Active Transportation Funding & the Next Transportation Bill

an APBP Webinar featuring:
Kevin Mills, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy
Celinda Lake, Lake Research Partners

Featuring Results of RTC’s Bipartisan National Poll
Purposes of Poll

- Demonstrate public support for federal role in active transportation
- Develop more effective messages to sway public and decision-makers
Advocacy Context

- Federal transportation reauthorization timetable
- Direct attacks: not the federal role/ can't afford
- Preserve core programs

“Washington continues to spend federal dollars on projects that have nothing to do with roads like bike paths and transit as well as completely unrelated projects like museums and squirrel sanctuaries.”
Rails to Trails Conservancy National Poll

Celinda Lake
April 29th, 2015

Conducted by Lake Research Partners & Bellwether Research
Survey Among 1000 Likely 2016 Voters
September 9th – 14th, 2014 (MOE +/- 3.1%)
Methodology

Bellwether Research and Lake Research Partners designed and administered this survey which was conducted by telephone using professional interviewers September 9th-14th, 2014.

The survey reached a total of 1000 likely 2016 voters nationwide.

Telephone numbers for the survey were drawn using a voter file sample. The national data were weighted slightly by gender, age, party identification, race, and region to reflect the attributes of the actual population.

The margin of error for the total national sample is +/- 3.1%.
Regional Definitions:

- **New England** - Respondents who live in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island or Connecticut.

- **Middle Atlantic** - Respondents who live in New York, New Jersey or Pennsylvania.

- **East South Central** - Respondents who live in Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, or Kentucky.

- **West South Central** - Respondents who live in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, or Texas.

- **South Atlantic** - Respondents who live in Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia or Florida.

- **East North Central** - Respondents who live in Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, or Ohio.

- **West North Central** - Respondents who live in Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, or Kansas.

- **Mountain** - Respondents who live in Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah or Nevada.

- **Pacific** - Respondents who live in California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska or Hawaii.
Context
Key Findings – Context

❖ Voters favor a federal role in funding walking and biking paths and they do not want to decrease the amount of money being spent.

❖ This survey illustrates there is a definite constituency for walking and biking paths and broad support for expenditures in this area.
Key Findings – Context

❖ Over forty percent of voters say they have too few paths in their communities.

❖ It appears that attitudes are highly correlated between perceptions of the number of paths and attitudes toward funding: if a voter thinks the number of paths is about right, they want to maintain current funding. If a voter thinks there are too few paths, then they want to increase funding.

❖ Few people want to decrease spending.
Voters’ perception of the number of walking and biking paths in their communities is evenly split between having too few paths and the right amount of paths. Very few voters say there are too many paths.

![Perception of Community Walking and Biking Paths](image)

Thinking about the walking and biking paths that exist in your community, would you say that you have too many, too few, or just the right amount?
Democrats and voters in the South Central region are among the most likely to say there are too few paths. Republicans and voters in the Midwest are most likely to say the number of paths is about right.

Those who are most likely to say there are too few paths include:
- Voters in the West South Central region – 55%
- Voters in the East South Central region* - 54%
- Democratic women – 54%
- Strong Democrats – 52%

Those who are most likely to say there are just the right amount of paths include:
- Voters in the West North Central region – 64%
- Weak Republicans – 58%
- Republican men – 57%

*Note small sample size

Thinking about the walking and biking paths that exist in your community, would you say that you have too many, too few, or just the right amount?
Funding
Key Findings - Funding

❖ Voters prefer maintaining or increasing the percentage of federal transportation funds that support walking and biking over decreasing funds by nearly four to one. More than four in ten voters prefer to maintain the percentage of current federal transportation funds that support walking and biking. A third would increase this funding and a fifth would decrease it.

❖ In a hypothetical exercise, voters would spend significantly more than the current budget on funding for public transportation and walking and biking paths.

❖ When asked to distribute $100 in funding across roads, public transportation, and walking and biking paths, voters designate about $27 to walking and biking paths, 18 times the current funding.
Key Findings - Funding

❖ Voters seek a combination of transportation options and want federal funding to reflect it.

❖ Voters are less likely to vote for a candidate who would eliminate funds for walking and biking paths and says that federal transportation funds should be used only for highways and roads.

❖ Republicans agree, as do Democrats and Independents.
A plurality of voters prefer to maintain 1.5 percent of the federal transportation funds that support walking and biking. A third would increase this funding and a fifth would decrease it.

74% would maintain or increase.

Among Republicans, 64% say funding should be maintained or increased, while only 30% say funding should decrease.
Voters seek a mixed plan of transportation options reflected in transportation funding. When asked to distribute $100 in funding, voters designate about $27 to walking and biking paths, 18 times the current funding.

Poll Results

- Walking/Biking/Sidewalks: $26.90
- Roads/Highways: $42.20
- Public Transit: $30.70

Current Budget (per $100)

- Walking/Biking/Sidewalks: $1.50
- Roads/Highways: $77.50
- Public Transit: $21.00

78% of voters believe that funding for expanding and improving walking and biking paths should be more than $2 – the current equivalent distribution in the budget.

If you had $100 tax dollars, how would you distribute it among each of the following - maintaining and creating roads and highways; expanding and improving public transportation; expanding and improving walking and biking paths, and sidewalks.
Key 2016 voting blocs support keeping funding for walking and biking trails by wide margins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key 2016 Constituencies</th>
<th>Maintain</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College-educated women</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican women</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moms</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voters are less likely to vote for a candidate who would eliminate funds for walking and biking paths and says that federal transportation funds should be used only for highways and roads.

Vote Likelihood for a Candidate that would Fund Only HWYs/Roads and Eliminate Walking/Biking Funds

- Less likely: 43
  - Much less likely: 25
  - Somewhat less likely: 13

- More likely: 21
  - Somewhat more likely: 13

- No Difference: 33

Split sample question
Across party identification, voters agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely to Vote for a Candidate Who Would Eliminate Funds</th>
<th>Less Likely</th>
<th>More Likely</th>
<th>No Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an engaged debate, we framed this as a choice of how to spend funds in a tough economy when we can’t really afford it and voters STILL opted (albeit narrowly) to continue funding bike and walk paths.

Now let me read you two statements and tell me which one comes closest to your view:

**Statement A:** Some people/other people say that walking and biking paths are essential infrastructure.

**Statement B:** Some people/other people say that in these tough economic times, we can't afford to spend money on walking and biking paths.
[Essential Infrastructure] Some people/other people say that walking and biking paths are essential infrastructure. Investing in paths and sidewalks provides safe places for our children, seniors and people with disabilities to get around. Other Americans want the practical choice to walk or bicycle provided by safe and convenient walking or biking routes that connect the places where we live, work, shop, learn, and play. Everyone deserves access to jobs and other opportunities regardless of whether they can drive.

[Can't Afford] Some people/other people say that in these tough economic times, we can't afford to spend money on walking and biking paths. We must focus our tax dollars on our deteriorating infrastructure, like our aging bridges and our roads and highways. The federal government must focus their efforts on improving the nation's highways and bridges, not constructing paths. If communities want to expand their paths, then it should be a local issue, not a federal issue.
The Middle Atlantic and Pacific are cost-sensitive when the argument is about infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Can’t Afford</th>
<th>Essential Infrastructure</th>
<th>Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now let me read you two statements and tell me which one comes closest to your view.
In an engaged debate that pits healthy communities against concerns about not being able to afford the investment, voters split between the two arguments.

Now let me read you two statements and tell me which one comes closest to your view:

**Statement A:** Some people/other people say America needs to invest in safe routes to walk and bike to build healthy communities for healthy people.

**Statement B:** Some people/other people say that in these tough economic times, we can't afford to spend money on walking and biking paths.
[Healthy Communities] Some people/other people say America needs to invest in safe routes to walk and bike to build healthy communities for healthy people. Walking and biking paths provide safe and convenient connections to destinations and help local businesses thrive. Also, physical activity helps prevent chronic diseases, which saves greatly on health care costs. Paths are a highly cost-effective way to meet certain transportation needs, while contributing to the economic and public health of our communities.

[Can't Afford] Some people/other people say that in these tough economic times, we can't afford to spend money on walking and biking paths. We must focus our tax dollars on our deteriorating infrastructure, like our aging bridges and our roads and highways. The federal government must focus their efforts on improving the nation's highways and bridges, not constructing paths. If communities want to expand their paths, then it should be a local issue, not a federal issue.
Noticeably, it is stronger to talk about healthy communities in the Mid-Atlantic and Pacific regions.

Now let me read you two statements and tell me which one comes closest to your view.
What Resonates
Reasons People Support Walking and Biking Paths

We should invest federal transportation dollars in walking and biking paths because...

CHILDREN
Walking and biking paths and sidewalks help create safe places for our children to be active.

HEALTH CARE PREVENTION
Walking and biking saves on health care costs by increasing routine exercise and prevention of chronic disease.

COST SAVINGS
Walking and biking paths are very affordable to build, and nationally they provide billions of dollars in fuel and health care savings every year.
The two pillars of messaging around walking and biking paths are that they save on health care costs and create safe places for children.

Walking and biking saves on health care costs by increasing routine exercise and prevention of chronic disease*  
Disagree: 12  
Agree: 64  
Net: +75

Walking and biking paths and sidewalks help create safe places for our children*  
Disagree: 14  
Agree: 64  
Net: +70

Too many of our children stay inside watching TV, or spending time online and not enough time being active outdoors. Walking and biking paths and sidewalks help create safe places for our children to be active*  
Disagree: 17  
Agree: 62  
Net: +64

* Split sample questions

Now let me read you some different statements and tell me if you agree or disagree with each one. (If agree/disagree, Ask: Is that strongly/somewhat?)
In a second tier but still with strong support, voters place statements around improving communities, balance and choices, reducing obesity and chronic disease, and reducing oil dependence and greenhouse gas emissions.

Creating walking and biking paths improves our communities:

- Strongly agree: 58
- Somewhat agree: 14
- Net: +44

Creating interconnected walking and biking paths improves our communities:

- Strongly agree: 56
- Somewhat agree: 13
- Net: +43

We need a balanced transportation system that provides the choice not to drive everywhere:

- Strongly agree: 54
- Somewhat agree: 15
- Net: +39

By investing in transportation systems that also offer the options of biking, walking, and public transportation, we can meet our mobility needs while also reducing obesity rates and chronic disease:

- Strongly agree: 53
- Somewhat agree: 18
- Net: +35

By investing in transportation systems that also offer the options of biking, walking, and public transportation, we can meet our mobility needs while also reducing our oil dependence and greenhouse gas emissions:

- Strongly agree: 52
- Somewhat agree: 20
- Net: +32

Now let me read you some different statements and tell me if you agree or disagree with each one. (If agree/disagree, Ask: Is that strongly/somewhat?)
When talking about facts concerning walking and biking, the most believable fact to voters is that paths are very affordable and create significant fuel and health care savings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking and Biking Facts: Believability</th>
<th>Not Believable</th>
<th>Believable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking paths are very affordable to build, and nationally they provide billions of dollars in fuel and health care savings every year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking is the second most common way to get around in America</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half of all trips made by Americans today are within 20 minutes or less by bicycle and a quarter are within 20 minutes by foot</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 4 communities that built walking and biking networks, over 85 million vehicle miles were averted over a 4 year span</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net

+33

+19

+24

+19

Now let me read you some different statements and tell me how believable you find each statement -- very believable, somewhat believable, a little believable, or not believable at all?
Similarly, the fact about affordability and savings is also the strongest in persuading voters to support federal funding for walking and biking paths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking and Biking Facts: Likelihood to Support Federal Funding</th>
<th>Less Likely</th>
<th>More Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking paths are very affordable to build, and nationally they provide billions of dollars in fuel and health care savings every year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 4 communities that built walking and biking networks, over 85 million vehicle miles were averted over a 4 year span</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half of all trips made by Americans today are within 20 minutes or less by bicycle and a quarter are within 20 minutes by foot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking is the second most common way to get around in America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now let me read you some different statements and tell me if that statement makes you more or less likely to support federal funding for walking and biking paths. (If more/less likely, Ask: Is that much/somewhat more or less likely?)
It is clear that the top fact is affordability and savings.

- Walking is the second most common way to get around in America.
- In 4 communities that built walking and biking networks, over 85 million vehicle miles were averted over a 4 year span.
- Half of all trips made by Americans today are within 20 minutes or less by bicycle and a quarter are within 20 minutes by foot.
- Walking and biking paths are very affordable to build, and nationally they provide billions of dollars in fuel and health care savings every year.
- Much More Likely to Support Federal Funding for Walking and Biking Paths.
Across party identification, the fact that is most believable and the most likely to make voters support federal funding for walking and biking paths is that they are affordable and provide billions in savings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking and biking paths are very affordable to build, and nationally they provide billions of dollars in fuel and health care savings every year.</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Independents</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Believable</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Likely</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Poll Results in Federal Advocacy

1. Maintain/ increase most useful politically

- 43% Maintain
- 31% Increase
- 19% Decrease
- 6% Don’t know

74% Want to increase or maintain federal funding
Using Poll Results in Federal Advocacy

2. “$100” provocative result; represents ‘balance’

When asked to distribute $100 of taxes on transportation, voters on average allocated:

- $42.20 to maintain and create roads and highways
- $30.70 to expand and improve public transportation
- $26.90 to expand and improve walking and biking paths and sidewalks

Current federal allocation of transportation funding:

- $77.50 Roads
- $21.00 Transit
- $1.50 Walking/Biking
Using Poll Results in Federal Advocacy

❖ 3. messaging triangle (all positive)

Reasons People Support Walking and Biking Paths

CHILDREN
Walking and biking paths and sidewalks help create safe places for our children to be active.

HEALTH CARE PREVENTION
Walking and biking saves on health care costs by increasing routine exercise and prevention of chronic disease.

COST SAVINGS
Walking and biking paths are very affordable to build, and nationally they provide billions of dollars in fuel and health care savings every year.
Using Poll Results in Federal Advocacy

4. Emphasize unfinished business ("right amount?")
Reauthorization Agenda

- **Protect Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)**
  - TAP should rise to 3% share with increased transportation funding. At least maintain current funding level in status quo bill.
  - Eliminate state ability to transfer funds out of TAP & the Governor’s opt out provision for Recreational Trails. Eliminate TAP eligibilities that relate to regulatory compliance of highway projects.

- **Promote Active Transportation Systems**
  - Create means to fill gaps in active transportation networks-- low interest revolving loan fund or loan guarantee opportunity, like TIFIA, made accessible for smaller projects (threshold, costs)
Online Advocacy Resources

❖ Poll results.................................................................railstotrails.org/poll

❖ Making the case material..............................................................
http://www.railstotrails.org/policy/active-transportation-for-america/

❖ Policy platform.............................................................................
http://www.partnership4at.org/about/policy-platform

❖ Transportation Alternatives Project lists
(TrADE).................................
.................................trade.railstotrails.org/community_data
Click on map in district for List of TAP Projects by Congressional District
## Transportation Enhancements/Alternatives

Project List - 1992-2013

### Pennsylvania - 09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State &amp; Local</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Montour Trail</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>$1,402,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$1,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Access Improvement Project</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>$541,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Bedford Springs Hotel Ped. Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>$147,461</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$147,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Downtown Bedford Streetscape Improvement Project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>$291,661</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$291,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Scenic Enhancement of Lutzhell Road and Related Historic Sites</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cohan</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>$179,968</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$179,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Hyndman Borough Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hyndman</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>$576,608</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$576,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Scenic Beautification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Snake Spring</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Railroaders Museum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$1,788,000</td>
<td>$447,000</td>
<td>$2,235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Gateway Corridors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$352,816</td>
<td>$88,204</td>
<td>$441,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Altoona 12th Ave. Gateway Project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Altoona Gateway- 12th Ave Streetscape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$347,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Quarter Roundhouse Project</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Altoona Heritage Discovery Center - Visitor Center and Transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Station Mall Health Walkway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$562,532</td>
<td>$234,100</td>
<td>$796,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Pleasant Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$277,263</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$277,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Altoona Streetscape Phase 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$480,737</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$480,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Ward Avenue Curb &amp; Sidewalk Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Bells Gap Railroad/Logan Valley Streetcar Trail</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Antis</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$237,900</td>
<td>$272,102</td>
<td>$510,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Canoe Creek Extension of Lower Trail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frankstown</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Canal Basin Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg Borough Sustainable Streets Initiative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Canal Basin, PH II &amp; III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Gateway Gardens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg Sustainable Streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$262,056</td>
<td>$377,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Broad Street Streetscape/Traffic Calming Project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$305,060</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$305,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Horseshoe Curve Trees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$42,078</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1906 Train Station</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roaring Spring</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Historic Railway Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tyrone</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Tyrone Borough Sustainable Streets Initiative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tyrone</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$932,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$932,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Tyrone Gateway Project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tyrone</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$86,414</td>
<td>$17,283</td>
<td>$103,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Tyrone Borough Sustainable Streets Initiative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tyrone</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Tyrone Borough Sustainable Streets Initiative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tyrone</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$786,559</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$850,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>TYRONE BOROUGH STREETSCAPE PROJECT, PHASE IIB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tyrone</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>$1,436,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cycle Southern Alleghenies Bicyclte Rt. Signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,400</td>
<td>$10,350</td>
<td>$51,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>C &amp; I Trail Bridge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Black Lick</td>
<td>Cambria</td>
<td>$713,000</td>
<td>$179,000</td>
<td>$892,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>C &amp; I Trail- A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Black Lick</td>
<td>Cambria</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Transportation Alternatives Data Exchange
Please contact TrADE with project updates: trade.railstotrails.org
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