



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17101-1900

OFFICE OF  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

December 19, 2016

District Executives:

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) is committed to bettering our transportation system and our communities through collaborative planning. We must find creative solutions to sustain and expand mobility throughout the Commonwealth. This means improving our planning process to reflect changing demographics and technological innovation. We are broadening the benefits we deliver and taking a more holistic approach to planning. We are tasking PennDOT staff and our planning partners to consider community needs at the beginning of the planning process to ensure the best allocation of our resources. This new approach, *PennDOT Connects*, will make our planning processes more efficient and cost effective to the benefit of all Pennsylvanians.

### **Collaboration Requirements**

To formalize the *PennDOT Connects* policy into PennDOT's program development and project delivery procedures, collaboration meetings with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO), Rural Planning Organizations (RPO) and local governments must become a routine element of our process. Collaboration provides the opportunity for details unique to communities to be identified and discussed for each project in planning, prior to developing project scopes and cost estimates.

Specific areas to be discussed during collaboration include, but are not limited to:

- Safety issues/concerns
- Bicycle/pedestrian accommodations
- Transit/multimodal considerations
- Stormwater Management
- Presence of/impacts from (current/future) freight-generating land uses
- Utility issues
- Transportation operations considerations
- Emergency Services accommodations
- Planned development
- Long Range Transportation Plans
- Regional planning studies, e.g. corridor studies, resource management studies, watershed studies, etc.
- Consistency with current community comprehensive or other plans
- Consistency with current and/or proposed zoning

- Other proposed transportation improvements
- Impacts on the natural, cultural, or social environment
- Right-of-way considerations
- Anticipated public opinion
- Community or cultural events in the candidate project area
- Maintenance Agreement requirements

A common issue in many PennDOT projects is the lack of thorough collaboration with the community during project planning. Without early community input, crucial elements may not be included at the outset of project scoping. Identifying those elements later results in project delays and higher project costs. Our goal is to make every investment as safe and effective as it reasonably can be for every community, and improve efficiencies for the overall project delivery process. To further the goal of addressing community needs to the fullest extent practical, District Office staff, with support from the Center for Program Development and Management (Program Center), will meet with Planning Partner and local government planning staff as early as possible during project planning.

This new approach to planning will make the decision-making process for developing project scopes more transparent, allowing the opportunity for better planning at the local and regional levels. More transparency provides the opportunity for community input into our project scopes earlier in the process, providing better understanding of local contextual issues, and avoiding delays later in project delivery. More transparency can also serve to provide better information to local governments, allowing them to better plan other improvements in their communities. Providing more information for local governments can avoid conflicts with our transportation projects later in construction.

### **Planning Considerations**

Local government outreach should involve consideration of local planning objectives and community mobility needs, including, but not limited to, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, transit access, stormwater management, and green infrastructure. Planning partners and local governments must demonstrate the need to include community mobility and related objectives in project scopes. Ideally, decisions should be based, in-part, on comprehensive planning, corridor studies, resource management studies, multimodal studies or other related planning studies that demonstrate a need for community features.

If no documented planning is available, community features must be well thought-out and consistent with the current and future land uses within the community. If suggested community-related project features are well thought-out and justified, they should be incorporated into project scopes of work for consideration during project delivery.

## **Other Considerations**

It is important to note that it will not be possible to address all community features through our transportation program. There is no mandate to formally reach consensus on all issues related to community collaboration. However there is a mandate for PennDOT's due diligence to justify and document why decisions are made, either to include or not include recommended community features on projects. If the issues discussed during local government collaboration are not justified based on a lack of adequate planning documentation, unacceptable impacts to environmental resources, excessive right-of way impacts, lack of willingness to maintain by local government, or other issues related to impacts or excessive cost, justification must be included in the Project Initiation Form, discussed under Documentation Requirements, below.

Cost will always be a factor in transportation planning, but it will no longer be a justification not to include elements in a project without some level of cost analysis compared to the potential community benefits. The *PennDOT Connects* process will ensure cost/benefit reviews of every unique addition to a project. Issues that could impact our ability to cost effectively address community needs include, but are not limited to, excessive utility relocations, excessive right-of-way requirements, excessive environmental impacts, excessive impacts to underground drainage facilities, excessive stormwater management requirements, and the need to construct or relocate retaining walls or other structures. PennDOT staff will strive to plan projects that improve economic competitiveness, access to work, and overall quality of life.

PennDOT leadership recognizes that emergency projects must be delivered under very short time constraints to restore essential services to the public. *PennDOT Connects* is not applicable to projects declared to be emergencies by the President, Governor, or the Secretary of Transportation or my designee for PennDOT emergencies.

## **Implementation Timeframe**

The *PennDOT Connects* process will be applied to projects on the 2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Collaborative meetings will be required for all projects that had no project phase included on a prior TIP, as well as for all other TIP projects that have not started Preliminary Engineering or started Preliminary Engineering after July 1, 2016.

## **Documentation Requirements**

Until the current screening forms are updated, the enclosed Attachment 1, *PennDOT Connects* Project Initiation Form, shall be used to document community needs in planning before projects are programmed on a TIP. These forms shall be attached to the screening form. The Project Initiation Form includes signature blocks for the PennDOT Engineering District, Program Center, and MPO/RPO.

## **Future Direction**

Local government collaboration meetings must occur before new projects are added to future TIPs, and are strongly encouraged for projects added to Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) updates. If local collaboration for *PennDOT Connects* does not occur during the collaboration process prior to LRTP or TIP updates, the meeting must be conducted prior to adding a new project during the TIP update process. The objective is to fully consider community features for future projects in planning before projects are programmed on a TIP.

## **Quality Assurance**

As a component of their role in supporting MPOs/RPOs and District Offices during the LRTP update, TIP update, and TIP revision processes, Program Center Program Managers will provide quality assurance throughout the planning and program development process, with a specific focus on MPO/RPO and local government collaboration to meet the objectives of *PennDOT Connects*. District Office personnel must notify Program Center staff in advance of *PennDOT Connects* meetings with local governments. Program Center staff will participate in *PennDOT Connects* meetings, as appropriate, and are responsible for ensuring that *PennDOT Connects* meetings are occurring on all new projects, as outlined in the policy.

## **Ongoing Collaboration**

Decisions reached on community features during planning must be communicated to the local government. As the District Office will manage the future project, the District is ultimately responsible for informing the municipality of the decision to consider identified community features through future project phases. The District Office and Planning Partner may agree on an alternative approach for communicating decisions to local governments, so long as the decision is clearly communicated.

Collaboration with local government staff must also occur during project delivery. In addition to collaboration during the process prior to TIP approval, MPO/RPO and local government staff must be invited to participate in Environmental and Engineering Scoping Field Views once a project moves into preliminary engineering. Local government collaboration must consider comprehensive planning, other planning products, community mobility needs, and related community features. The community features identified during planning must be reviewed and refined at the Scoping Field View.

## **Ongoing Documentation**

Local community features identified and accepted in planning or early in preliminary engineering must be documented in a scoping document in the Categorical Exclusion Expert System. The removal of previously identified community features from the scope of work during the scoping process must be properly justified and

documented as part of the scoping field view minutes and recorded on the "results" form of a scoping document. The ADE-Design, or their designee will be responsible for ensuring that decisions related to *PennDOT Connects* are properly documented during project scoping, including consideration of local maintenance responsibilities.

### **Local Government Outreach**

Another key component of *PennDOT Connects* is local government training. The Planning Deputate is developing a training strategy to raise awareness and understanding of *PennDOT Connects*, its value, and the basic framework for a partnership approach going forward for local government employees. This includes a review of the responsibilities of District Offices, Central Office, Planning Partners, and local governments. The training is also intended to manage the expectations of local governments, and encourage planning at the local level today to support opportunities for better projects in the future.

### **Central Office Executive Collaboration**

To allow the Executive-level management staff to collaborate with the Districts on the implementation of *PennDOT Connects*, Program Center staff will schedule meetings with each District to discuss all new TIP projects that have proceeded with the *PennDOT Connects* policy to share experiences, and learn from best practices. Districts will work with the Program Center to create an agenda for these meetings. New TIP projects must be presented and reviewed by Executive staff before proceeding through preliminary engineering. Completed *PennDOT Connects* Project Initiation Forms provide the documentation for these meetings. Issues to be addressed in these meetings shall include:

- An overview of community collaboration outcomes with a summary of community features incorporated into each project
- Individuals in each District and Planning Region who participated in the collaboration process, as well as a summary of local government staff who responded to requests for collaboration
- Examples of how local government input influenced the scope of projects
- Challenges experienced during the collaboration process
- Recommendations to improve future collaboration
- Any issues that cannot be resolved through collaboration among the District Office, Planning Partner, and the Program Center Program Manager

MPO/RPO staff may be invited to participate in the *PennDOT Connects* management meetings. These meetings will be Chaired by the Secretary or her designee and conducted bi-monthly, or as needed to meet project delivery schedules.

## In Conclusion

The *PennDOT Connects* policy for program development and project delivery may require additional time and financial resources in the planning and early preliminary engineering phases. However, the benefits that community features such as sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit accessibility can provide in terms of improving economic competitiveness, access to work, and quality of life, as well as the potential to avoid delays later in project delivery, can far outweigh the additional resource requirements. If District or MPO/RPO staff require additional human resource support to conduct the above activities in the Planning Phase, the Program Center has Open End Agreements available for meeting or field view coordination, meeting documentation, and support for the screening process.

I look forward to working with you on the successful implementation of this important collaborative planning process on PennDOT projects. If you have any additional questions regarding *PennDOT Connects* policy on enhanced community collaboration, please contact Brian Hare, P.E., at [bhare@pa.gov](mailto:bhare@pa.gov) or 717.783.9359.

Sincerely,



Leslie S. Richards  
Secretary of Transportation

Enclosure

cc: Leo Bagley, Office of the Secretary  
James Ritzman, P.E., Deputy Secretary for Planning  
George McAuley, Jr., P.E., Deputy Secretary for Highway Administration  
Toby Fauver, FAICP, Deputy Secretary for Multimodal  
William Cressler, Esq., Office of Chief Counsel  
Roger Cohen, Director, Policy Office  
Larry Shifflet, Director, Center for Program Development and  
Management  
MPO/RPO Executive Directors  
MPO/RPO Assistant Directors  
MPO/RPO Transportation Planning Directors  
Renee Sigel, Federal Highway Association  
Keith Lynch, Federal Highway Association  
Matt Smoker, Federal Highway Association  
Richard Roman, P.E., Director, Bureau of Maintenance and Operations  
Angela Watson, AICP, Office of the Deputy Secretary for Multimodal  
Melissa Batula, P.E., Bureau of Project Delivery  
Glenn Rowe, P.E., Bureau of Maintenance and Operations

District Executives  
Page 7  
December 19, 2016

cc cont'd:

Christine Spangler, P.E., Bureau of Project Delivery  
ADEs-Design

District Planning and Program Managers

James Arey, Center for Program Development and Management

Mark Tobin, Center for Program Development and Management

Brian Hare, P.E., Center for Program Development and Management

District Executives  
Page 8  
December 19, 2016

LSR/JDR/kah

S:\Planning\PennDOT Connects FINAL Draft V16 12-12-16.docx

bcc: Edna Weaver, Office of the Secretary  
Ellen Sweeney, Center for Program Development and Management  
Karen Heath, Office of the Deputy Secretary for Planning



## PennDOT Connects Project Initiation Form

**Meeting Date** \_\_\_\_\_

This form should be completed in conjunction with the proposal screening process. Upon completion, this form should be attached to the screening form. This form is meant to expand on and enhance the information provided in the screening form and to document coordination with local planners.

*Project Name:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Project Location:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Project Purpose:*

---

---

---

*Project Need:*

---

---

---

---

*Short Project Description and Scope:*

---

---

---

---

Every transportation project should begin its life as a project that improves safety, mobility, and accessibility for all users: drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit passengers, freight carriers, and area residents and businesses. Early scoping should ensure that the design and development process clearly documents considerations that meet as many objectives as reasonably possible, including maintenance considerations. If the decision is made to not include specific considerations in the project scope, those decisions should be documented, as well. The following sections document various considerations related to these objectives. Supportive web maps are available as a resource for those completing this form on [MPMS IQ](#).

**Pedestrians**

Dedicated pedestrian facilities should be evaluated for all highway projects. Depending on the project's context, these may include elements like a multiuse trail, sidewalk, and crosswalks with supportive elements like flashing beacons. In rural areas, a wider shoulder can serve as a very basic pedestrian path.

1.	<p><b>Pedestrian facilities to be considered:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Shared roadway/wide shoulder</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalks</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Crosswalks</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian Signalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Multi-use trail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional element(s): _____</p> <p>Notes: _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p><b>Pedestrian facilities will NOT be accommodated because (at least one):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Location is greater than .25 mile from any existing pedestrian facility or public transit stop, and is not recommended for a pedestrian connection in any local, county, or regional plan.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Location has unique site constraints, such as steep slopes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Safer pedestrian accommodations would drastically increase the overall anticipated project cost (in such cases, consider opportunities to ensure future pedestrian accommodations are not precluded by the design).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional reasons(s) and notes:</p>
----	--	--

**Bicyclists**

Bicycle mobility should be evaluated for all highway projects. Depending on the project's context, improvements may include elements like a multiuse trail, protected bicycle lane, striped bicycle lane (standard or buffered), sharrows, and supportive elements like dashed pavement markings in conflict areas and bicycle detection at traffic signals. In rural areas, a marked shoulder can serve as a very basic bicycle connection, provided it is supplemented with pavement markings in conflict areas as necessary.

2.	<p><b>Bicycle facilities to be considered:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Multi-use trail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Protected bike lane</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Striped bike lane (buffered or standard)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Marked shoulder with supplemental pavement markings</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Share the Road Signage</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional element(s): _____</p> <p>Notes: _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p><b>Bicycle facilities will NOT be accommodated because (at least one):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Location is greater than 0.5 mile from any existing bicycle facility or public transit stop, and is not recommended for a bicycle connection in any local, county, regional, or state plan.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Location has unique site constraints, such as steep slopes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Safer bicycle accommodations would drastically increase the overall anticipated project cost (in such cases, consider opportunities to ensure future bicycle accommodations are not precluded by the design).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional reasons(s) and notes:</p>
----	--	--

**Public Transit**

Public transit needs should be evaluated for all highway projects. Depending on the project's context and the nature of area transit service (if any), these may include elements like improved bus stops, sidewalks or other pedestrian ways (see 1.) providing access to stops and stations, transit curb extensions, bus pullouts that are long enough for efficient transit operations, signal schemes that accommodate transit preferentially, or other elements.

3.	<p><b>Public transit improvements to be considered:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improved bus stops</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalks or pedestrianways providing access to stops or stations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transit curb extensions or bus pullouts</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other transit-preferential elements, including signal treatments</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional element(s): _____</p> <p>Notes: _____                  _____                  _____                  _____</p>	<p><b>Public transit improvements will NOT be accommodated because (at least one):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Location is not served by any public transit routes and no new service is identified in any public transit agency plans.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Location has unique site constraints, such as steep slopes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improved public transit accommodations would drastically increase the overall anticipated project cost (in such cases, consider opportunities to ensure future public transit improvements are not precluded by the design).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional reasons(s) and notes:</p>
----	---	---

**TSMO & ITS Enhancements**

Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Enhancements should be evaluated for all highway projects. Depending on the project's context and the nature of the needs (if any), this category would include elements necessary to mitigate these issues. For example, there are a wide variety of solutions to address congestion including traffic signal improvements, traffic incident management, active traffic management, and integrated corridor management.

4.	<p><b>TSMO and ITS Enhancements to be considered:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There are multiple types of emergency vehicles responding on this roadway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is a future vision/plan of transportation operations and ITS enhancements on this roadway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This roadway is designated as an official detour route for a Limited Access facility, or is the nearest parallel route to a principal arterial or transit corridor</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Traffic signals on this roadway are connected, or enhancements to connectivity are being considered</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional element(s): _____</p> <p>Notes: _____                  _____                  _____</p>	<p><b>TSMO and ITS Enhancements will NOT be accommodated because (at least one):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Congestion is currently not an issue within the project's limits or adjacent to its limits</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No opportunities currently exist to improve traffic signal operations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No opportunities currently exist to connect fiber to PennDOT's TMC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improved accommodations would drastically increase the overall anticipated project cost (in such cases, consider opportunities to ensure TSMO and ITS Enhancements are not precluded by the design)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional reasons(s) and notes:</p>
----	---	---

**Freight/Economic Activity/ Manufacturing (Trucking, Rail, Ports, Pipeline)**

Freight transportation needs such as those arising from truck operations should be evaluated for all highway projects. Depending on the project's context and the nature of area freight generators and operations, these may include considerations like vertical clearances, bridge weight allowances, pavement design, turning radii, intersection geometry, signage, pavement markings, highway-railroad grade crossings, designated pull/off waiting areas, alternate access, and traffic control devices.

5.	<p><b>Freight considerations:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Freight operators currently use this roadway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There are existing freight generators adjacent to this facility</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This project is a designated NHS intermodal freight connector and/or serves a concentration of freight generators like industrial parks.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is a future vision/plan for freight operations on this transportation facility</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional element(s): _____</p> <p>Notes: _____                  _____                  _____</p>	<p><b>Freight improvements will NOT be accommodated because (at least one):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Location is currently not used by any freight operators, there are no significant adjacent freight facilities, and no new operations are identified in any development or freight plans.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improved freight accommodations would drastically increase the overall anticipated project cost (in such cases, consider opportunities to ensure future freight improvements are not precluded by the design)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improved freight accommodations would pose significant conflict with other modes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional reasons(s) and notes:</p>
----	---	---

**Stormwater and Green Infrastructure**

Many stormwater retention and infiltration options are available to address flooding and drainage issues within the limits of a project. These may include elements like rain gardens, vegetated bioretention areas (retention basins), vegetated swales, vegetated infiltration gardens, storm water tree trenches, permeable pavements, etc.

6.	<p><b>Stormwater and Green Infrastructure to be considered (including appropriate maintenance agreements):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Rain garden</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation bioretention areas</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Vegetated swales</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Vegetated infiltration gardens</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate stormwater elements to be determined. Determination on specific elements to be made during project design</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional element(s): _____</p> <p>Notes: _____                  _____                  _____</p>	<p><b>Stormwater and Green Infrastructure will NOT be accommodated because (at least one):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater is currently not an issue within the project's limits or adjacent to its limits.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improved accommodations would drastically increase the overall anticipated project cost (in such cases, consider opportunities to ensure other improvements are not precluded by the design).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater problems are the result of previous development with inadequate or no stormwater control. The developer/municipality have been made aware of this issue.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional reasons(s) and notes:</p>
----	---	---

<p><b>Other (Utilities, Health, Community/Cultural Events, etc.)</b>                  Other needs should be evaluated for all highway projects. Depending on the project's context and the nature of the needs (if any), this category would include elements necessary to mitigate these issues. Utilities may be present in the area of a proposed project and there may be opportunities to incorporate them into the project or the need to move them to a new location. There may be opportunities for a project to improve public health through transportation by increasing physical activity, decreasing air and noise pollution, and increasing access to goods and services that support public health.</p>		
7.	<p><b>Other improvements to be considered and maintenance considerations have been made:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Utility Relocation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Public Health Improvements (increasing physical activity, decreasing air and noise pollution, increasing access to good and services that support public health)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Timing of Community/Cultural Events will be considering during construction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional element(s): _____</p> <p>Notes: _____                  _____                  _____                  _____</p>	<p><b>Other improvements will NOT be accommodated because (at least one):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Utilities are currently not an issue within the project's limits or adjacent to its limits.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No opportunities currently exist to improve healthy living within the project's limits or adjacent to its limits.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improved accommodations would drastically increase the overall anticipated project cost (in such cases, consider opportunities to ensure other improvements are not precluded by the design).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No Community/Cultural Events currently take place within the project's limits and no known events are planned for the future.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional reasons(s) and notes:</p>
<p><b>Public Controversy</b>                  Anticipated substantial public controversy surrounding the project should be considered. Examples of reasons for public controversy include residential and commercial displacements, long detour routes, long construction times, and impacts to environmental, historic or community resources. Identifying potential public controversy early allows for the identification of increased public involvement measures during project scoping.</p>		
8.	<p><b>Public controversy is anticipated because:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Likely residential and/or commercial displacements</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Long detour route/long construction time</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Business impacts</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Impacts to environmental, historic or community resources</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p> <p>Notes: _____                  _____</p>	<p><b>Public controversy is NOT anticipated (at least one):</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Construction impacts will be minimal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No/minimal detour involved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No/minimal displacements</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional reasons(s) and notes:</p>

<b>Source/References</b>		
Please list any source or reference documentation used in completing this form, along with any organizations or individuals that were consulted during the project analysis process. Include websites, studies, concept plans, etc. that were used to support the information on this form. Specifically identify any existing plans that include the project or the recommended additions to the project.		
9.	<b>Sources/References Consulted:</b>	<b>Organizations/Individuals Consulted:</b>
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

**Completed By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewed By MPO:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewed By PennDOT District:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewed By PennDOT Program Center:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_