

Attachment 1

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

MEETING DATE: May 26, 2011

MEETING LOCATION: CMAP Offices

CALLED TO ORDER: 9:05 am

ATTENDANCE:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS OR ALTERNATES:

Tom Rickert (Chair)
Ed Barsotti, League of Illinois Bicyclists
Dan Thomas, DuPage County
Kiersten Grove (for Keith Privett), CDOT
Bruce Christensen, Lake County
Andrea Hoyt, DuPage County Forest Preserve
Gin Kilgore, Break the Gridlock/League of Illinois Bicyclists
Pam Sielski, Forest Preserve District of Cook County
John LaPlante, TY Lin International
Barbara Moore, Citizen
Randy Neufeld, SRAM (Representative to the Transportation Committee)
Kevin Staniel, RTA
Matthew Sussman, CNT (on phone)
Allan Mellis, Citizen
Jonathan Tremper, Metra
Chalen Daigle, McHenry County Council of Mayors

ABSENT:

Sam Mead, IDOT
Deborah Fagan, Citizen
David Longo, IDNR
Craig Williams, Alta Planning & Design
Richard Bascomb, Village of Schaumburg
Ron Burke, Active Transportation Alliance
Karen Shinnars, PACE
Robert Vance, CTA

STAFF:

Tom Murtha
John O'Neal

OTHERS:

Mike Sullivan, Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors
Tammy Wierciak, WCMC
John Donovan, FHWA
Eve Pytel, MMC
Allison Bos, Southwest Council of Mayors
Thomas Weaver, Metra

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 CycleTracks Smartphone Application

Matt Stratton, CMAP staff member, gave the Task Force an overview of the CycleTracks. CycleTracks is a smartphone application developed by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA). The free (voluntary) app uses iPhone and Android GPS support to record users' bicycle trips, display maps of rides, and build a geographic database of bicycle trips useful to planners at SFCTA. Mr. Stratton described the app – showing screenshots of its interface – its use by SFCTA, and discussed its potential for adaptation and use in our region.

3.2 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program: Program status / Focused Programming Approach

Staff began the discussion of next steps in prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian project submittals and evaluation information for the CMAQ 2012-2016 Program by introducing two documents to the Task Force – one was a revised draft of the two-part handout distributed at the last (May 6) meeting, which 1) summarized the CMAQ 2012-16 Bike-Ped project submittals (“Project Submittal Summary - Draft 2”) in terms of the major categories or project types within which they fall, and 2) offered a table or matrix with which the Task Force might evaluate project submittals (“Project Evaluation Matrix”). The later was developed by staff at the League of Illinois Bicyclists, and revised by CMAQ staff. The second document consisted of a table presenting notes on project understanding of bike-ped submittals and plan inclusion information [i.e. whether or not a project is a part of an existing plan and, if so, what (type of) plan (“Project Understanding and Plan Inclusion Information”)]. This document, as introduced, was in preliminary draft form and covered only three of the Councils of Mayors.

General discussion ensued of how best to rank or prioritize projects, and of what criteria or factors might best be used, given the limitations of data available.

Project readiness was one criteria which the Task Force discussed. The ability and commitment to provide the required local match was considered important. Mr. Christensen pointed out that in some regions/states, CMAQ is not used to fund Phase 1 engineering but only Phase 2 or construction, which ensures that projects receiving funding are in fact “underway.” Task Force members suggested that a project which includes local commitment to an “overmatch” – i.e. to providing more than the 20% required – could be considered a sign of ‘project readiness,’ or at least of local/sponsor ‘commitment’ generally. CMAQ staff stated that what we are often trying to judge with this criteria is the “momentum” a project has.

Ms. Hoyt stated that evidence of community support or participation could contribute to an understanding of project readiness. She added that two FPDCC project submittals involved projects that public and private entities had already heavily invested in, which demonstrated the local commitment.

Ms. Kilgore noted that we shouldn't, in her opinion, "punish" projects that did not have the same level / history of community participation or previous investment – some ideas seeking CMAQ funding, she explained, may in fact be new, but great ideas – but rather that we should think in terms of "acknowledging" those projects that do have that previous, extant commitments, investment, or community input process.

The Task Force then discussed criteria around "transit access". Mr. Staniel stated that Pace could provide individual line/stop boardings and alightings if this was needed as part of analysis of transit access. Mr. Mellis asked if we would be recommending NOT to fund projects that did not provide access to transit. Staff stated that this was indeed likely, since the GO TO 2040 Plan emphasized to such a great degree the need to increase and improve transit. The major goal, staff reminded members, of the Task Force – and other focus groups' – involvement in the CMAQ Project Selection Committee evaluation of projects was in fact to advance the implementation of GO TO 2040.

A discussion of projects which overcome a major barrier then took place. Distinguishing what constitutes a "major" barrier and what the relative importance of a specific connection might be in the larger "network" was discussed. Mr. Neufeld stated that the Task Force might search for a measure of the "attractiveness" of a specific facility -- i.e. would a specific facility, when built, represent a small or large "bump up" in terms of bike- or walkability in the area and/or the region? As an example, Mr. Neufeld asked the Task Force to consider the difference between constructing the Bloomingdale Trail and installing a bike lane on North Avenue. The relative effect that a facility would have on the viability of cycling as a means of transportation in the area might be helpful in evaluating projects. Mr. Barsotti added that asking questions like "how *much* of an improvement would a specific proposal make (on an area's bike-ability or walk-ability)?" and, connected with this, questions like "what are the alternative routes in an area?" should be asked.

The Task Force proposed forming an informal working group to further elaborate and define a method or methods for determining "attractiveness levels" of project submittals. Volunteers for this group included Randy Neufeld, Gin Kilgore, Ed Barsotti, and John LaPlante.

The Task Force then discussed the criteria of safety when evaluating projects. It was determined that crash data was the only hard data we had on the need for improved safety in a project area, but that using this data alone involved the exclusion of areas where no facilities or major barriers currently excluded anyone from walking or cycling (and thus, precluded any crashes from occurring). The goal would be to try to evaluate the need for a specific projects from a safety perspective using not only hard crash data but also softer information like land use, development patterns, existing roadway facility designs, etc.

Mr. Murtha asked whether additional information from sources like, for example, the Walkable Communities Workshops, which CMAP has sponsored and participated over the years, should be considered in the evaluation of projects. The Task Force agreed that it should and suggested that such information would fit under the rubric of "community participation" or "other planning efforts," discussed earlier in the meeting.

Finally, it was agreed upon that the working group mentioned above would meet directly after the Task Force meeting, which it did. The working group, and other Task Force members who

chose to stay, further discussed methods and criteria for evaluating safety and the attractiveness of projects submitted for CMAQ funding. CMAQ staff summarized this discussion and its conclusions in a memo dated May 27 *re* 'Safety and Facility Attractiveness Criteria' (q.v.). Together with this memo, staff created a table listing all bike and ped projects with CMAQ ID number, project title and sponsor, and columns for "Before Rank," "After Rank," "Buffer (if not 0.5 miles)," and "Notes" for each of the Councils of Mayors.

3.3 Project Updates

Ms. Kilgore announced the formation of a group to "Bike the Ike."

Ms. Hoyt informed the Task Force of the award of another contract for the West Branch of the DuPage River Trail, which utilizes an existing underpass under North Avenue.

Mr. Neufeld alerted Task Force members to the recent publication of the National Association of Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeways Design Guide and the APBP webinar (May 25, 2011), which presented it and which was recorded and should soon be available on APBP's website for download.

5.0 Public Comment and Announcements

No comments or announcements were made.

6.0 Next Meetings

Friday, June 17, 2011 at 1:00 PM

Wednesday, June 29, 2011 at 1:00 PM

7.0 Adjournment: 10:45 AM