



MEMORANDUM

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force
Ad Committee for CMAQ Submittal Evaluation

From: Tom Murtha / John O'Neal

Date: May 27, 2011

Re: Safety and Facility Attractiveness Criteria

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force at its meeting on May 26, 2011, requested methods and criteria to evaluate CMAQ 2012-16 bicycle and pedestrian project submittals in relation to both safety concerns and the facility attractiveness for cycling or walking at and near the proposed projects. Following are recommendations from an ad hoc group set up for that purpose.

Regarding safety, the group suggested a simple count of pedestrian and bicycle crashes – both K and A crashes and all crashes – that occurred between 2005 and 2009 within project buffer areas (1/2 mile for pedestrian projects, and 1-mile for bicycle projects). Other factors, data, and information might also come into play when evaluating projects for a safety benefit, and can be identified for the project proposals as appropriate.

As regards the facility attractiveness, the group suggested that an examination of the change which would occur as a result of the project was the best approach to take. The group suggested that this include a ranking of the “before” conditions for cycling or walking in a project area or corridor, followed by a ranking of those conditions “after” the proposed project was built, together estimating the magnitude of improvement the project would achieve.

The group suggested the following categories and associated numbers/scores for both the ‘existing conditions’ and the ‘post implementation conditions’:

- 0 = Impassable barrier
- 1 = Arterial road with no accommodation
- 2 = Arterial/collector road with some accommodation (staff suggests that this include marked shared lanes).
- 3 = Low-speed, local streets (providing continuous, unhindered non-motorized access to important destinations)
- 4 = Unprotected bike lane
- 5 = Trail, sidepath, cycletrack, or other buffered bike lane

The “before” measures would be taken at the worst point in the corridor of the project. For example, an impassible river barrier with no alternative access for miles would be ranked “0” no matter how good the cycling infrastructure on either side of the river banks. For this analysis, a ½ mile buffer distance around the facility would usually suffice, though in certain situations the buffer area might be changed.

Other factors which would supplement and inform the rating of both the current nature and performance of a project location and its ‘post implementation’ performance would be roadway speed, volume (ADT), the number of lanes, and lane widths. This information can supplement the ratings, if available.

Evaluation would include notation of the before and after categories, rather than just the numerical difference between the categories.

Present on the committee were the representatives of three Counties – Kane/Kendall Counties, DuPage County, and Lake County. These representatives agreed to help by rating projects within their respective counties. In addition, several advocacy and private groups were willing to help with other areas.

Here are instructions for finding the project submittals.

The projects are posted in pdf format on the CMAP FTP site at

<ftp://ftp.cmap.illinois.gov/pub/docs/CMAQ/FY2012-2016/>

User name: cmapftpro

Password: cmapread

Navigate to the appropriate directory (Bike encouragement, bike facility, bike parking, pedestrian facility) for each project type.