

Attachment 1

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

MEETING DATE: April 20, 2011

MEETING LOCATION: CMAP Offices

CALLED TO ORDER: 1:05 pm

ATTENDANCE:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS OR ALTERNATES:

Tom Rickert (Chair)
Keith Privett, CDOT (Alternate Chair)
Richard Bascomb, Village of Schaumburg
Ron Burke, Active Transportation Alliance
Bruce Christensen, Lake County
Chalen Daigle, McHenry County Council of Mayors
Andrea Hoyt, DuPage County Forest Preserve
Allan Mellis, Citizen
Gin Kilgore, Break the Gridlock/League of Illinois Bicyclists
Barbara Moore, Citizen
Randy Neufeld, SRAM (Representative to the Transportation Committee)
Pam Sielski, Forest Preserve District of Cook County
Kevin Staniel, RTA
Matthew Sussman, CNT
Jonathan Tremper, Metra
Jim Stoner, IDOT
Robert Vance, CTA

ABSENT:

Ed Barsotti, League of Illinois Bicyclists
Deborah Fagan, Citizen
John LaPlante, TY Lin International
David Longo, IDNR
Craig Williams, Alta Planning & Design

STAFF:

Doug Ferguson
Tom Murtha
John O'Neal
Ross Patronsky

OTHERS:

John Donovan, FHWA
John Mick II, Baxter and Woodman
Eve Pytel, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus
Chris Staron, NWMC
Mike Walzacak, NWMC

1.0 Introductions: Members and attendees introduced themselves.

2.0 Approval of the Minutes

No changes to the minutes were made. *Motion was made and seconded for approval of the 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:

- **Deborah Fagan, Member-at-Large**

The motion was unanimously approved.

3.0 Regional Planning

3.1 City of Chicago Pedestrian Plan Update/Pedestrian Crash Analysis:

Kiersten Grove (CDOT) and Stacy Meekins (T.Y. Lin) presented recent work on pedestrian safety and pedestrian plan development in Chicago. They explained that pedestrian crash analysis was an important part of improving safety, and that the current analysis of 2005-2009 data built off an earlier analysis of 2001-2005 data. The findings of the crash analysis included the following:

- Chicago's pedestrian fatality rate per 100,000 people was 1.77. This was lower than most large cities.
- The number of crashes has declined over the past decade, from 4,042 in 2001 to 3,130 in 2009.
- 15-18-year-olds had the highest crash rate per person among all age groups.
- The community areas with the greatest numbers of crashes form an east-west band across Chicago, from Austin and Belmont-Cragin to the Loop and Near North Side.
- Most (80%) pedestrian crashes were on arterial and collector streets. Most (56%) youth pedestrian crashes were also on arterial and collector streets, but a higher portion (44%) were on local streets.
- Eight of twelve high-crash corridors were four-lane roadways. All of the high-crash corridors were arterials.
- Taxis were involved in 28% of pedestrian crashes in the CBD, and five percent of city-wide pedestrian crashes (no data exists for the proportion of taxis among automobile traffic).
- On average, two pedestrians were injured or killed in a hit-and-run crash every day.
- On a community area basis, pedestrian crashes were highly associated with crime. 85% of the variation in the number of serious and fatal pedestrian crashes among the community areas was explained by variations in the number of crimes. No other variable was found to be significant in that analysis.
- On arterial highways analyzed, as average running speed increased (not the speed limit), the rate of serious and fatal injury crashes increased.

Based on this and other data, CDOT will develop key messages, an enforcement campaign, and a marketing campaign, all to effectively reduce the number of pedestrian crashes within the city.

CDOT and T.Y. Lin also presented the scope and schedule of the CDOT Pedestrian Plan (phase II). The tasks included a vision statement, a philosophy (linking the vision to goals and objectives), a comprehensive set of pedestrian improvements, prioritization, funding, “putting the pedestrian plan to work,” and outreach. The vision statement, already developed, reads:

The people of Chicago cultivate, encourage, and enjoy mutual respect on our streets. People choose to be pedestrians because the experience is the safest, most connected, accessible, and above all, the most enjoyable. Because we are committed to a strong pedestrian environment as an essential part of our complete transportation system, we are a healthier, more livable city.

The pedestrian policies will include the four Es – engineering, education, encouragement, and enforcement. The City will review best practices and develop implementation criteria.

The prioritization system will be a system to evaluate projects. To develop this system, the City will review other prioritization systems. Potential evaluation factors will be developed with input by the Mayors Pedestrian Advisory Council into a weighted system for project prioritization.

“Putting the pedestrian plan to work” will include visual examples of potential types of projects. Materials will be provided for outreach documents for both the public and local leaders.

Ms. Grove invited early involvement by members of the Task Force in the development of the plan. She noted that CMAP participates, and also noted participation by Task Force members. The outreach process for plan development will focus on the late spring and early summer. She indicated that a draft plan was scheduled to be available by December, at which time she will seek input by the Task Force as a group.

Ms. Pytel asked “what is a crash.” Ms. Grove responded that the analysis included police reports. If there wasn’t a police report for a crash, there is no data point.

Mr. Mellis asked a number of questions, which Ms. Grove indicated she would address separately with Mr. Mellis.

4.0 Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Programming

4.1 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program

Mr. Ferguson reviewed the focused programming approach for CMAQ, and the role of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force. He noted that the emphasis was on identifying projects among those submitted to implement GO TO 2040, and also filling in any gaps by identifying important potential GO TO 2040 implementation projects and sponsors. He added that the focus groups will not be programming projects, but will be providing a package of projects that tell a story.

He noted that we received 357 total applications. Approximately \$900 million was requested. Approximately \$360 million will be available over five years.

Mr. Murtha began by noting that other focus groups were working to develop project evaluation criteria. Mr. Murtha noted that the evaluation would begin with inclusion of the projects within GO TO 2040 and other plans adopted by CMAP and other units of government, then add other criteria that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force prepared such evaluation criteria in 2009. Mr. Murtha indicated that much of this work is suitable for the current effort. Mr. Murtha reviewed the CMAQ evaluation criteria proposed in 2009 ([Handout 1](#) posted on the Task Force minutes page). The recommendations focused on issues like evaluating the value of alternatives to off-street bicycle facilities; transit access; identifying origins and destinations, and not just the population served by a facility (since a high population without suitable destinations can yield – *no*– bike /ped trips, while a lower population with mixed use might generate many such trips); targeting arterials and collectors for pedestrian projects. In addition, Mr. Murtha noted that the analysis can include such factors as crash data.

Thus, analysis was suggested that would include, for each project, how the projects work within the criteria in a table format. The focus areas would be transit, destinations served, consistency with adopted plans and programs, and crashes. He added that this information and knowledge of Task Force members would be used to develop a recommended package of projects by July 1.

Mr. Neufeld stated that this is a great start, but that new ideas should be considered. He mentioned, in particular, bike share and protected bikeways. Regarding bike share programs, Mr. Neufeld noted that bike share really functions as transit where it has been implemented. He added that protected bikeways, by attracting a wider range of ages than traditional bikeways, should be evaluated differently than those traditional bikeways.

Several members supported staff's intention to expand the review of projects to more than the destination served. They noted that when there are destinations within a short distance of the trip origin, there is the potential for attracting many users to bike/ped facilities.

Mr. Stanciel asked about the schedule, particularly what was suggested for the next bike-ped meeting. Would staff evaluations be available? Mr. Murtha responded that the 6th was early for evaluations to be complete, but suggested that the meeting be an opportunity to learn about projects that were either agency priorities or were not typical bike-ped facility projects, in such a way that more information was necessary for a more complete understanding by the Task Force. In response to a question, he suggested that the latter would probably be more important for Task Force consideration.

Mr. Burke reviewed the list of projects submitted, and noted that there were not as many transit projects submitted as in the past. Mr. Ferguson agreed, but noted that the actual implementation of major transit projects funded with CMAQ averaged about one per year, which was consistent with the number of projects submitted.

Mr. Mellis asked whether there would be a quantitative evaluation for all of the criteria. Mr. Murtha responded “no,” that some criteria might be ranked high-medium-low.

Ms. Hoyt asked about the evaluation of trail projects. She noted that though such projects may go through forest preserve areas, they connect important destinations. Mr. Murtha agreed.

Mr. Mellis asked about the presentations. After a short discussion, it was agreed that the next meeting would be focused on such presentations, emphasizing those projects which need information to understand. We will shoot for a dozen short presentations, with substantial assistance from the PLs in identifying such projects.

Upon the suggestion of Mr. Neufeld, it was also agreed that an overall description of the submittals would be useful. Mr. Murtha agreed to provide such a summary at the next meeting.

4.2 Project Updates

Mr. Privett updated the committee on the City’s access to transit study. He stated that 32 stations were evaluated, and suggested that a presentation of the results would be appropriate for the Task Force in the future.

Ms. Hoyt updated the committee on several projects in DuPage County, focusing on the West Branch Trail. She said that projects are underway this summer to fill two small gaps in the trail, the first under North Avenue and the second in Naperville.

Mr. Rickert noted that Kane County is updating its bicycle plan. Mr. Christensen noted that Lake County is updating its long range plan too.

5.0 Public Comment and Announcements

No comments or announcements were made.

6.0 Next Meeting

Friday, May 6, 2011 at 1:00 PM.

7.0 Adjournment: 3:00 PM