



COMPREHENSIVE SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITY

Route 228 Balls Bend Realignment Project Middlesex Township, Butler County

Prepared by:



Prepared for:



TABLE OF CONTENTS



Public Involvement Plan Overview.....	1
--	----------

Public Involvement Activities

Middlesex Township Meeting Summary – May 6, 2015.....	5
Public Meeting Summary - June 24, 2015.....	10
Stakeholders Interest Form & Stakeholders Committee List	24
Stakeholders Committee Meeting #1 Summary – October 15, 2015.....	28
Local Business Interview contact reports.....	41
Jeff Stull – Thrower Concrete	
Ed Vogel – Vogel Disposal	
Public Officials Briefing Summary – February 9, 2016.....	44
Stakeholders Committee #2 – February 10, 2016.....	49
Public Meeting Summary - February 24, 2016.....	55

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN OVERVIEW



McCormick Taylor assisted Engineering District 10-0 of Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) in the development and implementation of the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the Ball's Bend Realignment Project, on Route 228 in Middlesex Township, Butler County. The PIP was designed to expand outreach and engagement to roadway users throughout the project area in a focused way to identify, explore and address interests and concerns.

The Balls Bend project is an approximately 1.6 mile project that will widen and realign Route 228 extending from the Adams Township line east to the Route 8 intersection in Middlesex Township. The purpose of this project is to accommodate current and future growth and development and increasing traffic volumes. A 2001 study of the Route 228 Corridor, from Route 19 in Cranberry Township to Route 8 identified capacity, access, and safety as Needs to be addressed in order to improve safety and mobility along the entire corridor. The Ball's Bend Realignment Project will address these concerns by realigning the curve located near Davis Road.

The Public Involvement Plan included ongoing coordination with the local municipality, Middlesex Township, Public Meetings and Plans Displays, the formation of a Stakeholders Committee, and ongoing communication with state, county and local public officials.

Public Involvement Activities:

The following is a chronological listing of Public Involvement activities that were conducted throughout the Preliminary Engineering portion of the project:

Nov. 19, 2014:	Public Officials Briefing #1 and Public Meeting #1 (Project Introduction for Public Review and Feedback)
May 6, 2015:	Middlesex Township Supervisors Coordination Meeting (Identify and Discuss Constituent Interests and Concerns)
June 24, 2015:	Public Officials Briefing #2 and Public Meeting #2 (Introduction of a Third Alternative and Comparative Analysis)
Aug. / Sept. 2015:	Formation of a Project Stakeholders Committee
Oct. 15, 2015:	Stakeholders Committee Meeting #1 (Orientation, Concurrence on Purpose and Needs, Identify Key Concerns)
Oct. / Nov. 2015:	Five Stakeholder Segment Meetings Conducted by Stakeholders

Dec. 2015 / Jan. 2016: Two Local Business Interviews

(Corridor Significance, Truck Trip Generation, Project Need)

Feb. 9, 2016: Public Officials Briefing #3

(Identify the Final Alternative)

Feb. 10, 2016: Stakeholders Committee Meeting #2

(Identify the Final Alternative)

Feb. 24, 2016: Public Meeting #3

(Identify the Final Alternative)

Public Meetings:

Three public meetings were conducted for the Balls Bend Realignment Project.

The initial Public Plans Display was hosted by PennDOT Engineering District 10 in November 2014 as part of the initial Preliminary Engineering phase of the project. PennDOT introduced project Purpose and Need and two widening alternatives. Each alternative would realign the Balls Bend Curve at Davis Road but vary in that one would continue the widening eastward to Route 8 on the existing alignment and the other would widen north of existing Route 228 near or along Allemande Lane. Meeting attendees acknowledged the project Purpose and Needs with concerns later noted by several local residents who faced possible relocation. Other residents, whose properties would not be acquired, expressed concern for the effects the project would have on their quality of life if their homes would be closer to the new four-lane roadway. Loss of farmland was also a concern.

In June 2015, PennDOT and McCormick Taylor held a Public Officials Briefing and a second Public Meeting to present a comparative analysis of the two alternatives that were previously introduced and to identify a third alternative that was developed slightly north of the existing alignment based on initial public feedback. The Department announced the intention to create a short-term Stakeholders Committee comprised of representatives of community segments including residents, businesses, farm owners, schools, local officials and emergency service providers. The Stakeholders Committee would coordinate directly with the PennDOT project team to provide community-based feedback on the alternatives.

A third public meeting, conducted as an open house Public Plans Display was held in February 2016 to formally present the Final Alternative, which was developed in concert with the project Stakeholders Committee, for review and feedback by the general public. The public spoke one-to-one with Project Team members. Feedback gathered by conversation and comment form indicated general support for the Final Alternative.

Stakeholders Committee:

A Stakeholders Committee was formed of community members representing various stakeholder segments, including:

- Homeowners
- Businesses
- Schools
- Property Owners
- Middlesex Township Officials
- Emergency Service Providers

Stakeholders were identified based on telephone interviews with those who expressed interest at the June 24, 2015 public meeting. Stakeholders were selected based upon the community segment that they most effectively could represent; their geographic location within the project area; and their ability to objectively consider project information to effectively share that information with others in their respective community segments to provide effective feedback to the Project Team. The Stakeholders Committee essentially served as an informational conduit between the community and the Project Team. The quality feedback received was used by PennDOT to determine a Final Alternative. The Committee was convened for two focused and facilitated meetings.

The first Stakeholders Committee meeting in October 2015 was focused on the alternatives analysis completed on the three alternatives presented at the June 2015 Public Meeting. The Project Team presented the Project Performance Measures, pros and cons, and a comparative matrix of all three alternatives. Stakeholders were also tasked with reaching out to their community segments, friends, and neighbors to share the mapping and other project information and gather additional feedback to assist PennDOT in the identification of a Final Alternative.

The second Stakeholders Committee meeting in February 2016 included a summary of work completed by the Project Team since the previous meeting, including stakeholder segment feedback, and coordination with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC). The Final Alternative (Alternative C Modified) was presented for detailed discussion and feedback and met with general concurrence of the Stakeholders Committee.

Stakeholder Segment Meetings

Each Stakeholder Committee member was responsible for the in-depth exploration and identification of the interests and concerns of their respective community segments. Committee members were tasked with sharing information from their PennDOT Project Team meetings with their community segments and providing segment feedback to the Project Team. Committee members conducted their own Stakeholder Segment Meetings following the October 2015 Stakeholders Committee meeting to fulfill their information-sharing responsibilities. PennDOT provided copies of project informational materials and mapping support the segment meetings.

Business Interviews

Telephone interviews were conducted with two local businesses that generate truck traffic on Route 228 in the project area. The interviews were conducted with Vogel Disposal and Thrower Concrete, at the recommendation of the Stakeholders Committee. Feedback received in the business interviews reinforced the need for the project and support for the four-lane widening of the entire Route 228 Corridor.

Middlesex Township Coordination:

Following the identification of public concern about the realignment alternative presented at the November 2014 public meeting, a coordination meeting was conducted with Middlesex Township's Manager and Supervisors to consider a third alternative that would be located closer to the existing Route 228 alignment to minimize impacts to the Hawkins Farm and the residential community along Allemande Lane while balancing effects to the environment, improving safety and mobility, and addressing access and constructability issues.

Public Officials Briefings:

Three Public Officials Briefings were held to coincide with public meetings (November 2014, June 2015 and February 2016). Each briefing provided an opportunity for public officials to: learn about recent project developments; provide feedback on specific issues like emergency access and current and future land use; and, respond to constituent inquiry.

Conclusion:

The implementation of the Public Involvement Plan for the Balls Bend Realignment Project provided for the engagement of the local community, which actively participated in the project development process. The collaborative process led to concurrence on the development of a Final Alternative (Alternative C Modified). Documentation for all component Public Involvement activities associated with the Public Involvement Plan is contained within the following sections of this Comprehensive Summary of Public Involvement Activity.



Middlesex Township Meeting Summary May 6, 2015



Meeting Minutes

Middlesex Township

May 6, 2015

3:00 pm

Attendees:

Eric Kaunert, Township Manager

Michael Spreng, Supervisor

Donald Marshall, Supervisor

James "Hap" Evans, Supervisor

Ben Gilberti, P.E., HRG Engineering, Municipal Engineer

Kevin Hartnett, P.E., MS Consultants

Michael Hnath, Township Solicitor

Colleen Stephan, Rep. Daryl Metcalfe's office

Chad Mosco, P.E., PennDOT

Ken Rich, McCormick Taylor

Carrie Hill, McCormick Taylor

Mr. Kaunert opened the meeting by welcoming all guests and giving an overview of the discussion for the day.

Project Update:

Mr. Mosco began by describing the study of the SR 228 corridor that was completed in the early 2000s. The Ball's Bend Realignment project is one part of the vision for the overall corridor. PennDOT is examining three different realignment alternatives -

1. Online widening and "flattening" the Balls Bend curve: impacts business, floodplains, wetlands, streams, and utilities with fewer residential and farmland impacts. This alternative has greater constructability issues than the offline alternatives including work zone safety and increased costs associated with the Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT).
2. Straightening the roadway to eliminate the curve: This is the offline alternative furthest north: fewer impacts to business, wetlands, streams, floodplains, with fewer constructability issues for work zone safety and MPT and lesser overall cost. This alternative would increase farmland and residential impacts.
3. Relocating a section of the roadway slightly northward of the existing alignment: Proposed by Middlesex Township as a potential compromise alternative that would retain some roadway curvature for traffic calming (speed reducing) effects and address constructability concerns.

Ken Rich briefly discussed the need to get input from the township and the public, to support PennDOT's ultimate selection of a Preferred Alternative.

Mr. Kaunert asked if the Department had discussed any costs for any or all of the alternatives. Mr. Mosco gave the rough estimates: Alternative #1 is the most expensive at around \$25 million and the other two alternatives are approximately \$21 million. The higher costs for Alternative #1 mostly stem

from the need to 'borrow' or bring in earth from outside the project and the need for more temporary roads during construction.

The township supervisors asked for the comparison of the number of residential or business relocations for all of the alternatives. Residential impacts were estimated as follows: Alternative #1 could have 3; #2 could have 10; and #3 could have 5 relocations.

Mr. Kaunert brought up a question regarding Old Route 8 South which connects to both State Route (SR) 288 and SR 8. Mr. Gilberti, the township's engineer, mentioned that the bridge near the connection to SR 8 is in disrepair. The supervisors and the engineer have discussed tying Fulton Dr. in to SR 8 and creating cul-de-sacs at both ends of Old Route 8 South.

Mr. Gilberti expressed the township's request that all new tie-ins involving township roads be as close to 90° as possible, for safety and sight-distance purposes.

Mr. Kaunert asked if the old section of SR 228 would be formally turned back to the Township, and Mr. Mosco said that it would. Mr. Gilberti then asked whether the bridge structures would be turned back to the Township or to Butler County, as most if not all of the bridges in Middlesex Township are actually maintained by the County. Mr. Mosco said that PennDOT would look for Township input regarding all connecting roads and those details would be addressed in the final design of the realignment.

Regarding the tying-in of the township roads, Mr. Kaunert stated that the police department considers the intersection of SR 228 and Davis Road (near the top of Ball's Bend) as the most dangerous intersection in the Township. Mr. Mosco agreed and discussed the need for the realignment to improve the sight-distance at Davis Road, Harbison Road and a few other intersections. Mosco and Rich indicated that tie-ins to the local roadway network will also be explored during public involvement activities.

Mr. Evans asked who would own the property that would be between the 'old' Ball's Bend and the new alignment. Mr. Mosco explained that it would depend on how the land would be used after construction. For example, it may need to be a constructed wetland, and if that were the case, PennDOT would own it in order to maintain it.

Mr. Kaunert asked if PennDOT knew how much roadway would be turned back to the Township after the realignment. Mr. Mosco will get him that information.

Mr. Kaunert has had discussion with the owners of the farm property that would be intersected with the realignment. Their request was that the roadway be moved 250 feet south of the proposed straightened alignment (Alternative #2). He wondered if Alternative #3 would meet that requirement. Mr. Mosco agreed that it would probably be very close to that distance, and will follow up with the exact distance between the two alignments.

Mr. Kaunert also asked if there had been a traffic analysis of the proposed alternatives. Mr. Mosco answered that they had not done simulations of the alternatives, just studies of the current traffic patterns. That will part of the in-depth studies.

Mr. Marshall asked what would happen to the section of Old Route 8 South that is south of SR 228. Mr. Mosco said that it is probable that that portion of the road would become a cul-de-sac.

Public Involvement

Mr. Rich then discussed the next steps regarding public involvement. PennDOT develop more details to equally compare the three alternatives and their various impacts. There will be a public officials' briefing and public plans display meeting in the next six to eight weeks. That meeting will be utilized to present the three alternatives together with some comparison information and the public will be informed of the opportunity to be considered for participation in a limited duration stakeholders/focus group to provide direct input to PennDOT's project team.

The Stakeholder Committee, including residents and business owners and representatives of school district, emergency service, local public and elected officials, and other community stakeholder segments will discuss the alternatives and provide feedback regarding community interests and concerns for each of the three alternatives. Upon conclusion of the Stakeholders Committee activity, PennDOT will conduct one more public meeting to present the overall results of the Alternatives comparison and will identify its preferred alternative. Supervisors offered the use of the Middlesex Township Building for the Stakeholders Committee meeting(s) and public plan display. It was acknowledged that the Middlesex Township Fire Hall or local school may need to be used for the plans displays due to potential turnout.

Given that the Township has been involved in direct talks with local property owners, Mr. Rich asked if the Township felt that they were in a position such that they could gain closure with the community, but the manager and supervisors all felt that the committee should be convened at least once. The Township Secretary has a list of residents who requested to be notified of other meetings about the realignment that they would be happy to share. McCormick Taylor will obtain that list to assist in refining the project contact list, considering participation on the Stakeholders' Committee and for invitations to public meetings.

Dates for the public meeting and public officials briefing were discussed. A date during the last week of June was tentatively proposed by the Township. PennDOT will coordinate the next public plans display date.

Other Township Interests/Concerns:

The Township would like to see Fulton Road directly connected to SR 8 instead of the existing connection with Old Route 8 South (north of the Balls Bend project area) to provide safer access to SR 8 and SR 228 and to improve the residential integrity of Fulton Road.

Mr. Gilberti and Mr. Kaunert also inquired if PennDOT might be willing to partner with the Township on a multi-modal grant to improve the roadway and/or the intersections with SR 8 and SR 228. Mr. Mosco said that he would discuss it with others at PennDOT.

The portion of the meeting related to the Ball's Bend project was adjourned at approximately 4:15 p.m.

Follow Up Items

Mr. Mosco will send to the Township the amount of roadway to be turned back to the Township after the realignment.

Owners of the farm that would be intersected by the new alignments requested that the roadway be moved 250 feet south of the proposed straightened alignment (Alternative #2). Mr. Mosco will send to the Township the exact distance between the two alignments which they can share with the property owners.

McCormick Taylor will obtain the list of individuals who wished to be notified of new developments with the project to assist in refining the project contact list, considering participation on the Stakeholders' Committee, and for invites to public meetings.

Is there a possibility that PennDOT might be willing to partner with the Township on a multi-modal grant to improve the roadway and/or the intersections with SR 8 and SR 228?



Public Meeting & Public Officials Briefing Summary June 24, 2015

Prepared for:



Prepared by:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary.....	3
II.	Meeting Format.....	4
III.	Meeting Details.....	5
IV.	Presentation Summary.....	6
V.	Public Comments.....	7
VI.	Appendix.....	12

I. Executive Summary

On Wednesday, June 24, 2015 a Public Officials Briefing and Public Meeting were conducted by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) Engineering District 10-0, regarding the Ball's Bend Realignment Project. The purpose of the project is to address capacity, access, and safety needs along Route 228 focusing on the curve near Davis Road.

Nine (9) Public Officials signed-in for the Public Officials Briefing and 57 people registered at the Public Meeting.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Introduce the third realignment alternative to the public
- Announce the formation of a short-term Stakeholders Committee and solicit community interest in participation
- Collect initial public comment and feedback on all three alternatives

The Public Officials Briefing and Public Meeting both began with a short presentation by the project team followed by an open Questions & Answers period. Following the presentation and discussion, all attendees were encouraged to visit display stations and talk with Project Team members. The informational displays included:

- Station 1: Registration and Introduction
- Station 2: Mapping (Route 228 Corridor and Ball's Bend project area)
- Station 3: Public Involvement Opportunities
- Station 4: Comments

All attendees were encouraged to submit their questions and concerns via the Comment Form, and to submit completed Stakeholders Committee Interest Forms if they wished. The submission deadline for both forms was July 15, 2015. Nine (9) Comment Forms and twenty (20) Stakeholders Committee Interest Forms were returned.

II. Meeting Format

Date: Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Time: Public Officials Meeting: 4-5pm
Public Meeting: 6-7:30pm

Location: Middlesex Township Building
131 Browns Hill Rd
Valencia, PA 16059

Format: Plans Display with short presentation and open Question and Answer period.

Purpose:

- Introduce the third realignment alternative to the public
- Announce the formation of a short-term Stakeholders Committee and solicit community interest in participation on the committee
- Collect initial public comment and feedback on all three alternatives

Meeting Notification:

Letters were mailed in late May to Public Officials to invite them to the Public Officials Briefing and the Open House Public Meeting. Additional letters were mailed to property owners adjacent to the alignment alternatives to invite them to the Public Meeting. A newspaper advertisement was placed in the Butler Eagle and Cranberry Eagle two weeks before the Public Meeting and was supplemented with a press release issued by the District's Community Relations Coordinator. Copies of all of these outreach materials are in the Appendix to this report.

Handouts

The following handouts were made available to all who attended both the Public Officials Briefing and the Public Meeting. Copies of all handouts can be found in the Appendix to this report.

- Informational handout including background information about the Route 228 Corridor Study; work completed and planned throughout the corridor; descriptions of the alternatives under consideration for the Ball's Bend project; the Project Purpose & Need; and information regarding the Public Involvement Plan.
- General Comment Form
- Stakeholders Committee Interest Form

Attendance

Nine officials signed in at the Public Officials Briefing, and 57 individuals signed in at the Public Meeting. Copies of sign-in sheets are included in the Appendix to this report. The following Project Team members were also in attendance:

PennDOT District 10

Mark Rozich, P.E., Project Manager
Chad Mosco, P.E.
Richard Waxter
Lane Dumm
Cody Young

McCormick Taylor

Ken Rich
Carrie Hill

III. Meeting Details

The public meeting was structured as an open house plans display to enable the public to speak one-on-one with the Project Team at display stations, and to aid in the identification of participants on a local Stakeholders Committee. There was one brief presentation by the project team at approximately 6:00 p.m. Following the presentation, the community members in attendance had many questions for the project team regarding all aspects of the project. Notes from the Question & Answer portions of both meetings can be found in Section 5 – Public Comments. Listed below is a list of displays by station.

Station 1: Registration and Introduction

- Sign-In sheet
- Informational handout, comment forms, Stakeholders Committee Interest form

Station 2: Mapping

- 228 Corridor map
- Ball's Bend Alignment alternatives
- Alternative comparison matrix

Station 3: Public Involvement

- Public Involvement plan display board
- Sign-up sheet for those who would like to be considered for participation

Station 4: Comments

- Comment forms
- Drop box

IV. Presentation Summary

The Public Officials briefing began at 4:00 p.m. Mark Rozich, P.E., PennDOT Project Manager opened the meeting by introducing all members of the project team. He then proceeded to describe the Purpose and Need of the Ball's Bend project, and how explained how it fits with the other projects planned or completed along the Route 228 corridor. Mr. Rozich detailed each of the three alternatives currently being evaluated for the realignment of Ball's Bend. He touched on the highlights, including some of the positive and negative impacts of each alternative.

Alternative #1: Online widening and "flattening" the Balls Bend curve: impacts business, floodplains, wetlands, streams, and utilities with fewer residential and farmland impacts. This alternative has greater constructability issues than the others including work zone safety and increased costs associated with the Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT).

Alternative #2: Straightening the roadway to eliminate the curve: This is the alternative furthest north with fewer impacts to business, wetlands, streams, floodplains, with fewer constructability issues and a lower overall cost. This alternative would increase farmland and residential impacts.

Alternative #3: Relocating a section of the roadway slightly northward: Retains some curvature for traffic calming (speed reducing) effects and addresses constructability concerns.

Ken Rich then spoke about the public involvement portion of the project. PennDOT has developed a Public Involvement Plan which includes the formation of a Stakeholders Committee and additional public meeting(s). He discussed the difference between the Stakeholders Committee and other such groups, like Community Advisory Committees. This Committee will focus on the Ball's Bend project, and will gather for a limited number of meetings. Mr. Rich encouraged all Public Officials in attendance to submit Stakeholders Committee Interest Forms, if they wished to be involved. The officials in attendance had questions and feedback for the project team and all of that information can be found in Section 5 – Public Comments.

The Public Meeting portion began at 6:00 p.m. The meeting was initially planned to be an Open House style meeting, with a brief presentation at 6:45, but due to the large number of attendees when the meeting was opened, it was decided to begin with the presentation. The same presentation was given to the public as to the Public Officials. Mark Rozich introduced the project team, and began the presentation with the Purpose and Need of the Ball's Bend project, and how it fits with the other projects planned or completed along the 228 corridor. He included some details regarding the highlights, including some of the positive and negative impacts, of each alternative currently being evaluated at Ball's Bend.

Ken Rich described PennDOT's Public Involvement Plan which includes the formation of a Stakeholders Committee and additional public meeting(s). The Stakeholder Committee will represent a cross-section of the community, and provide input, feedback, and local knowledge to help PennDOT determine the Preferred Alternative. He encouraged all in attendance to take and fill out a Stakeholders Committee Interest Form. Following the meeting, the forms will be reviewed and a Stakeholders Committee, with balanced representation from all stakeholder segments, will be formed. The expectation is that this Committee will meet a limited number of times for discussion focused strictly on the alternatives.

The Question & Answer portion of the Public Meeting took up a substantial portion of the meeting, and the comments, questions, and ideas presented to the project team can be found in Section 5 - Public Comments.

V. Public Comments

Comments Collected During Public Officials Briefing Q&A

	Submitted By:
<p>Q: What is the goal of the public meeting?</p> <p>A: To display the three alternatives, announce the third alternative that was added based in part on public involvement to-date, and solicit feedback and participation on the Stakeholders Committee</p>	Eric Kaunert (Middlesex Township Manager)
<p>Q: What kinds/amounts of utilities would be involved in each alternative?</p> <p>A: Depends; definitely electric, cable, and phone; a fairly new sewer line was put in nearby 5-10 years ago</p> <p>Q: Will you need fill for the project?</p> <p>A: Yes. Alt #1 would be a 'borrow job', and Alt #2 & #3 would use fill from within the job</p> <p>Q: Will the bridge near Harbison & Parks be addressed?</p> <p>A: Yes. Depending on the alternative, it may be eliminated. PennDOT is looking for feedback from public/officials regarding necessary connections. Some may be dead-ended based on local traffic and residential concerns. Rights in/out could also be an option.</p> <p>Q: Will there be traffic signals?</p> <p>A: Signals are not warranted at this time, but could be added later, based on traffic volumes. There will definitely be turn lanes throughout. (17,000 vehicles per day currently).</p>	Kim Geyer (Secretary to County Commissioner Bill McCarrier)

Comments Collected During the Public Meeting Q&A

Category		Submitted By:
Corridor Schedule	Q: How are projects prioritized? A: Crash data, congestion, air quality, among other considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pittsburgh Street intersection will begin in 2018 Three Degree Rd. will follow Pittsburgh Street Three Degree Rd. is tentatively scheduled for 2018-2020 IF FUNDED -The project is currently in design, and it may need to be phased to advance. PennDOT is currently trying to minimize property takes. No funding yet for Three Degree Rd. or Ball's Bend - Ball's Bend probably will not be scheduled before 2020 The Pittsburgh St. project is approximately \$5.5mil to fix only the intersection 	Paul Kress
Corridor Study	Q: How many citizens groups and studies will there be? What are we doing with the previous study results? A: The results of the previous study are being applied throughout the corridor, including Ball's Bend. The study recommends two lanes in each direction with center left turn lanes at intersections and access controls.	Dolly Weinzetl
Engineering	C: Ball's Bend was created by PennDOT, and it doesn't work.	Dolly Weinzetl
	C: Don't want a Cranberry solution "bringing Cranberry to us" (ie, the Cranberry typical section)	Dolly Weinzetl
	C: Ball's Bend safety problem resulted from local opposition (from Ball brothers) to a straighter improvement/alignment that was initially proposed.	Nana Carr
Funding	C: 422 was incrementally improved and it's still not done R: Priority of improvements are considered regionally based on available funding	Paul Kress
Logistics	C: The first public meeting was not OK - not held in the township (from a resident affected by Alternative #2)	Unknown
	C: Public thought that the project was predetermined at the first public meeting	Unknown
Maintenance	C: Problems at Route 228/Franklin Rd. (referred to maintenance)	Unknown
	C: Need to fix all of Route 228 at once	Unknown
	C: Route 228 pavement is bad between Ball's Bend and Three Degree Rd. Are there plans to fix the pavement? (referred to maintenance)	Unknown
Project Schedule	Q: When will we know the preferred alternative? A: After stakeholder meetings; ROW acquisition and final design will follow, but NOT without funding	Unknown

Right of Way	<p>C: PennDOT should use fill that is locally available (near Giant Eagle)</p> <p>R: We will need to balance the earthwork (per Mark Rozich)</p>	Nana Carr
	<p>Q: Will part of Route 228 be given back to the Township?</p> <p>A: If the offline alternatives are selected, the old portion of Route 228 may be returned to the township. Turn backs must be in an acceptable level of maintenance. How much of Rte. 228 is turned back will depend upon which Alternative is selected.</p>	Unknown
	<p>Q: How will 'close' homes be affected?</p> <p>A: There is no prescribed distance. Uneconomic remnants of properties will be acquired. Relativity of safety based on closeness to homes - 'clear zone': can be 30 feet from the white line, but PennDOT will typically purchase more than that.</p>	Unknown
	<p>C: The area is zoned as mixed use with some business</p> <p>R: Required ROW funding will be based on the selected alternative</p>	Unknown
	<p>Q: Will PennDOT use eminent domain to acquire properties?</p> <p>A: Eminent domain can be used, but PennDOT will try to avoid 'takes' where possible and will consider preferences.</p>	Unknown
	<p>Q: What are appraisals based on?</p> <p>A: Fair market value. PennDOT can partially compensate property owners' appraiser, attorney, or engineers' fees, if they desire.</p>	Unknown
	(Mr. King is part owner of Harvest Valley Farm which farms the Hawkins Farm) - Their prime land is on the hillside between Alternatives #2 and #3. There they grow corn, green beans, etc. They donate portions of their crops to the Greater Pittsburgh Food Bank. They currently rent the land, but Mr. King hopes to buy that property in the future.	Dave King
	<p>Q: Family owns Ball's Bend and will be affected either way. Regarding MPT and work zone safety, is that considered over/after residential concerns?</p> <p>A: All aspects are considered, and seeking to balance all impacts.</p>	Paul DeLatorre
Safety	<p>C: Projects are needed throughout the corridor; It's a shame that state officials are not available to answer for the funding problems</p>	Tom McMeekin
	<p>Q: What about safety in school zones?</p> <p>A: Three Degree Rd. project is being somewhat straightened - not completely - to control speeds past the schools. We will invite school district officials to participate on the Stakeholders Committee.</p>	Unknown

Stakeholders Committee	Q: How will the public interface with PennDOT and Middlesex Twp? A: Via the Stakeholders Committee	
	How many people will serve on the committee? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 2 residents per alternative (total of 6 including alternates) • 3-6 businesses • 2 school reps. • 3 EMS reps The team will be seeking help to identify local trucking reps	
Other	C: Rumor that Westinghouse moved to Cranberry with the stipulation that Route 228 would be widened to 4 lanes. R: PennDOT is unable to substantiate the rumor.	Nana Carr

Feedback from Comment Forms

		Submitted By:
Noise	I don't see the need other than the actual Ball's Bend, to straighten the road. Are you increasing the speed to 65? If it remains at 45-50 mph with additional lanes and turning lanes, the current mainline section near Harbison Road should work fine. With increased traffic, sound attenuation from the increased noise should be implemented at every possible area to allow residential areas more livable outdoor environment.	Glenn Jurena
Noise/Access	Any adjustment to Route 228 will affect my property, usability, property value, and family. Of the three alternatives, I agree most with Alternative #1 and my 2 nd choice would be Alternative #3. If Alternative #3 is chose, I would like a type of noise barrier considered. Additionally, if Alternative #2 is chosen, my driveway will need significantly change, with difficulty accessing a hard road.	Jason & Dena Fantini
	Please continue to notify me about future meetings.	Barb Seitz
Safety	This has been discussed for the last 10-20 years. Need to move forward and make some decisions. Alternative #3 seems to be the likely choice when you consider future growth, cost and safety issues. No matter what alternative is chosen, there are going to be unhappy people. My home will be impacted in almost every scenario, but we hesitate to make major improvements since in some of the alternatives, it would be a waste. We have children that will be driving in the next several years and safety just pulling into/out of our driveway is a huge risk. Do something!!!	Michel Kuntz
	I think Alternative #1 is the best to serve all homeowners in the area.	Richard Reilly
Maintenance	Water/drainage issues on Route 228 at Park Rd. through Old Rte. 8 South on the eastbound side. Also, drainage issues on Warrendale Rd., southbound side, approximately 200 ft. from the intersection with Route 228	Bonnie Chapel (via Ken Rich)
Cost/Right of Way	I feel that being this project is being paid for by tax payers that the taxpayers that will be affected by this realignment should have the most input. I also feel that the alternative that takes the least amount of residents homes and property should be chosen, even if the cost is more.	John Hetzel

Right of Way	I am very worried about having a 4 to 5 lane highway in my front yard. If that is the case, I would rather my home be taken away instead of my freedom. It is the law that Route 228 can be 30 foot from my front door. How is that fair to a resident of this community for almost 25 years now. Emotions can and are high understandably so.	Mary Hetzel, CPhT
Corridor Consistency/Right of Way	<p>I expect to be contacted. I am in total agreement that Balls Bend needs to be eliminated. Also a consistent and uniform highway needs to be constructed 4 lanes and turn lanes from Route 8 to Cranberry with a consistent driving speed, 45 is sufficient. There's too much traffic to be any higher. Once these changes are made the road will be safer and people will be able to make better time travelling since the newly constructed highway will be safer. "No passing zones" implemented. Possibly sidewalks, might as well go all the way, also keeping in mind Cranberry is getting closer to Middlesex Twp. Example Rt. Route in Wexford PA safer, accidents have dropped incredibly.</p> <p>I would like to know if and which Routes [alternatives] make our property up for buy out? Looks like #3 for sure and #1. Regardless we will not be able to sell our property due to the project. We have invested a substantial amount of money into said property. (1) hooked into sewage (2) metal roof (3) siding and windows (4) water softener system (5) two new furnaces, one new heat pump/AC (6) painting and new flooring (7) two remodeled full bathrooms (8) two decks Also a business operating from property – Tree removal service and Lawn Scaping. Also spoke to Marcus (?) about the highway. He was quite rude and said you already live on a highway. He was very inconsiderate, rude, smug, and cocky. Might not matter to him. However, all this matters to us. We will need to be accommodated.</p>	Michelle Chambers

VI. Appendix

- a. Property Owner Letter
- b. Property Owner Mailing List
- c. Public Officials Letter
- d. Public Officials Mailing List
- e. Public Meeting Advertisement
- f. Sign-In Sheets
 - i. Public Officials
 - ii. General Public
- g. Display Boards
 - i. Corridor map
 - ii. Alternatives map
 - iii. Alternatives Comparison Matrix
 - iv. Public Involvement Opportunities
- h. Handouts
 - i. Informational hand-out
 - ii. General Comment Form
 - iii. Stakeholders Committee Form
- i. Feedback gathered
 - i. Completed Comment Forms
 - ii. Completed Stakeholders Committee Forms



Stakeholders Interest Form & Stakeholders Committee List



Stakeholders Committee Form | Public Meeting | June 24, 2015

Thank you for your interest in the SR 228 Ball's Bend Realignment Project Stakeholders Committee. Please complete this form if you would like to be considered for membership. Members will be assigned by PennDOT to ensure that all areas of interest are represented. This form can be returned to a project team member during the meeting or to the address listed on the reverse side of this form by July 15, 2015.

Name: _____

Address: _____ City: _____

State: _____ Zip: _____ Telephone: _____

E-mail: _____

What stakeholder segment do you represent?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Property Owner |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Church |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middlesex Township Resident | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Trucking | <input type="checkbox"/> School |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

If other, please describe: _____

What are your specific interests regarding the Stakeholders Committee?

Do you feel there is a stakeholder segment not represented?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe: _____

What meeting time works best for your schedule?

☐ Morning ☐ Afternoon ☐ Evening

What is your preferred method of contact?

☐ E-mail ☐ Telephone ☐ Mail

Please return by July 15, 2015 to:

McCormick Taylor

1000 Omega Dr., Suite 1550

Pittsburgh, PA 15205

Attn: Carrie Hill



Ball's Bend Realignment Project Stakeholders Committee

ROUTE 228 MAINLINE

Nana Carr

DAVIS ROAD

Paul Dela Torre

Frank Folz, alternate

HARBISON ROAD

John Soltis

HARBISON/PARKS/228 INTERSECTION

Tim Kuntz

ALLEMANDE LANE

Mary Hetzel

Richard Reilly, alternate

HAWKINS FARM

Liz McMeekin

Greg Peterson, alternate

MATHEWS LANE

Candace Mathews

MARS SCHOOL DISTRICT

Jane Roth

BUSINESS

Steve Baker, BEAR Equipment

TRUCKING

Ed Vogel, Vogel Disposal

Jeff Stull, Thrower Concrete

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Randy Ruediger, Middlesex Police Department

Kim Blystone, Middlesex Volunteer Fire Company

MIDDLESEX TOWNSHIP

Eric Kaunert, Twp. Manager



Stakeholders Committee Meeting #1 Summary October 15, 2015



BALLS BEND STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE MEETING #1

MEETING DETAILS

Date: Thursday, October 15, 2015

Time: 6:00 - approximately 9:30 pm

Location: Middlesex Township Building in Valencia, PA.

The following Stakeholders Committee members were in attendance:

- Steve Baker, Bear Playground Equipment
- Nana Carr
- Paul DeLaTorre
- Frank Folz
- Mary Hetzel
- Eric Kaunert, Middlesex Twp. Manager
- Tim Kuntz
- Candace Mathews
- Liz McMeekin
- Greg Peterson
- Frank Randza, Mars Area School District
- Richard Reilly
- Jane Roth, Mars Area School District
- Sgt. Randy Ruediger, Middlesex Twp. Police
- John Soltis

The following Project Team members were in attendance:

- Mark Rozich, P.E., PennDOT District 10-0, Project Manager
- Chad Mosco, P.E., PennDOT District 10-0, Lead Designer / Assistant Project Manager
- Kevin Pollino, PennDOT District 10-0, Right of Way Administrator
- Jessica Rizzilli, PennDOT District 10-0, Environmental Manager
- Brian Steffy, P.E., PennDOT District 10-0, PennDOT Assistant Construction Engineer
- Ken Rich, McCormick Taylor
- Carrie Hill, McCormick Taylor

Also in attendance were Colleen Stephan (Rep. Daryl Metcalfe's office) and Ray Steffler (resident) as observers.

PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE

Following opening remarks and introductions to begin the meeting, Stakeholders Committee facilitator Ken Rich explained the purpose and function of the committee.

- The committee will function as a short term task group to consider the three alternatives and provide unbiased feedback to PennDOT based on the community segment each stakeholder represents.
- Feedback received will be considered by PennDOT in its selection of a preferred alternative.

Mr. Rich then summarized Operating Guidelines for the Stakeholders Committee. Copies of the guidelines were provided to each Committee member.

A group brainstorming activity was also conducted with the Committee members, who were asked to identify community-based measures they feel are important to consider in the review of the three alternatives. The following measures were identified by the Committee (the number in parenthesis indicate the number of members expressing the same measure:

- Improve Safety on Route 228 (6)
- Ease Congestion (3)
- Minimize Residential Impact
- Maintain a lower speed (2)
- Enhance Property Values
- Improve the Harbison/Park/Route 228 Intersection
- Kill No one, Achieve No Crashes During and After Construction
- Design the Project for Future Traffic Volumes
- Improve Residential and Business Access to and from Route 228
- Address Noise
- Reduce Commute Times
- Improve/Attract Business Traffic
- Minimize Future Maintenance Costs
- Minimize Community Impacts
- Support Constructability, Timely Delivery, Cost Effectiveness
- Address Sight Distance Concerns at Harbison Road/Route 228.
- Support Future Growth

PROJECT HISTORY

PennDOT Engineering District 10-0 Project Manager Mark Rozich summarized the history of the Balls Bend Project which was considered as part of an overall corridor study of Route 228 intended to improve corridor safety and mobility between Route 19 in Cranberry Township and Route 8 in Middlesex Township, Butler County.

The Route 228 Corridor Study has evolved since 2001.

- 2001: The initial Route 228 Corridor Study developed 18 online and offline alternatives and included development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
- 2004: The Corridor Study was re-evaluated and the EIS changed to an Environmental Assessment (EA) due to funding constraints.
- 2006: The Environmental Document was prepared.
- 2007: A Public Hearing was held to present the alternatives and study findings to the community.

- 2009: Because of a lack of funding, the project did not receive environmental clearance, and the EA was cancelled.

The Corridor Study results have been used as a Master Plan for improvements along the corridor, and the details from that plan are being updated for this project.

- An “Urban Boulevard” design was identified as the vision for Route 228, and future improvements will be developed on or near the existing alignment, as funding becomes available.
- The Urban Boulevard design includes two lanes in each direction with center left turn lanes at select intersections and green space in median areas. The Urban Boulevard design would be capable of handling twice the traffic volumes of the current roadway and would not require additional lanes for many years. The Urban Boulevard also works with the current land use and zoning conditions, while still accommodating growth.
- Traffic along the corridor continues to grow; development interest along Route 228 continues to spread eastward from Cranberry Township; and the character of the Route 228 Corridor is changing.
- Mr. Rozich noted that work zone safety and constructability were not high priorities in the 2001 study, which focused more on the end product for the entire corridor. PennDOT is now considering those, and other, engineering related concerns.
- Other concerns that engineering will address include: school bus safety, the balance of earthwork (borrow/fill) for the project, and access of side roads and drives to and from Route 228.

Mr. Rozich said funding for the remaining final design, utility relocation, right-of-way acquisition and construction phases of the project is neither identified nor programmed at this time. However, identification of Preferred Alternative will help to facilitate advancement of funding for other phases of project development. As such, construction of the Balls Bend project will not start until 2020 or beyond.

In response to committee questions, Mr. Rozich said that construction-related damage to local roads would be repaired by PennDOT and sections of existing Route 228 that are unused after the project would likely be offered for turn back to the township.

PROJECT PURPOSE

The purpose of the project is to accommodate current and future growth and increasing traffic volumes. As of 2014, 16,500 vehicles (8% trucks) travel the Balls Bend portion of Route 228 daily. In 2001, there were 12,300 vehicles, and by 2020, that number is projected to grow to about 20,500.

PROJECT NEEDS

Capacity, Safety and Access were identified as Needs for the corridor.

Capacity: Current traffic demand exceeds existing capacity of the roadway and continued development will contribute to the delays presently experienced on Route 228 in the project area.

Safety: Rear-end collisions contribute most significantly crash occurrence in the project area. Intersecting roads and driveways provide additional points of conflict.

- Route 228 is congested, resulting in lower speeds, and minor incidents can cause major delays.
- Route 228 is used as a regional through highway and a local access road for residents, businesses and community facilities (schools, etc.). The lack of turning lanes causes lengthy queues behind turning vehicles stopped in the travel lane, and drivers cannot easily enter Route 228 from driveways or intersecting roads.
- Rear-end crashes make up the majority of crashes in the area, and intersecting roads are common conflict points. The available detours for incidents are undesirable.
- Crashes are occurring at the Balls Bend curve, the Harbison Road intersection, and the Route 228 curve nearest Route 8. Crashes at the curve nearest Route 8 involve vehicle speeds, backups from the signals, turns at the Old Route 8 intersection and collisions with deer.

Access: Left turning vehicles significantly impede mobility as they “block” through traffic while waiting for an opportunity to execute the left turns. Full access from drives and side roads create delay and points of conflict. The improvement will seek to control access at select locations.

Mr. Rozich explained that as PennDOT is designing the improvement, constructability and work zone traffic control /safety during construction is also being considered. Constructability sets better control for contractors who will build the improvement.

PROJECT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Environmental Considerations

Jessica Rizzilli, PennDOT District 10-0 Environmental Manager summarized environmental considerations of the project.

The environmental goal for this project is to advance an alternative that is most prudent and feasible, avoiding and minimizing impacts to environmentally-sensitive features. Some of the environmental features found in this project area are: wetlands, watercourses, agricultural land, historic property, residences and businesses and the impacts to each environmental constraint are considered.

- Farmlands (Harris / Carr) to the south of Route 228 are listed as historic on the National Register as applied by the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission (PHMC). These, in part, have precluded further development of a southern alternative that had been previously considered conceptually.
- Environmental Studies that were conducted as part of the Route 228 Corridor Study will be reevaluated. This includes noise studies.

Engineering Considerations

In addition to the engineering considerations discussed during the Project Purpose and Needs portion of the presentation, Mark Rozich identified key engineering considerations as: geometry, intersecting roads, driveways, drainage, bridges, subsurface, constructability, maintainability, and project cost.

ALTERNATIVES

Chad Mosco, PennDOT District 10-0 Project Designer and Co-Project Manager presented the three curve flattening alternatives by summarizing the three main components necessary for each:

1. The alternatives will be four-lane.
2. Left turn lanes will be provided where needed.
3. The Balls bend Curve will be realigned.

The alternatives under consideration by PennDOT are:

Alternative A: Realign Balls Bend Curve; conduct widening online to the east of the curve

Alternative B: Realign Balls Bend Curve; straighten Route 228 to the east by northward realignment.

Alternative C: Realign Balls Bend Curve; relocate Route 228 to the east slightly northward of the existing alignment.

All three alternatives were evaluated based in part upon environmental, engineering, right-of-way and utilities, construction and cost considerations. Mr. Mosco summarized pros and cons of each alternative and reviewed the corresponding Comparative Matrix (please see the Appendix). Pros and Cons identified in the PowerPoint presentation were based upon the comparison of impacts among the three alternatives.

ALTERNATIVE A (potential effects):

PROS

- One potential business displacement
- Two to five potential residential displacements
- 1.13 acres of wetland / floodplain impact
- 1.03 acres of farmland
- Minimal historic property impacts
- Minimal archaeological issues
- Fits existing land use

CONS

- Large impact to 100 year floodplain
- Longer, costlier bridge needed
- Temporary widening and shoring costs
- Difficult to build under traffic
- Portion of the new sewer line will need to be relocated (up to 50% of the cost would be locally funded)
- Higher construction costs

PROS (continued)

- Lesser quality construction
- Work zone safety concerns for motorists and construction workers

CONS (continued)

- Three bridges to maintain

DISCUSSION:

- Alternative A will impact most 100 year flood plain of the three alternatives.
- Potential impact to the DeLa Torre property is approximately 5 acres.
- Fifty percent (50%) of the funding required to relocate the recently-installed sewer line would be borne locally.
- Alternative A bisects wetlands and is the most hydrologically constrained alternative.
- Roadway needs to be raised approximately 3 feet at the bridge near Park Road.
- Alternative A is a “borrow” project from an earthwork standpoint, and will require fill to be trucked in from elsewhere (costly). Balanced earthwork is preferred.
- All access points and intersections will be adjusted to meet sight distance requirements. (Same is true for each of the three alternatives.)
- Left turn lanes will be constructed along Route 228 at Harbison, Park and Davis Roads.
- Properties to which access or utilities cannot be provided will be likely acquisitions (i.e., drive access for Randy Park property will be difficult to provide and may require acquisition, although we don’t yet know for sure).
- Old Route 8 would likely be terminated visa cul-de-sac south of Route 228.
- Phased traffic control could extend construction to 3 seasons.

ALTERNATIVE B (potential effects):

PROS

- Zero business displacements
- 0.27 acres of wetland impacts
- Minimal historic property impacts
- Minimal archaeological issues
- 2 bridges to maintain
- Safer and more efficient to build
- Better-constructed end product
- Shorter bridge in floodplain
- Minimal utility impacts

CONS

- Higher right-of-way costs
- Potential for 7 to 10 residential displacements
- 4.20 acres of farmland impact
 - Bisects farm field
- Bisects community
- Potential for increased speeds

DISCUSSION:

- It was suggested that the Hawkins Farm will be considered as a business when determining impacts.
- Property owners are concerned about the threshold for proximity of the relocated roadway to homes under Eminent Domain. Amounts of acquisition are limited under Eminent Domain

although appraisals will include just compensation for direct and indirect damages. Proximity of the roadway will be considered as an indirect damage.

- State certified appraisers will appraise values of land, home and business which will then be negotiated with the respective property owner(s). PennDOT will make funding available to pay for a second appraisal at the discretion of the property owner.
- Harbison Road will be able to access Route 228 in all three alternatives.
- Sections of Route 228 that will no longer be utilized will be made available for turn back to Middlesex Township, who will receive additional Liquid Fuels funds to bring the roadway up to an acceptable state of maintenance for ongoing maintenance through an annual stipend.
- If safe driveway access cannot be provided to a property, that property will be acquired.
- If development of land continues to grow consistent with land use desires, then land values will likely change regardless.
- Property owners would rather lose their homes than have their homes left close to the new roadway in an extremely undesirable location.
- Alternative B will require two construction seasons to build.

ALTERNATIVE C (potential effects):

PROS

- Would displace one warehouse
- 0.47 acres of wetland impact
- Minimal historic property impacts
- Minimal archaeological issues
- Two bridges to maintain
- Shorter bridge in floodplain
- Minimal utility impacts
- Does not bisect community
- Shifts farm field impact further south
- Safe and efficient to build
- Better constructed end product

CONS

- Higher right-of-way costs
- Five to seven potential residential displacements
- Potential to impact 4.53 acres of farmland (further south)
- One business displacement

DISCUSSION:

- Alternative C was added by PennDOT based upon public feedback received at public meetings within the past year. Alternative C is a compromise between Alternatives A and B that resolves the safety issues without bisecting both the Hawkins Farm and the neighborhood north of the roadway.
- The unused existing section of Route 228 would be removed and local access to the realigned portion of roadway would be provided.
- Alternative C would require two construction seasons to build.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

- Right-of-Way: Kevin Pollino outlined the general Right-of-Way process for residents impacted by the new alignment.
 - If property acquisition is necessary, then there is a process in place to afford property owners the opportunity to get a second appraisal.
 - If PennDOT only requires a portion of the property or the new alignment reduces the value of a property, an appraisal of the property before and after the new alignment is conducted, and PennDOT reimburses the property owner for the lost property value.
 - Even after construction, the Right- of Way claim remains open, and the property owner can have the value reassessed once the project is complete.
 - PennDOT and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania do not assess value based on 'special benefits', which means that they assess property based on current conditions at the time of sale, without looking at future conditions, possible development opportunities, etc.
- The general preference of the Committee was that PennDOT should acquire the whole property rather than leave effected residents in an extremely undesirable location.
- The Committee expressed general consensus that Alternative B should be removed from consideration. A majority said it was the least desirable, citing reasons such as displacing the largest number of residents and dividing the community. Two Committee members dissented: Ms. Hetzel would prefer an option that displaced her home rather than leaves her closer to the roadway. Mr. Baker dissented because Alternative B would completely bypass his business property, while Alternatives A and C could result in displacements. Mr. Rozich said he is inclined to dismiss Alternative B based on the total input received.
- No preference between Alternative A or Alternative C was indicated by the Stakeholders Committee. Opinion varied based upon which stakeholder property was impacted by either Alternative.
- Stakeholders were urged to take mapping and information back to their community segments for further discussion. Results should be shared electronically with PennDOT via email at CMHill@mccormicktaylor.com by Friday, November 6, 2015. PennDOT will make hardcopy mapping available through the township building for those requesting it. Mr. Rich will provide a set of questions to all stakeholders to convey to members within their respective community segments.
- Mr. Rozich reviewed the prioritization of the projects 'in the pipeline', stating that the Three Degree Road project will probably be funded before the Balls Bend project. The funding for the construction of the Balls Bend project is expected until 2020 or later. Funding for Final Design and Right-of-Way acquisition would occur at least one year sooner, but exact timing is not yet known.
- Township Manager Kaunert asked if there had been any consideration or calculation of what developable land would be left after any of the alternatives were built. Mr. Rozich stated that they did not plan for specific development, and that based on the Preferred Alternative, zoning could change, or new land use plans could be developed.

- Mr. Steffy explained that most of the constructability issues associated with this project have to do with the sharpness of the curves (horizontal and vertical geometry) and site distances on the temporary roadways that will need to be built, especially if Alternative A is selected.
- Alternative A will require three (3) construction seasons to build. Alternatives B and C will take two (2) construction seasons.
- Mr. Rozich affirmed that the local road network will be reconnected to the new alignment. The Department will coordinate with the Township to help determine local access.
- Ms. Rizzilli acknowledged that options to the south of Route 228 were initially considered but were not advanced, with FHWA concurrence, due to multiple impacts to historic properties.
- PennDOT representatives from various disciplines, along with input from this Stakeholders Committee, input from resource agencies and FHWA all will be considered in the decision to identify the Preferred Alternative.

WHAT'S NEXT

- Stakeholder Committee members will share mapping and information (available online via ftp site provided) with their respective community segments and provide feedback to the PennDOT project team by email at: CMHill@mccormicktaylor.com by November 6, 2015.
- Coordination with the Stakeholders Committee to announce the Preferred Alternative.
- Coordinate a public meeting to introduce the recommended Preferred Alternative to the general public for feedback prior to finalization.

This Stakeholders Committee Meeting Summary for the Balls Bend Realignment Project was developed by McCormick Taylor based on information sharing conducted on October 15, 2015 and, is accurate to the best of our knowledge. Anyone having different recollection of the event is urged to provide their information to McCormick Taylor via email at CMHill@mccormicktaylor.com.

Kenneth V. Rich, facilitator
McCormick Taylor, Inc.

Carrie M. Hill, Public Involvement Specialist
McCormick Taylor, Inc.

cc: Project Team
Stakeholders Committee

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH FEEDBACK SUMMARY

Following is a general summary of feedback received from Stakeholder Committee members who conducted outreach meetings with their respective stakeholder segments after PennDOT District 10's meeting with the Committee on Oct. 15, 2015. (Following each comment or question is the name of the Committee member who provided it.)

Alternative A: Flattening of the Curve

- C: The majority of individuals at the meeting at Quality Gardens thought Route 228 should stay on line (Alt. A). (PETERSON)
- C: One resident wanted the option that took her house but thought on line [Alternative A] made more sense. (PETERSON)
- C: Residents of Allemande Lane have all come to a general opinion that Alt. A is best for the residents. (HETZEL)
- C: Leaving the highway on line [Alternative A] for the most part affects the least amount of tax paying residents. (HETZEL)
- C: The overwhelming consensus among B.E.A.R. of PA employees is opposition to Alt. A as this option will seemingly have the most adverse impact on travel time & safety during construction. (BAKER)
- C: Family members, friends and acquaintances who regularly travel Route 228, between Route 8 and Route 19, for work, shopping, dining out, church, etc. view Alt. A as least desirable. (BAKER)
- C: Keep the section of the highway that parallels with Allemande Lane on line where the Bear Company is located (Alt. A) and just take that property. (HETZEL)

Alternative B: Straightening of the Curve

- C: As a business owner, Steve Baker talked to each of his employees and Alternative B is the only plan that does not have a devastating impact on the business. The employees (representing 8 families) unanimously favor Alternate B. (BAKER)
- C: The school district would accept the dismissal of Alternative B, if appropriate research has been done and it is recommended. (ROTH)

Alternative C: Northward Shift

- C: Mars Area School District's main concern is safety. The District believes that Alternative C addresses this concern. (ROTH)

Individual Concerns:

Construction Concerns:

- C: Contacts with other business owners representing child care, landscaping, restaurant, electrical contracting, sprinkler service, and real estate businesses who travel Route 228 frequently indicated a lot of concern regarding travel times during construction. (BAKER)
- C: If PennDOT chooses Alt. A, then B.E.A.R. Company could be used to park vehicles during construction. (HETZEL)
- Q: How will local commutes be impacted during construction (It currently takes 45 minutes from Cranberry to Route 8)? (MATHEWS)

Design:

- C: One resident thought the road should stay 2 lanes and just make turn lanes at the intersection. (PETERSON)

Existing Conditions/Maintenance

- Q: What will be done to maintain an acceptable level of maintenance of existing Route 228? Some parts are in need of repair and will not last until construction can be started. Balls Bend roadway is eroding badly. (MATHEWS)

Lighting:

- Q: How will the effects of lighting be identified and addressed? (MATHEWS)

Mapping:

- Q: Will community members be able to see elevations associated with each alternative? (MATHEWS)

Noise/Aesthetics:

- Q: How will noise impacts be assessed and addressed. Will there be plantings or noise walls to act as a buffer zone? (MATHEWS)

Right-of-Way

(Property Impacts / Property Values / Relocations):

- C: Everyone at the Quality Gardens meeting seemed to just want to talk about the lines on the map in regards to their property. They seemed more focused on process. Route seemed to have been fixated on staying on line since that was what came out of the last outreach. (PETERSON)

C: Allemande residents understand the need to improve the road to handle the increasing traffic load, but disagree with taking a bunch of property and homes just to make it easier for Penn DOT. (HETZEL)

C: If the highway is going to be moved close to their homes, Allemande residents would rather you combine Alternative B and Alternative C and take their homes. (HETZEL)

C: Some Allemande residents are concerned that relocation might result in increased (tripled?) property taxes for them. (HETZEL)

C: Richard Reilly is concerned that his home will be surrounded and he will be left with less than an acre. (HETZEL)

Q: Will there be re-zoning of the area due to construction? (MATHEWS)

Q: What will be the projected impact to residential property values for nearby residents? (MATHEWS)

Q: For impacted residents who lose their property, can the mineral rights/gas leases stay with the land owner? (MATHEWS)

Q: What would be the like effects of relocation on mortgages and property taxes? Would PennDOT look for like conditions regarding mortgages and taxes for each relocation? (HETZEL)

Speed/Safety:

C: All of the residents at the Quality Gardens meeting shared the concern that the road is too fast now and it seems we are just making it faster. (PETERSON)

Utilities:

Q: Could the placement of sewage be under the new road? (MATHEWS)

Q: How extensive will utility impacts be with each of the three alternatives? (MATHEWS)



Local Business Interview Contact Reports



CONTACT SUMMARY

Details:

DATE:	January 28, 2016
CONTACT:	Jeff Stull, Manager
REPRESENTING:	Thrower Concrete
TEAM CONTACT:	Ken Rich, Ball Bend Stakeholder Committee Facilitator

CONTACT DETAIL

Mr. Stull was contacted to solicit feedback on the significance of Route 228 and the Balls Bend Realignment Project to trucking operations associated with Thrower Concrete. Following is a summary of the feedback received:

- Route 228 is one of the primary haul routes for Thrower Concrete.
- With a satellite plant in Cranberry Township and 55 to 60 concrete trucks in Saxonburg, Mr. Stull estimates 100 daily trips on Route 228 during the spring, summer and fall months.
- Stull's cousin operates Crystal Concrete who also uses Route 228 quite a bit. He had a cement mixer that traveled over the hill within the Balls Bend Curve within the past year.
- A tractor trailer was also hit by a 10-ton dump truck coming from Davis Road.
- Stull feels the main traffic problem is school traffic on Route 228. He acknowledges that cement mixers are slow moving and can cause back-ups along the existing two-lane corridor.
- Stull is concerned about constructability of the Route 228 improvement and its effect on truck traffic. He does not favor anything that will close access to trucks during construction.
- He supports the four lane widening of the entire Route 228 Corridor from Route 19 to Route 8.



CONTACT SUMMARY

Details:

DATE:	January 27, 2016
CONTACT:	Ed Vogel Sr. , President
REPRESENTING:	Vogel Sanitation
TEAM CONTACT:	Ken Rich, Ball Bend Stakeholder Committee Facilitator

CONTACT DETAIL

Mr. Vogel was contacted to solicit feedback on the significance of Route 228 and the Balls Bend Realignment Project to trucking operations associated with Vogel Disposal. Following is a summary of the feedback received:

- There have been several (6 or 7) fatalities over the years on Route 228 at the Balls Bend Curve.
- He would like to see the Route 228 intersection with Route 8 moved further north to avoid the low point entering onto Route 8 where lowboys and car trailers tend to get hung-up.
- Vogel operates 24 hours per day.
- Vogel Disposal has 100 trucks that use Route 8 daily. They stagger trips on Route 228 being sure that truck go out before 7:00 a.m. and return before 3:00 p.m. to avoid congestion that occurs with business rush hours (to Cranberry and Pittsburgh) and school schedules.
- A lot of traffic going to Pittsburgh (228/79/279)is using Myoma Road, Mars-Evans City Road, Union Church Road and Three Degree Road to avoid red lights on Route 228.
- Mr. Vogel estimates that another 100 vehicles per day use Route 228 to move scrap steel to ARMCO from Ohio and then rolled steel to Detroit. He also cites heavy use by the ALDI warehouse at the old US Steel Plant and by ESM who hauls lime and cement.
- A developer (Chris Kozelac, from Mars-Evans City Road) bought 200 acres for mixed use development from the southeast quadrant of the Route 228/Route 8 intersection.
- Four or five developers are spawning growth along the Route 228 corridor.
- Mr. Vogel likes widening the roadway to five lanes and urges PennDOT to build it safe and do it right.



Public Officials Briefing #3 Summary February 9, 2016



PUBLIC OFFICIALS BRIEFING SUMMARY

Meeting Details:

Date: Tuesday, February 9, 2016

Time: 11:00 am

Location: Middlesex Township Building

The following Public Officials were in attendance:

- Eric Kaunert, Township Manager
- Michael Spreng, Supervisor
- Donald Marshall, Supervisor
- Jeff Mikesic, HRG Engineering, Municipal Engineer for Middlesex Township
- Kim Geyer, Butler County Commissioner
- Colleen Stephan, Rep. Daryl Metcalfe's office

The following Project Team members were in attendance:

- Mark Rozich, P.E., PennDOT
- Chad Mosco, P.E., PennDOT
- Ken Rich, McCormick Taylor
- Carrie Hill, McCormick Taylor

Mr. Rozich opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees and presenting an overview of the meeting agenda. Attendees participated in self introductions.

About the Project

Mr. Rozich provided an overview of the history of the Route 228 Corridor project, beginning with the 2001 corridor study. He also discussed the resulting projects that are planned or have been completed along the corridor, including:

- Pittsburgh Street Intersection Project will enter the Right-of-Way acquisition phase in 2016
- Three Degree Road Project is scheduled for construction in 2020.

The Project Purpose and Needs, originally outlined in that 2001 study, were also discussed. The Needs are all related to capacity, safety, and access.

He also reviewed the three alternatives that were considered and presented at the June 24, 2015 public meeting and October 15, 2015 Stakeholders Committee meeting. Mr. Mosco also mentioned concerns related to Alternative A (online) and Alternative B (straightened) that led PennDOT to add Alternative C. Alternative A raised constructability and safety concerns, and Alternative B raised concerns with both the project team and the community about speeding on a straightened, wider roadway. Alternative C skirts the community and included 2 curves to calm traffic speeds.

They presented a comparison of the effects of all three alternatives, including environmental considerations (including potential farmland, flood plain, residential and business impacts), engineering features, Right-of-Way considerations, utilities, construction considerations, and cost.

Public Involvement to Date

Mr. Rich discussed the public involvement approach implemented for this project, including a public meeting, the formation and function of the Stakeholders Committee and ongoing coordination with Middlesex Township.

Mr. Rich also summarized the feedback that came from the initial Stakeholders Committee, including feedback that Committee members solicited from friends and neighbors within their respective community segments, and interviews with business owners who were not able to attend the first Committee meeting:

- Safety of the Balls Bend Curve is a concern
- Mobility along Route 228 should be improved
- Local preference of an alternative varies based on location
- Residents prefer to be relocated rather than being left closer to the improved roadway
- Lack of a preferred alignment and construction funding makes it difficult to plan for the future
- Concerns for property evaluation in the Right-of-Way acquisition process

Mr. Rozich added that while the Stakeholders Committee did not reach consensus on a final alternative at its first meeting, and some may not like the Final Alternative, he thought that they at least came to appreciate the complexity of the project through their involvement.

Agency Coordination

The PennDOT project team met with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) to provide an update on the three alternatives presented to the public and to the Stakeholders Committee.

The PHMC re-evaluated the historic status of several properties along the 228 corridor, related to the Ball's Bend and Three Degree Road Projects.

After examining all of the alternatives, considering farmland, property acquisitions, environmental impacts, historical properties, constructability, and public feedback to date, FHWA conditionally supports Alternative C (a slightly straightened alignment immediately north of the existing roadway) with some modifications.

About the Final Alternative

The Final Alternative is 'Alternative C Modified' – the result of re-examining Alternative C based on the feedback from FHWA. The benefits of this new alignment are:

- Addresses safety and mobility concerns for the corridor
- Better balances flood plain and farmland impacts
- Reduces farmland impacts by an additional two acres
- Avoids residential impacts along Allemande Lane
- Geometry is most desirable
- Easiest and safest to build
- Most economical alternative
- Does not require permanent property acquisitions for temporary construction impacts
- Estimated \$1 million+ in user cost savings annually during construction

Mr. Rozich noted that the visioning study in 2001 called for only the Balls Bend curve to be realigned with the remainder of the improvement to closely follow existing Route 228 eastward to Route 8. Alternative C Modified is relocated slightly north of the existing roadway. This is an adjustment based on current conditions and the way the corridor has changed over the years since the study was completed. He also noted that

construction of the offline Alternative C Modified would last two seasons, compared with three construction seasons required to build online Alternative A.

Construction funding for this project, \$24.3 million, is included in the Draft Twelve Year Program, and funding for Final Design and Right-of-Way phases are included in the Draft State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). If that status remains when the Twelve Year Program is adopted, then Final Design and Right-of-Way phases could be advanced after completion of Preliminary Engineering, possibly in 2017 and 2019 respectively depending upon funding availability.

Local Roadway Network Tie-Ins

The Township officials in attendance discussed details of local tie-ins and what should happen with the portions of existing Route 228 that would remain east and west of Harbison Road upon project completion. The Township may opt to integrate all or parts of the roadway segments into their local roadway network, or those sections would be vacated back to adjacent property owners.

The Township officials offered the following feedback:

OLD ROUTE 8 NORTH

- They favor installing a cul-de-sac on Old Route 8, immediately north of existing Route 228 at a location that would eliminate the need to maintain a nearby structure.

OLD ROUTE 8 SOUTH

- Consider extending/straightening Old Route 8 to connect with existing Route 228
- Consider extending existing Route 228, east of Harbison Road, to connect to Old Route 8 south of proposed new Route 228.
- The Township is willing to consider placement of a cul-de-sac on Old Route 8, immediately south of Route 228 in exchange for improvements to the intersections of Old Route 8 / Park Road and Old Route 8 / Route 8 South.

ROUTE 228 EAST OF HARBISON ROAD

- Township officials are willing to consider elimination of existing Route 228, east of Harbison Road in favor of letting developers determine their own means of access.

The Township acknowledged the significant role that future land use will play throughout the area. A rezoning study is currently underway along the Route 228 Corridor in Middlesex Township.

PennDOT will continue to coordinate with Middlesex Township regarding local roadway tie-ins to the project.

Next Steps/Schedule

The anticipated schedule for the remainder of the project is as follows:

Ongoing - Conclude Preliminary Engineering

- Conclude Public Involvement
 - Public meeting scheduled Feb. 24
- Secure Environmental Clearance
 - Update Project Needs
 - Re-evaluate environmental studies
 - Conclude preliminary engineering activities

Late Fall 2017 - Final Design

Late Fall 2019 - Right-of-Way acquisition

2021 - Plans available for construction bid letting

Follow Up Items

- PennDOT will draft options for the Old Route 8 /“new” Route 228 intersection including:
 - Cul-de-sacs north and south of new Route 228
 - A connection from Parks Road to Old Route 8 using existing Route 228
 - Improving the intersection of the southern segment of Old Route 8 and “new” Route 228.
- PennDOT will send the Township manager the list of properties which would be acquired or possibly affected.
- McCormick Taylor will send to Colleen Stephan the Powerpoint presentation that was used at this meeting.

This Public Officials Briefing Summary for the Balls Bend Realignment Project was developed by McCormick Taylor based on information shared on February 9, 2016 and, is accurate to the best of our knowledge. Anyone having different recollection of the event is urged to provide their information to McCormick Taylor via email at CMHill@mccormicktaylor.com.

Kenneth V. Rich, Facilitator
McCormick Taylor, Inc.

Carrie M. Hill, Public Involvement Specialist
McCormick Taylor, Inc.

cc: Project Team
Public Officials in attendance



Stakeholders Committee Meeting #2 Summary February 10, 2016



BALLS BEND STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE MEETING #2

Meeting Details

Date: Wednesday, February 10, 2016

Time: 6:00 - 7:30 pm

Location: Middlesex Township Building in Valencia, PA.

The following Stakeholders Committee members were in attendance:

- Crystal Baker, BEAR of Pennsylvania
- Paul DeLaTorre
- Mary Hetzel
- Eric Kaunert, Middlesex Township Manager
- Tim Kuntz
- Candace Mathews
- Liz McMeekin
- Jeff Mikesic, HRG Engineering, Municipal Engineer for Middlesex Township
- Greg Peterson
- Jane Roth, Mars Area School District
- Sgt. Randy Ruediger, Middlesex Twp. Police
- John Soltis

The following Project Team members were in attendance:

- Mark Rozich, P.E., PennDOT District 10-0, Project Manager
- Chad Mosco, P.E., PennDOT District 10-0, Lead Designer/Assistant Project Manager
- Greg Schnur, PennDOT District 10-0, Construction Unit
- Ken Rich, McCormick Taylor
- Carrie Hill, McCormick Taylor

Also in attendance was resident Tom Napierkowski as an observer.

Mr. Rozich opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees and presenting an overview of the meeting agenda. Attendees participated in self introductions.

Project Update

Mr. Rozich provided a brief overview of the work that had been done since the previous Stakeholders Committee Meeting in October 2015:

- Five stakeholder segment coordination meetings were held; feedback provided
- Interviews conducted with other local businesses regarding trucking operations on Route 228 (Thrower Concrete & Vogel Disposal)
- PennDOT coordination with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and PA Historic & Museum Commission (PHMC)
- Discussion with a local development interest
- Construction funds identified for 2021

Stakeholder Feedback Update

Mr. Rich summarized the feedback that came from the initial Stakeholders Committee meeting, feedback that Committee members solicited from friends and neighbors within their respective community segments, and interviews with business owners who were not able to attend the first Committee meeting. Following were the common concerns that were identified:

- Safety of the Balls Bend Curve is a concern
- Mobility along Route 228 should be improved
- Local preference of an alternative varies based on location
- Residents prefer to be relocated rather than being left closer to the improved roadway
- Lack of a final alternative and related construction funding makes it difficult for property owners to plan for the future
- Concerns for property evaluation in the Right-of-Way acquisition process

One of the major developments since the last Stakeholders Committee meeting involved the identification of Final Design, Right-of-Way and Construction funds in the Draft 12-Year Program Update by PennDOT and the Southwest Pennsylvania Commission (SPC). If that holds true upon adoption of the 12-Year Program later this summer, the project will be able to advance toward completion, satisfying many of the local concerns.

FHWA Coordination

Mr. Rozich discussed the work that PennDOT has done with FHWA to arrive at a Final Alternative. After examining all of the alternatives, considering farmland, property acquisitions, environmental impacts, historical properties, constructability, and public feedback to date, FHWA conditionally supports Alternative C (a slightly straightened alignment immediately north of the existing roadway) with some modifications.

About the Final Alternative

The Final Alternative is 'Alternative C Modified' – the result of re-examining Alternative C based on the feedback from FHWA. The benefits of the Final Alternative are:

- Addresses safety and mobility concerns for the corridor
- Better balances flood plain and farmland impacts
- Reduces farmland impacts by an additional two acres
- Avoids residential impacts along Allemande Lane
- Geometry is most desirable
- Easiest and safest to build
- Most economical alternative
- Does not require permanent property acquisitions for temporary construction impacts
- Estimated \$1 million+ in user cost savings annually during construction

Large format maps of Alternative C Modified were laid out on tables and time was provided in an informal breakout session stakeholders to discuss details one-to-one with PennDOT team members.

Following the informal breakout session, the general session was reconvened and the Final Alternative was discussed openly.

Mr. Rozich noted that \$24.3 million in construction funding for this project is included in the Draft Twelve Year Program, and funding for Final Design and Right-of-Way phases are included in the Draft State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). If that status remains when the Twelve Year Program is adopted, then Final Design and Right-of-Way phases could be advanced possibly in late 2017 and late 2019 respectively, depending upon completion of Preliminary Engineering in 2016/17 and funding availability.

The following were discussed in open discussion during the general session:

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

- Construction time is expected to be about two years, and it could be as many as three depending on coordination with local utilities. Earthwork and off-line work would likely be done first. During the phases affecting the existing alignment, PennDOT will work to maintain two directional traffic on Route 228 as much as possible. (Alternatives A and B would have required at least three years of construction time.)
- One stakeholder asked if the Ball's Bend project would be contingent on the Three Degree Road Project starting and staying on schedule. Mr. Mosco replied that it could, depending on what kind of delays occur. As the two projects are on adjacent segments of the road, PennDOT would work to make sure that on-line work would not occur in both areas at the same time. With the current schedule, the on-line work at Three Degree Road would be occurring while the offline work at Ball's Bend was being done.

RIGHT OF WAY/PROPERTY CONCERNS

- The cut and fill lines on the large format mapping were also discussed. It was asked whether those were 'hard and fast' or if further Right-of-Way would be required around those areas. Mr. Mosco replied that there may be additional property needed in some areas depending on the soil and grades of the cuts, and whether more land was needed for sediment ponds or drainage. That detail will be developed further through final design.
- Ms. Baker said the back portion of their business property (BEAR Equipment) is very prone to flooding. The Final Alternative would run through that flood plain and she is concerned about that water being displaced into the remainder of the property, where the main building for their business is located. PennDOT will work to mitigate that water during Final Design.
- Ms. Baker also said that there is a lease on their property for a gas pipeline to travel beneath their property. This will be noted during Final Design and taken into account during Right-of-Way acquisition.

HARBISON ROAD

- One of the main concerns for many of the residents is the intersection of Route 228 and Harbison Road, especially when making a left from Harbison onto Route 228 eastbound toward Route 8 or crossing Route 228 to continue to Park Road.
 - PennDOT is working with the Township to determine how the local roads will connect to the new alignment.
 - Ms. Hetzel asked why there was no plan for a signal at the Harbison Rd./Route 228 intersection. Mr. Mosco said that PennDOT will consider several options to address safety of the intersection. Presently, no justification (warrants) for a signal are foreseen there.
 - Mr. Soltis' home faces Harbison and he said that there is a lot of traffic through their neighborhood, especially during rush hours. He asked whether a cul-de-sac could be placed on Harbison immediately north of Route 228 to eliminate direct access. PennDOT cited concerns regarding easy access for local residents and emergency services.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

- One more public meeting is anticipated during Final Design – when construction and rightofway plans are ready to be presented.

Next Steps/Schedule

The anticipated schedule for the remainder of the project is as follows;

Ongoing - Conclude Preliminary Engineering

- Conclude Public Involvement
 - Public meeting scheduled Feb. 24
- Secure Environmental Clearance
 - Update Project Needs
 - Re-evaluate environmental studies
 - Conclude preliminary engineering activities

Late Fall 2017 - Final Design

Late Fall 2019 - Right-of-Way acquisition

2021 – Plans available for construction bid letting

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:30 pm. The large format mapping was distributed among the Committee members in attendance to share with their respective stakeholder segments. Additional copies of the maps were delivered to the Middlesex Township building later in the week for use by other Committee members who did not originally receive copies.

This Stakeholders Committee Meeting Summary for the Balls Bend Realignment Project was developed by McCormick Taylor based on information sharing conducted on February 10, 2016 and, is accurate to the best of our knowledge. Anyone having different recollection of the event is urged to provide their information to McCormick Taylor via email at CMHill@mccormicktaylor.com.

Kenneth V. Rich, Facilitator
McCormick Taylor, Inc.

Carrie M. Hill, Public Involvement Specialist
McCormick Taylor, Inc.

cc: Project Team
Stakeholders Committee



Public Meeting Summary

February 24, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary.....	3
II.	Meeting Format.....	4
III.	Meeting Details.....	5
IV.	Information Collected.....	6
V.	Appendix.....	8

I. Executive Summary

On Wednesday, February 24, 2016 a Public Meeting were conducted by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) Engineering District 10-0, regarding the Ball's Bend Realignment Project. The purpose of the project is to address capacity, access, and safety needs along Route 228 focusing on the curve near Davis Road.

74 people registered at the Public Meeting.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Update project status
- Display the final alternative
- Collect public feedback

The Public Meeting was structured as an Open House Plans Display to enable the public to speak one-on-one with Project Team members at display stations. The informational displays included:

- Station 1: Registration and Introduction
- Station 2: Project Summary
- Station 3: The Final Alternative
- Station 4: Right of Way
- Station 5: Public Involvement to Date

All attendees were encouraged to discuss their questions and concerns with the Project Team members staffing each of the display stations. Attendees were also given a comment form with which they could also submit their comments and feedback to the Project Team. The submission deadline for the forms was March 9, 2016. Eleven (11) Comment Forms were returned at the meeting and 1 was returned via mail.

II. Meeting Format

Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016

Time: 6-7:30pm

Location: Middlesex Township Building
131 Browns Hill Rd
Valencia, PA 16059

Format: Open House Plans Display

Purpose:

- Update project status
- Display the final alternative
- Collect public feedback

Meeting Notification:

Letters were mailed in mid-February to Public Officials, Stakeholders Committee members, and community members who attended the previous public meeting to invite them to the Open House Plans Display. A newspaper advertisement was placed in the Butler Eagle and Cranberry Eagle twice, one week and again 4 days in advance of the Public Meeting and was supplemented with a press release issued by the District's Community Relations Coordinator. Copies of all of these outreach materials are in the Appendix to this report.

Handouts

The following handouts were made available to all who attended both the Public Officials Briefing and the Public Meeting. Copies of all handouts can be found in the Appendix to this report.

- Informational handout including background information about the Project Purpose & Need; mapping and details of the Final Alternative – Alternative C Modified, and information regarding the Public Involvement to date and the Stakeholders Committee.
- General Comment Form

Attendance

74 individuals signed in at the Public Meeting. Copies of sign-in sheets are included in the Appendix to this report. The following Project Team members were also in attendance:

<u>PennDOT District 10</u>			<u>McCormick Taylor</u>
Mark Rozich, P.E.,	Jim Vartar	Amanda Olbeter	Ken Rich
Chad Mosco, P.E.	Brian Steffy	Tom Baltz	Carrie Hill
Richard Waxter	Teala Delfonso	Vincent Villano	
Marc Rudnik	Doug Tanaka	Jessica Rizzilli	
Kevin Pollino	Cody Young		

III. Meeting Details

The public meeting was structured as an open house plans display to enable the public to speak one-on-one with the Project Team at display stations. Below is a list of displays by station.

Station 1: Registration and Introduction

- Sign-In sheet
- Informational handout
- Comment form

Station 2: Project Summary

- Map of the existing project area with description Purpose and Needs of the project

Station 3: The Final Alternative

- Alternative C Modified mapping – 4 copies
- Benefits of Alternative C Modified
- Future Typical Section
- Next Steps

Station 4: Right of Way

- Table top detail maps of Alternative C Modified
- Handout information regarding the ROW process
- PennDOT representatives available for discussion

Station 5: Public Involvement to date

- Summary of feedback from Stakeholders Committee/interviews
- Small version of Alternative C Modified mapping
- Comment forms
- Drop box

IV. Information Collected

The Open House Plans Display format allowed for more interaction between the Project Team and the local community. Public feedback was collected in two ways: through Project Team members at display stations and through a comment form given to each attendee at the meeting. Summaries of the information collected through both channels are below. (All comment forms and feedback collected at display stations can also be found in the appendix to this report.)

Comments Collected At Display Stations

Name: not given

Contact info: property adjacent to Old Rte. 8S

Team Member/Station: Jessica Rizzilli/Station 3

Comments: Like the cul-de-sac on Old Rte. 8S

Name: Leslie Lawther

Contact Info: 724-898-4565

Team Member/Station: Jessica Rizzilli/Station 3

Comments: I would prefer PennDOT purchase my home. 108 Allemande Lane

Name: not given

Contact Info: Historic property owners

Team Member/Station: Vince Villano/Station 3

Comments: Like cul-de-sac at Old Rte. 8 S

Name: Ellen Hawkins

Contact Info: not given

Team Member/Station: Vince Villano/Station 3

Comments: Marcellus shale line going through Augustine and Orchard Lane across existing line; Also fiber optic cable inside old (abandoned) pipe crossing Hawkins Farm. Williams Communications owns or leases it. Go up Harbison Road and you will see orange pipe with name on it. (See map – included in appendix to this report)

Summary of Feedback from Comment Forms

All meeting attendees were given a comment form as they entered the meeting. Eleven (11) forms were returned during the meeting at Station 5, and 1 form was returned via mail before the comment period ended on March 9, 2016. The comments captured below are cited verbatim as they appear on the comment form and were not revised in any way.

1. Please provide the following information: *(optional)*

- Leslie Lawther; 108 Allemande Ln.; 724-898-4565
- Darlene Keck; 290 Park Rd.; 724-898-9643
- Bruce T. Kennedy; 116 Tanglewood Dr., 16059-2532; 724-898-2489
- Marlin Keck; 290 Park Rd., Valencia, PA 16059; 412-973-3110; sharkey4818@gmail.com
- Dennis & Julie Detar; 159 Old Route 8 S, Valencia PA 16059; 412-316-7484; dennis.detar@dc88.com
- Linda J. Moody; 245 Rte. 228W, Valencia, PA 16059; 724-898-3328; ljmoody@consolidated.net
- Richard Reilly; 102 Allemande Ln., Valencia, PA 16059; 724-898-0256; reilly@zoominternet.net
- Joseph Roach; 212 Old Route 8 S; 412-335-1433; joeroach@wexfordcontracting.com
- Jim Roach; 212 Park Ave. Ext, Mars, PA 16046; 412-760-3685; wexblast@gmail.com
- Don & Deb Scelza; 220 Old Route 8 S, Valencia; 724-898-3603
- Judy Sved; 222 Old Route 8 S, Valencia; 412-400-7305; JMS5759@yahoo.com
- Michelle Chambers, 229 Rte. 228 West; 724-898-2128; mchambers813@gmail.com

All contact information was checked against the main project contact list, and all respondents will be included in any future project communications.

2. Please check which statements represent your interests in the project. (Please check all that apply.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 8- I live in the project area | 9- I own property in the project area |
| 0 - I work in the project area | 1- I own a business in the project area |
| 1- I am a farmer in the project area | 0- I provide EMS services |
| 8- I am a commuter through the project area | |

Other:

- Have lived in area many years
- My house is on Ball's Bend, but off the road site
- Son Bryan [noted on Ms. Chambers' form, next to 'I own a business in the project area']

3. How often do you travel through the Ball's Bend area?

- | | | | |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 10- Daily | 1- Weekly | 0- Monthly | 0- Not at All |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|

4. Which of the following concerns do you have regarding the existing Ball's Bend curve? (Please check all that apply)

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 11- Safety | 10- Traffic Congestion | 6- Sight Distance | 8- Travel Speed | 9- Truck Traffic |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|

Other:

- Access from side roads

- Need to control speed in area no matter where it is built

5. Based on the information discussed, the Final Alternative addresses current concerns associated with the existing Ball's Bend curve. (Please circle one)

2- Strongly Agree 6- Agree 2- Neutral 1- Disagree 0- Strongly Disagree

Please explain.

- *Not all problems will be solved. Most will be beneficial.*
- *Due to closeness of expected hwy worried about traffic and traffic noise. Will there be a sound barrier?*
- *I would prefer that you widened 228 in place.*
- *Improvements are needed, really not looking forward to starting over. Don't and will not live by a 4 lane hwy. It's bad enough now.*

6. Based on the information provided, the Final Alternative provides a reasonable solution to meet the identified transportation needs and environmental impacts. (Please circle one)

2- Strongly Agree 7- Agree 2- Neutral 0- Disagree 0- Strongly Disagree

Please explain.

- *This alternative seems to fit the needs better than others of the most people in the community.*
- *Seems much better than original plans. Less people affected. Feel bad for people on other side of The Kenneys. P.DOT should buy them out also.*

7. Please provide any additional comments you may have:

- I would rather you took my house than sit beside the road. So if its beside me, I want you to take it. 228 is already noisy and it will get a whole lot noisier!
- Would like if the final decision could be made soon so we can get on with our lives so that we know what is going to happen in our future. All these alternatives are just costing everyone a lot of money.
- Biggest aid is to keep the public informed.
- We are happy to see this moving forward. As we live right on 228 we hear and see a lot of accidents and traffic. This is something that has been needed for many safety reasons. I think this will help 228 greatly.
- My home is on the edge of the Route Planned. Afraid of the impact this will make. Would like to offer my house for sale, as we feel the property value will drop. Also, with Davis Road being redirected, there will be headlights going directly into our home.
- These drawings show that approx. ½ of my property will be taken. I would rather you take all of it and I would be relocated.
- We would love to have a cul-de-sac at the 228 end of Old Route 8 S.
- As a 30-year resident on Old Route 8 South, I will be very happy to have Old Rte. * South DEAD ENDED at the existing 228 intersection. There is no reason for any traffic on that road except for the residents.
- Pleased with new plan. Hope we can find a place we can call home. No Housing Plans – Love our space.

V. Appendix

- a. Invitation Letters
- b. Public Meeting Advertisement
- c. Press release
- d. Sign-In Sheets
- e. Display Boards
 - i. Project Summary/Purpose & Needs
 - ii. Benefits of Alternative C Modified
 - iii. Next Steps
 - iv. The Final Alternative
 - v. Typical Section
 - vi. Tabletop mapping of Final Alternative
 - vii. The Final Alternative (small)
 - viii. Public Involvement to Date
- f. Handouts
 - i. Informational hand-out
 - ii. General Comment Form
- g. Feedback gathered
 - i. Comments collected at Display Stations
 - ii. Completed Comment Forms