Public Participation Report
Response to Public Comments
May / June 2020

- Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment of the Draft 2021-2024 TIP

- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP

- Amendment to the region’s transportation plan: SmartMoves for a Changing Region

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Two Chatham Center – Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Voice 412.391.5590
Fax 412.391.9160
comments@spcregion.org
www.spcregion.org
# Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission

## 2020

### Officers

**Chairman:** Rich Fitzgerald  
**Vice Chairman:** Tony Amadio  
**Secretary-Treasurer:** Leslie A. Osche  

**Executive Director:** Vincent Valdes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegheny County</th>
<th>Armstrong County</th>
<th>Beaver County</th>
<th>Butler County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Darin Alviano</td>
<td>Tony Amadio</td>
<td>Kevin Boozel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Heckman</td>
<td>Michael Cooley</td>
<td>Daniel Camp</td>
<td>Kim Geyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Levine</td>
<td>Pat Fabian</td>
<td>Kelly Gray</td>
<td>Mark Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J. Macey</td>
<td>Donald K. Myers</td>
<td>Charles Jones</td>
<td>Richard Hadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Miller</td>
<td>Jason L. Renshaw</td>
<td>Jack Manning</td>
<td>Leslie A. Osche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fayette County</th>
<th>Greene County</th>
<th>Indiana County</th>
<th>Lawrence County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Dunn</td>
<td>Mike Belding</td>
<td>Robin Gorman</td>
<td>Morgan Boyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Grata</td>
<td>Rich Cleveland</td>
<td>Sherene Hess</td>
<td>Loretta Spielvogel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Junko</td>
<td>Jeff Marshall</td>
<td>Mark Hilliard</td>
<td>James Gagliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Lohr</td>
<td>Betsy McClure</td>
<td>Mike Keith</td>
<td>Amy McKinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent A. Vicites</td>
<td>Blair Zimmerman</td>
<td>Byron G. Stauffer, Jr.</td>
<td>Daniel J. Vogler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>Westmoreland County</th>
<th>City of Pittsburgh</th>
<th>Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (2 Votes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Maggi</td>
<td>Tom Ceraso</td>
<td>Scott Bricker</td>
<td>Brian Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Putnam</td>
<td>Gina Cortilli</td>
<td>Rev. Ricky Burgess</td>
<td>William Kovach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Sherman</td>
<td>Douglas Chew</td>
<td>William Peduto</td>
<td>Kevin McCullough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Irey Vaughan</td>
<td>Sean Kertes</td>
<td>Mavis Rainey</td>
<td>Cheryl Moon-Sirianni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Wheat</td>
<td>Robert Regola</td>
<td>Aurora Sharrard</td>
<td>Larry Shifflet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor’s Office</th>
<th>Pennsylvania Department of Community &amp; Economic Development</th>
<th>Port Authority of Allegheny County (1 Vote)</th>
<th>Transit Operators Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Walls-Lavelle</td>
<td>Johnna Pro</td>
<td>Katharine Kelleman</td>
<td>Sheila Gombita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Highway Administration*</th>
<th>Federal Transit Administration*</th>
<th>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*</th>
<th>Federal Aviation Administration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Nolan</td>
<td>Theresa Garcia-Crews</td>
<td>Laura Mohollen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nonvoting Members

The preparation of this publication was financed in part through grants from the United States Department of Transportation’s Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration; the U.S. Department of Commerce; the Appalachian Regional Commission; the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; the Department of Transportation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and, the counties of Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Greene, Indiana, Lawrence, Washington, Westmoreland, and the City of Pittsburgh. The views and opinions of the authors or agency expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of these agencies.
Public Participation Report
Response to Public Comments

May / June 2020

- Draft 2021-2024
  Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens
  Assessment of the Draft 2021-2024 TIP

- Air Quality Conformity Determination
  for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP

- Amendment to the region’s transportation plan:
  SmartMoves for a Changing Region
This document is available in alternate formats upon request. SPC will provide translation and interpretation services upon request at no charge. Please call 391-5590.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) hereby gives public notice that it is the policy of the Commission to assure full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. Title VI and other related statutes require that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, sex, national origin, age, or disability, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which SPC receives federal financial assistance. Any person who believes they have been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice by SPC under Title VI has a right to seek remedy through the Title VI Discrimination Complaint Form, please see our website at: www.spcregion.org or call 412-391-5590.
Contents

I. Introduction

II. Organization of Report

Part 1

Summary of Public Comments and the Response to Comments on:

- Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment of the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
- Amendment to the region’s transportation plan: SmartMoves for a Changing Region

Part 2

Written and Electronic Comments

Part 3

Virtual Public Meeting Summaries

Part 4

Documentation of Public Outreach Efforts
May and June 2020

Part 5

I. **Introduction**

This document presents comments received and responses to comments for the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission's (SPC) public comment period from May 11 through June 12, 2020 on the following draft documents:

- Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment of the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
- Amendment to the region’s transportation plan: *SmartMoves for a Changing Region*

A summary of 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 29, 2020 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 draft documents:

- **Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
- **Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment of the Draft 2021-2024 TIP**
- **Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP**
- **Amendment to the region’s transportation plan: SmartMoves for a Changing Region**

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 copies of the written and electronic comments that were received during the May 11 through June 12, 2020 public comment period.
- **Part 2** includes summaries of three Virtual Public meetings that were held during the May 11 through June 12, 2020 public comment period. Also included is a summary of fall 2019 Public Participation Panel meetings held to solicit early input into the Draft TIP.
- **Part 4** includes documentation of the public outreach activities during the May 11 through June 12, 2020 public comment period.
- **Part 5** documents revisions to the Draft 2021-2024 TIP, Air Quality Conformity Determination, Environmental Justice Report, and the SmartMoves Plan Amendment, as a result of the public comment period of May 11 through June 12, 2020.
Part 1

Summary of Public Comments and the Response to Public Comments
### 2021 - 2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

#### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source, Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6th Street Bridge Rehab       | Multimodal Improvements     | Allegheny | Scott Bricker, BikePGH  
The 6th St Bridge currently has protected bike lanes on it. When the bridge closes, it's important that there is an equivalent detour for people riding bikes. The 7th St Bridge would make an appropriate detour. We request that the protected bike lanes are reinstalled in the project as well. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. The dedicated bike lanes on the 6th Street Bridge will be reinstalled after the rehabilitation of the bridge is complete. The detour plan for vehicular traffic, bicyclists and pedestrians is currently in the design stage. Due to widths of the bridge decks, it may not be possible to have a dedicated lane for bicyclists on the 7th or 9th Street bridges. Options are currently being explored to provide the safest detour route for all modes of transportation.

| Allegheny River Green Boulevard | Multimodal Improvements     | Allegheny | Scott Bricker, BikePGH  
BikePGH fully supports this project |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. This project is programmed on the 2021-2024 TIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becks Run Road</td>
<td>Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Scott Bricker, BikePGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is on the City of Pittsburgh Bike Network. It is extremely dangerous for people on bikes as drivers speed frequently here. At minimum, we’d like to see a wider shoulder on the route, especially on the uphill side.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Thank you for your comments. Allegheny County will explore the feasibility of wider shoulders. Due to the terrain and many utility issues this may not be an option. All modes of transportation are being explored and will be evaluated on their feasibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street RR</td>
<td>Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Scott Bricker, BikePGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etna</td>
<td>BikePGH fully supports this project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Thank you for your comments. This project is programmed on the 2021-2024 TIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment Source. Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Charles Anderson Bridge         | Multimodal Improvements    | Allegheny| **Scott Bricker, BikePGH**  
This bridge (and Panther Hollow Rd) are in the plans for connecting the Schenley Drive protected bike lanes to a larger bike network. This bridge should feature safe, comfortable bike lanes when finished and bike access to the Charles Anderson Playground. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with City of Pittsburgh representatives. The City is in the process of evaluating the feasibility of adding bike lanes to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| City of Pittsburgh Bus          | Multimodal Improvements    | Allegheny| **Scott Bricker, BikePGH**  
BikePGH needs to see more details in order to better comment on this project.                                                                                                                                                     |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with City of Pittsburgh representatives.
# TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Healthy Ride Electrified | Multimodal Improvements   | Allegheny  | Scott Bricker, BikePGH  
BikePGH fully supports this project                                                              |
| Interstates         | Parkway West Improvements | Allegheny  | Lodovico Innocenti  
Would love to see a project that widens the parkway west from 2 to 3 lanes to the airport bypass. Also I-79 could significantly benefit from safety improvements and widening. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. This project is programmed on the 2021-2024 TIP.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Allegheny County and PennDOT District 11 representatives. Improvements to I-79 are included in the region's long range plan.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source, Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Ave</td>
<td>Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td><em>Alison Keating</em>&lt;br&gt;Liberty Ave project should not be done with tunnel vision. Without the ability to pass buses, cars will become backed up and may simply choose to take Penn or Smallman, adding traffic to streets not in need of it. We need more data on where people are coming from and where they're going; if we can shift users to Rt 28 or Bigelow, that would go unnoticed, but if they're going to terrorize more of the smaller streets, this project may backfire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with the City of Pittsburgh and PennDOT District 11 representatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Ave</td>
<td>Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td><em>Scott Bricker, BikePGH</em>&lt;br&gt;Better pedestrian facilities should be part of this project as well as a bike lane connection from Herron St Bridge to at least 32nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with City of Pittsburgh representatives. The feasibility of adding bike lanes for the bike connection will be investigated by the City.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| McKees Rocks Bridge Phase 2 | Bridge Improvement  | Allegheny | *Alison Keating*  
McKees Rocks Bridge Phase 2, should include bicycle improvements to the sidewalks, because that's where most people ride, and there's no acknowledgement of that right now. Signage explaining how pedestrians and cyclists can better interact would also help, pedestrians frequently yield to cyclists out of fear, but this is incongruous with other pedestrian rights of the road. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with PennDOT District 11. Safety considerations are at the forefront of all projects. Unfortunately, the existing sidewalk width does not meet minimum requirements for shared use paths. Bicycles are required to yield to pedestrians on sidewalks; not doing so may become an issue of enforcement. The potential for additional signage for this scenario will be investigated by District 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source, Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| McKees Rocks Bridge Phase 2 | Sidewalk Improvements | Allegheny | **Jerrold Green**
I note that Sidewalk Repair is included in the project description, and it is sorely needed, and appreciated. What is not considered, and should be, is how pedestrians are to get from the PA-65 end of the bridge to their jobs, shopping, etc., once they cross the bridge. This bridge connects affordable housing in McKees Rocks with jobs and retail on Rt. 65, but the sidewalk to those businesses in Bellevue is intermittent and what is there is poorly maintained.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Safety considerations are at the forefront of all projects. Maintenance of sidewalks beyond the bridge is the responsibility of the municipality through signed maintenance agreements with PennDOT. Maintenance of the referenced sidewalk appears to be the responsibility of the City of Pittsburgh. This sidewalk is also outside the scope and limits of work for this project, which end at the bridge approach slabs. Your comments will be shared with city officials.
**TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn Ave Resurfacing Phase 2</td>
<td>Road Resurfacing</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Alison Keating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Penn Ave Resurf. Phase 2, this project should learn from the first, please speak to Port Authority about how you can build better bus stops, after the lights, where it's safer to stop and let passengers come and go. The tree pits have been a failure, please set them up for success this time. There must be more done to slow cars, the speeds are untenable; understanding why people are using the street is critical, they could likely be encouraged to drive elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with City of Pittsburgh and PennDOT District 11 representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>Multimodal Improvements</th>
<th>Allegheny</th>
<th>Scott Bricker, BikePGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRT Establish Bus &amp; Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BikePGH fully supports this project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. This project is programmed on the 2021-2024 TIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th><strong>Comment Source.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewickley Bridge Preservation</td>
<td>Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td><strong>Scott Bricker, BikePGH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a popular and necessary route for people on bicycles. We encourage the widest possible shoulders on the bridge, as well as thinking through the transitions and intersections at each end. There was a teenager on a bike killed here several years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Thank you for your comments. Through the PennDOT Connects process, municipalities and cities can work with PennDOT to include active transportation options in transportation projects. Safety considerations are at the forefront of all projects. PennDOT District 11 will take all comments under advisement for possible incorporation into the project if feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Spines (ATCMTD) EF OPS</td>
<td>Adaptive Signals</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td><strong>Scott Bricker, BikePGH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive signals must recognize and accommodate pedestrian movement and minimize ped wait time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Allegheny County, City of Pittsburgh, and PennDOT District 11 representatives. Pedestrian movements and wait time should be considered in properly designed and located adaptive traffic signal projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment Source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 50 in Bridgeville</td>
<td>Road Capacity</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Bob Fryer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposes solutions to congestion and traffic problem on SR50 (Washington Pike) through Bridgeville, Collier, and South Fayette. Requests more funding for studies to solve the congestion and traffic issues and requests more funding for the widening of SR50. Requesting state help in getting Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad company to replace a bridge over SR50 in Bridgeville so that the road can be widened from two lanes to 4 lanes helping to solve congestion issues on SR50. Includes proposed solutions. This comment included a large attachment containing letters and maps regarding SR 50 and the Bridgeville area.

Response: Thank you for your comments. Currently there are a few projects underway in the SR 50 corridor. A public meeting was held in 2018 for the upcoming SR 0050-A28 project. This project involves the additional lanes on SR 0050 by widening the existing bridge, South Fayette Township & Bridgeville Borough, Allegheny County. Also adding additional lanes on SR 3034 (Chartiers Street). New traffic signal, ADA curb ramps. District 11 staff has met with Mr. Fryer multiple times to discuss the project. Bridgeville Borough and South Fayette Township fully support the project and are contributing funds towards it. Current status of the SR 0050-A28 project: Final PS&E package being prepared. Utility relocation plans and agreements are in the process of being finalized. Right-of-way negotiations and acquisitions are also ongoing. Anticipated that a project let in late 2020 or 2021 is possible. Also planned is the SR 50-A32 project which includes the following: Roadway widening for additional lanes and intersection improvement of PA 50/I-79, from Mayer Street to Great Southern Shopping Center and from I-79 to Thom's Run Road in Collier Township, Allegheny County. Bridge plans submitted by Mr. Fryer for the RR structure over SR 50 have recently been reviewed by the District Bridge Engineer and have been taken into advisement. RR involvement and contribution will be necessary for the bridge project to advance.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source, Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| US 19/Banksville Rd      | Adaptive Signal     | Allegheny| **Scott Bricker, BikePGH**  
Adaptive signals must recognize and accommodate pedestrian movement and minimize ped wait time.                                                                                                                                  |
| US 19/Washington Rd (South Hills) Adaptive Signal SR 19 | Adaptive Signal | Allegheny | **Scott Bricker, BikePGH**  
Adaptive signals must recognize and accommodate pedestrian movement and minimize ped wait time.                                                                                                                                  |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Allegheny County and PennDOT District 11 representatives. Pedestrian movements and wait time should be considered in properly designed and located adaptive traffic signal projects.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source, Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td><strong>Chris Sandvig on behalf of Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group</strong>&lt;br&gt;Such projects are eligible uses of existing highway funds and justifiable as congestion mitigation and safety enhancement projects. Particular TIP projects of concern throughout PCRG’s membership footprint include: i. Penn Ave. Resurface Phase 2 from Evaline Street to Graham Street in City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; ii. Reconstruction of 1,000 feet of roadway on SR 837 starting at Smithfield Street then mill and overlay on SR 837, East Carson and West Carson Street starting at Smithfield Street to Saw Mill Run Boulevard in City of Pittsburgh; iii. Intersection and signal improvements region-wide; iv. Design and Construction of an Adaptive Traffic Signal System along SR 51, Clairton Boulevard, from Peters Creek Road to Provost Road in the City of Pittsburgh, Baldwin, Brentwood, Jefferson, Pleasant Hills and Whitehall Boroughs, all within Allegheny County; v. New traffic signals, pedestrian accommodations and equipment, new signing and pavement markings on Liberty Avenue from Grant Street to Herron Avenue in the City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County; vi. Design and Construction of a Traffic Adaptive Signal System along SR 1001 - Freeport Road from 8th Street in Sharpsburg to Powers Run Road in O’Hara Township, Allegheny County; vii. Parkway East Active Traffic Management study for the Interstate 376 East corridor (see more detail below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. The TIP lists 93 roadway and bridge projects ($524 million) located on current public transit routes. In addition, there are 16 new CMAQ funded projects ($40.9 million) in the TIP estimated to reduce vehicle trips by 2,344 trips per day and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 13,327 miles per day, primarily through expansion of the region’s active transportation network, enhancements to public transit service and traffic signal system upgrades. SPC and its planning partners understand that Transit Signal Priority (TSP) could be beneficial on many corridors in our region. Transit signal priority is planned as part of the Downtown-Oakland BRT. Planning partners are considering implementation of TSP in some signal upgrade projects such as State Route 51 in the South Hills (which was recommended by an SPC study). As funding becomes available, further studies of TSP implementation will be planned and coordinated with planning partners and municipal traffic signal owners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Various Projects   | Public Transit Improvements | Allegheny    | *Pittsburghers for Public Transit (PPT)*

We applaud the SPC’s thoughtful and comprehensive approach to identifying priority transportation projects for funding in the TIP. We just have a few comments to add.

1. The SPC and legislators of the ten county region need to identify a sustainable state transit funding stream in advance of any moves to discharge the Turnpike transit obligation. All efforts should be made to remove the state police from illegitimately siphoning hundreds of millions of dollars from the Motor License Fund, and that should be evaluated as a possible short-term replacement for transit funding shortfalls. Moreover, the SPC and legislators should identify additional opportunities for local source funding including the possibility of a ride-hailing tax, corporate income tax or commensurate fee on our major, untaxed non-profits in our region.

2. PPT requests that feasibility and engineering studies be considered for the TIP of the priority BRT corridors that riders identified through our Beyond the East Busway planning effort. The planning effort, done using a participatory planning tool generated by CivicMapper and concluding with a report by EvolveEA, calls for BRT Extensions of the East Busway to Monroeville and the extension of the 61C BRT to McKeesport. The BRT extensions of the East Busway to Monroeville that should be prioritized involve adding a slip-ramp from 376 in Edgewood to access the busway and BRT shoulder lanes on 376, as well as on-street transit improvements through Rankin, Braddock and East Pittsburgh and terminating at Forbes Hospital. Two reports on this proposal are forthcoming for the SPC and for regional legislators.

3. Ensure that funding allocation in the TIP properly reflects the emphasis around transit, bike and pedestrian mode-shift highlighted in the SPC’s Smart Moves plan.

4. We are concerned with the emphasis around e-mobility (including e-scooters and ride-hailing) for first-last mile connections with the proposed mobility hubs. These modes are cost-prohibitive for a lot of transit users, are not accessible for riders with disabilities, and make revenue off of monetizing users' mobility data without consent. We strongly emphasize the importance of having prioritized sidewalk, lighting, and shelter investments at and around transit. Thank you for your consideration.
Response: Thank you for your comments. SPC and its members are actively communicating the urgency of finding a sustainable revenue stream for public transportation funding with our delegation. Multiple SPC Commissioners and executive leadership were active in the Southwest Partnership for Mobility Advisory Council and in developing the Southwest Partnership for Mobility Report that identifies a vision for future mobility in southwestern Pennsylvania that is supported by a range of stable and viable funding options for public transportation. An extension of the Martin Luther King Jr. East Busway to Monroeville is included in the vision set forth in SmartMoves for a Changing Region. Additionally, there is funding programmed for the Parkway East Corridor Transportation Network between Downtown and Monroeville. Taken together, these represent the potential for specific project development and service planning to address the need for improvements like those cited in the comment. Also, it should be noted that SPC recognizes the importance of the planning effort cited in the comment as well as the significance of the results of that effort.
## TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Various Projects| Transit funding and projects         | Allegheny | Chris Sandvig on behalf of Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group  
More resources must be allocated to transit if this region is to remain competitive in the attraction of youth, talent, and investment, let alone become more competitive or equitable. We support the recommendations of the Southwestern PA Partnership for Mobility’s recommendations to allow local jurisdictions to raise funds for such priorities. We are pleased to see that many highway projects are cross-referenced as transit projects on SPC’s TIP story board. However, we stress that enhancing transit access and accessibility and attracting riders - not simply make it easier to operate a vehicle - be the expectation of these projects. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. SPC and its partners will continue to consider the enhancement of transit accessibility in the planning and programming of the region’s TIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td><em>Chris Sandvig on behalf of Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parkway East Active Traffic Management Study must include transit. In 2014, PCRG commented on the Parkway East Mobility Study – Plan and Potential Construction, that was on the 2015-18 TIP. There is little in the current iteration of study of the Parkway East corridor description to suggest that our comments have been heard. Worse, the sentiment of the communities already adversely impacted by the Parkway seem to have been lost. PennDOT’s own 2013/14 engagement, in response to community backlash against ramp metering, revealed a very strong preference that transit expansion be part of the solution to Parkway East congestion mitigation. Yet the current iteration of this study makes no mention of transit is even made in the description of the project. PCRG and its members believe that shoulder, arterial BRT from the Edewood Ave./E. Busway overpass through Monroeville is a viable, cost-effective rapid transit expansion that could pay dividends for traffic mitigation and economic development. Not even considering this is a glaring omission. It does not fall on Port Authority’s shoulders, alone, to explore transit opportunities like this; as the administrator of public transportation funding and programming in the state, and as with ped/bike, PennDOT must do more to advance and incorporate transit into projects – especially in a time of increasingly constrained resources. These projects are not mutually exclusive, nor do their costs need to be additive. Hence, our 2014 comments, in full below, still hold true today: As a representative of community groups serving over a half-million residents within the economic core of the region, we encourage SPC and PennDOT to explore and support multi-modal transportation enhancements throughout this corridor. Mainline improvements must not come at the expense of communities within this core. As such, each improvement should be scrutinized to determine whether it supports traffic reduction and encourages mode shift to transit and pedestrian/bicycle utilization safety within these neighborhoods. Those that do not support quality of life in neighborhoods near I-376 or achieve a modal shift away from the private automobile should not be supported. We urge SPC and PennDOT to support corridor enhancements that will...
increase transit ridership as a primary form of transportation in the I-376 corridor. This would include capital investments in premium transit enhancement and expansion into eastern Allegheny County.

Response: Thank you for your comments. The study portion of the Parkway East Corridor Traffic Management project has been completed. At the conclusion of the study, District 11 presented the findings to public officials and stakeholders on September 28, 2017. There was consensus on the Active Traffic Management project, which is the work that is currently advancing on the 2021 Draft TIP, as well as several others that have are planned pending funding availability, i.e., Bates Street on Ramp extension, Squirrel Hill Interchange improvements. The initial project that was selected from the study, supported by the stakeholders and elected officials, is the current Parkway East Active Traffic Management project. The Parkway East Active Traffic Management System (PE ATMS) is an intelligent transportation system (ITS) improvement intended to improve traffic safety and operations on portions of I-376 in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. The limits of the project are between the Grant Street interchange (MP 70.5) and the eastern terminus of I-376 at the Pennsylvania Turnpike and US 22 (MP 84.5). All comments will be taken under advisement. An extension of the East Busway to Monroeville is included in the Vision set forth in SmartMoves for a Changing Region and the Port Authority of Allegheny County is currently developing a long-range plan. Additionally, there is funding programmed for the Parkway East Corridor Transportation Network for I-376 between Downtown Pittsburgh and Monroeville. SPC recognizes the need for Integrated Corridor Management and coordination between the Parkway East and any potential expansion of public transit service in this critical link to and from the urban core of the region. As such, SPC will continue to work collaboratively with PAAC and PennDOT District 11 as these initiatives advance into the project development process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Anonymous&lt;br&gt;Please do not expand any existing roadways, or add any additional lane miles. Please reduce lane counts, lane widths and road size in general moving forward. Please partner with other organizations to change land use policies to discourage more suburban sprawl and refocus on existing built areas and roadways. Please partner with other organizations to encourage use of non-single-occupant vehicles in all possible instances through all possible incentive and design elements. Please shift from a &quot;get them there as fast as possible&quot; mentality to a mentality of ensuring that system users have basic access to the places they need to go. Let's put live, work and play closer together. Let's take funding away from any highway expansion effort and redirect it to transit or mixed use development or walk/bike support or any other better idea. Please also advocate at the federal level for vehicle manufacturers to stop marketing vehicles that are safe for those inside them, but increasingly deadly for anyone around them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Allegheny County and PennDOT District 11 representatives.
# TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Various Projects      | Transit             | Allegheny| *Chris Sandvig on behalf of Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group* Making sure road projects are transit projects We are pleased to see that many highway projects are cross-referenced as transit projects on SPC’s TIP story board. However, we stress that enhancing transit access and accessibility and attracting riders - not simply make it easier to operate a vehicle - be the expectation of these projects. This would include, but is not limited to: 1) Ensuring that any ITS traffic signal upgrades include transit signal priority (TSP) transponders at purchase or that transponders be easily installed at a future date; 2) Including ADA-compliant crosswalks, signalization, signage, and sidewalks along any improved roadway throughout the network that is not a limited-access highway; 3) Accommodating safe bicycle connections to transit, especially along commuter/express bus corridors, high-ridership lines, and fixed-guideways; 4) Incorporating “superstops” along commuter corridors with express/commuter bus service, and bus shelters in other locations, into the budget and design of any highway betterment project. Projects should also include pedestrian amenities to safely access these stops. 5) Planning and engineering for future shoulder and commercial corridor bus rapid transit (BRT) on the major arteries of the region, starting with the Parkway East/Business 22, SR837/Rankin Bridge from McKeesport to the E. Busway terminus, and SR885/Second Ave./Irvine Street starting in W. Homestead (SR885/Second Avenue Corridor Study, 12-23-19) 6) Complying with Pittsburgh’s Complete Streets ordinance within the city boundaries and applying Complete Streets approach to any roadway improvement, especially in dense population/commercial centers such as the City of Pittsburgh, Washington city, McKeesport, Swissvale, and other urban-form communities; 7) Clear, easily understood signage throughout the road network which alerts and directs potential transit riders to park-and-ride locations and stations. This would include, as an example, signage on the Parkway West directing people to the Carnegie West Busway station.
Response: Thank you for your comments. The integration of investments in highway network and transit system improvements in the FY2021-2024 TIP represents the implementation of the primary goals and vision of the region’s long range plan: SmartMoves. To that end significant investments are made in safety and operations, as well as improvements that foster connectivity in communities and corridors throughout the region, and provide sustainable, multimodal transportation choices. The TIP lists 93 roadway and bridge projects ($524 million) located on current public transit routes. In addition, there are 16 new CMAQ funded projects ($40.9 million) in the TIP estimated to reduce vehicle trips by 2,344 trips per day and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 13,327 miles per day, primarily through expansion of the region’s active transportation network, enhancements to public transit service and traffic signal system upgrades. SPC and its planning partners understand that Transit Signal Priority (TSP) could be beneficial on many corridors in our region. Transit signal priority is planned as part of the Downtown-Oakland BRT. Planning partners are considering implementation of TSP in some signal upgrade projects such as State Route 51 in the South Hills (which was recommended by an SPC study). As funding becomes available, further studies of TSP implementation will be planned and coordinated with planning partners and municipal traffic signal owners. In addition, two implementation planning projects resulting from priority descriptions in SmartMoves—SmartMoves Connections: A Vision for Regional Transit, and the Corridors of Regional Significance Master Plan, are designed to further corridor-level planning and integrated multimodal project development. Both planning projects are designed to continue to deliver multimodal solutions like transit hubs, expansion of exclusive transit facilities, complete streets-type applications, infrastructure where applicable, and multimodal approaches to access and signage.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Chris Sandvig on behalf of Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Funding We fully understand the challenges to transit funding in Pennsylvania even before COVID-19 stripped the highway system of its primary revenue sources. However, more resources must be allocated to transit if this region is to remain competitive in the attraction of youth, talent, and investment, let alone become more competitive or equitable. This even more necessary in the realities of a COVID-19 world. PCRG and its members cannot stress strongly enough the need to go beyond maintaining existing service to expand transit - including rapid transit - in this and future TIPs. We support the recommendations of the Southwestern PA Partnership for Mobility’s recommendations to allow local jurisdictions to raise funds for such priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. The financial plan for transit investment contained in the FY2021-2024 TIP shows a $2.2 billion investment in transit capital projects and continuing maintenance and operations of the region’s transit system. This level of investment is predicated on continued regional transit investment from federal sources and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, utilizing both existing revenue mechanisms as well as the potential creation of additional revenue mechanisms such as local funding sources. Expansion of service offerings and capital expenditures will be dependent on allocation of additional resources.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Various Projects      | Allegheny| *Chris Sandvig on behalf of Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group*  
The Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, a membership-based coalition of over 50 community and economic development corporations and neighborhood-based groups within southwestern Pennsylvania’s urban core – serving a regional population in excess of 600,000 – respectfully submits the following comments on the 2021-24 TIP. PCRG and its members believe that transportation investments within our region should follow the spirit and intent of the SmartMoves For a Changing Region long-range transportation plan – meaning: investments must minimize the consumption of unpopulated land; concentrate and increase 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. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments and notes regarding the SmartMoves for a Changing Region long range plan.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. The safety performance target values are sometimes higher than the baseline values primarily because of the method used to calculate targets. Targets are calculated and stated as five year rolling averages. A reduction target is applied to the most recent actual crash data year (year 5) to obtain a projected year 6 target. Then the year 6 target is used to project the new 5 year rolling average utilizing Years 2 through 6. If actual Year 1 crash data is low (good), then eliminating Year 1 in the new projection could lead to higher target values than baseline even with an applied reduction target. In addition, with regard to the most recent target setting, starting in 2016, in accordance with federal guidelines, there was a definition change that affected how we count injuries. This conversion resulted in the counting of many more "suspected serious injuries" than we had previously counted as "major injuries". This also resulted in targets that were higher than baseline despite a reduction being applied.
Various Projects  Adaptive Signals  Allegheny  

Response:  Thank you for your comments. The region’s traffic signals are generally owned and maintained by local governments. Statewide programs, such as the Automated Red Light Enforcement Program and the Green Light Go Program, as well as regional programs such as SPC’s Regional Traffic Signal Program and CMAQ Program can all be utilized to fund traffic signal infrastructure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the TIP talks about active transportation and improving accessibility for all including low income, there doesn't seem to be much in the way of prioritizing active transportation shown on the map or in the city. A potential project could be a planning study to explore how to extend the exiting trail system to serve more of the city. With reduced capacity of transit, additional options for non-vehicular travel is needed. It should not be mandatory to own a personal vehicle to traverse the city. Safe and convenient active transportation options must exist. Examples include extending the Eliza furnace trail at least to Regent Square, building the Allegheny green boulevard and connections into the neighborhoods, creating a trail from the South Hills into downtown. Active transportation meets many goals of the TIP such as benefits to quality of life and reduction in climate change. The funding available to it should be commensurate. The increase in interstate funding at the detriment to other projects is unfortunate. Is there no way to find creative solutions to trim budgets and maintain funding to other also critical projects.

Response: Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County and PennDOT District 11 representatives.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Seems like many projects are concentrated in Beaver county.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Beaver County and PennDOT District 11 representatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Various Projects     | Roadway Funding     | Allegheny | Douglas Smith  
My comments are not project specific. The PTC’s program cutting is necessary and reflective of actual traffic - I feel as thought FHWA forcing PA to put additional money into the Interstate system in PA at this time is misguided. With funding already down, and the Coronavirus driving revenue much lower, the real NEED is on the non-Interstate roads and bridges. Add to this that Act 89 funds are basically expired and the FAST act expires end of 2020 an there is real URGENCY to re-direct those finds to state and local roads. If the Federal Government wants extra investing in Interstates, they can find a way to add revenue.  

Response:  
Thank you for your comments. The redirection of additional federal NHPP funds toward the Interstate Highway System is a direct result of the federal Performance Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) initiative introduced in MAP-21 and further defined in the FAST Act. PBPP requires states to set targets across many areas including the condition of roads and bridges on the NHS Network, which includes the Interstate System. The Interstate System is critical to the movement of people and goods across the Commonwealth and beyond. In fact, the Interstate System carries approximately 27% of the Commonwealth’s vehicle miles traveled while only accounting for about 6% of the state owned roadway miles. If the system is left to fall into a state of disrepair, the Commonwealth risks being further restricted in the way it invests its federal transportation funds. SPC also recognizes the impact that the redirection of regional funding to the Interstate System will have on other lower level state-owned roads, which are critical to the region, its economy and mobility. SPC is continuously working with our City of Pittsburgh and county partners along with PennDOT to maximize the funding we are currently receiving to ensure critical regional roads are maintained adequately and safely for all users.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Various Projects | Pittsburgh Beltway       | Allegheny | *Joseph A. Schuster*  
I am a 69 year old lifetime resident of Allegheny County, and with all of the transportation proposals and projects that have been proposed through the years, I cannot recall anyone proposing the idea of the construction of a beltway around the Southwestern Pennsylvania region. Simply look at Columbus, Ohio, and you'll quickly see that in Columbus, you can get from here to there in approximately twenty minutes, using their beltway. It's a fine road, invaluable to their region. It just makes sense. Why this region hasn't taken a long hard look at this project for this area is beyond me. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission is currently in the process of implementing two major projects - the Southern Beltway (Section from Route 22 to I-79) scheduled to be complete in 2021; and the completion of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from Route 51 to the Parkway East, scheduled to be completed in 2034. These two projects, along with a planned future project that will complete the Southern Beltway, connecting I-79 to the Mon-Fayette Expressway, would essentially complete a “beltway” around Pittsburgh utilizing the aforementioned roads along with I-76 - the Pennsylvania Turnpike. |

| Project          | Project Description       | County    | Comment Source.  
 |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| West Ohio St/Ridge Ave Bridges. | Multimodal Improvements | Allegheny | *Scott Bricker, BikePGH*  
West Ohio St is part of the bike network and connects to bike lanes. Please be sure bike lanes are included in the project |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with City of Pittsburgh representatives. The current project scope includes bike lanes on this project.
## TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source, Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cranberry North</td>
<td>Road Resurfacing of Rt. 19</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>This project description is incorrect, the project starts at the Allegheny County Line and continues north to Zelienople. I support this project starting at the County line and going North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 228/UPMC Enhancements</td>
<td>Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>This is also an outdated description. The other missing project is Freedom Road from Commonwealth Drive to Haine School Road, which is a US Department of Transportation BUILD grant funded project, with local funds from Cranberry Township and Butler County. I support the updated description of the Rt. 228 project as well as the non-listed Freedom Road BUILD project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with PennDOT District 10 (sponsor of the project). PennDOT District 10 will review project description. If changes are made in the project description, it will be reflected in the final version of the 2021 TIP.
## TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 3021 Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Jerry Andree</td>
<td>The description is incorrect. The correct description is north from Rt. 228 to the intersection of Peters Road. I support this corrected description.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with PennDOT District 10 (sponsor of the project). PennDOT District 10 will review project description. If changes are made in the project description, it will be reflected in the final version of the 2021 TIP.

| Local Bridges | Bridge Improvements | Fayette | Tracy Zivkovich, Brownsville Borough Council President | We were notified by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation that two of our bridges are in serious condition due to structural deficiencies, and that they need to be addressed as soon as possible. The first is the Charles Street bridge, and the second is the Brownsville Avenue bridge. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with the county and PennDOT District 12-0 representatives and will be retained as input into the 2023 TIP update.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source, Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 982 Intersection</td>
<td>Roadway Safety</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td><strong>Bullskin Township Volunteer Fire Company</strong> Resolve unsafe conditions at intersections along SR 982 in Bullskin Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. This issue has been referred to the PennDOT District 12-0 traffic unit for their review. If the decision is made to install any devices, the municipality will need to sign a maintenance agreement and will be responsible for the overall maintenance of the device including the costs of maintaining.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 982 Intersection</td>
<td>Roadway Safety</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td><strong>Fayette County Commissioners</strong> Resolve unsafe conditions at intersections along SR 982 in Bullskin Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. This issue has been referred to the PennDOT District 12-0 traffic unit for their review. If the decision is made to install any devices, the municipality will need to sign a maintenance agreement and will be responsible for the overall maintenance of the device including the costs of maintaining.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>422 Interchange</td>
<td>Cyclist/Pedestrians safety</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Laurie Lafontaine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PA 286:us 422 Interchange East**
This project will incorporate bike/ped accommodations. Potential intersections were not identified concerning safety for cyclist and pedestrians. MPMS #25752 Claypool Hts. Bridge-Include accommodation on bridge for future bike/ped use. MPMS#100122 SR 4005 PA 954 to Oakland Ave. Narrative does not match what is shown on map. In either of those scenarios there is opportunity to provide bike lane on the existing shoulder in either case. This would provide logical connections to existing and planned bike/ped facilities. Indiana County has an Active Transportation Committee. Please include this committee when seeking information or comments.

**Response:**
Thank you for your comments. Prior to the public meeting the mapping was fixed to accurately depict the project. Through the PennDOT Connects process, municipalities and cities can work with PennDOT to include active transportation options in transportation projects. Under the current project scope, the Claypool Heights bridge structure will be widened to accommodate 8-foot shoulders to accommodate passage by other modes. The current project scope on the SR 4005 project is the resurfacing of the existing roadway and shoulder template to preserve the pavement surface with no additional pavement width.
SR 4005 Corridor Improvement

Multimodal Improvements

Indiana

Jeffrey Grim

On a quick review, project MPMS #100122’s description does not match the map. The description: along SR 4005 (Indian Springs Road) from PA 954 to PA 286 (Philadelphia St) On the map it is showing SR 954 from SR 4005 (Indian Springs Road) to the Indiana Borough/White Township line and from Philadelphia Street to SR 110. Either corridor undergoing a resurfacing project would benefit from wide shoulders for bicyclists. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Response:

Thank you for your comments. Prior to the public meeting the mapping was fixed to accurately depict the project. Through the PennDOT Connects process, municipalities and cities can work with PennDOT to include active transportation options in transportation projects. The current project scope is the resurfacing of the existing roadway and shoulder template to preserve the pavement surface with no additional pavement width.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Route 65 Bridge Improvement | Intersection Improvements | Lawrence | *Linda D Nitch*  
Lawrence County TIP regarding E Washington Street New Castle PA 16101 Route 65 bridge improvement. With the improvements planned for the E Washington Bridge in New Castle is there any way that the 108 (Croton Ave)/65 (E Washington St) intersection be included in the project? The intersection is very dangerous and the turning radius for the tractor trailer trucks is really difficult. I would think it wise to improve this area all at once. Also, creating an aligned intersection with Court Street and Countyline crossing over 65 would allow truckers the flexibility of better vision and access onto 65. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Lawrence County and PennDOT representatives. This project is scheduled to start design in the near future. Your comments will be maintained and reviewed for incorporation into project if possible. Also, during the PennDOT Connects process working with the municipalities and community these areas will be reviewed.

| Bebout Road/East McMurray Road intersection | Congestion and safety improvements | Washington | *Paul F. Lauer, Peters Twp Manager*  
Supports proposed turning lanes and new traffic signal |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. This project is programmed on the 2021-2024 TIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| US 19 Corridor Signal Upgrade | Adaptive Signals    | Washington | **Paul F. Lauer, Peters Twp Manager**  
As a community in northern Washington County, the Township would like to express its support for the U.S. 19 Corridor Signal Upgrade (Project #107432), which is allotted $3 million for construction in 2024. U.S. Route 19 is the primary arterial in northern Washington County, and serves as a major commercial corridor for our communities as well. This route is heavily signalized, especially in Peters Township which is home to ten (10) signal systems. Since any improvements to mobility along U.S. Route 19 must logically involve signal upgrades, and adaptive signal systems have proven to be successful in alleviating congested arterials throughout the Commonwealth, this project is vital to residents and businesses in northern Washington County. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. This project is programmed on the 2021-2024 TIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valleybrook/Bebout Road Intersection</td>
<td>Congestion and safety improvements</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Two other projects within the Township will help to address congestion and improve safety for Township residents. For the past two years, the Township has been working collaboratively with PennDOT District 12-0 and its consultants to advance the Valleybrook/Bebout Road Intersection (Project #109242) and the Bebout Road/East McMurray Road Intersection (Project #109025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Transit route improvements</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>I wish to alert planners that several of the Washington County Projects are on roadways used by Freedom Transit fixed route public transit and hope that will be factored into the planning for the affected projects. Specifically those projects include: #4, Signal improvements in the City of Washington at multiple intersections; Project #5, US 19 Corridor Signal Upgrade; #16, Bebout Rd/E McMurray Rd intersection improvements; #17, roundabout at Valleybrook/Bebout Rd intersection; #20, bridge replacement on South Main St in City of Washington; and #29 bridge project in McDonald Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. This project is programmed on the 2021-2024 TIP.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Washington County and PennDOT District 12-0 representatives.
# TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venetia Road (SR 1006) and Bebout Road (SR 1010)</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Paul F. Lauer, Peters Twp Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, we would like to request that funding be allocated to perform Preliminary Engineering on an upgrade to the intersection of Venetia Road (SR 1006) and Bebout Road (SR 1010). This intersection is functionally deficient and meets the warrants to justify signalization. The Peters Township Transportation Improvement Fee Capital Plan identifies the culvert replacement, road widening, and signal installation at this intersection as a project in excess of $5 million. The Township is prepared to earmark a portion of its own Transportation Improvement Fee Program funds toward improving this intersection. The Township has a proven history of financially assisting PennDOT District 12-0 highway improvement projects.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with the county and PennDOT District 12-0 representatives and will be retained as input into the 2023 TIP update.
### TIP Public Comment Period Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I-70/SR201    | Congestion and safety improvements    | Westmoreland  | **Rostraver Board of Commissioners**  
I-70/SR201: This corridor continues to increase in traffic congestion and will continue to grow since SR 201 is the regional commercial hub of the Mon Valley. On a daily basis during rush hour, traffic backs up onto I-70 as motorists are trying to exit onto SR 201. The backup on I-70 gets so bad during the holiday season that PennDOT annually installs temporary signage along I-70 to alert traffic of stopped vehicles trying to exit on to SR 201. Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled regional commercial corridor to improve operations, safety, and capacity. There are two areas along SR 201, that Rostraver Township has been presenting and pleading for funding: the intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and the I-70 eastbound ramp, and the intersection of SR 201 and SR1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas). Enclosed please find a timeline and supporting documentation to further explain the history of pleading for improvements for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor since 2005. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with county and PennDOT District 12-0 representatives and the Statewide Interstate Steering Committee, which is responsible for developing the Statewide Interstate TIP. This comment will be retained as input into the 2023 TIP update. As part of the "Arnold City Interchange" project, which is currently in Final Design, the District will be reconstructing the existing interchange and incorporating innovative techniques and technology to help alleviate traffic from the PA 201 interchange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pricedale Pedestrian Br | Bridge Improvement          | Westmoreland | *Rostraver Board of Commissioners*
|                      |                               |            | The Pricedale Pedestrian Bridge provides access to the residents over I-70 to walkover the interstate to get their mail since only PO boxes are used in Pricedale. The demographics for these residents consist of a racial minority and low income, and they desperately relay on this pedestrian bridge for access over I-70. Enclosed are photos from Penn DOT on this pedestrian bridge, showing the need for safety improvements. In closing, thank you for your time and consideration for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor (intersection of SR 1099/3013 and the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033), the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection and Pricedale Pedestrian Bridge improvements to be considered proposed amendments to the 2021-2024 TIP. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with county and PennDOT District 12-0 representatives and will be retained as input into the 2023 TIP update. The District and county have had discussions on the Pedestrian Bridge. Ideas are currently being discussed internally to determine the most cost effective and context sensitive solution and factoring in the need for the residents to have a safe and practical way to get to the post office. The District will be in contact in the near future to discuss this further.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottdale/Smithton Active</td>
<td>Cyclist/Pedestrains</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>John Turack, Executive Director, Smart Growth Partnership Westmoreland County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To whom it may concern: Please follow the outcomes from this project (Scottdale/Smithton Active Transportation Plan) for inclusion in current and future SPC TIP’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank You for your comments. Your comments will be shared with county and PennDOT District 12-0 representatives. SPC encourages community active transportation planning like the one for Smithton/Scottdale that was provided by the commenter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SR 201/SR 51 | Congestion and safety improvements | Westmoreland    | **Rostraver Board of Commissioners**  
SR 201/SR 51: With the closing of southbound traffic at Vernon Drive and SR 51, the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection has become increasingly busy. Traffic coming out of Vernon Drive cannot make a left turn onto SR 51 southbound, now all that traffic is directed onto SR 201 to access the SR 51 southbound ramp. McTish-Kunkle and Associates prepared an Intersection Improvement Traffic Alternative Analysis for the intersection of SR 201 (Rostraver Road), Circle Drive, and SR 51 southbound on-ramps. The report used 2015 average daily traffic numbers and collected manual turning movement counts on March 16, 2016. After that time, Rostraver Township granted approval for a subdivision, Marian Woodlands, consisting of 130 single family lots off SR 201. Phase I is almost built out and Phase II and III of that development are under construction and increasing the traffic along SR 201 and the SR 51 ramps. In addition, an additional residential development is in the preliminary stages at the Willowbrook Golf Course to consist of 171 dwelling units. Rostraver Township would like to see operational and safety improvements made to this intersection as suggested by McTish Kunkle and Associates on behalf of Penn DOT. Enclosed please find a timeline and supporting documentation for improvements for the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection. |

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. A study was completed in 2016/2017. At that point an alternatives analysis was developed. The District continues to keep this project on our Long Range Plan with the plan to eventually have a project, but due to funding constraints the Preliminary Engineering Phase has not been advanced. Please note that the developer is responsible for a Traffic Impact Study and to mitigate for any increased travel in this area determined as a result of the development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source. Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Public Transportation Improvements</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td><em>Pete Blancia</em>&lt;br&gt;You really need to improve public transportation available in the Vandergrift area. There is currently NO available public transportation from Vandergrift to Pittsburgh. None. This is really deplorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Westmoreland County Transit Authority representatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Westmoreland county to Pittsburgh improvements</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td><em>Scott Maritz</em>&lt;br&gt;Still no good plan or investment for making it better, safer, easier to get from Westmoreland into PGH. This hurts this side of PGH and the squirrel hill tunnel needs to be looked at for secondary routes or ways to help give alternate options to traffic patterns from the East into the City and/or to the Airport. Lots of investment is going into the airport and will be an asset but this needs better access around Pittsburgh versus through it. I feel someone needs to globally look at this versus county by county plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Allegheny and Westmoreland Counties and PennDOT representatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment Source. Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Westmoreland county multimodal</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Chad Amond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Westmoreland County Transportation in Westmoreland is generally defined by the County’s roadway network, particularly major traffic corridors like interstate 70, Interstate 76, US Route 30, and US Route 22. Public transit within the County is limited and faces decreasing ridership. Many areas of Westmoreland are accessible exclusively by automobile, placing greater stress on existing infrastructure. Further, despite an opportune regional position and high demand from County residents, transit options to Pittsburgh and other major destinations are minimal. Westmoreland County Strategies for the Comprehensive Plan of the County The following strategies are intended to help implement the Core Objective. Each is accompanied by specific action steps that ensure the objective can be appropriately achieved and monitored throughout the life of the Plan. 1. Enhance Transit, Increase Ridership, &amp; Promote Transit Oriented Development 2. Create Mobility Plans 3. Increase Walkability &amp; Biking Options 4. Increase Flight Options 5. Improve Passenger Rail Service 6. Augment Ridesharing Options 7. Focus on Freight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with Westmoreland County and PennDOT District 12-0 representatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various Projects</td>
<td>Bridge Improvements</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Vaughn W. Neill, P.E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Whom It May Concern: Westmoreland County Public Works maintains a legacy road system of 52 miles of roads and 33 bridges (8 foot span minimum) throughout the County. There are currently 3 projects with Federal Funds in process. The County is interested in being able to use the Act 13 Marcellus related bridge funding to be able to undertake more repair projects. Please see below for 10 structures we would like to be considered for inclusion in the 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The 6 bridges over 20 feet were identified in recent NBIS inspections as being poor or fair and include recommendations for repair and retrofit. The 4 bridges under 20 feet were inspected in 2019 and are all candidate for replacement due to age and condition. Thank you for your consideration.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. The referenced Westmoreland County bridge projects that are funded with 100% local Act 13 funds will be noted in the appendix of the final TIP and added to the 2021 TIP through a TIP modification in October 2020 for tracking purposes.
Part 2

Written and Electronic Comments
Andy Warple, AICP, Director - Transportation Planning
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Two Chatham Center - Suite 400
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-3451

Dear Mr. Warple,

As a member of the Transportation Technical Committee from Fayette County as well as other committees such as CMAQ, ARC, Smart Transportation, TAP and PPP, we consider the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission to be a valuable resource to Fayette County and our region with respect to transportation interests. Transportation (Transit, Highway/Bridge, Airport, Freight/Rail, Bike-Pedestrian etc.) are all areas in which SPC interconnects state organizations, counties and major players (planners, consultants, and engineers) in order to achieve commonsense results to an extremely complex funding structure. We advocate the 2021 - 2024 TIP plan including the region’s priority roadway, transit and multimodal transportation improvements programmed for advancement over the next four (4) years, Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment, Air Quality Conformity Determination, and Amendment to the region’s transportation plan SmartMoves for a Changing Region to reflect updated revenue projections and a revised project list including project phasing and cost information. We look forward to continuing to work with SPC and other participating counties to advance regional projects.

The county is attentive to preserving, promoting and developing the tourism and hospitality industries by capitalizing on historic, cultural, recreational and ecological assets. The Fayette County Commissioners have placed a priority on business development with a focus on existing business retention and expansion, and, in the fall of 2019, the county completed an updated countywide comprehensive plan. In partnership with PennDOT District 12, the county has diverse projects on the Transportation Improvement Plan and Long-Range Plan. Maintenance of the existing transportation system is very important. Parallel to SPC and PennDOT, the county’s transportation and development approach establishes a priority on safe and secure multimodal and intermodal network for both people and goods. For example, in Fayette, we have been working tirelessly to complete construction of the Sheepskin Trail network that not only connects to the Great Allegheny Passage, but also links to the Mon-River Trail in West Virginia. Another essential project to Fayette County is extending the runway at the Joseph A. Hardy Connellsville Airport, accommodating business jet aircraft. In order to accommodate the design
aircraft, the main Runway 5-23 will need to be extended to a total length of 5,000 feet. A preliminary cost estimate has been developed with a total project cost of approximately $40 million dollars. Another important project to the commissioners is that of safety improvement at the intersection of US Route 119 and US Route 40 (National Road Heritage Corridor) in Uniontown adjacent to the Uniontown Mall and St. Mt. Macrina. Keep in mind that U.S. Route 119 corridor is vital to the Fayette County’s economy. The impacted townships are South Union and North Union Townships. With respect to Saint Mount Macrina, the commissioners are planning to develop this site (medical offices) which will likely necessitate adaptation of both egress and ingress along Route 40. The commissioners would like to see Route 21 widened for safety concerns, for in recent years there has been an increase in the average daily traffic, as well as in accidents. Also, the commissioners have an interest in improving the Route 51 corridor between Uniontown and Rostraver Township. For there is significant development opportunities with industrial parks and business parks along this section of highway. Furthermore, Perryopolis Parks and Recreation Authority maintains an historical site, Washinton’s Grist Mill and aspires to develop a trail to connect to the Great Allegheny Passage.

Other key projects for Fayette County are as follows: McClure Road Intersection and Kingview Road Intersection, US Route 119 Reconstruction: Uniontown to Penn State & Connellsville to Kingview, US 40 / PA 381 Intersection (Wharton Township), PA 711 Crawford Avenue Bridge (City of Connellsville), Bruceton Mills Road T-311 (Markleysburg Borough), and PA 21 (German Township). With respect to county owned bridges, the county has a priority list of structurally deficient bridges it would like to distinguish as soon-to-be projects in the state’s bundling program. Included in this list are Bridge 182 (Dutch Hill); Bridge 153 (Confluence Dam); Bridge 15 (Doc Twigg); Bridge 68 (Upper Wolf’s); Bridge 7 (Cool Spring); Bridge 3 (Braznell); Bridge 92 (Lover’s Leap); and Bridge 91 (Buncie). In conclusion, there are two structurally deficient bridges in the City of Uniontown that require reconstruction: Gallatin Avenue Bridge and Jefferson Street Bridge.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur T. Cappella
Chief Community Development Specialist

cc: William Arnold, Director, Fayette County Bridge Department
Fayette County Commissioners
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: 2021 – 2024 TIP
Bullskin Township Volunteer Fire Company – Safety – State Route 982

Dear Mr. Waple,

The Fayette County Commissioners have been contacted by the Bullskin Township Volunteer Fire Company concerning a safety issue. In January of this year, a letter was sent to PennDOT-12 Executive, Joseph J. Scezzur, concerning traffic safety problems in Bullskin Township, Fayette County. Mr. Brad Gillott, President BTVFC, has communicated to us that on more than a few occasions when responding to fire emergencies, his fire trucks have almost encountered collisions due to the amount of large truck traffic and high rates of speed by motorists. It’s upsetting and alarming. The intersections include State Route 982 and Longanecker Road and State Route 982 and Keefer Road.

It is imperative that we request PennDOT District-12 to take action to resolve this unsafe condition along such a prominent section of state road. In fact, we have spoken with supervisors of Bullskin Township and they have expressed support, as well as a willingness to maintain PennDOT’s recommendation. For instance, it was pointed out that a flashing light could be used as a preventative measure.

As a final point, Commissioner Vicites participated in SPC’s virtual public meeting concerning the 2021-2024 TIP on Thursday, May 28, 2020, in which he emphasized this situation as a matter of safety and that we would like to see it addressed in the Transportation Improvement Program. Mr. Vicites further indicated he would follow up with the Bullskin Township Volunteer Fire Department and he has. Therefore, please let us know if you require any additional information concerning this matter. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Dave Lohr
Commissioner
Chairman

Vincent A. Vicites
Commissioner
First Vice Chairman

Scott Dunn
Commissioner
Second Vice Chairman
January 9, 2020

Penn Dot District 12  
Attn: Joseph J. Szczur, Executive  
825 N. Gallatin Ave. Ext.  
Uniontown, PA 15401


Dear Mr. Szczur:

Over the past couple of months, the Bullskin Township Volunteer Fire Company (BTVFC) has inquired with our Township Supervisors, County Commissioners, and State Representatives on some Traffic Safety-issues we have been encountering. On several occasions when responding to Fire Calls, our Fire Apparatus have encountered near misses due to the amount of large truck traffic & speed of said vehicles. The intersections referenced include State Route 982 & Longanecker Road and State Route 982 & Keefer Road.

Everyone we have spoken with, advised that we need to contact Penn Dot due to State Route 982 being a State Road. We are writing you to see if some-type of blinking warning lights or system could be placed & activated for these designated areas when fire calls occur?

Another major concern is the traffic light at the intersection of State Routes 982 & 119. The concern is during the end of school (Bullskin Elementary) letting out and traffic back-up between roughly 2:00pm to 5:00pm. If an accident or fire call occurs and we have to respond in that direction, the traffic back-up is beyond the school to Englishman Hill Road. Can an engineer possibly investigate this?

Any help would be greatly appreciated and if you would want to meet to discuss further, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Brad R. Gillett, President BTVFC  
724-331-1123 (Cell)

Kyle Quinn, BTVFC Chief  
724-880-8991 (Cell)

CC: Bullskin Township Supervisors  
Fayette County Commissioners  
State Senator Pat Stefano
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE – May 29, 2020

RE: Smithton and Scottdale Boroughs Launch Community Survey and Interactive Map Program

Smithton and Scottdale, PA (May 22, 2020) – While the development of the Scottdale-Smithton Active Transportation Plan and a Complete Streets Policy is not virtually complete, the process for creating the plan is progressing virtually through the advent of a new community survey and interactive map program.

Smithton and Scottdale are developing an Active Transportation Plan to make walking, biking and other modes of active transportation in these communities safer, easier and more accessible for everyone. The leaders in these communities want to hear from you! An on-line survey and mapping program has been launched to gather input from the residents of Scottdale, Smithton and the neighboring communities.

Active Transportation is defined as any mode of transportation that is self-propelled like walking, biking and using a wheelchair; or is non-motorized like kayaking or horse-riding. Your feedback and ideas will help shape the plan for improving active transportation in these communities.

The Complete Streets Policy will establish the Vision and will encourage development of streets in these communities that provide safe, convenient and comfortable travel, and access for all transportation modes.

Scottsdale and Smithton are placing a high priority on public outreach and collaboration to develop this Active Transportation Plan and its accompanying Complete Streets Policy. An on-line Community Survey and Interactive Map Program have been created to obtain guidance on community transportation priorities. Input on biking and walking enhancements, safety and access improvements and connections to existing trails, waterways, greenspaces and community assets that you would like to see in these communities is also being obtained through the Survey and Map Program.

Links to the survey and map are available on the Smithton (www.smithtonboro.us) and Scottdale (www.scottdaleborough.com) municipal websites. We plan for these links to also be accessible from local social media accounts and other sources within the communities. Borough residents of all ages, officials and staff, members of community organizations and other interested parties are encouraged
to take the **Survey and to use the Map Program to provide location-specific input.** Meaningful engagement ensures that community priorities are identified, and that achievable projects and action items are developed. **Responses will be collected until June 30, 2020.**

Development of the Active Transportation Plan and a Complete Streets Policy is being managed by a Project Team including representatives from both Scottdale and Smithton in cooperation with a team of consultants coordinated by the Smart Growth Partnership of Westmoreland County. Funding is provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Health through the State Physical Activity and Nutrition grant and the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

# # #

Since 2014, the Pennsylvania Department of Health (Department or PA DOH), Division of Nutrition and Physical Activity, has been collaborating with the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health Center for Public Health Practice (the University) in conjunction with the Swanson School of Engineering Center for Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure to increase opportunities for physical activity utilizing the built environment. The program through which walking routes and walking groups have been formed is WalkWorks. To-date, with the engagement of community-based partners, 89 walking routes have been created in 21 Pennsylvania counties. In the fall of 2017, WalkWorks began offering financial assistance to public agencies, such as municipalities and planning commissions, for the development of active transportation plans (ATPs) and related policies. For information about WalkWorks, including the location of our partners and walking routes as well as the funded municipalities, please visit the PA WalkWorks website.

**Specific questions should be directed to:**

**John Turack**  
Executive Director, Smart Growth Partnership  
[www.facebook.com/smartgrowthpartnership](http://www.facebook.com/smartgrowthpartnership)  
[https://www.facebook.com/SmartGrowthPartnershipofWestmoreland](https://www.facebook.com/SmartGrowthPartnershipofWestmoreland)  
“Connecting community places, people, and their associations”

**Community Development Assistant**  
Energy, Business and Community Vitality  
**Penn State Extension, Westmoreland County**  
The Pennsylvania State University  
[https://www.facebook.com/ecdPennStateExt/](https://www.facebook.com/ecdPennStateExt/)  
[https://extension.psu.edu/community-development](https://extension.psu.edu/community-development)  
214 Donohoe Rd, Suite E  
Greensburg, PA 15601  
724-837-1402 x84214  
724-837-7613 Fax  
724-448-2787 cell  
Jdt15@psu.edu
Where to Access the Survey:

Links to the Survey and Map are available on the Smithton (www.smithtonboro.us) and Scottdale (www.scotdaleborough.com) municipal websites.

You can also link to the Survey from your Smartphone using this QR code:

We thank you for your input!

What is Active Transportation:

Smithton and Scottdale are developing an Active Transportation Plan to make walking, biking and other modes of active transportation in our communities safer, easier and more accessible for everyone. Active Transportation is defined as any type of transportation that is self-propelled like walking, biking and using a wheelchair; or is non-motorized like kayaking or horse-riding.

Topics:

An on-line Community Survey and Interactive Map Program have been created to gain input from the residents of Scottdale, Smithton and the neighboring communities. We want to know about the biking and walking enhancements, safety and access improvements and connections to existing trails, waterways, greenspaces and other community destinations that you would like to see in our communities.

Provide your input...

Community Survey and Interactive Map Program
Please use this map to write in your comments about your needs and visions for active transportation in your community. For example, are there intersections that need better crosswalks? Can you safely access the neighborhood park? How about on your bike? What other areas of concern are there? Feel free to write comments anywhere on the map, and draw arrows if you have a comment about a location nearby that isn’t shown.

Your comments will help give valuable input into the development of an Active Transportation Plan for your community. For more information about the project, please contact John Turack at (724)-837-1402 or at jdt15@psu.edu.
June 3, 2020

Andy Waple
Director, Transportation Planning
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Dear Mr. Waple:

On behalf of Peters Township, a Home Rule Community in Washington County, I am addressing this letter to the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) to support three (3) projects on the Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and to request that a fourth project be allocated funding for design. We certainly appreciate the time and consideration the officials from SPC, PennDOT, and the surrounding counties have taken to develop the Draft TIP, and the fact that three (3) projects which will greatly improve safety and mobility within Peters Township will be advanced in the immediate future.

As a community in northern Washington County, the Township would like to express its support for the U.S. 19 Corridor Signal Upgrade (Project #107432), which is allotted $3 million for construction in 2024. U.S. Route 19 is the primary arterial in northern Washington County, and serves as a major commercial corridor for our communities as well. This route is heavily signalized, especially in Peters Township which is home to ten (10) signal systems. Since any improvements to mobility along U.S. Route 19 must logically involve signal upgrades, and adaptive signal systems have proven to be successful in alleviating congested arterials throughout the Commonwealth, this project is vital to residents and businesses in northern Washington County.

Two other projects within the Township will help to address congestion and improve safety for Township residents. For the past two years, the Township has been working collaboratively with PennDOT District 12-0 and its consultants to advance the Valleybrook/Bebout Road Intersection (Project #109242) and the Bebout Road/East McMurray Road Intersection (Project #109025).

The intersection of Valleybrook Road and Bebout Road is a primary gateway to the eastern area of Peters Township, which has seen tremendous growth in recent years. Since 2014, 290 new residential lots have been created in this area. The current three-
way, stop sign controlled intersection is functionally obsolete, and results in substantial queuing during peak travel times, hindering emergency response to this vast swath of the Township. The proposed roundabout will provide a safe and efficient alternative to improve mobility.

Similarly, the current configuration of the Bebout Road/East McMurray Road intersection fails to safely and efficiently handle traffic volumes. East McMurray Road is a major collector in the Township, and a primary connection to Allegheny County. The proposed turning lanes and new traffic signal will address this situation, and complete a string on signal upgrades recently undertaken by the Township along the East McMurray Road corridor. Both of these projects have been identified in the Township’s Transportation Improvement Fee Capital Plan as needed capital improvements to the Township’s roadway network.

Finally, we would like to request that funding be allocated to perform Preliminary Engineering on an upgrade to the intersection of Venetia Road (SR 1006) and Bebout Road (SR 1010). This intersection is functionally deficient and meets the warrants to justify signalization. The Peters Township Transportation Improvement Fee Capital Plan identifies the culvert replacement, road widening, and signal installation at this intersection as a project in excess of $5 million. The Township is prepared to earmark a portion of its own Transportation Improvement Fee Program funds toward improving this intersection. The Township has a proven history of financially assisting PennDOT District 12-0 highway improvement projects.

Recently, a developer was forced to abandon a major development in the immediate vicinity of this intersection because of the needed upgrade. Moreover, given the intersection’s proximity to one of the Township’s oldest neighborhoods, Hackett, the lack of progress on any improvement will hinder redevelopment of this area. The Township believes that beginning the process toward upgrading this intersection in the next TIP cycle is a worthwhile use of the region’s transportation funding.

Peters Township appreciates your consideration of these comments and your attention to the needs of our residents. If you have any questions, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

Paul F. Lauer
Township Manager

Cc:  The Honorable Natalie Mihalek, 40th Legislative District of Pennsylvania
     The Honorable Pam Iovino, 37th Senatorial District of Pennsylvania
     Joseph Szczur, P.E., District Executive, PennDOT District 12-0
     Jason Theakston, Washington County Planning Commission
June 12, 2020

SPC Comments
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Ref: Comments on the 2021-24 Draft Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for Southwestern Pennsylvania

SPC Comments Staff;

The Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group, a membership-based coalition of over 50 community and economic development corporations and neighborhood-based groups within southwestern Pennsylvania’s urban core – serving a regional population in excess of 600,000 – respectfully submits the following comments on the 2021-24 TIP.

PCRG and its members believe that transportation investments within our region should follow the spirit and intent of the SmartMoves For a Changing Region long-range transportation plan – meaning: investments must minimize the consumption of unpopulated land; concentrate and increase 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:

Transit Funding
We fully understand the challenges to transit funding in Pennsylvania even before COVID-19 stripped the highway system of its primary revenue sources. However, more resources must be allocated to transit if this region is to remain competitive in the attraction of youth, talent, and investment, let alone become more competitive or equitable. This even more necessary in the realities of a COVID-19 world. PCRG and its members cannot stress strongly enough the need to go beyond maintaining existing service to expand transit - including rapid transit - in this and future TIPs. We support the recommendations of the Southwestern PA Partnership for Mobility’s recommendations to allow local jurisdictions to raise funds for such priorities.

Making sure road projects are transit projects
We are pleased to see that many highway projects are cross-referenced as transit projects on SPC’s TIP story board. However, we stress that enhancing transit access and accessibility and attracting riders - not simply make it easier to operate a vehicle - be the expectation of these projects. This would include, but is not limited to:

1) Ensuring that any ITS traffic signal upgrades include transit signal priority (TSP) transponders at purchase or that transponders be easily installed at a future date;
2) Including ADA-compliant crosswalks, signalization, signage, and sidewalks along any improved roadway throughout the network that is not a limited-access highway;
3) Accommodating safe bicycle connections to transit, especially along commuter/express bus corridors, high-ridership lines, and fixed-guideways;
4) Incorporating “superstops” along commuter corridors with express/commuter bus service, and bus shelters in other locations, into the budget and design of any highway betterment project. Projects should also include pedestrian amenities to safely access these stops.
5) Planning and engineering for future shoulder and commercial corridor bus rapid transit (BRT) on the major arteries of the region, starting with the Parkway East/Business 22, SR837/Rankin Bridge from McKeensport to the E. Busway terminus, and SR885/Second Ave./Irvine Street starting in W. Homestead (SR885/Second Avenue Corridor Study, 12-23-19)
6) Complying with Pittsburgh’s Complete Streets ordinance within the city boundaries and applying Complete Streets approach to any roadway improvement, especially in dense population/commercial centers such as the City of Pittsburgh, Washington city, McKeensport, Swissvale, and other urban-form communities;
7) Clear, easily understood signage throughout the road network which alerts and directs potential transit riders to park-and-ride locations and stations. This would include, as an example, signage on the Parkway West directing people to the Carnegie West Busway station.

Such projects are eligible uses of existing highway funds and justifiable as congestion mitigation and safety enhancement projects. Particular TIP projects of concern throughout PCRG’s membership footprint include:

1) Penn Ave. Resurface Phase 2 from Evaline Street to Graham Street in City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County;
2) Reconstruction of 1,000 feet of roadway on SR 837 starting at Smithfield Street then mill and overlay on SR 837, East Carson and West Carson Street starting at Smithfield Street to Saw Mill Run Boulevard in City of Pittsburgh;
3) Intersection and signal improvements region-wide;
4) Design and Construction of an Adaptive Traffic Signal System along SR 51, Clairton Boulevard, from Peters Creek Road to Provost Road in the City of Pittsburgh, Baldwin, Brentwood, Jefferson, Pleasant Hills and Whitehall Boroughs, all within Allegheny County;
5) New traffic signals, pedestrian accommodations and equipment, new signing and pavement markings on Liberty Avenue from Grant Street to Herron Avenue in the City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County;
6) Design and Construction of a Traffic Adaptive Signal System along SR 1001 - Freeport Road from 8th Street in Sharpsburg to Powers Run Road in O’Hara Township, Allegheny County;
7) Parkway East Active Traffic Management study for the Interstate 376 East corridor (see more detail below)

Parkway East Active Traffic Management Study must include transit
In 2014, PCRG commented on the Parkway East Mobility Study – Plan and Potential Construction, that was on the 2015-18 TIP. There is little in the current iteration of study of the Parkway East corridor description to suggest that our comments have been heard. Worse, the sentiment of the communities already adversely impacted by the Parkway seem to have been lost.

PennDOT’s own 2013/14 engagement, in response to community backlash against ramp metering, revealed a very strong preference that transit expansion be part of the solution to Parkway East congestion mitigation. Yet the current iteration of this study makes no mention of transit is even made in the description of the project. PCRG and its members believe that shoulder, arterial BRT from the Edewood Ave./E. Busway overpass through Monroeville is a viable, cost-effective rapid transit expansion that could pay dividends for traffic mitigation and economic development. Not even considering this is a glaring omission. It does not fall on Port Authority’s shoulders, alone, to explore transit opportunities like this; as the administrator of public transportation funding and programming in the state, and as with ped/bike, PennDOT must do more to advance and incorporate transit into projects – especially in a time of increasingly constrained resources. These projects are not mutually exclusive, nor do their costs need to be additive. Hence, our 2014 comments, in full below, still hold true today:

As a representative of community groups serving over a half-million residents within the economic core of the region, we encourage SPC and PennDOT to explore and support multi-modal transportation enhancements throughout this corridor. Mainline improvements must not come at the expense of communities within this core. As such, each improvement should be scrutinized to determine whether it supports traffic reduction and encourages mode shift to transit and pedestrian/bicycle utilization safety within these neighborhoods. Those that do not support quality of life in neighborhoods near I-376 or achieve a modal shift away from the private automobile should not be supported. We urge SPC and PennDOT to support corridor enhancements that will increase transit ridership as a primary form of transportation in the I-376 corridor. This would include capital investments in premium transit enhancement and expansion into eastern Allegheny County.

We thank you for your consideration of our requests and encourage you to contact us if you need further clarification.

Sincerely,

Ernie Hogan
Executive Director
Thank you for taking public comment on the TIP. These comments are submitted by Laura Chu Wiens, Executive Director on behalf of Pittsburghers for Public Transit (PPT).

We applaud the SPC’s thoughtful and comprehensive approach to identifying priority transportation projects for funding in the TIP. We just have a few comments to add.

1. The SPC and legislators of the ten county region need to identify a sustainable state transit funding stream in advance of any moves to discharge the Turnpike transit obligation. All efforts should be made to remove the state police from illegitimately siphoning hundreds of millions of dollars from the Motor License Fund, and that should be evaluated as a possible short-term replacement for transit funding shortfalls. Moreover, the SPC and legislators should identify additional opportunities for local source funding including the possibility of a ride-hailing tax, corporate income tax or commensurate fee on our major, untaxed non-profits in our region.

2. PPT requests that feasibility and engineering studies be considered for the TIP of the priority BRT corridors that riders identified through our Beyond the East Busway planning effort. The planning effort, done using a participatory planning tool generated by CivicMapper and concluding with a report by EvolveEA, calls for BRT Extensions of the East Busway to Monroeville and the extension of the 61C BRT to McKeesport. The BRT extensions of the East Busway to Monroeville that should be prioritized involve adding a slip-ramp from 376 in Edgewood to access the busway and BRT shoulder lanes on 376, as well as on-street transit improvements through Rankin, Braddock and East Pittsburgh and terminating at Forbes Hospital. Two reports on this proposal are forthcoming for the SPC and for regional legislators.

3. Ensure that funding allocation in the TIP properly reflects the emphasis around transit, bike and pedestrian mode-shift highlighted in the SPC’s Smart Moves plan.

4. We are concerned with the emphasis around e-mobility (including e-scooters and ride-hailing) for first-last mile connections with the proposed mobility hubs. These modes are cost-prohibitive for a lot of transit users, are not accessible for riders with disabilities, and make revenue off of monetizing users' mobility data without consent. We strongly emphasize the importance of having prioritized sidewalk, lighting, and shelter investments at and around transit.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Laura Chu Wiens
She/Her/Hers
Executive Director
Pittsburghers for Public Transit
Laura@pittsburghforpublictransit.org
(703) 424-0854
April 20, 2020

Andrew Waple, CEO
Southwestern Pennsylvania (Planning) Commission
#2 Chatham Center, Suite #500
112 Washington Place
Pgh. Pa. 15219

Dear Andy, (I hope you don't mind my informality),

Thanks for returning my recent phone within a few hours, despite your currently having to work out of your home. This letter explains important facts that are not mentioned in this attached packet of information that I promised to mail you, that I've sent to the officials on Bridgeville's council, planning commission and parking authority.

I realize that my asking you and some of your staff members to read thru all of this information is presumptuous of me, but 2 generations of the families and children in Bridgeville (and South Fayette) have had several aspects of "the quality of their lives" substantially suppressed because of the discriminatory spending of federal, state and county road building funds by federal, state and county public officials over a period of 50 years,

that collapsed the tax revenue producing Bridgeville business district and prevented the expansion of the South Fayette business districts. Yet, NO ATTEMPT was ever made to improve consumer-motorist access to the side by side Washington Pike business districts of the 3 communities by Penn DOT or the range of federal, state and county elected officials who were to be representing the People here.

******************************************************************************

Attached is the description of the solution that will end the 50 year old, problably the most economically ruinous, traffic congestion problem in Allegheny County, along the historical Washington Pike corridor thru the Bridgeville, Collier and South Fayette business districts.

My "most economically ruinous" claim includes 2 comparatively recent public opinion polls (with a record setting mail back response ratio of 50%), proving that more than 50% of the resident and transient consumer-motorists in a 4 mile radius around Bridgeville have been detouring around all 3 traffic congested business districts for 50
years, thereby reducing the net profits of the businesses and the tax revenues to each of the communities by 50%! Countless numbers of businesses, including anchor stores, have left the area, and the Great Southern Shopping Center was sold at half of its originally appraised price, after Penny’s Department Store moved out.

The years of extensive traffic congestion naturally drove the Region's consumer-motorists to other sites, thereby doubling the tax burden on the families in both Bridgeville and South Fayette!

Collier Township's Washington Pike shopping center was built just before the traffic volumes began increasing. Only 10 years ago, there were 6 gas stations within 1/4 mile of the South Fayette/Bridgeville Washington Pike/Route #50 "T" intersection next to the Bridgeville I-79 Exit. (Gas stations love stacked traffic congestion, comprised of passing motorists with nearly empty gas tanks, who are angry about sitting in traffic and hungry on their way to work every morning, as you know).

The reduction in federal, state, county and local tax revenues from extensive traffic congestion is more acceptable when it's like the....legendary Route #51/Route #88 intersection traffic congestion site, because that entire region of the County has been "completely built out" for 75 years and the federal, state, county and city tax revenues will never comparatively fundamentally increase.

But the 50 year old, Washington Pike congestion traffic problem is different, because it greatly suppressed the development of 40 square miles of open, undeveloped commercial and residential land in South Fayette and Collier, thru which the only North/South interstate highway in Western Pennsylvania passes, that was intentionally built by the FHWA next to and parallel to Washington Pike for several miles, for anticipated economically development reasons!

(Actually, the late President John Kennedy ordered the construction of I-79 from Morgantown, West Virginia to Pittsburgh and Erie because West Virginia voters played a "key" role in his being elected by only 1/20 of a percent of the votes that were cast.)

It is deeply disturbing that.... most of the members of Congress, the State Legislature and the County Board of Commissioners representing the People and business owners in Bridgeville, South Fayette and Collier have been aware of the traffic congestion continuing and increasing the economic suppression, but never attempted to end the injustice.
The motives behind the unfortunate, puzzling, political reality that caused and sustained this traffic congestion problem, are not mentioned in my attached traffic congestion solution proposal. But it severely corrupted the fundamentals of the democratic process and was implemented by:

1. Bridgeville officials and
2. Penn DOT and County officials.

1. Regarding Bridgeville officials. For 50 years 20% or more, of the only 2500 voters in Bridgeville had full time jobs at the former Mayview State Hostital, Woodville State Hospital and Kane County Hospital. That was 10,000 jobs at sites all within a 1 mile radius of Bridgeville.

   As a result, these individuals were (and still are being) easily voted into positions as members of Bridgeville Council, the planning commission and the parking authority, and have still been vetoing every attempt to widen or extend the road network in the community (or build parking lots in the business districts) because....

   it always requires purchasing property and offending a few voters who could place their RE-elections in jeopardy, positions that years ago they were using to arrange promotions for themselves at the State and County hospitals and offices!

   As you know ALL of the 7 Regional, major secondary roads lead to Bridgeville's "bottle neck" 2 lane wide road network, yet no attempt has been made to eliminate this Regional traffic congestion problem.

   Bridgeville officials still covertly oppose traffic reduction road improvements. They resent my publicizing better solutions to a range of community problems, but more recently because 3 years ago, I informed Dan Cessna, the former CEO at Penn DOT, about their agreement to allow the widening of the "strategic" Washington Pike creek bridge between Bridgeville and South Fayette, by only 6 feet! With 300 projects to oversee Dan did not know about the details of this project.

   So.... he called a meeting of the officials from the 4 surrounding communities in March of that year, allowed me to make my presentation for a 7 lane wide bridge, hid his disappointment in his traffic department engineers, and recommended the formation of the
4 community Traffic Task Force, that Bridgeville officials had no choice but to join!
(The 7 lane bridge is on the SPC’s schedule to be built).

I’m mentioning all these details because the recommendation of "the attached 4 community comprehensive traffic congestion solution" Plan of mine (which is actually not my Plan but the Plan previously recommended by 6 other city planning firms), will have to come from YOUR agency, in compliance with the policies of the Federal Highway Administration.

2. Regarding Penn DOT and County officials. Ever since North/South Interstate Highway #79 was built parallel to and next to Washington Pike thru South Fayette, Bridgeville and Collier in the late 1960’s, and 30,000 consumer motorists a day stopped driving thru the North/South Upper St. Clair/Mt. Lebanon central business district on Route #19, (which is parallel to Washington Pike and only 4 miles away),

Penn DOT has been aggressively, politically influenced to do nothing to reduce the enormous traffic congestion problem thru the Washington Pike business district, so it could not become a formidable competitor to the Upper St. Clair/Mt. Lebanon business district.

Your own records show Penn DOT’s and the County’s only interest has been to improve and build East/West routes ACROSS WASHINGTON PIKE to connect consumer-motorists from Interstate #79 with the Route #19 business district!

In addition, you are aware of the several major, multi-million dollar, 4 lane road widenings that the State and the County have built leading to the Upper St. Clair/Mt. Lebanon business district, during the decades when there was certainly no traffic congestion problem for consumer-motorists, who had switched to using I-79 to drive to and from Pittsburgh every day.

(It’s interesting to notice that the widening of routes like...Bower Hill Road, Gilkinson Road, Conner Road and Route #88 were never continued to the adjacent Dormont, Bridgeville or South Park business districts!)

***************************************************************************

I know that federal funds can not to be spent improving local streets in a community. But, considering the new billions in federal, state and county tax revenues that would result by solving the Washington Pike business district traffic congestion problem, I think
the FHWA would make it an exception to that policy, that I'm sure they have made before. The primary responsibility for the movement of traffic on North/South Washington Pike is Penn DOT's, NOT Bridgeville's, South Fayette's and Collier's. (By the way, isn't a situation where Bridgeville gives the ownership of parallel Shady Avenue to Penn DOT, a reasonable approach to follow).

********************************************************************************

The most important sections of the attached proposed Comprehensive road network for Bridgeville are also the least expensive to build:

1. Extending Shady Avenue to Hickman Street in Bridgeville 220 yards, and
2. making 300 yards of Bower Hill Road 2 lanes, one way West bound, and 300 yards of parallel Baldwin Street 2 lanes, one way East bound.

(Switching the Bower Hill Road traffic to Baldwin Street was a recommendation 2 years ago, by a professional that Bridgeville hired to solve the flooding of the homes on Baldwin Street by the McLaughlin Run Creek. Bridgeville officials didn't seem to object).

Constructing these 2 sections of the proposed Comprehensive Road Plan would substantially....

A. Reduce the traffic congestion mostly for the East/West transient motorists from Scott, Upper St. Clair and Mt. Lebanon driving to and from I-79 thru Bridgeville on.... Bower Hill Road, McLaughlin Run Road, Cook School Road, Mayview Road and Lesnett Road, and

B. therefore, consolidate the political support for such a Penn DOT/Allegheny County proposed project from Scott, Upper St. Clair and Mount Lebanon officials.

At any rate.... I hope you take the time to read thru this traffic congestion elimination proposal and study the drawings, and I'll call you next week, to discuss the possibilities. Thanks again for your sincere concern.

Yours truly,
P.S. Please notice the 3 NEW, not so obvious routes on the drawings I've sent you that could be built at reasonable costs, that would greatly reduce the general Bridgeville traffic congestion problem.

1. Extending Station Street West thru the Bridgeville business district to the Northbound entrance ramp lane of the Bridgeville Exit to Interstate Highway #79 North. (A few years ago this merge lane from Route #50 was doubled in width, over a new 2 lane wide bridge over Chartiers Creek, and the ramp was extended to now be slightly over 3/4 of a mile long! (Station Street is the extension of Bank Street, the main route to and from I-79 for Upper St. Clair & Bethel Park motorists using Mayview Road and Lesnett Road to and from I-79, every day, and would allow them to avoid the Washington Pike/Route #50 "T" intersection.

Years ago, I co-incidentally spoke with a Penn DOT engineer at the West end of Station Street in Bridgeville, who was considering the possibility of building this route to I-79 North.

2. Also, straightening the "zig-zag" at the bottom North/South Chess Street hill to create a convenient, significant "by-pass" of the North/South Bridgeville Washington Pike (Avenue) traffic congestion to and from Prestley Road (a major Regional road) and the Bridgeville I-79 Exit.

3. Also, the Bridgeville Exit ramp lane for Northbound motorists ends at a "T" intersection on Route #50 that will ALWAYS be an unsolvable problem where the motorists in a single column on the exit ramp, are expected to merge right into 2 side by side, one way, East bound lanes of Route #50 vehicles.

The SOLUTION is to... build a gradual, 90 degree, right turn extention from the North bound I-79 exit ramp, behind the 4 business buildings, to the Washington Pike traffic light intersection in front of the Get'Go gas station.

The old dry cleaning business building along this suggested route was removed
last month, and the property is for sale. In addition, none of the existing buildings there would be affected in any way. The design for cutting into the hill side on the right, to create the new sweeping right turn is the only solution where the cost would be far less than the resulting major reduction of the congestion.
Shown is the Chess Street section of a proposed, strategic consumer-motorist route between Prestley Road, to and from Bridgeville's Central Business District. It would require the elimination of the "Z" shaped Chess Street/Murray Ave. intersection at the bottom of the Chess Street Hill.

Shown is a new, proposed, economically important consumer motorist route thru Bridgeville's Central Business District, for Mayview Road and Lesnett Road motorists by extending the west end of Station Street to reach the north bound merge lane to Interstate Highway 79 of the Bridgeville I-79 exit.
URGENT!

March 25, 2020

To ALL Bridgeville officials from Bob Fryer:

At the present time, you are in the process of revising Bridgeville's Comprehensive (Economic) Development Plan.

Comments recently made by some of you on council, the planning commission and the parking authority about revising the Plan indicate you are seriously mistaken about HOW to do it, and about the features the Plan MUST contain to allow Bridgeville to receive the federal, state and county funding to increase its COMMERCIAL tax revenue income from its business districts, in order to END the range of personal disadvantages and excessive taxes we residents have had to deal with for over 50 years!

* Your comments reveal that some of you still remain under the mis-guided impression that any updated Plan should be subdued, minor and not include the necessary major roadway improvements to eliminate the traffic congestion, in order to attract much larger numbers of consumer-motorists to drive thru Bridgeville's business districts,

because Bridgeville can't afford paying for any of the roadway improvements it desperately needs.

This is the reason why the Bridgeville comprehensive road plan MUST be comprehensive enough to end the unreasonable, 50 year old traffic congestion delay for the motorists from South Fayette, Collier and Upper St. Clair
driving thru Bridgeville! That way....

1. The extensive North-South, 2 LANE Washington Avenue (Pike) 50 year, traffic congestion for 20,000 vehicles a day problem will be recognized as PENN DOT'S responsibility to solve and pay for, not Bridgeville's, regardless of how Penn DOT resists admitting that and,

2. the 13,800 vehicle a day East-West, 2 LANE Bower Hill Road traffic congestion problem will be seen as Allegheny County's responsibility to solve and pay for, not Bridgeville's.

(It would be interesting to find out WHY former Bridgeville officials made the mistake of assuming the responsibility for the section of Allegheny County's Bower Hill Road between the McLaughlin Run Road intersection and the Washington Avenue intersection) (?)

* Your comments ALSO reveal that some of you oppose the fundamental, 200 year old, community economic development policy of.... having the federal, state, county or the Borough PURCHASE critical parcels of land, at reasonable prices that are necessary to, for instance:

A. Extend or widen roads to solve Bridgeville's economically ruinous 50 year old traffic congestion problem and

B. build more parking lots to solve our grossly deficient 250 space parking problem.

* The 21 page (3 drawing) packet of community development
information I gave to several Bridgeville officials at last month's public meeting, specified the several proposed, strategic public capital improvement projects in Bridgeville that former and some present boro officials prevented from being built (or allowed to be built inexpensively and thererfore incorrectly as a favor to another Bridgeville official),

because because they did not want to "offend" a comparatively small numbers of Bridgeville voters, who might have prevented their re-elections.

These confirmed examples in the information packet included:

1. Opposing the construction of the 2 one way, parallel streets (Shady Avenue & Washington Avenue) thru our central business district for 50 years, that was recommended by 6 different city planning firms,

2. the refusal to stop the cement company within the community from emitting the extensive pollution of the air, thousands of Bridgeville residents had to breathe for decades that shortened their life spans,
   (and your eliminating the existing Bridgeville ordinance that prevented the 70,000 pound cement trucks from driving on a residential street),

3. allowing an inexpensive, obviously too small culvert to be built under Commercial Street, thru which the Mclaughlin Run Creek has to flow, that has caused the decades of the flooding of the Baldwin Street, Mclaughlin Run Road and Carol Street homes and businesses, (that negatively affected the life spans of those residents.)

4. I forgot to mention.... refusing to ask Penn DOT to stop North bound motorists on Washington Avenue from turning LEFT into the 1st motor bank in the area at the Station Street intersection, WHERE
THERE WAS NO LEFT TURN STACKING LANE, that resulted in a consistant, 1 mile long traffic jam in Bridgeville that extended into South Fayette for 5 years, until the news media informed the votors that Bridgeville officials were responsible for this indifference to the Public welfare. (It should be noted that the bank was providing some Bridgeville officials home morgages for almost no interest rate fee.)

*****************************************************************************

Despite its present disadvantageous circumstances, Bridgeville still has the best opportunity to greatly increase its commercial tax revenue income by re-designing its business districts, of any community in the REGION because:

A. The REGION's main consumer-motorist road, North-South Washington Pike, passes thru its central business district, 
B. the other 6 major secondary REGIONAL roads ALL lead to Bridgeville's business districts, 
C. North-South Interstate Highway #79 is located parallel to Washington Avenue, Bridgeville's main street, 
D. 1 of the 2 Exits of #79 is literally located immediately next to the Bridgeville central business district,
E. over the last 50 years, Bridgeville has had the advantage of being completely enveloped by the suburban residential expansion from Pittsburgh, comprising of the highest income families in the County, and F. adjacent South Fayette and Collier are 2 of the fastest, residentially expanding communities in the County of.... the high income families.

*****************************************************************************
THE ROAD NETWORK FOR CONSUMER-MOTORISTS OF BRIDGEVILLE'S REVISED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN "MUST" INCLUDE:

A. The 220 yard extension of Shady Avenue, in order to complete the 2, one way, 3 lane wide couple of streets thru the central business district, creating a 2nd main street,

B. the addition of 2 lanes on the East side of Washington Pike between the Bower Hill Road intersection and the Prestley Road intersection,

C. continuing this 4 lane wide, two way, thru lane configuration of Washington Avenue 100 yards further over the bridge to Collier,

D. making East-West Bower Hill Road and Baldwin Street 2 separate, parallel one way streets 2 lane wide streets and connecting them to Washington Avenue,

E. modifying the "Chess Street route" from Prestley Road so consumer-motorists can avoid Washington Avenue traffic delay, and drive directly into the central business district, and

F. extending Station Street to the West to the Interstate Highway #79 North bound entrance ramp, which has been extended to be over 1/4 mile long. This concept has already been considered by Penn DOT because it would detour thousands of motorists away from the Chartiers Creek bridge and the
inadequate "T" shaped Washington Pike/Route #50 intersection.

(It would ALSO bring thousands of Mayview Road and Lesnett Road consumer-motorists a day thru the Bridgeville central business district, and double the value of the properties along Station Street.)

***************
The 3 most important basic features of Beckman's (and 6 other city planner's) Bridgeville Plan can be studied in the drawings attached to this information document.

1. The 220 yard extension of Shady Avenue to create 2 one way North/South main streets thru our business district, cutting the traffic delay in half and attracting twice the volume of consumer motorists, and create a competitive tax revenue producing central business district, that Beckman's drawings show can expand Westward to include Shady Avenue and Chess Street as parallel streets to Washington Avenue.

(The Beckman plan also obviously included the logical widening of Washington Avenue by 2 lanes from the Bower Hill Road intersection North to the Prestley Road intersection, and adding 1 lane 100 yards further to connect with the 4 lane wide Washington Pike in Collier Township.)

2. Notice the resulting expansion of the central business district Westward from Washington Avenue to the parallel streets of Shady and Chess, that will happen when the Bridgeville traffic congestion problem is eliminated, in addition to the doubling of the value of the properties in the higher land use area shown.

3. Notice the multi-family (high rise apartment) area immediately next to both the West and the East sides of the central business district. This common principle of city planning is to have thousands of consumers living next to businesses in Bridgeville WHO WILL WALK to the stores, businesses and professional offices rather than getting in their vehicles and driving some where else!

********************************************************************************
FUTURE LAND USE PLAN
BOROUGH OF BRIDGEVILLE
TRAFFIC CONGESTION SOLUTION FACTS:

This packet of information contains...
"quotes" and drawings taken directly from the analysis and formal recommendations made by 6 different traffic engineering or city planning firms to Bridgeville, Pennsylvania officials,
that were ignored, concerning HOW to solve the extensive, ruinous Washington Pike traffic congestion problem.

NOTE: Any traffic studies that might be done now, by independent traffic agencies or Penn DOT to determine exactly "how much wider" Washington Pike would have to be made to substantially reduce the traffic congestion problem, WOULD BE MEANINGLESS,
BECAUSE 50% OF THE RESIDENT MOTORISTS IN THE GENERAL AREA, HAVE BEEN CONSISTENTLY DETOURING AROUND THE SOUTH FAYETTE/BRIDGEVILLE BUSINESS DISTRICT BECAUSE OF THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION FOR THE LAST 35 YEARS!

1. THE 2005 BRIDGEVILLE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE by the Mackin Engineering Company.


3. THE 2008 CONCLUSIONS OF the BRIDGEVILLE TRAFFIC AND PARKING ANALYSIS (13 Pages + photos and statistical tables) by ....the Allegheny Together Agency, and the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation.


5. The 1993 4 LANE WIDE WASHINGTON PIKE analysis & PLAN through South Fayette & Bridgeville designed by G.A.I. Engineering Company.

6. The 1988 TRAFFIC STUDY OF WASHINGTON PIKE and intersecting Bower Hill Road and McLaughlin Run Road) by Classic Development Consultants Inc. (Jack Trant, city planner).
PREPARED BY:
Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation
100 West Station Square Drive, Suite 450
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Phone: 412-471-5808
Website: www.phlf.org

MAP # 1
"Generally, the (Bridgeville official’s) objectives focus more on...promoting HEALTH and SAFETY."

"To encourage...REVITALIZATION AND STRENGTHEN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT (ECONOMICALLY), the Ordinance should include ADDITIONAL OBJECTIVES that reference Bridgeville’s historic resources, with principles such as .”

"c. providing opportunities for the re-use of and encouraging the maintenance of historic structures to....spur economic development “

"THE PURPOSE OF THE BUSINESS DISTRICT IS TO...provide retail shopping and service facilities that serve the needs of the general community,

that are in appropriate locations, on arterial roads and collector streets, in order to allow convenient (consumer-motorist) access, and to minimize the impact of traffic on neighborhoods, and on the local streets ! ”

3. THE FOLLOWING ARE EXACT QUOTES TAKEN FROM THE CONCLUSIONS SEGMENT OF THE TEXT OF...”.The BRIDGEVILLE TRAFFIC AND PARKING ANALYSIS” (13 Pages + photos and statistical tables) conducted by....the Allegheny Together Agency, and the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation.

"State Route 50 (Washington Pike) is a major regional connector. In 2007, there were 18,889 average trips a day on Washington Ave. BETWEEN STATION ST. AND PRESTLY ROAD according to Penn DOT.”

"That’s a lot of potential customers, but also a lot of through traffic that creates congestion through Bridgeville and contributes to an unfriendly pedestrian environment.”
(NOTE: The observation above does NOT include the significant greater traffic volume on the OTHER HALF of Washington Ave. between the Southend Bridge (over Chartiers Creek to South Fayette) and Station St. in Bridgeville.)

QUOTE: Page 2

"Moreover, Washington Pike is NOT the only MAJOR regional connector (road) that runs through the Bridgeville CBD."

"Bower Hill Road connects Bridgeville with Mt. Lebanon and intersects with Washington Pike at the North end of Bridgeville’s CBD."

QUOTE: Page 2

"BOTH WASHINGTON PIKE AND BOWER HILL ROAD NARROW FROM 4 LANES TO 2 LANES AS THEY ENTER DOWNTOWN BRIDGEVILLE. THIS CREATES A MAJOR CHOKING POINT FOR CONGESTION THAT PEAKS IN THE HEART OF THE CBD."

"Congestion increases significantly at peak hours, including the morning, noon time and evening. At these times the (vehicle) ARRIVAL rate exceeds the (vehicle) DEPARTURE rate, AND LONG LINES (of motor vehicles) FORM!"

QUOTE: Page 5

"Many of the traffic calming techniques that Penn DOT lists in its Smart Transportation Guidebook have (already) been implemented in the Bridgeville CBD like....roadside (landscaping) development, minimal building setbacks, curbs, sidewalks, narrowing the (roadway) lane widths, crosswalks, in street yield signs and advanced yield signs."

QUOTE: Page 5

"It is important to note that calming traffic along this section of Washington Ave. to make it more pedestrian friendly IS NOT THE ONLY GOAL FOR DEALING WITH TRAFFIC ALONG THIS CORRIDOR! "

"At one of the Allegheny Together workshops (held in Bridgeville), there was some discussion AND SUPPORT EXPRESSED FOR REDUCING TRAFFIC CONGESTION."
REDEVELOPMENT AREA
BOROUGH OF BRIDGEVILLE

MAP #3
"Reducing congestion and calming traffic seem to be mutually exclusive goals, in this case. There is not enough space though this corridor to expand the number of lanes without radically altering the street scape."

**NOTE:** A footnote on page 1 of the study states that the authors never looked at Bridgeville's Comprehensive Plan that includes... the 2 one way street solution to the community's 40 year congestion problem, WHICH WOULD NOT ALTER THE STREET (SCAPE) IN ANY WAY! It would actually create a 2nd main street in town.)

4. THE FOLLOWING ARE **EXACT QUOTES** TAKEN FROM THE CONCLUSIONS SEGMENT OF THE TEXT OF..."THE 1992 PROPOSED BRIDGEVILLE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN" by... Beckman Associates.

**QUOTE:** Page 5

**Goals and Objectives:**

"The most vital concerns (expressed) by the Bridgeville residents are 1) the quality of development; 2) traffic; 3) services and facilities; and 4) the environment."

"The delays, hazards and frustration of traffic is one of the most frequently discussed problem which Bridgeville faces."

**QUOTE:** Pages 5 & 6

**Traffic and Transportation Goals:**

"Important thoroughfares upon which development is centered, should be widened to facilitate traffic flow."

"Traffic flow on Washington Avenue should be revised to facilitate flow and minimize conflicting movements."

**QUOTE:** Page 31

**Major Thoroughfare Plan:**

"The major problem to be addressed is the congestion of Route #50, Washington Avenue, through Bridgeville. Route #50 is a 4 lane highway through its alignment in the Chartiers Valley (through Heidelberg, Scott & Collier),"
except for its route through Bridgeville, where it is a 2 (or 3) lane road! It should be 4 lanes at a minimum, with additional turning lanes provided as necessary."

"This Plan proposes to utilize the space of a parallel street to provide for the needed room, Shady Avenue. The Plan would divide Route #50 into 2 roadways, one North-bound on Washington Avenue, and the 2nd, South-bound on Shady."

"Application of this (2 one way street) idea to Bridgeville (would) yield many benefits.... reduced congestion, expanded traffic capacity, reduced traffic conflict, safer and more spacious facilities for pedestrians, and improved business environment." (Doubling the number of passing consumer-motorists equals doubling the profits for the businesses."

SEE MAP #2 (The only map in the Study regarding traffic congestion, recommends the 2 one way street solution).

SEE MAP #3 (Notice the area defined as....being the best for EXPANDING THE REDEVELOPMENT AREA of the central business district.

It is the area next to Shady/Moore Avenue, the parallel street that is to be part of the 2 one way streets, (that the DEMOCRAT members of Bridgeville Council have refused to ask Penn DOT to build.)


QUOTE : 1.0 Introduction
"The feasibility of the one way couple (Washington Avenue/Shady Avenue as 2 one way streets) will be evaluated."

QUOTE : 6.0 Page 7
Couple Analysis (Making Washington Avenue 2 one way streets)
"The need and feasibility of a one-way couple has been evaluated."
"Couple B requires Washington Avenue to be one-way Northbound between Hickman Street and Murray Avenue (with the Murray/Bower Hill Road intersection to be re-aligned). Murray Street would be one way West bound (between Shady and Washington Ave.)

"Shady Avenue would then be one way Southbound through a parking lot, over a railroad right-of-way and continuing on to Moore Avenue."

"Hickman Street would then be one way Eastbound from Moore Street to its intersection with Washington Avenue."

QUOTE : Page 9

"Shady Avenue is approximately 33 feet wide along most of the corridor. This width is adequate to carry two-twelve foot lanes of traffic with the possibility of a 9 foot wide parking lane."

QUOTE : Pages 11 & 12

7. 2 Staging (The order in which the roads in Bridgeville should be improve

"Widen Washington Pike to 4 lanes from the Chartiers/Church Street intersection to the Hickman Street intersection (by the post office)"

(NOTE : That has already been constructed.)

"Realign the Bower Hill Road / Murray Street intersection (on Washington Avenue)."

(NOTE : That has already been constructed.)

"Reconstruct Washington Avenue from Station Street to Bower Hill Road."

(NOTE : That has already been constructed.)

QUOTE : Pages 11 & 12

"Construct the Shady Avenue (Washington Avenue 2 one way streets) couple"
NOTE: There are 2 contributing factors that must be taken into consideration when reviewing traffic study data about the extensive 40 year old Bridgeville, South Fayette, Collier traffic congestion problem on Washington Pike:

A. A previous major, public opinion telephone poll that was done 20 years ago, revealed that 50% of the residents in the communities around Bridgeville and South Fayette even back then, were consistently detouring around the community because of the traffic congestion. Since the traffic congestion has grown much worse each year since then, and no additional through lanes have been added to the 2 lane road thru the 2 communities, the percentage of detouring consumer-motorists is now certainly higher.

A 2nd July 2015 survey was done contacting 500 families thru the churches in Bridgeville. 50% of the families mailed back the completed forms, that again revealed that 50% of the region's residents have been consistently detouring around the Bridgeville/South Fayette/Collier Washington Pike traffic congestion for decades!

THEREFORE, any current traffic studies that are to determine how many more lanes need to be added to Washington Pike, would be greatly underestimated.

Any daily traffic volume study totals would have to be multiplied by a factor of at least 2 (two) to substantially lessen the congestion at the site, because....when the 4 lane widening of Washington Pike is continued from Collier Twp. through Bridgeville and South Fayette, the 50% of the resident and transient consumer motorists in the region who have been detouring around the business districts of both communities,

will begin taking the more direct, preferred routes to their destinations, that will include driving through South Fayette, Bridgeville and Collier, and the congestion level will return to what it was!

B. The recommendations by the experts in the 6 traffic studies that this document reviews, that were formally presented to Bridgeville Council members and their staff members, (the last one being in 2008), are even MORE applicable today to devising a general solution to the present traffic congestion problem, because....

the problem has grown steadily worse over the years, and no additional lanes have been added to the roadway to increase traffic volumes THROUGH the adjacent South Fayette, Bridgeville, Collier business district on Washington Pike.

For decades, the ONLY roadway improvements by State and County road builders have been to make it more convenient for resident motorists living in the communities to the East of Washington Pike, in Upper St. Clair, Mt. Lebanon and Bethel Park, to drive to and from the Bridgeville Exit and the Kirwan Heights Exit of North/South Interstate Highway #79.

All of the East/West roads in the larger REGION lead to 235 year old North/South Washington Pike, (which is the reason Interstate #79 was built next to and parallel to that Washington Pike), but for some unexplained reason, the obvious solution to the REGION'S traffic congestion problem has never included widening 2 lane Washington Pike from Collier Twp. to 4 lanes through Bridgeville and South Fayette!
May 15, 2020

Larry R. Parsons, CEO (330-767-3401)
Jonathan Chistek, President
Alex Javis, Executive Vice-President
Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad Corporation
100 East 1st Street
Brewster, Ohio 44613

Gentlemen:

For the past 50 years, the officers of the Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad Company have been publicly and repeatedly accused of being "completely unreasonable" concerning the need to replace the steel railroad bridge over Pennsylvania State Route #50 (Washington Pike) in Bridgeville, Pennsylvania, that has been preventing the 4 lane widening of this 2 lane road, thereby sustaining the most extensive and economically destructive traffic congestion problem in the Southwestern section of Allegheny County!

Incidentally, as a former Chairman of the Bridgeville Planning Commission and a pro se attorney, I have accumulated a range of evidence that proves your company's officials have been falsely accused over 5 decades of being "uncompromising" and the cause of the Region's huge traffic congestion problem. (I'll explain more about the creators of the false rumor later in this letter.)

In the meantime....would you please study a comparatively inexpensive solution to the railroad bridge problem that I've devised, that a Penn DOT engineer admitted was better than anything they ever considered. My design has also been recently analyzed by a University of Pittsburgh School of Engineering professor who also agrees that it is an innovative and buildable concept, that will allow the 4 lane road widening to be constructed, and the proposed extension of the railroad bridge to be built at half the usual cost!

I've enclosed some drawings for building "an extention" of the present bridge for you to review, that were primarily designed to not require you to interrupt your use of this track line, except only occasionally for 2 days over some week ends!
The cost of the bridge extension is of utmost importance to the economic development of the **Region**. If you agree with the basic concept and the occasional, brief rescheduling of your runs, because eliminating the extensive, 50 year old traffic congestion problem would also greatly benefit the residents and businesses in the 4 surrounding **communities** of South Fayette, Collier, Upper St Clair and Scott,

I have been told that arrangements for major federal, state, county and municipal funding are likely, that would **reduce your share of the cost to a minimum of around 7%**!

*.................................*

**Keep in mind the dominant policy of the Federal Highway Administration** (that pays for 80% of almost every road improvement and bridge replacement in Pennsylvania) has always been to fund projects that will eventually result in the increased future production of federal, state and county tax revenue, and also that:

A. **Penn DOT is responsible** for the North-South movement of transient and resident consumer-motorists on North-South Route #50 (Washington Pike), not the officials of Bridgeville, South Fayette, Collier or the Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad Company.

B. Interstate Highway #79 (the only North-South interstate highway in Western Pennsylvania) **was intentionally build next to, parallel to**, and a few places over top of Washington Pike (Route #50) by the FHWA officials who have been expecting the result of increased federal, state and county tax revenues from the increased commercial and residential development.

C. That South Fayette Twp. and Coller Twp. thru which Interstate Highway #79 and parallel Washington Pike passes, are 40 square miles of tree covered, undeveloped land and now the 2 top, most rapidly residential developing municipalities in Allegheny County!

*.................................*

**I'm primarily concerned about....** the 50 years of traffic congestion that has been intentionally left unresolved by Penn DOT that has caused.... the collapse of the tax revenue producing Bridgeville Central Business District, resulting in the almost doubling of the taxes on the low to middle ($55,000 a year) income of 5,000 Bridgeville residents.
The best public services like...community facilities, leisure, recreational and teaching programs for the young and the elderly have never existed here, or at best being obviously, completely inadequate compared to those in the surrounding communities. Several years ago, before the combining of the schools in the region was accomplished, our less than ideal environment resulted in only 11% of the high school graduates in town furthering their formal education, despite their high SAT scores.

Over the years, we've all heard the rumor countless times from Penn DOT personal, and understandably repeated by the public officials in Bridgeville, Collier and South Fayette.

This politically motivated rumor was created by the State and County road building agencies to justify not eliminating the traffic congestion on Route #50 (Washington Pike) thru the Bridgeville, Collier and South Fayette business district to prevent it from from becoming a formidable competitor to the Route #19 business district in Upper St. Clair and Mt. Lebanon, only 4 miles away.

It was 1st established (and intensely promoted) by Upper St. Clair and Mt. Lebanon officials in the late 1960's, when 30,000 consumer motorists a day suddenly switched from driving to and from Pittsburgh every day thru 52 traffic lights and the Route 19 business districts, to using the just constructed I-79 thru South Fayette, Bridgeville and Collier, crippling the large business districts along Route #19.

AT ANY RATE.... I realize railroad companies don't have to be overly concerned about public opinion, but I'm asking for a meeting with you to discuss your possible support of the principles of my proposal to modify your bridge, and improve "the quality of life" that has negatively affected 2 generations of the families and children in my home town.

Sincerely yours,

Bob Fryer (412-221-2099)
Shown is only 1 of 3 of the traffic congestion sites that have existed for 40 years leading into Bridgerville because the 4 lane widening of 2 major roads were not continued thru Bridgerville and South Fayette! The photo shows the one obviously from Collier Twp. 2 similar obstructions have discouraged 50% of the consumer-motorists from driving thru Bridgerville's central business district on Washington Pike from South Fayette. The 3rd obstruction to the potential financial success of Bridgerville (& South Fayette) was the termination of the 4 lane widening of Bower Hill Road coming in from Scott at the Painters Run Road intersection, in order to steer consumers to the Route #19 business district.

The basic cause of the traffic congestion has been the 2 LANE WIDE section of Washington Pike in Bridgerville that is a "bottle neck" to the 4 LANE WIDE roads on either side of Bridgerville, and the failure to widen the same road to 4 lanes thru South Fayette!!

For 40 years, this has been THE BARRIER to the expansion of Bridgerville's business districts, that has caused the inadequate tax revenue income, that has resulted in the excessive tax burden on the residents and not having the tax revenue income to pay for many of the community's needs and infra-structure improvements that have effected the quality of life there.

The certain solutions to these problems have been recommended to Bridgerville's elected officials by 3 different city planning companies beginning in 1969, and also repeatedly recommended by the Bridgerville Planning Commission members over the years, but they were never implemented by the elected members of Bridgerville Council!

EXHIBIT # 59
To Whom It May Concern: (May 15, 2020)

The attached letter to the Officers of the Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad Company explains:

1. The necessity of ending the extensive, 50 year old Washington Pike obstruction of the movement of 50% of the consumer-motorists to and from the 3 tax revenue producing Bridgeville, Collier & South Fayette business districts on Washington Pike, that has measurable diminished the profits of the businesses, the tax revenue income to the communities, and has therefore negatively affected "the quality of the lives" of the 10's of thousands of families and children living in the area, and living specifically in Bridgeville, and

2. the attached letter also explains the REASON for the enormity of the traffic movement obstruction is that.... ALL 6 of the REGION's major secondary roads lead to a 1/4 mile long section of Washington Pike in Bridgeville that has remained a 2 lane wide bottleneck for 5 decades (See the drawing) because....

Penn DOT and the officials in Bridgeville, Collier & South Fayette have never honestly and aggressively tried jointly solving the problem that has included approaching the railroad company officials about co-operating in an effort to eliminate one of the "main" obstructions to the huge traffic problem being....

the railroad bridge is "too short" to allow Washington Pike to be widened to 4 lanes wide passing under it, a widening that 6 different independant traffic engineers have formally stated is necessary to solve the Regional traffic problem!

**********************************

Bob Fryer, 412-221-2000

(SEE EXHIBIT #1)

(SEE EXHIBIT #2)
THE FOLLOWING IS AN OVERLY SIMPLIFIED DESCRIPTION OF THE PHASES OF THE PREPARATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION SITE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF "EXTENDING" THE LENGTH OF THE RAILROAD BRIDGE, NOT REPLACING THE BRIDGE, THERE BY NOT SIGNIFICANTLY INTERRUPTING THE USE OF THE RAILROAD LINE, IN ADDITION TO REDUCING THE COST BY ONE HALF, COMPARED TO REPLACING THE ENTIRE BRIDGE! (SEE EXHIBITS #3, #4 & #5)

1. A LINE OF APPROXIMATELY 20 TWELVE INCH (12") DIAMETER HOLES, 30 FEET DEEP MUST BE BORED AND FILLED WITH CONCRETE IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE TRACKS OF THE PRESENT RAILROAD LINE TO ALLOW ITS USE TO CONTINUE. (A 6" diameter cylinder sleeve of heavy steel wire would be placed into each bored hole before the pouring of the cement, for additional re-enforcement.) (SEE EXHIBIT #6)

2. THE AREA OF.... THE SLOPE BEHIND THE PRESENT SOUTHERN HALF OF CONCRETE BRIDGE PIER, ON THE EAST SIDE OF WASHINGTON AVENUE, ALONG THE LONG ROW OF CONCRETE SUPPORT COLUMNS, CAN THEN BE REMOVED DOWN TO THE LEVEL OF WASHINGTON AVENUE, SO THE SOUTHERN HALF OF THE BRIDGE EXTENSION CAN BE BUILT. (SEE EXHIBIT #7)

The bridge extension must be built in TWO separate sections, a Southern half and a Northern half, therefore....

3. FIRST, ONE HALF OF A NEW CONCRETE EASTSIDE BRIDGE PIER CAN BE POURED AND FORMED. (SEE EXHIBIT #8)

4. THEN, A 3rd MAIN 45 FOOT LONG 6 FOOT HIGH, HORIZONTAL BRIDGE BEAM (GIRDER) MUST BE INSTALLED EXACTLY ON THE "CENTER LINE" BETWEEN THE POSITION OF THE PRESENT RAILROAD TRACKS, AND THE PREVIOUS 2nd PARALLEL SET OF RAILROAD TRACKS THAT WERE REMOVED. (SEE EXHIBIT #8)

5. THEN, THE 3 VERTICAL STEEL COLUMNS MUST BE ERECTED IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE WEST ENDS OF. (SEE EXHIBIT #8)
A. THE 1 NEW ADDITIONAL 3rd MAIN (CENTER) HORIZONTAL STEEL BRIDGE BEAM, AND ALSO

B. THE OTHER 2 NEW MAIN STEEL HORIZONTAL BRIDGE BEAMS CAN BE ERECTED.  (SEE EXHIBIT #8)

THE VERTICAL COLUMNS ARE ALL TO BE 11½ FEET HIGH, 16 INCH "H" SHAPED VERTICAL COLUMNS, AND ARE TO BE POSITIONED RIGHT NEXT TO THE PRESENT IDENTICAL VERTICAL COLUMNS SUPPORTING THE EAST ENDS OF THE PRESENT MAIN BRIDGE BEAMS, THAT ARE POSITIONED ON THE SIDE WALK. (The inter-connecting diagonal beams supporting the 3 new main bridge girders will be somewhat different from the existing diagonal beams supporting the existing ONLY 2 main bridge girders.)

6. With half of the NEW concrete Eastside bridge pier poured and the NEW vertical steel columns in position, the network of horizontal steel beams can now be installed to complete the SOUTHERN half of the bridge extension.

***

7. AFTER THAT, THE COMPLETION OF THE NORTHERN HALF OF THE BRIDGE EXTENSION CAN THEN BEGIN.

8. THE RAILROAD COMPANY "CAN MOVE" ITS EXISTING TRACKS OVER THE NEW, COMPLETE TED, LONGER SIDE OF THE BRIDGE, BY CONSTRUCTING A 500 YARD LONG "SLIGHT PARALLEL SWERVE" FROM ITS PREVIOUS ALIGNMENT.  (SEE EXHIBIT #8)

9. NOW, WITH THE CONSTRUCTION SITE FOR THE NORTHERN HALF OF THE BRIDGE EXTENSION "CLEARED" OF THE TRAIN RAILS....

A. THE SLOPE THERE CAN ALSO BE REMOVED DOWN TO THE LEVEL OF WASHINGTON AVENUE,  (SEE EXHIBIT #8)

B. THE 2nd NORTHERN HALF OF THE CONCRETE BRIDGE PIER CAN ALSO BE Poured, AND

C. THE 2nd NORTHERN HALF OF THE EXTENSION OF THE
BRIDGE CAN BE BUILT AND COMPLETED. (SEE EXHIBIT #9)

10. THE RAILROAD TRACKS COULD THEN BE MOVED BACK TO THEIR PREVIOUS ORIGINAL POSITION, IF THE RAILROAD COMPANY OFFICERS FELT THAT WAS NECESSARY.

11. THE ROW OF 20 CONCRETE 20 FOOT HIGH COLUMNS COULD BE REMOVED.

12. THE ORIGINAL CONCRETE BRIDGE PIER ON THE EAST SIDE OF WASHINGTON AVENUE COULD BE REMOVED.

13. 2 ADDITIONAL 1 WAY LANES COULD BE BUILT ON THE EAST SIDE OF WASHINGTON AVENUE UNDER THE NEW BRIDGE EXTENSION, (AND COMBINED WITH EXTENDING SHADY AVENUE IN BRIDGEVILLE 220 YARDS IT WOULD CREATE 2 ONE WAY 3 LANE WIDE MAIN STREETS THRU THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF CONSUMER-MOTORISTS DRIVING THRU THE BUSINESS DISTRICT,

THE OLDEST AND MOST ECONOMICALLY DESTRUCTIVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION PROBLEM IN THE SOUTHWESTERN SECTION OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY WILL BE ELIMINATED!

BOB FRYER, 412-221-2000
BRIDGEVILLE IS THE CAUSE OF THE REGION'S EXTENSIVE, 50 YEAR OLD, ECONOMICALLY DESTRUCTIVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION PROBLEM BECAUSE, DESPITE ALL OF THE THE MAJOR "SECONDARY" ROADS LEADING THERE FOR 150 YEARS, NO EFFORT HAS BEEN MADE BY PENN DOT AND BRIDGEVILLE OFFICIALS TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM, FOR UNACCEPTABLE POLITICAL REASONS.

WHEN BRIDGEVILLE'S TAX REVENUE PRODUCING CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT COLLAPSED 50 YEARS AGO BECAUSE OF THE OVERWHELMING TRAFFIC CONGESTION, ITS FAMILIES HAVE BEEN PAYING 50% MORE OF THEIR LOW TO MODERATE ANNUAL INCOMES COMPARED TO SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES. YET, THEIR PUBLIC FACILITIES, SERVICES & PROGRAMS CANNOT NOT BE COMPARED TO NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES.
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SPC Comments
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: Proposed amendments to the 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program

To Whom It May Concern:

Rostraver Township would like three projects to be considered as amendments to the draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). They are the I-70/SR 201 Corridor, SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection, and the Pricedale Pedestrian Bridge.

**I-70/SR 201 Corridor:**

This corridor continues to increase in traffic congestion and will continue to grow since SR 201 is the regional commercial hub of the Mon Valley. On a daily basis during rush hour, traffic backs up onto I-70 as motorists are trying to exit onto SR 201. The backup on I-70 gets so bad during the holiday season that Penn DOT annually installs temporary signage along I-70 to alert traffic of stopped vehicles trying to exit on to SR 201. Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled regional commercial corridor to improve operations, safety, and capacity. There are two areas along SR 201, that Rostraver Township has been presenting and pleading for funding: the intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and the I-70 eastbound ramp, and the intersection of SR 201 and SR1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas). Enclosed please find a timeline and supporting documentation to further explain the history of pleading for improvements for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor since 2005.

**SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection:**

With the closing of southbound traffic at Vernon Drive and SR 51, the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection has become increasingly busy. Traffic coming out of Vernon Drive cannot make a left
turn onto SR 51 southbound, now all that traffic is directed onto SR 201 to access the SR 51 southbound ramp. McTish-Kunkle and Associates prepared an Intersection Improvement Traffic Alternative Analysis for the intersection of SR 201 (Rastraver Road), Circle Drive, and SR 51 southbound on-ramps. The report used 2015 average daily traffic numbers and collected manual turning movement counts on March 16, 2016. After that time, Rostraver Township granted approval for a subdivision, Marian Woodlands, consisting of 130 single family lots off SR 201. Phase I is almost built out and Phase II and III of that development are under construction and increasing the traffic along SR 201 and the SR 51 ramps. In addition, an additional residential development is in the preliminary stages at the Willowbrook Golf Course to consist of 171 dwelling units. Rostraver Township would like to see operational and safety improvements made to this intersection as suggested by McTish Kunkle and Associates on behalf of Penn DOT. Enclosed please find a timeline and supporting documentation for improvements for the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection.

**Pricedale Pedestrian Bridge:**

The Pricedale Pedestrian Bridge provides access to the residents over I-70 to walkover the interstate to get their mail since only PO boxes are used in Pricedale. The demographics for these residents consist of a racial minority and low income, and they desperately rely on this pedestrian bridge for access over I-70. Enclosed are photos from Penn DOT on this pedestrian bridge, showing the need for safety improvements.

In closing, thank you for your time and consideration for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor (intersection of SR 1099/3013 and the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033), the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection and Pricedale Pedestrian Bridge improvements to be considered proposed amendments to the 2021-2024 TIP. If you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to further discuss these projects, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER

John Lorenzo  
Chairman

Enclosures

TMS/pb

cc:  Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners  
      Joseph Szczur, P.E. Penn DOT  
      Senator Pat Stefano  
      Representative Eric Davanzo  
      Westmoreland County Commissioners
Rostraver Township, Westmoreland County
MPMS/ID Number 88507 I-70/SR 201 Interchange
• SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and I-70 Eastbound Ramp
  • SR 201 and SR 1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas)

Brief History:
2019-
* Rostraver Township submitted a letter to the Westmoreland County Planning Department asking for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor to be part of the Transportation Improvement Program

*Rostraver Township submitted a letter to SPC as part of the Smart Moves Plan to request funding for MPMS/ID Number 88507 (I-70 at SR 201 Interchange)

*State Representative Justin M. Walsh sent a letter to SPC supporting the SPC Smart Moves Plan for I-70/SR 201 corridor

2018-
*Rostraver Township submitted a letter to SPC to add the I-70/SR 201 Corridor and SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection as Proposed Amendments to the 2019-2022 TIP

2017-
*Rostraver Township submitted a letter to SPC to reconfigure the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and to redesign the SR 201/SR 3013 (Vance Dei Cas) intersection

2016-
Rostraver Township submitted testimony to SPC to reconfigure the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and to redesign the SR 201/SR 3013 (Vance Dei Cas) intersection

2015-
*Rostraver Township submitted testimony and a letter to SPC during the Long-Range Plan Public Comment Period for I-70/SR 201, for the intersections of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and I-70 Eastbound Ramp, and the intersection of SR 201 and SR 1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas)

2014-
Rostraver Township submitted testimony to SPC to reconfigure the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and to redesign the SR 201/SR 3013 (Vance Dei Cas) intersection

2013-
*Rostraver Township sent SPC a letter asking for monies from MPMS 60360 and MPMS 67854 to be spent on the I-70/SR 201 Corridor [SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and I-70 eastbound ramp, and SR 201 and SR 1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas) intersection]

2012-
*Rostraver Township sent SPC comments on the 2013-2016 Draft TIP, requesting funding for I-70/SR 201 Corridor [SR 3033

*Documentation attached
(Pricedale Road) and I-70 eastbound ramp, and SR 201 and SR 1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas) intersection]

2011 - *Rostraver Township submitted a project abstract to the State Transportation Commission to reconfigure the I-70 eastbound ramp and SR 3033 (Pricedale Road)

2009 - *Meeting held at Rostraver Township Municipal Building with Penn DOT to discuss reconfiguring the I-70 eastbound ramp and SR 3033 (Pricedale Road)

2008 - *Rostraver Township sent a letter to Penn Dot supporting MPMS 60360 to upgrade the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013/Vance Dei Cas

*Honorable Congressman Murtha sent a letter to Joe Szczur at Penn Dot giving the OK to use the funding to upgrade the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013

*Honorable Congressman Murtha sent a letter to Allen Biehler at Penn Dot supporting Rostraver Township’s priority to upgrade the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013

2007 - *Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners did a letter making the upgrade of SR 201 and SR 3013 a priority

*Westmoreland County Commissioners send a letter to Penn Dot expressing their support for SR 201 and SR 3013

*State Representative Ted Harhai send a letter citing congestion and safety as a problem for the SR 201 Corridor

*Submitted testimony to SPC to support MPMS 60360

2006 - *Submitted testimony to SPC to support MPMS 60360

2005 - Submitted support of MPMS 60360 to SPC online

*2005-2008 Draft TIP shows MPMS 60360 (I-70/SR 201 Upgrades) receiving federal earmark

There is a corridor congestion problem for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor. Ortho-Rodgers & Associates, Inc. did a study for Penn Dot entitled *Interstate 70 and State Route 201 Corridor Study* in 2004. The study showed documented problems and to date no funding has been dedicated to the I-70/SR 201 Corridor.

*Documentation attached
July 19, 2019

Daniel Carpenter, Assistant Deputy Director
Westmoreland County Department of Planning and Development
40 N Pennsylvania Avenue
Fifth Floor
Suite 520
Greensburg, PA 15601

RE: Transportation Improvement Program
I-70/SR 201 Corridor

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

Please accept this letter as a request to add the I-70/SR 201 Corridor to the Transportation Improvement Program for operations, safety and new capacity. Since 2005, Rostraver Township has been requesting SPC to fund the I-70/SR 201 Corridor/Interchange. I have enclosed a timeline and supporting documentation to further explain the support history for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor.

The I-70/SR 201 Corridor/Interchange continues to increase in traffic congestion and will continue to grow since SR 201 is the regional commercial hub of the Mon Valley. On a daily basis during rush hour traffic backs up onto I-70 as motorists are trying to exit onto SR 201. The traffic gets so backed up that Penn DOT installs temporary signage along I-70 to alert traffic of stopped vehicles trying to exit onto SR 201. Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled regional commercial corridor to improve operations, safety and capacity. There are two areas along SR 201 that Rostraver Township has been presenting and pleading for funding:

Intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and the I-70 eastbound ramp and
Intersection of SR 201 and SR1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas).

Thank you for your time and consideration to program and fund MPMS/ID Number 88507 for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor. If you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to further discuss this project, please contact me at your earliest convenience.
Enclosures

TMS/psb

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
    Senator Pat Stefano
    Representative Justin M. Walsh
    Westmoreland County Commissioners Charles Anderson, Gina Cerilli & Ted Kopas
    Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
    Joseph Szczur, P.E.
June 6, 2019

SPC Comments
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: SPC Smart Moves – Long Range Plan – MPMS/ID Number 88507

Dear Planning Committee,

It has come to my attention that Rostraver Township is seeking programming and funding for the I 70/SR 201 interchange.

I wholeheartedly support these proposals and would appreciate your favorable consideration of the I-70 / SR 201 corridor/ interchange to improve the safety and flow of traffic in the district.

I trust you will give all due consideration to their request. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Justin M. Walsh
State Representative
58th Legislative District
JW/jo
SPC Comments
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: SPC Smart Moves – Long Range Plan

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept this letter as support from Rostraver Township for the SPC’s long range plan – Smart Moves for MPMS/ID Number 88507 (I-70 at SR 201 Interchange). This project is shown in the Plan as a need but not currently programmed with an estimated $58,000,000 total. Since 2005, Rostraver Township has been requesting SPC to fund the I-70/SR 201 Corridor/Interchange. I have enclosed a timeline recap and supporting documentation to further explain the support history for the I-70/SR 201 Interchange.

The I-70/SR 201 Corridor/Interchange continues to increase in traffic congestion and will continue to grow since SR 201 is the regional commercial hub of the Mon Valley. On a daily basis, congestion on SR 201 during rush hour backs up onto I-70. It gets so bad that Penn DOT annually installs temporary signage along I-70 to alert traffic of stopped vehicles trying to exit on to SR 201. Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled regional commercial corridor. There are two areas along SR 201, that Rostraver Township has been presenting and pleading for funding:

Intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and the I-70 eastbound ramp and
Intersection of SR 201 and SR1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas).

Thank you for your time and consideration to program and fund MPMS/ID Number 88507 for the I-70/SR 201 Intersection. Rostraver Township supports the other projects listed in the SPC Smart Moves Plan but wants programming and funding for MPMS/ID Number 88507. If you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to further discuss this project, please contact me at your earliest convenience.
Enclosures

TMS/pb

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners  
Senator Pat Stefano  
Representative Justin M. Walsh  
Westmoreland County Commissioners Charles Anderson, Gina Cerilli & Ted Kopas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Program Number</th>
<th>Reconstruction/Scoping Project Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>State Route</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</th>
<th>Selection State Route</th>
<th>State Route</th>
<th>Reconnaissance/Scoping/Reference Study 2019</th>
<th>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</th>
<th>Selection State Route</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>111073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo &amp; Downtown Townships</td>
<td>211073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheektowaga Boro, Hamburg</td>
<td>311073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonawanda</td>
<td>411073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Royall</td>
<td>511073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Woodlawn</td>
<td>611073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheektowaga, Buffalo</td>
<td>711073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Tonawanda</td>
<td>811073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Royall</td>
<td>911073</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SR 201</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>WP 1/4</td>
<td>2019011</td>
<td>NTRM Mileage From NTRM Mileage From City/County Line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPC Comments
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

June 1, 2018

RE: Proposed amendments to the 2019-2022 TIP

To Whom It May Concern:

Rostraver Township would like two projects to be considered as amendments to the draft 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). Both projects were submitted during the public participation on May 31, 2018 in Westmoreland County. They are the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements and the I-70/SR 201 Corridor. Enclosed please find testimony to be submitted for both projects.

**SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection:**

With the closing of southbound traffic at Vernon Drive and SR 51, the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection has become increasingly busy. Traffic coming out of Vernon Drive cannot make a left turn onto SR 51 southbound, now all that traffic is directed onto SR 201 to access the SR 51 southbound ramp. McIntosh-Kunkle and Associates prepared an Intersection Improvement Traffic Alternative Analysis for the intersection of SR 201 (Rostraver Road), Circle Drive, and SR 51 southbound on-ramps. The report used 2015 average daily traffic numbers and collected manual turning movement counts on March 16, 2016. After that time, Rostraver Township granted approval for a preliminary subdivision, Marian Woodlands, consisting of 130 single family lots off SR 201. Phase I and Phase II of that development are under construction and increasing the traffic along SR 201 and the SR 51 ramps.

**I-70/SR 201 Corridor:**

This corridor continues to increase in traffic congestion and will continue to grow since SR 201 is the regional commercial hub of the Mon Valley. Congestion on SR 201 during rush hour and during the holiday season traffic backs up onto I-70. It gets so bad that Penn DOT annually...
installs temporary signage along I-70 to alert traffic of stopped vehicles trying to exit on to SR 201. Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled regional commercial corridor. There are two areas along SR 201, that Rostraver Township has been presenting and pleading for funding; the intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and the I-70 eastbound ramp, and the intersection of SR 201 and SR1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas).

In closing, thank you for your time and consideration for the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements and SR 201 Corridor (intersection of SR 1099/3013 and the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033) to the proposed amendments to the 2019-2022 TIP. If you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to further discuss these projects, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAYER

Devin M. DeRienzo
Chairman

Enclosures
TMS/pb

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
Senator Pat Stefano
Representative Justin M. Walsh
Westmoreland County Commissioners Charles Anderson, Gina Cerilli & Ted Kopas
June 2, 2017

SPC Comments
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: Proposed amendments to the 2017-2020 TIP

To Whom It May Concern:

Rostraver Township would like two projects to be considered as amendments to the draft 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). They are the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements and the I-70/SR 201 Corridor. Rostraver Township fully understands the I-70/SR 201 Corridor will be addressed during the I-70 improvements but wanted to keep that corridor on your radar.

SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection:

With the closing of southbound traffic at Vernon Drive and SR 51, the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection has become increasingly busy. McTish-Kunkle and Associates prepared an Intersection Improvement Traffic Alternative Analysis for the intersection of SR 201 (Rostraver Road), Circle Drive, and SR 51 southbound on-ramps. The report used 2015 average daily traffic numbers and collected manual turning movement counts on March 16, 2016. After that time, Rostraver Township granted approval for a preliminary subdivision, Marian Woodlands, consisting of 127 single family lots off of SR 201. Rostraver Township would like confirmation that the level of service reflects the anticipated traffic from Marian Woodlands. Rostraver Township does support an intersection improvement but wants verification that the level of service is accurate with flows from Marian Woodlands.
I-70/SR 201 Corridor:

This corridor continues to increase in traffic congestion and will continue to grow since SR 201 is the regional commercial hub of the Mon Valley. Congestion on SR 201 during rush hour and during the holiday season causes traffic to back up onto I-70. Penn DOT annually installs temporary signage along I-70 to alert traffic of stopped vehicles trying to exit on to SR 201. Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled regional commercial corridor. There are two areas along SR 201, that Rostraver Township has been presenting and pleading for funding; the intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and the I-70 eastbound ramp, and the intersection of SR 201 and SR1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas).

In closing, thank you for your time and consideration for the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements and SR 201 Corridor (intersection of SR 1099/3013 and the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033) to the proposed amendments to the 2017-2020 TIP. If you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to further discuss these projects, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAYER

Gary N. Beck, Sr.
Commissioner

TMS/msc

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners  
    Senator Pat Stefano  
    Representative Justin M. Walsh  
    Charles Anderson, Gina Cerilli & Ted Kopas, Westmoreland County Commissioners  
    Brian Lawrence, Westmoreland County Planning Department  
    Bill Beaumariage, Penn DOT District 12
June 8, 2015

SPC Comments
Two Chatham Center
112 Washington Place
Suite 500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: Public Comments on long range plans to the year 2040

To Whom It May Concern:

Enclosed please find documentation from the Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners for three intersections to consider in the long range plans. The first project is for funding for safety improvements to the SR 51/SR 3025 (Vernon Drive) intersection. The second project is for two intersections to include funding for the I-70/SR 201 Corridor, for the intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and I-70 Eastbound Ramp and the intersection of SR 201 with SR 1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas).

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER

Patrick G. Egros
Chairman

TMS/psb
Enclosures

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
May 28, 2013

SPC Draft TIP, Initial Input
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: Draft 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)

To Whom It May Concern:

Since 2006, Rostraver Township has been submitting testimony for the 2007-2010 Draft TIP and subsequent TIP drafts to have improvements done at the intersection of SR 201 and SR 1099/3013. Enclosed please find a preliminary cost estimate to improve traffic patterns at this intersection by installing new traffic signals, turning lanes, upgrading existing traffic signals, and reconfiguring access points. In addition, enclosed are letters of support for this project from the Westmoreland County Commissioners, Representative Harhai and Representative Murtha.

In 2009, Rostraver Township began meeting with elected officials and Penn DOT to see if monies from MPMS 60360 or MPMS 67854 could be used to upgrade/reconfigure the I-70 eastbound ramp off of SR 3003 (Pricedale Road) to help alleviate some of the congestion on SR 201. In 2003, a needs study was done for the I-70/201 corridor by Ortho-Rodgers and Associates but the final study is still waiting final review from Penn DOT and the Federal Highway Administration since the recommendations were beyond "reasonable expense".

Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled commercial corridor by adding the SR 201 and SR 1099/3013 project and I-70 eastbound ramp and SR 3033 project to the 2015-2018 draft TIP. There is congestion on SR 201 during rush hour and especially during the holiday season when traffic backs up onto I-70.
Thank you for your time and consideration for adding SR 201 and SR 1099/3013 and I-70 eastbound ramp and SR 3033 to the 2015-2018 TIP. The SR 201 corridor is the top priority for Rostraver Township.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER

Andrew S. Temoshenko
Commissioner

Enclosures

TMS/pb

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
Senator Kim Ward
Representative Ted Harhai
Charles Anderson, Tyler Courtney & Ted Kopas, Westmoreland County Commissioners
Chris Bova, Westmoreland County Planning Department
Mike Turley, Westmoreland County
May 23, 2012

SPC Comments
425 Sixth Avenue
Suite 2500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RB: Draft 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)

To Whom It May Concern:

Rostraver Township received an email from the Smart Growth Partnership on Thursday, May 17, 2012 at 5:56 pm regarding the “Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission seeks input on Draft 2013-2016 TIP.” The Township is appreciative that Smart Growth sent the Township said notice, but the Public Participation Panel for Westmoreland County was at 6:00 pm on the same day, May 17, 2012. Needless to say, Rostraver Township was not able to attend the Public Participation Panel in Westmoreland County. Please add this letter to the public comments for the draft 2013-2016 TIP.

It is my understanding that previous chairman of the Board of Commissioners have objected to MPMS 31763/SR 806 Abandoned Tramway Bridge project. Rostraver Township does not understand the need or benefit for this project. There are other projects that are a higher priority to the Township, and the Township would prefer to see the projects described below to be on the TIP over MPMC 31763.

Since 2006, Rostraver Township has been submitting testimony for the 2007-2010 Draft TIP and subsequent TIP draft to have improvements done at the intersection of SR 201 and SR 1099/3013. Enclosed please find a preliminary cost estimate to improve traffic patterns at this intersection by installing new traffic signals, turning lanes, upgrading existing traffic signals, and reconfiguring access points. In addition, enclosed are letters of support for this project from the Westmoreland County Commissioners, Representative Harriel and Representative Murtha. In 2009, Rostraver Township began meeting with elected officials and Penn DOT to see if monies from MPMS 60360 or MPMS 67854 could be used to upgrade/reconfigure the I-70 eastbound ramp off...

1 Attached is the sign in sheet from the meeting in 2009 and an aerial photograph of the area
of SR 3003 (Pricedale Road) to help alleviate that some of the congestion on SR 201. In 2003, a needs study was done for the I-70/201 corridor by Ortho-Rodgers and Associates but the final study is still awaiting final review from Penn DOT and the Federal Highway Administration since the recommendations were beyond "reasonable expense". Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled commercial corridor by adding the SR 201 and SR 1099/3013 project and I-70 eastbound ramp and SR 3033 project to the 2013-2016 draft TIP.

Thank you for your time and consideration for adding SR 201 and SR 1099/3013 and I-70 eastbound ramp and SR 3033 to the 2013-2016 TIP.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER

[Signature]
Andrew S. Temoshenko
Commissioner

Enclosures

TMS/pb

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
    Senator Kim Ward
    Representative Ted Harhai
    Charles Anderson, Tyler Courtney & Ted Kopas, Westmoreland County Commissioners
    Jason Rigone, Westmoreland County Planning Department
    Smart Growth Partnership.
From: Sargent, Martin J [MSARGENT@pa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2011 10:46 AM
To: Tamira Spedaliere
Subject: STC Abstract for I-70 Ramp Configuration - 2013-64-0001

This email is to notify you that the 2013 Abstract you submitted for Westmoreland County, titled, I-70 Ramp Configuration was received and has been assigned the Identification Number of 2013-64-0001.

If you have any questions regarding this e-mail or require additional assistance, please feel free to contact:

Martin Sargent, Specialist Transportation Programs
PA Department of Transportation
Twelve Year Program Section - Center for Program Development and Management
400 North Street, 6th Floor; Harrisburg, PA 17120-0064
Phone: 717.772.0794 Fax: 717.787.5247

Confidentiality Notice: This electronic communication is privileged and confidential and is intended only to the party to whom it is addressed. If received in error, please notify the listed contact.
**State Transportation Commission**  
**2013 Transportation Program**  
**Project Abstract (V2013.1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. ( ), Ms. ( ) First Name</td>
<td>Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Rostraver Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:commissioners@rostraver.us">commissioners@rostraver.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(724) 929-8877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>(724) 929-5009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testifying For?</td>
<td>Rostraver Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Are you planning to present this project at any of the STC hearings?</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** I-70 Ramp Reconfiguration  
**Project Phase:** Multiple Phases  
**Is the Project/Phase on the Local Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)?** No  
**If known, what is the MPMS #?** 678  
**Project Type:** Enhancement  
**County:** Westmoreland  
**Planning Partner:** SPC MPO  
**Municipality:** Rostraver (Twp)  
**Road or Facility Name:** I-70 Ramp Reconfiguration  
**State Route #:** I-70

---

*Please provide a detailed description of the project.*

Reconfigure the I-70 east bound ramp off of Pricedale Road/SR 3003

Please provide the benefits and/or needs of the project.

**There is a traffic congestion problem at the intersection of SR 201 and Pricedale Road traffic light. If the ramp was reconfigure motorists just get directly on I-70 eastbound instead of driving up to the signalized intersection at SR 201.**

Please provide the total cost of the project. (Estimated or Actual) $0

*Please indicate whether you support or oppose this project.*  
Support Project ( )  
Oppose Project ( )

*How would you suggest this Project be funded?*

Use MPMS 67854 to help pay for this project.
# ATTENDANCE SHEET

**TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER**  
**201 MUNICIPAL DRIVE**  
**BELLE VERNON, PA 15012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rick LoPresti</td>
<td>Rostrawer Commissioner</td>
<td>724-929-8878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harri Bailey</td>
<td>PennDOT</td>
<td>724-439-7259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Dutka</td>
<td>PennDOT</td>
<td>724-489-7340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Patterson</td>
<td>Rost Top Co.</td>
<td>724-929-8827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Gluck</td>
<td>Pittsburgh ABE</td>
<td>724-355-4800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Neyrech</td>
<td>PennDOT</td>
<td>724-489-7340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Anderson</td>
<td>Rost Commissioner</td>
<td>724-820-3104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. DeCar</td>
<td>Chester ABE</td>
<td>724-483-8291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Yunker</td>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>724-535-2692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Smolich</td>
<td>Rost ABE</td>
<td>924-820-3102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ritten</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>724-600-7002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Harkins</td>
<td>Rostaver Township</td>
<td>724-929-8811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mowdy</td>
<td>Rostaver Township</td>
<td>724-929-8811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Gawik</td>
<td>Gov. Office</td>
<td>412-565-5700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Nick Lorenzo, Chairman
Township of Rostrover
Board of Commissioners
Municipal Building
201 Municipal Drive
Belle Vernon, Pennsylvania 15012

Dear Mr. Lorenzo:

This is in response to your June 9, 2008 request for information concerning the State Route 0201/3013 and State Route 0051/Barl Road Intersections in Rostrover Township, Westmoreland County.

Your letter indicates that you believe that both intersection projects are not on the Draft 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Plan. Upon review of the current Draft TIP, the State Route 0051/Barl Road intersection is on the Plan for all phases.

The State Route 0201/3013 intersection is not actually a project on its own at this time; however, it is a part of the I-70/State Route 0201 Study. In order to make this a stand-alone project, new policies concerning funding of projects on the TIP must be met. Either of two scenarios that would be required by both SPC and FHWA are as follows:

- All project phase and fully funded costs must be on the TIP.
- The project must be on SPC’s Long Range plan.

Since neither of these conditions exist, the project cannot be advanced through FHWA and preliminary design must be initiated.

As mentioned in previous correspondence, the I-70/State Route 0201 Study resulted in some recommendations. The available earmark Funds will need to be used to complete any feasible recommendations prior to moving funding.

Should you have any further questions or require additional information, please contact Assistant District Executive Design & Alan Bailey, P.E., at 724-439-7259.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Szymaszek, P.E.
District Executive
Engineering District 12-0

[2008 RAB MPL]
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER
Board of Commissioners

Municipal Building
201 Municipal Drive
Belle Vernon, PA 15012
(724) 929-8877 • Fax: (724) 929-5009
www.rostraver.us
e-mail: commissioners@rostraver.us

March 17, 2008

Congressman John P. Murtha
547 Main Street, Suite 401
Johnstown, PA 15907

Attn: Joe Yankovich

Re: Intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013/MPMS 69360

Dear Honorable Congressman Murtha:

The Rostrawer Township Board of Commissioners has made the upgrade of the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013 a priority since discussing it at the Work Session held on May 21, 2007.

The Westmoreland County Commissioners wrote PennDOT a letter dated September 26, 2007 supporting a traffic study to be conducted on the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013. Representative Harhai sent the Township a letter dated June 5, 2007 that supports our “efforts to improve conditions at this intersection” and pledging his “assistance to work with Congressman Murtha and his staff to secure the resources required to execute this plan.” Both Senator Regola and Representative Harhai have made a point to attend our many meetings regarding this important project for our community.

We would appreciate all of the help and direction you can provide concerning this project.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER

Nick Lorenzo, Chairman
Thomas G. Patterson, Vice Chairman
Patrick G. Egros, Commissioner
Ralph Iacoboni, Commissioner
Brian L. Sokol, Commissioner

Cc: Rostrawer Township Board of Commissioners
Joseph Szczur, P.E. (PennDOT)
Westmoreland County Commissioners
Representative Ted Harhai
Senator Bob Regola
May 2, 2008

Mr. Joe Szczur
District Executive
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
PO Box 459
Uniontown, PA 15401-0459

Dear Mr. Szczur:

This letter is in regards to the funding that is in place for the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013 in Rostraver Township.

As evidenced by the attached letter, the Rostraver Commissioners, as well as other County and State officials, have decided that the available funding be used to upgrade the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013. I do realize that, as you have stated, the money would be better utilized towards a bridge project. However, please understand that this is the decision of the majority of the elected officials and residents that I serve in Congress. As their public servant, it is necessary that I act in their favor.

I request that the funding currently available be used to make improvements to the intersection mentioned above. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further, I ask you to please call my office.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. MURTHA
YOUR CONGRESSMAN

JPM:jy
To: Nick Lorenzo  
Fax number: 724-929-5009

Date: 5/12/2008

Regarding: SR 201 and SR 3013

Comments:

Fr: Joseph Yankovich  
Field Rep.  
Honorable John P. Murtha  
1-800-289-2642
June 9, 2008

Joseph J. Szczur, P. E.
District Engineer
Engineering District 12-0
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Transportation
P: O. Box 459
Uniontown, PA 15401

Dear Mr. Szczur:

Rostraver Township has reviewed the 2009-2012 Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) listing as prepared by the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commissions (SPC). Rostraver Township was disturbed to notice that MPMS numbers 60360 (I-70/SR 201 Upgrades) and 75977 (SR 51/Darr Rd Intersection) have been removed from the proposed list. I plan to submit testimony to SPC on Tuesday, June 17, 2008 at the Westmoreland County Courthouse supporting both of these projects.

The attached letter sent from the Honorable Congressman Murtha’s office dated May 2, 2008, supports the use the funds from MPMS 60360 to upgrade the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013. Rostraver Township has made this project a priority and would like this to remain on the 2009-2012 Draft TIP.

Two different studies have been done along SR 51/Darr Road, one by HRG for SPC entitled Route 51 Land Use & Transportation Initiative and another study by SP&K for Penn Dot for a Route 51 Needs Study. On the 2007-2010 TIP, both federal and state monies were proposed for MPMS 75977. Rostraver Township would like a copy of the SP&K study and for this project to remain on the 2009-2012 Draft TIP.
As I have previously stated, Rostraver Township supports both projects (MPMS 60360 and 75977) and would like an explanation as to why these projects have been removed from the 2009-2012 Draft TIP especially since funds have been spent on previous studies for both of these projects.

TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Nick Lorenzo
Chairman

Attachments

TMS/sf

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
    Honorable Congressman John P. Murtha
    Senator Bob Regola
    Representative Ted Harhai
    Westmoreland County Commissioners
    Allen D. Bishler
May 2, 2008

Mr. Joe Szczur
District Executive
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
PO Box 459
Uniontown, PA 15401-0459

Dear Mr. Szczur:

This letter is in regards to the funding that is in place for the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013 in Rostraver Township.

As evidenced by the attached letter, the Rostraver Commissioners, as well as other County and State officials, have decided that the available funding be used to upgrade the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013. I do realize that, as you have stated, the money would be better utilized towards a bridge project. However, please understand that this is the decision of the majority of the elected officials and residents that I serve in Congress. As their public servant, it is necessary that I act in their favor.

I request that the funding currently available be used to make improvements to the intersection mentioned above. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further, I ask you to please call my office.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. MURTHA
YOUR CONGRESSMAN
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–3812
May 2, 2008

The Honorable Allen Biehler
Secretary
PA Department of Transportation
400 North St.
Commonwealth Keystone Bldg 8th Fl
Harrisburg, PA 17120-8041

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The Rostraver Township commissioners have contacted me to inform me that their transportation priorities have changed. I'm writing to express my support for their request to prioritize the upgrading of the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013 as long as this request complies with all PennDOT standards and regulations and requirements for federal highway funding.

If you have any further questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JOHN P. MURTHA
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

JPM:AM
September 26, 2007

Joe Szur
District Manager
PennDOT District 12
825 North Gallatin Avenue Ext.
Uniontown, PA 15401-2105

Dear Mr. Szur:

We write to express our support for a traffic study to be conducted on the intersection of SR 201 and SR 3013. The study would determine the feasibility of upgrading the intersection with new traffic signals, turning lane and new access driveway to the Jacobson property.

As you are aware this traffic study has the support of the Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and we hope you look favorably upon our request.

Sincerely,

Tom Balya
Chairman

Tom Cerso
Commissioner

Phil Light
Commissioner

CC: Nick Lorenzo, Chairman, Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
    Larry Larse, Westmoreland County Planning Department
June 5, 2007

Mr. Nick Lorenz, President
Board of Commissioners
Township of Rostraver
Municipal Building
201 Municipal Drive
Belle Vernon, PA 15012

R.B.: MPMS 60360

Dear Commissioner Lorenz:

Thank you for your letter dated April 12, 2007 regarding the above-referenced project. I am in complete agreement with your opinion that more than enough resources have been expended studying the problem. We are well aware of what the issue is now is the time to implement the solution, which you kindly included with your correspondence.

For many years, the current configuration of that intersection has led to increased traffic congestion and decreased safety. The proposal put forth by Rostraver Township will greatly improve the traffic flow and reduce the hazards endured by the public that utilize the Route 201 corridor.

I wholeheartedly support the township's efforts to improve conditions at this intersection and pledge my assistance to work with Congressman Minta and his staff to secure the resources required to execute this plan.

Please have your staff contact my office if you have any further questions so that we can get the ball rolling with this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

R. Ted Hartman
State Representative
38th Legislative District
June 12, 2007

Congressman John P. Murtha
Centre Town Mall
PO Box 780
Vine and Walnuts Streets
Johnstown, PA. 15907-0780

Attention: Allen Myers

Dear Honorable Congressman Murtha:

Enclosed please find the supporting documentation which supplemented my testimony presented to SPC on June 5, 2007 during the Westmoreland County Public Participation Panel for MPMS 60360. I have also enclosed a status report from SPC clarifying the placement of MPMS 60360 as being initiated on a previous Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), but not advanced on the 2007-2010 TIP.

Rostraver Township does not want MPMS 60360 to be removed from the TIP and would appreciate any support you could give to this project. Please contact me at your convenience to set a meeting to discuss our proposal submitted to SPC. I look forward to hearing from you soon. Thank you for your time and consideration.

TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Nick Lorenzo
Chairman

TMS/psb

Enclosures

CC: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
File (w/ enclosures)
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER
Board of Commissioners

Municipal Building
201 Port Royal Road
Belle Vernon, PA 15012
(724) 929-8877
Fax (724) 929-5009
www.rostraver.us
e-mail: commissioners@rostraver.us

July 24, 2006

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

RE: Testimony for MPMS 60360

To Whom It May Concern:

Enclosed please find supporting documentation to supplement the testimony I presented on July 13, 2006 during the Westmoreland County Public Participation Panel for MPMS 60360. According to the draft 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program, MPMS 60360 does not appear on the draft. Rostraver Township believes too much time and effort has been spent on this project since a needs study was done by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for this area.

Rostraver Township would like to see some improvement with the intersection of SR 201 and SR 1099. Enclosed please find a preliminary cost estimate to improve traffic patterns at this intersection by installing two new traffic signals, a left turn lane and upgrading the existing traffic signals. As well, enclosed are a drawing showing the existing conditions of the intersection and a drawing showing the proposed improvements.

Please accept this letter as a formal notice that Rostraver Township does not MPMS 60360 taken off the 2007-2010 TIP. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER

Nick Lorenzo
Chairman

TMS/ef

Enclosures

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
Joe Szczur
Rostraver Township

Intersection Improvements to SR 201 and SR 1099

Project Description: Improve traffic patterns, create access entrance to proposed Business Park, existing gas station, car wash and beer distributor. Install two (2) new traffic signals, left turn lane, and upgrade existing traffic signals.

COST BREAKDOWN

1. Traffic Signals $250,000.00
2. Left Turn Lane $600,000.00
3. Right-of-Way $50,000.00
4. Lighting $100,000.00
5. Engineering $12,000.00

TOTAL PROJECT $1,112,000.00
Rostraver Township, Westmoreland County
SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements

Brief History:

2018- * Rostraver Township submitted a letter to SPC asking to amend the 2019-2022 TIP to make improvements to this intersection

2017- * Rostraver Township submitted a letter to SPC to support a project for the SR 201/SR51 Ramp Intersection Improvements. (With the closing of southbound traffic at Vernon Drive and SR 51, the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection has become increasingly busy. Traffic along Vernon Drive cannot make a left turn onto SR 51 southbound, now all that traffic is directed onto SR 201 to access the SR 51 southbound ramp.)

2016- McTish-Kunkel and Associates prepared an Alternatives Analysis Report for Penn DOT for the SR 201 & SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements. * 4 Project alternatives and preliminary cost estimates were presented.

*Documentation attached
SPC Comments  
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500  
112 Washington Place  
Pittsburgh, PA  15219

RE: Proposed amendments to the 2019-2022 TIP

To Whom It May Concern:

Rostraver Township would like two projects to be considered as amendments to the draft 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). Both projects were submitted during the public participation on May 31, 2018 in Westmoreland County. They are the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements and the I-70/SR 201 Corridor. Enclosed please find testimony to be submitted for both projects.

SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection:
With the closing of southbound traffic at Vernon Drive and SR 51, the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection has become increasingly busy. Traffic coming out of Vernon Drive cannot make a left turn onto SR 51 southbound, now all that traffic is directed onto SR 201 to access the SR 51 southbound ramp. McTish-Kunkle and Associates prepared an Intersection Improvement Traffic Alternative Analysis for the intersection of SR 201 (Rostraver Road), Circle Drive, and SR 51 southbound on-ramps. The report used 2015 average daily traffic numbers and collected manual turning movement counts on March 16, 2016. After that time, Rostraver Township granted approval for a preliminary subdivision, Marian Woodlands, consisting of 130 single family lots off SR 201. Phase I and Phase II of that development are under construction and increasing the traffic along SR 201 and the SR 51 ramps.

I-70/SR 201 Corridor:
This corridor continues to increase in traffic congestion and will continue to grow since SR 201 is the regional commercial hub of the Mon Valley. Congestion on SR 201 during rush hour and during the holiday season traffic backs up onto I-70. It gets so bad that Penn DOT annually
installs temporary signage along I-70 to alert traffic of stopped vehicles trying to exit on to SR 201. Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled regional commercial corridor. There are two areas along SR 201, that Rostraver Township has been presenting and pleading for funding; the intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and the I-70 eastbound ramp, and the intersection of SR 201 and SR1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas).

In closing, thank you for your time and consideration for the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements and SR 201 Corridor (intersection of SR 1099/3013 and the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033) to the proposed amendments to the 2019-2022 TIP. If you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to further discuss these projects, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAYER

Devin M. DeRienzo
Chairman

Enclosures

TMS/pb

cc: Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners
    Senator Pat Stefano
    Representative Justin M. Walsh
    Westmoreland County Commissioners Charles Anderson, Gina Cerilli & Ted Kopas
June 2, 2017

SPC Comments
Two Chatham Center, Suite 500
112 Washington Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: Proposed amendments to the 2017-2020 TIP

To Whom It May Concern:

Rostraver Township would like two projects to be considered as amendments to the draft 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). They are the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements and the I-70/SR 201 Corridor. Rostraver Township fully understands the I-70/SR 201 Corridor will be addressed during the I-70 improvements but wanted to keep that corridor on your radar.

SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection:
With the closing of southbound traffic at Vernon Drive and SR 51, the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection has become increasingly busy. McTish-Kunkle and Associates prepared an Intersection Improvement Traffic Alternative Analysis for the intersection of SR 201 (Rostraver Road), Circle Drive, and SR 51 southbound on-ramps. The report used 2015 average daily traffic numbers and collected manual turning movement counts on March 16, 2016. After that time, Rostraver Township granted approval for a preliminary subdivision, Marian Woodlands, consisting of 127 single family lots off of SR 201. Rostraver Township would like confirmation that the level of service reflects the anticipated traffic from Marian Woodlands. Rostraver Township does support an intersection improvement but wants verification that the level of service is accurate with flows from Marian Woodlands.
I-70/SR 201 Corridor:

This corridor continues to increase in traffic congestion and will continue to grow since SR 201 is the regional commercial hub of the Mon Valley. Congestion on SR 201 during rush hour and during the holiday season causes traffic to back up onto I-70. Penn DOT annually installs temporary signage along I-70 to alert traffic of stopped vehicles trying to exit on to SR 201. Since time and money have been spent on studying the I-70/SR 201 corridor, Rostraver Township would like to see upgrades to this heavily traveled regional commercial corridor. There are two areas along SR 201, that Rostraver Township has been presenting and pleading for funding; the intersection of SR 3033 (Pricedale Road) and the I-70 eastbound ramp, and the intersection of SR 201 and SR1099/3013 (Vance Dei Cas).

In closing, thank you for your time and consideration for the SR 201/SR 51 Ramp Intersection Improvements and SR 201 Corridor (intersection of SR 1099/3013 and the I-70 eastbound ramp with SR 3033) to the proposed amendments to the 2017-2020 TIP. If you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to further discuss these projects, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TOWNSHIP OF ROSTRAVER

[Signature]
Gary N. Beck, Sr.
Commissioner

TMS/msc

cc:  Rostraver Township Board of Commissioners  
     Senator Pat Stefano  
     Representative Justin M. Walsh  
     Charles Anderson, Gina Cerilli & Ted Kopas, Westmoreland County Commissioners  
     Brian Lawrence, Westmoreland County Planning Department  
     Bill Beaumariage, Penn DOT District 12
### CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROADWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASS 1 EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$202,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0501-7313</td>
<td>12&quot; REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, TYPE B, 15'-1.5&quot; FILL</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0505-2741</td>
<td>TYPE S CONCRETE TOP UNIT AND BICYCLE SAFE GRATE</td>
<td>SET</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0505-2850</td>
<td>STANDARD INLET BOX, HEIGHT 42&quot; X 10&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0508-0001</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509-0003</td>
<td>INSPECTOR'S FIELD OFFICE AND INSPECTION FACILITIES, TYPE B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509-0008</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT PACKAGE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0566-0020</td>
<td>POST CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BMPs</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0589-0002</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION SURVEYING, TYPE B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNING AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0931-0001</td>
<td>POST MOUNTED SIGNS, TYPE B</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0935-0001</td>
<td>POST MOUNTED SIGNS, TYPE F</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0960-0224</td>
<td>WHITE HOT THERMOPLASTIC LEGEND, &quot;ONLY&quot;</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0974-0489</td>
<td>WATERBORNE PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; HOT THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; HOT THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804-0011</td>
<td>SEEDING AND SOIL SUPPLEMENTS - FORMULA B MODIFIED</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804-0012</td>
<td>SEEDING - FORMULA E MODIFIED</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0860-0002</td>
<td>INLET FILTER BAG FOR TYPE C INLET</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0865-0001</td>
<td>SILT BARRIER FENCE, 18&quot; HEIGHT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTENANCE &amp; PROTECTION OF TRAFFIC</td>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-0231</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL WARNING LIGHTS, TYPE B</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-0240</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$558,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% CONTINGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$111,651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% CONSTR. INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$102,486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$770,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$771,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0991-0001</td>
<td>PERMITS FOR UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0991-0002</td>
<td>SURVEYING UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RIGHT-OF-WAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0991-0003</td>
<td>CALIBER FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $30,000
## CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROADWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0601-7373</td>
<td>18&quot; REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, TYPE B, 15'-1.8&quot; FILL</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0605-2741</td>
<td>TYPE S CONCRETE TOP UNIT AND BICYCLE SAFE GRATE</td>
<td>SET</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0606-2850</td>
<td>STANDARD INLET BOX, HEIGHT 40&quot; X 10&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0608-0001</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0609-0003</td>
<td>INSPECTOR'S FIELD OFFICE AND INSPECTION FACILITIES, TYPE B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0609-0009</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT PACKAGE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0686-0202</td>
<td>POST CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BMPs</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0689-0002</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION SURVEYING, TYPE B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0689-0005</td>
<td>NETWORK SCHEDULE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0936-0010</td>
<td>STRUCTURE MOUNTED FLAT SHEET ALUMINUM SIGNS WITH STIFFNERS</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0936-0020</td>
<td>STRUCTURE MOUNTED FLAT SHEET ALUMINUM SIGNS</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0951-0120</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL SUPPORT, 25' MAST ARM</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0951-0130</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL SUPPORT, 35' MAST ARM</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0951-0135</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL SUPPORT, 35' MAST ARM</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0952-1030</td>
<td>NEMA TS-2, TYPE 1, CONTROLLER ASSEMBLY, TYPE 1 MOUNTING</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0954-0012</td>
<td>2 INCH CONDUIT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>$2,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0954-0151</td>
<td>TRENCH AND BACKFILL, TYPE I</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0954-0153</td>
<td>TRENCH AND BACKFILL, TYPE III</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$1,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0954-0202</td>
<td>SIGNAL CABLE, 14 AWG, 5 CONDUCTOR</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0954-0203</td>
<td>SIGNAL CABLE, 14 AWG, 7 CONDUCTOR</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0954-0202</td>
<td>JUNCTION BOX, JL-27</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0954-0402</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL SERVICE, TYPE B</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0955-2208</td>
<td>VEHICULAR SIGNAL HEAD, THREE 12&quot; SECTIONS</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0955-2210</td>
<td>VEHICULAR SIGNAL HEAD, FIVE 12&quot; SECTIONS</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0956-0700</td>
<td>VIDEO DETECTOR</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0956-0801</td>
<td>OPTICAL PREEMPTION SYSTEM</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNING AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0931-0001</td>
<td>POST MOUNTED SIGNS, TYPE B</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0935-0001</td>
<td>POST MOUNTED SIGNS, TYPE F</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE HOT THERMOPLASTIC LEGEND, &quot;ONLY&quot;</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE HOT THERMOPLASTIC LEGEND, &quot;LEFT ARROW&quot;, 12'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATERBORNE PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; HOT THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24&quot; HOT THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4802-0001</td>
<td>TOPSOIL FURNISHED AND PLACED MODIFIED</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804-0011</td>
<td>SEEDING AND SOIL SUPPLEMENTS - FORMULA B MODIFIED</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804-0014</td>
<td>SEEDING - FORMULA E MODIFIED</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0860-0002</td>
<td>INLET FILTER BAG FOR TYPE C INLET</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0865-0001</td>
<td>SILT BARRIER FENCE, 14' HEIGHT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAINTENANCE &amp; PROTECTION OF TRAFFIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-0231</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL WARNING LIGHTS, TYPE B</td>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-0240</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$713,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% CONTINGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15% CONSTR. INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$128,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$984,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$985,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001-0001</td>
<td>RELOCATE OVERHEAD UTILITIES (1 POLE AFFECTED)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL |       |       |       |            | $30,000 |

## RIGHT-OF-WAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001-0001</td>
<td>ESTIMATE RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION (NO ANTICIPATED PROPERTY IMPACTS)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL |       |       |       |            | $0.00  |
## CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROADWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-0024</td>
<td>CLASS 1 EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>3.370</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$67,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-3400</td>
<td>ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>7,320</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$554,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-0024</td>
<td>REMOVE EXISTING BUILDINGS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0000</td>
<td>PLAIN CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT, 6&quot; DEPTH</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0745</td>
<td>18&quot; REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, TYPE B, 18&quot; X 8&quot; FILL</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0250</td>
<td>STANDARD INLET BOX, HEIGHT 6&quot; X 10&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0000</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0000</td>
<td>INSPECTOR'S FIELD OFFICE AND INSPECTION FACILITIES, TYPE B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0000</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT PACKAGE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0000</td>
<td>PLAIN CONCRETE MOUNTABLE CURB, TYPE A</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0000</td>
<td>POST CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BMPs</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0000</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION SURVEYING, TYPE B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675-0000</td>
<td>NETWORK SCHEDULE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIA</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0931-0000</td>
<td>SIGNING AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0931-0000</td>
<td>POST MOUNTED SIGNS, TYPE B</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATERBORNE PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; HOT THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24&quot; HOT THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOPSOIL FURNISHED AND PLACED MODIFIED</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0904-0004</td>
<td>SEEDING - FORMULA B MODIFIED</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0905-0002</td>
<td>INLET FILTER BAG FOR TYPE C INLET</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0905-0001</td>
<td>SILT BARRIER FENCE, 18&quot; HEIGHT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAINTENANCE &amp; PROTECTION OF TRAFFIC</td>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-0231</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL WARNING LIGHTS, TYPE B</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0901-0240</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** | **$1,172,443**

20% CONTINGENCY | 0.20 |

15% CONSTR. INSPECTION | 0.15 |

**TOTAL** | **$1,617,971**

SAY | **$1,618,000**

## UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELOCATE UTILITIES</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELOCATE UNDERGROUND WATERLINE (POSSIBLE IMPACT)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELOCATE OVERHEAD UTILITIES (3 POLES AFFECTED)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **$100,000**

## RIGHT-OF-WAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESTIMATE RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION (2 ANTIPTICATED PROPERTY IMPACTS)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **$50,000**
## CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0601-7312</td>
<td>18&quot; REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, TYPE B, 15'-1.5&quot; FILL</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0605-2741</td>
<td>TYPE S CONCRETE TOP UNIT AND BICYCLE SAFE GRATE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0655-2850</td>
<td>STANDARD INLET BOX, HEIGHT &lt;= 10'</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0669-0001</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0609-0003</td>
<td>INSPECTOR’S FIELD OFFICE AND INSPECTION FACILITIES, TYPE B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0608-2020</td>
<td>POST CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BMPs</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0685-0002</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION SURVEYINGS, TYPE B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0685-0003</td>
<td>NETWORK SCHEDULE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRAFFIC SIGNALS

- N/A

### SIGNING AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0931-0001</td>
<td>POST MOUNTED SIGNS, TYPE B</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0935-0001</td>
<td>POST MOUNTED SIGNS, TYPE F</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0960-0224</td>
<td>WHITE HOT THERMOPLASTIC LEGEND, &quot;LEFT ARROW&quot;, 12'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0960-0225</td>
<td>WATERBORNE PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; HOT THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; HOT THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4802-0001</td>
<td>TOPSOIL FURNISHED AND PLACED MODIFIED</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804-0011</td>
<td>SEEDING AND SOIL SUPPLEMENTS - FORMULA B MODIFIED</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804-0016</td>
<td>SEEDING - FORMULA E MODIFIED</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0860-0002</td>
<td>INLET FILTER BAG FOR TYPE C INLET</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0855-0001</td>
<td>SILT BARRIER FENCE, 18&quot; HEIGHT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAINTENANCE & PROTECTION OF TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0905-0031</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL WARNING LIGHTS, TYPE B</td>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0905-0240</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNS</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** $581,440  
**20% CONTINGENCY** $116,288  
**15% CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION** $87,169  
**TOTAL** $774,787  
**SAY** $775,000

## UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELOCATE OVERHEAD UTILITIES (1 POLE AFFECTED)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $30,000

## RIGHT-OF-WAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESTIMATE RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION (NO ANTICIPATED PROPERTY IMPACTS)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $0
North Entrance - Firestone Bridge
October 20, 2015

Mr. Robert A. Lohr, Zoning Officer
Township of Rostraver
201 Municipal Drive
Belle Vernon, PA  15012

Re: Customer Care Complaint #20150922-D12-A2LL6U

Dear Mr. Lohr:

This is in response to your September 18, 2015 letter concerning the condition of the Pedestrian Overpass over Interstate 70 (Bridge No. 64-0070-0414-2286) in Rostraver Township, Westmoreland County.

The bridge receives a regular inspection every two years in accordance with National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS) focusing on areas that exhibit deterioration. The last inspection was completed this past spring. After receipt of the aforementioned letter, the pedestrian bridge was re-inspected. That inspection revealed no significant changes in the condition of the bridge or deficiencies that were not known previously, and the bridge is structurally sound to carry pedestrians. Repair of the steel railing on the concrete stairs and the hole in the steel deck at the north end will be scheduled in the near future. The next inspection is scheduled for May 2017.

At this time, the bridge is not scheduled for replacement or rehabilitation. Your concerns, the number of people crossing the bridge, and its importance relative to the state highway system, will be considered in the planning of future projects. Until then, the bridge will continue to be inspected and maintained.

Thank you for your interest in the safety of transportation facilities in Rostraver Township. Should you have any further questions about this matter, please contact me at 724.439.7340, or Assistant District Executive-Design, Rachel D. Duda, P.E., at 724.439.7259.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Joseph J. Szczur, P.E.
District Executive
Engineering District 12-0

120/SJH/clh
August 17, 2011

Rostraver Township, Westmoreland County
Pedestrian Overpass over I-70

Mr. Robert A. Lohr, Zoning Officer
Township of Rostraver
201 Municipal Drive
Belle Vernon, PA 15012

Dear Mr. Lohr:

I am writing in response to your letter dated July 28, 2011 concerning the condition of the pedestrian bridge that spans over Interstate 70 in the Township (Bridge No. 64-0070-0414-2286).

The bridge receives a regular inspection every two years in accordance with the National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS) focusing on areas that exhibit deterioration. The last inspection was completed this past spring. After receiving your letter, the bridge was re-inspected. The inspection revealed no significant changes in the condition of the bridge or deficiencies that we were not aware of previously. The bridge is capable of carrying pedestrian loads safely. The next inspection is scheduled for May 2013.

The bridge is not scheduled for replacement or rehabilitation at this time, however your concerns will be considered in the planning of future projects. Until then, we will continue to inspect and maintain the bridge.

Your interest in the safety of transportation facilities in Rostraver Township, Westmoreland County is appreciated. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please telephone me at 724-439-7340.

Very truly yours,

Rachel O'Duda

Joseph J. Szczur, P.E.
District Executive
Engineering District 12-0

120/SJH/mle

cc: dumm

Engineering District 12-0 | P. O. Box 459 | Uniontown, PA 15401
Westmoreland County
Pricedale Pedesrain Bridge
Over I-70

Mr. Henry V. Sciortino
Secretary-Manager
Rostraver Township
R. D. #1, Municipal Building
Rostraver, Pennsylvania 15012

Dear Mr. Sciortino:

In reply to your letter of May 5, 1982 concerning the condition of the subject bridge, our Maintenance Department has reviewed this situation and have programmed a rehabilitation of the deteriorated abutment.

Your interest and concern for the safety of Pennsylvania motorists and pedestrians is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Walter E. Bothe

John E. Claypool, P.E.
District Engineer
District 12-0

120/KW/mab
May 5, 1982

John E. Claypool, P.E.
District 12-0
Department of Highways
P. O. Box 459
Uniontown, PA 15401

Re: Overhead Bridge Crosswalk I-70

Dear Mr. Claypool:

During the course of a public meeting held in Rostraver Township, a citizen pointed out that a crosswalk in Pricedale suspended over I-70 is in need of repair and possibly lighting. I would appreciate very much if members of your staff could review the circumstance and make appropriate determinations and reply to the Township concerning any finding.

Sincerely,

Rostraver Township

Henry V. Sciortino
Secretary-Manager

HVS:fm
IN REPLY REFER TO

Westmoreland County
L. R. 118
Rostraver Township
Pedestrian Bridge over Interstate 70

Honorable James J. Manderino
Member, House of Representatives
425 Main Capitol Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Dear Mr. Manderino:

I received your March 17, 1980 letter concerning the pedestrian bridge over Interstate 70 in Pricedale, Rostraver Township.

This pedestrian bridge is under contract to be painted this fiscal year. We have been aware of the condition of this structure and many others for quite some time and were fortunate enough to place this structure on our 1979-80 Bridge Painting Program.

Hopefully, as funding becomes available it will be possible to paint many more of the structures that are in dire need of painting.

I thank you for your interest in assisting the public with problems involving bridges in our district.

Very truly yours,

John L. Sokol, Jr., P.E.
District Engineer
District 12-0

120/TAA/mab
Part 3

Summaries of Virtual and Public Participation Panel Meetings
Virtual Public Meetings—Spring 2020

In spring 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic and Governor Wolf's Stay-At-Home orders, SPC was unable to hold in-person public meetings with our Public Participation Panels for the public comment period. Three virtual public meetings were held instead, one for each of our PennDOT Districts, giving an overview of what was included in the draft TIP. Resources were put on the SPC website and comments were accepted through a new client relationship management program. Recordings of the archived virtual public meetings are available on the SPC YouTube Channel.

Early Input Public Participation Panel Meetings—Fall 2019

In fall 2019, SPC held a Public Participation Panel meeting in each of the ten counties. These meetings gave the public an update on the development of the draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). At the meetings the public heard about the progress of major transportation projects, were able to ask questions of SPC and PennDOT personnel, and were able to give their ideas and feedback as early input for the draft TIP.

Public notices and samples of outreach are provided in Section 4.
Part 4

Documentation of Public Outreach Activities
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission Notice of
PUBLIC MEETINGS

Join SPC’s Public Participation Panels for an update on developing the draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The draft 2021-2024 TIP is the implementation mechanism for SmartMoves for a Changing Region, the region’s official transportation and development plan. Hear about the progress of major transportation projects, ask questions of SPC and PennDOT, and give your ideas and feedback for the draft TIP.

SPC’s Public Participation Panels encourage you to attend a public meeting to learn more about the draft documents. Meetings will be open house in format. There will be opportunities to look at maps, talk to representatives from SPC, PennDOT, transit operators, and planning departments, ask questions, and submit comments.

Please note the time and location of your county meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Oct. 22</td>
<td>1-3pm</td>
<td>Beaver County Courthouse, Commissioners Meeting Rm, 810 Third St., Beaver, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Oct. 28</td>
<td>11:30-1pm</td>
<td>Crane Rm Grille, 3009 Wilmington Rd., New Castle, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Oct. 30</td>
<td>3-6pm</td>
<td>Indiana CareerLink, 300 Indian Springs Road, Indiana PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny &amp; City of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Nov. 4</td>
<td>3-6pm</td>
<td>SPC Conference Center, Two Chatham Center, 112 Washington Place, 4th floor, Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Nov. 7</td>
<td>3-6pm</td>
<td>Fayette Chamber of Commerce, 65 W Main St., Uniontown, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Nov. 12</td>
<td>3-6pm</td>
<td>Washington County Courthouse Square Building, Rm 103, 100 West Beau St., Washington, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td>3-6pm</td>
<td>Greene County Office Building, 1st floor conference Rm, 93 E. High St., Waynesburg, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Nov. 19</td>
<td>3-6pm</td>
<td>Butler County Government Center, 1st Floor Public Meeting Rm, 124 West Diamond St., Butler, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>Nov. 20</td>
<td>3-6pm</td>
<td>Westmoreland County Commissioner’s Meeting Rm, 2 N Main St., Greensburg, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Dec. 5</td>
<td>3-6pm</td>
<td>Armstrong County Commissioners Conference Rm, 450 Market St., Kittanning, PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This notice satisfies the program of projects requirements of the Urbanized Area Formula Program of the Federal Transit Administration for Beaver County Transit Authority, Butler Transit Authority, Fayette Area Coordinated Transit, Mid Mon Valley Transit Authority, Port Authority of Allegheny County, Washington County Transportation Authority, Westmoreland County Transit Authority, Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, and Commutetion, a program of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) is committed to compliance with nondiscrimination requirements of civil rights statutes, executive orders, regulations and policies applicable to the programs and activities it administers. Accordingly, SPC is committed to ensuring that program beneficiaries receive public participation opportunities without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability or economic status. Meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities and the location is reachable by public transit. SPC will provide auxiliary services for individuals with language, speech, sight or hearing needs, provided the request for assistance is made 3 days prior to the meeting. SPC will attempt to satisfy requests made with less than 3 days notice as resources allow. Please make your request for auxiliary services to Jared Bedekovich at (412) 391-5590, Ext. 343, or jbedekovich@spcregion.org. If you believe you have been denied participation opportunities, or otherwise discriminated against in relation to the programs or activities administered by SPC, you may file a complaint using the procedures provided in our complaint process document or by contacting SPC’s Title VI Coordinator by calling (412) 391-5590. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Discrimination Complaint Form, please see our website at: www.spcregion.org or call 412-391-5590.

For more information please contact:
Jared Bedekovich
(412) 391-5590 x343
jbedekovich@spcregion.org
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission Public Participation Panel

Join SPC’s Public Participation Panel for an update on developing the draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The draft 2021-2024 TIP is the implementation mechanism for SmartMoves for a Changing Region, the region’s official transportation and development plan.

Hear about the progress of major transportation projects, ask questions of SPC and PennDOT, and give your ideas and feedback for the draft TIP. SPC’s Public Participation Panel encourages you to attend a public meeting to learn more about the draft documents. The meeting will have an open house format. There will be opportunities to look at maps, talk to representatives from SPC, PennDOT, and Westmoreland County Planning, ask questions, and submit comments.

Date: November 20, 2019
Time: 3:00 PM - 6:00 PM
Location: Westmoreland County Commissioners’ Meeting Room
Address: 2 North Main Street, Greensburg, PA 15601

Additional Info...


Other News in 1. County

Elliott Finalizes Purchase of Former Jeannette Glass Property
Posted on: October 25, 2019

Election Poll Workers Needed
Posted on: September 4, 2019

We're hiring!
Posted on: January 3, 2018
Chamber: Women’s Summit a Success

The Indiana County Chamber of Commerce held its monthly board of directors meeting on Thursday at the Indiana Country Club.

The board discussed issues including the Women’s Summit, workforce programs, the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative and more.

CHAMBER UPDATE

Chamber President Mark Hilliard said the first Indiana Women’s Summit was a big success.

“We had a fantastic keynote speaker and some amazing panels,” Hilliard said. “The feedback has been wonderful so far, and it was through the hard work of a number of individuals that the event was so successful.”

The event featured keynote speaker Christina Cassotis, CEO of the Allegheny County Airport Authority, as well as panels covering these topics: health and happiness, safety and security, and career and community. This year’s event at the Kovalchick Convention and Athletic Complex was sold out, and Hilliard said the board is looking to grow it even more for next year.

In addition, Hilliard updated the board on the Indiana County Ready soft skills program that was presented to all of the county high schools in September.

“We are waiting on a couple of final numbers to get a true count,” Hilliard said. “But we can safely say that we are looking at over 400 Indiana County juniors and seniors being enrolled in this program for the first year, which is fantastic.” He said that assisting local businesses with their workforce needs will be a key issue of the chamber moving forward.

LOCAL/STATE GOVERNMENT

Indiana County Commissioner Rod Ruddock said discussions are underway regarding the county budget for the next fiscal year. Ruddock said that although the process is never easy, he is hopeful that it will be a positive one for the upcoming year.

Ruddock provided an update for the new office of the Indiana County Conservation District. The county commissioners recently voted to table the bids for the project until a few additional issues are addressed.

Ruddock said he does feel that the project will continue to move forward soon.

Rural broadband continues to be an issue that is high on the commissioners’ list. Ruddock informed the board about a plan to improve cellular service around the area of Blue Spruce Park.

“We have to find a way to do things in a smart way while in control of our finances,” he said. “The important thing is to continue to chip away at the problem so that our county residents are all served.”

State Sen. Joe Pittman updated the board on Gov. Tom Wolf’s recent announcement to join the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, which would set a price and cap on greenhouse gas emissions from power plants. The executive order was made without the involvement of the general assembly.

“The coal and waste power plants in this area employ close to 800 people at a salary well above the statewide average,” Pittman said. “I am deeply disappointed in what I feel is an unnecessary and expensive trading scheme that will negatively impact these hard-working men and women and their families.”

State Rep. Jim Struzzi echoed Pittman and said that they both are currently working on legislation that would prevent the governor from moving forward with the plan without legislative approval.

“This would be severely detrimental to our local and regional economy and would be extremely harmful to the coal industry, manufacturing and our local communities,” Struzzi said. “That is why Senator Pittman and I are doing everything that we can to prevent this.”

State Rep. Cris Dush added that this is not simply an issue that will affect businesses in the community.

“This initiative would not only result in these businesses having to pay,” Dush said. “Many of the area school districts will end up having to pay more, and consumers will end up paying more.”

The legislators urged the chamber board and the county to become more involved in the issue.

Wednesday marked the ribbon-cutting of Urban Outfitters in White Township.

Pittman said that it was gratifying to see the result of so many years of hard work from a number of individuals and organizations in the area.

“We now have an obligation to build on this achievement,” Pittman said.

“This is an opportunity to have a hub not just in the Windy Ridge Business Park but in our community and we really need to take advantage of it.”

Dush agreed, saying that everyone needs to work to continue to bring jobs back into the area.

“Success follows success,” Dush said. “For years we have exported too many employees with that strong western Pennsylvania work ethic, and now it’s time to bring them back.”

In other business, Struzzi said he is looking forward to going back into session next week in order to move legislation that would help volunteer firefighters in the state through a tuition assistance program. The proposed legislation could allow firefighters to lower their tuition for post-secondary education depending on the amount of volunteer years they have put in.

Struzzi also reminded the board...
about the Senior Expo on Oct. 24 at S&T Arena, where he will be partnering with Pittman and Dush on the event.

EDUCATION

ARIN Intermediate Unit 28 Executive Director Jim Wagner updated the board on the teacher in the workplan program run by the Workforce Investment Board. Wagner said that this year they have run into a few challenges with the program that is designed to get more local teachers into area businesses in an effort to learn and educate their students about them. Wagner said he hopes that they are able to work through the challenges and get the program back to the level of prior years soon.

ARIN IU 28 will no longer be offering fingerprinting services as of Jan. 1. Wagner said the state is continuing to look for a new location for these services in Indiana County, but currently they have not found one.

ENERGY

Dave Brocious from Sky Point Crane provided the board with an update on commodities by reporting that the price of natural gas has dropped to a nationwide average of $2.30 per MCF; while the regional price of natural gas in Pennsylvania has dropped well below $1 per MCF. This has created more downward pressure on the industry to cut costs. Brocious said this has led to workforce reductions as well as the reduction in rig counts and is creating many challenges in the energy market.

In other industry-related news, Brocious informed the board that ExxonMobil has recently visited Beaver County with an interest in potentially building a new petrochemical plant.

“This could be huge for our region,” Brocious said.

TRANSPORTATION

Byron Stauffer Jr., executive director of the Indiana County Office of Planning and Development, updated the board on the Hoodlebug Trail expansion project. Stauffer explained that construction is currently underway on the corner of Eighth and Church streets, which is where a new bike station will eventually be housed. The project will connect Indiana Borough at the Eighth Street parking lot through the Indiana University of Pennsylvania campus and to the existing Hoodlebug Trail along 13th Street.

This ties into work previously completed by White Township to cross over Rose Street. Stauffer stated that he anticipates the project to be completed before the end of the year.

In related news, Stauffer informed the board that the Burrell Township supervisors recently rejected the site plan (SALDO application) for a proposed bridge for pedestrians and bicyclists over Route 22 east of Blairsville. The county is working to address the township’s comments.

In addition, Stauffer commented that development of the next Transportation Improvement Program continues in an effort to begin developing a set of projects for the next four years in collaboration with PennDOT District 10 and the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission. Stauffer indicated that another Public Participation Panel will be scheduled soon.

BUSINESS RECRUITMENT/RETENTION

The Pennsylvania Economic Development Association’s annual conference will be coming to Indiana next week. Stauffer informed the board that approximately 150 economic development professionals from across the state will be at the Kovalchick Complex from Oct. 21 to 23, hearing a variety of speakers and panels.

In addition, Stauffer mentioned on behalf of the Indiana County Center for Economic Operations that his office is working with several companies that are considering Indiana County for investment or expansion, which could lead to new job opportunities for our residents and the region. Stauffer stated that discussions are ongoing for multiple locations throughout the county.

ICDC

Stauffer, on behalf of Indiana County Development Corporation President Jim Wiley, thanked everyone who was a part of the URBN Outfitters ribbon-cutting last week.

“We are very happy with the success of Urban, but this is only a part of our comprehensive approach to ensuring that all of our area businesses have their workforce needs met,” Stauffer said.

He also updated the board on development activities at the 119 Business Park, the Corporate Campus, HighPointe at Indian Springs and at NORMA Pennsylvania.

MANUFACTURING

Steve McPherson of MGK Technologies said that manufacturing continues to do well in Indiana County. He mentioned that while companies are still looking for additional employees during the fall season, they are now looking for more specific positions.

MEMBERSHIP

Upcoming chamber member events include:

- Chamber Check-In, Oct. 29
- Business After Hours at Luther Ford-Lincoln, Nov. 6
- Chamber of Commerce annual luncheon at KCAC, Dec. 4

The chamber will meet next on Nov. 14 at the Indiana Country Club.
Examples of Fall 2019 social media outreach for Early Input Public Participation Panel meetings.
SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA COMMISSION
NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETINGS

Note: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and Governor Wolf's Stay-At-Home orders, SPC is unable hold in-person public meetings at this time. Virtual public meetings and other online public participation opportunities will be provided for interested parties to review and comment on draft documents. SPC will provide paper copies of materials upon request (see information later in this notice).

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) is seeking input from the public on the following important draft documents that will advance investments in the region's transportation plan:

- Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which identifies the region’s priority roadway, transit and multimodal transportation improvements programmed for advancement over the next four years
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment of the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
- Amendment to the region’s transportation plan SmartMoves for a Changing Region to reflect updated revenue projections and a revised project list including project phasing and cost information included in Draft 2021-2024 TIP

Beginning Monday, May 11, 2020, these draft documents will be available for public review on the internet at www.spcregion.org. Three virtual public meetings will be held that will provide an overview of the draft documents, updates on project advancement, and opportunities for the public to ask questions and submit comments. One virtual meeting will be held for each of the three southwestern Pennsylvania PennDOT Districts, which serve multiple counties in the region. All virtual meetings will recorded and made available online.

VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETINGS

Wednesday, May 20, 2020
6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
PennDOT District 10 (Armstrong, Butler, Indiana Counties)
Access Meeting: www.spcregion.org

Thursday, May 28, 2020
6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
PennDOT District 12 (Fayette, Greene, Washington, Westmoreland Counties)
Access Meeting: www.spcregion.org

Tuesday, June 2, 2020
6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
PennDOT District 11 (Allegheny, Beaver, Lawrence Counties and the City of Pittsburgh)
Access Meeting: www.spcregion.org

Comments on the draft documents will be accepted by SPC representatives during each virtual public meeting. Written comments may also be submitted to comments@spcregion.org, by mail to SPC
Comments at Two Chatham Center, Suite 500, 112 Washington Place, Pittsburgh, PA 15219 or by fax to (412) 391-9160.

All comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, June 12, 2020.

Upon consideration of public comments received, the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission will consider approval of the draft documents at their meeting at 4:30 p.m., on Monday, June 29, 2020. This meeting will be held at Two Chatham Center, 112 Washington Place, 4th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219. In the event that this meeting must be held virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic, notices will be posted at www.spcregion.org and at SPC’s offices.

For individuals without access to the internet, paper copies of draft materials will be mailed upon request. SPC will respond to requests for paper copies as soon as possible in accordance with Governor Wolf’s Stay-At-Home orders. To request paper copies, please contact Shannon O’Connell at (412) 391-5590, ext. 334 or soconnell@spcregion.org.

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) is committed to compliance with nondiscrimination requirements of civil rights statutes, executive orders, regulations and policies applicable to the programs and activities it administers. Accordingly, SPC is committed to ensuring that program beneficiaries receive public participation opportunities without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability or economic status. SPC will provide auxiliary services for individuals with language, speech, sight or hearing needs, provided the request for assistance is made 3 days prior to the virtual meeting. SPC will attempt to satisfy requests made with less than 3 days notice as resources allow. Please make your request for auxiliary services to Jared Bedekovich at (412) 391-5590, Ext. 343, or jbedekovich@spcregion.org. If you believe you have been denied participation opportunities, or otherwise discriminated against in relation to the programs or activities administered by SPC, you may file a complaint using the procedures provided in our complaint process document or by contacting SPC’s Title VI Coordinator by calling (412) 391-5590. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Discrimination Complaint Form, please see our website at: www.spcregion.org or call 412-391-5590.

TRANSIT SERVICE INFORMATION
For information regarding transit services in Allegheny County, please 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 for Beaver County Transit Authority, Butler Transit Authority, Fayette Area Coordinated Transit, Mid Mon Valley Transit Authority, Port Authority of Allegheny County, Washington County Transportation Authority, Westmoreland County Transit Authority, Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, and CommuteInfo, a program of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission.
COMISIÓN DEL SUROeste DE PENSILVANIA
AVISO SOBRE EL PERIODO DE COMENTARIOS PÚBLICOS Y LAS REUNIONES PÚBLICAS VIRTUALES

Aviso: debido a la pandemia de la COVID-19 y las órdenes de quedarse en casa del gobernador Wolf, la SPC no podrá realizar reuniones públicas presenciales en este momento. Se ofrecerán reuniones públicas virtuales y otras oportunidades de participación pública en línea a las partes interesadas para que revisen y comenten los proyectos de los documentos. La SPC proporcionará copias en papel de los materiales cuando se soliciten (ver información a continuación en este aviso).

La Comisión del Suroeste de Pensilvania (SPC) está buscando recibir comentarios del público sobre los siguientes proyectos de documentos importantes que promoverán inversiones en el plan de transporte de la región:

- Proyecto 2021-2024 del Programa de Mejora del Transporte (TIP, por sus siglas en inglés), que identifica las mejoras en carreteras, tránsito y transporte multimodal de la región programadas para que avancen en los próximos cuatro años.
- Evaluación de Beneficios y Cargas de Justicia Ambiental del Proyecto 2021-2024 del TIP.
- Determinación de la Conformidad de la Calidad del Aire del Proyecto 2021-2024 del TIP.
- Enmienda del plan de transporte de la región SmartMoves for a Changing Region para reflejar las proyecciones de ingresos actualizadas y una lista de proyectos revisada, que incluye las etapas del proyecto y la información sobre costos incluida en el Proyecto 2021-2024 del TIP.

A partir el lunes 11 de mayo de 2020, estos proyectos estarán disponibles para la revisión pública en internet en el sitio www.spcregion.org. Se realizarán tres reuniones públicas virtuales donde se proporcionará una descripción general de los proyectos, actualizaciones sobre el avance del proyecto y oportunidades para que el público haga preguntas y envíe comentarios. Se realizará una reunión virtual para cada uno de los tres distritos del suroeste de Pensilvania del Departamento de Transporte de Pensilvania (PennDOT, por sus siglas en inglés), que cubren varios condados de la región. Todas las reuniones virtuales se grabarán y estarán disponibles en línea.

REUNIONES PÚBLICAS VIRTUALES

Miércoles 20 de mayo de 2020
6:00 p. m. a 7:00 p. m.
Distrito 10 del PennDOT (condados de Armstrong, Butler e Indiana)
Acceso a la reunión: www.spcregion.org

Jueves 28 de mayo de 2020
6:00 p. m. a 7:00 p. m.
Distrito 12 de PennDOT (condados de Fayette, Greene, Washington y Westmoreland)
Acceso a la reunión: www.spcregion.org

Martes 2 de junio de 2020
6:00 p. m. a 7:00 p. m.
Distrito 11 de PennDOT (condados de Allegheny, Beaver y Lawrence y la ciudad de Pittsburgh)
Acceso a la reunión: www.spcregion.org
Los comentarios sobre los proyectos serán recibidos por los representantes de la SPC durante cada reunión pública virtual. Los comentarios escritos también pueden enviarse por correo electrónico a comments@spcregion.org, por correo a SPC Comments at Two Chatham Center, Suite 500, 112 Washington Place, Pittsburgh, PA 15219, o por fax a (412) 391-9160.

Todos los comentarios deben recibirse antes de las 4:00 p. m. del viernes 12 de junio de 2020.

Una vez que se hayan revisado todos los comentarios públicos recibidos, la Comisión del Suroeste de Pensilvania evaluará la aprobación de los proyectos en la reunión que se realizará a las 4:30 p. m. del lunes 29 de junio de 2020. Esta reunión se realizará en Two Chatham Center, 112 Washington Place, 4th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219. En el caso de que esta reunión deba realizarse de manera virtual debido a la pandemia de la COVID-19, se publicarán avisos en www.spcregion.org y en las oficinas de la SPC.

Para las personas que no tengan acceso a internet, se enviarán copias en papel de los proyectos cuando se soliciten. La SPC responderá a las solicitudes de copias en papel lo antes posible de acuerdo con las órdenes de quedarse en casa del gobernador Wolf. Para solicitar copias en papel, contáctese con Shannon O’Connell al (412) 391-5590, ext. 343 o por correo al soconnell@spcregion.org.

La Comisión del Suroeste de Pensilvania (SPC) se compromete a cumplir con los requisitos de no discriminación de las leyes de derechos civiles, órdenes ejecutivas, regulaciones y políticas que se apliquen a los programas y actividades que administra. En consecuencia, la SPC se compromete a garantizar que los beneficiarios del programa reciban oportunidades de participación pública independientemente de su raza, color, nacionalidad, sexo, edad, discapacidad o situación económica. La SPC proporcionará servicios auxiliares para las personas con necesidades relativas al idioma, habla, visión o audición, siempre que tal asistencia se solicite al menos 3 días antes de la reunión virtual. La SPC intentará cumplir con las solicitudes hechas con menos de 3 días de anticipación en la medida que sus recursos lo permitan. Para solicitar servicios auxiliares, contáctese con Jared Bedekovich al (412) 391-5590, Ext. 343, o por correo al jbedekovich@spcregion.org. Si cree que se le han negado oportunidades de participación o que ha sido discriminado de cualquier otra forma en lo que respecta a los programas o actividades que la SPC administra, puede enviar un reclamo usando los procedimientos indicados en nuestro documento de procedimiento de reclamo o contactando al Coordinador del Título VI de la SPC al (412) 391-5590. Para obtener más información o para recibir un Formulario de Reclamo de Discriminación según el Título VI, visite nuestro sitio web www.spcregion.org o llame al 412-391-5590.

INFORMACIÓN SOBRE EL SERVICIO DE TRÁNSITO

Este aviso cumple los requisitos del programa de proyectos del Programa de Fórmula del Área Urbanizada de la Administración Federal de Tránsito para la Autoridad de Tránsito del Condado de Beaver, la Autoridad de Tránsito de Butler, el Tránsito Coordinado del Área de Fayette, la Autoridad de Tránsito del Valle de Mid Mon, la Autoridad Portuaria del Condado de Allegheny, la Autoridad de Transporte del Condado de Washington, la Autoridad de Tránsito del Condado de Westmoreland, la Comisión del Suroeste de Pensilvania, y CommuteInfo, un programa de la Comisión del Suroeste de Pensilvania.
COMMISSIONE DELLA PENNSYLVANIA SUDOCCIDENTALE
AVVISO DEL PERIODO DI COMMENTO PUBBLICO E DI INCONTRI PUBBLICI VIRTUALI

Nota: A causa della pandemia COVID-19 ed alle ordinanze di rimanere a casa del Governatore Wolf, al momento SPC non può tenere incontri pubblici di persona. Per gli interessati, verranno organizzati incontri pubblici virtuali ed altre opportunità di partecipazione pubblica online per rivedere e commentare le bozze dei documenti. SPC fornirà copie cartacee dei materiali su richiesta (vedi ulteriori informazioni più avanti in questa comunicazione).

La Commissione della Pennsylvania Sudoccidentale (SPC) sta cercando informazioni dal pubblico sui seguenti importanti documenti di bozza che faranno avanzare gli investimenti nel piano dei trasporti della regione:

- Bozza 2021-2024 del Programma di Miglioramento del Trasporto (Transportation Improvement Program, TIP), che identifica i miglioramenti prioritari della carreggiata, del transito e del trasporto multimodale della regione programmati per l’avanzamento nei prossimi quattro anni.
- Valutazione dei benefici e degli oneri per la giustizia ambientale della Bozza 2021-2024 TIP
- Determinazione della conformità della qualità dell’aria della Bozza 2021-2024 TIP
- Modifica del piano di trasporto della regione SmartMoves for a Changing Region in modo da riflettere le proiezioni delle entrate aggiornate ed un elenco di progetti rivisto che include la fase del progetto e le informazioni sui costi inclusi nella Bozza 2021-2024 TIP


INCONTRI PUBBLICI VIRTUALI

Mercoledì 20 Maggio 2020
Dalle 18:00 alle 19:00
Distretto PennDOT 10 (Contee di Armstrong, Butler, Indiana)
Per accedere all’incontro: www.spcregion.org

Giovedì 28 Maggio 2020
Dalle 18:00 alle 19:00
Distretto PennDOT 12 (Contee di Fayette, Greene, Washington, Westmoreland)
Per accedere all’incontro: www.spcregion.org

Martedì 2 Giugno 2020
Dalle 18:00 alle 19:00
Distretto PennDOT 11 (Contee di Allegheny, Beaver, Lawrence e città di Pittsburgh)
Per accedere all’incontro: www.spcregion.org
**I commenti** riguardanti le bozze dei documenti saranno accettati dai rappresentanti SPC durante ogni incontro pubblico virtuale. I commenti scritti possono essere inviati via email a comments@spcregion.org, per posta a SPC Comments Two Chatham Center, Suite 500, 112 Washington Place, Pittsburgh, PA 15219 o via fax al numero (412) 391-9160.

**Tutti i commenti dovranno essere ricevuti entro le 16:00 di Venerdì 12 Giugno 2020.**


**Per le persone che non hanno accesso ad Internet, su richiesta verranno inviate copie cartacee delle bozze dei documenti.** SPC gestirà la richiesta di copie cartacee il prima possibile, conformemente alle ordinanze di restare a casa del Governatore Wolf. Per richiedere le copie cartacee, è possibile contattare Shannon O’Connell al numero (412) 391-5590, est. 334 o via mail all’indirizzo soconnell@spcregion.org.

La Commissione della Pennsylvania Sudoccidentale (SPC) si impegna a rispettare i requisiti di non discriminazione di statuti sui diritti civili, ordini esecutivi, regolamenti e politiche applicabili ai programmi ed alle attività che gestisce. Di conseguenza, SPC si impegna a garantire che i beneficiari del programma ricevano opportunità di partecipazione pubblica indipendentemente da razza, colore, origine nazionale, sesso, età, disabilita o stato economico. SPC fornirà servizi ausiliari per le persone con esigenze riguardanti lingua, linguaggio, vista o udito, a condizione che la richiesta di assistenza venga effettuata 3 giorni prima dell’incontro virtuale. SPC tenterà di soddisfare le richieste effettuate con meno di 3 giorni di preavviso, come consentito dalle risorse. Cortesemente, inviare le richieste per i servizi ausiliari a Jared Bedekovich al numero (412) 391-5590, est. 343, o via mail all’indirizzo jbedekovich@spcregion.org. Se si ritiene che siano state negate le opportunità di partecipazione o si sia stati altrimenti discriminati in relazione ai programmi o alle attività gestite da SPC, è possibile presentare un reclamo utilizzando le procedure fornite nel nostro documento di procedura di reclamo o contattando il Coordinatore VI Titolo di SPC chiamando il numero (412) 391-5590. Per maggiori informazioni o per ottenere un modulo di denuncia di discriminazione di VI Titolo, consultare il nostro sito Web all’indirizzo: www.spcregion.org o chiamare il numero 412-391-5590.

**INFORMAZIONI SUL SERVIZIO DI TRANSITO**


西南賓夕法尼亞州委員會(SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA COMMISSION)
公眾意見期間及虛擬公開說明會通知

附註：由於 COVID-19 流行病及沃爾夫州長(Governor Wolf)的居家令(Stay-At-Home orders)，
SPC 無法在這個時刻舉辦現場公開說明會。因此將提供虛擬公開討論會及其他公共參與機會給關
注此議題的團體以評估草案文件並給予意見。SPC 將依照請求提供紙本內容給需要者(請見本通
知稍後提供的資訊)。

西南賓夕法尼亞州委員會(The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission, SPC)正尋求大眾對下列
重要草案文件的建議，這些建議將會推進地區交通運輸計畫的投資：

- 2021 至 2024 交通改善計畫(Transportation Improvement Program, TIP)草案，其指出地
  區發展優先發展的道路、大眾運輸和複合運輸(multimodal transportation)的改進方案，計
  劃在未來四年內進行改進
- 2021 至 2024 TIP 草案的環境正義利益與負擔評估
- 2021 至 2024 TIP 草案空氣品質合格測定
- 對該 不斷變化地區(Changing Region) 的 SmartMoves 之地區運輸計劃進行了修訂，以反
  映最新收入預測和修訂的專案計畫清單，其中包括 2021 至 2024 TIP 草案中包含的專案
  計畫階段和成本資訊

從 2020 年 5 月 11 日起，這些草案文件將可供公眾評估，網址為 www.spcregion.org。將舉辦三
場虛擬公開說明會，以提供草案文件總覽、計畫進展狀況更新以及公眾發問和提出意見的機會。
這三個西南賓夕法尼亞州委員會(PennDOT)第 10 區都會各有一場虛擬說明會，以服務該區域的多
個郡。所有虛擬會議都將被記錄且可供線上觀看。

虛擬公開說明會

2020 年 5 月 20 日，週三
晚上 6:00 至晚上 7:00
賓州交通局(PennDOT)第 10 區 ( 阿母斯壯郡(Armstrong)、巴特勒郡(Butler)、印第安納郡
(Indiana) )
由此登入說明會：www.spcregion.org

2020 年 5 月 28 日，週四
晚上 6:00 至晚上 7:00
賓州交通局(PennDOT)第12區(費頁特郡(Fayette)、格林郡(Greene)、華盛頓郡(Washington)、威斯摩蘭郡(Westmoreland))
由此登入說明會：www.spcregion.org

2020年6月2日，週二
晚上6:00至晚上7:00
賓州交通局(PennDOT)第11區(亞利加尼郡(Allegheny)、比佛郡(Beaver)、羅倫斯郡及匹茲堡市(City of Pittsburgh))
由此登入說明會：www.spcregion.org

法案文件的意見將於每一次虛擬公開討論會議期間由SPC代表接受。也可將書面意見傳送至comments@spcregion.org、郵寄至SPC意見中心，地址是Two Chatham Center, Suite 500, 112 Washington Place, Pittsburgh, PA 15219或者傳真至(412) 391-9160。

所有意見都必須在2020年6月12日下午4點前被接收到。

經過考慮收到的公眾意見後，西南賓夕法尼亞州委員會將於2020年6月29日，週一，下午4:30的會議，考量是否通過草案文件。本討論會將在Two Chatham中心, 112 Washington Place, 4th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219舉辦。如果由於COVID-19流行病的緣故，本公開討論會必須以虛擬方式進行，通知將張貼於www.spcregion.org和SPC的辦公室。

草案內容的紙本將依照請求提供給無法使用網路的民眾。在遵照沃爾夫州長的居家令指示下，SPC會盡快回應紙本資料的需求。若需請求紙本資訊，請與Shannon O’Connell聯繫，電話是(412) 391-5590，分機334或傳送電子郵件至soconnell@spcregion.org。

西南賓夕法尼亞州委員會(SPC)致力於遵守適用於其管理的計劃和活動的公民權利法規、行政命令、法規和政策的非歧視性要求。因此，SPC致力於確保計畫受益者獲取公眾參與機會，不論種族、膚色、原始國籍、性別、年紀、殘疾或經濟狀況為何。SPC將提供公眾輔助服務，包括語言、發言、視覺或聽覺需求，前提是必須在虛擬討論會3天前提出協助的需求。在資源許可的狀況下，SPC將嘗試使在會議召開時間3天之內所提出的請求得到協助。請向Jared Bedekovich提出輔助服務的需求，撥打下列電話(412) 391-5590，分機343，或傳送電子郵件到jbedekovich@spcregion.org。若您相信在SPC主管的相關計劃或活動中，您被拒絕參與或遭受歧視，您可以利用我們申訴處理文件中提供的程序或與SPC第六章協調員聯繫，撥打(412) 391-
提出投訴。更多相關資訊，或欲取得第六章歧視投訴表，請參見我們的網站，網址是：
www.spcregion.org或撥打412-391-5590。

交通運輸服務資訊
更多關於阿利根尼郡(Allegheny County)的交通運輸服務的資訊，請撥打港口管理局客服電話，號碼為412-442-2000。關於其他郡的交通運輸狀況，請訪問以下網頁：
www.commuteinfo.org/comm_trans.shtml或撥打1-888-819-6110。

本通知符合比佛郡(Beaver)運輸局、巴特勒(Butler)運輸局、費頁特(Fayette)地區協調運輸、中夢谷(Mid Mon Valley)運輸局、阿利根尼郡(Allegheny County)港口管理局、華盛頓郡(Washington County)運輸局、威斯摩蘭郡(Westmoreland County)交通管理局、西南賓夕法尼亞州委員會和交通資訊(CommuteInfo，西南賓夕法尼亞州委員會的計劃)的聯邦運輸局都市化地區公式計劃(Urbanized Area Formula Program)之專案計畫要求。
The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) hereby gives public notice that it is the policy of the Commission to assure full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. Title VI and other related statutes require that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, sex, national origin, age, or disability, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which SPC receives federal financial assistance. Any person who believes they have been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice by SPC under Title VI has a right to file a formal complaint with the Commission. Any such complaint must be in writing and filed with SPC’s Title VI Coordinator within one hundred eighty (180) days following the date of the alleged discriminatory occurrence. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Discrimination Complaint Form, please see our website at www.spcregion.org or call 412-391-5590.
MEMORANDUM

TO: SPC Document Review Network

FROM: James R. Hassinger, Executive Director

RE: Online Documents for Public Review and Comment

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) is seeking input from the public on the following important draft documents that will advance investments in the region’s transportation plan:

- Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which identifies the region’s priority roadway, transit and multimodal transportation improvements programmed for advancement over the next four years
- Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment of the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
- Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
- Amendment to the region’s transportation plan SmartMoves for a Changing Region to reflect updated revenue projections and a revised project list including project phasing and cost information included in Draft 2021-2024 TIP

Beginning Monday, May 11, 2020, these draft documents will be available for public review on the internet at www.spcregion.org. Three virtual public meetings will be held that will provide an overview of the draft documents, updates on project advancement, and opportunities for the public to ask questions and submit comments. More information is available in the attached notice.

**Note:** Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and Governor Wolf’s Stay-At-Home orders, SPC is unable hold in-person public meetings at this time. Virtual public meetings and other online public participation opportunities will be provided for interested parties to review and comment on draft documents. SPC will provide paper copies of materials upon request.

Thank you for participating in SPC’s Online Document Review Network! We appreciate your assistance and cooperation. Please contact Jared Bedekovich of my staff, at 412-391-5590, extension 343, or jbedekovich@spcregion.org if you have any questions.
2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Public Outreach

Metropolitan and Rural Planning Organizations (MPOs or RPOs) work with individuals and community members representing transportation and business interests, and local and state governments to plan transportation projects that address the community's mobility needs for the future. Planning Partners, MPOs and RPOs, each develop a TIP which represents the first four years of the Twelve-Year Program. District 10 encompasses Armstrong, Butler, Clarion Indiana and Jefferson Counties. There is one MPO and two RPO's; Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) MPO (Armstrong, Butler, and Indiana Counties), North Central RPO (Jefferson County), and Northwest RPO (Clarion County)

Planning Partners will periodically hold public meetings to gather public input during this process. These public meetings are taking place in May and June of 2020, for the District 10 region.

Please visit the links below to view public outreach documents and associated maps for the 2021-2024 TIP update.

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission MPO
Select below images to access the comment form and map for the SPC region.

![Comment Form](spc_comment_form.png)
![SPC Map](spc_map.png)
Examples of Spring 2020 social media and other outreach for Virtual Public Meetings.

VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETINGS

Wednesday, May 20, 2020
6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
PennDOT District 10 (Armstrong, Butler, Indiana Counties)
 Archived Live Stream

Thursday, May 28, 2020
6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
PennDOT District 12 (Fayette, Greene, Washington, Westmoreland Counties)
 Archived Live Stream

Tuesday, June 2, 2020
6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
PennDOT District 11 (Allegheny, Beaver, Lawrence Counties and the City of Pittsburgh)
 Archived Live Stream

TIP Virtual Meeting for PennDOT District 11 (Allegheny, Beaver, Lawrence Counties and the City of Pittsburgh) is NOW live and will start at 6pm
https://youtu.be/BlaMzB5a8hk

Public Comment: DRAFT 2021-2024: District 11
Meeting will begin at 6:00pm. Please visit www.spcregion.org to learn more!
A session is scheduled for 6 to 7 p.m. Thursday, concerning highway, bridge and transit system improvements proposed in PennDOT District 12 (Westmoreland, Fayette, Green and Washington counties).
https://triblive.com/.../virtual-meetings-set-to-review-regi...

Virtual meetings set to review Southwestern Pa.'s proposed 2021-24 transportation projects

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission is seeking input through a series of virtual meetings focusing on regional and local transportation needs from 2021-24.
https://observer-reporter.com/.../article_714ae470-9ea5-11ea-...
"While this TIP process actually began in July of last year, Wednesday’s hearing is one of three planned, with one apiece covering the three PennDOT districts in the 10-county region, during a monthlong comment period."

SPC holds hearing on funding

TIP Update Virtual Meeting for PennDOT District 10 (Armstrong, Butler, and Indiana Counties) is LIVE now!
https://youtu.be/B5bY7pMX1A8

District 10 TIP Update
Visit www.spcregion.org to learn more!
We are seeking input from you on the Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Southwestern Pennsylvania. The draft TIP identifies the region’s priority roadway, transit, and multimodal transportation improvements programmed for advancement over the next four years. View the documents and comment here --> https://www.spcregion.org/get-involved/public-comment/
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission • @spcregion • Jun 8

The public comment period for the Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program ends this Friday (6/12). Three archived virtual public meetings and all draft documents are available here for review and comment.

---

Public Comment: DRAFT 2021-2024 Transportation I... Public Comment Virtual Meetings The public comment period is now closed. Upon consideration of public ...

spcregion.org
Example of the PublicInput.com interactive public engagement platform for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP:

PublicInput.com

to simplify the process and build better relationships with your community.

Online/Offline Engagement Hub
- Set up surveys and websites
- Support traditional meetings with presentation and polling tools
- Host Virtual Public Meetings
- Manage all forms of engagement
- Collect Title VI demographic info and compare with census data

Communications Cloud
- Engage in two-way email, SMS, and social media conversations
- Geo-enabled subscriber database
- Drag-and-Drop email builder
- Automate replies or messages
- Optimize campaign performance with open rates and tracking

Resident Database
- Automatic integration throughout
- Sync participants across channels
- Build momentum with each interaction
- Manage your contacts, groups, and relationships

2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Survey

Please use this map to view projects in the 2021-2024 TIP for Southwestern Pennsylvania. Click on the projects to view their descriptions. To leave a comment on a project listed in the map or any of the draft documents listed please use the form located below.
SPC holds hearing on funding

By PATRICK CLOONAN
pcloonan@indianagazette.net

Indiana and nine other counties in the greater Pittsburgh region are seeking to figure out how to best spend federal and state funds meant for a wide range of transit and transportation projects.

The newest Transportation Improvement Plan for the region (from Oct. 1, 2020, to Sept. 30, 2024) will include more money for interstate projects and less for local projects.

“It is disappointing that the funding that we all need to advance our projects isn’t there,” said Byron Stauffer Jr., executive director of the Indiana County Office of Planning and Development, during a 48-minute virtual public meeting of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission.

What SPC Director of Transportation Planning Andy Waple called “Smart Moves for a Changing Region” is part of what overall is a $22.7 billion plan for the next 25 years, including $5.6 billion over the next four federal fiscal years, which begin in October and end in September.

“It covers expenditures for highway, bridge, state and local, and transit funding,” Stauffer said.

It is a biennial process.

“TIPs are a four-year document, but they are updated every two years,” Stauffer said.

And while this TIP process actually began in July of last year, Wednesday’s hearing is one of three planned, with one apiece covering the three PennDOT districts in the 10-county region, during a monthlong comment period.

“It began on May 11 and runs through June 12,” Waple said.

“There is money there,” Stauffer stressed in an interview following that hearing. “However, it is being redirected to the interstate network of roads” — and Indiana County does not have any interstates.

“These are challenging times,” the Indiana County planner said. “It is roughly a 20 percent decrease from past TIPs, which is substantial.”

Stauffer is one of five Indiana County representatives on the SPC board, along with county Commissioners Mike Keith, Robin Gorman and Sherene Hess and Indiana County Chamber of Commerce President Mark Hilliard.

“Everyone is working cooperatively,” Stauffer said. “There are needs everywhere. We just have to get in line and fight for every penny we can.”

An appendix to the proposed TIP covers plans for projects in each of the 10 SPC counties, including 14 pages given over to more than a score of plans for Indiana County.

Waple showed examples of high-priority projects in Armstrong, Butler and Indiana counties, which make up PennDOT District 10 with offices in White Township and Butler.

High-priority projects shown for Indiana County will come as no surprise to motorists. Included are ongoing improvements to Route 286, including the widening of Oakland Avenue between Rustic Lodge and the U.S. Route 422 interchange and replacement of culverts along Philadelphia Street in Indiana.

One notable difference in Indiana is the removal Wednesday of a traffic signal at Philadelphia and 11th streets, destined for elimination by PennDOT two years ago, during the TIP for the federal fiscal years of 2018-19 through 2022-23.

Despite opposition from borough officials, PennDOT insisted that it could not reinstall the existing signal, while three separate studies over three years found that the intersection did not meet Federal Highway Administration standards for what would be a new $330,000 signal.

A high-priority project in Armstrong County is getting support from Indiana County officials, the $3,434,500 upgrade of the Margaret Road intersection with Route 422 in Plumcreek Township, involving realignment of the existing Route 422 and expansion of turning lanes at an existing at-grade intersection.

It is at a stretch known as the Margaret Dip, approximately seven miles west of Shellota, and about halfway between Shellota and downtown Kittanning.

It’s a dangerous stretch that has had multiple traffic accidents, some fatal, over the years.

According to the TIP, plans are to spend $1,434,500 on utilities at the Margaret Road intersection in 2023, with the remaining $2 million going toward construction in 2024.

In turn, Stauffer said, it is part of an ongoing $20 million-plus overhaul of Route 422.

He said some improve-
ments were planned in front of Cunningham Meats, on a stretch just west of the Philadelphia Street exit in Armstrong Township.

A hearing May 28 at 6 p.m. will focus on PennDOT District 12, which locally includes Westmoreland County, while the final hearing on June 2 at 6 p.m. will focus on PennDOT District 11, centered around Pittsburgh.

Comments may be made on the spcregion.org website; emailed to comments@spcregion.org; mailed to SPC Comments, Two Chatham Center, Suite 500, 112 Washington Place, Pittsburgh, PA 15219; or faxed to (412) 391-9160. All comments must be received by 4 p.m. June 12.

"IT IS disappointing that the funding that we all need to advance our projects isn’t there."

Byron Stauffer Jr., executive director, Office of Planning and Development
ROUGH TERRAIN
Regional plan includes less money for roads over next four years

By Ed Blazina
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission’s proposed Transportation Improvement Plan includes more money over the next four years, but less of that spending will be for local road and bridge improvements in the 10-county region.

The draft plan released last week for 2021-24 calls for spending $5.6 billion on transportation, up from $4.9 billion under the current plan. But despite increased spending, the state’s concentration on improving interstate highways means less money for local road and bridge projects, said Andy Waple, director of transportation planning for the agency.

This proposal may have to be adjusted because of funding shortfalls due to the COVID-19 pandemic or because of a possible national infrastructure bill that could inject money into the region.

The agency updates the four-year plan every two years, showing progress on continuing projects expected to be completed in the next two years and identifying new projects that will begin in the near future. The commission includes representatives from Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Greene, Indiana, Lawrence, Washington and Westmoreland counties and the City of Pittsburgh.

Overall, Mr. Waple said, the money available for prominent local roads such as routes 22, 30 and 51, McKnight Road and others has been reduced about 40% to $279 million under the draft plan.

Mr. Waple said that’s because of the state’s decision last year to move $3.15 billion through 2028 to interstate highways. The state is shifting the money — starting with $50 million this year and increasing $50 million each year — because it is afraid it could lose hundreds of millions in federal funds if the interstates continue to deteriorate and no longer meet federal standards.

“It just creates big holes in the care of those smaller roads,” Mr. Waple said. “There’s just not as much money for all those roadways.”

The road projects included in the plan mostly involve work that has been talked about for many years, including improvements to the Route 38-Highland Park Bridge interchange, the ongoing construction of the Southern Beltway near Pittsburgh International Airport and the forthcoming construction of the Mon-Fayette Expressway from Jefferson Hills to Monroeville.

Allegheny County Executive Rich Fitzgerald, who doubles as chair of the regional commission, said he understands the funding shortfall, but he remains concerned a lack of road improvements will hurt the regional economy.

“Unfortunately, this might be the new normal in transportation,” said Mr. Fitzgerald, echoing comments made last week by Yassmin Gramian when she said projects statewide would be reduced in scope or postponed due to lack of funding.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he is holding out hope for a national infrastructure bill to deal not only with road and bridge projects but also water and sewer improvements.

“Certainly, investment in infrastructure is going to need to increase,” he said. “The question is how to pay for it. It makes sense for us to invest in the economy of the nation and the region.”

Another example of the lack of funds is landslide remediation, which has become a more common, expensive problem as a result of heavy rain in the past few years. In PennDOT Districts 11 and 12 (Allegheny, Beaver, Lawrence, Washington, Westmoreland, Greene and Fayette counties), Mr. Waple said, there are about 350 slides that would cost $235 million to fix, but the plan has only $31 million for 20 slides.

“We have far more needs than resources available to address them,” Mr. Waple said.

He stressed the unusual nature of this year’s draft because of changes that could be spurred by the state having less transportation money. A high percentage of money for road improvements comes from the gasoline tax at a time when the public is driving less.

“It’s not an ideal time here to put out a draft with everything going on with COVID-19,” Mr. Waple said.

As usual, the draft calls for the biggest portion of the spending, about $2.2 billion, to go to public transit. Port Authority is expected to receive about $2 billion of that.

New projects in the draft include funding for competitive projects in transportation-related categories, such as bike trails, sidewalks and other related improvements. Those projects include:

• A Complete Green Street Project at South 21st Street on Pittsburgh’s South Side designed to remove 4 million gallons of runoff. The joint project by the city, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy and Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority, which also includes pedestrian improvements, trees and other planting areas, will cost $3.5 million, including $1 million in competitive funds.
• Improving signals, re-
storing sidewalks and upgrading stormwater facilities around the Jefferson Avenue interchange with Interstate 70 in Washington at a cost of $12.6 million ($492,000 competitive).

- Upgrading pedestrian access to Port Authority’s South Hills Junction station at a cost of $8.6 million ($1 million competitive).

The draft is available for public comment until June 12 at the SPC website, https://publicinput.com/21-24_TIP_Update. Instead of in-person hearings in each county, the agency will hold three virtual meetings at 6 p.m. Wednesday (Armstrong, Butler, Indiana counties); May 28 (Fayette, Greene, Washington, Westmoreland counties); and June 2 (Allegheny, Beaver, Lawrence counties and the City of Pittsburgh).

After any changes, the draft is expected to be taken up for a vote on June 29.

__Ed Blazina:
blazina@post-gazette.com, 412-559-2992 or on Twitter @EdBlazina
The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission is seeking input through a series of virtual meetings focusing on regional and local transportation needs from 2021-24.

Local projects in the area mentioned in the 45-page report are the Valley Brook and Bebout roads intersection, Peters Township; Interstate 70 modernization, betterment of Route 88 in the Mon Valley and Route 19 in Waynesburg and a bridge over I-70 in the Twilight area.

The comment period is now open, and the commission will use the virtual meetings to gather feedback on projects planned for those years.

The draft, known as the Transportation Improvement Plan, identifies the region's priority roadway, transit and multimodal transportation improvements

It also seeks to assess the burdens and benefits to the environment, including air quality.

Amendments to the region's transportation plan, "SmartMoves for a Changing Region" reflect updated revenue projections and a revised project list including phases of projects and cost.

Virtual public meetings will be held that will provide an overview of the draft documents, updates on project advancement, and opportunities for the public to ask questions and submit comments.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and Gov. Tom Wolf's stay-at-home orders, the commission did not plan in-person public meetings.

Here is the schedule:
- 6 to 7 p.m. Thursday for PennDOT District 12, which includes Fayette, Greene, Washington and Westmoreland Counties.

- and 6 to 7 p.m. Tuesday, June 2, PennDOT District 11, which includes Allegheny County and Pittsburgh, plus Beaver and Lawrence counties.

Virtual public meetings will be livestreamed on the day of the meeting and archived videos will be available the day after the meeting by visiting the website https://publicinput.com/21-24_TIP_Update to comment on projects.

Written comments may also be submitted to comments@spcregion.org, by mail to SPC Comments at Two Chatham Center, Suite 500, 112 Washington Place, Pittsburgh, Pa., 15219 or by fax to 412-391-9160.

All comments must be received by 4 p.m. Friday, June 12.

SPC employees are working remotely and are available via email.

The public can also access information at https://www.spcregion.org/get-involved/public-comment/.

Those interested will also be able to review and comment on draft documents online. Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission will provide paper copies of materials upon request.

---

**Barbara Miller**  
Staff Writer

Staff Writer Barbara S. Miller is a graduate of Washington & Jefferson College. She covers Washington County government, courts and general assignments.
Virtual meetings set to review Southwestern Pa.’s proposed 2021-24 transportation projects

A car moves along the Route 981-Hecla Road intersection in Norvelt on Tuesday, Nov. 29, 2016. Proposed improvements to the Norvelt triangular intersection will address congestion and safety.

Virtual public meetings are planned to allow citizens to learn about and comment on transportation improvements proposed in Southwestern Pennsylvania through 2024.

Since large gatherings are on hold during the covid-19 pandemic, the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission will instead livestream public input sessions on the draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
A session is scheduled for 6 to 7 p.m. Thursday, concerning highway, bridge and transit system improvements proposed in PennDOT District 12 (Westmoreland, Fayette, Green and Washington counties).

A similar meeting will be livestreamed at 6 p.m. June 2 for projects managed by PennDOT District 11 (City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny, Beaver and Lawrence counties).

Visit spcregion.org to access the meetings or to view archived videos that will be available the day after the sessions.

That website includes a summary of the TIP and a link for commenting on the transportation plans. Comments also may be submitted through 4 p.m. June 12 via email, at comments@spcregion.org, or by mail, sent to SPC Comments at Two Chatham Center, Suite 500, 112 Washington Place, Pittsburgh, PA 15219.

The draft 2021-2024 TIP proposes more than $5.6 billion in funding for improvements in the region over the four years, including PennDOT District 10 (Armstrong, Butler and Indiana counties).

The TIP includes improvements proposed along the Route 30 corridor, spanning Westmoreland and Allegheny counties, and continuation of widening and interchange improvements on Interstate 70 in Westmoreland and Washington counties.

Other projects planned in Westmoreland County include: Work on two sections of the Laurel Valley Transportation Improvement Project, which will upgrade and realign the main route between Mt. Pleasant and Arnold Palmer Regional Airport; improvement of the Georges Station Road intersection with Route 30; safety improvements on Route 356; rehabilitation of the West Newton Bridge.

Planned projects in Allegheny County include: An upgrade of the Banksville Interchange on Interstate 376; reconstruction of Pittsburgh’s Smithfield Street; improvements on Liberty Avenue, Lebanon Church Road and the Highland Park Bridge; rehabilitation of the McKeesport Duquesne Bridge and Pittsburgh’s Sixth Street Bridge.

Jeff Himler is a Tribune-Review staff writer. You can contact Jeff at 724-836-6622, jhimler@triblive.com or via Twitter @jhimler_news.
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Document Revisions as a Result of Public Comment
Public Participation Report
May/June 2020

Changes to the Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program in Response to Public Comments

In accordance with SPC’s Public Participation Plan, the public is offered the opportunity to review the Draft 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program, and to provide comments during a public comment period. This public input opportunity was widely advertised, and a series of virtual public meetings were held to provide opportunities for public comment.

SUMMARY OF PROJECT CHANGES TO 2021-2024 TIP

- All Districts - Various project descriptions underwent minor changes to provide more consistent information. This was predominately in response to comments from the interagency air quality review and comments were addressed prior to the SPC 2021-2024 TIP comment period.

- Within the detailed project list (Appendix 6). The following projects had their narratives adjusted as a result of public comments:
  - Cranberry North Resurfacing (109627): Project limits were clarified
  - SR 3021 Improvements (110783): Project limits were clarified
  - SR 4005, SR 954 to Oakland Ave (100122): Project limits were clarified
  - Waynesburg Betterment (113683): Project limits were clarified.

- Minor technical edits were done on the funding of 5 projects at the request of PennDOT District 10. These projects were:
  - Rural Valley Bridge #4 (83245)
  - Fagley Run Bridge #2 (83245)
  - Baker Hollow Bridge (109617)
  - SR 3007 over Marshall Run (83382)
  - As a result of these moves one new line item project (79843) was created to contain reserve BOF funds ($83,400)

- A map and table of interstate TIP projects was added to supplement information on the state managed interstate TIP.

- A list of Act 13 bridge projects in Westmoreland County was added to Appendix 9. These 100% locally funded projects are being tracked for possible addition to the TIP in October 2020.

Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Assessment of Draft 2021-2024 TIP
No changes; no public comments were received on this document.

Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Draft 2021-2024 TIP
No changes; no public comments were received on this document.

Amendment to the region’s transportation plan to reflect project phasing and cost information included in Draft 2021-2024 TIP
No changes; no public comments were received on this document.

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission