common Acronyms

For questions about the Draft Air Quality Report, contact Chuck Imler at (412) 391-5900 x319 or e-mail imler@sporegion.org.
Transportation: Report On Environmental Justice

DRAFT Report On Environmental Justice

Proposed Companion Document to the 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania

Are you looking for the current (active) Environmental Report: Benefits & Burden Analysis for the 2035 Plan? If so, click here.

The DRAFT Report on Environmental Justice is provided in Adobe Acrobat PDF. In order to view it, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader installed. If you don’t have Acrobat Reader, it’s available as a free download from Adobe.

[Get Acrobat Reader]

• Download The Report

[too]

**Note:** Baseline Plan is a third-party resource and a computer translation of the original webpage; it is provided for general information only and should not be regarded as complete or accurate.
Public Participation Panels

DRAFT Public Transit Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan

Are you looking for the CURRENT Public Transit Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan? If so, click here.

In order to view these files, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader installed. If you don’t have Acrobat Reader, it’s available as a free download from Adobe.

Chapters

I. Purpose and Background of the Plan
II. Public Involvement and Outreach
III. Regional Profile and Summary of Transportation Services
IV. Funding Programs and Barriers to Coordination
V. Transportation Plans and Issues
VI. Key Strategies
VII. Comprehensive Plan Process
VIII. Next Steps

Discussion Group Summaries

Plan Update Appendices

Plan Update Appendices 1
Plan Update Appendices 2
Plan Update Appendices 3

Original Plan Appendices

In order to view these files, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader installed. If you don’t have Acrobat Reader, it’s available as a free download from Adobe.
SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA COMMISSION

About Us: Meetings

[ SPC Meetings || Other Meetings ]

Following is a list of upcoming Commission and Corporation meetings, and other meetings related to SPC programs. At SPC meetings, unless otherwise noted, are on the 3rd Thursday of the Regional Service Times. 425 South Avenue, downtown Pittsburgh (location).

SPC Meetings

May 10th
Commission Executive Committee, 12:00 p.m., A. S. Hunt Room

May 17th
General Membership Meeting, 6:00 p.m., Pittsburgh Room

June 7th
Corporation Board of Directors Meeting, 10:00 a.m., A. S. Hunt Room

June 21st
Corporation Board of Directors Meeting, 10:00 a.m., A. S. Hunt Room

Other Meetings/Events

2011 Long Range Plan Update – Pittsburgh Meeting Schedule

May 2011

May 5th
Washington County, 3:00 p.m., Washington County Courthouse, 100 West, 1st Street, West, Washington, PA 15301

May 12th
Franklin County, 3:00 p.m., Franklin County Courthouse, 429 South Avenue, Suite 200, Franklin, PA 15333

May 19th
Beaver County, 3:00 p.m., Beaver County Government Center, 104 West, 1st Street, Beaver, PA 15010

June 21st
Lawrence County, 3:00 p.m., Lawrence County Courthouse, 200 West, 1st Street, New Castle, PA 16101

June 28th
Butler County, 3:00 p.m., Butler County Courthouse, 429 South Avenue, Butler, PA 16001

July 2nd
Greene County, 3:00 p.m., Greene County Courthouse, 200 South, 1st Street, Waynesburg, PA 15370

June 2011

June 8th
Westmoreland County, 3:00 p.m., Westmoreland County Courthouse, 429 South Avenue, Greensburg, PA 15601

June 15th
Washington County, 3:00 p.m., Washington County Courthouse, 100 West, 1st Street, Washington, PA 15301

June 22nd
Butler County, 3:00 p.m., Butler County Courthouse, 429 South Avenue, Butler, PA 16001

June 29th
Allegheny County, 3:00 p.m., Allegheny County Courthouse, 6119-6200, 10th Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15222

July 6th
Allegheny County, 3:00 p.m., Allegheny County Courthouse, 6119-6200, 10th Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15222

July 13th
Allegheny County, 3:00 p.m., Allegheny County Courthouse, 6119-6200, 10th Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15222

For information regarding travel services to Pittsburgh, contact the Allegheny County Port Authority Customer Service at 1-800-426-9215, or contact the Pittsburgh Convention & Visitors Bureau at 412-231-3010.

Spanish

La SPC está comprometida con la promoción de los intereses económicos de los residentes de cada condado, mediante ejecutivos, regulaciones y políticas aplicables. Los residentes en las que se utilizan las reuniones pueden ser accesibles para personas desaparecidas. En caso de ser necesario, se puede hacer que la persona que presente la información sobre las reuniones, se adapte a la necesidad de la persona que se presenta la información. Para obtener información sobre las reuniones, por favor, contactar el número telefónico (412) 231-3010.

Deutsch


Italiano

La SPC si impegna a rispettare i diritti di segreteria dei dipendenti, e degli altri, nonostante le regolazioni e le istruzioni aziendali. Il successo dell'azienda è fondato sull'accessibilità e sulla qualità. Per ulteriori informazioni, per favore, contattare il numero (412) 231-3010, interno 281 al servizio anteriore.
Business Leaders take note
Regional Prosperity: How the Region’s Plan Can Impact the Region’s Bottom Line

Friday, June 10
11:30 am - 12:30 pm
Regional Enterprise Tower, 31st Floor
No fee to attend
RSVP to info@sustainablepittsburgh.org
Bring a brownbag lunch. Dessert provided.

The region’s metropolitan planning organization (MPO), the
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, is now accepting
public input on the draft 2040 Transportation and Development
Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This plan helps to guide
the region’s growth and development patterns. At stake is
channeling investments for infrastructure and economic
development in ways that can improve quality of life, lessen the
cost of doing business, increase long-term profitability, help
reduce infrastructure costs, and contribute to recruitment and
retention of employees.

Come learn more about how the region’s draft 2040
Transportation and Development Plan is material to sustainable
development. This session will equip you to provide formal
comment to SPC by their 6/17 deadline.

Business leaders in America are increasingly focused on
rationalizing regional patterns of development to more
successfully spur economic prosperity and extend livability to
more persons. The bottom line business case of smart growth is
increasingly apparent.

Come be part of the conversation about how the region’s plan
and you can help to:
- channel the pattern and character of growth and development
to hasten regional sustainability that protects and enhances
investments
- ensure economic growth occurs without the impacts and
inefficiencies of unchecked sprawl
- promote sustainable communities
- level the field for development and redevelopment to revitalize
our older urban centers
- focus on the new economic nexus of land use, transportation,
housing, and transit oriented development
- learn about new interactive tools to analyze the suitability of
locations for transit oriented development

http://www.sustainablepittsburgh.org/index.html
From: Sustainable Pittsburgh [info@sustainablepittsburgh.org]
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2011 11:44 AM
Subject: This Friday! - How the Region's Plan can impact bottom line

Business Leaders take note
Regional Prosperity: How the Region's Plan Can Impact the Region’s Bottom Line

Friday, June 10
11:30 am - 1:00 pm
Regional Enterprise Tower, 31st Floor
No fee to attend
RSVP to info@sustainablepittsburgh.org
Bring a brownbag lunch. Dessert provided.

The region’s metropolitan planning organization (MPO), the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, is now accepting public input on the draft 2040 Transportation and Development Plan for Southwestern Pennsylvania. This plan helps to guide the region’s growth and development patterns. At stake is channeling investments for infrastructure and economic development in ways that can improve quality of life, lessen the cost of doing business, increase long-term profitability, help reduce infrastructure costs, and contribute to recruitment and retention of employees.

Come learn more about how the region’s draft 2040 Transportation and Development Plan is material to sustainable development. This session will equip you to provide formal comment to SPC by their 6/17 deadline.

Business leaders in America are increasingly focused on rationalizing regional patterns of development to more successfully spur economic prosperity and extend livability to more persons. The bottom line business case of smart growth is increasingly apparent.

Come be part of the conversation about how the region's plan and you can help to:
- channel the pattern and character of growth and development to hasten regional sustainability that protects and enhances investments
- ensure economic growth occurs without the impacts and inefficiencies of unchecked sprawl
- promote sustainable communities
- level the field for development and redevelopment to revitalize our older urban centers
- focus on the new economic nexus of land use, transportation, housing, and transit oriented development
- learn about new interactive tools to analyze the suitability of locations for transit oriented development

Presented by Sustainable Pittsburgh, Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, Urban Land Institute - Pittsburgh District Council
ERI 10
2ND FRIDAY BOOK DISCUSSION
GROUP. Little Bee by Chris Cleave.
10 a.m. Northland Public Library.
McCandless. 412-866-8100.
REGIONAL PROSPERITY. HOW THE REGION’S PLAN CAN IMPACT THE REGION’S BOTTOM LINE. Presented by Sustainable Pittsburgh & Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission. RSVP to info@SustainablePittsburgh.org. 11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. Regional Enterprise Tower. Downtown. 412-258-0646.
FRIDAYS IN THE FOREST. Five free, family-friendly candlelight dinners at Cafe Phipps. Fri. 6 & 8 p.m. Phipps Conservatory & Botanical Garden, Oakland. 412-422-6915.
OAKLAND OPEN MIC. Poetry, music & political speeches welcome. Second and Fourth Fri. of every month, 7 p.m. Kiva Room, Oakland. 610-731-1804.
Regional planning group seeks opinions on transit

Friday, June 10, 2011
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, the region's metropolitan planning organization, today will present a draft of its 2040 Transportation and Development Plan to encourage input in time for a June 17 deadline. The input of business leaders is particularly encouraged but the general public is welcome.

The meeting is from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the Regional Enterprise Tower, 31st Floor. There is no fee to attend but RSVP is requested to info@sustainablepittsburgh.org.

Bring a brownbag lunch. Dessert is provided.

The plan will guide the region's growth and development toward more sustainable investment in such needs as infrastructure and economic development.
Regional commission asks towns to consider sustainable transportation
Public input sought before revising plan

Monday, June 13, 2011
By Diana Nelson Jones, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission added sustainability practices to its update of the region’s long-range transportation and economic development plan for the first time five years ago.

Friday, at one of the many public input sessions the commission has held in recent weeks, transportation planners emphasized the need for municipalities to plan accordingly for the 2040 plan, an update of its 2035 plan.

The meeting at the Regional Enterprise Tower, Downtown, emphasized development around existing access to public transportation. This is a major tenet of the smart-growth movement, which says that when you develop jobs, housing and retail around transit systems, then economic vitality, higher quality of life and public safety will follow.

Southwest Planning is responsible for planning and setting priorities for the use of state and federal transportation money that comes to the region. Every four years, the commission updates its long-range plan. In the process, it studies every county master plan.

"The SPC doesn’t create what’s in its plan," said Court Gould, executive director of Sustainable Pittsburgh. "That comes from your governments."

While transportation is a focus, economic development, small business, social equity, environmental justice, air quality conformity, health and population growth are all in the mix, said Matt Pavlosky, a SPC transportation planner.

Asked by one attendee what role agriculture plays in the input so far, Lew Villotti, the agency's planning and development director, said eight of the 10 counties had linked tourism and agriculture and most considered it "an important component of economic development."

"We promote agriculture in the plan," he said.

Mr. Gould said the agency's 2035 plan "was a departure from documents prior, the stepping cut point" for the agency in planning for sustainable development. The Smart Growth Conference that is held here annually now serves as a forum for public input into the agency plan, he said.

To view the plan and provide input, visit www.spcregion.org.

Diana Nelson Jones: dnelson@post-gazette.com or 412-263-1626.

First published on June 13, 2011 at 12:00 am
Public hearing on transportation plan set


WAYNESBURG - Highway improvements to the Route 19/21 Morrisville corridor and the Route 21 approach to Masontown Bridge are projects included in the region's proposed new long-range transportation and development plan.

The draft plan of the 2040 Long-Range Transportation and Development Plan will be the subject of a public hearing at 6 p.m. Thursday in Stover Hall at Waynesburg University.

The document, last updated in 2007, addresses long-term transportation and development projects in the 10-county Southwestern Pennsylvania region.

This particular planning document "looks at how development and transportation work together," said Ann Bargerstock of the Greene County planning department.

"You want to be sure economic development projects are being served by transportation and transportation projects are driven by economic development," she said.

The document was prepared by the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, of which the county is a member. SPC is responsible for planning and coordinating transportation, economic and infrastructure development in the 10-county region.

Matt Pavlosky, SPC transportation planner, said the plan update includes fewer new projects, taking into account funding constraints as well as the increased costs of construction.

Projects included are those for which there are foreseeable funding sources, he said. In the last few years, because of costs and funding levels, the focus has shifted to maintenance and safety as opposed to new capacity projects, he said.

The long-range plan primarily focuses on major projects planned during a 25-year span, the years 2015 through 2040.

Projects for years 2011-14 are found in the four-year Transportation Improvement Program, a plan that was reviewed and approved last year and includes projects scheduled for the next four years.

For Greene County, the draft long-range plan calls for improvements to Route 19/21 in Morrisville, Franklin Township, long a bottleneck for traffic entering and exiting Waynesburg.

Part of the project involves expanding the size of the railroad underpass and Freedom Bridge to four lanes. The plan lists $3.4 million available for the project for the years 2011-14 and $22.1 million for the years 2015-22.

An additional $19 million is listed in the plan for the years 2015-22 for other improvements in the corridor.

Another long-range project included in the plan is the reconstruction of Route 21 at Masontown Bridge. The plan includes $6.7 million for the years 2011-14 for the project.
The road project will coincide with the replacement of the Masontown Bridge, a project for which bids will be sought in September. The bridge is in poor condition and carries the primary access road to the east.

The one economic development project cited in the plan for Greene County is the development of a business park at the airport.

Bargerstock said it is important for residents to review the planning documents and attend the hearing.

"This is an opportunity for people to provide input on projects of regional significance in terms of transportation planning and economic development activities," she said.

The plan is available for review on the SPC website at www.spcregion.org. Copyright Observer Publishing Co.