

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In Re: Transportation Committee
House Resolution 301

* * * * *

Stenographic report of hearing held at the
Allegheny County Courthouse, Gold Room,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on

Wednesday
September 7, 1988
1:00 p.m.

- HON. AMOS K. HUTCHINSON, CHAIRMAN
- HON. RON GAMBLE
- HON. JOSEPH PETRARCA
- HON. TOM MURPHY
- HON. RAY GEIST
- HON. TOM MICHLOVIC

Also Present:

- Paul Landis
- Larry Gordon

I N D E X

1		
2		<u>Page:</u>
3	JACK SIMMONS	5 (Direct Testimony)
4	ROBERT LURCOTT	10 (Direct Testimony) 16 (Murphy)
5		
6	BILL MILLAR	18 (Direct Testimony) 29 (Hutchinson) 31 (Murphy)
7		
8	JACK FREEMAN	31 (Direct Testimony)
9	DR. RALPH BANGS	37 (Direct Testimony) 40 (Murphy) 40 (Gamble)
10		
11	DR. GEORGE WHITE	41 (Direct Testimony) 46 (Geist) 49 (Michlovic)
12		
13	KAREN LaFRANCE	52 (Direct Testimony) 55 (Gamble) 57 (Murphy)
14		
15	GREG HERNDON	58 (Direct Testimony)
16	JACK POLARITZ	62 (Direct Testimony) 67 (Michlovic) 71 (Murphy)
17		
18	JUNIA CAMPBELL	72 (Direct Testimony)
19	PETER LONGINE	76 (Direct Testimony) 78 (Michlovic)
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 **CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON:** This hearing will come to
3 order. My name is Amos K. Hutchinson, from my left to my
4 right, give your name.

5 **REPRESENTATIVE GAMBLE:** Representative Ron
6 Gamble, airport area.

7 **REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA:** Representative Joseph
8 Petrarca, Westmoreland County, 55th District.

9 **REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:** Tom Murphy, North Side.

10 **REPRESENTATIVE GEIST:** Ray Geist, Altoona.

11 **MR. LANDIS:** Paul Landis, Executive Director for
12 the minority leader of the Transportation Committee.

13 **MR. GORDON:** Larry Gordon, Research Analyst,
14 Transportation Committee.

15 **CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON:** This hearing is brought
16 about by a Resolution that Tom Murphy and Gamble,
17 Michlovic, Dawida, Preston and Petrone and was passed by
18 the House, so we are having our first meeting today and I
19 will now turn the meeting over to Tom Murphy.

20 **REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:** Thanks, Amos. Just very
21 briefly before we get into the speakers, I have introduced
22 -- we have introduced this Resolution because of the real
23 pressing need for better mass transportation in the
24 region. As the region's economic base changes, as
25 employment opportunities become more diverse and develop in

1 new locations such as the airport, there is a real need for
2 people to get access to those employment opportunities from
3 the traditional places where they live, like the Mon Valley
4 or even, for that matter, the City of Pittsburgh. And
5 without a good mass transit system, those opportunities
6 become inaccessible. Inaccessible for many, many
7 residents, particularly for those that rely entirely on
8 public transit, and often are the poorer members of our
9 community.

10 The Port Authority has faced difficult times in
11 Allegheny County because of the continuous federal cutbacks
12 and it is their estimate that it will be years before they
13 can proceed with any kind of substantial expansion on the
14 mass transportation network as we know it in this region.

15 It seemed to me, and those of us involved with
16 this, it was time for the state to look at a mechanism that
17 will -- or mechanisms that will provide an easier way, in a
18 more localized way, to finance any kind of improvements
19 that we want to do, without having to rely on federal
20 financing.

21 So, the purpose of this hearing will be to
22 explore, one, the need for the mass transit, and I am
23 hopeful there will be unanimous opinion there is a need for
24 expansion of the system and, two, the mechanisms that we
25 will need or have to explore to finance it, both from a

1 state participation and also from local means and, third,
2 is the type of system that we ought to begin to explore, be
3 it an extension of the Light Rail, be it a Busway, be it
4 magnetic levitation train, any of the three or a mixture of
5 the three would be something that we ought to consider, but
6 probably the most difficult challenge facing us right now
7 is how we pay for it, and I think the state can
8 appropriately begin to explore and play a role in helping
9 to finance the construction of a modern rapid and efficient
10 mass transit system.

11 With that said, I would like to have the first
12 witness, Barbara Hafer. Commissioner Hafer here? She is
13 not here yet?

14 CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON: No. He is going to read
15 it.

16 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Good.

17 MR. SIMMONS: Good afternoon, gentlemen. My
18 name is Jack Simmons. Unfortunately, Commissioner Hafer
19 will not be here today, and I was asked to read the
20 testimony that she has presented to you into the Record.

21 Good afternoon, Chairman Hutchinson and Murphy
22 and distinguished members of the House Transportation
23 Committee. I am not Barbara Hafer, but Jack Simmons
24 working for and acting instead of Barbara Hafer,
25 Commissioner of Allegheny County.

1 I want to personally thank the Committee for the
2 attention it is giving to public transportation and its
3 critical importance to the mobility of our citizens and to
4 economic development throughout Allegheny County. There
5 are a number of public transit improvements currently under
6 consideration for various corridors of Allegheny County.
7 These include the North Side-Downtown-Oakland Spine Line
8 connecting with our Light Rail Transit System, the
9 extension of the highly successful Martin Luther King, Jr.,
10 East Busway beyond Wilkinsburg and possibly into the Mon
11 Valley, and further improvements to the South Hills trolley
12 system, and a study of highway and transit options for the
13 Parkway West airport corridor.

14 I know that the Committee is well aware of the
15 economic changes which have confronted our region,
16 particularly the rapid deterioration of our steel-based
17 economy. Pennsylvanians can take pride in the way that we
18 have adapted. We must continue to grow, continue to
19 evolve. However, this growth and evolution can only be
20 accommodated through transportation investments which
21 provide the necessary shape and support to development.
22 Thus, we face the challenge and opportunity of implementing
23 the projects noted.

24 Public transportation in Allegheny County has
25 witnessed significant capital achievements within the past

1 few years, all of which are attributable to the federal,
2 state, local partnership which funds transit. These
3 projects include construction of the Martin Luther King,
4 Jr., East Busway and the South Busway, the renovated
5 Monongahela Incline and the opening of the new Light Rail
6 Transit Line between Downtown Pittsburgh and the South
7 Hills. These projects provide comfortable, convenient
8 transportation to record numbers of people, and have
9 brought significant economic stimulus to the region. The
10 South Hills Light Rail Transit Project alone generated an
11 estimated \$1.8 billion in business sales and revenues and
12 created thousands of new jobs.

13 Further, transit investments have helped attract
14 new businesses here and have enabled many others to
15 continue calling Allegheny County their home. Much of the
16 new office building construction in Downtown Pittsburgh has
17 been influenced by the construction of the Light Rail Line
18 and new Subway System. The Steel Plaza Subway Station has
19 become the focal point of major development plans,
20 including a hotel, an apartment and commercial complex.
21 Continued investment in transit facilities and services is
22 a prerequisite for Allegheny County to continue offering a
23 favorable climate to business.

24 The transit improvements being planned pose
25 significant opportunities. The Parkway West corridor,

1 serving the booming area surrounding the Greater Pittsburgh
2 International Airport, represents growth area of Allegheny
3 County. Travel conditions on the Parkway West, already
4 thoroughly congested, can only continue to deteriorate as
5 traffic in the area grows by an estimated 25 percent by the
6 year 2010. The exciting Midfield Terminal Project and the
7 associated Southern Expressway is the impetus for this
8 growth. A current study of the Southwestern Pennsylvania
9 Regional Planning Commission, of which I am a member, will
10 identify alternatives for improvement and will recommend
11 the right mix of highway and transit improvements.

12 In northern Allegheny County, high occupancy
13 vehicle lanes are being constructed by the Pennsylvania
14 Department of Transportation as part of the I-279, 579
15 Expressway. These lanes will provide North Hills commuters
16 with fast, convenient access to Downtown Pittsburgh,
17 similar to those riders who travel Port Authority's
18 busways. The lanes are scheduled to be open for service in
19 1989.

20 Turning to another part of the county, the Spine
21 Line. The Spine Line corridor is the most populated and
22 highly urban section of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.
23 It is also the highest volume transit corridor, and as
24 such, has been the focus of rapid transit development
25 studies over many years.

1 The new Light Rail Transit System has proven to
2 be an unqualified success and it behooves us to now expand
3 it to other communities of Allegheny County. The proposed
4 Spine Line would serve the Oakland section of Pittsburgh.
5 With its many educational, institutional and medical
6 centers, Oakland is one of the largest generators of
7 transit trips in Pittsburgh. The North Side and Squirrel
8 Hill sections, which the Spine Line could also serve,
9 include a strong mix of employment, retail and residential
10 activity.

11 Investment in transit makes sense. It is truly
12 time to move forward, and we, as elected officials, must
13 focus our energies to see that these projects are pursued
14 and accomplished in the shortest possible time frame. We
15 need to continue seeking federal financial support for
16 these projects. However, the limited availability of
17 federal funding will mean that we will not be able to rely
18 on federal funding to the degree we have in the past.
19 Certainly Allegheny County is not in a position to fill the
20 void left by reduced federal funds. Thus, it is essential
21 that the Commonwealth assume a leadership role in
22 fashioning a financing mechanism to bring these worthy
23 projects to reality. At the local level, we stand ready to
24 help formulate such a plan of action.

25 Clearly we have a host of projects we need to

1 undertake in Allegheny County. We are, indeed, fortunate
2 to have available to us an efficient and well-managed
3 transit system upon which we can build in the future in
4 Allegheny County. I am interested in recommendations that
5 the Committee will hear today. Addressing these capital
6 financial needs would have a profound effect on this county
7 in the 1990s and beyond. With your help, and through your
8 foresight, we can bring about the transportation
9 improvements which will enhance mobility for county
10 residents and spur regional economic growth.

11 With that I thank you very much for the
12 opportunity to present testimony to your Committee
13 regarding this topic.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thanks, Mr. Simmons.
15 Are there any questions? Thank you.

16 MR. SIMMONS: Thank you very much.

17 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Mr. Robert Lurcott, City
18 Planning Director.

19 Councilman Coyne cannot be with us today.

20 MR. LURCOTT: Mr. Chairman, members of the House
21 Transportation Committee, I am Robert Lurcott, Planning
22 Director for the City of Pittsburgh. On behalf of Mayor
23 Masloff, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to
24 discuss mass transportation needs within our area.

25 The 1980s saw completion of two significant mass

1 transportation improvements, the Martin Luther King Busway
2 and Stage I of the LRT. It will, however, also see the
3 completion of a major regional highway, North Shore/East
4 Street/North Hills Expressway. The effects of the latter
5 are already evident in the land development boom in the
6 North Hills.

7 We now face a question of what kind of
8 transportation improvements the 1990s will see: The
9 Southern Expressway to serve the airport, 837 improvements
10 and possibly portions of Mon Valley Turnpike or
11 expressway.

12 But what about mass transit? Will we see Stage
13 II of the LRT? Will we see the Spine Line to Oakland and
14 the North Side? Will we see affordable and reliable mass
15 transit from city neighborhoods to the airport area?

16 Why is mass transit important to the people and
17 businesses of the region? Simply, it is an efficient,
18 reliable means of moving people and is relatively
19 inexpensive. Mass transit is beneficial not only to its
20 users, but also those who drive. Our expressways are not
21 congested, relative at least to those of Los Angeles or
22 Denver or Dallas or Atlanta, but put the 30,000 daily
23 Martin Luther King Busway riders in automobiles, and what
24 would the Parkway East be like? Put 27,000 daily "T"
25 riders in automobiles, and what would the Parkway West be

1 like? And what kinds of public investments would we be
2 prepared to make to alleviate the problems that that would
3 cause?

4 Remember that 12,000 riders on PAT buses cross
5 the Fort Pitt Bridge bound for Downtown every peak hour
6 every morning. That would translate into almost 10,000
7 more cars, that in turn would translate into the need for
8 another tunnel, another bridge, and many more parking
9 garages.

10 Transportation matches people and jobs. It
11 permits employers to tap the region's well-trained labor
12 supply, and it permits people to find and hold jobs. Mass
13 transportation is and must remain a competitive strength
14 for our region.

15 Between now and the year 2000, SPRPC projects
16 that the six county region will gain 96,000 jobs. Over
17 half of the net additional jobs would be in just three
18 centers, Downtown Pittsburgh, Oakland and the airport area;
19 Downtown gaining 28,000 jobs, Oakland 10,000 and the
20 airport area and Findlay Township alone would gain 10,000,
21 as projected.

22 Expanded mass transit is important for the
23 growth of each of these three job centers and for the
24 people of our region who will seek these jobs. These
25 people will come from Pittsburgh's North Side,

1 Lawrenceville, the Hill, Hazelwood and the South Side.
2 They will come from the communities of Mon Valley and from
3 the North and South Hills.

4 If we rely on the private automobile to
5 transport people to these new jobs, we will exclude some
6 people from these jobs and we will ultimately commit
7 ourselves to a larger and even more expensive expressway
8 system in the shortsighted and vain hope that we can
9 ultimately afford to build an expressway system to meet all
10 the region's transportation needs.

11 As our economic base changes from its reliance
12 on the metals industry located in our river valleys to a
13 more diversified economy with fewer constraints on
14 location, we face very real choices for our transportation
15 systems.

16 We believe we must continue to build and improve
17 mass transit systems. First, PAT should move as rapidly as
18 possible to modernize the existing trolley system which
19 serves city neighborhoods and South Hills suburbs. This is
20 Stage II of the "T". PAT should also finalize its studies
21 of the Spine Line as quickly as possible so that it, too,
22 can be constructed before the end of this century, which
23 gives us 11 years, effectively. The LRT opened just seven
24 years after the alignment was selected and the decision was
25 made to build it.

1 The Commonwealth should be ready to provide
2 substantial funding for the Spine Line, just as it provided
3 substantial highway funds, frequently in the name of
4 economic development. Federal funds are still available,
5 but increasingly these funds flow to states and locations
6 which provide the most attractive package of non-federal
7 monies. The Spine Line should become a reality in the
8 1990s.

9 Finally, mass transit on its own exclusive
10 right-of-way from Oakland to the Golden Triangle to the
11 airport should be an accepted part of the long range plan
12 for the Parkway West corridor. Study underway now at SPRPC
13 is addressing those kinds of issues. I think it must be
14 looked at as a means of ensuring access to not only the
15 airport area, but Downtown and Oakland, to be part of a
16 mass transit system for the region, rather than simply a
17 means of gaining access to the airport area itself.

18 If we are looking at the kinds of jobs projected
19 by SPRPC for those three centers, those three centers in
20 total need to be accessible to all the people, or at least
21 the majority of people in this region, if they are, in
22 fact, going to address the region's economic development
23 needs in a just way. Actions which derive from the study
24 currently underway will determine land use patterns in this
25 largely undeveloped corridor for the next 75 years.

1 Studies should guarantee that a corridor is
2 preserved for an exclusive right-of-way for mass transit in
3 the future, but reliable and affordable mass transit to the
4 airport should not only be a project for the next century.
5 Pittsburghers must have access to airport area jobs just as
6 residents throughout the region have access to jobs within
7 the city.

8 Just as the Commonwealth has pledged funding for
9 the construction of the Southern Expressway, so that it may
10 be open when the Midfield Terminal is open, the
11 Commonwealth should support reliable and affordable bus
12 transportation from Pittsburgh's neighborhoods to the
13 Midfield Terminal and the airport area by 1992, in advance
14 of when likely long-term mass transit solution is
15 available.

16 In closing, I would like to thank the Committee
17 for this opportunity to discuss the needs for mass
18 transportation improvements as part of a balanced
19 transportation system for this region and I would like to
20 stress the need for early action so our citizens have
21 access to the job centers in the Golden Triangle, Oakland
22 and the airport area.

23 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Are there questions?
24 Ron?

25 REPRESENTATIVE GAMBLE: No.

1 BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:

2 Q. Bob, I read in your statement that you would
3 encourage us to put funding, traditional funding for the
4 highways and roads in mass transit on the same platter, in
5 effect, in that it would give municipalities a choice, if
6 we are going to give you, from the Department of
7 Transportation, X millions of dollars under a variety of
8 formulas or whatever, that you would have the choice
9 whether you would want to use that in cooperation with the
10 Port Authority for mass transit purposes rather than
11 traditional uses of highways.

12 Is that something that you would want, as a
13 municipality, to work that closely with the Port Authority,
14 and in effect being able to contribute some of the money
15 you receive from the state for highways to mass transit?

16 A. Well, I wouldn't want to say at this point that
17 we can take all of our -- or half of our highway funds that
18 we have allocated --

19 Q. I understand that.

20 A. -- which are less than what we would like to
21 see.

22 Q. But would you want that flexibility, is what I
23 am saying?

24 A. Well, I think the system has to work together.
25 We have to think of mass transit as part of the

1 transportation system and, therefore, there should be some
2 kind of coordinated decision-making process about it. Just
3 as we would like to have some say of where highway funds go
4 in the region, I would think we would feel the same way
5 about mass transit as well.

6 I think we are talking about the need for more
7 funding totally than what we have, if we are really going
8 to get what is possible out of the job production potential
9 of those three centers.

10 CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON: I would like to -- this is
11 not a question. The State Police receives about \$90
12 million out of Transportation money. The people with PAT
13 and SEPTA and all the other mass transportations get money
14 out of the General Fund, which is transferred to the
15 Transportation. So it's actually -- it is a stand-off with
16 the State Police and the transit. Instead of us giving it
17 to the State Police, we are giving it to transit through
18 the Transportation. The State Police are paid 85, 90
19 percent by the Transportation, so that is what you have to
20 look at if you are going to look at the question that he
21 talked about. Thank you.

22 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: We also give you money,
23 as you know, for maintenance from the gas tax formula, the
24 municipalities get money and it seems to me that within
25 that we might want to try to build a mechanism for you to

1 commit some of that to mass transit.

2 MR. LANDIS: The Constitution says you can't.
3 You would have to change the Constitution.

4 MR. GORDON: We are working on that.

5 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thanks, Bob. Bill
6 Millar, Director of the Allegheny County Port Authority.

7 MR. MILLAR: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. How
8 are you?

9 CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON: Fine.

10 MR. MILLAR: Welcome to Allegheny County. We
11 are glad to have you with us. I want to particularly thank
12 you and the other members of the Transportation Committee,
13 particularly Tom Murphy and Ron Gamble from the Allegheny
14 County delegation, for their help in putting together these
15 hearings. I think this is a really good opportunity to
16 talk about the future. I think all of us like to talk
17 about the future and the improvements that can happen in
18 this community.

19 As I have been introduced, I am Bill Millar, I
20 am Executive Director of the Port Authority of Allegheny
21 County, and I appear before you today on behalf of the
22 Board and the employees of the Port Authority, but also on
23 behalf of County Commissioner Tom Foerster, County
24 Commissioner Foerster, who asked that I extend my greetings
25 and also thank you for holding these hearings as well.

1 I want to spend a little time painting the
2 picture of what has been done in Allegheny County in terms
3 of public transit improvement and point out how the
4 investment that the state and the county has made in public
5 transit has enabled us to obtain federal funding in very
6 large amounts that have been part of the whole renaissance
7 and the economic development that is going on in Allegheny
8 County and southwestern Pennsylvania in general.

9 First, I want to thank this Committee because
10 over the last ten years you have assisted in appropriating
11 some \$130 million worth of state aid for the capital
12 assistance projects I am talking about today, and that,
13 when coupled with the millions of dollars the Allegheny
14 County Commissioners have appropriated, has enabled us to
15 go to Washington and bring back to this region over \$600
16 million worth of federal capital aid.

17 So, in toto, we have put together over an \$800
18 million program, the kind of program that has generated
19 revenues in the business sector of over \$2 billion,
20 provided some 60,000 jobs and really enabled the Downtown
21 area in Pittsburgh to continue to grow and develop. As Mr.
22 Lurcott before me pointed out, you simply could not have
23 the development in Downtown Pittsburgh if you did not have
24 the type of transit systems that we have. In fact, about
25 60 percent of the people who come into town every day to

1 work come by public transportation and, indeed, about 50
2 percent of the shoppers who come to town every day come by
3 public transit, and without the help that this Committee
4 and, indeed, the whole legislature has given to public
5 transit, that simply wouldn't be possible.

6 Now, some of you are not from Allegheny County
7 and may not be totally familiar with the size of our
8 organization or the type of service that we provide. Port
9 Authority is the second largest transit agency in the
10 state. Of course, the largest being SEPTA down in the
11 Philadelphia area.

12 We have a fleet of about 900 buses, a fleet of
13 street cars, PCC cars. We also own both of the inclines in
14 town, although we operate the Mon Incline with our own
15 employees and lease out the Duquesne Heights Incline. We
16 contract for service with the CSX Transportation
17 Corporation to provide commuter rail service into the Mon
18 Valley, and a service that many Allegheny County residents
19 don't realize is in the Port Authority family is we also
20 support the Access Program, which this year will provide
21 some 2 million rides, using largely funds from the State
22 Lottery, for elderly and handicapped persons throughout
23 Allegheny County.

24 We have some 2900 employees, \$160 million
25 operating budget and in recent years have been running with

1 about a \$40 million annual capital budget as well. In the
2 past several years, with your help, we have seen a lot of
3 improvements, and I brought along a little map here today
4 which I want to use in my presentation.

5 Everything you see here in green is what we have
6 done. This is basically a map of Allegheny County. Of
7 course, you see the river shown here in blue, Downtown
8 Pittsburgh here, airport out there, South Hills, North
9 Side, North Hills, East End, Oakland right here.

10 Everything you see in green here are projects
11 that we have completed working together. Those included
12 the Martin Luther King, Jr., East Busway, they include the
13 Mon Valley commuter rail service, they include the South
14 Busway, they include Stage I of the Light Rail Transit
15 Program and they include the HOV lanes which will be in the
16 median of the East Street Valley Expressway system which is
17 being built by PennDOT later on. I think this is no small
18 accomplishment and through the hard work of a lot of
19 people, we have gotten this done.

20 But everything shown here in dotted lines, in
21 these red or orange red dotted lines, are at least the
22 projects that the community is pretty well agreed need to
23 be done, never mind, I am sure, many other projects that
24 you will hear about today, as people have a lot of good
25 ideas on how to improve public transit. I would like to

1 talk a little bit about each of these projects and the
2 title of my talk is how can we accelerate projects, and
3 that is what I will get to in the end, and what I think we
4 need to finish our presentation.

5 I think we can think of these as four main
6 projects or project areas. The first is the so-called
7 Spine Line corridor. Now, Spine Line, as it is currently
8 envisioned, would be an extension of the Downtown Light
9 Rail System, our "T" system, over to the North Side. It
10 would also be an extension out to the East End of the city,
11 at least as far as Oakland, perhaps out to Squirrel Hill
12 and the communities in the East End as well.

13 That is our major project. We envision that as
14 a lengthy project. If it has to rely entirely on federal
15 funding, we are probably talking about a project that
16 cannot be built, even if the whole community agreed it is
17 the right thing to do today, cannot be built for 10 to 12
18 years at current federal funding levels. Its a big
19 project. The studies are all underway, the community
20 meetings are starting to be held and the first phase of the
21 planning study should be done in something just under two
22 years.

23 The second area of projects to consider is
24 extension of the highly successful Martin Luther King, Jr.,
25 East Busway. Today, the Busway goes from Downtown

1 Pittsburgh to Wilkinsburg. It is 6.8 miles in length,
2 carries about 30,000 passengers a day, has been an
3 unqualified success.

4 There are discussions going forward right now
5 and a planning study about to be underway to talk about the
6 first leg of an extension of this Busway, perhaps through
7 Edgewood and down into Swissvale. We are also beginning to
8 do some of the planning and gather the data necessary to
9 take a look whether it should be extended down into the Mon
10 Valley, perhaps Rankin, Braddock, East Pittsburgh, maybe up
11 into the Turtle Creek area and perhaps down the Mon Valley
12 in the direction of McKeesport as well. So, the extension
13 of the East Busway, again another good project and
14 something we need to think about.

15 Third, we need to think about what to do with
16 the rest of the rail system in the South Hills. I have
17 already spoken of the Stage I program, which was a ten and
18 a half mile reconstruction of that line that included the
19 building of the Downtown subway, included the acquisition
20 of some 55 modern Light Rail vehicles, included the
21 building of a major car storage and maintenance facility
22 out here at the south end of the line, but that ten and a
23 half miles is only half of the rail system that is out
24 there. There remains 12 miles which something must be done
25 about.

1 Why must it be done? We must make a decision
2 about this because, frankly, it is falling off the
3 hillsides, and I would be very happy to arrange a tour for
4 the Committee, at the Committee's convenience, to literally
5 see how years of neglect on the rails have allowed this
6 rail system to fall into great disrepair, and so we need to
7 make a decision.

8 We see this project as having three phases that
9 we can talk about. Phase I or Phase A might be in the
10 extreme southern part of the county, in the Library area.
11 An awful lot of ridership on our system comes from this
12 particular section. Phase II might look at the so-called
13 Drake area, which is really an extension of the Stage I
14 program that we have looked at already, and Phase III, or
15 Phase C would have to look at the Overbrook or the valley
16 section, that part that goes along Route 51, up in the
17 woods and serves that section of the city as well as goes
18 down to Castle Shannon.

19 We have some very hard questions to ask. Should
20 we be rebuilding all three of those sections as rail
21 systems? Should we rebuild part as a rail system, part as
22 an extension of the South Busway? Should we consider that
23 there are portions of that that need to be abandoned?
24 Those types of questions. We are moving this fall -- in
25 fact, as we speak, there is a request for proposal on the

1 street to obtain engineering service to allow us to begin
2 to address that kind of problem that is here.

3 Now, the fourth area that we need to think
4 about, and I am sure one you will give very careful
5 consideration, is how do we serve the new airport terminal,
6 how do we serve the Parkway West corridor? This is
7 certainly the area of the County that is one of the most
8 rapidly growing areas. Right now there is a major study
9 underway chaired by Tom Foerster and being conducted by the
10 Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission to
11 examine the whole Parkway West corridor, to look at it not
12 only from the standpoint of public transit, which is, of
13 course, something I am very interested in and I am sure you
14 are, too, but also to examine some of the highway
15 alternatives that might be available out there as well.

16 So, we have studies going in all four of these
17 project areas and the issue then really becomes a simple
18 one and an old one and one you deal with every day in the
19 legislature. If all of these turn out to be viable
20 projects, you are looking at about \$1 billion worth of
21 expenditure just where the dotted lines are. Never mind
22 all the little fancy things people might want to add to
23 them or other projects that may come up today. You are
24 looking at a billion dollars worth of construction and
25 construction that frankly, for the growth of this

1 community, that we need done today and yet it isn't
2 possible today. So we need to talk about how can we make
3 improvements in this.

4 A couple things I would like to suggest in this
5 regard. First, we are not alone, and I think it is sort of
6 auspicious today you are holding this hearing. I don't
7 know if any of you have seen TIME magazine this week, but
8 the cover story in TIME magazine this week is all about
9 grid lock and how do we move people through our urban areas
10 and between our urban areas, and what we need to do, and
11 public transit is certainly part of the answer to that.

12 CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON: Is that part of a football
13 game?

14 MR. MILLAR: Grid lock? I don't know. It might
15 be. There have certainly been a lot of clippings from the
16 news media in the southeastern part of the state. I'm sure
17 you have seen many things about SEPTA. SEPTA recently
18 announced that they need a minimum of \$3.6 billion to just
19 rebuild the system as it exists down there. There have
20 been other articles such as the mag lev ideas that we have
21 heard about recently and other types of technology to look
22 at. So, there is no shortage of ideas and no shortage of
23 people to help us think about our problem. What we need to
24 do is come up with a program to move forward.

25 What I think needs to be done is that I think we

1 need to put together a Mass Transit Capital Funding Task
2 Force and I think this Task Force needs to include members
3 of the legislature, members of the local government,
4 members of the Casey administration, business sector,
5 citizens groups and others that are interested in mobility
6 in our urban areas for many years to come. I think such a
7 Task Force should look at the problems not only of
8 identifying what projects are out there. I have outlined a
9 billion dollars worth and SEPTA has outlined \$3.6 billion
10 worth, but there may be other worthy projects as well that
11 ought to be looked at and then ask, how are we going to
12 proceed to finance these things.

13 I think we need, as part of this Task Force, to
14 look at how other states and communities have done it.
15 Some states, for example, have put together massive state
16 wide bond issues to deal with these types of problems.
17 Other states have looked at various forms of dedicated
18 funding to look at and handle these kinds of problems.
19 Here in Pennsylvania we have got an innovative piece of
20 legislation in transportation development districts we need
21 to look at to see whether that makes some sense for
22 answering these kinds of problems. There may be some
23 opportunities for private funding.

24 You notice the one thing I haven't mentioned yet
25 is federal funding. There is a very good reason for that.

1 If we wait for federal funding to take on these projects,
2 just as if we wait for our road projects, we are going to
3 wait a long, long time. There are decades worth of work to
4 be done here.

5 There are, however, some interesting provisions
6 in federal law we need to examine. For example, some
7 states have put together their own programs, gotten on with
8 the construction program, and then been reimbursed by the
9 federal government over many years. In other words, get
10 the construction under way, get the jobs put in place, get
11 the benefits of the system, and then actually create a fund
12 for receiving federal aid to reimburse us for those costs.
13 Currently for the kinds of projects I am talking about, the
14 federal government reimburses at a rate of 75 percent.

15 Why is it important to get on with it? Because
16 every day we wait the cost grows and the congestion worsens
17 and the economic development opportunity passes us by. For
18 example, if you look at our Light Rail Transit Program,
19 which was about a half a billion dollar program, we
20 estimate that merely waiting for the federal aid in that
21 particular program, which was delayed several years, cost
22 that program, i.e., the taxpayers, \$63 million of increased
23 costs, just because of the delay in the flow of the funds.

24 So, I think it is a very important issue, one we
25 need to think about carefully, one in which we need to

1 invite a broad specter of our community and a broad specter
2 of interest into the debate.

3 With that, I just want to repeat, I am glad you
4 are here and glad to have a chance to talk with you and I
5 would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

6 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Questions?

7 REPRESENTATIVE GAMBLE: No.

8 CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON: I do.

9 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Amos.

10 BY CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON:

11 Q. I was at a convention of national legislators
12 this last summer in Reno and one of -- they had two or
13 three people out of the federal government, out of DOT, and
14 we talked about money and there was a girl there -- you
15 probably know her, she has something to do with the
16 comptrollers and she has to pass the money out.

17 She says the amount of money is going to be slow
18 coming, plus there was a resolution put on the floor for
19 the Committee, was to cut out giving money to transit out
20 of the -- no, keep the one cent on gas tax, but take the
21 money away from the General Fund and there was another
22 fellow there and myself. I told them about out of the 12
23 million people there is about 8 million people in the SEPTA
24 and PAT movements, plus the one in Harrisburg and the other
25 ones, and I couldn't vote for that because them people had

1 to get back and forth to work and it was tabled. I don't
2 think it will see the light of day any more.

3 But that is what you people ought to be watching
4 for, because when the national legislature passed a
5 resolution, one of them that Joe and I put in for toll
6 roads came to pass this last year when they give \$35
7 million to the state to build the Monongahela thruway or
8 toll road.

9 I just want you to watch all animals coming in
10 at you. You are being cut from all sides, and the one
11 person that was for this resolution went to Toronto to see
12 their system and he said, well, in our system, I forget,
13 Virginia, he says they take buses out with nobody on them
14 and bring them back unloaded and he said they are wasting
15 my money and your money.

16 So they are all points to look at.

17 A. Right. I agree with you and I thank you for
18 the warning. We are very much aware of a lot of national
19 discussion that is going on. Certainly we are in a
20 presidential year and it will be interesting to see what
21 the presidential candidates feel about this type of
22 investment.

23 Q. Right now they will promise you anything.

24 A. No doubt about it. The current administration
25 in Washington has not been in favor of federal funding for

1 these types of projects to the same degree as other
2 administrations have.

3 BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:

4 Q. You know, the bottom line is unless we figure
5 out new ways of financing these plans, they are not going
6 to happen in this century.

7 A. Exactly.

8 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: That is really the
9 situation we face. I would like to recognize
10 Representative Michlovic. Do you have any questions?

11 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: No.

12 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thanks, Bill, for
13 testifying.

14 MR. MILLAR: Thank you very much.

15 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Your suggestions are
16 very helpful. We are going to take a minute break for the
17 stenographer.

18 (Thereupon, a recess was taken).

19 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Dr. Jack Freeman from
20 the University of Pittsburgh, Executive Vice President.

21 DR. FREEMAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. On
22 behalf of the largest employer in the most livable city in
23 America, we welcome you. We are delighted to have you
24 here.

25 I want to applaud the Committee's recognition of

1 the critical problems associated with the need for reliable
2 and affordable mass transit in Allegheny County. My
3 testimony today will focus on a particular project which is
4 of critical importance to the University of Pittsburgh and
5 those institutions located in that part of our city. I
6 will leave to others the opportunity to address the
7 technical issues associated with the enhancement of the
8 broader mass transportation system in the county.

9 We have provided you with written testimony on
10 the subject of the Spine Line, but I want to highlight
11 several key issues that I think are important.

12 We regard at the University of Pittsburgh the
13 Spine Line Project as the single most critical element in
14 the long-term growth of strategy in the City of Pittsburgh
15 and I want to go on record as strongly endorsing Mr.
16 Millar's comments in support of the Spine Line Project.
17 The price tag is admittedly high, about \$400 million, we
18 estimate, but we believe it is the most cost effective and
19 essential investment that one can make in the region's
20 economic future.

21 Oakland, as all of you know, is one of
22 Pittsburgh's unique comparative advantages. Few cities in
23 the world can boast the rich concentration of resources,
24 educational, research, medical support, cultural activities
25 and recreational activities in such a compact area that we

1 find in the city's Oakland section. The future of Oakland
2 and the future of Pittsburgh are intimately tied together.
3 It is important to relate the advanced research and
4 educational programs of the universities and hospitals in
5 Oakland to the long-term future development of
6 bio-engineering and bio-technology that we find present in
7 the Oakland section.

8 Yet Oakland is not easily accessible from any
9 other part of the city, with the possible exception of the
10 East Hills. It is important that we find a way to tie the
11 enormous growth potential and the resources of Oakland to
12 the Downtown section and from Downtown into the South Hills
13 and the North Hills and the Mon Valley, other areas of
14 important growth in the county.

15 Without improved access through mass transit,
16 the region cannot fully benefit from the enormous economic
17 resources that are present in Oakland, which is one of the
18 two or three most rapidly growing centers of economic
19 activity in the county.

20 Let me share with you some important economic
21 facts. The University of Pittsburgh is the largest
22 employer in Pittsburgh and after Westinghouse is the
23 largest non-governmental employer in the County of
24 Allegheny, with 8500 employees, 29,000 students. Last year
25 the University's expenditures exceeded \$450 million and

1 they are going to go over \$530 million in the current
2 year.

3 Pitt attracts about 217,000 visitors each year
4 to cultural, professional, educational and sporting events
5 in the area. Our health care division, MACD, itself
6 generates \$250 million a year in income from research and
7 patient care. If you apply to that contribution a
8 reasonable and even conservative multiplier, perhaps two
9 times, it is clear that the presence of the University of
10 Pittsburgh generates in excess of \$2 billion in economic
11 impact from Pitt and the related medical activities.

12 Other Oakland based institutions, colleges and
13 hospitals and private businesses probably bring the total
14 economic impact to perhaps \$4 billion annually. The new
15 construction associated with the university and its
16 affiliate hospitals now on the books and underway will
17 generate more than \$300 million in construction activities
18 translated into 6,000 construction jobs and when those
19 projects are completed, over 1,000 full-time permanent jobs
20 in Oakland.

21 Many public services in addition to mass transit
22 are needed, of course, to support this massive
23 infrastructure. In recognition of this, MACD and the
24 university have made voluntary commitments of over \$11
25 million over the next ten years to help support these

1 activities through a creative partnership with the city,
2 the hospitals, the university and city government.

3 To continue this extraordinary economic growth,
4 mass transit to link Oakland to the other centers of
5 economic growth in Allegheny County is absolutely vital.
6 The Spine Line is the key to that growth. Without it, the
7 future of Oakland and the future of the entire city will be
8 threatened. Other colleagues, George White and Ralph
9 Bangs, will speak to you in a moment about the critical
10 need also to improve transportation between Oakland and the
11 Mon Valley through actions to tie the Mon Valley into all
12 cultural and growth, economic growth centers in the city.

13 But we believe that the completion promptly of
14 the Spine Line is the key to growth not only in Pittsburgh,
15 but in the Oakland area as well.

16 So, we thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the
17 opportunity to present to you those thoughts on this vital
18 topic. I would be happy to answer any questions.

19 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thanks. Questions,
20 Tom?

21 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: I didn't realize that
22 this hearing was going to be -- turn into a promotion of
23 the Spine Line in the Pittsburgh area. I, for a long time
24 -- and I'm sorry I'm late and missed the earlier
25 presentations by Commissioner Hafer and particularly Bill

1 Millar -- but I, for a long time, have had real severe
2 reservations about that Spine Line and there is no reason
3 in the world that we need to build a tunnel, to dig a
4 tunnel underneath the Hill District to get traffic -- to
5 get people from Oakland to Pittsburgh five minutes faster.

6 The reason Pittsburgh -- Oakland is the third
7 largest generator of traffic in this city is because it has
8 the best damn transportation in the city. You can get from
9 Oakland to anywhere in ten minutes. Now, why are we
10 talking about spending a half billion dollars to put it
11 underground? It doesn't make any sense. It is outmoded
12 technology, too. We read in this week's Sunday paper about
13 the high speed rail and the cost of that rail. For crying
14 out loud, for the same price we could be putting a high
15 speed rail from the airport to the City of Pittsburgh.

16 What are we talking about the Spine Line for?
17 It's ridiculous.

18 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Do you have any other
19 questions?

20 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: No.

21 CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON: Do you have any more
22 speeches to make?

23 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: No. Thank you, Dr.
24 Freeman.

25 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Dr. Ralph Bangs and Dr.

1 George White from the University of Pittsburgh, Government
2 Research.

3 DR. BANGS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and
4 members of the Transportation Committee. At the University
5 Center for Social Urban Research at the University of
6 Pittsburgh, our work involves analysis of industrial,
7 demographic and labor force changes in southwestern
8 Pennsylvania. Earlier this year we produced a state of the
9 region report and soon we expect to begin a study for the
10 Allegheny County Department of Planning and other local
11 organizations on ways to link the unemployed to the growth
12 centers in the county. I have a one page handout which
13 will be submitted to this Committee summarizing this
14 proposed research and my remarks today represent some of
15 our current understandings about employment problems in
16 this region and how they relate to the concerns of this
17 Committee.

18 First, it is important to realize that
19 employment problems in Allegheny County have changed in a
20 fundamental way in recent years. Earlier in this decade,
21 the central problem was the general lack of jobs for the
22 number of people seeking employment. However, the problem
23 is no longer overall unemployment, since unemployment is at
24 about five percent, job growth is continuing, and many jobs
25 are available in various industries at different pay levels

1 and in different occupations. Rather the problem is the
2 inability of a diverse group of people to find employment
3 despite an abundant supply of jobs.

4 These people, who are not reflected in general
5 unemployment data, include the long-term unemployed, the
6 discouraged workers, employable welfare recipients,
7 part-time workers wanting full-time jobs and unemployed
8 dislocated workers.

9 Some are easy to employ in the sense that they
10 have at least a high school education, some skills and work
11 experience and are employable with present qualifications
12 or with some training. Others are unprepared for anything
13 but low paying jobs and need much education and training to
14 become prepared.

15 Whether the unemployed are skilled or unskilled,
16 easy to employ or difficult to employ, they face several
17 types of barriers to employment. For purposes of this
18 hearing, I will briefly describe barriers relating
19 specifically to the geographic mismatch between jobs and
20 people seeking jobs. Most new jobs and job openings appear
21 to be concentrated in a few growth centers as we heard,
22 such as near the Greater Pittsburgh Airport, in Oakland and
23 in Downtown Pittsburgh.

24 These areas, which have economic advantages
25 involving capital investment, transportation, positive

1 imagine and so on, are likely to generate jobs for many
2 years into the future. However, many of the people with
3 employment difficulties are located in other parts of the
4 county such as in the Mon Valley or in the inner city and
5 have difficulty accessing these jobs in growth centers.

6 Physical distance between residents and the
7 location of jobs is a problem if people lack public or
8 private transportation, are unable or unwilling to relocate
9 closer to the jobs, are unaware of the jobs in these other
10 areas or are not used to commuting to jobs. So there are a
11 variety of types of problems relating to the geographic
12 mismatch. These appear to be real problems for many people
13 in the county and perhaps in nearby counties and hopefully
14 our study will detail many more of these problems.

15 In particular, we want to know how many of the
16 unemployed -- and we think quite a few -- can be linked up
17 to the jobs in these growth centers, why they are not
18 accessing these jobs now and how we can use transportation
19 improvements and other types of services to help them
20 access these jobs.

21 Thank you for this chance to speak to the
22 Committee today and I would be happy to answer any
23 questions you have.

24 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Tom, Ron, Joe, any
25 questions?

1 **REPRESENTATIVE GAMBLE:** I am glad you didn't
2 mention the Spine Line.

3 **CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON:** He knew better.

4 **BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:**

5 **Q.** Doctor, just very quickly, do you have an
6 estimate, of the population of 2 million in Allegheny
7 County, how many people would fall into the unemployed or
8 under employed?

9 **A.** An estimate that we did earlier this year was
10 that 8 percent of the labor force, perhaps more than
11 100,000 people, have employment difficulties, and we are
12 not sure how many of those can be linked to the jobs that
13 exist now, how many have the necessary skills or education
14 to link up.

15 Others can be linked with more training and
16 education, so quite a few of the people we are talking
17 about.

18 **Q.** Do you have any idea of the number of
19 households in Allegheny County that don't have an
20 automobile and rely on public transportation?

21 **A.** Offhand, I don't.

22 **BY REPRESENTATIVE GAMBLE:**

23 **Q.** Were you here for Mr. Millar's presentation?

24 **A.** Yes.

25 **Q.** In your educated opinion would you think that a

1 direct line from Downtown Pittsburgh to the Greater
2 Pittsburgh International Airport, with all the known growth
3 that is going to be there, should have top priority over
4 some of these other projects that were on the drawing
5 board?

6 A. I am not a transportation expert and I can't
7 speak on that directly. I think general understanding is
8 that much of the growth in this county is occurring around
9 the airport, that is well established, and that the
10 transportation linkage between Downtown and the airport is
11 probably going to be inadequate to handle that growth.
12 That is just general understanding. I don't have any
13 particular expertise to answer that question.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you. Mr. Robert
15 Gleeson, Carnegie Mellon University. Do you want to
16 testify? I thought you were both together.

17 Dr. George White for the University of
18 Pittsburgh.

19 DR. WHITE: Good afternoon. I am delighted that
20 the Committee is here to listen to testimony. I am
21 delighted for the opportunity to testify myself.

22 It is absolutely appropriate for the legislature
23 of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to concern itself on
24 the issues of public transit for Pittsburgh, Allegheny
25 County and the Western Pennsylvania region for the pace and

1 nature of our economic and social redevelopment strongly
2 depend on our intelligence in reconfiguring the systems
3 which had been patterned for river bottom, heavy industry.
4 Our future competitive advantages, even for 21st century
5 manufacturing, require much different transit philosophies
6 and systems.

7 The physical assets for these advantages are
8 readily identifiable; Greater Pittsburgh International
9 Airport, the Golden Triangle corporate and governmental
10 center and the Oakland university and hospital research
11 complex.

12 The human assets for these advantages are the
13 responsible and diligent work force skilled in all
14 categories which is resident throughout the region. The
15 capital investment in structures has already been
16 committed. The \$500 million for the Midfield Terminal, the
17 250 million for the Oakland University and hospital medical
18 renaissance, the redevelopment of the J and L Steel Mill
19 site into the Pittsburgh Technology Center and the major
20 corporate investments in Golden Triangle buildings all bear
21 witness to this vision of the future.

22 However, the necessary commitments to the
23 transit system have not been made and could be costly. The
24 studies already underway on the Spine Line to link the
25 Triangle with Oakland and on the airport corridor to link

1 the new Midfield Terminal with its Pittsburgh heart, are
2 considering options with hundreds of millions of dollars of
3 capital costs.

4 As the legislature peers over the shoulder of
5 those studying our options, it is well advised to remember
6 that we must certainly bear three costs for the necessary
7 transit in our future; first, the cost of capitalizing the
8 systems; second, the cost of operating subsidies for the
9 systems and, third, the cost of penalties if we defer the
10 systems. No identifiable source exists currently for the
11 hundreds of millions of dollars necessary to capitalize
12 ideal systems. But with the provision of immediate
13 operating subsidies, the penalty involved in deferring
14 connection of Mon Valley, Oakland and the Golden Triangle
15 with Greater Pitt International Airport can be avoided.

16 The use of the former Pennsylvania Railroad main
17 line right-of-way via Penn Station to Sewickley with a
18 guaranteed connection by shuttle bus to the airport is
19 outlined in the attached paper, the title of which is Mon
20 Train to the Plane Now, dated May 27th, 1988.

21 Free of all capital costs except minor amounts
22 for station amenities, this service could be instituted by
23 the Port Authority before next summer. The guaranteed
24 train and bus connection would permit 34 minute Triangle
25 and 42 minute Oakland schedules, even at the height of rush

1 hour, regardless of the perpetual Fort Pitt and Parkway
2 West traffic jams.

3 Political leadership should rethink its position
4 on operating subsidies for the Port Authority. It is
5 absolutely certain that any airport transit, now or in the
6 future, and any Spine Line, now or in the future, will
7 require major operating subsidies. Our being unwilling to
8 cover such subsidy costs now is merely saying that we would
9 rather incur the penalties of deferral than meet the costs
10 of subsidy.

11 Now, the penalties of deferral that I care about
12 come in two categories. The first is distorted investment
13 now surrounding the new airport planning, because premiere
14 assets elsewhere in the county are relatively
15 inaccessible. That investment is not growth. I add
16 parenthetically when the David Lawrence Convention Center
17 has a light schedule, when the New Liberty Center Office
18 Tower is 30 percent occupied -- and several people know I
19 am responsible for converting the Gulf R and D Center to
20 the University of Pittsburgh Applied Research Center, we
21 are more than 60 percent re-occupied while the Downtown
22 Gulf skyscraper is empty. When those assets are idle and
23 you build a new office park near the airport because people
24 can't get through the Fort Pitt Tunnel, that does not
25 represent growth.

1 The longer the nature and timing of transit
2 links to Greater Pitt Airport are unclear, the deeper the
3 deferral penalty. I quote unedited from the current Port
4 Authority schedule for Route 21A, which is the Coraopolis
5 route and I quote, "The Airport Flyer designation is being
6 changed to Moon Township Flyer to avoid confusion with the
7 airport name, which is misleading to people trying to reach
8 Greater Pittsburgh International Airport".

9 In fact, it is not possible for employees or
10 travelers to reach Greater Pitt today by PAT at all, and
11 only those leaving by limousine from luxury hotels at \$8.00
12 fare can reach the airport by public conveyance.

13 Now, the second of my concerns is perhaps more
14 pointed. This is the penalty of deferral and how it
15 affects the Mon Valley. True, if one did a market survey
16 of airport, Triangle or Oakland travelers to ask how many
17 were en route to the valley, the statistics would say very
18 few. Gentlemen, that is not the answer, that is the
19 problem.

20 Rather than world class solutions available a
21 decade and a half billion dollars hence, we would be well
22 advised to replace the transit system we can't afford now.

23 REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: I have a couple
24 questions. You said some things in your testimony that
25 kind of light bells with me.

1 BY REPRESENTATIVE GEIST:

2 Q. First of all you make the assumption that no
3 transit system can pay for itself because you use the word
4 subsidy early and often.

5 Secondly, you make the assumption that
6 government, only government, should do it, the private
7 sector can't do it and, thirdly, you rule out technology as
8 a solution.

9 A. Could I take them in that order?

10 Q. Yes. I would appreciate it if you would.

11 A. The Port Authority is subsidized in all its
12 service. The most heavy subsidized per rider is the
13 current Mon Valley train that comes to what I will
14 characterize as a dead end terminus in the B & O terminal,
15 but even the bus riders require subsidy.

16 SEPTA, the same way. Throughout the United
17 States, the Metro in Washington, receives extraordinary
18 subsidies, the Bay Area Rapid Transit system in San
19 Francisco the same. Wise decisions by political leadership
20 such as yourself can decide how far the subsidies should
21 go, what costs should be borne by private enterprise and
22 what incentive should be there to make sure they do it
23 smartly. But without commitments by government at some or
24 many levels, there will be no urban mass transit in the
25 United States.

1 Strongly held opinion -- and the Record, as far
2 as I know in every major city in the country supports that
3 absolutely clear and has been for decades in Europe. It is
4 a hard call on that.

5 I would like to flip to the technology one. I
6 hope Professor Gleeson will speak about the possibilities
7 that the new magnetic levitation, technical possibilities,
8 could fit in Pittsburgh. It will be at least a decade of
9 successful research before they could have engineering
10 reality and they will require --

11 CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON: Absolutely not. I'm
12 sorry. I beg your pardon. This fellow -- nobody knows
13 more about it than he does, he eats it day and night. I
14 served with him on a Committee for high speed rail and he
15 is not stupid when it comes to that. I will take his
16 word.

17 DR. WHITE: Fine. One of the charms of a
18 university is we have as many opinions as we have people
19 and we maintain professional respect for each other. I
20 defer that there is a possibility on the technical side, if
21 the financial elements are in place, to put a demonstration
22 system up and running. They exist in Japan, they exist in
23 Germany, that is absolutely true. If we wanted to do that,
24 we could have that kind of a demonstration system operating
25 in the city within a year. I believe that experts at

1 Carnegie Mellon themselves are very careful to point out
2 how much research they would like to see done before they
3 were comfortable with the system they were recommending.

4 CHAIRMAN HUTCHINSON: That is for here.

5 DR. WHITE: Refresh my memory on the --

6 BY REPRESENTATIVE GEIST:

7 Q. Technology. You are embracing an area of
8 technology --

9 A. I am recommending that we run a train from
10 Elizabeth through Glassport to McKeesport to Braddock to
11 Oakland to Penn Station to Sewickley with an immediate link
12 connection to the airport that requires no major capital
13 investment at all, saving our money for the right system at
14 the right time and putting that system in operation this
15 year. I would be delighted, and I think many arguments
16 that I could advance to you, not in this hearing, that
17 Oakland itself, the Spine Line is dumb if we do it dumb and
18 smart if we do it smart, and the best chance to do it smart
19 is to sort out the magnetic levitation technology and see
20 how it fits in Oakland. Could I hold on that subject if
21 you want me to, but I defer to the Chairman.

22 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Are there other
23 questions?

24 REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: I have one more comment.
25 I have served with Tom Murphy for ten years in the House

1 and although he is of the wrong political party, he is a
2 good guy and ten years ago when we first started high speed
3 rail in Pennsylvania, Tom Murphy was one of the first guys
4 that was in line and has been very supportive.

5 When you talk about technology and where it is
6 in the rest of the world, I would like to suggest that you
7 take a look at Birmingham, England, where they tied the
8 airport, the train station and their Convention Center Expo
9 Center together. They have been running a mag lev feeder
10 system over there for the last five years with never a down
11 minute in time and it is a pretty unique little system that
12 works very, very well and if Pittsburgh is going to be the
13 advanced technology center of transportation, I would
14 strongly suggest that you and the academic world out there
15 start taking a look at the 20/20 report that just came out
16 that completely excludes rail technology in the future and
17 in the way they address the grid lock that is a great place
18 for the University of Pittsburgh, especially their
19 engineering school, to start, and also for Carnegie
20 Mellon.

21 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thanks, Rick. Tom.

22 BY REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC:

23 Q. George, I am curious as to how you are making
24 the connection to the airport from Downtown, when that
25 route started in the Mon Valley. You are going through the

1 B and O station?

2 A. The rail route that one would follow links
3 three different railroads, P and LE starting in the valley,
4 switching to B & O main line, which just runs in end to
5 end, and then going through Panther Hollow on the B & O and
6 then Amtrac, put in a connector between the B & O and the
7 old Pennsylvania Railroad behind the Iron City Brewery.
8 That is the route that the Capital Limited follows from
9 Chicago to Pittsburgh to Washington.

10 So behind the Iron City Brewery you switch from
11 the B & O to the old Pennsylvania Railroad to Penn Station
12 and right along the Ohio River to Sewickley where the bus
13 is waiting for the train to come, so you never miss the
14 bus.

15 The bus goes up Narrows Run Road four miles to
16 the airport, three stop lights and it takes you to the
17 airport. It's just about the equivalent of checking in a
18 rental car and getting in a van. It takes you to a gate.

19 There is no better rail link in Pittsburgh to go
20 from Pittsburgh to the airport than to start right here in
21 the Triangle and go there and just by good fortune for your
22 district, it happens to be the one that runs continuously
23 to the Mon Valley.

24 REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Just one quick --

25 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Tom has it.

1 BY REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC:

2 Q. You are coming in to the B & O?

3 A. No, through Panther Hollow and its not the
4 Spine Line, but it would help the museum, CMU and Pitt
5 substantially, we hope, to get, for example, an escalator
6 at the Forbes Avenue overpass to go to the rail route, so
7 we have a high speed connection from Mon Valley to Oakland
8 to the Triangle and the airport.

9 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you, George.

10 BY REPRESENTATIVE GEIST:

11 Q. What is the travel time by Light Rail?

12 A. The Light Rail we have right now is average
13 speed of 17 miles an hour. That is the speed over ground
14 of Bill Millar's extraordinary system. The heavy rail
15 would make substantial distances at 40 miles an hour.
16 Nothing like what we would profess to do for studies for
17 mag lev.

18 In fact, we at Pitt and the folks at CMU are
19 pursuing research which, as you know, is much faster.

20 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Robert Gleeson from
21 CMU? Steve Arcirill, Project Manager, Michael Zamagias
22 Development Corporation?

23 Karen LaFrance, Director, East Liberty
24 Development Corporation, Working Group on Community
25 Development of the City of Pittsburgh.

1 MS. LaFRANCE: Good afternoon. My name is Karen
2 LaFrance, Executive Director of East Liberty Development,
3 Inc. I am speaking on behalf of the Working Group on
4 Community Development, which is a consortium of
5 neighborhood groups in the City of Pittsburgh. The Working
6 Group has been evaluating the potential effects that the
7 new Midfield Terminal will have in the region and in the
8 neighborhoods that we work in and care deeply about. Many
9 of us have grave concerns about the health of the city in
10 general as we continue to lose population and jobs.

11 The Working Group has a deep conviction that the
12 health of Pittsburgh is intimately tied to and instrumental
13 in the economic health of this region. The Working Group
14 believes that the potential for growth around the airport
15 and around its major roadways is very real, can already be
16 observed, and is positive. But this region must avoid the
17 destructive effects of such growth. These have been seen
18 in other areas and can lead to increasingly isolated and
19 polarized societies segregated by income, race, age and
20 economic opportunities.

21 The Working Group calls for a new and
22 comprehensive vision which links, through public policies,
23 economic interest in the region to the more distressed
24 areas of the region such as the city, the Mon Valley and
25 other areas. This can be done, we believe, in four ways,

1 by doing four things: Setting up a tax base growth revenue
2 sharing program for the region so that all municipalities
3 share in the benefits of growth, no matter in what location
4 that growth takes place. Minneapolis and St. Paul have
5 such a system in place. Tax base sharing like this could
6 cut down on wasteful competition among the region's
7 municipalities for new companies and other developments.

8 Second, by developing a comprehensive master
9 land use plan with disposition controls on land use so that
10 the less desirable areas of the region are developed on a
11 parity basis with hot areas around the airport.

12 Third, by pledging a percentage of new tax
13 revenue from the airport corridor to an urban reinvestment
14 fund, which could be used for less marketable economic
15 development sites, for housing and for infrastructure
16 reinvestment around the region.

17 Finally, by pledging jobs at the airport and in
18 surrounding areas to residents of distressed areas of the
19 region with meaningful referral and recruitment systems and
20 real accessibility.

21 That brings me to the subject of your hearing
22 today. We recommend that the issues of jobs and access to
23 employment be tackled comprehensively. The first point,
24 with respect to the airport, we need to evaluate very
25 carefully any proposal for massive publicly funded capital

1 improvements which might serve a laudable goal of
2 increasing the access of disadvantaged people to jobs. The
3 answer may not be to throw all of our hopes into a 30 year
4 project that could be obsolete in its routing by the time
5 it is in place, or which could, like major road projects
6 have traditionally done, exacerbate the population and
7 business drain from urban areas. There must be careful
8 consideration of what such a project could mean in terms of
9 impact on existing urban areas.

10 Second point, rather than massive new projects,
11 the Working Group suggests that there be an investigation
12 of incremental low capital cost alternatives. For example,
13 use and upgrade as necessary the existing road systems in
14 the region, thus reinvesting in already built
15 infrastructure, use the existing buses, evaluate new travel
16 patterns and adjust bus routes accordingly. Make mass
17 transit work for the region.

18 Third, encourage employers, through public
19 policies, to provide shared transportation to and from
20 residential areas in the city and other less advantaged
21 areas to the jobs that may be in the -- around the
22 airport.

23 A requirement to hire persons from CDBG eligible
24 areas for any development receiving public subsidy could
25 provide a hefty incentive for employers to provide

1 transportation. Thank you.

2 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Tom, do you have
3 questions?

4 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Just a comment. I
5 think your suggestions are really right on the mark in
6 terms of requesting a comprehensive review of all the
7 impacts of the transportation. You know, it is a question
8 whether you're -- what you are doing to the communities
9 that are away from the airport, for example, if you put the
10 high speed rail out there, you are trying to generate jobs
11 in those communities, let's say in the Mon Valley or
12 wherever, and to set up an arrangement where the hot areas
13 at the airport would get less subsidy or something is
14 necessary. I think that is what we have to examine along
15 with the transportation routes in this whole plan.

16 And finally, the whole notion of getting the
17 best bang for your buck, without going on one particular
18 project or technology until you evaluate that against
19 several other kinds of transportation systems, it seems to
20 me to be the way we should evaluate it. Thank you.

21 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Ron.

22 BY REPRESENTATIVE GAMBLE:

23 Q. I think you missed the target totally. You say
24 that you want to set up a tax base growth revenue sharing
25 program for the region so that all municipalities share in

1 the benefits and then you want to pledge a percentage of
2 new tax revenue from the airport corridor.

3 Are you stating that, for example, Findlay,
4 North Fayette, Robinson, Moon, all of those areas that will
5 benefit by the airport expansion should share their taxes
6 with other areas of the county that aren't doing as well?

7 A. That's what I'm saying. I think you have to
8 look at the cost that those areas are going to bear as well
9 as the benefits and that the cost of growth can be fairly
10 hefty. People have already talked here about grid lock, we
11 are talking about the inability to fill jobs in the new
12 businesses that may be attracted to those townships. There
13 are costs that those areas are going to bear as well, and I
14 think that that ought to be shared across the region in a
15 more beneficial arrangement.

16 Not that those areas ought to just, you know,
17 give up what they have, but we all have costs and benefits
18 with respect to the airport.

19 Q. Those areas also will have a considerable
20 amount of expense just due to the expansion with increased
21 police protection and so forth.

22 It irks me, being that I am from that district,
23 and for many years the Mon Valley was the boom area of this
24 entire area, and while it was booming, people in my
25 district were driving on dirt roads and milking cows, and

1 now finally its our turn and everyone wants to share in
2 it. I think the way that the entire area shares in this is
3 by the jobs that will be produced out there. As far as
4 revenue sharing from local municipalities, I have been on
5 Record and certainly do oppose that. It is our turn in the
6 sun.

7 BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:

8 Q. Karen, let me just suggest what I hope might be
9 a middle ground with my colleagues and roommates here and
10 that is the thought if we created an urban reinvestment
11 fund that money be used, rather than sharing it with other
12 municipalities, in a more regional approach for mass
13 transportation to expand the mass transportation system.
14 How would you react to that? This, in effect, would be a
15 committed local source of revenue for the mass transit.

16 A. My sense is that the problem is bigger than
17 just getting people from one place to another to a job.
18 The problem has to do with housing patterns, has to do with
19 130 municipalities. It needs a bigger approach than merely
20 a transportation connection. I think there are issues
21 about job training, there are issues about education, all
22 of those things.

23 We are trying to put together a scheme that
24 makes sense for everything and maximizes the benefits of
25 the airport for the region and not just for that, you know,

1 that physical space that it occupies, and I think we have
2 to look comprehensively not only at issues like housing,
3 but also transportation, because in the future, we may live
4 all over this region and you have built some kind of rapid
5 transit link that doesn't link where people live any more,
6 and that is what we have to look at.

7 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you. Tom.

8 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Just one point on
9 that regional tax, it would also apply to those areas,
10 those poor areas that may have a new business develop
11 there, so those new businesses would also -- so everybody
12 would be sharing.

13 MS. LaFRANCE: Absolutely. Downtown Pittsburgh,
14 for example.

15 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Downtown Pittsburgh,
16 et cetera, right.

17 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thanks, Karen. Mr. Greg
18 Herndon.

19 MR. HERNDON: Thank you very much for your
20 indulgence. I am Greg Herndon, the Project Director for
21 the North Side Conference, Neighborhood Employment
22 Project. Our project evolved in September of 1987 on a
23 pilot basis. The City of Pittsburgh Department of
24 Personnel and the City Planning and the North Side
25 Conference and the North Side Civic Development Council

1 have implemented a neighborhood employment project on
2 Pittsburgh's North Side to link new businesses,
3 particularly in growth industries and major employers on
4 the North Side, with local residents through community
5 based organization.

6 The Neighborhood Employment Project is
7 implemented jointly by the North Side Civic Development
8 Council and the North Side Conference with assistance from
9 an advisory board. The Neighborhood Employment Project is
10 intended to compliment the ongoing economic development
11 activities on the North Side by providing more focused,
12 locally supported and locally controlled job placement
13 services. The local focus is more effective in reaching
14 out to eligible applicants and finding job opportunities
15 for them.

16 The Neighborhood Employment Project provides
17 customized services to North Side employers. Available
18 services include, but are not limited to, information about
19 job openings, assistance in employee recruitment,
20 interviewing and screening of applicants and development of
21 programs for on-the-job-training positions.

22 To date, the total number of unemployed North
23 Side residents who have used our service is 653. Further
24 analysis indicates that of this total, 112 are high school
25 dropouts, 90 have attained GEDs, 332 have high school

1 diplomas, 86 have acquired college credits and 33 are
2 college or university graduates.

3 Our project has placed 788 applicants and 36
4 employers have used our services to fill jobs. Needless to
5 say, a greater opportunity for employment for North Side
6 residents is extremely needed, particularly in the areas of
7 service and entry level type of jobs. In a recent study
8 prepared by S. K. Sweetes Associates entitled Economic
9 Development, Planning for Pittsburgh's North Side, it was
10 stated that incomes of area residents are clearly
11 concentrated in the lower end of the distribution, below
12 \$10,000.00 annual family income of 1970. This is
13 reflected, too, in 1970 median family income statistics,
14 about 7,500 per annual income rate, which is significantly
15 lower than the city median of 8,800 per annual rate.

16 The proportion of people receiving welfare or
17 public assistance, 14 percent, was much higher than city
18 wide, 9.4 percent, as was the percentage of families below
19 the poverty line, 15 percent versus 11 percent. The study
20 concluded that from the standpoint of the economic
21 development strategy, the most important features of the
22 North Side area revealed by the 1970 profile are the
23 following, low educational attainment, a significant youth
24 employment, education and training problem, a relatively
25 large number of female headed households, relatively high

1 percentages of the area's labor forces in blue collar and
2 service worker occupations, subject to high risk for
3 unemployment, under employment, layoffs, turnover and/or
4 low earnings, the possible problem of North Side workers
5 getting access to jobs, either occupationally or
6 geographically.

7 If job growth is in an industry, in occupational
8 areas out of reach of their experience or training or in
9 geographic areas hard to reach without an automobile, a
10 tendency of the area's labor force is to be relatively less
11 employed in the higher growth sections of the Pittsburgh
12 area economy, a significantly lesser tendency for the area
13 labor force to be engaged in the entrepreneurial pursuits
14 relative to the city as a whole, whose rate of
15 self-employment is significantly low, is itself low.

16 The North Side Conference on Neighborhood
17 Employment Project clearly recognizes the prodigious need
18 for North Side residents to be able to compete for jobs
19 which in many cases are being created outside of the North
20 Side region. The labor force of the North Side is in need
21 of service and entry level jobs, also many are without
22 means of transportation.

23 Therefore, on behalf of the residents of the
24 North Side, the North Side Employment Project urges the
25 development and implementation of a transportation system

1 so that jobs can be acquired in the airport vicinity.
2 Respectfully submitted, Gregory Herndon, Project Director.

3 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you. Tom?

4 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Nothing.

5 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: I would just simply say,
6 I think, Greg, what you outlined is a problem not only
7 unique to the North Side, but certainly many areas that Tom
8 Michlovic represents in the Mon Valley, the difficulty of
9 people getting access to jobs. I think your experience in
10 trying to locate jobs for people only underlies how hard it
11 is, particularly in areas where there has not been
12 significant job growth. Thank you very much.

13 MR. HERNDON: Thank you.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Mr. Russell York,
15 Project Manager, of The Buncher Company. Jack Polaritz,
16 Findlay Township Planning Board. This is Commissioner Ray
17 Chappell. Would you like to join him up here? Thank you
18 for coming to Pittsburgh.

19 MR. POLARITZ: A combination of circumstances
20 has produced a great opportunity for the metropolitan
21 Pittsburgh area to develop a valuable transportation
22 network one, which offers job opportunities to people
23 throughout the region, without relocating them from their
24 hometowns. It also allows creation of additional economic
25 base over and above that projected for the airport

1 facility. Thousands of jobs are being created with the new
2 Greater Pittsburgh International Airport located in Findlay
3 Township. Many additional jobs will be created by support
4 facilities being projected or constructed nearby, including
5 office, industrial parks and shopping centers. With this
6 blessing of economic development comes the real possibility
7 of a grid locked highway system in the western areas of
8 Allegheny County.

9 A recent study of the U. S. Route 22 corridor
10 done by Schneider Engineers for the Commonwealth of
11 Pennsylvania shows what the people traveling to Greater
12 Pittsburgh International Airport from Washington County are
13 likely to encounter. "The best word to describe the
14 problem is grid lock". It further states that "extensive
15 development is already underway at the interchange between
16 the Parkway West and U. S. Route 22 at both interchanges
17 along the Parkway West on either side of U. S. Route 22
18 interchange. Without an alternate route to the Midfield
19 Terminal, it may well take travelers longer to transverse
20 the interchanges than it will to travel from the study area
21 to the Parkway West".

22 Considering the potential catastrophic impact a
23 grid locked airport area road network could have on the
24 entire region, we would like to offer a two part solution
25 taken from the Township Comprehensive Plan developed by

1 Findlay.

2 Two cornerstones form the basis of the
3 Comprehensive plan. Item 1 includes construction of a
4 rapid transit line to connect with the Pittsburgh Subway.
5 Item 2 is the construction of a limited access highway
6 linking the airport with I-79 and potentially the Mon
7 Valley Expressway.

8 The transit route originates from two points,
9 including the airport on one leg and the Allegheny
10 County/Washington County and Findlay/North Fayette Township
11 boundaries on the second leg. Both join and follow the
12 abandoned Montour Railroad to the under utilized P and LE
13 right-of-way at Montour Junction. The proposed transit
14 route proceeds to Station Square and joins there with the
15 "T".

16 When the Spine and South Hills lines of the "T"
17 are completed -- sorry about that -- the airport route
18 allows residents of the North Side, Oakland, Hill District
19 and the South Hills a safe, low cost, traffic free, quick
20 commute to jobs. This enables the airport, nearby
21 industrial office parks and shopping centers to utilize a
22 large labor pool without dislocating workers.

23 Further growth projected for Washington County
24 will have some of the related traffic burden on Allegheny
25 County roads eased if people can access sporting events and

1 entertainment via rapid transit. Commuters from the Ohio
2 Valley and Washington County will now have access to
3 Pittsburgh without going into the traffic nightmare of the
4 Fort Pitt Tunnels.

5 By accessing Station Square, the proposed
6 airport route also enhances development possibilities for a
7 transit line following former Conrail tracks to Sheraden,
8 Ingram, Crafton, Carnegie and points south. Transit to
9 these areas will further alleviate some of the tremendous
10 traffic burden now put onto the Parkway West.

11 The second item of our overall plan has a
12 limited access highway constructed as both an extension and
13 replacement of current Pennsylvania Route 980. It is to be
14 constructed in phases and ultimately connecting
15 Pennsylvania Route 51 Moon Township with Interstate 79 in
16 Washington County.

17 Initial construction is from the southwest
18 expressway at Moon Clinton Road exit, just west of the new
19 airport terminal, to Route 22 at Champion. This phase
20 takes all of West Virginia, Ohio and Washington County out
21 of the Pittsburgh stream en route to Greater Pitt. It
22 takes pressure off a major bottleneck on the Parkway West,
23 between the 22/30 and Montour Exits. Local roads are freed
24 from carrying commuters between Washington County homes and
25 jobs at the airport.

1 Second phase construction sees Route 980
2 developed as an expressway to I-79 following abandoned
3 Montour Railroad right-of-way in Washington County. An
4 important result of this connection is that Parkway West
5 traffic is reduced by allowing direct access to the airport
6 from southern Allegheny County, central and eastern
7 Washington County, plus regions east and south of
8 Washington County. This highway, coupled with proposed
9 rapid transit, serves to substantially reduce traffic
10 volume on the Parkway West.

11 Growth, based on airport jobs, will be provided
12 for areas along this expressway. This road also serves as
13 a lightning rod to attract new industries and offices
14 throughout the western end of Allegheny County. It allows
15 controlled, orderly growth patterns to develop to the
16 benefit of both the business person and the
17 environmentalist.

18 Third phase construction has upgrading of
19 Flaugherty Run Road into a four lane highway allowing
20 further participation in economic benefits by Beaver
21 County.

22 If a proposed leg of the Mon Valley Expressway
23 is built from the Mon Valley to I-79, a tie-in with the new
24 Route 980 is a natural. It makes airport employment a
25 possibility for residents of the Mon Valley, as well as

1 creating a new market for their local businesses. A new
2 era opens up for Mon Valley residents, whereby they can
3 participate in the airport development without having to
4 relocate.

5 Our two part approach offers a sharing of the
6 airport pie by all residents of our great metropolitan
7 area. It is based on recycling a number of obsolete
8 entities, including railroads and strip mined land, turning
9 the useless into the usable. Producing the least
10 disturbance to the environment, while producing a maximum
11 benefit to the region's population is our goal. It is our
12 hope that you will see the merits of our plan and help
13 guide it to a positive result.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you. Tom,
15 questions?

16 BY REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC:

17 Q. On my map the red line that is supposed to
18 represent the 980 connection --

19 A. 279, correct.

20 Q. -- it doesn't follow the 980 route.

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q. It goes down to Canonsburg, right, from --

23 A. It would actually come in above Canonsburg.

24 The Montour Railroad abandoned right-of-way, on the very
25 last big fold out map -- which is why I put I-79 on that

1 for you -- but the abandoned right-of-way goes to a point
2 about a mile and a half north of the current exit of I-79,
3 the current Canonsburg exit.

4 Q. Okay. Where would it connect with the Mon
5 Valley Expressway?

6 A. I have been trying to get a plan, a preliminary
7 plan of one of the submissions, you know, on that Mon
8 Valley route, but there is a leg that comes from just below
9 McKeesport to I-79, approximately in that area. I don't
10 know whether it is called the blue route or green route or
11 whatever route. But there is one of the plans for the Mon
12 Valley Expressway does bring it up to Canonsburg.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. Very possibly following that Montour
15 right-of-way, is my understanding.

16 Q. Fine. Because a lot of discussion about the
17 "Mon Valley Expressway", it goes all the way down through
18 Fayette County and Westmoreland and Washington Counties and
19 oftentimes some of those connections are very much south,
20 so somebody coming from the Allegheny portion of the Mon
21 Valley, it would probably be faster for them to take the
22 existing Parkway. It would not be a benefit, but if you
23 are coming from McKeesport, that would certainly service
24 the residents in Allegheny County.

25 I have another question about -- just that whole

1 airport development.

2 A. Surely.

3 Q. With respect to the jobs and access question,
4 how do you expect to handle the growth in the, you know, in
5 your communities and is there any -- do you have any kind
6 of reason to believe that the development out there would
7 not benefit Beaver Valley or Beaver County residents more
8 than the residents in your neighborhood, in your town?

9 A. Could you phrase the question again because I
10 missed it.

11 Q. Well, I mean, we built the International
12 Airport by, you know, just by virtue of our space
13 limitations on the border of Allegheny County. It has been
14 Allegheny County that made the investment, it has been
15 Allegheny County that has taken the risk on the bonds. And
16 now we are faced with -- there is probably going to be very
17 rapid residential growth out that way. And I am wondering
18 if the Beaver County isn't going to benefit more than
19 Allegheny County, I mean, in terms of their residents
20 getting those jobs, their residents being in a better
21 position. They are certainly in a better position than
22 those folks in the Mon Valley that are out of work.

23 A. The initial phase that we propose on this 980
24 is a method of first of all channeling some of the growth
25 from the airport back into Allegheny County. The initial

1 4.5 miles runs through Findlay Township and what that does
2 is it expands -- most of that area has been strip mined out
3 there and offers little use under current plans.

4 If the 980 route would go in, it would allow a
5 tremendous amount of development in Findlay. Then with the
6 980 going down the Montour abandoned railroad corridor,
7 what that does is that starts along basically the boundry
8 of Washington and Allegheny Counties and what that would
9 allow to develop is South Fayette and North Fayette, as
10 well, because they have direct routes, the old 22, I
11 believe it -- what is it, Route 50 coming from Bridgeville
12 on in. All of these would have direct access to that
13 particular link.

14 So, therefore, you would go out north along the
15 northern edge of Washington County and the southern edge of
16 Allegheny County, where there is nothing right now.

17 Q. One of the problems we face in trying to do
18 something with the Mon Valley Expressway is that you are
19 going over peoples homes and properties and wouldn't that
20 be the same on Route 980?

21 A. No. That is not correct, because what it is,
22 is first of all the initial leg would be built either, A,
23 on county land, because the county owns up to Route 30; B,
24 over the Imperial Land Company's land, which is all strip
25 mined over land. There would be very, very minimal tearing

1 down homes, relocating, doing anything on the first phase.

2 The second phase, by following the Montour
3 right-of-way, the Montour right-of-way was a coal hauling
4 railroad. It sort of ran through the wilderness. There
5 has never been any major construction along it whatsoever.
6 So basically this was chosen for that very point. Land
7 acquisition costs would be very minimal and dislocation of
8 people would be minimal, at least to the I-79 connection.

9 Now, if you extend it and use the Montour
10 right-of-way beyond I-79 towards the Mon Valley, a lot of
11 that has been taken over by Peters Township and used as
12 hiking/biking path, so you are going to have to come up
13 with some sort of a substitute for them if you use that as
14 a basis for your extention from the Mon Valley Expressway
15 up. However, once again, you are going to be dislocating
16 very few people. Even though the railroad right-of-way
17 itself is not as wide as perhaps an expressway would be,
18 there is still nothing alongside of it, by and large.

19 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Ron?

20 REPRESENTATIVE GAMBLE: No.

21 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Just one quick
22 question.

23 BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:

24 Q. One of the problems that I am seeing is that we
25 are losing the abandoned right-of-ways. They are being

1 sold to private use. So one of your suggestions would be
2 for us, maybe in the short-term, to provide some funds to
3 acquire those.

4 A. Absolutely. Yes. We have been scrambling for
5 awhile to come up with funding to do that, capture that
6 right-of-way and hold onto it. What you have, currently
7 there is a shopping center going in, I believe it is in
8 Robinson Township, and they came down and they purchased
9 about two acres of that right-of-way. Now, it is going to
10 be ceded back to Moon Township, but it would be nothing
11 right now for somebody to come along, a developer, and
12 purchase a mile, half a mile or whatever and really styme
13 or make an immense profit turning around, selling that
14 thing back to governmental functions.

15 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you for coming
16 today. J. William Hemphill.

17 MR. POLARITZ: He is not here.

18 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Okay. David Toal
19 Baskin, Flaherty, Elliot & Mannino? I didn't see David
20 here. Is there a representative of Russell Rea Zapella?

21 Ms. Junia Campbell from CARE, Incorporated.

22 MS. CAMPBELL: Good afternoon. My name is Junia
23 Campbell. I am the Executive Director of Carnegie Area
24 Revitalization Effort, Incorporated, sometimes known as
25 CARE. I would like for you to consider in the evaluation

1 process the following: Some time ago I heard that the
2 Spine Line from Squirrel Hill to Downtown Pittsburgh was
3 the next major project for PAT in their expansion of a
4 rapid transit system. Later I heard that the Spine Line
5 was to extend under the Allegheny River to the North Side
6 near the Three Rivers Stadium. If this occurs, why stop at
7 the Three Rivers Stadium when there is a natural
8 right-of-way that is four and a half miles in length from
9 the Corliss Tunnel area on Carson Street to Parkway West
10 and Carnegie on the way to the Greater Pittsburgh Airport?

11 Much has already been said on the new expansion
12 of the airport, with the new terminal building and with the
13 thousands of jobs that will be created there. Now is the
14 time to put the cart before the horse and build the mass or
15 rapid transit system from Squirrel Hill all the way to the
16 airport.

17 Presently the Fort Pitt Tunnels have reached
18 their capacity and its a bottleneck. The four-and-a-half
19 mile right-of-way that I speak of, sometimes referred to as
20 the Corliss Roadway, circumvents the Fort Pitt Tunnel. A
21 mass and/or rapid transit system spanning over the Ohio
22 River, over a new bridge would have a straight shot, four
23 and a half miles long, continuous in length, with no
24 intersections. Three bridges and a tunnel already exist
25 onto this route through parts of the City of Pittsburgh,

1 the heart of Ingram and Crafton, again through a portion of
2 the City of Pittsburgh, across a major existing railroad
3 bridge, over Chartiers Creek to Rosslyn Farms and
4 Carnegie. Once Carnegie is reached, the high density
5 population area has been crossed and it is now clear
6 sailing to the airport.

7 I also understand that the new Southern
8 Expressway at the airport has a right-of-way for a rapid
9 transit system included in its plans that will carry a
10 system from the area of White Swan Park directly into the
11 new terminal building. The only remaining link would then
12 be from Carnegie to White Swan Park along Parkway West.
13 This should be the easiest link to solve.

14 I suggest that this group review thoroughly the
15 Southwest Regional Planning Commission study that is now
16 being undertaken, which includes this corridor to the
17 airport. Not only does this solve Squirrel Hill's
18 situation, but there is also an added bonus, people in the
19 South Hills and points southwest will have direct access to
20 the stadium, to Downtown Pittsburgh and the Oakland
21 universities and medical centers.

22 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you. Tom, do you
23 have questions?

24 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Less for the witness
25 than for you, has the Southwest Regional Planning

1 Commission discussed that plan with this Committee at all?

2 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: They are doing a study.
3 They have not, but the intention will be, after this public
4 hearing, is to sit down with them and begin to explore some
5 concrete options.

6 One of the problems I think, Miss Campbell, that
7 we raised earlier, is the right-of-way you are talking
8 about has been purchased by a private company, is my
9 understanding.

10 MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

11 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: That is one of the
12 urgencies of us trying to do something now.

13 MS. CAMPBELL: I know it is.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: The access that comes
15 right here to Station Square that Miss Campbell is talking
16 about is more than halfway to the airport through the most
17 difficult part. It was available to the public less than a
18 year ago and it was purchased by a private company because
19 we could not -- there was nobody to take any action or
20 money available.

21 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Okay. You are going
22 to have SPRPC come in?

23 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Yes.

24 REPRESENTATIVE GAMBLE: Thank you.

25 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you, Mrs.

1 Campbell. Peter Longine, Allegheny County Transit
2 Council.

3 MR. LONGINE: Thank you very much. I am Peter
4 Longine. I was to have been here with an associate of mine
5 to present a statement that was a reflection of the
6 membership of the Allegheny County Transit Council.

7 The Transit Council is a group of approximately
8 50 residents of this area who use the transit system and
9 who advise the Port Authority Board and staff on all
10 matters of policy from a rider's perspective. We are the
11 state mandated advisory board to the Port Authority. The
12 Council members have looked at the resolution and have --
13 and support it. We feel that the airport, the development
14 along the airport corridor is happening rapidly, that there
15 are many jobs being created, that the opportunity to
16 connect these jobs to the people in the area is important.

17 This is my associate John Robeson. John is the
18 Vice President of the Council. I am the President of the
19 Council. If you could see that the Committee gets that.

20 What I would like to do is simply summarize the
21 substance of that statement, which is that we support
22 development of transportation along the corridor linking
23 Downtown to the airport. At the same time, we are aware of
24 other priorities that the Port Authority and the various
25 planning bodies, including citizen groups, have supported

1 in this area, including the redevelopment of the LRT in the
2 South Hills, the Spine Line connecting Oakland or Squirrel
3 Hill to Downtown and the extension of the East Busway. We
4 feel that these priorities are also important and should be
5 reflected in the resolution that is adopted.

6 We feel that as important as the airport
7 corridor is, we do not feel that it should displace these
8 other priorities for which studies have already been funded
9 and which a considerable amount of work, including
10 testimony from a number of citizen groups, has already been
11 received. There are, however, things that we feel that you
12 as state legislators can do that would be of real help in
13 advancing not only the airport corridor, but the other
14 projects as well, and they include, through the
15 appropriations mechanism, the funding for the non-federal
16 part of the capital costs of these various transit
17 projects, funding for the maintenance of the transit
18 projects which have been built and providing the local
19 governments, the county governments with the authority to
20 generate the funds that they need for local funding and
21 local financing of transit projects.

22 We would like to see the airport corridor, a
23 development of the airport corridor added to the Port
24 Authority's agenda of important transit projects, because
25 as I say, we feel that we have a window of opportunity

1 which will not remain open indefinitely for building
2 something that will allow for intelligent development along
3 that corridor. However, we feel that new funding will be
4 required for that, we encourage you to work with your
5 colleagues to develop the non-federal part of such new
6 funding and we would certainly support you in that effort.

7 We also, since we prepared this statement,
8 became aware of the Carnegie Mellon proposal for the mag
9 lev project which we feel, although it is technically a
10 very exciting project, is also one that we feel the
11 decisions on what type of technology ought to be used
12 should follow rather than precede the decisions on what
13 sort of service ought to be provided, so we are not
14 particularly promoting that technology, but we are
15 promoting the process of participation in planning that
16 leads to sound decisions, sound technical decisions.

17 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you. Tom, do you
18 have any questions?

19 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Yes.

20 BY REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC:

21 Q. Mr. Longine, how much discussion, in your
22 group, takes place around the financial or economic
23 elements, the cost of these alternatives?

24 MR. LONGINE: John, would you answer that.

25 MR. ROBESON: As a matter of fact, we are having

1 a conference, a forum rather, on that very subject on --
2 later this month, on the 26th, on the 26th in this very
3 room called Transportation 20/20.

4 As you know, Representative Michlovic, the basic
5 federal legislation, the Highway Trust Fund Act, is
6 expiring in two years and there is a national discussion of
7 what legislation should take place. We are --

8 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: John --

9 MR. ROBESON: -- we are setting up a forum to
10 get peoples views on funding. On the state level, we have
11 had some discussion of the need for a dedicated tax or at
12 least more flexibility for the county to be able to
13 adequately support public transit.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: The reason I asked
15 that, you missed my comments, my outburst earlier. I am
16 very, at this point, very much opposed to the notion of a
17 Spine Line, because you spend all your money digging a
18 tunnel. The advantage of the mag lev concept as opposed to
19 the Spine Line is that it is above ground and it is much
20 less costly per mile to build and you can get more bang for
21 your bucks, and I think that is what we have to consider in
22 all of these transit discussions, is we are only going to
23 be able to do certain things with the money and we are
24 going to be paying for them for a long, long time and let's
25 make sure that they are the right decisions.

1 I think that, you know, transportation systems
2 across this country that have depended or extended
3 themselves underground, they are finding great difficulty
4 in paying those systems off, because they are just too
5 costly.

6 MR. ROBESON: I have been involved in the
7 transportation -- I have been involved in the process of
8 planning for an east/west mass transit line for 12 years or
9 so as a member of the Allegheny County Transit Council and
10 before that as a member of the Transportation Task Force
11 and the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Alliance and as a board
12 member of the Bellfield Area Citizens Association and of
13 the ODI Transportation Committee. The basic point here is
14 the need for an east/west commuter line serving -- relating
15 to Oakland as the locus of the two largest job sites in
16 Allegheny County, at this point, namely the University of
17 Pittsburgh and the University Health Center, as well as a
18 number of other sizable ones, and as you know, Oakland is
19 the third largest trip generator in the entire state, and I
20 am sure you have heard that.

21 Now, it isn't really a matter of -- in fact, the
22 current so-called Spine Line study involves a couple of
23 slightly different corridors, not all of which are
24 underground.

25 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: John, I don't think we

1 want to get into a debate of Spine Line.

2 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Right.

3 MR. ROBESON: The question is not mag lev versus
4 Spine Line.

5 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: We can't afford to pay
6 for any of them right now.

7 MR. ROBESON: Okay. It is not a question of mag
8 lev versus Spine Line. The question is participating in an
9 orderly planning process or disrupting everything and
10 starting over and maybe getting something in seven or eight
11 years.

12 The mag lev is very possible.

13 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Please. Do you have any
14 further questions?

15 REPRESENTATIVE MICHLOVIC: Just the comment that
16 if the corridor is, you know, above ground, it makes it a
17 lot cheaper and a lot more sense than putting it
18 underground.

19 MR. ROBESON: That could be done with several
20 different technologies.

21 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you. Any other
22 questions? Mr. Charles Rompala, Keystone Railroad
23 Association? Jack Robin, Chairman of the Allegheny County
24 Port Authority? Mr. Larry Kloss, Transit Local 85 will not
25 be here.

1 Are there any other people that came late that
2 were supposed to be testifying earlier? Let me just thank
3 all of you for staying. I hope this is just the beginning
4 for this region to begin to define as an important priority
5 mass transit. Obviously the key issue in all of this
6 before we decide where it goes or what kind of ride it will
7 be is how we pay for it. That is the key question. Its an
8 issue that the state has to begin to address because
9 clearly the federal government as a source of financing is
10 problematic. I believe that we will begin to do this later
11 this year and early next year in the session. I think Bill
12 Millar's suggestion of forming a financial task force state
13 wide to begin to look at innovative solutions is worthwhile
14 and my intention will be to proceed with that when we get
15 back.

16 Thank you for coming. The hearing is
17 adjourned.

18 (Thereupon, at 3:00 o'clock p.m., the Hearing
19 was adjourned).

20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Cathy R. Mull, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the proceedings are contained fully and accurately in the Record taken by me of the Hearing in the previously entitled matter, and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, this 19th day of October, 1988

Cathy R Mull

Cathy R. Mull, Notary Public
in and for the Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania

NOTARY SEAL
CATHY R. MULL, NOTARY PUBLIC
PITTSBURGH, ALLEGHENY COUNTY
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES APRIL 15, 1989
Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries