

Attachment 1

**Draft Meeting Notes
Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force**

MEETING DATE: June 17, 2011

MEETING LOCATION: CMAP Offices

CALLED TO ORDER: 1:05 pm

ATTENDANCE:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS OR ALTERNATES:

Tom Rickert (Chair)
Keith Privett, CDOT
Dan Thomas, DuPage County
Ron Burke, Active Transportation Alliance
Bruce Christensen, Lake County
Andrea Hoyt, DuPage County Forest Preserve
Gin Kilgore, Break the Gridlock/League of Illinois Bicyclists (on phone)
Pam Sielski, Forest Preserve District of Cook County
Richard Bascomb, Village of Schaumburg
Barbara Moore, Citizen
Randy Neufeld, SRAM (Representative to the Transportation Committee)
Kevin Staniel, RTA
Robert Vance, CTA
Matthew Sussman, CNT
Allan Mellis, Citizen
Jonathan Tremper, Metra
Chalen Daigle, McHenry County Council of Mayors

ABSENT:

Ed Barsotti, League of Illinois Bicyclists
John LaPlante, TY Lin International
Sam Mead, IDOT
Deborah Fagan, Citizen
David Longo, IDNR
Craig Williams, Alta Planning & Design
Karen Shinnars, PACE

STAFF:

Tom Murtha
John O'Neal

OTHERS:

Thomas Weaver, Metra
Mike Sullivan, Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors
Jan Ward, KKCom
Mike Walczak, NWMC
John Donovan, FHWA
Claire Hellwig, CDOT Intern

1.0 Introductions: Members and attendees introduced themselves.

2.0 Approval of the Minutes

No corrections to the minutes were made. *Motion was made and seconded for approval of the meeting notes. The motion was unanimously approved.*

3.0 Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Programming

3.1 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program: Program status / Focused Programing Approach

Staff began the discussion of the ongoing work to develop a package of CMAQ bicycle and pedestrian project submittals to recommend to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee by describing the collection, analysis, and presentation of data that had been accomplished since the last meeting. Staff described the large matrix they had produced and on which these data and analyses were presented, stressing that it was unfinished and in draft form. Staff ended by asking how the Task Force would like to proceed.

Mr. Christensen began discussion by asking whether staff was seeking consensus on a list of projects to forward to the CMAQ PSC. Mr. Murtha replied, Yes, consensus on both projects and, more broadly, on a set of general, regional goals and strategies, which the list of projects would embody or express.

Mr. Mellis asked whether staff proposed ranking the projects in a “good, better, best” fashion. Mr. Murtha responded that the Task Force should put together a ‘package,’ which will tell a ‘story’ that is compelling and convincing to the CMAQ PSC, adding that the ‘story’ should be about implementing GO TO 2040.

Discussion ensued about whether or not to rank or apply a “value” for each of the proposed projects. Most members expressed the opinion that applying a numerical ranking would be problematic, giving a false sense of objectivity and finality. Task Force members representing implementing agencies expressed willingness to work on their jurisdictional priorities, which could help the overall evaluation of projects.

Discussion followed as to whether the final list or package of projects would represent a broad “spectrum” or the whole “cosmos” of viable and desirable bike-ped projects for the region. Consensus was reached that the list of recommended projects should be broader than just what might make a successful CMAQ project, and that the list could serve as a ‘reserve’ for other programs and funding sources.

Mr. Neufeld stated that in an ideal world, sub-regional entities would prioritize their submittals, so that when CMAP had to spread projects around the region, they could draw on the sub-regional prioritizations to help them.

Discussion ensued about the exact (working) relationship between the focus groups and the CMAQ PSC, and between the analysis that the focus groups do and that which the CMAQ PSC does. Staff stated that this relationship will, necessarily, continue to evolve.

Mr. Burke stated that he was confused by the terminology, as well as the exact method and final ‘product’ the Task Force would produce. He asked whether our analysis would feed into the CMAQ PSC analysis or be added in after their analysis was done. He wondered whether it wouldn’t make more sense for us to take the list of projects with the CMAQ PSC analysis results and then add our analysis and thoughts *to* that. Mr. Murtha stated that the analyses were being carried out simultaneously and independently. The exact definition of a “package” of projects was then discussed. Mr. Privett asked whether staff would exclude some project submittals as not worthy achieving regional goals and impact. Staff affirmed this.

Staff stated that we should be looking for ‘big ideas’ that accomplish significant regional goals around the themes the Task Force had deemed most important, such as ‘access to transit’, ‘innovation’, ‘overcoming significant (physical) barriers.’ Mr. Rickert added that we may also wish to create or at least have in mind the ideas of ‘access to jobs’, and/or ‘project readiness.’ The Task Force agreed that the second idea, ‘project readiness’, was a criteria that should apply to projects within any category. Discussion ensued about the difference between ‘categories’ and ‘criteria’. Mr. Murtha reiterated that focus group staff had been directed to “develop stories” to advance projects. As an example, he stated that the Transit Focus Group had settled upon the idea or ‘story’ of “modernization.”

Discussion continued as to how, precisely, the ranking or evaluation of projects would be done and what the “final product” of this evaluation would be. One option was characterized as a “simple ranking of projects in order of their quality or desirableness;” another option would be to rank projects in order of their quality or desirableness under categories such as “Access to transit”, “Innovation”, “Filling in of important gaps or overcoming major barriers”, “Access to jobs”, “Consistency with / correspondence to the Regional Greenways and Trails Plan”. Ms. Kilgore, on the phone, stated that whatever we call or name the categories, the ability of projects to do the most good for the region’s bikability is what is most important.

Mr. Neufeld stated that he would like to make two points before adjourning. First, he informed the Task Force that the Transportation Committee had discussed a “contingency list” for CMAQ and other projects, which should be nearly ready-to-go and over \$20M in cost. He thought that perhaps there should be bicycle/pedestrian projects on this list. And secondly, he stated that if a goal of the CMAQ programming process is to have a ‘regional spread’ of projects, then we should probably look to prioritizing on the sub-regional level, i.e. the Task Force and the CMAQ PSC should solicit prioritization from the sub-regional Councils of Mayors among all the projects within their jurisdiction.

3.2 Project Updates

No project updates were given.

4.0 Public Comment and Announcements

No comments or announcements were made.

5.0 Next Meetings

Wednesday, June 29, 2011 at 1:00 PM

6.0 Adjournment: 2:20 AM