

Attachment 1

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

MEETING DATE: 1/6/11

MEETING LOCATION: CMAP Offices

CALLED TO ORDER: 1:00 pm

ATTENDANCE:

(Task Force Members)

Tom Rickert (Chair)

Keith Privett, CDOT (Alternate Chair)

Randy Neufeld, SRAM (Representative to the Transportation Committee)

Richard Bascomb, Village of Schaumburg

Ron Burke, Active Transportation Alliance

Deborah Fagan, DuPage County

Bruce Christensen, Lake County

Kevin Staniel, RTA

Chalen Daigle, McHenry County Council of Mayors (on telephone)

Gin Kilgore, Break the Gridlock

Ed Barsotti, LIB

Barbara Moore, Citizen

Matthew Sussman, CNT

Robert Vance, CTA

Andrea Hoyt, DuPage County Forest Preserve

Jonathan Tremper, Metra

Sam Mead, IDOT

John LaPlante, TY Lin International

Dave Tomzik, PACE

Craig Williams, Alta Planning & Design

(Staff)

John O'Neal, CMAP

Tom Murtha, CMAP

Holly Ostidick, CMAP

Pete Saunders, CMAP

(Others)

Nathan Roseberry, Village of Hoffman Estates

Eve Pytel, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus

Tom Armstrong, Active Transportation Alliance

Jane Healy, Citizen (Blue Island) and Active Transportation Alliance Board

Megan Holt, IDOT (on telephone)

John Donovan, FHWA

Dave Longo, IDNR (on telephone)

Valbona Kokoshi, Southwest Conference of Mayors
Mike Walczak, NWMC
Chris Staron, NWMC
Paul Lippens, Active Transportation Alliance
Mike Sullivan, Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors

1.0 Introductions: Members and attendees introduced themselves.

2.0 Approval of the Minutes

A correction to the date on the minutes was made. *Motion was made and seconded for approval of the revised meeting notes. The motion was unanimously approved.*

2.1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force Membership / Representation

Motion was made and seconded for confirmation of the following member representations:

- **John LaPlante, Consultant (TY Lin International)**
- **Sam Mead, IDOT (*ex officio*)**

The motion was unanimously approved.

3.0 Regional Planning

3.1 GO TO 2040 LTA Program

CMAP staff (Pete Saunders) described CMAP's Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program, a three year initiative to support local planning projects related to land use, transportation, and housing and which will help implement GO TO 2040. The program is funded by a \$4.25M HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant. The LTA program is currently accepting applications. The program will provide staff assistance to communities needing help with local comprehensive plans, plan updates and revisions, local land use regulation updates or revisions, specific studies and area plans, feasibility studies, and other types of planning activities. Mr. Saunders stated that CMAP will be hiring as many as 10 staff members at the senior, associate and assistant levels.

He stated that CMAP announced the LTA program and call-for-projects on December 10, 2010 – sending emails to all mayors and managers in the region – and that the deadline for applications was January 28, 2011. He added that, so far, CMAP has had approximately 35 inquiries; 14 communities have expressed their intention to apply, and four applications are already in. He added that one application was for assistance on a bicycle and pedestrian plan submitted by a suburban park district. He anticipates that the review of project applications will run through February, with awards announced and project getting underway in March.

Mr. Saunders stated that there would be two additional calls-for-projects later this year –one in May and one in September. These later calls will enable projects that are not quite ready now or need more fleshing out to apply.

Mr. Neufeld asked whether Chicago neighborhoods were eligible to apply, and whether there was coordination of the LTA program with RTA's similar program. Mr. Saunders replied that CMAP program staff were seeking to have a geographic spread or balance for the projects similar to that of the CMAP Board – i.e. 1/3 in Chicago, 1/3 in suburban Cook Co., and 1/3 in the collar counties. As he regards the City of Chicago, he said that CMAP staff had met with the City's Department of Community Development (now, together with the Department of Zoning and Land Use Planning, part of the Department of Housing and Economic Development), and neighborhoods could be eligible but that they should have the support of the Department of

Community Development. He added that if a CDC were interested in applying, then they should coordinate with the City and its Department of Community Development.

As for coordination with the RTA, Mr. Saunders informed the Task Force that there was coordination and that there would be a joint community planning program announced in the future. This program would involve a more traditional call-for-projects (instead of a staff assistance program). He also stated that this joint CMAP-RTA program, in keeping with RTA's purview and mission, would have more of a transportation focus than the LTA staff assistance program.

Mr. Rickert asked whether Park Districts were eligible. Mr. Saunders said, yes, but again, he stressed that they should have municipal support. He added that counties and forest preserve districts were also eligible, and that there had in fact been some interest expressed from counties. He added that the program does encourage inter-jurisdictional, inter-agency projects.

Ms. Kilgore asked whether CMAP was looking for help to get the word out about the LTA program. Mr. Saunders said, yes, but that staff was in fact fairly happy with the response to the program and the call-for-projects they had thus far received and already anticipate a substantial number of applications.

3.2 Northwest Municipal Conference (NWMC) Bicycle Plan – 2010 Update

NWMC staff (Mike Walczak and Chris Staron) together with consultant, Paul Lippens of Active Transportation Alliance, gave the Task Force a presentation on the recently completed update of the NWMC Bicycle Plan. In turn, they gave background on the NWMC itself and previous NWMC bike planning efforts, and described the current plan structure, focus, the planning process, results, and overall recommendations. They pointed out that the previous planning efforts had covered only NWMC communities within Cook County (many of its members are outside of Cook Co.) and that it had not really included 'next steps'. Mr. Lippens described the methods used to arrive at the plan's "regional corridors," and Mr. Staron then described the methods and results of prioritizing these corridors for implementation.

Mr. Privett asked whether the Village of Lincolnwood had participated in the NWMC plan update, and Mr. Walczak said, yes, they had. Discussion about two planned bikeway corridors in Lincolnwood – the ComEd and UP ROWs – ensued. Ms. Moore stated that she thought the NWMC Bike-Ped Committee needed to work with the Forest Preserve District, at least on the certain of the regional corridors, since some villages/municipalities (i.e. Wheeling and Northbrook, etc.) along these corridors were surrounded by or adjacent to Forest Preserve properties. Mr. Walczak pointed out that the Village of Wheeling had worked with the Forest Preserve District on the planning of the facility along Dundee Road within the Forest Preserve, for which they had received ITEP funding.

Ms. Kilgore congratulated the NWMC on their plan update, and asked whether the "Tier 3" corridors were "Tier 3" because of the number of barriers present. Mr. Walczak stated that it was a combination of all factors which resulted in assignment of the corridors to any of the three tiers. He added that the tier system was not intended to imply that only the Tier 1 corridors

should be pursued, but rather that the NWMC's analysis indicated that these corridors may be easier to implement.

Mr. Tomzic asked what level of planning detail went into the NWMC Bike Plan Update – more specifically, he wondered whether the level of planning had been such that Pace bus routes and stops, or the interface between pedestrians/bicyclists and Pace service, been examined. Mr. Walzcak stated that the planning effort had gone into that level of detail; that they had not looked beyond simply where the Pace routes were; and that consideration of the exact interface or interaction of Pace bus service and facilities along the corridors (and elsewhere) would need more detailed examination in the scoping and phase 1 engineering of any particular project. Mr. Staron added that the NWMC plan update, for all its work, was not a replacement for a 'feasibility' study or for phase 1 engineering. Those would in fact be the logical next steps for a corridor or for any one segment of a corridor.

Ms. Hoyt noted the connections shown on the plan map to the Fox River Trail, and asked whether connections to the DuPage trail and bikeway network were also considered. Mr. Walzcak said, yes, they had considered the connections to facilities in northern DuPage County. He added that the east-west nature of the corridors was the reason that the connections to the Fox River Trail stood out.

Ms. Pytel asked whether the effort to coordinate and unify bikeway signage across all the municipalities and other jurisdictions within Conference boundaries (one of the plan's 'next steps' or implementation projects) might be broadened further to become regional. Mr. O'Neal stated that in so far as CMAP staff was involved in and coordinated other Council efforts in bike planning and signage around the region, they would push for consistent and unified signage. Mr. Privett added that the City of Chicago's bikeway signage designs and specs had been incorporated into the latest edition of the MUTCD. Mr. LaPlante added that these MUTCD designs, although unified, also allowed for individual 'branding' through a two-part shield/sign design template.

3.3 Eisenhower Expansion Project – Eisenhower Regional Trail

Staff reported that, *per* last meeting's motion, staff had re-cast the proposed resolution as a letter, which had been signed by the Task Force Chairman and mailed to the Eisenhower project manager at IDOT.

Mr. Burke stated that he believed that the Village of Oak Park was planning a cycle-track along Madison Street – a facility which may potentially be a part of the facility, which the letter asks IDOT to study the feasibility of.

4.1 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program: Project and Strategy Identification and Prioritization

CMAP staff (Holly Ostlick) introduced and described the proposed modifications to the CMAQ Program development process. These modifications have come to be referred to as "focused programming." A memorandum describing the proposed modifications, developed by staff to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee, can be found with the minutes and agenda for this meeting (at <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/bicycle-and-pedestrian-task-force/minutes>).

Ms. Ostdick informed the Task Force that this memo was emailed today to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee and the Policy Committee members. It would be voted on at the next Policy Committee meeting (Thursday, January 13, 2011).

Ms. Ostdick explained that the proposed modifications include a consideration of how a project applying for CMAQ funding would advance the goals and objectives of the GO TO 2040 plan. Four focus or working groups, with expertise in CMAQ project types, would consider the proposed projects and provide input on these projects' ability to advance CMAQ and GO TO 2040 goals and objectives. The Bike-Ped Task Force would be one of these focus or working groups – the others would be the Regional Transportation Operations Coalition (RTOC), and two ad-hoc groups, one for transit projects, and one for diesel emissions reduction projects.

Mr. Christensen asked whether this memo was going to the Transportation Committee before going to the Policy Committee. Ms. Ostdick said, no, staff believed that sufficient discussion of the memo and its content had taken place.

Ms. Kilgore asked whether CMAQ air quality analysis would take place after focus/working groups' input, or before. Ms. Ostdick said, it would take place at the same time.

Mr. Privett emphasized that the Task Force would, *per* this memo, have two new responsibilities: one, to review and comment on bike-ped projects submitted to the CMAQ program; and two, to work more proactively with implementers to propose projects which advance not only CMAQ goals and objectives, but also those of GO TO 2040. He added that the Task Force might need to form an ad-hoc committee or working group during the period of evaluation of CMAQ project applications. Ms. Kilgore asked whether this effort should be seen as the creation of a buffer or safeguard or corrective measure to help advance regional priorities while at the same time preventing the dominance within CMAQ of those implementers who really “have their act together.” Mr. Rickert stated that, since there would still be a traditional call-for-projects, he imagined that agencies/entities with their “act together” might still have an advantage.

Mr. Neufeld asked whether it would be necessary to work on developing a procedure or process outlining how the Task Force would undertake this work. Ms. Fagan stated that she believed that, if development of a process or procedure were necessary, then it should happen *before* the call-for-projects and the beginning of ‘competition’ for funding -- since the interests of Task Force members (many of whom are implementers) to advance their own projects would then color if not dominate their thinking. Mr. Rickert stated that he imagined that a working group or ad hoc committee would be necessary to develop a process and to carry it out. Mr. Tomzic said that we may in fact have very little time to do this. Mr. Burke stated that, although this was the first time he had seen the memo – since it was only released this morning – he wondered (looking especially at Page 2 of the memo) whether Bike-Ped projects would fare well in the CMAQ evaluation process since, although they certainly meet CMAQ Goals and Objectives and the first set of GO TO 2040 Action Areas (two bullet points), they are not clearly “pointed to” in the second set of Action Areas (seven bullet points). Ms. Ostdick said that the goals, objectives, and action areas listed in the memo are just some of those that will be looked for when evaluating CMAQ project applications, and that an overall, general match with CMAQ and GO TO 2040 goals and objectives, in the broadest sense, is what the new process was designed to

achieve. Mr. Burke joked that the most important thing to insure was that bike-ped projects – whether or not explicitly pointed to in this second list of action areas – were in fact part of the “action” when programming CMAQ projects.

Mr. Christensen asked how the call-for-projects would work – would major implementers and planning liaisons do outreach to identify projects, or would it be better to funnel coordination of CMAQ through the PL’s? Mr. Rickert stated that this process/approach to programming CMAQ funds should be thought of as a “work in progress” and as such it would be necessary to monitor how it works – it may need to be changed in the future. Ms. Fagan stated bike-ped projects have many more potential sponsors than the other three ‘focus/working groups,’ which this new CMAQ programming process envisions. Mr. Neufeld stated that different focus/working groups may need to work together. Mr. LaPlante asked what the RTOC group was, that he had not heard of it before. Mr. Murtha replied that the acronym stands for “Regional Transportation Operations Coalition,” formed approximately a year ago “to serve as a forum for collaboration to advance multi-modal transportation systems operations.” (See the CMAP website, <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/regional-transportation-operations-coalition>, which states that, “Coordinated management and operation of transportation infrastructure, resources and services is an essential element to achieving the region's long-range transportation goals. The purpose of Regional Transportation Operations Coalition (RTOC) is to establish an institutional forum and structure where regional operations can be addressed.”

4.2 Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP)

Staff informed the Task Force that the Cycle 9 2010 ITEP program had been announced in October 2010, after the Task Force’s last meeting, and that a handout had been prepared showing the projects in northeastern Illinois, which were awarded funding and the amount of the award. Staff expressed its opinion that the projects chosen by IDOT for ITEP funding in northeastern Illinois were generally good projects.

4.2 Safe Routes to School (SRTS)

Megan Holt, IDOT SRTS Coordinator, gave the Task Force a summary and update on the State’s SRTS program and recent activities. Referring to a handout listing all communities/projects with an approved School Travel Plan (STP), Ms. Holt stated that 124 STPs had been approved. 181 had been reviewed. Additionally, 7 STP were granted “conditional approval,” resulting from their omission completing the GIS mapping section of the application. She added that 149 applications (separate from STPs) had been received, but that she does not know, at this point, how much money was applied for. Approximately, \$7.5M was available for FY2010 and another \$7.5M for FY2011, making a total of \$15M.

Ms. Holt stated that she thought that scoring would begin in March and that the program would be announced mid to late 2011.

Ms. Fagan stated that since the awards would be announced so late in 2011, schools or other implementers would not be expending the funds until 2012, and asked whether this would be a problem. Ms. Holt said, no, not at all. In fact, she added, the SRTS program, in the last round, had given awardees one year to complete their agreements with IDOT, and that contracts for non-infrastructure projects were currently taking about 3 months to process.

Mr. Privett asked whether, if a municipality or community missed this cycle, they could still go ahead and prepare a STP for future funding cycles. Ms. Host said, yes, absolutely, that she encouraged this. Mr. Privett asked whether communities could use funding/staff assistance available through CMAP's LTA program for this. Ms. Holt, again, said yes.

Mr. Barsotti asked if Ms. Holt knew how many of the 149 applications were non-infrastructure projects. Ms. Holt said she did not, at this point, know.

4.4 Follow-up Item: Pedestrians' right-of-way at crosswalks (Public Act 096-1165)

Staff reported that they had been informed by IDOT that the Bureau of Local Roads had sent out a Procedure Memorandum (No. PM2010-02) to all units of government informing them of the new law and offering guidance (from the MUTCD) on (signage) designs, which are consistent with and communicate the new law. IDOT stated that in addition a memorandum had been sent by State Police to all local police departments summarizing the new law.

Ms. Fagan asked whether IDOT had expressed any willingness to seek funding to publicize and raise public awareness of the law. Staff responded that they had not. Ms. Grove stated that the City of Chicago had received a Safety Grant for crosswalk enforcement. Mr. Barsotti stated that at in previous instances, safety grants had been given in order to disseminate information and raise awareness of new laws affecting pedestrian and bicyclist safety (e.g. the "3 foot passing law"). Mr. Williams stated that, in any case, someone must *apply* for this funding to happen. He said that States can apply for 402 funds, thought typically locals apply for them. He repeated that we need an organization to apply. Ms. Fagan asked Mr. Barsotti whether he thought that LIB would like to take this on. Mr. Barsotti said he would look into it. Mr. Burke stated that ATA had been doing some outreach as regards this law. Mr. Neufeld said that he though the Task Force might encourage the newly-elected Secretary of State to raise awareness of this law. Ms. Moore stated that perhaps the Task Force should draft a letter to the Secretary of State about this issue. Mr. Burke stated that ATA had been in contact with the Secretary of State's office about incorporating information on this law into drivers' education and other material and publications.

Motion was made and seconded for the Task Force to draft and send a letter to the Secretary of State's office requesting that they actively work to disseminate information on and, generally, raise awareness of Public Act 096-1165. The motion was unanimously approved.

4.5 Project Updates

Ms. Hoyt informed the Task Force of several projects the DuPage County Forest Preserve District had made progress on, including the extension of the West Branch DuPage River Trail between Ogden Ave. and Jefferson in Naperville. It is anticipated, said Ms. Hoyt, that this project will go out to bid in March. She added that another part of the West Branch DuPage River Trail (where it passes under North Ave. in West Chicago and connects to the Great Western Trail) has construction set to begin this spring, and that it is anticipated the project will be complete by the summer of 2012 (see <http://www.dupageforest.com/page.aspx?id=4294969001>). Finally, Ms. Hoyt reported on progress on the Winfield Riverwalk Trail (see

<http://www.villageofwinfield.com/DOCUMENTVIEW.aspx?DID=414>), which will connect downtown Winfield (and its Metra station) to the Geneva Branch of the Illinois Prairie Path.

Mr. Privett had a general note or warning for the Task Force: that IDOT had expressed concern that on a project team consisting of a number of consultants one (lead) consultant might not have at least 50% of the contract amount/responsibility. He suggest that any Task Force members who implement projects be sure that the lead consultant have 50% or more of the contract amount.

Mr. LaPlante stated that his firm, TY Lin, had been working with the Lakota Group to develop a Complete Streets policy for Oak Park.

Mr. Murtha informed the Task Force that CMAP was currently in the process of ramping up the UWP process and that he hoped that sub-regional bike plans, which had been funded through UWP before, would be funded again.

Ms. Grove informed the Task Force that the City of Chicago had begun work on its Pedestrian Plan. The last meeting of the Mayor's Pedestrian Advisory Council had developed a Vision Statement for the Plan.

5.0 Public Comment and Announcements

No comments or announcements were made.

6.0 Next Meeting

Wednesday, April 20, 2011 at 1:00 PM.

7.0 Adjournment: 2:40PM