

PENNSYLVANIA STATE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
BUSINESS MEETING
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
APRIL 8TH, 2026



Please note that these minutes are not intended to capture every comment but to identify critical discussion points and highlights of the TAC business meetings.

CALL TO ORDER:

A hybrid business meeting of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order on Microsoft Teams at 9:32 a.m. on April 8, 2026.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present on the Phone:

1. Ms. Jody Holton
2. Honorable Michael B. Carroll
3. Honorable Stephen DeFrank, Rodney Bender, alternate
4. Honorable Carrie Rowe, John Kashatus, alternate
5. Honorable Jessica Shirley, Nathan Crawford, alternate
6. Honorable Rick Siger, Melissa Wright, alternate
7. Honorable Judy Ward, Nolan Ritchie, alternate
8. Honorable Kerry Benninghoff, Laine Heininger, alternate
9. Honorable Ed Neilson, Kyle Wagonseller, alternate
10. Honorable Russel Redding, Lisa Graybeal, alternate
11. Honorable Timothy Kearney, Sam Arnold, alternate
12. Mr. Ashley Porter
13. Mr. Ron Wagenmann
14. Mr. Jeffrey Letwin
15. Mr. Richard Barcaskey
16. Mr. John Pocius
17. Mr. Alan Blahovec
18. Dr. Larry Nulton
19. Mr. Mark Murawski
20. Mr. Martin Malone
21. Ms. Cathy Farrell
22. Ms. Rebecca Oyler
23. Mr. David Heath
24. Mr. Ryan Mulvey
25. Mr. Robert Previdi

Members Not Present

1. Honorable Akbar Hossain, Orlando Almonte, alternate
2. Mr. Jeff Mercadante
3. Mr. Michael A. Carroll

CHAIR'S REMARKS:

Chair Holton discussed visiting a Vision Zero conference at Temple University.

MINUTES:

ON A MOTION by Ms. Cathy Farrell, seconded by Mr. John Pocius and unanimously approved, the Minutes of February 2, 2026, TAC Business Meeting were accepted without changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ms. Patricia Krebs of Campbelltown, PA, delivered public comments and provided specific recommendations on bicycle safety, stating that the Department should consider doing more with what it has. Her suggestions included compliant rumble strips, Green Light-Go programs that can include bicycle detection, better tar-and-chip application, and education for county maintenance managers, including a small funding source for each District.

Mr. Ross Willard of Enola, PA, delivered public comments on electric micromobility. Advances in lithium batteries have led to a surge in micromobility use. The state will need to plan for this future, particularly as construction of the new I-83 South Bridge proceeds. In addition, Mr. Willard commented on the pedestrian "Beg Button" located at Valley Road and US 11/15 in Enola, and that it is poorly sited.

Mr. Nolan Ritchie commented that the Senate Transportation Committee was evaluating legislation to provide a statewide framework for micromobility. Mr. Willard stated that different municipalities have policies for micromobility. Secretary Carroll commented that Senator Kearney has a bill, and Mr. Sam Arnold stated that Senate Bill 1008 focuses on the e-scooter issues.

SECRETARY'S REMARKS:

Secretary Carroll discussed the winter budget, stating that PennDOT has consumed 137% of its rolling 5-year average for snow removal. This will have a negative effect on county maintenance operations. PennDOT Districts 1, 2, 3 and 10 helped Rhode Island DOT, in coordination with Vermont DOT and the Maine National Guard during their recent blizzard, which brought up to 39 inches of snow,

The Secretary discussed budget hearings and the Vision Zero conference in Philadelphia.

Planning for the summer events in Philadelphia (the United States Semiquicentennial in July and the FIFA World Cup), along with the April NFL Draft in Pittsburgh are underway.

Mr. Mark Murawski asked about the record letting for 2026 of \$4 billion and if PennDOT could ever deliver a \$5 to \$6 billion program.

The Secretary stated that it would be hard to envision a \$5 billion program and that he felt that the Department would be unlikely to reach that level. Mr. Larry Shifflet stated that the Department would not want to put out a \$5 billion program and then not have the revenue to support it, as it is not good for the contracting industry, or the citizens of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Shifflet also stated that the Department would welcome the opportunity to deliver more.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION UPDATE:

Executive

Executive Deputy Secretary Larry Shifflet discussed the Federal fiscal year 2026 full appropriations bill, which has passed Congress. Negotiations for the FFY 2027 appropriations bill have begun, and the Department has been working with Pennsylvania's Congressional delegation. Mr. Shifflet also mentioned that the IIJA authorization expires at the end of this federal fiscal year, which is September 30, 2026.

Chair Holton asked if federal funding levels remain the same in the appropriations bill. Mr. Shifflet stated that the final year of the federal authorization would be represented as the current level of federal funding, and this has been standard operating procedure for over 20 years. Secretary Carroll mentioned that the President's budget proposal has an 80% reduction in passenger rail funding and a reduction in transit funding. Deputy Secretary Biggica stated that this would be devastating to any future expansion of passenger rail, such as for the Corridor ID program, of which Pennsylvania has three.

Administration and Budget

Deputy Secretary Corey Pellington delivered a brief report for the Administration and Budget Deputate. Hiring remains strong, with a vacancy rate of under 3%. The internship program has been expanded to 1,570 positions, including 350 engineering interns. Mr. Pellington gave an update on the lighting system for the Pittsburgh tunnels, and the energy savings will pay for the project itself over time.

The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program is currently undergoing reevaluation per the interim final rule published by the U.S. DOT on October 3, 2025, and all firms should have received direct communication from their original certifying organization. Each firm is required to submit a personal narrative, a personal net worth statement, and a copy of its tax return for the re-evaluation process. A new methodology is being developed with a consulting firm and Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Firms are recommended to reach out to the Department.

Mr. Ritchie asked why DGS was involved with the Pittsburgh Tunnel project. Mr. Pellington stated that these projects were under GESA (Guaranteed Energy Savings), and GESA projects are under DGS. They are used for facility asset upgrades, specifically due to the amount of lighting being replaced in the tunnels.

Ms. Cathy Farrell asked about the re-evaluation of the DBE program and how many are being reapproved as DBEs versus how many are no longer DBEs, with a follow-up question about building up a small business program for firms that are no longer are DBEs. Mr. Pellington stated that if a firm is decertified, they must wait 12 months. Some firms are choosing to withdraw for the moment. Less than 10 firms have been denied. In response to the follow-up question, Mr. Pellington stated that the Governor's Office has worked to prioritize small businesses overall with a variety of programs.

Driver and Vehicle Services

Deputy Secretary Kara Templeton delivered a brief report for Driver and Vehicle Services, covering the road user charge for EVs, with the next phase of implementation (payment plans) on track for July 2026. PennDOT has updated 24 driver license centers and will be extensively updating the Somerset facility over the next three months. Pennsylvania has 3.7 million users of RealID, which is about 37% of all ID holders. Susquehanna County enacted a \$5 local use ordinance, which is in effect on May 14, 2026.

April is Donate Life Month. The Department partners with the Department of Health for this initiative.

Ms. Rebecca Oyler asked if there were any updates about the issue of non-domiciled CDL drivers. Ms. Templeton stated that the Department is still paused on that issue at the direction of USDOT, and the Department would need additional approval from FMCSA to begin issuing non-domiciled commercial products under the newest final rule from FMCSA, which was issued in March.

Multimodal

Deputy Secretary Meredith Biggica delivered an update for the Multimodal depute. Ms. Biggica discussed the Advanced Air Mobility (AAM) program and the Electric Vertical Takeoff and Landing Integration Pilot Program (eIPP). Pennsylvania is one of eight partners selected by the FAA in March of 2026, and details will be forthcoming. 17 states are involved. Five advanced sites are to be identified, and the first site has been identified in Clearfield County.

Ms. Biggica stated that Aviation Capital grants should be announced soon for up to \$10 million in projects, and on passenger rail, several stations are under construction, including Coatesville, a pedestrian bridge at Lancaster, and construction at Parkesburg.

Mr. Murawski complimented the depute on being awarded the eIPP.

Mr. David Heath asked whether there was any funding attached to the eIPP and whether there was capacity to support the eIPP. Ms. Biggica stated that there is no federal funding and that staffing levels would remain as is.

Mr. Ritchie asked if there were updates on TASA awards. Deputy Secretary Mulkerin stated that the recommended list was being worked on, and that announcements should be made in spring or early summer.

Ms. Biggica noted that many airports have run out of authorization for capital budget and will need attention in the upcoming itemization bill.

Highway Administration

Deputy Secretary Christine Norris delivered a brief report for Highway Administration. A \$4 billion letting program is planned for 2026. 147 projects for \$608 million have been let so far this year. Bids are coming in 7% lower than the Department estimates.

The Distracted driving law goes into effect for citations on June 5, 2026. 10,000 crashes related to distracted driving were recorded in the last year, with almost 6,000 injuries and 49 fatalities. Hopefully, the Distracted Driving Law will reduce these numbers. The Department has media releases planned through May and June for communication. \$300,000 in NHTSA funding will be available for local law enforcement.

Planning

Deputy Secretary Kristin Mulkerin delivered a brief report for the Planning Deputate, stating that the update for the 2027 12-Year Program is in progress with regional TIP public comment periods underway. In addition, the Freight Movement Plan update is underway. Five focus group sessions have been held, and the virtual freight forum will be held on April 14 and 15, 2026.

TAC STUDY TOPICS DISCUSSION

Transportation Funding Assessment

Chair Holton introduced the TAC Funding Assessment study, stating that the study scope was revised to consolidate proposals and Department feedback. The study is scheduled to conclude in June of 2027, with findings delivered throughout the spring of 2027 to align with the budget cycle.

Mr. Heath stated that the study is not meant to determine how transportation is funded but should create a credible, objective foundation for policymakers. Mr. Heath urged the inclusion of quantifiable defensible metrics showing what different investment levels buy and the consequences of underinvestment, and a shared understanding to avoid fragmented policy discussions. Mr. Murawski supported the proposed framework and emphasized comparing investment levels and outcomes. Mr. Heath followed up, reiterating that the study's role is to build consensus rather than prescribe a single funding number.

Chair Holton noted that the scope includes consequences of underinvestment and comparisons to other states. She clarified that the study will not repeat the TROC and highlighted the value of long-term case studies.

Mr. Robert Previdi stated that the study should identify clear needs and risks, cautioned against limiting the discussion to what is currently affordable, and emphasized the importance of understanding the full needs over time. Mr. Previdi cited SEPTA's regional rail system as an example of underinvestment.

Mr. Alan Blahovec asked that references to public transit include both fixed-route and shared-ride transit and noted that shared-ride systems are critical in many counties. He offered support from the Pennsylvania Public Transit Association.

Secretary Carroll stated that transportation funding is drawn from the Motor License Fund, the General Fund, federal partners and county and local partners. He expressed concern that quantifying an astronomical financial need may cause legislators to disengage and emphasized the artful need for reconciling documented need with political reality.

Mr. Heath stated that the study would help define each level of investment, and that the scope should clarify how transportation funding works, including letting timelines.

Ms. Oyler asked for clarification on whether the study was meant to reiterate TROC and sought confirmation that the study would list how funding currently happens and catalog how other states have addressed funding without recommending specific options. Chair Holton reiterated that the study would not update TROC. Mr. Heath confirmed that the goal is to document current funding, highlight how other states are doing it, and evaluate levels of investment against outcomes prioritized by mode and region. Ms. Oyler also noted that the scope's stakeholder engagement section lacked clear private sector representation. The Secretary stated that APC (Associated Pennsylvania Constructors) and others are in the scope and that the list is not exhaustive. The Secretary also stated that it is the Department's job to highlight the need and consequences of not addressing it, and funding policy choices belongs to the Legislature.

Ms. Farrell offered a data point for the study from the ASCE, the State Infrastructure Report Card and volunteered to serve on the task force. Chair Holton confirmed that the task force invitation would be sent to the full TAC.

Mr. Ritche noted that transit reforms and efficiencies should be included in the scope of work and expressed concern about the Eastern Transportation Coalition's concerns about the MBUF (mileage-based user fee). Mr. Ritche stated that this is a non-starter. In addition, he noted that comprehensive action by June is unlikely and recommended watching the recent transit hearings to gauge the Republican caucus's position on the issue. He also noted that Pennsylvania already invests more in public transportation than most states except New York.

The Secretary added that the policymaker landscape would change pending the outcome of the November elections.

Chair Holton acknowledged Mr. Ritchie's efficiency point and that reforms are critical and confirmed that a task force invitation would follow.

ON A MOTION by Mr. David Heath, seconded by Mr. Mark Murawski and unanimously approved, the TAC Funding Assessment Study scope was approved.

Zipper Merge Study

Chair Holton reported that the draft scope has been reviewed by the Department and is ready to proceed. The study will examine behavioral aspect of the potential of zipper mergers around construction zones and land closures.

Mr. John Kashatus stated that the study should examine driver behaviors and identify ways to help educate the public about merging. The central challenge of the study is how to change driver behavior. The study is expected to be a quick turnaround, with a white paper finalized by the end of August and available for the October meeting. Mr. Kashatus stated that an email would be issued for volunteers.

Ms. Oyler asked if the study would capture Pennsylvania-specific practical applications such as how zipper merge is actually being used in the Districts. Mr. Kashatus stated that he was unaware of any mandate that makes it standard practice. Ms. Oyler stated that she has spoken with engineers who confirm that it is encouraged but wondered about practical applications. Chair Holton stated that PennDOT's review of the draft scope did not identify any existing applications.

Deputy Secretary Norris said that the core piece of the study would be the educational piece. Zipper merges are encouraged by the Department, and the challenge is getting drivers to understand how to navigate them.

Ms. Oyler raised a concern about merge points and signage inconsistency.

ON A MOTION by Mr. Mark Murawski, and seconded by Mr. Ron Wagenmann and unanimously approved, the Zipper Merge study scope was approved.

TRUCK PARKING

Mr. Mike Rimer, AICP and Mr. Bob Pento, PE gave an update presentation on Truck Parking and its expansion in Pennsylvania. Mr. Rimer discussed planning initiatives, coordination, and highlighted a number of sites around the Commonwealth that have new truck parking locations planned, under construction, or in operation. Mr. Pento discussed the recommended priority corridors and the planning aspects of expanding truck parking.

STUDY IMPLEMENTATION UPDATES

None.

MEMBER UPDATES

None.

OTHER BUSINESS:

The next TAC Meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 15, 2026, in Harrisburg, PA.

ADJOURNMENT

ON A MOTION by Ms. Farrell, seconded by Mr. Heath, and unanimously approved, the TAC meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.

FOLLOWUPS

Follow-ups from the public comments at the April TAC meeting were forwarded to their respective subject matter experts.

Follow-up #1:

Pat Krebs provided additional comment during the TAC Meeting:

Act 89 **multi modal grants** requirements need to be changed. 30% match is too great. In-kind work by municipalities should be allowed.

- The 30% match is required by Section 2106 of Title 74. Expenses related to the sponsor's use of services that have been provided on a volunteer or free basis (in-kind) cannot be used as a match. *Unless otherwise specified by law, financial assistance under section 2104(a)(2) and (4) (relating to use of money in fund) shall be matched by local funding in an amount not less than 30% of the non-Federal share of the project costs. Matching funds from a county or municipality shall only consist of cash contributions provided by one or more counties or municipalities*

Follow-up #2:

Ross Willard additional comment provided during the TAC meeting:

I am a walker, "I see signs that say no walking allowed" along the interstate, and we are not allowed to cross it. If we do, we put in those "beg" buttons. Classic Local example of these buttons, route 11/15 and valley street, Summerdale, so next time you go passed an intersection that has beg buttons close to an interstate, look for all plastic buttons that have been run over. In this case the beg button on the north side has been run over three times. PennDOT Paid for it the first time, my township has paid for it the other three times it has been run over. The South side beg button just was run over last month, it took them two weeks to replace it. Nobody comes down to the side walk properly to hit the beg button cause its too far. I've seen one person go by the beg button, they didn't hit it, because they are standing on what I call the triangle of death. They have three lanes of cars coming at them and they are standing in the middle of traffic, so they just run. Most of them don't do that, they get on the other side so its narrower it's dangerous. The people with common sense they actually go thru the woods and up over a hill. We need to do better on where we are placing these things. Because I would bet that in Summerdale that button is only tested by testers nobody ever pushes it to use it. Take a look at your local municipality and see if you can walk from your house to the grocery store thank you very much.

- *The location of pushbuttons is governed by the federal [Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices](#) (MUTCD, Chapter 4I), PennDOT [Publication 148](#) (TC-8803 sheet 4) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) law. Publication 148 hasn't been updated to reflect changes in the MUTCD 11th edition. Figure 4I-3.C appears to be the closest to this situation with a shared landing area. The buttons could be separated and placed on the far sides of the landing area. If the municipality wants to move the push-button locations, they would need to contact District 8 to revise the traffic signal permit, and the new locations need to meet the requirements.*

Follow-up #3

Pat Krebs provided additional comment during the TAC Meeting:

Noncompliant edge line rumbles: A dozen or so years ago, I suggested that each District be directed to identify the state roads with noncompliant edge line rumbles. Compile the list statewide. Some Districts may have none. Prioritize these roads in each District based on bicyclists' use. Perhaps they are a PA J route or V Route. In each budget year, fund the overlay or remove rumbles. Work through the list. There are now new materials that can cover rumbles effectively until there is a resurfacing project for the entire road. PREVENT noncompliant rumbles being installed now and in the future.

- *The non-compliant rumble strips concern from the 2008 to 2010-time frame has been addressed. In 2018 new rumble strip standards and guidance were published in PennDOT's construction standards (Publication 72) and in Design Manual 2 chapter 12. The rumble strips that were built to the old standards were replaced or will be removed or replaced through the pavement life cycle. The typical life cycle of pavement is around 10 years. Any remaining locations with rumble strip installed under old standards are being addressed as the pavement is replaced.*

VRU efforts underway by PennDOT will require municipalities' buy in. Allowing speed limits to be set for other conditions and not the 85% rule is needed asap.

- *The federally required VRU Safety Assessment requires state DOTs to involve municipalities and other VRU safety partners. PennDOT is gathering input and comments through numerous in person and virtual VRU SA meetings taking place through July. We also have PPAC involved in the process.*
- *In accordance with [Pennsylvania Code Title 67 \(Transportation\), Section 212.108](#), speed limits for public highways in the Commonwealth should be within 5 miles per hour of the average 85th percentile speed or the safe-running speed on the section of highway, except the speed limit may be reduced up to 10 miles per hour below either of these values under certain conditions defined in the regulation. With that said, PennDOT recognizes the Vehicle Code and Title 67 regulation allow for flexibility and engineering judgement as it applies to the setting of speed limits, which is particularly important in urban and suburban areas with high percentages of vulnerable road users. As a result, the department is in the process of rewriting its policy on the setting of speed limits with the goal of establishing limits that are self-enforcing, reflecting the surrounding land-use context and increase the overall safety of all road users. The draft version of this policy is currently under review by PennDOT staff as well as our stakeholders and we expect to implement it statewide in calendar year 2026.*

Follow-up #4

Pat Krebs provided additional comment during the TAC Meeting:

Tar and Chip applications by PennDOT and municipalities: There should be a directive that points out why the correct mix of tar and chip is important for bicyclists. Loose chip can result in crashes; loose chip is pushed by motor vehicles into the shoulders and make them unsuitable for cyclists to use. Passing motorists and oncoming motorists cause “dust storms” if the chip is not sealed. Bicyclists find it difficult to breath and chips get into eyes. Intersections are another place where chips pile up loosely.

- *PennDOT provides training to county maintenance managers and crews on tar and chip, which includes information on application rates and post operation sweeping to remove loose stones.*

Importance of PennDOT County Maintenance: County Maintenance is where small road repairs and upgrades can be made to state roads to improve bicyclists’ safety. Fill a pothole on the shoulder or in the road; scrap a hillside that has eroded over a shoulder; remove vegetation that has overgrown the shoulder. When resurfacing a road, be sure to widen the shoulders within ROW. An excellent county maintenance manager was nicknamed the Grate Guy, because whenever we found a grate that was not safe for bicyclists to cross, we told him, and within a few days the grate was replaced. He probably depleted District 8’s supply. He built shoulders on busy roads where there had been minimal or no shoulders previously. He cared.

- *Our focus is on core maintenance activities (i.e. Winter Maintenance, crack sealing, pothole patching, drainage, shoulder cutting, vegetation management, signs/pavement marking management, and bridge maintenance).*

Educate County Maintenance Managers and Crews about how they can improve the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians.

- *The maintenance manual (Publication 23) sets PennDOT policies and practices for roadway maintenance. It includes guidance on roadside management that relates to bicycle lane maintenance and operations.*

Provide a modest annual budget item for each county maintenance unit to be used for improving bicycling, if needed, and this includes updating Through Bike Lane road markings. Many of these are orphans and becoming ragged. Update SLMs on state roads.

- *The PA Code states that pavement markings for bicycles are the responsibility of local authorities and other agencies. PennDOT does not maintain bike lane markings.*

PA Code Chapter 67 §212.5(b)1 - Installation and maintenance responsibilities.

...

- (v) *Local authorities, or other agencies as indicated, are responsible for installing, maintaining and operating the following traffic-control devices, subject to Department approval prior to any change in the traffic restriction:...*
- (U) *Pavement markings for bicycles such as the bicycle lane symbol.*

Follow-up #5:

Pat Krebs provided additional comment during the TAC Meeting:

HOPs: HOPs must include bike/ped facilities or when the development is completed, the road is less safe for bicyclists. If sidewalks are minimal, pedestrians are left to find their own way on or off the road. When a shoulder is taken for a right turn lane and there is no through bike lane, the bicyclist must move into the travel lane often on a busy road or risk being struck with a right hook driver.

- *A Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) Applicant who will generate significant vehicular traffic must include a pedestrian/bicycle checklist (PennDOT Design Manual Part IX, Appendix S) to aid in determining the need for ped/bike facilities. Need determination should be a collaborative effort between the applicant, PennDOT, municipality, county, and MPO/RPO. Whenever possible, discussions should begin during the initial scoping meeting, prior to application submission.*

PennDOT's Policies and Procedures for Transportation Impact Studies and Assessments require the applicant to conduct a Mitigation Analysis to determine improvements necessary to address any drop in vehicular level of service and any safety concerns resulting from their development. This information can then be used to determine if a development's increased traffic warrants the need for pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities. Per Design Manual Part 2 (Appendix 14B), PennDOT will not install bike lanes without a municipal request.

As part of an update to the Policies and Procedures for Transportation Impact Studies and Assessments, we will be researching approaches for addressing non-vehicular impacts of development and will identify conditions under which multimodal analysis is required, along with the appropriate metrics for evaluation.

Follow-up #6

Pat Krebs provided additional comment during the TAC Meeting:

Active Transportation Plans: If these are important for planning and implementing, then PennDOT should expect MPOs or Counties to develop ATPs. Develop a template for them to use. PennDOT did this briefly in the 1990s. There should be reasons why ATPs are not needed.

- *PennDOT does not have the authority to require MPOs and Counties to adopt Active Transportation Plans (ATP). PennDOT has published [Pub 787G](#) - How-to Guide for Developing Active Transportation Guides which is available on the PennDOT website. The Guide serves as a resource for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs), counties, and local municipalities throughout Pennsylvania to update or develop an Active Transportation Plan. This Guide lists essential steps and highlights noteworthy practices in the active transportation or bicycle and pedestrian planning process from pre-planning to implementation and evaluation, along with hyperlinked resources, handbooks, and Pennsylvania specific examples. The Guide provides a framework for developing active transportation plans that apply at any jurisdictional level under a variety of contexts.*

Follow-up #7

Pat Krebs provided additional comment during the TAC Meeting:

PennDOT Connects only works with municipalities whose elected leaders and managers are interested in improving bicycling and pedestrian facilities. There ought to be a rewards system or a sticks and carrots approach.

- *PennDOT Connects is a program open to capturing locally suggested transportation improvements that involve many aspects of a local transportation system. Transportation enhancements that are encouraged include bicycle and pedestrian facilities as well as transportation projects that reinforce safety needs, efficiency, goods movement, convenience, economic development, resiliency, and desired mode shifts. The local community retains the prerogative to select the enhancement it would like to see in a local project*

Bicycling Tourism in PA could be an economic driver. Yes, there are rail trails that bicyclists do enjoy. However, many bicyclists want to explore the state by biking on roads. Next month, there will be over 100 cyclists enjoying the roads in south central PA due to one woman's enterprising effort to offer bike rides in several parts of PA. She calls this area *gorgeous and lovely*. How can touring cyclists travel into and out of the state capital? She reminds me that the 911 trail must use roads as well as off road trails. Touring on road cyclists come to see "sights" including agricultural rural areas, natural features and historic sites, eat, use lodgings and shop. They need safe roads.

- *PennDOT prioritizes the safety of all users of our roadway system, including bicyclists. While road sharing is encouraged, roadways throughout the Commonwealth present many different conditions. All roadway users must be conscientious and careful using these facilities.*

Follow-up #8:

Pat Krebs provided additional comment during the TAC Meeting:

Green Light – Go Program: When municipalities submit their pre application for a grant, remind them that detecting bicycles is included in the evaluation process by PennDOT. When approving grants to municipalities, require bicycle detection where appropriate. When promoting the program and announcing the grantees in news releases, the purpose should include the safety and convenience of bicyclists and motorists. (Pedestrians are also prime users of intersections.)

- *While not specifically called out in the Green Light-Go [Program Guidelines](#), bicycle detection is eligible for Green Light-Go funding under the “Detection and/or Controller Upgrades” application category. That category is one of the highest-scoring categories under the Project Benefits and Effectiveness scoring category since detection improves signal efficiency for all users. Bicycle detection would also be eligible when included as part of a project primarily in another category, such as Modernization Upgrades.*

We do not track bicycle improvements, specifically among Green Light-Go applications or awards. Most applications propose video or radar detection, which is typically better for detecting bicycles.

Aside from the Green Light-Go program, PennDOT has also been updating traffic signal design policies to improve bicycle detection for all traffic signals:

[Publication 148, Traffic Signal Standards](#) includes loop sensor design for enhanced bicycle and motorcycle detection (since 2010) – TC-8600 Sheet 1.

A major rewrite of Publication 149, Traffic Signal Design Handbook, is nearly complete. The latest draft is attached. There is discussion of bicycle detection in Chapters 9 and 17. Section 17.2 discusses pros/cons for different detection technologies, including performance for bicyclists.

Follow-up #9

The following is a summary of the comment to be shared: Ross Willard

What future insight to the use of electric micro mobility does the commission have? Because of the advances in Lith ion batteries (lower prices and longer mileage range), e micro mobility has exploded. And with inflation causing higher prices of cars/insurance/gas; financially challenged people are discovering that e bikes and e scooters offer further range than tradition bikes and are not limited like mass transit schedules or no mass transit at all. With big box stores selling \$300 - 500 e bikes and e scooters (note - we all know e scooters are illegal, but they are HERE).

We have a big influx of what we call entry level bicyclist entering the roadways with expert level speeds and no regard sometimes for traffic regulations. We have a lot of education to do! But is Pennsylvania planning for the future. Local scenario, the rebuilding of the Route 83 Harrisburg South Bridge (It's a local bridge with an interstate number) is not planned for having a micro mobility lane. When it's built in 8 years - it will be swamped with illegal riders taking the most direct route and everyone will be saying "Why is this Happening"? The whole state will be affected by this influx of micro mobility. We need to plan better now.

- *With the upcoming rehabilitation of the Market Street Bridge, including a new utility and pedestrian facility, the department believes that this should accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic across the Susquehanna River at Harrisburg. In addition, there will be no provisions for bicycles and pedestrians on the South Bridge as it is an interstate highway facility.*

Follow-up #10

Pat Krebs provided additional comment during the TAC Meeting:

PennDOT Policy: We won't fix a bicycling condition until there is a road project to be undertaken. Wait five, ten years and meanwhile deal with it. This policy should change.

- *Thank you for your interest in bicyclist safety and PennDOT's processes for supporting safe cycling on Pennsylvania's roadways. While the Department can address some bicycle safety issues as part of its maintenance activities, many improvements require larger efforts and coordination through the project development process. As part of that process, the Department, in conjunction with Metropolitan and Rural Planning Organizations, identifies projects to include in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program that support safety and asset management. We use a data-driven and evidence-based approach to identify and prioritize safety project investments. We also promote best practices with our partners and share data, tools, training, and other resources in support of their efforts to raise awareness and address roadway safety issues. Working together, we are more likely to reach our safety targets and goals. If you are aware of a specific location with safety concerns, please share it with us so we can contact the appropriate Engineering District.*