

Attachment 1

Draft Meeting Notes Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force

MEETING DATE: September 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
Chalen Daigle, McHenry County Council of Mayors
Barbara Moore, Citizen
Dan Thomas, DuPage County
Sam Mead, IDOT
Jonathan Tremper, Metra
Kevin Staniel, RTA
Valbona Kokoshi, LDOT (on phone)
Allan Mellis, Citizen
Greg Piland, FHWA (on phone)
Pamela Sielski, Cook County Forest Preserve District (on phone)
Robert Vance, CTA (on phone)

ABSENT:

Ron Burke, Active Transportation Alliance
Gin Kilgore, Break the Gridlock
Bruce Christensen, Lake County
David Longo, IDNR
Andrea Hoyt, DuPage County Forest Preserve
Craig Williams, Alta Planning & Design
John LaPlante, TY Lin International

STAFF:

John O'Neal
Tom Murtha
Don Kopec
Doug Ferguson

OTHERS:

Marty Mueller, Knight E/A
Mike Walczak, NWMC
Mike Albin, DMMC
Chris Staron, NWMC

Mike Sullivan, Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors (on phone)
Gabe Sulkes, IDOT
Felicia Burkes, IDOT
Allison Bos, SWCM
Jack Cebe, Alta Planning+Design
Janet Henderson, Images
Tammy Wierciak, WCMC (on phone)

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

Don Kopec gave the Task Force an overview of the federal transportation bill, MAP-21, and what might be expected for programmers and implementers, stressing that at this point in time, little was certain and that, basically, implementers and others must wait for USDOT/FHWA to issue guidance. He stated that the policies and programs for the bill's proposed performance measures may take as long as two years – the life of the bill itself in fact – to be fully developed and implemented. Mr. Kopec added that the inclusion of performance measures in the bill is an important advance and a step in the right direction. However, he stated that, as written, the performance measures amount to little more than “reporting” -- CMAP would have liked to have seen more substance to and detail on the performance measures.

Mr. Kopec explained that MAP-21 eliminates TE, RTP, and SRTS, bundling them into the consolidated program, Transportation Alternatives. He added that the funding for TAP will be split 50/50 between the state and the MPOs, with 50% being programmed by the state, anywhere in the state, and 50% programmed by the region. He stated that CMAP and IDOT do not want to run really different TA programs, so the plan is to coordinate the programs so that they look and act similar. He added that this will likely be discussed at the October Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. O'Neal asked what the funding levels were anticipated to be. Mr. Kopec replied that the TA program, statewide, was anticipated to be approximately \$28M annually, with \$14M going to state MPOs, and 75%-80% of this going to the northeastern Illinois region. Mr. Barsotti added that \$1.5M of the state's share of TA would be “taken of the top” for the Recreational Trails Program (RTP), to be programmed by IDNR.

3.1 CMAP Local Technical Assistance (LTA) Program

CMAP staff (Hala Ahmed) gave the Task Force an overview of the 2012 (“Round 2”) CMAP Local Technical Assistance (LTA) and the RTA/CMAP Community Planning programs. The purpose of these two programs is to direct resources to communities to pursue planning work

that helps to implement GO TO 2040. She reported that 109 “project ideas” or applications came from 88 entities. She reminded the Task Force that the Community Planning program provides grants and consultant assistance to projects that link land use and transportation planning, and is administered in partnership with the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), while the LTA program provides staff assistance and small grants for a wide range of planning projects. The LTA program application is a simple two page document requiring a basic description of the planning project to be undertaken, while the Community Planning program has a more detailed 15-page application. The LTA program was open to governments and to non-profits, while the Community Planning program was limited to units of government. Of the 109 “project ideas”, 96 were submitted to only the LTA program, 10 were submitted to only the Community Planning program, and 3 were submitted to both programs. (Some applicants submitted different ideas to the LTA and Community Planning programs.) In addition to the applications submitted to CMAP through this program, 13 additional applications were submitted to the RTA. 7 of the 13 project ideas submitted to the Community Planning program have been recommended for funding. Of these 4 involve a strong bicycle and/or pedestrian element.

Mr. Rickert stated that, when discussed by the UWP Committee, he had reservations about the use of money for this program, however he was, in the end, very pleased with this use of funds and believes that the Kane Co. projects – as well probably as others with which he is less familiar – demonstrate the value of the products funded by the LTA and Community Planning programs.

3.2 CMAP Future Leaders in Planning (FLIP) Program

CMAP staff (Ricardo Lopez) gave the Task Force an overview the FLIP program and announced that the program is currently seeking applications. He stated that the program offers an excellent educational opportunity for high school students to learn about the issues that shape our region’s economy and quality of life. In the first half of the program, students meet once a month on a Saturday for field trips and/or discussions with experts; in the second half of the program, students develop a project idea. The program concludes with presentations to the public and the CMAP Board. Mr. Lopez highlighted past FLIP projects such as that in Fairmont, IL, which involved interviews with students and teachers at the local high school as well as community leaders and which resulted in a successful application to IDOT for SRTS funding. Mr. Lopez stated that the FLIP program was especially in need of and seeking applications from McHenry and Kane Counties.

Mr. Privett remarked that the FLIP program was similar to a program being run by the Chicago Architecture Foundation, and that CMAP staff might consider partnering with them to offer a multi-disciplinary approach to planning for the built environment.

Mr. Lopez stated that this year’s theme for the FLIP program was “green infrastructure” and that the project was yet to be developed.

Ms. Moore stated that, in her experience – specifically with SRTS projects – having the students or children take ideas up to the parents – a “kid up” approach – was very effective.

3.3 Millennium Reserve

This presentation was postponed until the next Task Force meeting due to the inability of the presenter to attend.

4.0 Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Programming

4.1 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program

CAMP staff (Doug Ferguson) gave the Task Force an overview of the upcoming CMAQ call for projects (CMAQ 2017-18), providing the anticipated timeframe and outlining changes to programming and management policies and eligibility requirements. He stated that the changes, which he outlined at the last Task Force meeting, had been approved by the CMAQ PSC, Policy Committee, and Board. He emphasized that, generally, Phase 1 engineering would no longer be an eligible expense and that the proposal to fund subsequent phases at 100% was not possible under the new transportation bill, MAP-21. He added that different changes affected signal interconnect and diesel retrofit projects.

Mr. Neufeld expressed the opinion that the removal of phase 1 engineering as an eligible expense may spell the end of innovation for CMAQ bicycle and pedestrian projects. As an example, he pointed out that the Chicago bikeshare program could not have been funded, as well as other projects that do not follow a traditional phase 1 and phase 2 engineering process, under the new programming and management policies.

Mr. Murtha then initiated discussion about how the Task Force should approach the review or evaluation of CMAQ 2017-18 project submittals. He stated that during the last call, there was very little time for discussion and planning of how the review of submittals would take place. He added that, if possible, he thought the application booklet should state up-front the criteria by which project submittals would be evaluated. Mr. Murtha explained that the staff proposal outlined in the memo entitled "[CMAQ Focused Programming -- Bike-Ped Project Criteria and Performance Measures](#)" included 'criteria' which must be met (i.e. are 'prerequisites' for becoming a project recommended by the Task Force) and 'performance measures', which would be both evaluation criteria by which we can rank project submittals and criteria, once built and in place, by which we can evaluate the effectiveness of a project in bringing about mode-shift.

Ms. Kokoshi asked whether, once criteria are identified and met, then can a project be added if Phase 1 has been completed. Mr. Ferguson stated that in theory this could happen but a project would need to be removed from the program for another to be added. He referred to page four, 4.iv of the handout, "[CMAQ Programming and Management Policies \(June 2012\)](#)".

Mr. Barsotti expressed his concern about having "strict" criteria that might disqualify good projects. Mr. Walczak asked whether Phase 1 engineering could be funded when projects are "directly identified" by a focus group. Mr. Ferguson referred to the page 2, 2.ii.1-2 of the handout, "[CMAQ Programming and Management Policies \(June 2012\)](#)". Mr. Neufeld stated that in his opinion we needed to find a way to may Phase 1 funding available for certain projects or project types. He added that the criteria and performance measures proposed in the memo may need to be tweaked a bit. For example, he thought that in addition to bike and ped crashes we might want to look at vehicular crashes too, since bicycle projects can help reduce car-on-car crashes too.

Regarding the staff proposal that implementers conduct counts of cyclists and pedestrians before the project and on one day during each of the four years following construction, Mr. Neufeld stated that, while not ideal, such counts were better than nothing and generally a good idea, if we can ensure that they take place. He added that, while using transit ridership as a measure of the success of a bike or pedestrian project might be considered problematic, it was nevertheless “part of the picture”.

Mr. Privett stated that he thought the language was in the memo was a bit confusing and that we should change the phrase “performance measures” to “evaluation measures.”

Mr. Murtha stated that he proposed that staff do three things:

- 1) Create a new draft of this memo, incorporating the changes discussed.
- 2) Explore data, to find out what is available and what is needed
- 3) Form a working group to develop a program for “direct identification” of project(s)

Mr. Neufeld stated that he thought we need to clarify that the project(s) “directly identified” for CMAQ may also apply to other programs and programming activities, and that we might encourage folks to submit even non-CMAQ eligible projects in order to build up a list of bike-ped projects that are high priority for the region and its implementers.

Mr. Murtha, going back to Mr. Walczak’s question, asked whether we, as a focus group, should “directly identify” project(s) to submit to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee. He suggested that to do this we form an ad-hoc committee of the Task Force representatives of 1) the City of Chicago, 2) the Counties, and 3) the Councils of Mayors to develop projects to put forth as “directly identified” projects.

Barbara Moore asked whether the Task Force should then vote on the projects proposed to be put forth as “directly identified”. Mr. Neufeld stated that we should spend at least 30 minutes at the next bike-ped Task Force meeting to have 10 minute presentations on three proposed projects for “direct identification”.

Mr. Rickert suggested that our next Task Force meeting, in order to further discuss these issues, be scheduled for October 17 at 1:00 pm at CMAP offices.

4.2 Soles and Spokes Workshop

Mr. O’Neal gave the Task Force a brief overview of the Soles and Spokes workshop on bikeways, which took place on August 24, and described the plans for an upcoming workshop – *Designing Pedestrian Facilities for Accessibility* – to be held on November 1-2.

4.3 Project Updates

Mr. Privett stated that the City of Chicago had published its Pedestrian Plan. He suggested that the Task Force include a presentation on the plan in the next or a future meeting. He stated that Susan Carlson was the contact person for the plan.

Mr. Barsotti stated that LIB has been working with IDOT to revise the Bureau of Local Roads (BLR) manual to include better guidance on accommodating cyclists and pedestrians, and bringing it in line with the BDE manual and the State's Complete Streets law. He added that this effort is being led by Kevin Burke at IDOT.

Mike Walczak informed the Task Force that Phase 2 of the Higgins Road bridge was underway.

Mr. Privett stated that CDOT was in the final phase of its crash analysis, and that one bit of information that he himself found particularly interesting was that of +/- 35 bicyclist fatalities, only one was wearing a helmet, demonstrating the effectiveness and need for strong programs to encourage the wearing of helmets.

Mr. Sulkes announced that IDOT's Office of Planning and Programming was compiling a list of stakeholders for the state bicycle plan.

Ms. Sielski, referring to a handout, announced an upcoming event hosted by the Friends of the Cal-Sag Trail to raise funds for the trail's construction.

Mr. Thomas stated that the bridge over Grace St., the UP railway, and St. Charles St. in Lombard along the Great Western Trail should be completed in November. He also stated that this year would mark the 50th anniversary of the Prairie Path and that various events would be taking place to celebrate the trail, including a press conference on Oct. 3 at Mile Marker 0.

5.0 Public Comment and Announcements

No comments or announcements were made.

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