



PROJECT PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of the I-83/ PA 581 Interchange Safety Project is to mitigate the safety issues caused by the congestion through the interchange. There are a substantial number of rear-end crashes resulting from abrupt lane changes and braking episodes. Over the last five reporting years, the accident rate on northbound I-83 between Reeser's Summit and the York Split has varied between 4 to 10 times the statewide rates for divided expressways. PennDOT's Road Condition Reporting System (RCRS) and other sources indicate that the non-reportable crash rate may be 2 to 4 times higher than the reportable rate.

This project is not the ultimate solution that was identified in the December 2003 I-83 Master Plan, which will address all existing design and noise challenges. The intent of the I-83/ PA 581 Interchange Safety Project is to mitigate the most significant, but not all, features which contribute to congestion and related safety concerns of the existing interchange. This project will provide a second I-83 north lane between the New Cumberland Interchange and the John Harris Bridge and overlay with bituminous (black) pavement. It will include retaining walls along the east and west sides of I-83 south of Lowther Street, along with 50 inch concrete barrier in lieu of guide rail. The project also eliminates or restricts access to existing ramps to reduce congestion causing weave conditions.

APRIL 13, 2011 PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

**Written comments have been modified only to remove individual's names and/ or addresses and split apart in order to group them by category. Otherwise, they are word for word as received by public.*

NOISE CONCERNS/ COMMENTS

1. Need Sound Barriers (Dirt Mounts) Behind Lowther Street 500 Block to 900 Block.
2. PennDOT needs to consider sound barriers. Interstate traffic is on two sides of N.C. and Lemoyne; 83N before the left to Hbg. And 83N along Lemoyne Park. There should have been barriers originally but the road was cheaped out to include one lane serving as both 83N and as off ramp for 581E
3. Jake braking at N.C. ramp to Sherwood Park
4. Universal question – Sound barriers

5. I came to address my concerns about a sound barrier. I live by the New Cumberland on-ramp to 83N and would like sound barriers to be included in this project. There are many houses very close to the highway, and the noise and traffic levels are constantly increasing. Many people have this same concern. If there is no way for sound barriers to be included in this project, please let me know how that type of project would be taken into consideration
6. All of the comments concerning noise (walls, truck engine brakes) deserve to be addressed as creatively as possible. We need to involve FHWA in looking for waivers or other novel interpretations of the regulations to address these issues.
7. Also, the increased noise levels due to increased traffic volume.
8. I can see where this plan improves safety, but makes noise worse. Please replace any trees you take down and add more to abate noise.
9. Sound/ safety wall needed!!!! PLEASE TALK TO ME
10. Sound barriers*-When my family built this house none of this was here. I hear J-brakes of trucks, my windows rattle from the traffic now; you increase speed and its going to be worse, traffic.
11. Please look at increase traffic and noise on Lowther with changes.
12. Please consider safety/ sound barrier for 10th and Lowther Streets. Thx.
13. With the noise level as high as it is along 83 to not put sound barriers up is not acceptable. Signs should have been put up a long time ago to stop trucks from using jake brakes in this area. I would appreciate a response to this. Thank you.
14. Is it possible to go back to feds for sound barriers?
15. On the I-83 North portion along the Sherwood Park sound barriers should be installed. Just recently 581 had 1 lane installed and sound barriers were installed. Now we are going to install 3 lanes and no sound barriers?
16. When we moved here there were trees blocking view of 83 along left side of ramp, like a small forest with brush, now, all we see is trash and traffic also, cars park along our fence now that they widened the right side of the ramp. Soil receding along the fence, so we would like to see a retention wall along our house, right side of ramp. Noise wall would be even better, will provide security and less litter in yards. Trees were also removed on our side along fence, which blocked a lot of sound. Since the 83/581 split is right beside us, truckers use their "Jake" brake the whole way through here!!! Cars turning and going up the ramp squeal tires and push on gas!! Intersection cars beeping. Not to mention how our windows are and they "rattle" constantly. There is a bump on the bridge, when trucks hit it, it sounds like a bomb.

A traffic sound barrier type wall would be nice because of the “Jake braking” and “bump” and our old windows!! But it would probably be appreciated by the whole neighborhood! Put it from our house the whole way up to the split or more. 20’ high or more like the ones on 581. Could go the whole way around our nice parks!! Build a wall....please?! Would also stop littering over our fence.

17. I am appalled that PennDOT could really think that it is ok to bring our homes 15 feet closer to a major expressway and then say a sound barrier is unnecessary. When is it necessary? Sherwood Road residents have had the experience of a car landing in their yard. There are children who will be playing in a yard that is both dangerous and toxic. My mother, who has lived at this address for more than 40 years, is soon ready for a retirement home, which now has become much less affordable, as you devalued her home sale. The present economy was already a challenge for a home sale. Thanks to your ridiculous solution to a 40 year old problem, getting a fair price for her property is now virtually impossible. Thanks for nothing.
18. I can not believe a sound barrier is not in the highway reconstruction. I can not have my windows open in good weather and watch television because the noise from Rt. 83 North is so loud from the cars, trucks and motorcycles I can not hear the television. (My hearing is not impaired.) The trucks use their Jake brakes (should have a brake retard area from Cumberland County line to Dauphin County line). Motorcycles are just plain loud, sports cars speed up on ramp off Simpson Ferry Road and you can hear them changing gears all the way on 83 to the rumble strips. A sound barrier would greatly improve living near Rt. 83 North. A sound barrier wall would show me that my tax dollars are working for me not just to benefit traffic conditions which also need improved. Thanks for a chance to voice my opinion and concerns.
19. I was rather amused with your presenter explaining all the wonderful things this project will accomplish. I was not amused with PennDOT’s decision not to provide some noise relief for people in this area.—THIS IS DESPICABLE – A sound barrier along the ramp at 16th Street extending to the “gated emergency access” would greatly improve the quality of life for people living in my area. Sound barriers have been erected elsewhere. I expect my fuel tax money and vehicle fees to be used for my benefit, not to subsidize commuters in Philadelphia
20. As your presenter suggested, I shall contact my elected officials with my comments and complaints; both state and federal. Perhaps those people will be more receptive to peoples concerns
21. Look at adding vegetation on existing ramps that will be removed.
22. Sound walls along Sherwood.
23. Noise barriers – Master Plan would have had these, why not required for this project.

24. Concern about explosion being used during construction for sound and damage to homes.
25. Noise walls/ safety barriers – will retaining walls serve safety and sound? How high? If taking trees, will take away some noise protection.
26. Just because sound barriers are not required for this type of project, will they be considered? How much would they be?
27. If 83 carries 2 times as much traffic, why does 581 get sound barriers?
28. Not including sound barriers seems a bit strange. Looking at nearly all other sections of 581 between US 15 and I 83 where the number of lanes was increased and in most cases sound barriers were constructed makes me want more info on this part of the plan. What is the regulatory basis for this decision? If I recall at the meeting it was stated that they were not required for this project. The irony seems to be for some of the homes along I-83 on the east side between Simpson Ferry and RJ I-83/581 is that not only will Pen Dot not install sound barriers, you will remove the vegetation that is providing a sound barrier now. With the increase in the number of I-83 lanes and the increased traffic, sound barriers should be installed. Please provide me with the regulatory reference that indicates that although sound barriers were installed in most areas of the recent beltway projects, that they are not required for this project. This project is probably unique in that the distance from the roadway the houses along Sherwood St is the smallest distance and sound barriers will not be installed.
29. Someone noted that blacktop pavement is quieter than concrete pavement, what will we be using for the project?

NOISE RESPONSES

- Each of the projects constructed over the past 15 years on the Capital Area Beltway and in the Harrisburg area was evaluated for noise abatement on an individual basis. Some of the noise walls constructed were on projects with new alignments, some were major interchange reconstruction / reconfigurations, and some were noise wall demonstration projects, all being permanent, long-term improvements. The noise wall demonstration projects from the late 1990's and early 2000's were mandated directly by the Pennsylvania legislature as stand alone projects. The I-83/PA 581 Interchange Bottleneck Safety project goals are to reduce traffic queues, to eliminate four areas of traffic weaves and to improve merges by lengthening acceleration lanes all along the I-83 corridor within the project area and to minimize the resulting local traffic pattern changes. Based on our required coordination last year this project was determined not to be a Type 1 project. For your reference, PennDOT Publication 24, Project Level Highway Traffic Noise Handbook can be accessed from the PennDOT homepage. Please remember that the proposed project is not the permanent long-term

improvement for this interchange as conceptually shown in the 2003 I-83 Master Plan, which would include noise walls.

- As we indicated at the public meeting, we will be installing a 50 inch high concrete barrier instead of guiderail along the areas of I-83 south of the interchange. This potentially will reduce tire noise.
- We will be maintaining the existing blacktop pavement.
- PennDOT will look for opportunities to add landscaping to provide a visual screen along I-83 in the project area.
- The use of truck “jake” brakes can not be prohibited on limited access facilities such as interstate highways. For more information about this, please refer to PennDOT Publication 46, Traffic Engineering Manual, Chapter 11.8, Engine Brake Retarder Prohibition Policy. However, with the improvements proposed, we anticipate a more stable flow of traffic which will reduce the need for “jake” brakes.

**LOCAL ROADS, STREETS, NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS/
COMMENTS**

1. Lowther Street is overused with trucks from the freight warehouses. Do not use Lowther as a vehicle to solve current problem.
2. Volume increase on Carlisle Road and Lowther Street
3. Traffic light at Brandt and Lowther
4. Rationalize the Columbus/Lowther/Letchworth/10th Street intersection snafu.
5. As a resident on Walton Street, my concerns are with the increased traffic on Lowther and its potential to bleed off into surrounding neighborhoods
6. I like the circle idea on Shoreham, however, in summer with only 1 way on to street there is no way to get a firetruck down Shoreham Road. Parking is on both sides and we have problems getting through with ambulances. How about an emergency services access road to circle?
7. PennDOT never cleans out right of way fence area or cuts grass and it creates a full time job.
8. Look at speed bumps for 300 block of Walton.
9. I live across from Shoreham Road and think that changing entrance to 83S to a cul-de-sac is great. I will not mind having to go to Lowther to get on 83S. I hope this change will limit the traffic on Norman Road. A left turn lane (both directions) would be nice.
10. Walton Street is already a street used to beat the light on 3rd. It is going to get worse. People already speed down our street and I have special needs children. It scares me now. Please put speed bumps or something to stop the speeding and trying to beat the light.
11. We own 2 properties on Lowther Street – Please provide existing and proposed traffic count. We also own 2 properties on 3rd Street –Please provide existing and proposed traffic counts.
12. Concern that more traffic funneled to/from New Cumberland interchange will use local streets to get back to Lowther.
13. Will miss local connection to/from Shoreham.
14. Construction traffic flow at 3rd and Lowther. What other borough streets are going to be affected?

15. Rumor has it that Walton Street will be affected? The borough committed to the residents that the barrier at the Attorney General's Office would never be opened to public traffic.
16. What other short term changes going to take place?
17. Property to be taken on Lowther Street (300 block) to make the 5 lanes plus parking? What is your plan for the sidewalks and driveways?
18. 10th and Lowther Intersection – more thought should be given to the intersection at 10th and Lowther – better turning lanes, removal of the “Hot Dog” building, large truck turning, etc.
19. Traffic circles – since traffic circles are the “in” thing in Lemoyne, maybe they should be placed at Maple and Lowther and 10th and Lowther.
20. I can also appreciate the concern of homeowners on Lowther Street. Those people were incensed, and rightfully so. The removal of the entrance ramp at Maple Street will cause more congestion at S. 3rd Street in Lemoyne. Major users of the ramp you wish to remove are Coca Cola and Cumberland Distribution. You have not even addressed the problem of curb damage caused by truck drivers turning onto S. 10th Street from Lowther Street. Why you wish to convert a portion of a four lane street into three lanes eludes me.)
21. Concern about property values on Lowther Street because of widening near 3rd Street.
22. Consider red light at Brandt and Lowther, especially for people who live opposite park.
23. Consider access for firetrucks (during summer when parking not restricted) on Shoreham Road, as it becomes one lane, and plan is to create cul-de-sac.
24. Traffic volumes on 3rd Street.
25. Concern with people short cutting Maple to Walton. Emergency access for Shoreham Cul-de-sac.
26. Intersection 10th and Lowther needs improvement. Left hand turn lane to Weis Market.
27. Access off Lowther. Small neighborhood roads, increase in volume.
28. What is existing traffic count on Lowther vs. proposed?

29. If incident on Lowther, Walton Street is bumper to bumper now. Very concerned about increased volume on Lowther and what it will do to Walton Street.
30. Concern with small children on Lowther Street and bus stops.
31. Live in park area of Lemoyne, how many cars that used to use Brandt Street ramp now go through neighborhood? Was this looked at?
32. Concern over 10th/ Lowther/ Letchworth intersection.
33. We live right on the tree line that butts up against 83 northbound lane. When can we expect a reasonable answer as to how much property from that tree line we will lose?
34. Reducing the number of lanes from four to three on the new Lowther St Bridge (and the Lowther St from 10th Street to the RJ of Maple/Lowther) is not a good solution. This should remain as four lanes. Living in this area (NW end of New Cumberland) and using the Brandt Ave/ Lowther Street intersection now can be challenging. This will make the problem worse. Lowther St should remain four lanes at a minimum.

LOCAL/ NEIGHBORHOOD RESPONSES

- In regard to property impacts, we will be completing the preliminary engineering this spring, which includes the field surveying to supplement the aerial mapping that was done over this past winter. We should have a detailed answer to any property impacts this fall after we begin final design. We will be looking at options to minimize the amount of required right of way if any would be needed throughout the project area.
- The existing intersections at 10th/ Lowther and Third/Lowther Streets will be redesigned to accommodate the new traffic patterns and new state of the art traffic signals will be provided.
- A new traffic signal will be added to the Maple Street/ Lowther Street intersection. With this new traffic signal, there is no advantage for traffic to use Walton Street to “beat the light” at Third/ Lowther Street intersection.
- The Brandt Avenue/ Lowther Street intersection does not meet the minimum warrants for a traffic signal.
- Removal of the chain that closes the eastern end of Walton Street is not part of this project.

- There will only be minor future traffic volume increases on Lowther Street as a result of the project. We have looked at the existing volumes on Lowther Street and the proposed volumes based on the project improvements. There is enough capacity with the proposed three lane section to accommodate these volumes. The conversion of the current 4-lane roadway without turn lanes to a 3-lane configuration with turn lanes is intended to provide safety benefits for turning vehicles and provide an overall traffic calming corridor. The number of traffic lanes and other improvements on Lowther Street will be further evaluated during Final Design.
- As the design progresses, improvements at the 10th Street/ Lowther Street intersection will be developed to meet the operational needs. These improvements will also consider minor modifications to enhance safety at Columbus Avenue and Letchworth Road.
- Throughout the design process, coordination with Emergency Service providers and local municipalities will continue to ensure that proposed changes, including the cul-de-sac on Shoreham Road, do not adversely affect response times.
- We will be replacing the existing signals and modifying the number of lanes and lane configurations at the Lowther Street intersections with 10th Street and Third Street. These two signals will be interconnected and coordinated with the new signal at Lowther Street and Maple Street to provide smooth traffic flows.
- The new Lowther Street bridge will be built to accommodate potential future additional lanes on Lowther Street, if volumes were warranted in the future. As we begin final design, we will verify the proposed improvements for Lowther Street.

ACCESS ISSUES/ COMMENTS

1. Restore access to 581W from Lemoyne (Not rely on 16th Street in N.C.)
2. Today if you get on at N.C. and want to go west on 581, you have to change lanes very quickly. Often traffic is stopped in the right hand lane and it is difficult to see what is coming in the right lane. The proposal now means you will need to change over two lanes with traffic moving much faster. There needs to be a way to go west on 581 from N.C. and Lemoyne.
3. Concern is people on Hill (Downtown Ly) come to light @ So 3rd turn left to 581E, at end of proposed ramp is a crossroad for heart hospital with no light. Would like to see the ramp to get to heart center exit remain and do away with crossroad coming out crossing Lowther and extend the merge ramp towards bridge (not onto bridge) approx 250-300 feet then have the merge lane remain as one on bridge. Example of this extended merge lane would be like Lisburn Road to 15N.
4. Please improve access from Lemoyne/ New Cumberland onto 581 West. All the traffic that used to hop on at the ramp that was closed and now is emergency access only, must now go all the way down to Cedar Cliff and U-turn through 2 lights onto 83N. Or they must go through the back street. Or they must take side roads to Capital City Mall to get on the highway.
5. 83 WB offramp to Lemoyne – is there a height restriction at underpass? Would impact trucks going to 10th Street
6. I do question the wisdom of moving the “merge point” for vehicles entering Rt. 83 north from the ramp at 16th Street in New Cumberland. I understand that extending this ramp will be in compliance with federal regulations for Interstate Highway design. What else will this change accomplish other than obtaining federal funds?
7. More difficult to get to New Cumberland from 581 WB.
8. Any height restrictions on 581 WB to Lowther Street.
9. Do not shut ramp at 3rd Street loop, will cause traffic back ups
10. Has improving access been considered to 581 WB?
11. Current N.C. on ramp, where will barrier start?
12. 581 EB access to Highland Park from Camp Hill, will this be changed?
13. Any option to adding ramps with replacement of 10th Street Bridge? Worried about 581 WB access from Lemoyne area.

14. My concern is merging onto 581 Westbound at the end of the I83N to 581WB ramp. My concern is not entering 83N from the New Cumberland on ramp and having to weave over. The merge area at the end of the ramp merging onto 581W is extremely short and it makes it hard to contend with the traffic coming out of the city.
15. One item though that I believe still needing addressed, is the ramp to 581 westbound. While there is less traffic going this direction, I think an extended merge area is needed. Driving this multiple times during the week, I see many close calls at this point. This of course would require widening the bridge over the 83 to 581 ramp. Could a third lane all of the way to US 15 be considered, as is found in the other direction?
16. For traffic eastbound on 581 desiring to get to Lemoyne... they have to head south on I-83 for a few hundred yards (never merging) and exiting at Brandt Street. I think this could be improved by widening the 581 exit ramp to two lanes and make the right lane signed for direct exit to Lemoyne. This would keep the 581 to Lemoyne traffic from having to intersperse with others trying to merge onto I-83 south or exit off of I-83 south. I believe there is room to facilitate this, but it requires one additional lane in the rebuild plan for the Lowther Street Bridge.

ACCESS RESPONSES

- The I-83 northbound to PA 581 westbound ramp can not be extended because of insufficient width of the existing bridge that carries PA 581 over I-83. The PA 581 Bridge is not part of this project.
- With PennDOT's current funding limitations, adding a third PA 581 westbound lane to Route 15 would require the widening of several major structures and is cost prohibitive.
- The existing I-83 northbound on ramp from the New Cumberland interchange will no longer merge but extend and become the beginning of the second northbound I-83 lane with this project.
- For safety reasons, the Brandt Street on-ramp will remain closed/ gated for emergency vehicles only.
- There is insufficient width on the existing John Harris Bridge over the Susquehanna for an additional northbound lane.
- The PA 581 eastbound access to Highland Park will utilize the Lowther Street ramp. The existing Highland Park ramp will be closed. (Note: Go to the project website [<http://www.i-83beltway.com/ess1/i83pa581.html>] and click on the button to view existing and proposed local ramp access.)

SAFETY CONCERNS/ COMMENTS

1. Going 581 West from 83 North safety issue getting on New Cumberland Exit, Only Exit to go 581 West
2. My biggest concern is no matter how much we “open up” and increase speeds through I-83 NB to the York Split area, traffic will continue to back up between I-76 and New Cumb. interchanges, thus a whole new bottleneck will be more apparent. I’m concerned more lives will be lost before PennDOT considers at the very least, installing a truck climbing lane from I-76 to 83 NB. The bridge over the Yellow Breeches needs widened to accommodate this, but without this widening to 3 lanes from I-76 to the York Split, more lives will be lost. Thanks for listening
3. I avoid I-83N because of safety – I take back roads (Brandt Avenue to I-83N on-ramp near Maple Street that now will be closed). I’m now concerned about merging onto I-83 at the South Bridge because of the traffic – the right lane on the John Harris Bridge backs up because of the 2nd Street exit (a lot of traffic exits there).
4. You must address the safety issues that are located south of this project, specifically from the Exit 38 on-ramp to the New Cumberland exit. The on-ramps are too short for the large amount of traffic (bumper to bumper at 6:30am). Definite safety issue and someone will die in an accident if this area is not addressed sooner than later. This is why I avoid this part of I-83N and take back roads. P.S. I do appreciate that you are at least starting this project, but disappointed that limited funds will cause more loss of life.
5. Security – Just don’t feel safe with people stopping here at all times. Never know who it could be when outside with our dog.
6. Safety – why is weaving across 2 lanes to 581 WB not a concern?
7. Concern this project will worsen the bottleneck to the south of New Cumberland (location of last fatality). Was told during Master Plan that wouldn’t widen due to a cemetery on right. Trucks stay in left lane instead of being in right. Want sign at Fishing Creek Bridge over left lane to say “No trucks”.
8. The additional lane for 83 north from New Cumberland should actually start farther south. While the extension to Limekiln Road would require an expensive widening of the bridge at the Yellow Breeches Creek, what about starting the extra lane just north of the bridge? It would then double as a climbing lane for slower rigs as well as additional traffic during peak hours. The web site indicates the back ups often extend to the turnpike. The reality is, from 7:00-7:45 the traffic is really affected all the way back to Reeser’s Summit.
9. Finally, in my observations, about 2/3 of the traffic getting on north 83 at New Cumberland actually cross over to head west on 581. This route will not be

remediated in this plan. In a perfect world, I would route the right hand lane of I-83 west onto 581 via a large flyover. This would probably require an adjustment to Brandt Avenue, as well as relocating the PennDOT facility to the south side of the interchange. The center and left lanes of I-83 would continue north. It would eliminate the 270-degree tight turn to head west. I realize this is not funded, but I don't want the current plan to have to be "done over" to facilitate this later.

SAFETY RESPONSES

- Traffic entering I-83 northbound at the New Cumberland Interchange headed for PA 581 westbound will merge left to the middle lane (as is done today). Traffic must then merge left one more time (as is done today) to proceed to PA 581 westbound.
- The project, once completed, will accomplish all of the needs of the project, and as this is a safety project, it will improve many of the safety concerns throughout the project area. Accidents due to weaving and queuing are anticipated to decrease due to the fact that improvements are directed to reduce the weaving and queuing in this project area.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

1. Great scaled project that is feasible with significant improvement to both through traffic and local traffic. Build it and they will see the benefits. *I'm a through traffic 83 North from York to Hbg. & Hbg. South to York.
2. Great job! This will alleviate the congestion on I-83 NB and help calm traffic heading north on Third Street in Lemoyne.
3. Overall, a very good project proposal for the limited funding available
4. My hats off to most of the changes outlined;
5. Overall – Excellent proposal. Thank you
6. Good presentation! Thank you for starting this project. Please keep moving forward with it.....there will be problems and things to be tweaked, but it must be done.
7. Great design for the York commuter. I understand the local concerns, hopefully it can be a benefit when the Master Plan is completed.
8. !! Thank you. Good presentation!!
9. I applaud the decision to rebuild Lowther Street overpass (B—B) for it creates a very dangerous situation for traffic entering Rt. 83 south from Rt. 581 east.
10. I have just reviewed the preliminary plans for the reconstruction of the York Split. I was very pleased with everything I saw that is proposed, especially for the smoother flow on 83 across the river.
11. The ramp closures and realignments for northbound I-83 are exactly where they need to be. Kudos!
12. Though I dread the construction, it is sorely needed and it looks like most of the plan is a home run.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

1. Also, this was not advertised to the residents very well. It would have been appropriate to hand out flyers door to door.
2. Please contact me ref PA-Tpk Project!
3. Get it right the 1st time not 2nd or 3rd like 581 project and 83 bridge at Hbg!
4. Is not the real problem of back-ups on Rt. 83 north due to the “pinch point” at 19th Street in Harrisburg? (Another PennDOT marvel) Band-Aid fixes are a waste of effort and money. IF YOU CAN'T DO IT RIGHT, DON'T DO IT AT ALL!!
5. Talking to the PennDOT representative was like conversing with a Wooden Indian!!!
6. What surface will be used when constructed, as some are quieter than others?
7. Does website have a place for comments?
8. Wants a bypass along river on West Shore side by Wormleysburg/ Lemoyne. Could tie in at I-83/ Lemoyne exit.

MISCELLANEOUS RESPONSES

- The riding surface for the new pavement is expected to be bituminous (blacktop).
- The website can take comments by clicking on the Contact List Sign-Up/ Comments button on the left side of any page.
- Backups on I-83 northbound at PA 581 are the result of the single lane configuration of the existing I-83 ramp, as well as conflicts created by traffic weaves at existing on and off ramps.