

MEETING LOGISTICS	
<p>Folks are saying that they are not being let in because there is a 100 person max on the meeting. Why is this meeting limited to only 100 people?</p> <p>Can you start over? We were prevented from joining.</p>	<p>The team experienced some initial technical difficulties with capacity limits. This was addressed after 18 minutes. The City committed to repeat the meeting to enable any attendees who were frustrated with the 18-minute gap a second opportunity to get the information and participate. All technical content was repeated after the capacity limit was resolved and the meeting was extended by 20 minutes to compensate for the lost time.</p> <p>The additional virtual meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 29, 2020, 6pm to 8pm.</p>
<p>Is the meeting being broadcast live on Facebook or on the City platform for those that can't get in?</p>	<p>No, the meeting was not broadcast on Facebook. The team experienced some initial technical difficulties that were resolved after some minutes. All content was repeated and a supplemental meeting is being offered on Thursday, October 29, 2020 at 6pm..</p>
<p>Will tonight's presentation [October 21,2020] be made available on the project website?</p>	<p>Yes. The presentation was recorded and is available online: https://mon-oaklandmobility.com/public-engagement</p>
<p>Will the public comment period be extended as a result of adding an additional meeting?</p>	<p>The public comment period related to the Public Meetings began October 14th and extends to October 30th. Questions and comments are always accepted by email at: info@mon-oaklandmobility.com.</p>
SPATIAL AND GEOMETRIC DESIGN	
<p>Has the project considered locating the mobility trail next to the train tracks behind the fence?</p>	<p>Yes. Conceptual planning for the Mon-Oakland Connector began in November 2017. The conceptual planning phase included consultation with the public and resident advisors, to develop and evaluate five potential alignments (these can be found in the project and meeting records at www.mon-oaklandmobility.com) one of which included an alignment adjacent to the rail tracks. This rose to the top as the preferred alignment at the conclusion of the conceptual planning phase and, at the time, worked well with the conceptual design of the stormwater mitigation project.</p>

	<p>Through the preliminary engineering phase of the Four Mile Run stormwater mitigation project, PWSA determined that it was better to relocate the stormwater channel in the area adjacent to the rail corridor. This required relocating the mobility trail to the outer edge of the area of disturbance necessary for the stormwater mitigation project.</p>
<p>In what ways is the shuttle bus road through Schenley Park comparable to the Atlanta Beltline and the Bloomingdale Trail in Chicago?</p>	<p>The Mon-Oakland Mobility Trail is anticipated for use as a high quality linear park facility that also provides critical mobility connections. With regeneration in Hazelwood and other communities along the Mon Valley, it is anticipated that there will be increasing travel by bicycle and micromobility (e.g. scooters, skateboards, and similar) to regional economic centers such as Oakland.</p> <p>The Atlanta Beltline trail and the Bloomingdale Trail (aka the 606), like the Mon-Oakland Connector, utilize former rail corridors to provide this “bike+” connection and enhance the corridor as a park amenity. Similar to the united efforts of the City of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority, Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh and innumerable nonprofit and philanthropic partners, the Atlanta Beltline, like the Mon-Oakland project, seeks to provide holistic community improvement including affordable housing, sustainable transportation, and environmental enhancements.</p>
<p>Will users, including potential vehicles, be able to make the very sharp turns where the Sylvan Trail connects to Greenfield Avenue? Would Waldeck still lead to Bigelow?</p>	<p>The Mon-Oakland project consists of two phases. The first is the section from Neville Street to Greenfield Avenue. The second phase is from Greenfield Avenue to Hazelwood, and includes furthering the large scale investments in the Phase 1 area of the tunnel to Panther Hollow Lake and the “Chute” bypass.</p> <p>This portion (Greenfield to Sylvan/Waldeck) is in Phase 2 and still in the process of 60% design. The current design does not contemplate any change to that curve. The vehicles contemplated for trail use are small enough to navigate that turn. Full depth construction will begin at the outside edge of the pavement of the curve.</p>
<p>How will you connect Sylvan Street to Tasso Street via Noah Street Extension, a paper street, then connecting with Gladstone Street into Hazlewood?</p>	<p>Phase 2 Sylvan Avenue Design is creating a connection between Waldeck Street and Home Rule Street. This portion is a “backbone” that will open the door for additional connections projects such as side trails and/or stairs to streets above or below Sylvan Avenue</p>

<p>Please provide more detail on the “Chute Bypass”.</p>	<p>Please see the more detailed illustrations and information available at https://mon-oaklandmobility.com/virtual-meeting - please see “Station 4: Phase 2 Design/Phase 2: Swinburne Design”: The “Chute Bypass” (aka Swinburne Design) consists of three sections still in the concept stage of design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Mobility Trail connecting Junction Hollow from the soccer field to Swinburne Street. This connection will have a path width of 16’ and 2’ buffers on each side. • A side path along Swinburne Street. Swinburne Street will still have two vehicle lanes. The side path is anticipated to be 10’ wide. • A Mobility Trail connecting Swinburne Street along Swinburne Bridge to Swinburne Street connected to Swinburne Avenue. This connection will primarily be aligned in the paper right-of-way of Swinburne Street. The path width will be 16’ with 2’ buffers on each side.
<p>Where is the tunnel to Panther Hollow Lake? Have you already gotten agreement from the railroad to allow a crossing under their right of way? What will happen if the railroads prohibit access? How can it make sense to start this project not knowing whether the railroad is on board?</p>	<p>Please see the more detailed illustrations and information available at https://mon-oaklandmobility.com/virtual-meeting - please see “Station 1: Phase 1 design/Phase 1 Junction Hollow.” The bicycle/pedestrian tunnel will be located at the northern portion of Junction Hollow and cross under the railroad tracks in the vicinity of the illegal railroad crossing that exists today near Panther Hollow Lake. The proposed PWSA Channel and horizontal/vertical alignment of the Three Rivers Heritage Trail is designed to accommodate the future connection. Coordination with the railroad will occur when the design begins. Alternatives will be investigated if the railroad prohibits access.</p>
<p>Why only a few hundred feet? (In reference to pedestrian boardwalk in Phase 2 design)</p>	<p>The start of the mobility trail is taking off from the steep grade (8%+) coming off of Sylvan Avenue. This grade does not meet ADA requirements of a maximum grade of 5%. For this reason, we are proposing this second facility of ramps and level landings to meet ADA requirements and be more comfortable for all users. Having ramps and level landings on the mobility trail would have a jarring effect on bicyclists. After those first few hundred feet, the pedestrian boardwalk can tie back into the mobility trail where the vertical profile will be much more desirable at just under 5%.</p>

<p>Have you considered the following solution to improve the existing bike infrastructure for e-bikes and perhaps electric golf carts (for non-ambulatory travelers and travel in inclement weather):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) make Boundary Street one-way for motor vehicles, and the other side of it a two-way bike lane 2) make a trail Overpass from the bottom of the run to a) the beginning of the Jail Trail, and b) over Second Ave to Hazelwood Green. 3) Widen the existing trail to accommodate electric golf carts passing in either direction. 	<p>Many alternatives and design concepts were developed, explored and evaluated during the one-year conceptual design period (November 2017 to November 2018). The several components of this particular proposal were not viable for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limiting Boundary Street to one-way would force return travelers onto other streets of South Oakland. The resident advisors from South Oakland strongly expressed the desire for less traffic in South Oakland rather than more. • The many different state and national transportation facilities at the base of the Run - including Parkway East and freight rail lines, preclude most possibilities for efficient overpasses • The existing Three Rivers Heritage Trail in Junction Hollow will be temporarily removed by the PWSA stormwater project. When the trail is restored, we have an opportunity to separate swifter travelers (like bicycle commuters) from more leisurely travelers (like park strollers). This is a best practice to lower stress for all users..
<p>How high will those retaining walls on Boundary Street be?</p>	<p>Retaining wall average heights are approx. 7-feet right now. As the project moves forward we will work to reduce as much as possible (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>What is the proposed grade % from Junction Hollow to Eliza furnace parking lot?</p>	<p>The proposed grade is not fully defined yet due to coordination that will need to occur with the Swinburne Bridge project. The grade will meet ADA standards. If the Mobility Trail grade exceeds 5%, a second facility of ramps and level landings will be provided. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>How will this “Chute” impact day-to-day convenience of getting around? Does it include the “double-roundabout”?</p>	<p>The Chute bypass keeps pedestrians and bikes entirely out of the proposed "double roundabout" solution at Greenfield and Irvine. DOMI staff have noted that, while it solves issues for vehicles, it can be disastrous and highly inconvenient for bikes and pedestrians - in fact roundabouts like that have many issues for visually impaired pedestrians. Implementing the Chute bypass actually helps to resolve some of the ped/bike issues the SPC plan may introduce at that location. View the SPC Second Avenue Corridor Study here: https://www.spcregion.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/SR-885-Corridor-Study-Final-2019-12-23-3.pdf (Updated 11-4-20)</p>

<p>Who will be responsible for plowing snow and other maintenance?</p>	<p>The Department of Public Works will be responsible for all maintenance, as this trail is part of Schenley Park.</p>
<p>LANDSCAPE DESIGN</p>	
<p>What is the relationship between leafy trees and pollution?</p>	<p>Incorporating larger leafed trees can help to remove pollution from the air.</p>
<p>Will there be evergreens for year-round pollution filtration?</p>	<p>Yes, we're planning to incorporate deciduous and evergreen trees, however, the evergreen selections are much more minimal than the deciduous options.</p>
<p>How will the Swinburne Design/"The Chute Bypass" deal with the hillside/landslide issues that have occurred in this area for the last several decades?</p> <p>Why is the retaining wall only a few hundred feet?</p>	<p>The Swinburne Design/Chute Bypass is still conceptual but has progressed enough to confirm viability. There is still more detailed design required. The length of the wall has not yet been determined. Two alternative design concepts are under consideration. This connection might consist of a floating trail (bridge) that traverses the slope or a retaining wall or might be a mix of both the floating trail and retaining wall. The retaining wall would stabilize the slope in its immediate proximity. The wall will be built on the rock layer that is approximately 25' below the slope surface.</p>
<p>Is lighting on the trail necessary for vehicles (and others) to use it?</p> <p>How will you prevent light pollution in the park?</p> <p>How long would the lights be on? (concerned about impacts on animal nocturnal activity)</p>	<p>Lighting is not necessary, but many stakeholders have expressed that it is desirable to make the mobility path safer and more usable, particularly during the shorter daylight hours of the winter season. The project team has been seeking input on lighting over the past seven months of project development. Any lights in the park will comply with Dark Skies guidance and feature full cut-offs to prevent upward casting light pollution. No determination has yet been made as to the hours of illumination. This is valuable feedback to the design team.</p>
<p>How will the trail impact wildlife in the park?</p>	<p>The trails are not anticipated to have any greater impact on park wildlife than currently experienced by virtue of the existing heavily used trail, recreational field, and frequent service on the freight rail corridor (which is also anticipated to increase).</p>

<p>How many trees will be removed for the Mon-Oakland Mobility project and how will trees be replanted or replaced?</p>	<p>The segment of the Phase 1 Mon-Oakland Project within the Schenley Park Four Mile Run valley is contained wholly within the area of disturbance required for PWSA to implement the Four Mile Run stormwater mitigation project. No additional trees will be removed as a result of the first phase of the mobility project. The Phase 2 Chute Bypass sub-project is outside the PWSA area of disturbance and may result in impacts to trees and tree canopy. This component is still in preliminary engineering and more input is sought with regard to this component of the project. Any tree removal or canopy loss will require commensurate tree planting in the run.</p>
<p>Will there be removal of invasive species?</p>	<p>Yes, where the earthwork is happening, we will be replacing all existing invasive with natives. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>What entity is going to be responsible for the maintenance of all the new plantings? Is it split between the DOMI and PWSA projects, delegated to one, or taken on by Parks Conservancy?</p>	<p>Yes, the invasive vines have been a major discussion point through this. The mobility project will apply an initial treatment for invasive removal. PPC, DOMI and DPW have been in discussion as to how to apply the repeated treatments needed and have a sustainable plan for invasive management.</p>
<p>Are you looking at trees for habitat as well as beauty? Are there any particular animals/insects you hope to help through the choice of plantings?</p>	<p>We chose all native plantings because they provide food and shelter for wildlife, and promote biodiversity and stewardship of our natural heritage. There wasn't one animal/insect that we were specifically focusing on, however, it is our hope to remove a majority of the Tree of Heaven that is an attractor of the invasive spotted lanternfly. We also hope to remove other invasive plantings so that they do not overrun the park. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>BUDGET</p>	
<p>How much public money is being spent on the Mobility Trail/road?</p>	<p>The estimated cost for the second trail in Schenley Park - the Mobility trail - is \$430,000. The multiuse trail in the historic Sylvan Street right of way is estimated to cost \$1.7M. This includes slope stabilization required to reopen that right of way for any trail use. The Chute Bypass is an optional, but valuable, component of the design. It is a major infrastructure project that requires slope stabilization and elevated structures. As such, it is comparatively expensive and estimated to cost \$5.6M. The trail construction is a capital investment of local public money.</p>

<p>How many of the improvements are more expensive because they are designed to support a shuttle?</p>	<p>There is no material difference in designing the trail in a way that accommodates a small, limited weight shuttle versus designing the trail for safe and comfortable use by bicycle commuters, micromobility users (scooters, e-bikes, etc.) and others. The trail is 15' wide constructed of 5" of asphalt on a gravel base with a crushed stone shoulder. This is a typical trail standard as compared to standard construction for a conventional street - such as the reconstructed section of Boundary Street - is typically at least 20' wide and constructed of a 10" concrete base topped with 4" of asphalt and generally having curb and gutter. To see the difference between this trail pavement and typical street pavement, click here. The costly retaining walls required to realize the Sylvan Trail and Chute Bypass are required with or without shuttles.</p>
<p>How can you make these estimations without detail plans? What is the estimate for the actual budget? How high do you think it would be?</p>	<p>Estimates can hold accuracy at the concept level. Each section has a cost driver, work/item(s) that are the expensive portion of that project. The estimate revolves around the cost driver along with mid scale items that can be quantified within the limits of work. A contingency is added with the understanding that smaller cost items and adjustments to the cost driver will fall within that contingency. As the project progresses through design and detailed plans are developed, the contingency decreases. Once design is final, contingency is zero. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>

TRAIL PERMIT	
<p>What is the commuter-type traffic for which the mobility road is being built? What kind of vehicle(s) can use the mobility trail?</p> <p>Is this roadway only open to the shuttle bus, or can other vehicles use it? Is this just a road for permitted electric cars?</p> <p>Are electric wheelchairs allowed on the road without permits?</p> <p>Will services like Uber be able to get a permit and use the trail?</p>	<p>The mobility trail is being designed to accommodate a mix of users. It is designed to attract swifter personal mobility devices such as bicycles, scooters, skateboards and the like away from the more leisurely Heritage Trail. Small electric shuttle vehicles are also anticipated to use the trail. Pedestrians and persons using electric personal assistance devices like electric wheelchairs are also permitted, but will likely find the Heritage Trail to be a lower stress facility for these slower modes of travel. Pedestrians, people on bikes and micromobility devices will be permitted without restriction, however the maximum speed limit on the trail is 15 MPH (to which all must conform).</p> <p>Trail design does not permit sufficient width for two vehicles to pass on the trail in opposing direction while being of adequate width to permit a small shuttle vehicle to safely share the path with people on bicycles and other users. Trail design precludes significant volumes of conventional vehicles and cannot accommodate any vehicle in excess of 12,000 gross vehicle weight (approximately equivalent to a small shuttle or park maintenance vehicle).</p> <p>The proposed permit provisions would enable entities providing wheelchair accessible mobility services open to the public utilizing an all-electric vehicle that is operated by a natural person (driver), of a size less than 7' (W) x 20' (L) x 9'6" (H) with a gross vehicle weight less than 12,000 lbs. to apply for a permit for mobility trail use. The City is limited to permitting entities that may result in more than one vehicle on the trail at any given time. Given this, it is unlikely that more than one shuttle provider would be permitted.</p>
<p>Would the project still go forward if it did not provide for trail use by a shuttle?</p> <p>Why is the shuttle still included in this plan after nearly unanimous pushback? Is it possible to simply drop the shuttle? (Updated 11-4-20)</p>	<p>The Mon-Oakland Connector project is a cornerstone of a larger comprehensive community reinvestment and enhancement initiative that includes investments in affordable housing, commercial main street improvements, sidewalk and lighting upgrades, and infill redevelopment.</p> <p>The City and partners are committed to community stabilization investments irrespective of the shuttle, however economic development experts have indicated that a shuttle - even a small, limited capacity shuttle - with efficient service to Oakland is necessary to catalyze mixed use revitalization of Hazelwood Green (the old LTV mill site). If the project precluded a shuttle and therefore would likely not yield the</p>

	intended economic benefits, it would be down scaled, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, the existing trail in Junction Hollow would be restored in kind without a second rail allowing separation of bicycles from pedestrians, the Chute Bypass and tunnel to Panther Hollow Lake would be deferred indefinitely.
How many bike commuters are there currently and how many are you expecting to use the road in the next 5 years?	2019 existing conditions through Junction Hollow indicate a PM peak hour volume of 82 bicycles and an AM peak hour volume of 21 bicycles. Future projections have not been calculated at this time.
E-bikes are expensive. How will residents be able to use e-bikes on the trail if they cannot afford to buy one?	Pittsburgh Bikeshare, who operates the Healthy Ride public bike share system, is working to convert the existing conventional pedalcycle fleet to a fleet of electric pedal assist bicycles. These “e-bikes” will make bicycling the hilly terrain of Pittsburgh much easier for a broader range of people. As a public shared fleet, e-bikes are available to the public for a nominal fare. The City is working closely with Healthy Ride to support this conversion, expand the system to additional neighborhoods (including Hazelwood) and ensure e-bikes remain an affordable mobility option.
“Publicly accessible” doesn’t necessarily address cost to riders. Would there be a guarantee that any costs to riders, specifically for lower income residents, be either free or super low cost?	“Publicly accessible” must include both physical as well as economic accessibility. Permit language will be revised to better address this consideration. The Operating Plan proposed by Almono commits to a multi-year service free to all users.
If only electric propulsion is permitted, would this preclude fuel cell powered vehicles of the future?	At present, there are no commercially available fuel cell powered vehicles. Permit requirements can be adjusted, through the prescribed public process, if other clean, renewable propulsion systems become available.

<p>How will you prevent the shuttle bus road through Schenley Park from becoming a road for cars and trucks, similar to Bates Street and numerous streambed roadways around the city? Will the trail need to be wider for the maximum capacity of 1,000 riders per day?</p>	<p>The trail is only designed to a trail standard. The engineering specification is asphalt on gravel. A concrete base would be needed to sustain vehicle volumes of even a moderately trafficked street. Furthermore, the designed width of the trail precludes more than one vehicle on the trail at any given time. As a result, general vehicles are prohibited from use of the trail. Possible solutions will include either bollards spaced in such a way to preclude access or gates will be installed at trail entries that can only be lowered by way of a transponder supplied by the city for use in permitted vehicles. This will be determined as Final Design progresses.</p>
<p>Legally, if the “trail” connects two ends of Boundary Street, and it is using the Boundary Street right of way, isn’t it Boundary Street and not a trail?</p>	<p>No. First, the current alignment of the mobility trail is not entirely within the right of way of old Boundary Street. Secondly, not all rights of way accommodate vehicular use. Most of the public steps of the city are actually “street” rights of way. Some public rights of way - like Strawberry Way downtown - have been closed to vehicular use while others, like the many paper streets, were never used as streets even while they provided important pedestrian connections. There is no legal requirement that streets carry vehicles and there is no entitlement to vehicular use.</p>
<p>How do you control the number of vehicles on the trail?</p>	<p>Operators will be required to provide a real time open API of vehicle location and speed. The city, and any app developers, can monitor the presence of vehicles on the trail. If operators exceed the permitted one (1) vehicle on the trail at any given time, they could be subject to revocation of the permit for permit violation.</p>
<p>How can we be certain Permit Requirements will not change in the future? for what period of time will these restrictions be in force?</p>	<p>In 2019, City Council passed Resolution 2019-1274 which requires City Council approval prior to implementation of any transit option in Junction Hollow in Schenley Park. Permit provisions are being developed through this public process. Any issuance of permit for transit service in the Hollow must be approved by Council. Any change to permit provisions would require permit reissuance, triggering the same public and Council review.</p>
<p>What is the size/weight of these vehicles?</p>	<p>Under the permit policy, vehicles operating on the Mobility Trail must be no larger than 7 feet wide, 20 feet long, and 9 feet six inches high, which is roughly the size of an on-street parking space. The maximum fully loaded gross vehicle weight is 12,000 pounds, roughly the size of a fully loaded pick up truck. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>

<p>What body would need to approve the operating plan? Mayor alone or City Council?</p>	<p>The Operating Plan would be reviewed by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure and, if satisfactory, commended to City Council for approval. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>SAFETY AND OPERATIONS</p>	
<p>Will faster cyclists be able to choose to cycle on Boundary Street rather than the 3 Rivers Trail?</p>	<p>Boundary Street terminates at either end of the park. The new mobility trail is designed for use by people on bicycles. People on bicycles will be discouraged from using the pedestrian pathway adjacent to the stream to make that a more pleasant, and less stressful, travelway for these slower modes of travel.</p>
<p>What is the commuter-type traffic for which the mobility road is being built?</p>	<p>The mobility trail is not being developed explicitly for commuters, it is a general travel connection, however we recognize there are already a number of bicycle commuters and anticipate and encourage even more. The mobility trail will significantly expand bicycle travel capacity. No private vehicle commuters are permitted on the trail, only permitted, publicly accessible, shared mobility shuttles.</p>
<p>How can you have faster vehicles next to the soccer field? It's currently dangerous with bikers and spectators.</p>	<p>The maximum speed limit on park trails is 15 MPH for all users. Any micro-transit vehicles operating on the trail will conform to this maximum speed, meaning they will travel at a speed similar to the speed of bicycle travel. The mobility trail will be separated from the soccer field and other park destinations utilizing park features and landscape architecture.</p>
<p>Will the police have access to the trail?</p>	<p>Police have access to all public travelways. DOMI and DPW encourage police patrol to be on bicycle only and police vehicle travel on any of the trails generally discouraged.</p>
<p>Who will be in charge of safety on the trail?</p>	<p>Park trails are monitored by park rangers. Non-profits like BikePGH and Healthy Ride also have ambassador programs who provide additional “eyes on the trail” and enhance safety. Public safety through the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police is responsible for general safety and security while DOMI and DPW are responsible for maintaining trail conditions for physical safety.</p>

<p>How will you prevent The Run from becoming a parking lot for Oakland and Hazelwood?</p>	<p>At the request of Run residents, no shuttle stop will be provided in The Run. This will prevent anyone from boarding or alighting the shuttle and deter people from parking in The Run if they have no destination in the community. DOMI is currently working with the Department of City Planning and Public Parking Authority of Pittsburgh to review Residential Permit Parking program for possible modifications to improve the program for residents.</p>
<p>ALMONO PROPOSED SHUTTLE OPERATIONS</p>	
<p>Is the shuttle for 9 people sitting, and more if standing, or is 9 the max? Is capacity reduced if there are wheelchair users on board?</p>	<p>There are two shuttle options. The GEM e6 accommodates 6 people max and the Electro Transit Buddy accommodates 9 people max. Both shuttle options are for seated riders; they cannot manage standees. The GEM e6 can accommodate 1 wheelchair, while the Electro Transit Buddy can accommodate up to 2 wheelchairs. With one wheelchair, the seated capacity goes down by 1 to 2 seats.</p>
<p>How many people can the proposed shuttle service move? Earlier in the process I heard a shuttle could move thousands, but this operating plan sounds like hundreds?</p>	<p>Based on the service plan outlined, the shuttle could move up to 1,000 riders per day. Initial demand is estimated to be 180 riders per day, so the shuttle has more than enough capacity to accommodate additional demand as the shuttle benefits are confirmed and as Hazelwood Green is further developed.</p>
<p>Is this shuttle running constantly every 10 minutes, or do people have to call and reserve a seat in advance? How will people know if the shuttle is full? How can people be sure they'll get to work on time?</p>	<p>The proposed service is fixed, not on-demand. The shuttle would arrive at each stop every 10 minutes during peak hours and every 15 minutes during off-peak hours and on the weekends. Shuttles will be equipped with technology to provide information on how full they are so riders can be alerted prior to going to a stop.</p>
<p>What is the wait + travel time if people are bypassed by a shuttle that is full?</p>	<p>Travel time depends on the origin and destination of the individual, but for a person traveling from Fifth/Craig to Mill 19 who is able to get on a shuttle with available seats, total travel time is 26 minutes off peak: this includes 14 minutes spent in the shuttle, 5 minutes wait time, and 7 minutes (on average) of walk time. We assume riders will time their arrival at the origin stop in order to minimize their wait time as much as possible. In other words, they will show up 5 minutes before the shuttle is scheduled to arrive (half of the headway time). If a rider gets bypassed because a shuttle is full, then the wait time for the next shuttle would be 10 minutes during peak hours and 15 minutes during off-peak hours and on the weekends. This would result in a total travel time of 36-41 minutes. (Updated 10-26-2020)</p>

<p>Where are the shuttle stops?</p> <p>The CMU stop on Neville is only accessible by a steep set of steps or a CMU only elevator garage to get up to Forbes.</p> <p>Is there any opportunity to add a stop at Waldeck and Sylvan?</p> <p>Why is there not a stop in The Run (near Big Jim's)?</p> <p>Could there be more stops within the Hazelwood Glen Hazel neighborhoods?</p>	<p>The proposed shuttle stops are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● South Neville Street ● Boundary Street & Diulus Way ● Hazelwood Avenue & Sylvan Avenue ● Tecumseh Street & Second Avenue ● Mill 19 ● Roundhouse ● Schenley Plaza <p>The stop on Neville Street is a 1-2 minute walk from 5th Avenue WITHOUT stairs. It can also be accessed by the stairs from Tepper Quad, as mentioned.</p> <p>Almono is open to considering alternative stops in Hazelwood and elsewhere as it finalizes the service plan, though changes to the proposed plan could impact overall travel time.</p> <p>In the concept planning stage of the project, residents of The Run opposed a shuttle stop in The Run even if the service ran on an alignment near to the community.</p>
<p>Almono has proposed providing shuttle service open and free to all, but for how long?</p>	<p>Almono is committed to a multi-year agreement to provide the service free to users.</p>
<p>How much public money is being used to fund the private shuttle service?</p> <p>Are CMU, Pitt or UPMC contributing to the operation of the shuttle?</p> <p>How much public money is being used to build the Mobility Trail?</p>	<p>No public money is being used for vehicle acquisition or operations for the Hazelwood-Oakland Shuttle. Almono is making a multi-year commitment to fund those costs. At this time, Almono will be the sole funder of shuttle operations.</p> <p>Public money is being used for physical construction of the Mobility Trail. including the Junction Hollow portion of Schenley Park (\$450,000) and the new Sylvan Trail (\$1.7M). (Updated 10-26-2020)</p>
<p>Why is this shuttle service needed if the major institutions (CMU and Pitt) already run shuttle services?</p>	<p>The Hazelwood-Oakland Shuttle would be free to the public so anyone can ride it, unlike existing university shuttles which are only available to their affiliates. In addition, the Hazelwood-Oakland Shuttle would take a more direct route to connect the two areas, thereby minimizing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The existing CMU shuttle only connects as far as the Pittsburgh Technology Center (PTC) and does not service the residential and business areas of Hazelwood serviced by the proposed Mon-Oakland Connector.</p>

	<p>The new proposed service would utilize only electric vehicles, which are quieter and do not produce carbon emissions in comparison to shuttle vehicles in current operation.</p>
<p>Why is a shuttle service so critical to the viability of development on the Hazelwood Green site?</p> <p>How does development of Hazelwood Green help the City tax base?</p>	<p>By providing a direct connection between Oakland and Hazelwood, the Shuttle is an essential catalyst for the development of Hazelwood Green, which is expected to create 10,000 temporary construction jobs and over 6,000 new permanent jobs upon completion. Almono has and continues to work with its community partners in Hazelwood to ensure that its residents benefit from this expansion of workforce and wages.</p> <p>New tenants and new jobs will lead to \$33M in annual tax revenue into local and state government and the City of Pittsburgh School District - revenue that can pay for other badly needed improvements in infrastructure and social services.</p>
<p>Why operate a small shuttle now that does not provide enough capacity to accommodate the full build out of the site?</p> <p>How will this project scale? What is the end objective in five or ten (or more) years?</p> <p>If there are 20,000 trips projected for Almano in 2028 and 60,000 trips in 2040, how will this shuttle, moving 180 riders a day, come close to addressing increased car traffic? How will this shuttle prevent the project from building thousands of parking spaces?</p>	<p>Almono believes the shuttle would address immediate transportation needs now while longer-term, higher-capacity solutions emerge in the next 5 to 10 years. Industry experts commissioned to develop Almono’s proposed operating plan estimated current demand to be 180 riders per day if the shuttle were to begin operations immediately. Over time, as more jobs are created at Hazelwood Green, we estimate that demand could grow to 500 daily riders. Based on the service plan provided, the shuttle has the capacity to carry up to 1,000 riders per day. But Almono’s hope is that within the next 5 to 10 years, the shuttle will be one of several options for people looking for fast, reliable, affordable service between Hazelwood and Oakland, and that additional bus routes and Second Avenue BRT will be available to meet increased demand. While the need to build parking is inevitable for a development the size of Hazelwood Green, it is estimated that the shuttle would enable the elimination of 3,400 parking spaces commensurate with TOD guidelines. (Updated 10-26-2020)</p>

<p>What is the plan for when development exceeds shuttle capacity?</p> <p>Will you donate the shuttles to community groups?</p> <p>Will there no longer be shuttles on the trail once demand supports frequent bus service?</p>	<p>The Hazelwood-Oakland Shuttle is not meant to be the sole solution to address demand arising from a fully built-out Hazelwood Green. The new jobs emerging from Hazelwood Green will lead to increased ridership demand which will in turn bring more frequent, sustained, large-scale transit service to the region. Almono’s hope is that within the next several years, the Shuttle becomes just one piece of a larger, more robust transit network connecting Hazelwood and Oakland, including additional bus routes and BRT along Second Avenue. Almono would continue to assess demand for the shuttle as additional transportation alternatives emerge. Should ridership meaningfully decline on the shuttle then Almono may decide to phase out operations. It is too soon to determine what would happen to the vehicles if operations are phased out. (Updated 10-26-2020)</p>
<p>Why can’t Almono invest the funds in an extension of the Route 75 or other Port Authority bus improvements?</p>	<p>Almono supports expansion of Route 75 bus service as well as Bus Rapid Transit along the Fifth-Forbes and Second Avenue corridors. But it also believes the Shuttle could immediately fill existing gaps in service between Hazelwood and Oakland while these longer-term solutions are planned and implemented.</p> <p>In the site visits and studies done, we noted that crossing the Hot Metal Bridge is likely physically challenging given the width of the bridge and the operations of a PAAC bus. We also noted that of the 16 ODs between Oakland and HG studied, 8 of them would have minor benefits from the 75 extension over the shuttle- solely by comparing travel time.</p>
<p>Why not invest public dollars in helping to extend the 75 when the benefits would be far greater than these shuttles could provide?</p>	<p>Transit service is provided utilizing operating funds. Infrastructure is constructed utilizing capital dollars. Capital dollars cannot be converted to operating. The public funds are all capital.</p>
<p>Can the shuttle be operated by the Port Authority?</p> <p>Does the port authority have any role in the planning and designing?</p>	<p>The Port Authority has been briefed on the plans for the mobility trail and shuttle operations. The concept behind the shuttle is micro-transit, a small project that fills in gaps of service between larger transit routes operated by agencies like the Port Authority.</p> <p>This is a “proof of concept” pilot. With more infill and larger ridership base, they will be able to add more service and frequency to existing lines. Almono supports the efforts to expand service of the 75 route.</p>

<p>Will shuttle drivers be full time and receive health benefits? Why not union labor?</p>	<p>We have not yet selected an operator, but our operating model reflects wages and benefits comparable to other regional operators. The model is based on a mix of full-time and part-time drivers. Almono is committed to a prevailing wage for shuttle operators. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>How will community representative be chosen for the advisory board? Who will have appointment power? How many community members will be on the community advisory board? How long will they serve? What kinds of input would they be able to provide, will that input be transparently shared with the community that they represent, and how will that input affect planning and implementation? How will shuttle operation be publicly accountable?</p>	<p>The number of members on the advisory board and specific operations of the board are still to be determined. Almono is committed to appointing local residents to serve on the board. Primary responsibilities of the board would include governing operations of the shuttle, providing oversight of the third-party operator once it has been selected, and responding to community feedback and holding the shuttle service accountable to its needs. The City permit will also hold the service accountable through the associated public process and reviews of operating plans and performance measures. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>Do you have data that residents want the shuttle? Or who is deciding this “first step”?</p>	<p>Almono has heard from residents in Hazelwood that reliable, affordable access to jobs and services in Oakland is a high priority. A free shuttle service between Hazelwood and Oakland can immediately fill that gap in service while longer term, higher capacity solutions such as expanded bus routes and BRT are planned and implemented. (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>PROJECT PROCESS</p>	
<p>Why is this the last public meeting when this version of the plan has only recently being released?</p>	<p>The plan has evolved in an iterative process that began in December 2017. There have been multiple meetings. This is the final meeting for the base design of the first phase. There will be additional meetings as design continues.</p>
<p>Who was engaged in the development of this project? Were residents and other impacted stakeholders involved?</p>	<p>Public engagement and collaboration has been an important part of this project and the preceding study. The public outreach opportunities provided are listed on the project website: https://mon-oaklandmobility.com/public-engagement. The resulting collaboration has resulted in several design related adjustments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Boundary Street Realignment Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The bicycle/pedestrian connection between Joncaire Street and Filmore Street originally meandered along the left and right of

	<p>Boundary Street and traveled behind the CMU parking lot/maintenance facility. The community expressed the desire to have a more direct connection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City and design team explored alternatives and the City committed additional funds to ensure this connection could happen. ● The Chute Bypass <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Residents of Four Mile Run expressed concern for the Mobility Trail traveling within Saline Street right-of-way. Saline Street is the only access to the Run. ○ The bicycle community also expressed an interest for a connection between Junction Hollow and the Eliza Furnace Trail that would be safer than the Chute. ○ The Chute Bypass was developed through community input and alternative analysis. ● Bike/Ped Tunnel Connection at Panther Hollow Lake <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PWSA removed the Bike/Ped tunnel in the process from conceptual design to final design. ○ The communities expressed an interest in this connection. ○ DOMI is working to meet the community's desire to have this connection.
AFFORDABILITY	
<p>Has the impact of gentrification and displacement been addressed?</p>	<p>Yes, the City and URA are very focused on preserving affordable housing. Please see the many investments being made to preserve affordability: https://www.ura.org/news/ura-and-hazelwood-initiative-partner-to-preserve-affordable-housing-in-hazelwood</p>
<p>How is affordability being defined? What percentage of AMI? What percent of AMI is affordable housing?</p>	<p>For rental housing, affordable housing is usually less than 60% AMI. For for-sale housing, it's less than 80% AMI. However, half of the City's Housing Trust Fund dollars have to help people at 30% AMI which means the development of rental projects and the rehab of owner-occupied homes are prioritized at that income level. (Updated 10-26-2020)</p>

<p>What commitment is Almono making towards maintaining affordable housing?</p>	<p>Over the last several years the Almono partners have demonstrated their strong commitment to neighborhood stabilization in Hazelwood, supporting community leaders, and building capacity so that Hazelwood organizations can safeguard and enhance the wellbeing of all residents in this neighborhood.</p> <p>The Preliminary Land Development Plan for Hazelwood Green, approved by City Council, calls for affordable housing in Hazelwood Green, and that is a commitment the Almono partners stand behind.</p>
<p>What was done in relation to conducting an in-depth equity analysis (past Title VI requirements) for these areas and phases? What other public engagement was done in regard to allowing residents, past just the resident advisory group you mentioned, be a part of the decision-making process of these areas/phases?</p>	<p>The Title VI equity analysis is a requirement of federal aid and applies only to transit providers in urbanized areas (populations greater than 200,000) who operate 50 or more fixed route vehicles in peak service. The requirement is to ensure that changes do not disproportionately affect members of a group identified by race, color, or national origin. Title VI equity analysis is not required as the Mon-Oakland Mobility Project is not utilizing federal aid. However, the project serves the objectives of Title VI by providing increased service at lower cost to riders and increases access and connectivity to a currently underserved community. As such there is neither Disparate Impact nor Disproportionate Burden.</p> <p>Public engagement and collaboration has been an important part of this project and the preceding study. The public outreach opportunities provided are listed on the project website: https://mon-oaklandmobility.com/public-engagement. (See page 16-17 for details of design adjustments based on that collaboration.) (Updated 11-4-20)</p>

CONCURRENT PROJECTS	
<p>Is this project (the Mon-Oakland Connector) holding PWSA flood mitigation improvements hostage? Would PWSA implement the flood mitigations if the road was not implemented?</p> <p>How much does the mobility trail affect the stormwater outcomes of the PWSA project?</p> <p>Originally I heard the PWSA flood mitigation project was investing \$41M. Now I hear it is only \$19M. Why the difference?</p>	<p>Addressing stormwater impacts in Four Mile Run is a firm commitment of Mayor Peduto and PWSA. Flood mitigation improvements will be implemented. PWSA would be able to move forward with the stormwater project without the Mon-Oakland connector. However, the project and permitting could have a significant delay from the current construction schedule.</p> <p>The PWSA stormwater model found the additional mobility trail to have no measurable impact on stormwater flows. The latest city planning requirements were incorporated into the Mon-Oakland connector stormwater design, which requires no net increase in runoff. Therefore, the Mon-Oakland project is providing a net benefit compared to the trail system in place today which allows runoff.</p> <p>There was no change in the % reduction of structures at risk after incorporating the Mobility project due to the incorporation of stormwater best management practices such as rain gardens within the project.</p> <p>PWSA allocated \$41M several years ago to solving flooding and combined sewer overflows in the 4MR Sewershed. This capital commitment was based on preliminary planning and was not intended to be the bid amount of the final construction project. Through final design, PWSA's team was able to find significant cost savings utilizing different construction methods and streamlined approaches to mitigating flooding. To date, costs of design, permitting, easements, railroad coordination, utility relocations to build the stormwater, and the final construction costs are anticipated to be approximately \$30M. The decrease in cost from the \$41M is a result of value-engineering of the project and providing the best value to the ratepayers. (Updated 10-26-2020)</p> <p>See www.pgh2o.com/4mr for information regarding the PWSA project including costs.</p>

Mon-Oakland Mobility Project
 Virtual Public Meetings – October 21 & 29, 2020
 Zoom Meeting Questions & Answers

<p>Why isn't PWSA at these meetings? Why doesn't PWSA call a similar meeting for people to comment/question and see all the plans as they relate to this project?</p>	<p>PWSA has had a series of meetings focused on their project. Representatives from PWSA are in attendance here as well to listen. PWSA Four Mile Run Stormwater Project information can be found here: https://www.pgh2o.com/projects-maintenance/search-all-projects/four-mile-run-stormwater-project</p>
<p>Many residents of The Run received letters from DOMI that imply they might lose their homes and businesses to eminent domain? Please explain.</p>	<p>The letter is a "notice of intent to enter" which notified residents that surveyors working for the City may need to access their properties in order to obtain the information needed for the Swinburne Bridge project. This right to enter is specified in the state eminent domain code, which is why that wording was used in the letter. The letter is not for the purposes of taking properties.</p>
<p>The Second Avenue/Irvine corridor plan called for Bus Rapid Transit on that corridor. Are there plans to advance that BRT project?</p>	<p>The City of Pittsburgh originated the request for the 2nd Avenue/Irvine corridor plan and was an active participant in that planning effort. This City strongly supports the transit recommendations of the study and will work with other partners toward their eventual implementation. The Second Avenue BRT is included in the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission Long Range Plan: https://www.spcregion.org/programs-services/transportation/smartmoves-long-range-plan-transportation-improvement-program/ (Updated 11-4-20)</p>
<p>What investments are being made to improve dilapidated pedestrian infrastructure in the community?</p>	<p>In 2020 the City invested in improvements to critical sidewalk gaps in three city neighborhoods: Homewood, the Hill District and Hazelwood. These were generally short segments connecting to transit and other critical destinations. Additionally, the City is pursuing over \$1M in grant funding to provide quality sidewalks along the length of Irvine Street from the Hazelwood business district to Greenfield Avenue. The Irvine and 2nd Avenue corridor is also a part of the City's Smart Spines network which will upgrade all signals along the corridor to outfit them with transit signal priority and pedestrian crossing signals. Signal design is underway and upgrades will be completed in the next 2 - 3 years.</p>
<p>What is happening with the basketball court in The Run? It is still not open since COVID shutdown.</p>	<p>CitiParks and the Department of Public Works implemented COVID safety measures for a number of different park facilities in order to slow the spread of the virus within our community.</p>