

Attachment 1

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

MEETING DATE: December 19, 2012

MEETING LOCATION: CMAP Offices

CALLED TO ORDER: 1:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS OR ALTERNATES:

Tom Rickert, Chair
Keith Privett, CDOT (Alternate Chair)
Randy Neufeld, SRAM Corp (on phone)
Richard Bascomb, Village of Schaumburg (on phone)
Ed Barsotti, League of Illinois Bicyclists
Karen Shinnars, Pace (on phone)
Chalen Daigle, McHenry County Council of Mayors (on phone)
Barbara Moore, Citizen
Dan Thomas, DuPage County
Sam Mead, IDOT (on phone)
Steven Mannella, Metra
Kevin Staniel, RTA
Valbona Kokoshi, LDOT (on phone)
Allan Mellis, Citizen
Pamela Sielski, Cook County Forest Preserve District
Robert Vance, CTA
Ron Burke, Active Transportation Alliance
Gin Kilgore, Break the Gridlock
Ron Burke, Active Transportation Alliance
Gin Kilgore, Break the Gridlock

ABSENT:

David Longo, IDNR
Andrea Hoyt, DuPage County Forest Preserve

STAFF:

John O'Neal
Tom Murtha
Don Kopec
Doug Ferguson
Alex Beata

OTHERS:

Michael Alvino, CLOCC
Nathan Roseberry, TY Lin / CDOT
A.C. Buehler, Village of Northbrook
Jim Baxa, Village of Northbrook

Bruce Carmitchel, IDOT
Mike Brand, IDOT
Gabe Sulkes, IDOT
Jack Cebe, Alta Planning+Design
Hope Barrett, CLOCC
Jay Ciavarella, RTA
Len Cannata, WCMC
Tammy Wierciak, WCMC
Allison Bos, SWCM
Thomas Vander Woude, SSMMA
Paul Lippens, Active Transportation Alliance
Bob Cornew, Active Transportation Alliance
Marty Mueller, Knight Engineering
Mike Walczak, NWMC
Mike Albin, DMMC
Chris Staron, NWMC
Lauren DeLong, Citizen

1.0 Introductions

Members and attendees introduced themselves.

2.0 Approval of the Minutes

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

3.0 Local and Regional Planning

3.1 CMAP Local Technical Assistance (LTA) Program

CMAP staff (Shafaq Choudry) gave the Task Force an overview of the status of Round 1 LTA program projects, which are currently underway and which had a focus on non-motorized or active transportation (Antioch, Downers Grove, Elgin, Wheeling, and Fox Lake), and a report on the recently awarded (2012, Round 2) LTA/RTA Community Planning projects, which have a focus on non-motorized or active transportation (Cook County Forest Preserve, NWMC, Evanston, Niles, South Elgin, and UIC). The purpose of these programs is to direct resources to communities to pursue planning work that helps to implement GO TO 2040.

Mr. Neufeld asked, in relation to the Antioch project, what a “lifestyle corridor” was exactly. Ms. Choudry responded that it was basically a study or plan for developing the alignment for non-motorized, multi-use facility spanning the community, connecting outlying areas with the downtown business district, and linking important economic, institutional, and recreational destinations. The goal is to increase livability, quality of life, “brand” image, and economic activity in the Village through creation of a basic network for cycling and walking.

Mr. Burke stated that newer types of bikeway facilities, which are being installed in the City of Chicago and in some suburbs, should be considered when developing LTA bicycle and active

transportation plans. He emphasized that these types of facilities, which are intended to increase the safety and the perception of safety for all types of cyclists, of all ages, offer “great returns” in terms of getting people out on bicycles for transportation and recreational purposes.

Ms. Shinnors added that protected and buffered bike lanes can conflict with bus operations, and that there needed to be coordination when such facilities are installed along or across bus routes. She specifically mentioned the City of Evanston and the issues that their recent installation of a buffered and protected bike caused at points where it conflicted with Pace bus routes.

Mr. Neufeld added that Pace Bus and Evanston, and any other communities that face these issues, do not need to solve their problems alone. They can get expert help from the Green Lanes Project, which was established for just such a purpose.

3.2 Council of Mayors Bicycle Plan Updates

Planning Liaisons (PLs), Tammy Wierciak and Allison Bos, from the West Central Municipal Conference (Central and North Central Councils of Mayors) and the Southwest Council of Mayors, respectively, presented on the planning processes and products of their recent bikeway plan updates. Both Councils were assisted in their planning efforts by the Active Transportation Alliance as consultants. (Presentations have been posted on the Bike-Ped Task Force Minutes webpage.)

3.3 City of Chicago / CDOT

Keith Privett, CDOT representative to and alternate-chair of the Bike-Ped Task Force, presented on the City of Chicago’s Access to Transit Data Study, which reports on mode-of-access and user perceptions of transit access conditions for 48 CTA stations throughout the City of Chicago. The report has not been officially released – which is anticipated to occur sometime in the first quarter of next year. The survey was mailback/passback format, and designed to reach 30% of all ridership at peak hours. Out of 94,459 surveys handed out, 21,473 were returned. The survey addresses:

- Mode of access
- Length of access trip
- Final rail stop
- Car or bike parking usage
- Opinion on ease of access by (whether by car/bike/bus/walk)
- History of transit use
- Demographic information

Mr. Cebe asked whether there were plans to repeat the survey after bike share was in place. Mr. Privett stated that he was not aware of any definite plans at this point in time, but that this was a great idea, and that generally, in order to be really useful, having data of this sort from different years (ideally, at regular intervals) is extremely useful for understanding factors that effect ridership.

Mr. Burke asked if Mr. Privett knew how many persons live within ½ mile of CTA rail stations within the City of Chicago, in order to compare the survey results (which indicated that 57% walk ½ or less to transit) with residential population apropos of transit service.

Mr. Shinnars asked – half-jokingly, yet seriously too – whether it was too late to rename the study, more accurately, “Access to CTA Rail Stations”, since that is what it the survey addressed, as opposed to CTA bus service, which covers a much larger area. Mr. Privett replied that, yes, this was possible and did in face make sense.

Michael Alvino, Transportation Coordinator for the Consortium to Lower Obesity in Chicago Children (CLOCC), and consultant to the City of Chicago Department of Transportation, gave the Task Force an overview of work done to develop a Complete Streets Design Guidelines and Policies manual. This manual will help the CDOT to implement the 2006 City of Chicago Complete Streets policy. The manual will be officially released early in 2013.

The manual has four chapters: 1) Introduction, 2) Typology, 3) Design Guidance, and 4) Implementation. The manual will set the policy and the procedures for all CDOT roadway projects and for the engineers who design them. The manual specifies a “default” modal hierarchy for project, which puts pedestrian travel first, transit travel second, bicycle travel third, and automobile travel fourth. The Typology chapter addresses 1) Building Form and Function, 2) Roadway Form and Function, 3) Intersections and Crossings, and 4) Overlays. The Design Guidance chapter addresses 1) Modal Hierarchy, 2) Design Trees (which lead designers to desired cross-sections), 3) Cross-Section Elements, 4) Intersections, and 5) Geometric and Operational Policies. The Implementation chapter outlines the project delivery process, identifying goals that will ensure that projects result in complete streets.

Nathan Roseberry, an engineer with TY Lin and CDOT Bicycle Program, presented on the status and implementation efforts underway for the City of Chicago’s Streets for Cycling plan, and going into detail on the recent Dearborn Street two-way protected bike lane. Mr. Roseberry first gave an overview of accomplishments in planning, design, and construction of bicycle facilities and bridge improvements by CDOT and the City of Chicago in 2012. He then offered statistics on progress made since May 2011, when Mayor Emanuel took office, highlighting the recent (December 2012) publication of CDOT’s “Chicago Streets for Cycling Plan 2020,” and the “Chicago Forward: CDOT Action Agenda” in May 2012. Finally, he offered details and notes on the design and installation (opened on Dec. 14) of the Dearborn Street facility. This pilot projects is the first north-south facility in the Loop. It is a two-way protected bicycle lane on the west side of a street which is one-way northbound form automobiles. The facility, which is protected in different segments by parked cars and/or bollards includes bicycle signal heads, special signage, and bicycle detection loops (at the southern terminus of the facility). Mr. Roseberry stated that the project, which has been striped using paint as opposed to more permanent thermoplastic) will include, over the next few weeks, education and enforcement activities and ongoing monitoring and evaluation, which will help determine the (potentially revised) permanent installation, which will take place in 2013.

Mr. Mellis asked how the conflict with left-turning vehicles was addressed. Mr. Roseberry stated that they had installed a fixed, dedicated, lagging left turn signal for the vehicles northbound on Dearborn. Mr. Mellis then asked if CDOT planned to install bicycle speed limit signs. Mr. Roseberry said that this would be considered if the review/evaluation period indicated a need.

Mr. Burke stated that he had ridden the Dearborn facility and that in his opinion it represented a safe and very pleasurable ride. He emphasized the high-profile of the facility and its innovative design.

4.0 Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Programming

4.1 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program

Tom Murtha, of CMAP, led a discussion of the upcoming (2014-18) CMAQ call-for-projects and the possibility of “Direct Identification” of projects by the Bike-Ped Task Force. He stated that the Task Force recommendations for evaluation criteria and performance measures had been accepted by the CMAQ Project Selection Committee (PSC) at its October meeting and had been incorporated into the project application guidelines. He stated that – as regards the current call-for-projects, applications should be turned into Council of Mayors (CoM) Planning Liaisons (PLs) by January 22, which then must be turned into to CMAP by February 8. He stated that the key elements in this process are that it is an “open call” and that it is designed and intended to limit the scope of project applications by not funding Phase 1 engineering, but instead restricting funding awards to Phase 2 engineering and construction. As regards this restriction, there are two exceptions specified in the program guidance: 1) “hardship” cases, and 2) identification by focus groups of projects that are “critical” to the region and which are in the Regional Greenways and Trails Plan, and are “ready to go” (whether for Phase 1 engineering or a subsequent phase). He added that all the necessary documents and materials were posted on the CMAQ website, including the Project Submittal Booklet.

He then stated that some projects had been ascertained by the ad-hoc working group formed for this purpose as fit for “direct identification,” including the Skokie Valley Trail, bikeway elements (both along and across) as integral parts of the Elgin O’Hare Bypass, the Cal-Sag Trail (segment), and an as yet undefined City of Chicago Streets for Cycling project. Of these, Mr. Murtha stated that the Elgin O’Hare project has already gotten IDOT design approval, and the Cal-Sag Trail already has completed Phase 1 engineering and currently has Phase 2 engineering underway, so these do not in fact require ‘direct identification’ for eligibility/advancement. Mr. Murtha reminded the Task Force that, whatever they chose to do, the nature of their action was merely a “recommendation” to the CMAQ PSC, who would then simply factor it into the context of CMAQ goals and evaluation processes as a whole. In other words, he added, ‘direct identification’ of a project in no way guaranteed its funding.

Mr. Murtha then stated that representatives from the Village of Northbrook were present and would like to present briefly on the Skokie Valley Trail and its merits as a candidate for ‘direct identification.’ Doug Ferguson, CMAP staff to the CMAQ PSC, however, first offered additional clarification of the ‘spirit’ of the CMAQ program guidance on ‘direct identification’ and the basic intentions of the PSC when developing this guidance. He emphasized that it was not intended as means to avoid or “get around” the decision by the CMAQ PSC to not fund Phase 1 engineering. The CMAQ PSC developed guidance intended to advance projects that would help lower the unobligated balance. Mr. Rickert added that both the guidance which came out of the CMAQ PSC, as well as the efforts of the Task Force’s ad-hoc committee to explore ‘direct identification’ of projects, was to encourage truly “regional” projects, which should be pursued.

Representatives of the Village of Northbrook then presented on the Skokie Valley Trail project and its merits as a candidate for ‘direct identification.’ They emphasized its importance in the regional network, its inclusion in CMAP’s Regional Greenways and Trails Plan and the NWMC bicycle plan (as a Tier 1 Regional Corridor), its multi-jurisdictional nature, and its placement as an MYB list project in the last CMAQ round. They estimated the cost for Phase 1 engineering at \$350-400K. Task Force member, Barbara Moore, spoke in support of the project, and asked Ms. Kokoshi (representative of Lake County) whether they had funding for a bridge over Lake-Cook Road (where the Skokie Valley Trail would connect to the existing trail in Lake County). Ms. Kokoshi stated that the funds that Lake County had dedicated for this had been, due to the long delays with the Skokie Valley Trail, transferred to other uses, though Lake County strongly supported the project and this connection. Mr. Privett added that the Skokie Valley Trail, when constructed, would ultimately connect to the Sauganash Trail in Chicago. Ms. Moore stated that the project would connect and serve many schools – including several large high schools – as well as Pace bus routes and Metra stations.

Mr. Rickert stated that the ad-hoc committee felt that this project was one which was of importance to the region and which, due to its scope, was legitimately in need of Phase 1 funding. He stated that the question before the Task Force now was whether it should be moved forward as a ‘directly identified’ project. Mr. Neufeld asked the representatives from the Village of Northbrook and the NWMC PL’s whether they had had any discussion of ‘over matching’ – i.e. of offering to pitch in more than the required minimum 20% local match? The representatives said they had not discussed such a deal. Mr. Murtha reminded the Task Force that should Phase 1 be funded, then the sponsor would not be able to apply for CMAQ funds to complete Phase 2 or construction until Phase 1 was complete.

Mr. Privett, as representative of the City of Chicago and CDOT, stated that the City may look for Task Force support for ‘direct identification’ of projects within the Streets for Cycling program. He explained that the reason for this was that the on-street facilities being installed as part of the Streets for Cycling program were not “capital-” or “construction-intensive.” Rather, they consisted largely of Phase 1 engineering. He added that the City would look at different options for obtaining CMAQ funds for its cycling program, which could take the form of a formal request or ‘direct identification’ through the Bike-Ped Task Force/Focus Group. He noted that this may be an emerging problem for suburbs which are looking to design and build on-street facilities. Mr. Mellis asked what would be the dollar amount, which the City would be looking for. Mr. Privett said he did not, at this time, know but that it would depend partly on what could be accomplished in 2013-17, since their previous CMAQ award for the Streets for Cycling program (approximately \$30M) covered the period through 2016. Mr. Mellis asked whether the engineering costs went down as projects get designed and built. Mr. Privett said in some cases but that basic engineering work (drawings) always needed to be done for any one project. Mr. Burke asked whether Mr. Privett could say what percentage of the total cost of an average facility was “design/engineering,” and what percentage was “construction.” Mr. Privett stated that it varied, but that his guess would be that 30 to 50% of an average bikeway facility’s total cost was for design/engineering.

Mr. Neufeld pointed out that our present discussion shows clearly how the need to solve the problem of unobligated balances in the CMAQ program has in turn led to other problems, which we are now struggling to solve.

Jay Ciavarella, of the RTA, spoke about a CMAQ application, which the RTA was considering submitting. He stated that while they would likely submit this application as “Transit” project, it would have significant pedestrian elements and therefore he wanted the Task Force to be aware of it and, if possible, offer thoughts / feedback on it. Mr. Ciavarella stated that the RTA had funding many TOD plans around the region and would like to implement these plans. When local communities were asked, “What do you need to implement these plans?” they often if not usually said that what they needed the most was a funding source for small-scale capital/infrastructure improvements.

Therefore, he continued, the RTA was considering developing and applying to CMAQ for, an “umbrella” program to fund small-scale projects, such as sidewalks, benches, lighting, ramps, shelters, way-finding, etc. He added that the exact locations of specific projects were not, at this point, known but that the RTA would work with locals, service boards, and CMAP to identify projects. He stated that, while many of the details still needed to be worked out, the basic idea was to identify projects that would “improve access to transit.”

Ms. Kilgore stated that if projects included things like bicycle racks, then the RTA should encourage communities to develop joint purchasing agreements to lower costs through volume-pricing.

Mr. Mellis asked if the RTA would allow CMAP to give direct input on project selection and scope, and to have direct input on setting priorities. Mr. Ciavarella said that this would be possible but details would need to be worked out.

Mr. Vance asked how projects would be implemented, by whom? Mr. Ciavarella responded that the RTA would handle Phase 1 and that individual units would be sub-allocated for construction.

Ms. Kokoshi asked whether the RTA had considered the geographic spread of the projects in the collar counties where transit service is much less intensive than areas within and closer to Chicago. Mr. Ciavarella responded that the RTA tries to focus on ‘need’ and to tie projects to locally-adopted, RTA-initiated TOD plans, which have in fact primarily been in the collar counties. Mr. Murtha stated that the project and this approach was aligned with the Bike-Ped Task Force memo to the PSC, which outlined evaluation criteria and performance measures. Mr. Rickert stated that his long-standing concern that LTA plans and RTA Community Planning grant studies might simply end up “on the shelf,” could possibly be addressed – i.e. find a way to actually be implemented – by a program such as the RTA was proposing, he nevertheless felt that CMAP and the CMAQ PSC would need to be directly involved in identifying, scoping, and setting priorities for projects. Mr. Burke added that while a program with “multiple, undefined project locations” might be alright in theory, the exact criteria used for determining precisely where the projects would be and what the projects would actually consist of – in order to achieve real-world “mode shift” – would be crucial to success and should be in any application.

Mr. Rickert asked whether anyone proposed that a motion be made to recommend any of the projects discussed to be a ‘directly identified’ project. Ms. Moore said yes. ***Motion was then made and seconded for recommending that the Skokie Valley Trail project be forwarded to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee as a ‘directly identified’ project, eligible for Phase 1 engineering. The motion was unanimously approved.***

4.2 IDOT Updates

Mr. Sulkes offered the Task Force a brief update on the State Bikeway Plan, stating that a notice announcing IDOT's intent to award a contract had been issued (available on IllinoisBID at <http://www.purchase.state.il.us/ipb/IllinoisBID.nsf/frmBidDocFrameset?ReadForm&RefNum=22024123&DocID=FDE3FF66D20004AA86257A8400693E7B&view=viewSolicitationsOpenByDate>) and that the vendor chosen was Alta Planning & Design. The contract would run for one year from 1/11/2013 to 1/10/2014. The website for the State Bikeway Plan is at <http://www2.illinois.gov/gov/green/pages/bikeplan.aspx>.

Mr. Sulkes stated that, in response to concerns expressed by various agencies upon receipt of IDOT's recent "Bike Accommodation Data Request Form (OPP 102-515)," IDOT would consider CMAP's Bikeway Inventory System (BIS), which CMAP staff forwarded to them earlier this month, as a sufficient response for the northeastern Illinois region (IDOT Region 1).

Mr. Brand, of IDOT, on the telephone from Springfield, gave the Task Force a brief overview of the current status of IDOT's effort to update their statewide bicycle maps. Discussion ensued as to why the method used to produce these maps – that is to rank road segments by their "bikeability" – doesn't work for the northeastern Illinois region, where traffic volumes, speeds, and roadway geometries preclude safe bicycle travel on some roads that, by IDOT's automated methods of ranking bikeability, end up being wrongly characterized as safe for cyclists.

Mr. Burke, of Active Transportation Alliance, who produce a bicyclist user map for the northeastern Illinois region, stated that perhaps IDOT and Active Trans could partner on the production of IDOT's bicycle map for District 1. Mr. Murtha stated that this would be a good idea and explained that what we were looking for was a conversation on this issue. Mr. Brand asked whether the Active Trans map is free. Mr. Burke replied that it was not, but that it was given to individuals who join Active Trans and that, otherwise, it was sold (for \$10). Mr. Barsotti expressed his opinion that the IDOT IRIS database (and its deficiencies and inaccuracies) lay at the source of the mapping problems. Ms. Kilgore stated that CMAP and the Bike-Ped Task Force were not saying that objective information/data were not useful in the ranking of bike routes but that it must be adjusted for specific local conditions and situations. Mr. Privett expressed his opinion that now freely available, open data on cycling routes (as found, for example, on Google maps) may play a much larger role in the future and might be explored by IDOT as a means of accomplishing its goals with the maps.

Mr. Burke said that he would schedule a call with Mr. Brand and others at IDOT to further discuss this.

Mr. Carmitchel, standing in for Meridith Bryans, gave the Task Force a brief update on the Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP). He apologized for the long delay and stated that IDOT staff had finished their evaluation of project submittals and made their recommendations and that the program was now in the hands of the Governor. It was anticipated that an announcement would be made early next year.

Mr. Barsotti said that LIB and other stakeholders had hoped that the ITEP submittal evaluation and decision-making processes would have been more transparent and timely than it was.

4.3 Project Updates

No project updates were given.

5.0 Public Comment and Announcements

CMAP staff announced the upcoming Urban Street Design Training being offered by the Congress for New Urbanism (CNU). The course will cover the manual, *Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach*, which CNU developed in collaboration with the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and is now recommended practice by ITE.

6.0 Next Meetings

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, October 17, 2012 at 1:00 p.m.

7.0 Adjournment: 2:30 PM