



**S.R. 30, Section Q01 Improvements Project
Unity Township, Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania**

Comment Form Report

A public meeting was held for the S.R. 30, Section Q01 Improvements Project on Thursday, March 3, 2005 in the Community Room at DeNunzio's Italian Chophouse at the Arnold Palmer Regional Airport from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM. Just over 100 people attended the meeting which was conducted in an open house format. Of those who attended the public meeting held on the evening of March 3, 2005, twenty completed and submitted comment forms. This report presents the views expressed on those comment forms.

Of the twenty respondents, fourteen asked to be added to the project mailing list and submitted contact information. From that information, the table below—showing a breakdown of respondents by zip code—was derived.

City (postal)	Zip code	Number	Percent
Latrobe	15650	8	40%
Greensburg	15601	2	10%
Ligonier	15658	1	5%
Pleasant Unity	15676	1	5%
Not given		8	40%
Total		20	100%

The remainder of this report provides an item-by-item analysis of responses. Percentages, where given, add up to 100% based on twenty responses, except where respondents were allowed to indicate more than one choice. Additional comments provided by respondents appear at the end of the report.

Interests and Issues

Most (60%) of the respondents were residents of the project area. In addition, a majority (55%) said they shopped or did business in the project area. Some of the respondents worked, operated businesses, and owned property in the area.



Question 1: Please indicate your interest in the S.R. 30, Section Q01 Improvements Project.

Response	Number	Percent
Resident in the project area	12	60%
Shop, or do personal business (banking, medical, etc.), in the project area	11	55%
Work, or run a business in the project area	8	40%
Visit the project area for recreation, entertainment, dining out, etc.	8	40%
Other: Own business/property in the project area	3	15%

Of the twenty respondents, five (25%) indicated the addition of turning lanes as a design component that they “most preferred”, while eight (40%) said the elimination of turning lanes was a component they “least preferred”.

Question 2: Which components of the final design plan do you most prefer, and why?

Category	Response
Turning lanes (5 responses)	Having a turning lane onto SR 1045.
	I appreciate the additional turning lanes at Rt. 30 and 981 (and) the 3rd center lane on 981 north of 30. This will be a major safety improvement.
	Safety of turning at intersections.
	The attention to access to existing business, i.e. Unity Plaza - turning lanes and entrance/exit. Thank you. Entrance/exit at business along north side of 30/981 with turning lanes.
	Turning lanes on 981 N at Monastery Drive, straight and left turn lanes from Sharkey's, retaining access from 981 N onto Mission Road.
Other (6)	I'm happy about the median, landscaping - I hope it is more than "potential". No more jersey barriers. We need green and some color in the median. I believe it will have a traffic calming effect on Rt. 30 corridor.
	None
	The flow of traffic at 981/30 - less time spent at a red light.
	The next phase begins a bit later.
	Very well planned out - probably going to cause some problems during construction but will be worth it.
	The number of lanes through on Route 30.



Question 3: Which components of the final design plan do you least prefer, and why?

Category	Response
Lack of turning lanes (8 responses)	<p>As a resident of St. Vincent Shaft, I am concerned about the access to our homes. If the crossover is eliminated, that would necessitate traveling an additional 1.6 miles east to Mt. Laurel Plaza to make a u-turn and head back west to shaft entrance.</p> <p>Elimination of the left turn lane at the adult bookstore.</p> <p>Elimination of turn lane near entrance of St. Vincent Shaft. This was a recent improvement now (you're) considering elimination.</p> <p>Intersection of Monastery Drive and 981 on east side.</p> <p>Intersection Route 981 and Monastery Drive - no left turn lane off of Monastery Drive. If the design remains, there should be no right turn only lane either!</p> <p>No Lack of turning lane from Monastery Drive onto Rt. 981</p> <p>Not having a turn around lane in between St. Vincent and Route 981 - our service men will have to go to light at 981 to head towards Rt. 30W.</p> <p>The Lack of turning lane at the Adult Book Store will not be present. There should be no reason why to remove this. I am the GM at Nicco's Chimney Company.</p>
Other (5)	<p>Four lanes closer to my house.</p> <p>Hope the number of lanes will handle the volumes for both Rte. 30 and 981 during peak times.</p> <p>I feel that more and longer turning lanes aren't the issue. You're just stacking more traffic, only to jam it back into 2 lanes.</p> <p>Leaving Mission Road access open. There is already a significant amount of through traffic on the road. This project provides the opportunity to reduce or eliminate it.</p> <p>Removal of any trees, i.e., in front of Kennametal. Can these be moved?</p>



Prominent among the issues that concerned respondents most were: interruption of business (25%); increase in traffic (20%); and negative effect on the ambience of the area (15%).

Question 4: What are the issues and/or resource impacts resulting from the final design plan that most concern you?

Category	Response
Business interruption (5 responses)	Lack of customers due to restricted access to Nick's Chimney Company
	The overall impact to loss of business during the construction. Should have more 3rd shift work.
	Time line for construction and business interruption. Thank you.
	Traffic for our business - customers getting in and out of parking lot.
	We work at Nicko's Chimney Company. Last road work business (was) down 20%. This is a major concern.
Traffic (4)	Additional through traffic on Mission Road.
	At certain times of the day this intersection is very heavily used from both directions off of Monastery Drive!
	Four lanes closer to my house.
	Moving traffic - they need to lower the grade on Rt. 30 and (shoot) a bridge directly over it on 981.
Ambience (3)	I am concerned about the use of green space along the Rt. 30/981 right-of-way. I would like the inclusion or provision for bike/walking pathways along the right-of-way, particularly between SVC and the Rt. 30/981 intersection.
	More of a stark, industrialized and cold area to live in. Less country atmosphere - not small town. More cars - less rural.
	The threat of more billboards and highway visual clutter.
Access (1)	Forcing those living in St. Vincent Shaft. There needs to be some plan for us to get in and out of our homes at a red light.
Safety (1)	The main concern is safety and my suggestion is to allow access from St. Vincent Drive which would be the easier to enter from the traffic light on Route 30. I particularly do not feel safe trying to cross 3 lanes of traffic and I feel utilizing the light at St. Vincent Drive is the only feasible solution.
Other (2)	My only concern is with Laurel Transportation Project and how it is going to tie in (and where I am on the Citizen Advisory Board for that project).
	Own a portion of land near the project area



Public Meeting

Most of the respondents (75%) learned about the meeting through the newspaper. Twenty-five percent reported that they received an invitation.

Question 5: How did you learn of the Public Meeting?

Response	Number	Percent
Newspaper	15	75%
Invitation	5	25%
Website	1	5%
Friend/Relative/Neighbor	1	5%
Employer	1	5%

Nearly all of the respondents said that the meeting format was appropriate for learning about and understanding the project.

Question 6: Was the format of the meeting appropriate for you to learn about and understand the project?

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	19	95%
No Answer	1	5%
Total	20	100%

Most (80%) felt that the meeting format allowed them to express their opinions, but three respondents did not feel that way.

Question 7: Was the format of the meeting appropriate for you to express your opinion?

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	16	80%
No	3	15%
No Answer	1	5%
Total	20	100%



Most (75%) of the respondents said that the proceedings of the meeting addressed their questions or concerns completely. Of the two respondents who disagreed, one did not elaborate and the other said “I would like some additional studies and planning done in reference to (St. Vincent Shaft)”.

Question 8: Were your questions and/or concerns addressed completely?

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	15	75%
No	2	10%
No Answer	3	15%
Total	20	100%

The comment form provided open space for respondents to write in additional thoughts or concerns. These appear below.

Additional comments

- Stop wasting our tax dollars on things that don't work and build something that does!!!
- Our Unity Township supervisors must make safety a major concern. Emergency vehicles are also in need of a safety access and the only way is to allow the light at St. Vincent.
- New home being built in Wimmerton.
- I feel our state representative's office is standing off and not becoming involved enough. Replies from his office have been very inadequate.
- Good job, PennDOT and Unity Township supervisors. Good turnout, too.
- For the third time I want to present my safety concerns for the need to have a left turn lane at the intersection of 981 and Monastery Drive. This is planned for east-bound but not for west-bound on the county portion of Monastery Road beside the gas station.