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Executive Summary

Plan Overview

The Southern Alleghenies Rural Planning Organization (RPO) is charged with administering a multimodal transportation program, addressing not only the region’s highway and bridge infrastructure, but also the elements that support walking and bicycling. Through the 2016 update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, the RPO is placing a higher premium on planning for walking and bicycling for transportation and recreational purposes. The following sections provide information on the region’s bicycle and pedestrian networks and the ongoing efforts to maximize the investment of public funds into these facilities.

Biking and Walking, By the Numbers

While rates of bicycling and walking as means of travel to work are low, the region demonstrates opportunities for improved bicycle and pedestrian transportation through existing facilities and ongoing programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of &quot;Walk Huntington&quot; signs in the community</th>
<th>Total BicyclePA Route Miles in the Region</th>
<th>Total Number of Bicycle Fatalities since 2006</th>
<th>Average Annual Number of Pedestrian Crashes since 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total &quot;The Alleghenies&quot; Road Cycling Tours in the RPO</td>
<td>Number of State Parks and Forests in the Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Outreach

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan update included a multipronged public participation strategy to maximize opportunities for feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Steering Committee</th>
<th>Public and Targeted Listening Sessions</th>
<th>User Surveys</th>
<th>Phone Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the project outset, the RPO identified a 12-member steering committee to assist with the development of a regional vision for the plan and guide the overall planning process.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC conducted a series of public listening sessions throughout the RPO region and a total of approximately 60 attendees participated.</td>
<td>Digital and paper surveys were distributed throughout the region to capture additional input. In total, 316 individuals completed a user survey.</td>
<td>The plan update included voluntary phone interviews with stakeholders who were selected by the steering committee to provide more detailed input. 16 interviews were completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Directions

The plan’s goals, objectives, and performance measures/progress indicators were developed through a series of interactive workshops and technical meetings, stakeholder interviews, and steering committee meetings where attendees identified, discussed, and refined the region’s most critical bicycle and pedestrian transportation priorities and determined how to measure progress toward meeting them. A summary of plan goals is presented below.

**Goal 1:** Bolster the region’s bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure so that it is safe to use and enjoy.

**Goal 2:** Ensure our region’s bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is well maintained.

**Goal 3:** Continue planning for bicycle and pedestrian initiatives.

**Goal 4:** Educate our region’s stakeholders, elected officials, and public at-large of key regional initiatives involving bicycle and pedestrian transportation.

**Goal 5:** Maximize the benefits of transportation investments in the region.

Trail Gaps and Proposed Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements

The plan also began to develop an inventory of trail gaps within the existing bicycle and pedestrian network. Shown below, these gaps were identified through discussions with the steering committee, phone interviews with local stakeholders, and bicycle/pedestrian user survey responses.
Letter from the RPO Chairman

The Southern Alleghenies Rural Planning Organization, or RPO, serves as the Federally-designated group charged with developing and maintaining a transportation planning program for the 4-county region that includes Bedford, Fulton, Huntingdon, and Somerset Counties.

The RPO administers a *multimodal* program, addressing not only our region’s highway and bridge infrastructure, but also the elements that support walking and bicycling. Transportation is more than moving people and goods across a system of infrastructure – it is getting products and people to where they need to go.

Through this planning effort, the Southern Alleghenies RPO is seeking to place a higher premium on planning for walking and bicycling for transportation and recreational purposes. Ongoing changes in our region’s demographics, public preferences, and public health suggest that this issue is a timely one, and one that needs to receive a greater focus in our transportation planning and programming work.

This update of our bicycle/pedestrian plan is just one element as part of a continuous process at the Southern Alleghenies RPO in planning for the transportation needs of our region. The role of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure as an important element in meeting our region’s transportation challenges will continue to grow. As the demand for bicycle and pedestrian accommodation increases, the RPO must be ready to meet those challenges with the proper facilities and level of accommodation that the region expects.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan provides you with information on the region’s bicycle and pedestrian networks, and our ongoing efforts to maximize the investment of public funds into these facilities. Bicycle and pedestrian modes are important elements of our overall transportation program; this plan will help us in taking advantage of the opportunities we have in front of us to further position our region as one that offers a favorable operating environment for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Prestash, P.E., Chairman
Southern Alleghenies Rural Planning Organization
Introduction

The Southern Alleghenies Planning and Development Commission (SAP&DC) is a non-profit regional economic and community development organization serving Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Fulton, Huntingdon, and Somerset Counties and is a designated Local Development District (LDD) by the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC). Through various programs and funding sources, SAP&DC provides a broad range of services to member counties through its mission to address human resource development, encourage the creation and retention of jobs, and to improve the quality of life for residents of the Alleghenies.

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) and SAP&DC signed an Intergovernmental Agreement on April 2, 2003, designating SAP&DC as a Rural Planning Organization (RPO). As a result, SAP&DC implements a Rural Transportation Work Program for the counties of Bedford, Fulton, Huntingdon, and Somerset. This designation as an RPO has made the SAP&DC responsible for the planning and programming of transportation projects for the region. Part of the duties of an RPO is to develop a project-specific plan referred to as the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), which sets the direction for transportation in the region for a minimum of 20 years. The Southern Alleghenies region covers a broad expanse of over 3,425 square miles of land area, approximately 2,600 miles of state-owned roadway, and is home to nearly 175,000 residents (Error! Reference source not found.).

Planning Architecture

SAP&DC has established a Rural Transportation Technical Committee and a Rural Transportation Coordinating Committee to oversee the development and implementation of the regional long range transportation plan. The Technical Committee is responsible for the development and analyses of transportation plans and programs, and makes recommendations to the Coordinating Committee. The Coordinating Committee establishes transportation policy and makes final decisions on courses of action.

The Southern Alleghenies RPO, in cooperation with its member counties, will continue to ensure the quality and integrity of rural transportation issues and projects within the region. This will be accomplished by working closely with PennDOT, elected officials, and local leadership. The RPO will continue the comprehensive planning process that will result in programs and plans that consider all transportation modes. The conclusion will be a transportation planning and programming process that includes an inter-modal regional transportation system that facilitates the efficient, safe, and economical movement of people and goods. Transportation projects that focus on improving safety, enhancing mobility, moving goods, and preserving the existing system are key objectives of the transportation
planning goals of the RPO. Furthermore, the RPO will coordinate transportation activities with surrounding planning agencies as needed. These include the Altoona Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which serves Blair County, and the Johnstown Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which serves Cambria County.

The Long Range Transportation Plan

As an RPO, SAP&DC is responsible for developing a project specific Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) with a minimum 20-year planning horizon. The LRTP is financially constrained and serves as a springboard for identifying and recommending projects for inclusion in the state’s Twelve Year Program (TYP) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is subordinate to the STIP and is derived from the LRTP. The TIP is a listing of fiscally-constrained projects to be completed during the first four-year period of the LRTP and the TYP.

SAP&DC adopted the 2013-2037 Long Range Transportation Plan in November 2012. The LRTP outlines the vision for future transportation in the Southern Alleghenies region through a series of goals and objectives (shown in Table 1). These goals and objectives are broad, with the expectation that they will address the myriad of transportation needs of the entire Southern Alleghenies RPO region. Additionally, the LRTP provides a framework for the community to make decisions about its overall transportation system.

Table 1: SAP&DC Long Range Transportation Plan Vision and Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LRTP Vision:</strong> Provide a safe, efficient, and sustainable multi-modal transportation system that fosters economic development, protects the environment, and meets the needs of all residents in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LRTP Vision:**
Provide a safe, efficient, and sustainable multi-modal transportation system that fosters economic development, protects the environment, and meets the needs of all residents in the region.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inform and educate the public, stakeholders and elected officials on key regional transportation initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maximize the benefits of transportation investments in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Encourage local planning practices that support access management along the region’s arterial highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Background/Overview**

The broad nature of the LRTP goals and objectives present an opportunity for the regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to further refine objectives, strategies, and performance measures specific to bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation, and to help advance a strategic direction to move non-motorized modes of transportation forward in the Southern Alleghenies Region.

**Federal**

The update of the region’s bicycle/pedestrian plan comes as the FAST Act era is getting underway. Since the ISTEA era began in 1991, federal surface transportation policy has acknowledged the need to plan for bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation. The passage of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act in December 2015 has continued this emphasis, with a set-aside for bicycle and pedestrian projects under the Transportation Alternatives Program, or TAP. The FAST Act is an improvement over its predecessor legislation (MAP-21) in that it includes an increase in funding for bicycling and walking and makes nonprofits eligible for that funding. The bill also created a new safety education program and, for the first time, includes complete streets language. Regarding the latter, the FAST Act directs the US DOT to encourage states and Metropolitan Planning Organizations to set design standards to accommodate all road users. It also requires the US DOT to produce a report on implementation and best practices within two years.

**State**

Planning for bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation in Pennsylvania is guided by the statewide bicycle and pedestrian master plan. Pennsylvania was one of the first such states in the nation to develop such a plan, in 1996. PennDOT updated the plan in 2007, and as of this writing is revising it again to reflect modern practices for improved bicycle and pedestrian accommodation.

As part of statewide implementation of its original statewide bicycle/pedestrian plan, PennDOT offered technical assistance to each of its planning partners in developing regional bicycle/pedestrian plans. The Southern Alleghenies Regional Planning and Development Commission adopted its first such plan, in 2002.

Bicycle and pedestrian planning is again enjoying a renaissance in Pennsylvania, thanks to the General Assembly’s adoption of Act 89 of 2013, which created a statewide multimodal fund and provides a minimum of $2 million a year for bicycle and pedestrian projects statewide.

In addition to this dedicated funding stream, other hallmarks of progress that have been made include:

- **Safe Passing Law** - Several states have passed laws requiring a 3-foot buffer of bicyclists by passing motorists. Pennsylvania’s law goes further, as the passage of Act 3 of 2012 (the “Bicycle Safety Act”) created a 4-foot passing requirement.

- **Strategic Highway Safety Plan** – Bicycle and pedestrian safety is emphasized within the state’s SHSP. Pedestrian safety in fact is specifically targeted by one of the plan’s six priority Safety Focus Areas (SFAs).
• **Statewide Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator** – The Commonwealth in 2015 hired a new statewide coordinator, a position that had been vacant since 2008.

• **Trail Gaps Identified** – The state Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) in 2009 identified over 100 gaps within the state’s major trail system. Only five of these are within the Southern Alleghenies region:

  o Great Allegheny Passage to Deep Creek Lake, Md.
  o Connections between the Great Allegheny Passage at Meyersdale and Big Savage Mountain, US 40, and the Youghiogheny River
  o Link existing trails in Laurel Ridge S.P., Laurel Hill S.P., and Forbes State Forest
  o Lower Trail, from Alfarata Trailhead to Huntingdon Borough
  o Between US 30 and Laurel Mountain S.P.

Most recently, the independent state Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) developed a bicycle and pedestrian policy study. The effort noted that the state still suffers from a lack of sufficient transportation funding (which makes it difficult for stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian projects to compete against road and bridge infrastructure needs), inconsistencies in the completeness of bicycle and pedestrian checklists, challenges with local coordination, and limited staffing. The State Transportation Commission (STC) adopted the TAC’s final report in May 2016.

**Southern Alleghenies Region**

Southern Alleghenies’ most recent policy document involving bicycle/pedestrian transportation includes its **2013-37 Long Range Transportation Plan** (LRTP). Action strategies from this plan involving bicycle and pedestrian transportation and recreation include the following:

• Encourage the incorporation of sidewalks and bicycle lanes where appropriate into planned transportation improvements.

• Implement the recommended actions from Southern Alleghenies’ 2002 Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

• Continue to implement the recommendations from Southern Alleghenies’ Greenways and Open Space Network Plan.

• Coordinate with the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources on bicycle and pedestrian projects in the region.

• Continue to encourage communities to apply for Transportation Enhancement funds for streetscape improvements in community centers.

Tourism is one of the region’s most important industries, second only to Agriculture in importance in driving the economy. Bicycle and pedestrian modes provide recreational, as well as transportation
benefits, and as such, are promoted through tourism marketing efforts within the Southern Alleghenies region. Pennsylvania’s website, VisitPA.com highlights opportunities for residents and visitors to enjoy various forms of bicycle and pedestrian-related travel through a mix of hiking trails, rail trails, greenways, and roadway-based facilities. Interest in the region’s many cultural and historical assets are also motivators for bicycle and pedestrian travel, in addition to purely recreational impulses.

One of the state’s newest long-distance trails – the Great Allegheny Passage – formally opened entirely in June 2013, linking Pittsburgh with Washington, D.C. using former right-of-way from the Western Maryland Railroad and others to link with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal towpath in Cumberland, Md. The economic benefits of this trail have already been experienced in communities such as Confluence, Meyersdale, and Rockwood, even prior to the trail’s formal completion. Moreover, DCED has suggested that every dollar in state tourism promotion funding has a return on investment of at least $25 in state and local tax revenues derived from tourism-related spending.

Funding

The Southern Alleghenies region’s 2017 four-year Transportation Improvement Program includes a base funding allocation of $156 million in maintaining its highways and bridges. Funding is distributed across a variety of funding “buckets”, including the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Set-Aside (formerly the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)), which funds bicycle and pedestrian transportation. As an RPO region, Southern Alleghenies does not receive any funds directly for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). FHWA distributes TAP funds to the States, where 50 percent of the funds are available to regions with greater than 200,000 population, while the rest are available on a competitive basis to all of the state’s planning partners. These funds (nearly $73 million are being held in statewide reserve in the FFY2017-20 program) are distributed through a statewide competitive process for selection of projects. The TAP program is a successor to the popular Transportation Enhancements program that had been originally created by the passage of ISTE in 1991.

On the state level, Act 89 of 2013 was a landmark transportation bill that boosted funding for Pennsylvania transportation. A hallmark of the Act included the creation of a Multimodal Fund that would be capitalized at a level of $144 million annually by 2017. This new source for multimodal transportation included funding for proposed bicycle and pedestrian projects at a rate of $2 million a year.

Crashes and Fatalities

Pedestrian-related crashes in Pennsylvania represent 3.1 percent of the total reported traffic crashes; however, they account for 13.9 percent of traffic crash fatalities. Over the past decade within the Southern Alleghenies region, 4.5 percent of all roadway-related fatalities were pedestrian fatalities. For the decade ending 2015, the region averaged 1.9 pedestrian fatalities per year. Even though PennDOT and the RPO continue to make advances in highway safety, pedestrian crashes are constituting a greater share of overall crashes, as shown in Figure 2.

---

1 Federal regulations prohibit the regional distribution of these funds.
Bicycle crashes represent 1.0 percent of the total reported crashes, and 1.6 percent of all traffic deaths in Pennsylvania. For the decade ending 2015, there were 2 recorded bicycle-related fatalities within the region – both were within Bedford County.

**Figure 2: Southern Alleghenies: Average Annual Crash Trends, by Mode, 2005-15**

![Graph showing average annual crash trends by mode, 2005-15](image)

**Source: PennDOT Crash Information Tool**

The total number of pedestrian crashes corresponds to total county size. For the 5-year period ending 2015, Somerset County led the region in the average annual number of pedestrian crashes, with 7. The counties have not exhibited much variation from year to year in pedestrian crash activity, although total pedestrian crashes in Somerset County has been trending in a favorable direction in recent years. **Figure 3** shows how the counties have compared historically in the number of average annual pedestrian crashes.
Figure 3: Southern Alleghenies: Pedestrian Crashes, by County, 2005-15

Source: PennDOT

Table 2 provides more detailed information on regional trends in bicycle and pedestrian fatalities and crashes.

Table 2: Southern Alleghenies: Bicycle/Pedestrian Crash and Fatality Trends, 2006-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crashes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Crashes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Fatalities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PennDOT

Speeding and Aggressive Driving

Driver behaviors such as speeding and aggressive driving are of concern to the bicycle and pedestrian community. Figure 4 demonstrates how roadway-related fatalities across the region have been trending...
with regard to these two crash types. The region in 2015 registered no fatalities due to speeding, and only one fatality related to aggressive driving, reversing a negative trend.

Figure 4: Southern Alleghenies: Fatalities from Speeding and Aggressive Driving Crashes, 2005-15

Source: PennDOT

Demographics

The update of the region’s bicycle and pedestrian plan comes at a time of notable demographic change. Millennials, or those born between the years of 1980 and 1995, are abandoning the settlement patterns of their parents and grandparents in gravitating toward life in urban centers and use of forms of transportation other than the private automobile. Millennials now for the first time outnumber the baby boomers and figure to be a demographic force of their own in influencing how the region plans for bicycle and pedestrian forms of transportation. Compared to preceding generations, they are more racially diverse, technically savvy, and more flexible in terms of how they are communicated with. Figure 5 shows the composition of the nation’s population, by generation group over the next 35 years.
The aforementioned baby boomers are a demographic that has become accustomed to a high degree of mobility. This has historically been a highly influential demographic group, influencing everything from politics and economics, to transportation. Baby boomers began turning 65 in 2010. The region’s seniors are living longer and – on balance – are enjoying better health than their predecessors. As a greater number of seniors move into their retirement years, the combination of more leisure time and greater levels of disposable income will translate into a need for a transportation system that can better accommodate all users, both vehicular and non-motorized, on-road and off-road.

The regional trend of aging in place is demonstrated in Figure 6, which shows the percentage of population in age groups in the Southern Alleghenies from 1990 to 2014. Since 1990, the percentage of population in younger age groups, particularly age 34 and younger, has contracted, while the percentage of residents age 45 and older has increased. As the population ages, it is important to consider mobility options outside of personal automobiles for improved health, safety, and livability.
Total population within the RPO remained relatively stable between 2000 and 2014, with a slight decrease of 2.3 percent occurring in the 14-year period. The population decrease occurring in the RPO counties is not as great as that experienced within the LDD, where population decreased by 5 percent. This trend reflects a continuing population outflow from the more urbanized areas within Blair and Cambria counties, as identified in the 2015 Southern Alleghenies Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy update.

Figure 7 illustrates population change between 2000 and 2014 at the municipal level for the counties within the RPO. The boroughs of Bedford, Meyersdale, and Somerset experienced the most significant population decline in the region, registering decreases of 337, 498, and 577 residents, respectively over the 14-year period. Conversely, Somerset Township in Somerset County and Walker Township in Huntingdon County registered the greatest gains in total population, with increases of 2,900 and 440 residents, respectively.
Population is widely dispersed throughout the RPO region, with the majority of the region’s municipalities having a population density of fewer than 100 people per square mile, as shown in Figure 8. Population density is greatest within larger communities such as Bedford, Somerset, and Windber, with densities greater than 1,500 people per square mile. Population density is an important consideration when planning for efficient and cost effective transportation systems. In rural areas with low population densities, multi-use paths can provide bicyclists and pedestrians with a safe place to travel and enhance the quality of life by providing recreational space for leisure activities.
In addition to population estimates, travel information was analyzed to identify mode split and evaluate travel time to work. The term “mode split” refers to the type of transportation a worker chooses to completing their journey to work, e.g., walking, bicycling, bus, driving, etc. According to the 2010-14 American Community Survey, there are 78,472 workers in the RPO region 16 years or older. Of these, 63,716 (or 82%) drove alone to work (shown in Figure 9). This percentage has increased steadily since 1990, when 72 percent of workers drove alone. Bicycling and walking comprise a much smaller portion of commuting activity in the region. While the region is reliant on the private automobile for travel, there are still opportunities for making infrastructural improvements that support bicycling and walking.
Transportation planning and public health efforts are becoming increasingly interrelated. Transportation systems shape how communities are designed and can have a profound influence, both positive and negative, on public health. According to 2014 Center for Disease Control and Prevention health data, 31 percent of adult residents in the Southern Alleghenies RPO region are obese and 10 percent have been diagnosed with diabetes. This increase is consistent with the statewide average, shown in Figure 10. Among 10- to 17-year-olds, the state obesity rate is 13.5 percent, less than half of the adult rate. Active transportation presents an opportunity for planners and public health officials to leverage limited resources towards significant community health benefits. Obesity is one of the biggest drivers of preventable chronic diseases and health care costs.
Figure 10: Adult Obesity Rates in Pennsylvania, 1990-2014

Existing Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System

Prior to implementing new programs, policies, and infrastructure, a thorough analysis of existing conditions for bicycle and pedestrian facilities is needed. This inventory served as a baseline for stakeholders in identifying and prioritizing new projects. The analysis included a review of bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are currently in use and gaps in the non-motorized transportation network. A summary of this is shown in Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13.
Figure 11: Existing Roadway-Based Bicycle Routes

Cycle Southern Alleghenies Road Cycling Tours
1. Raging Rapids Adventure Tour
2. Rivers and Bridges Scenic Tour
3. Magic Mountain Mystery Tour
4. Manns Choice Challenge
5. Nine Mile Town Historic Tour
6. Covered Bridge Scenic Tour
7. Bedford Springs Tour
8. Whiskey Rebellion Tour
9. Apple Barrel Orchard
10. Tuscarora Mt. Challenge Tour
11. Spelunker Tour
12. The Fisherman’s Tour
13. Time Travelers Path

Bicycle PA Routes
- Route G
- Route S

Map showing various bicycle routes in the region, including the southern Alleghenies area. The map highlights different routes and points of interest, such as historical sites and scenic locations, indicating their proximity and connectivity.
Figure 12: Existing Non-Roadway, Multi-use Trail Network
County Profiles

While the Southern Alleghenies region is quite distinct from the rest of Pennsylvania, there are aspects to the region that are not uniformly distributed – each county within the region exhibits its own challenges and possibilities regarding planning for bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation.

By way of introduction, the plan begins with a summary of each county within the planning region and the unique environment it offers within the realm of planning for bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation.
**Bedford County**

The county is favored with several trails, and opportunities for additional mileage to be added. Two notable trails include the Bedford Heritage Trail in Bedford, which currently connects the Bedford Springs Resort to downtown Bedford through a series of off- and on-road trails and sidewalks. Local businesses and property owners played a crucial role by donating right-of-way easements. The Bedford Joint Municipal Authority anticipates additional development of the trail and connecting it to more attractions in the future. There is potential for the trail to be extended further north to connect to Old Bedford Village – one of the county’s marquis tourist destinations. A second trail includes the Huntingdon and Broad Top Trail (H&B), which currently extends from the Village of Riddlesburg in Broad Top Township to the Village of Tatesville in Hopewell Township. A long-range goal would be to connect the trail from its terminus in Tatesville to the Pike2Bike trail – the planned trail that would use the long-abandoned tunnels of the Pennsylvania Turnpike.

The planned bicycle trail involving the turnpike tunnels is one of the region’s top bicycle/pedestrian initiatives currently underway. A feasibility study to be launched in the summer of 2016 will investigate the potential of incorporating the turnpike tunnels as part of a bicycle/pedestrian trail. The “Pike2Bike Trail” as it is known is owned by a non-profit organization under a single deed for all of its 8.5-mile length. Current plans call for an asphalt surface, which would allow year-round use of the trail. Economic studies of the project have suggested that improvements to the tunnels could pay for themselves within just a few years.

Bedford County is also criss-crossed by two cross-state bicycle routes, including BicyclePA Route S and Route G. Route S uses PA 31 through Manns Choice before following US 30 through Bedford. The route follows a series of four-digit state routes – including Main Street in Everett – before joining US 30 in Breezewood before ascending Sideling Hill into Fulton County. Route G has a north-south orientation and follows PA 96 from the Mason-Dixon Line north before taking US 30 and Pitt Street into Bedford. From the county seat, the route continues north using North Richard Street (SR 4009) to the Village of King, and then Business Route 220 (SR 3013) into Blair County.

Bedford has the region’s highest rate of senior population, with more than 1 in 5 older than the age of 65. This rate is expected to grow to become one in three by 2040, according to data from the independent long-term county economic and demographic projection forecasting firm of Woods & Poole.
Area: 1,012 square miles, ranking ninth in the state in size

Potential projects/initiatives: Pike2Bike Trail; extension of the Heritage Trail from Fort Bedford to Old Bedford Village; extension of the H&BT Trail to Warrior’s Path State Park

Pedestrian Crashes (2006-15): 52
Bicycle Crashes (2006-15): 52

The planning process included targeted outreach to seniors, as shown in this “listening session” which was held at the Bedford Area Senior Center in Bedford.
**Fulton County**

Fulton is one of the smallest counties in Pennsylvania, when measured by both land area and total population. At the 2010 census, the county had a total population of only 14,845, making it the fourth least-populous county in the state. One of the county’s two boroughs – Valley Hi – has the distinction of being the smallest borough in Pennsylvania, with a total population of 15. The county is bounded by Dickey’s Mountain and Tuscarora Mountain to the east, and Sideling Hill to the west. These physiographic features make navigating the county challenging for motorists and bicyclists alike. The county leads the state in the number of registered vehicles, per capita.

Fulton County also has the distinction of being the only county in the state to never have had active rail freight service (despite the presence of coal fields in its northwestern corner). This fact puts the county at a disadvantage in any efforts at turning abandoned rail lines into walking and hiking trails. Cowans Gap State Park is a 1,085-acre park, with 11 miles of hiking trails. The county is also characterized by large acreages of state game lands (30,791 acres, in all), and the presence of Buchanan State Forest.

Cross-state BicyclePA Route S traverses the county. From the west, the route follows PA 915 to a series of four-digit state routes to the Village of Hustontown, where it then follows PA 475 and Forbes Road to US 522 at Fort Littleton. The route proceeds to Burnt Cabins before turning south onto Allens Valley Road (SR 1005) to Cowans Gap State Park.

**Area:** 437 square miles

**Potential projects/initiatives:** Pike2Bike Trail; a connection from McConnellsburg to the new hospital; connection to the C&O Canal in Hancock, Md.

**Pedestrian Crashes (2006-15):** 13

**Pedestrian Fatalities (2006-15):** 1

**Bicycle Crashes (2006-15):** 1

**Bicyclist Fatalities (2006-15):** 0
**Huntingdon County**

Bicycling has been driving much of Huntingdon County’s growth in tourism, particularly since the completion and grand opening of the Allegrippis Trail system in 2009. The network currently includes 36 miles of trail, with more being planned. Bicycling is an important element of the county’s tourism promotion efforts, as the county has taken steps to designate three scenic routes: the Fisherman’s Loop, Spelunker’s Loop, and Time Traveler’s Path. These routes have been approved by PennDOT and range in length from 40 to 70 miles. A small portion of BicyclePA Route G traverses the northwestern corner of the county, using portions of the Lower Trail to Alfarata, PA 453 from Water Street to PA 45 through Spruce Creek, Seven Stars, and on to the county line.

While the county boasts of award-winning trails, there are missing links within its system of on- and off-road trails. A prime example includes the Standing Stone Trail. The “trail of the year” includes two designated Trail Towns in Three Springs and Mapleton, yet connections are needed to Huntingdon and Mt. Union. The trail links Greenwood Furnace State Park to Cowans Gap State Park through Rothrock State Forest, Rocky Ridge Natural Area, several state game lands, and Buchanan State Forest. Elsewhere, there is interest in extending the Lower Trail from Alfarata to Huntingdon Borough, and the Canoe Creek State Park. Other gaps include the terminus of the Thousand Steps Trail to the trailhead at Jacks Narrows along US 22. In Mt. Union, community leaders are also working to get a trail system blazed along the River Trail.

Within the college town of Huntingdon Borough, “Walk Huntingdon” is an example of local implementation of a national initiative. Over three dozen signs have been posted around the borough to direct pedestrian traffic and raise awareness of various attractions throughout the community.

Huntingdon is also the home of Juniata College, the planning region’s largest institution of higher learning. The campus of this 4-year school is located over a mile north of the central business district, and even experienced bicyclists are not comfortable navigating the borough’s streets to and from the college. Such “town/gown” issues represent opportunities for the county, school, and region to address in improving non-motorized transportation and community vitality.

An important potential intermodal connection of note includes Amtrak’s *Pennsylvanian* passenger rail service stop in Huntingdon Borough. There is no baggage car available west of Harrisburg, and so bicyclists must find alternatives to getting their bicycles to and from the area.
A bicyclist rides the Lower Trail in Morris Township. The trail is part of the Pittsburgh-to-Harrisburg Main Line Canal Greenway and is recognized as a National Recreation Trail.

Area: 889 square miles

Potential projects/initiatives: Lower Trail extension to Huntingdon Borough; Walk Huntingdon; connections from Juniata College to downtown; 9/11 Memorial Trail extension; proposed trail linking Mapleton to Mt. Union; improved connections between Huntingdon Borough and Lake Raystown

Pedestrian Crashes (2006-15): 58
Pedestrian Fatalities (2005-14): 7
Bicycle Crashes (2005-14): 20
Bicyclist Fatalities (2005-14): 0
Somerset County

With a total land area of over 1,074 square miles, Somerset County is one of the largest counties in Pennsylvania, ranking seventh in size. Unlike the other three counties, Somerset is situated within the Appalachian Plateau at the eastern edge of the Allegheny Front. The Plateau surface has been carved by rivers and streams into a patchwork of valleys and hills which makes bicycling challenging.

More than a century ago, railroads acquired rights-of-way along the more gentle grades offered by bodies of water such as the Casselman and Youghiogheny Rivers in their quest to connect to the rich coal areas of western Pennsylvania. These rivers offered the railroads with a favorable gradient as they challenged the rugged Allegheny mountains for access into the nation’s interior and the raw materials it afforded.

The Western Maryland Railroad was one of those railroads that once served Somerset County industry. By the mid-1970s however, it had ceased operations (a victim of excess capacity), but its legacy lives on in the guise of the Great Allegheny Passage (GAP), which formally opened completely between Pittsburgh and Cumberland, Md. in 2013. The GAP uses former right-of-way of the Western Maryland and several other railroads, and is perhaps the county’s marquis bicycle/pedestrian facility. The county’s portion of the trail includes several of its signature features, including the 3,295-foot Big Savage Tunnel, Salisbury Viaduct, and Pinkerton High Bridge. Communities such as Confluence, Rockwood, and Meyersdale have been revitalized and continue to benefit economically from this historically important corridor. The GAP connects Pittsburgh with the C&O Canal in Cumberland, Md. The Somerset communities along the GAP are thus part of a broader 334.5-mile long corridor between Pittsburgh and Washington, D.C.

Somerset County is also served by BicyclePA Route S, which from the west uses the GAP to Rockwood, then SR 3015 (Water Level Road) to Somerset, then Plank Road (SR 3041) to Menser Road, then PA 31 to the Village of Dividing Ridge, where it then takes Wambaugh Hollow Road (SR 1015) to the Borough of New Baltimore.
Bicycle parking at the Flight 93 National Memorial in Stoney Creek Township.

The Flight 93 National Memorial, which opened in 2015 near Shanksville, has been the inspiration for a September 11 National Memorial Trail that would connect all three 9/11 sites, including Shanksville, Washington, D.C., and New York City. The trail would use portions of US 219 and PA 160 between the Great Allegheny Passage in Rockwood, to the Flight 93 National Memorial site before continuing on to downtown Johnstown.

**Area:** 1,074 square miles, ranking seventh in size among Pennsylvania counties

**Potential projects/initiatives:** linking Somerset Borough to Somerset Lake to the north, and to the Great Allegheny Passage in Rockwood to the south; Quemahoning trail system; Continental Divide Loop Trail

**Major Bicycle/Pedestrian Assets:** Great Allegheny Passage, linking the boroughs of Confluence, Rockwood, and Meyersdale to the C&O Canal in Cumberland, Md.

**Pedestrian Crashes (2006-15):** 83

**Pedestrian Fatalities (2006-15):** 5

**Bicycle Crashes (2006-15):** 23

**Bicyclist Fatalities (2006-15):** 0
Public and Stakeholder Participation and Results

At the project outset, the RPO identified a 12-member steering committee to assist with the development of a regional vision for updated bicycle and pedestrian plan and guide the overall planning process. Steering committee members represented a broad spectrum of bicycle and pedestrian interests. In the 5-month plan update timeframe, the steering committee met on four occasions with the following objectives:

- **Meeting 1 – February 26, 2016**: Review scope, schedule, and affirm regional goals.
- **Meeting 2 – March 29, 2016**: Review input gathered from public meetings and survey responses and develop a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis.
- **Meeting 3 – April 19, 2016**: Review draft objectives and strategies, and identify other elements of a working draft of the implementation plan.
- **Meeting 4 – May 11, 2016**: Review draft plan.

Input and guidance from the steering committee was critical in defining a future vision for planning for bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation across the region and identifying actions for improving mobility for all residents.

**Public Involvement: Listening Sessions**

In March and April 2016, SAP&DC conducted a series of listening sessions throughout the Southern Alleghenies RPO region. A total of approximately 60 attendees participated in these meetings, which were held on the following dates and venues:

- **Fulton County Commissioners Meeting Room – March 22, 2016**
- **Bedford County Commissioners Meeting Room – March 24, 2016**
- **Huntingdon County, Bailey Building Ballroom – March 28, 2016**
- **Somerset County Parks and Recreation Committee Meeting – April 6, 2016**

Through these meetings, SAP&DC was able to collect valuable input about bicycle and pedestrian transportation issues and concerns that needed to be responded to through the plan update process. Additionally, meeting attendees had the opportunity to ask questions of SAP&DC and county planning staff on the details of the planning and programming process.

The Commission also facilitated a listening session with school district officials on March 15, and a group of 40 seniors in Bedford Borough on April 1, 2016.

**Public Involvement: User Surveys and Phone Interviews**

The final tactic for maximizing public involvement was the use of user surveys and phone interviews. Survey questions were tailored to address the FTA required elements of the Coordinated Plan, specifically prompting the respondent to answer questions related to transportation barriers, service participation, and potential strategies for closing service gaps.

For this plan, two different survey approaches were used:
• **MetroQuest**: A web-based, interactive survey tool that can be accessed via desktop or laptop computer, tablet, or mobile phone. Each survey has five screens that collect a variety of responses. MetroQuest surveys have mapping capabilities, which provide a spatial component in assessing public feedback. The MetroQuest survey was heavily marketed throughout the region using graphic postcards and fliers, email marketing to County Planning Directors and others, and information presented on the SAP&DC website. **Figure 14** presents a screen capture of the MetroQuest welcome screen.

![Figure 14: MetroQuest Welcome Screen](image)

• **Paper Surveys**: To account for residents who may not have computer or mobile device access, or who simply prefer non-digital communication channels, a paper survey was also made available. The paper survey format mirrored the digital MetroQuest survey to ensure consistency among survey respondents.

• **Phone Interviews**: In addition to digital and paper surveys, the bicycle and pedestrian plan update included telephone interviews with those who have vested interests in bicycle and pedestrian planning throughout the region. The purpose of the phone interviews was to complement information gleaned from the steering committee and MetroQuest results. Survey respondents were kept confidential. In total, the commission completed 16 interviews.

**Phone Interviews**
As part of stakeholder and public involvement for the bicycle/pedestrian plan update, the Commission facilitated interviews with stakeholders identified by the steering committee. Interviews were held via telephone with the exception of three that occurred in conjunction with the county outreach meetings. The steering committee identified a total of 23 stakeholders for engagement as part of the planning process. The organizations represented as part of this outreach included:

- 94-Bikes (Formerly Pedal Power)
- Appalachia Intermediate Unit 8
- Blair Bicycle Club
- Cambria County Planning Commission
- CamTran
- Everett Area School District
- Friends of Raystown Lake
- Huntingdon County Visitors Bureau
A total of 16 stakeholders participated in interviews and their comments are summarized below, by interview question.

**Should the plan focus on recreation trails or commuting/general/transportation trails?**

- There should be a balanced, two-pronged approach that focuses on both recreational trails and general transportation use.
- Trails and bike-pedestrian connections need to be a high priority because of their regionally significant economic impact.
- Communities are placing greater value on engaging the population in healthy lifestyles through livable, walkable, and bikeable communities.
- The region should focus on developing bicycling as a general mode of transportation and how it can be connected to other transportation modes.

**What are the primary issues the plan should address?**

- Accessibility
- Bicycling as a mode of transportation
- Connectivity
- Development of trail infrastructure
- Economic development potential
- Encouraging youth participation
- Facilitating cooperation with private land developers
- Funding and implementation
- Healthy lifestyles
- Land Preservation
- Government leadership and coordination
- Marketing and promotion
- Off-road route development
- Safety
- Sustainability

**What gaps in the region’s bicycle and pedestrian network need to be closed?**

- Gaps in sidewalks in small boroughs throughout the region should be addressed.

- There are gaps throughout Pennsylvania’s greenway system that should be closed to make all trails connected.

- *9/11 National Memorial Trail Corridor* - CSX recently donated land for trail development from the Great Allegheny Passage to Shanksville, near the Flight 93 National Memorial. Developing this trail should be among the region’s highest priorities.
Standing Stone Trail - There is a highway crossing of US 22 near Mapleton where the Standing Stone Trail crosses. The crossing is dangerous and if the highway were expanded, it would be nearly impossible to cross. There is also a gap which requires six miles of road walking between Three Springs and Meadow Gap.
MetroQuest Survey
During spring 2016, SAP&DC conducted an online, interactive survey through MetroQuest to solicit feedback from the community on bicycle and pedestrian issues in the region. The survey questions were developed with input from the steering committee to ensure meaningful responses from the general public. Once live, the survey was promoted at county listening sessions and through the SAP&DC website. Promotional survey postcards, shown in Figure 15, were provided to steering committee members and other planning stakeholders to distribute as needed.

Figure 15: MetroQuest Promotional Postcard

The online survey was available from March 16, 2016 to May 5, 2016, and through a series of five screens, the survey asked respondents to:

- Complete a series of standard survey questions about bicycle and pedestrian issues and interests (e.g. “how bikeable and/or walkable is your community?”; “when I don’t walk or bike, it’s because; etc.”);
- Prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvement strategies that would be beneficial to the Southern Alleghenies region;
- Identify bicycle and pedestrian destinations, safety concerns, and potential new infrastructure improvements on a map;
- Provide basic demographic information.

There were 576 people who visited the survey link and of those, 316 provided input. Along with the data collected from responding to standard survey prompts, each screen offered additional space for comments and additional feedback. Over 950 comments were received. Figure 16 provides a summary of survey responses.
Figure 16: Summary of MetroQuest Survey Responses

How can we best improve bicycling and walking in the region?

- **NEW RECREATIONAL TRAILS**
- **IMPROVED BIKE/PED FACILITIES**
- **SAFETY INITIATIVES**
- **LAND USE MANAGEMENT**
- **BETTER SIGNAGE AND MARKINGS**
- **EDUCATION**
- **BIKE/PED FACILITY MAINTENANCE**
- **ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS**

When I don’t walk or bike, it’s because:

- ★ My destination is too far away/don’t have time/inconvenient (24% of respondents)
- ★ Bad weather (19% of respondents)
- ★ Scarcity of bicycle/pedestrian facilities - bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, etc. (18% of respondents)

Who took the bike/ped plan survey?

- ★ 24% of respondents are age 55 or older, while 13% are age 24 or younger.
- ★ 45% of respondents are female, 54% are male, and 1% prefer not to say.
- ★ 86% of respondents own both a car and a bike, while less than 1% own neither.
- ★ 81 survey respondents expressed an interest in supporting the RPO in bike/ped efforts by providing an e-mail address for notification of additional opportunities for involvement.

Map Marker Snapshot*

Legend

- ★ Home Location (107 points total)
- ★ Safety Concern (128 points total)
- ★ New Infrastructure (57 points total)

*Biking and walking destination points (291 points total) not shown.
Plan Directions

This plan’s goals, objectives, and performance measures were developed through a series of interactive workshops and technical meetings, stakeholder interviews, and steering committee meetings where meeting attendees identified, discussed, and refined the region’s most critical bicycle and pedestrian transportation priorities and determined how to measure progress toward meeting them. **Goals and objectives** will be used to direct transportation investments and to translate the strategic vision into something that can be measured and tracked. **Performance measures** will be used to monitor and communicate progress towards goals, evaluate investment scenarios, comply with national performance requirements, and track plan implementation over time. **Strategies** will support Plan implementation and the achievement of its goals and objectives.

The five goal areas of the plan include: 1) safety, 2) maintenance, 3) planning, 4) education/promotion, and 5) funding. Several recommendations are listed under each goal.

This section of the plan summarizes the directions (i.e., goals, objectives, and strategies). The objectives are accompanied by related performance measures that will be used in tracking the region’s performance, over time. Strategies are identified by the intended timeframe for completion – short-term represents less than five years, while long-term strategies are initiatives that should be tackled in the longer-term. “Ongoing” initiatives characterize those that should be part of work programs on a recurring basis.

Goal statements are described here in more detail and are not discussed in any priority order.
GOAL 1: Bolster the region’s bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure so that it is safe to use and enjoy.

Safe travel conditions for bicycle and pedestrian modes are vital to quality of life and economic prosperity. Federal FAST Act legislation continues to make safety a national goal. PennDOT and the Southern Alleghenies Planning and Development Commission use a combination of education, enforcement, and infrastructure improvements to help improve safety across the region’s bicycle/pedestrian networks. Access management is one example of land use management tools that can improve safety and efficiency of the roadway network. The following underscores the region’s plan for continuing to work in making safety a part of its transportation planning work. Although outside of the planning region, Frankstown Township’s recent decision to commit nearly $50,000 for a Rails to Trails underpass project to provide a safe connection from the Lower Trail to Canoe Creek State Park is an example of a local municipality willing to put resources toward improving connectivity and quality of life through bicycle and pedestrian planning while at the same time improving safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of crashes and fatalities involving bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
<td>Number of roadway-related bicycle and pedestrian crashes and fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatalities in Speeding Crashes&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatalities in Aggressive Driving Crashes&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Lead/Support (Timing)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the incorporation of sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, and bicycle lanes where appropriate into planned transportation improvements.</td>
<td>County planning commissions/PennDOT (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with rail carriers to develop rail with trail opportunities</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC/Rail Carriers</td>
<td>Consider legislation for railroad liability; protection in case of accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage municipalities to adopt access management ordinances.</td>
<td>County planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td>PennDOT in 2006 created a sample ordinance, available at: <a href="http://www.dot.state.pa.us/public/PubsForms/Publications/PUB%20574.pdf">http://www.dot.state.pa.us/public/PubsForms/Publications/PUB%20574.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>2</sup> For the 5-year period ending 2015, this number was 29 for the Southern Alleghenies region.

<sup>3</sup> For the 5-year period ending 2015, this number was 18 for the Southern Alleghenies region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to incorporate crash data into TIP planning and development.</td>
<td>RTTC/RTCC/PennDOT (ongoing)</td>
<td>PennDOT’s CDART tool is available to its partners to analyze crash data received through its Crash Reporting System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage municipalities to use sandwich board signs in downtown areas.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC/PennDOT (ongoing)</td>
<td>Market existing resources at PennDOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the development of community driven data collection</td>
<td>County active transportation committees/Emergency Responders</td>
<td>This could include neighborhood “speed watch” programs; bicycle/pedestrian counts; development of pedestrian “walkability scores”, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify potential road corridors for “road diets” and traffic calming measures.</td>
<td>County planning commissions, with County Active Transportation Committees (Long-term)</td>
<td>PennDOT Publication 383 is a resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage municipalities to have pedestrian “countdown” signal heads, particularly in areas that have a high population of seniors and disabled.</td>
<td>County planning commissions, with County Active Transportation Committees (Long-term)</td>
<td>Ensure countdown signals have sufficient delay before vehicular movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate drivers and bicyclists about the rules of the road.</td>
<td>Community organizations (ongoing)</td>
<td>Fairs and other local events are possible venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate municipalities about bicycle/pedestrian safety measures.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC/County planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td>The LTAP program could be leveraged as a resource and is offered at no cost to municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify concerns on bicycle route corridors.</td>
<td>County Active Transportation Committees with County and Municipal Planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td>Groups could perform walkability surveys and analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase signage along bicycle routes.</td>
<td>PennDOT/County planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td>County Active Transportation Committees could identify needed signing and work through their respective county planning commission to address deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 2: Ensure our region’s bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is well maintained.

The Southern Alleghenies RPO and PennDOT have maintained a “maintenance first” approach to program development for many years. The goal area emphasizes maintaining where we have made investments in the past through a variety of means, including capacity management, operations, and demand management. Maintenance can be accomplished in part through PennDOT’s Betterment Program, which primarily includes maintenance and resurfacing projects done with county funds by contract (not PennDOT maintenance crews), and includes improvements such as shoulder work. Maintenance is also important on the region’s trails and crosswalk/sidewalk facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures/Progress Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop bicycle and pedestrian maintenance priorities throughout the region.</td>
<td>• Maintenance priority list is developed in all four counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure resources are in place to assist with bicycle/pedestrian facility maintenance and development.</td>
<td>• Number of volunteer and municipal partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Lead/Support (Timing)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage PennDOT to develop a program of cleaning berms and crosswalks on bicycle routes twice annually to better serve the needs of bicyclists while meeting roadway maintenance goals.</td>
<td>• RTTC/RTCC (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a program that would notify PennDOT, district and county maintenance divisions, and municipalities of berms that require maintenance/improvement.</td>
<td>• County active transportation committees</td>
<td>Includes clearing snow and anti-skid material in the spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore partnerships with the judicial system for trail maintenance/alternative sentencing, etc.</td>
<td>• Area recreation authorities (Short-term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a volunteer network in each county to help perform trail maintenance.</td>
<td>• County Active Transportation Committees (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer opportunities for youth to be included in trail maintenance.</td>
<td>County Active Transportation Committees (Short term/On-going)</td>
<td>Potential projects for high school seniors, scouts, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and implement interpretive signing projects on trails to provide increased educational opportunities.</td>
<td>County Active Transportation Committees/Trail Organization with visitors bureau and historical societies (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with local businesses to provide trail maintenance.</td>
<td>Area recreational authorities, local chambers of commerce (Ongoing)</td>
<td>REI requires new employees to perform trail maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory the number of curb ramps that are not ADA-compliant and develop a strategy for their improvement.</td>
<td>Municipalities, with county planning commissions/ PennDOT (ongoing)</td>
<td>Leadership on this strategy depends on who owns the roadway – state versus local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 3: Continue planning for bicycle and pedestrian initiatives.

The region needs to have a supporting architecture in place to be able to properly plan for bicycle and pedestrian transportation and recreational needs into the future. Chief among the strategies included under this goal area include the creation of Active Transportation Committees in each county. These committees could report to their respective county planning commissions and be charged with raising awareness of bicycle and pedestrian planning concerns. Their responsibilities can be defined at a county level, and could include initiatives ranging from evaluating existing conditions and maintenance needs, gap analysis, and local advocacy. These groups together could form a consortium that could inform bicycle and pedestrian planning at a regional scale under the auspices of SAP&DC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures/Progress Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve bicycle/pedestrian access in our economic centers.</td>
<td>• Walkability/Bikeability Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close existing gaps in the region’s network of bicycle/pedestrian links to promote a higher degree of connectivity.</td>
<td>• Number and total lengths of remaining trail gaps by county</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Develop the institutional framework needed to advance planning for bicyclists and pedestrians at a regional and county level. | • Number of county-level active/sustainable transportation committees  
  • Bicycle/pedestrian coordinator identified at county level                  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Lead/Support (Timing)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop “Active Transportation” committees in each county to help guide bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts at a local level.</td>
<td>• County Planning (short term)</td>
<td>Needs to represent a diverse group (health, economic, academic, environmental demographics) to combine to form a consortium for regional dialog and planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop county-wide bicycle/pedestrian plans or address as part of comprehensive plan development.</td>
<td>• County planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Examine the potential for off-road trail development to connect the region to other regional economic centers.</td>
<td>• SAP&amp;DC with a consortium of the region’s County Active Committees (Long-term)</td>
<td>Strategy can include connections to such places as Altoona, Cumberland, Md., Johnstown, and State College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from cycling groups to obtain information on existing conditions and project needs.</td>
<td>County Active Transportation Committees with county planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage mixed-use development to make walking and bicycling more practical.</td>
<td>County and municipal planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify corridors to be targeted as part of PennDOT’s Betterment Program</td>
<td>County Active Transportation Committees with County Planning Commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage area businesses to install bicycle racks.</td>
<td>County Active Transportation Committees, with chambers of commerce and main street managers (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate the potential of allowing bicycles to be loaded/unloaded at the Huntingdon Amtrak station.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC, with Huntingdon County’s state and federal representatives (Long-term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw from the candidate projects raised during the plan development process.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC with PennDOT (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, review, and prioritize a list of trail gaps annually.</td>
<td>County Active Transportation Committees with county planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the region’s bicycle/pedestrian plan every 5-10 years.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a Safe Routes to School Program in the region’s schools.</td>
<td>County and municipal planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing for bicycle parking can help improve downtown vitality and encourage bicycle use.</td>
<td>PennDOT’s Bureau of Rail Freight, Ports and Waterways could also be a resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate projects appear in this plan in Appendix A: Candidate Project Listing.</td>
<td>Candidate projects appear in this plan in Appendix A: Candidate Project Listing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This strategy would take advantage of emerging opportunities, re-evaluate priorities, and address gaps in the network. The Plan update task force could draw membership from newly created county Active Transportation Committees.</td>
<td>This strategy would take advantage of emerging opportunities, re-evaluate priorities, and address gaps in the network. The Plan update task force could draw membership from newly created county Active Transportation Committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools can complement their SRTS program by offering pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs to teach children safe behaviors and skills to improve safety.</td>
<td>Schools can complement their SRTS program by offering pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs to teach children safe behaviors and skills to improve safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 4: Educate our region’s stakeholders, elected officials, and public at-large of key regional initiatives involving bicycle and pedestrian transportation.

This goal area addresses two concerns that were raised during the plan’s development: 1) that the transportation planning process can sometimes be esoteric and inaccessible to the public, and 2) the region’s bicycle/pedestrian assets and opportunities are not being properly marketed to their fullest extent. As such, strategies under this goal area are oriented toward education and promotion of bicycle and pedestrian modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures/Progress Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase the availability of promotional materials and social media to promote bicycle/pedestrian activities and initiatives.</td>
<td>• Every county will have related information on its website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify the benefits of bicycling and walking, both for public health and the environment.</td>
<td>• Number of newsletters, classes, and reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Lead/Support (Timing)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate bicycle and pedestrian articles and information on commission and counties’ web page and social media pages.</td>
<td>• County government (ongoing)</td>
<td>This strategy could include a “Transportation 101” link that provides information on how to move a proposed project from concept to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet with municipal officials on a recurring basis to discuss the benefits of including bicycle/pedestrian design elements in land development planning.</td>
<td>• County planning commissions (ongoing)</td>
<td>This activity could be performed at COG and at annual supervisor conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide information on area attractions, including bicycle/pedestrian venues.</td>
<td>• County Visitors’ Bureaus (Short-term)</td>
<td>User groups include: college students, tourists, residents, historical/environmental groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote bicycling as a general mode of transportation – not just recreation.</td>
<td>• County Active Transportation Committees (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include the benefits of a healthy lifestyle through bicycling and walking in print and online trail promotional materials.</td>
<td>• SAP&amp;DC Marketing Coordinator (Short-term)</td>
<td>Revive the SAP&amp;DC Tourism Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revive “The Alleghenies” promotional material.</td>
<td>• SAP&amp;DC Marketing Coordinator (Long term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educate the public about the health advantages of walking through implementing community walking and biking programs.</td>
<td>• County Active Transportation Committees with health care providers (ongoing)</td>
<td>Target high school health classes. Outreach targets could also include chambers, and business and industry groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider international marketing to increase the region’s number of international visitors to its trails.</td>
<td>• PA Tourism Council and Pennsylvania DCED, with SAP&amp;DC (Long-term)</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC currently has no funding for tourism/marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 5: Maximize the benefits of transportation investments in the region.

The RPO is charged with conducting a “continuous, comprehensive, and cooperative (3C)” transportation planning process in accordance with federal and state requirements. This means it must balance the needs of bicycle and pedestrian modes against its 2,600-mile state-owned roadway network and 1,430 state-owned bridges greater than 8 feet in length as it develops plans and programs such as its 2013-37 long range transportation plan, and 2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The demand for transportation funding will always overwhelm needs. As the RPO seeks to maintain a greater recognition of the role and value of bicycle and pedestrian modes in its transportation planning program, it will need to develop not only the planning infrastructure described earlier, but also new planning tools and techniques to assist in planning and decision-making. These elements – which include a project prioritization process and the identification of a regional priority bicycle/pedestrian network – are described in the following strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Increase investment in sidewalk construction and ADA curb ramps</td>
<td>- Total dollars allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Target bicycle/pedestrian investments where they will be most effective.</td>
<td>- Total investments on priority corridors (to be identified)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Lead/Support (Timing)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Identify a regional priority bicycle/pedestrian network that could be used for prioritizing bicycle/pedestrian projects.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC, with members of the Active Transportation Committees (Long-term)</td>
<td>A priority network could serve as an element of the data-driven prioritization process described above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sub-allocate resources from the region’s base allocation to fund bicycle/pedestrian projects.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC with PennDOT (ongoing)</td>
<td>This strategy would help with local matches and would help support the funding of more substantial projects across the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coordinate with the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), Federal Highway Administration, and PennDOT and other state and federal agencies to encourage investment for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the region.</td>
<td>SAP&amp;DC, with member counties (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Develop a data-driven process to identify and prioritize existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities to be considered for improvements.

- SAP&DC (Long-term)

  Such a process would add analytical rigor to the RPO’s decision-making process so essential in an era of fiscal constraint.

- Maintain a list of funding and technical assistance resources required to implement bicycle pedestrian projects.

- SAP&DC (ongoing)

  GIS resources could be included as part of this strategy.
Appendix A: Candidate Project Listing

The following projects were identified through the regional planning process. Planning-level cost estimates for these candidate projects have not been identified.

**BEDFORD COUNTY**

- Implement the recommendations of the forthcoming Pike2Bike Trail study;
- Connect Bedford Borough to the C&O Canal/Great Allegheny Passage in Cumberland, Md.;
- Extend the Heritage Trail northward to Old Bedford Village;
- Support extensions of the H&TB Trail further north and south.

**FULTON COUNTY**

- Develop a trail between Lion’s Club Park to McConnellsburg;
- Develop a ring trail around McConnellsburg Borough;
- Address needed bicycle/pedestrian improvements at Meadow Grounds.

**HUNTINGDON COUNTY**

- Improve Terrace Mountain and connect the Terrace Mountain Trail to Saxton Borough;
- Improve bicycle and pedestrian connections from the Juniata College campus to downtown Huntingdon;
- Support the development of former EBT rail lines into potential rail-trails;
- Extend the Lower Trail eastward from Alfarata to Huntingdon Borough, connecting the communities of Alexandria and Petersburg via the Juniata Valley School District to provide a safe route between the communities and the schools;
- Connect the Lower Trail to Canoe Creek S.P., including the US 22 underpass;
- Improve the crossing of Standing Stone Trail across US 22 near Mapleton;
- Implement the Walk Huntingdon sign project. The Walk Huntingdon sign project builds off the national Walk [Your City] program. The program helps communities increase walkability by placing community signs with information on how long it requires walking to particular destinations.
- Add connections between Huntingdon Borough and Lake Raystown;
- Connect Mt Union, Mill Creek, and Huntingdon with a multi-use path using the Mainline Canal Greenway.

**SOMERSET COUNTY**

- Support the development of the 9/11 National Memorial Trail eastward;
• Develop a trail from Somerset Borough to Somerset Lake;
• Support the development of the Continental Divide Loop Trail (Meyersdale – Grantsville, Md. – Oakland, Md. – Confluence);
• Develop a trail system at Quemahoning Lake;
• Develop a dedicated trail from Somerset to the Great Allegheny Passage in Rockwood.

**REGION‐WIDE**

• Examine the potential for off-road trail development to connect the region to other regional economic centers such as Altoona, Cumberland, Md., Johnstown, and State College.
• Identify and implement interpretive signage projects on trails to provide increased educational opportunities.
• Organize volunteers throughout the region to maintain trails.
• Identify issues with berms and increasing berm cleanings/ maintenance. Similar to reporting potholes in roads, it might be helpful to report problems with berms to PennDOT. PennDOT typically cleans berms once a year between March and April. A second annual cleaning might be helpful. Berm cleaning is a cost effective maintenance solution that improves safety.
• Improve bicycle access on roads by installing wider paved berms in rural areas and bicycle lanes in boroughs and in areas with concentrated development.
Appendix B: Funding and Assistance for Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Throughout the course of the stakeholder interviews, several types of assistance and funding were identified. The following sources are in addition to local trail groups and community fundraising. Specific funding sources are identified if the source was referenced by an interviewee.

- **REI Bedford – Trail Maintenance**
  - REI Bedford coordinates volunteers and supplies for trail maintenance.
  - REI typically tries to help out with one project per quarter by providing a ½ day to full day of volunteers.
  - Volunteers work on basic maintenance and cleanup.
  - Projects are planned a few months in advance and limited to Bedford County or a reasonable distance (usually not more than one hour away).
  - If REI is not able to provide physical assistance they usually help by supplying equipment or water bottles.

- **REI Bedford – Grants**
  - REI issues grants annually and starts its process between January and February.
  - Awards typically range from $2,000 to $10,000.
  - Recent trail projects have included: helping out with the Allegrippis Trails at Raystown Lake, maintaining local rail trails, and helping with connecting the Lower Trail to Canoe Creek State Park.

- **Federal Highway Administration - Federal Lands Access Program**
- **Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC)**
- **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**
- **PA DCNR**
- **PA DCED**
- **PennDOT**
  - PennDOT provides grants to help plan for and implement projects such as trail and multimodal projects.
  - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funding has been used for bike rack installation.
- **SAP&DC - Southern Alleghenies Regional Greenways Mini-Grants**
- **County and Municipal contributions – financial and land contributions.**
- **Foundations – Regional foundations such as The Mellon Foundation and Heinz Endowments have financially supported trail projects.**
- **Local businesses**
- **Area hospitals**
- **Local higher educational institutions**
- **Local banks**
- **Railroads – Land Donation. (CSX has donated former railroad right of way for trail development in the region.)**
Appendix C: Summary and Disposition of Public Comments Received on the Draft Plan

The plan underwent a 30-day public review and comment period, from May 12, 2016 to June 10, 2016. The following is a summary and disposition of all comments received.

Comment: As advisor to the Juniata Valley School District Sustainability Club since 2008, I organize projects and events to encourage students to consider the benefits of environmentally sustainable practices. These projects and events demonstrate benefits to participants' individual health, to the health of our community and to the health of our planet. For example, we have participated in National Bike to School Day five times and in National Walk to School Day four times. We also host Walk AT School Day for our elementary school children, since it is not safe for these youngest students to walk along Route 305 between Alexandria and Petersburg on Walk to School Day. And recently, Sustainability Club initiated Walk Huntingdon to support the improvement of pedestrian traffic in Huntingdon by placing 38 signs—which indicate the number of minutes it takes to walk from where a sign is placed to the destination given on that sign—along a Central Corridor from Juniata College to Portstown Park.

While reviewing the draft of the Southern Alleghenies Planning and Development Commission's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, I looked for the inclusion of safe routes for walking and biking to school. The Alexandria and Petersburg communities flank our two district buildings (JVES and JVHS) and are not more than 1.5 miles each from our school's campus; yet, there is no safe way for our students to walk or bike to school OR between communities. Our students are completely dependent upon motorized vehicles for transportation. While we encourage students and their families to reduce their carbon footprint by walking and biking instead of driving, in reality there is no viable means to do so, not here in the Valley nor to neighboring Huntingdon.

At this time in our planet's history, when 97% of climatologists agree that addressing the effects of human induced climate change is of paramount importance for all nations, I believe that communities everywhere should make safe routes to school a priority. During the 2015-2016 school year, Sustainability Club helped to implement the 5 2 1 0 health initiative developed at the Barbara Bush Children's Hospital of the Maine Medical Center, which suggests that children who are able should engage in at least 60 minutes of physical activity each day. Safe walking and biking paths from Alexandria and Petersburg to our school's campus and between the two communities could guarantee compliance with such standards for many of our community's children. Figure 9 on page 19 of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan shows the rate at which obesity among adults has increased since 1990, but I see no reference made to obesity levels among children. Surely, healthy habits such as walking and biking have their greatest impact when people begin establishing such habits as children. Why is it that the infrastructure of our communities is designed to make such healthy practices an intentional effort rather than a byproduct of our daily routines? If it is because we believe children will choose to exercise to develop healthy lifestyle habits into adulthood, rates of increase in obesity show that for many, that's not working.
All in all, I am pleased with the goals and strategies included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and sincerely appreciate the efforts of all those who have worked hard to prepare this draft. I would, however, like to also see a focus on the benefits of walking and biking for children on safe trails to school and other places throughout the Southern Alleghenies region.

**Response:** The revised plan contains a strategy related to the development of a Safe Routes to School Program in each of the region's member counties. Such a program would entail several elements, including: educating students on how to walk and ride safely; making physical improvements to travel corridors near each school; providing safe bicycle storage; and encouraging more students to bicycle and walk to school. Obesity rates for children has also been added to the plan narrative.

**Comment:** I've lived here for five years and biked extensively to get around. I've had two bikes stolen in that time, and once stolen there's little chance of getting it back. For someone of little means, this could be devastating; similar to having a car stolen. It's small, and I have seen some bike racks going up in town, but there should be bike racks at more locations such as the court house, department and grocery stores, etc. At many of these locations, I have to chain my bike to a tree. With more bike racks available, it may encourage more people to ride by showing them that it is indeed an option.

**Response:** The draft plan does encourage the placement of more bicycle racks to encourage and foster use of bicycles as a mode of travel. Specifically, the proposed county Active Transportation Committees would be charged with leading efforts for this particular plan strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #1 (Safety)</strong> - Using the performance measure <em>Number of roadway-related bicycle and pedestrian crashes and fatalities</em> is inherently tricky, in that it doesn't account for changes in level of infrastructure use by bicyclists and pedestrians. Ideally, a denominator would be added to the performance measure - e.g., <em>Number of roadway-related bicycle and pedestrian crashes and fatalities per # person-miles ridden or walked along roadways.</em> If it's not possible to incorporate a denominator into the performance measure, analyses of this performance measure should at least mention the possibility that changes in infrastructure use rates could be muddying the results.</td>
<td>The RPO agrees with the comment made. PennDOT maintains enormous amounts of data on its highway and bridge network, as well as on traffic data related to vehicular travel demand. Corresponding data for bicycle and pedestrian trip-making is not as prevalent, and incomplete, at best. The plan does employ a rolling 5-year average to account for any changes or anomalies in the data. The data do show that crash trends for vehicular and bicycle/pedestrian use are trending in a positive direction. A note was added in the Plan Directions chapter to raise awareness of this situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #1 (Safety)</strong> - The previous draft included an objective of reducing traffic speed and aggressive driving. I noticed that this objective was removed. Why was this removed?</td>
<td>This objective has been re-inserted, along with two accompanying performance measures: Fatalities in Speeding Crashes, and Fatalities in Aggressive Driving Crashes. PennDOT's <a href="#">Pennsylvania Bike Routes map</a> includes traffic...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #1 (Safety)</strong> - Traffic counts are performed by PennDOT for motor vehicles, why not have PennDOT count people, too? Use that information to prioritize creating a 4-foot space for pedestrians and cyclists. If not a lane then at least increase signage for high pedestrian/cyclist traffic areas.</td>
<td>speed and volume as helpful indicators for selecting safe routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #1 (Safety)</strong> - Can we use the map markers that identified a &quot;safety concern&quot; as a performance measure?</td>
<td>A potential follow-up activity to the regional bicycle/pedestrian plan process that the regional commission may consider would be to develop a bicycle/pedestrian level of service analysis, or identifying the “comfort level” of using these modes on various roadway segments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #1 (Safety)</strong> - Driver behaviors such as speeding and aggressive driving are not mentioned in this plan and yet they are factors related to being &quot;safe.&quot; Can these issues be addressed somewhere in this section?</td>
<td>Not all markers left on the electronic MetroQuest map may be compelling or meaningful. For example, some markers were not “snapped” to a roadway feature, making some interpretation as to the user’s intent challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #2 (Infrastructure)</strong> - Consider adding a second performance measure: Amount of grant funding directed to bicycle and pedestrian facilities’ maintenance and development.</td>
<td>New performance measures have been added to the plan to capture trends related to these crash types. A figure has also been added, with related discussion documenting how the region has been performing over time relative to these crash types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #3 (Planning)</strong> - Consider changing the performance measure from “number of remaining trail gaps by county” to number and total lengths of remaining trail gaps by county. This would capture more improvements (e.g., short extensions of trails into gaps).</td>
<td>The number and capacity of grants available for bicycle/pedestrian transportation is always changing, and may not be an accurate measure as to how well the region is faring with regard to investment in these modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #4 (Education)</strong> - Consider adding to the performance measure: Number of newsletters, classes, and reports, and number of partnerships with other organizations committed to promoting healthy lifestyles through biking and walking.&quot; Such organizations could include healthcare providers, area employers, health insurers, schools, etc.</td>
<td>This is a good change in principle, but is too coarse as a meaningful measure at this point in the plan’s development and implementation. SAP&amp;DC should work with county planning commissions in identifying a definitive baseline number as a way of measuring progress against this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed performance measure is too vague and open-ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan overview in the Executive Summary is missing a word:  <em>Through the 2016 update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, the RPO is seeking to place a higher premium on planning for walking and bicycling for transportation and recreational purposes.</em></td>
<td>This has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd like to see the list of potential projects/initiatives for Huntingdon County include &quot;Add connections between Huntingdon Borough and Lake Raystown.&quot;</td>
<td>This has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd like to see climate change explicitly mentioned as part of the rationale for improving bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. The Long Range Transportation Plan offers a vision that includes &quot;sustainable multi-modal transportation&quot; that &quot;protects the environment&quot; (page 9) and through the interview process &quot;sustainability&quot; was mentioned as a primary issue that needed to be addressed by the plan (page 31). And yet there appears to be no mention of climate change or using active transportation to reduce pollution and the carbon footprint. Based on comments collected it appears that there is strong interest in making sure that this is included in the final plan.</td>
<td>The RPO agrees that bicycle and pedestrian modes need to be advanced not only for their transportation and recreation benefits, but also for their role in reducing emissions. One of the objectives subordinate to Goal 4 (Education) encourages the communication of the benefits of bicycle and pedestrian transportation not only for public health, but also for the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd like to see mention made of the Mainline Canal Greenway.</td>
<td>Mention of this feature has been highlighted within the plan’s Huntingdon County profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 12 shows the Calendar Run Trail at Indian Lake as a trail gap or proposed trail. That trail is finished, and as far as I know there are no plans to connect it to any other trail system. If it isn’t too late, it should probably be taken off of that map.</td>
<td>Reference to the Calendar Run Trail has been removed from the figure as a “gap” in the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inventory of (all) shoulders, side lanes, road widths and actual edge side conditions seems to be sorely needed. Physical feasibility conditions should be identified for the possibilities for active movements of bikes and people along the various rights of ways adjacent to the vehicle lane cart-ways. A comprehensive inventory of conditions should be identified followed by values and priorities for definable improvements. (Ratings and rankings of segments and links need to be articulated; such as; critical and severely</td>
<td>As noted earlier, PennDOT maintains an enormous inventory of information regarding its roadway and bridge assets. Information on other assets is not as prevalent. One of the plan strategies includes the development of a “data-driven process” to identify and prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Such an inventory of substandard infrastructure would be valuable for implementing such a process, and the Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous, and/or high demand for usage (now, soon, or later) and when; therefore improvement schedules such as a 12-year plan and short term schedules articulated into an official document.</td>
<td>Transportation Committees proposed by this plan to be created could be charged with collecting this information as one of their core functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Plan seems to be a policy document of sorts; a &quot;management action plan&quot; is what is really needed. Policies are already defined by law, what the folks in charge are really going to do about it is the pressing issue.</td>
<td>The regional bicycle/pedestrian plan is indeed a policy plan. The implementation element of the plan provides the guidance needed for turning strategy into action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of the Lower Trail Extension it would be important to include connecting the communities of Alexandria and Petersburg via Juniata Valley School District to provide a safe route between the towns and the schools.</td>
<td>This has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of the Lower Trail Extension it would also be important to include the Mainline Canal Greenway for historic preservation, environmental protection and health benefits.</td>
<td>This has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential projects/initiatives for Huntingdon County include &quot;Add connections between Huntingdon Borough and Lake Raystown.&quot;</td>
<td>This has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity between Mt Union, Mill Creek, and Huntingdon with a multi-use path using the Mainline Canal Greenway should be considered as a candidate project.</td>
<td>This has been added.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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