

## Publication 46 - Chapter 9.2 Updates

### CT T-24-012

PLEASE READ AND FOLLOW THESE INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING COMMENTS!!!

Before entering comments, use "File, Save-As" command to save this file with a unique name. Attach your comment file and e-mail or send hardcopy back to RA-PDBOMO-CT@pa.gov.

Comment No.	District/Organization	Date	Contact	Page	Approved/Modified/Disapproved	Comments	Follow up by Work Group
Example	7-0		John Doe	7-2	Approved	Third Paragraph, second line, "...tht..." should be spelled "...that..."	
1	D-3	9/17/2024	Shawn Stille			No comments.	N/A
2	4-0	9/16/2024	Joe Talutto			No comments.	N/A
3	4-0	9/16/2024	Robert Wasilchak			No comments.	N/A
4	4-0	9/18/2024	Robert Kretschmer			No comments.	N/A
5	5-0	8/22/2024	Chuck Richards	9-2		<b>2nd paragraph,</b> When erecting signs for these routes, every turn is to have a BicyclePA Route Marker Turn Assembly (M1-8A) in advance of the turn, and a confirmation BicyclePA Route Marker (M1-8) after the turn in each direction of travel. Existing Bike routes have signs at the turn as well. So existing routes have 3 signs in each direction, where this is requiring only 2 signs in each direction for each turn.	Existing BicyclePA route policy in Pub. 46 only required two signs at each turn in each direction - a BicyclePA Route Marker Turn Assembly (M1-8A) and a confirmation BicyclePA Route Marker (M1-8). The draft policy has been revised to clarify that a sign can be placed in advance of or at the turn and then an additional sign after the turn. It is not necessary to have 3 signs at each turn.
6	5-0	8/22/2024	Chuck Richards	9-2		<b>last paragraph,</b> same comment as noted above.	See response to Comment #5.
7	10-0	9/25/2024	Adam Marshall			Do we need to specify that the plans must be sealed by a professional engineer or is that covered in general somewhere else in our policies	Policy has been revised to require plans be sealed by a PE unless waived by the local PennDOT District Executive.
8	D-11	9/18/2024	Erik Porter			No comments	N/A
9	OCC	9/18/2024	Jaaon Wolgemuth			No comments.	N/A
10	PPAC	09.10.2024	Alex MacDonald			Would like to see more information/guidance on how interested parties can request designation or find additional information	The policy outlines the process to request approval to use state highway right-of-way for a bicycle route. If additional information is needed, the District Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator can provide it. No revisions necessary.
11	PPAC	09.10.2024	Alex MacDonald			Can the policy provide more specific metrics for what would qualify as a designation? How will the policy help unify the districts with discrete specifications?	The policy references the MUTCD and PennDOT Pub 13 which should be followed when indentifying a designated route and designing the necessary traffic control devices for the route.
12	PPAC	09.10.2024	Alex MacDonald			Who should applicants contact/where can application information be found?	No revisions needed. The policy outlines the process and what is needed to apply to a district for a bicycle route designation. Any questions can be directed to the District Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator.
13	PPAC	09.10.2024	Alex MacDonald			Can an example application be provided to applicants to help standardize it?	No revision is necessary. There is no application required. The policy outlines what is required to be included in the Signing and Pavement Marking Plan to be submitted to the district for review.
14	PPAC	09.10.2027	Alex MacDonald			No. 4 under Bicycle route approval process- what will reviewers be looking for/grading for in the application. How will the review process be standardized across districts?	No revisions are necessary. The districts will review the Signing and Pavement Marking Plan to ensure there are no safety concerns or prohibitions to bicyclists as indicated in the policy. There is no specific criteria for bicycle route designations. Each district will review the proposed routes based on existing conditions and use engineering judgement for approving.
15	PPAC	09.10.2024	Alex MacDonald			No. 6 mentions "traffic control devices" but the rest of the policy is only discussing signage. Are traffic control devices also a possibility that entities can be applying for under this designation?	No revisions necessary. Traffic control devices include both signing and pavement markings required for the bicycle routes.
16	PPAC	09.10.2024	PPAC			Provide the draft policy to trail organizations for review.	Due to the large number of trail organizations and the feasibility of having them all review the policy, we rely on PPAC to review and comment on behalf of the trail organizations since there are members representing trail and pedestrian constituencies.
17	9/11 National Memorial Trail Alliance	09.18.2024	Jeffrey McCauley			In the policy it mentions "a major intersection" and I was wondering if the definition of what a major intersection for signing purposes could be referenced and when the Trail route goes through more urban areas would it be possible to lower the 3-5-mile location of signs along the route to maybe a half mile in certain areas of dense urban development.	Major intersections are where two or more major roadways meet and are typically signal controlled. Language has been added to clarify this.  In urban areas, signs could be installed after each major intersection based on the policy. Because of this, no revisions are necessary to allow for more closely spaced sign locations in urban areas.
18	Policy	9/18/2024	Gothie	9-2		Final paragraph - consider also noting multiple municipalities may need to provide letters of support	Policy has been revised to clearly indicate a letter of support is required from each municipality where the bicycle route is proposed.
19	Policy	9/18/2024	Gothie	9-3		First Paragraph - note that proposed trails crossing more than one PennDOT district will need to be approved from both districts and signed Right-of-Entry agreements with both districts.	No revisions necessary. All districts involved with a proposed bicycle route will review the proposed route within their respective area. Only one Highway Use Agreement will need to be executed for the proposed route.
20	Policy	9/18/2024	Gothie	9-3		Note the 67 PA Code 212.5 does not explicitly mention bicycle signs as being included as a local responsibility however pavement marking for bicycles are. Suggest this is clarified. See - <a href="https://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pacode?file=/secure/pacode/data/067/chapter212/chap212toc.htm">https://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pacode?file=/secure/pacode/data/067/chapter212/chap212toc.htm</a>	Policy has been revised to clarify the local authority is responsible to maintain the traffic control devices approved in the signing and pavement marking plan.
21	FHWA	9/19/2024	Jeff Engle	9-2		Sec 9.2 Bicycle Routes: Consider replacing the 1st sentence with something to the effect... "Bicycle routes throughout the Commonwealth can be in various designated forms, State-numbered or County, Local or otherwise-named, or given a US route designation. They can be a part of a Shared-Use path as well. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) Section 9D 'Guide and Service Signs' provides guidance for signing of Bicycle and Shared Use Paths of various designations."	First sentence has been revised to read, "Designations for bicycle routes within the Commonwealth include state lettered routes, local or regionally named routes, or U.S. numbered bicycle routes. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Section 9D Guide and Service Signs, provides guidance on signing for bicycle routes."

**Publication 46 - Chapter 9.2 Updates**  
**CT T-24-012**

**PLEASE READ AND FOLLOW THESE INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING COMMENTS!!!**  
 Before entering comments, use "File, Save-As" command to save this file with a unique name. Attach your comment file and e-mail or send hardcopy back to RA-PDBOMO-CT@pa.gov.

Comment No.	District/Organization	Date	Contact	Page	Approved/Modified/Disclaimer	Comments	Follow up by Work Group
22	FHWA	9/19/2024	Jeff Engle	9-2		<p>Note: Bicycle and Pedestrian use of Interstate and other Limited Access ROW is not expressly prohibited by FHWA (<a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/freeways.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/freeways.cfm</a>), and transportation networks are not to restrict safe bicycle and pedestrian movements. Therefore, consider adding a new paragraph/a few sentences to Sec 9.2 (likely following J. Engle text in FHWA Comment No. 17) something to the effect: Bicyclists and pedestrians are to be safely accommodated along transportation facilities. In certain circumstances, this may mean, portions of a desired Bicycle Route or Shared-Use Path may fall within Interstate or other Limited Access roadway ROW, if it can be accomplished safely. In such instances, careful application of design features (significant separation or positive protection) will be required, as well as appropriate signing that will not conflict with roadway vehicular traffic. The following guidance on signing for the various bicycle route types and roadway applications are to be the minimum conditions to be addressed".</p>	Section 9.3 in Publication 46 addresses the process for establishing bicycle access on freeways. DM1-C (Pub. 10C) addresses requests for non-motorized trails in limited access right-of-ways. No revisions are necessary to Section 9.2.
23	FHWA	9/11/2024	Bill Houpt	General		<p>Would it be beneficial to include a statement regarding the use of Limited Access ROW somewhere in this section? Even if it is expected to follow the same approach as other state owned ROW, it may be a good idea to mention it specifically for clarity. If it is included somewhere else, consider referencing it here.</p>	Section 9.3 in Publication 46 addresses the process for establishing bicycle access on freeways. No revisions are necessary to Section 9.2.
24	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	General		Consider clarifying the process for bicycle routes located in multiple PennDOT Districts.	See response to Comment #19.
25	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	General		Consider clarifying if the process is the same for revisions to bicycle routes, both temporary (possibly due to construction or closures) and permanent. How are detours or other impacts due to construction by an entity other than the owner of the bicycle route signs handled?	Revision to an approved bicycle route requires a revised plan submission to the department for approval. Detours for established routes due to construction would be handled as part of the construction project that is affecting the route.
26	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	General		Consider mentioning and/or provide a brief summary of US Bicycle Routes.	First section of 9.2 has been revised to include U.S. route designations.
27	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	General		Will PennDOT be maintaining a map of other approved bicycle route designations (beyond the PA Bicycle Routes)? If so, consider requiring the sponsor to submit information that could be used for PennDOT's mapping purposes. If not, consider requiring the sponsor to provide a publicly accessible map and information about the route.	No revision necessary. At this time, PennDOT is not maintaining a map and will not require the sponsor to have a publicly accessible map although most likely they will.
28	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	General		Consider including Planning Partners in the process, possibly by having the bicycle route request shared with the Planning Partner for their information.	No revision is necessary. Applicants can coordinate with their respective planning partners as necessary.
29	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	9-2		Introductory text: Consider adding a reference to the AASHTO's Guide to Bicycle Facilities, which includes guidance on signing and wayfinding for bicycle routes in Section 4.11 (in the current 4th Edition).	Reference to PennDOT Pub 13 has been added to the policy which references the AASHTO Guide to Bicycle Facilities.
30	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	9-3		For Bicycle Route Approval Process #1: Consider adding "and prepares a bicycle route overview map that shows the proposed route along with other pertinent information, such as municipal boundaries and other bicycle routes or facilities."	Item #2 identifies what the applicant is required to submit. A bullet identifying "existing bicycle routes and facilities" has been added to #2.
31	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	9-3		For Bicycle Route Approval Process #2: Consider clarifying whether the signing and pavement marking plans must be prepared by a professional engineer or other qualified professional.	Policy has been revised to require plans be sealed by a PE unless waived by the local PennDOT District Executive.
32	FHWA	9/12/2024	Natasha Manbeck	9-3		Bicycle Route Approval Process #3: Add bicycle route overview map and municipal letter(s) of support to the list of submission requirements to the DTE.	No revision necessary. Letters of support are already addressed in the policy.