

**Attachment 1
Draft Meeting Notes
Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force**

MEETING DATE: 05/27/09

MEETING LOCATION: CMAP Offices

CALLED TO ORDER: 2:00 pm

ATTENDANCE:

(Task Force Members)

Thomas Rickert, Kane County (Chair)

Keith Privett, Chicago Department of Transportation

Richard Bascomb, Village of Schaumburg

Andrea Hoyt, Forest Preserve District of DuPage County

Rae Keasler, City of Aurora

Les Nunes, IDOT

Bruce Christensen, Lake County

Allan Mellis, FPDCC

Jonathan Tremper, Metra

Randy Neufeld, Chicagoland Bicycle Federation

Ed Barsotti, LIB

Craig Williams, TY Lin

Barbara Moore, Citizen/Resident, Local Communities (Northfield, IL)

Dave Longo, IDNR (on phone)

(Staff)

John O'Neal, CMAP

Tom Murtha, CMAP

Don Kopec, CMAP

Lori Heringa, CMAP

Bob Dean, CMAP

Holly Ostidick, CMAP

(Others)

Keith Sherman, IDOT (on phone)

Erma Tranter, Friends of the Parks

Carolyn Helmke, Active Transportation Alliance

Jessica Thompson, LIB

Ders Anderson, Openlands

Steve Lazzara, Will County

Kiersten Grove, CDOT

Mike Walczak, North West Municipal Conference

Tammy Wierciak, West Central Municipal Conference

Perry Recker, Friends of Cal-Sag Trail / Blue Island Transportation Committee
Sarah Lutz, McHenry County
Stacey Meekins, TY Lin
John LaPlante, TY Lin

1.0 Introductions: Attendees introduced themselves

2.0 Approval of the Minutes: Staff noted the following corrections to the minutes:

- Task Force member, Barbara Moore noted here incorrect absence from the Minutes of February 11, 2009.

Motion was made and seconded for approval of the revised meeting notes. The motion was unanimously approved.

3.0 Regional Planning

3.1 Regional Greenways and Trails Plan

Lori Heringa, Project Manager for the update CMAP's Regional Greenways and Trails Plan, gave the Task Force a summary and update on the status of the Plan. She stated that a draft version was nearing completion and would be posted online (on CMAP's website) for public comment sometime later this month. (The draft plan is now available online at: <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/greenwaysandtrails.aspx>)

In describing the nature and content of the Plan, Ms. Heringa gave the Plan definition of both Greenways and of Trails. She stated that according to the Plan's definition, all streams would be Greenways. She stated that, in this regard, the Plan will follow and reference the Regional Waterways or Water Trails Plan. She emphasized that while the majority of the Plan's Trails would be "Green", some – such as bicycle sidepaths – would not; and indeed, some, small sections of Trails would even be on-road.

Ms. Heringa introduced and discussed the Plan's Primary Regional Trail System Map, characterizing it as "the 'backbone' of the regional trail system." She noted that 'loop trails', inside of Forest Preserves, are not shown, although they may have a major recreational role. She stated that 'green trails,' or green corridors, were distinguished as such and were, as the name suggests, trails or corridors which would offer the user a "green experience."

Ms. Heringa emphasized that the Plan and maps were the result of input from all stakeholders – Councils of Mayors, Counties, Forest Preserve districts, etc. She noted that the map does not show proposed public open spaces (i.e. future open spaces), as such land may be or going to be under negotiation, and revelation of this could de-rail attempts to acquire it for public purposes.

Ms. Heringa noted that there were still a few "problem areas", e.g. the Des Plaines River Trail between North Ave. and Lake Cook Road, and the Cal-Sag Trail, where better connections may be possible.

Mr. Rickert asked whether it will be, as it the past, one map when it is all finished. Ms. Heringa stated that there would be one main (map) document, but that if more information, such as Primary Trails, could not be shown clearly on the main map, then perhaps there would be additional maps or inset maps. She stated that this would depend somewhat on the cartographer (Northeastern Illinois University).

Mr. Nunes asked what the time horizon of the plan was. Ms. Heringa responded that, like the comprehensive plan, it would be 2040. Mr. Nunez asked whether the Plan prioritized projects. Mr. Murtha responded that, “No, not in and of itself; but it would – as it has in fact already begun to do – play an important role by helping to define needs and priorities, and plan for multimodal connections and safety.”

Ms. Heringa stressed that the trail lines – except for those already existing – on the map were, in large part, ‘conceptual’, and that details and exact alignments could only be worked out on the project scale.

Mr. Murtha recommended that the Task Force take action to send the Draft Greenways and Trails Plan on to the Transportation and Environment and Natural Resources Committees.
Motion was made and seconded.

Mr. Rickert reminded the Task Force that comments on the Plan can be submitted before the next Steering Committee meeting.

3.2 GO TO 2040 Plan

Project Manager Bob Dean gave the Task Force an update on the *GO TO 2040* plan and plan process, especially as regards its consideration of bicycling, walking and multimodal transportation.

Mr. Dean stated that Staff, following the Task Force suggestion, made a comparison of WalkScore and CMAP’s Pedestrian Environment Factor (PEF) methods. He distributed a handout (three maps), which showed the results of the two methods when applied to the region, and one showing the ‘difference’ between the two methods. Mr. Dean stressed that the two methods produced results which were generally consistent, though minor differences could be discerned in some areas, which may be the result of WalkScores focus on retail. This could result in an auto-centric suburban mall receiving perhaps a higher than justified score.

Mr. Privett noted that the satellite urban centers (such as Joliet, Elgin, Waukegan, etc.) pop-out a rather more on the PEF map more than they do on the WalkScore map, and that the south side of the City of Chicago likewise pops out more on the PEF map than the WalkScore map.

Ms. Helmke asked what the PEF was based on. Mr. Dean replied that it was based solely on raw population density. Mr. Barsotti stated that LIB had developed a Complete Streets Roadside Audit method for assessing bikeability/walkability. He informed the Task Force that they could learn more about this on LIB’s website. He added that if anyone had suggestions for incorporating land use, he would be very interested in talking to them after the meeting.

Mr. Dean moved on next to updating the Task Force on the process and progress of the Scenario evaluation for the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that Staff was currently analyzing scenarios, which he defined as a “combination of actions” that together will produce a certain kind of future for the region. He stated that Staff had developed three scenarios given the following names – Reinvest, Preserve, and Innovate.

In order to illustrate the way that non-motorized transportation may be evaluated, analyzed and integrated into the scenario planning, Mr. Dean projected PowerPoint slides showing maps of (simulated) PEF in the region under the Preserve scenario, opposite the ‘baseline’ PEF, noting how the PEF is increased under the Preserve scenario.

Mr. Rickert asked whether the scenarios were based on current or future/projected VMT. Mr. Dean stated that it was based on projected VMT, noting that under a scenario such as Preserve VMT will still go up in the future, it will just go up less drastically than under the baseline, business-as-usual scenario.

Mr. Dean described the upcoming workshops, which CMAP would be hosting in order both to receive public input and, more generally, to get the word out about the interactive/online public planning tools developed as part of the *GO TO 2040* plan.

N.B. –The agenda was changed here in order to accommodate Keith Sherman, who was participating via telephone. Item 4.2 was taken up here.

3.3 Quad-State Bikeways Planning

Mr. Murtha informed the Task Force about recent efforts to coordinate planning among four MPOs along the southern shores of Lake Michigan. Trails were identified as one important area for unified, coordinated planning. In draft form, the four states would agree to share information; and (if there is consensus on this) to determine or identify quad-state trail corridors. This information could in turn be coordinated and meshed with efforts on the national level to develop a national system of trails.

Mr. Privett stated that CDOT would very much like to be involved in this effort.

4.0 Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Programming

4.1 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program

John O’Neal reported on the status and near-term schedule for the 2010 CMAQ program, referring to a map of the CMAQ project applications throughout the region, which CMAP staff will use to analyze applications, and to a handout summarizing these project applications. Mr. O’Neal stressed the upcoming 30-day public comment period, to begin near the end of July.

4.2 Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP)

Mr. Sherman informed the Task Force that Governor Quinn was very interested in the Enhancement program – and more specifically that he was interested in using it for bicycle and pedestrian transportation. He added that he believed that the Governor’s office – while it had not yet acted in terms of announcing the winning projects – would be doing announcing something soon.

Mr. Barsotti asked who are the main contacts at the Governor’s office? Mr. Sherman responded that Bill Grunloh, Dick Smith, and Chris Reed were involved.

Keith Privett asked about the “120-day clock”, which Mr. Sherman stated turned out to be a misunderstanding and that it did not apply directly to the Enhancement program.

Mr. Nunes explained that ITEP fell under the State programs, which altogether had 120 days to spend ½ of their stimulus funding, which IDOT has accomplished.

Mr. Sherman stated that which the State wanted to spend out the ARRA money, the Governor’s office’s slow action has led to delays and missed opportunities, and the ARRA money has not been completely used up.

Mr. Privett asked whether there would be an update on the IDOT website, and Mr. Sherman stated that, yes, once IDOT receives a list of projects – assuming that there will be an announcement of projects soon. Mr. Sherman expressed his opinion that after this round of Enhancement projects, IDOT would revert to the former, older approach to programming in which experts assess projects,

Mr. Neufeld stated that there are in fact 40-45 states in the country that have established best practices for administering and programming an Enhancement program – Illinois does not have to re-invent the wheel in coming up with a rational, transparent, fair and effective program.

Mr. Privett added that CMAP’s CMAQ program is a model too, which we can look to to balance the different factors that must be taken into account when evaluating and ranking projects.

Mr. Sherman stated that he believed that in the past, project selection was, upon review, fairly good, but that he agreed that the process was not an open or transparent one, and that this non-transparent process was a defect of the program in the past.

Mr. Privett noted that ARRA offered states to fund projects at 100%, but asked whether IDOT plans to continue to fund at 80%-20%?

Mr. Sherman stated that, yes, for the most part this was the plan. However, the Governor has stated that some poorer communities may need 100% funding to participate. If that is the case, then the State may have to develop some fair way of making exceptions to the 70%-20% norm.

4.3 Safe Routes to School

4.3.1 IDOT

Mr. Murtha informed the Task Force that CMAP staff had received and was distributing a list of “Approved School Travel Plans” for the last/current cycle of the IL SRTS program. He stated that other than this, Staff had nothing to report on SRTS, but asked whether anyone else had any news or information on the program – especially whether or not it was in danger of being cut in the future. Mr. Barsotti stated that he believed that, regardless, the program should be ready for extension/continuation, in order to avoid having unauthorized balances and thus vulnerable to rescission. Mr. Neufeld stated that he believed the SRTS program would be heavily funded in the future.

Task Force members asked that Meagan Holt report at the next meeting of the Task Force on the status of the program.

4.3.2 Active Transportation Alliance

Mr. O’Neal referred to the handout referenced above on Approved School Travel Plans. Mr. Neufeld informed the Task Force that Walk to School Day is October 6, and that Active Trans was engaged in encouragement and incentive training program to PTA and volunteer school groups.

4.4 Rescissions and Lapses

4.4.1 IDOT

Mr. Nunes updated the Task Force on state rescissions, referring to the one-page handout, showing the historical (1997-2009) amounts for the State of Illinois of: ‘Unobligated Balances’, and ‘Unobligated Balances to be Rescinded’ for each of the following programs – Interstate Maintenance, National Highway System, Highway Bridge, STP-Flexible, STP-Enhancements, and CMAQ. (See Attachment 9 at: <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/bikeped/minutes.aspx>.)

4.4.2 CMAP Discussion on avoiding rescissions and lapses

Ms Ostlick explained the difference between lapses and rescissions in the relation to federal legislation and regulations, referring to a handout indicating at what point in the programming process funds for each of the major transportation programs are safe from rescission. She emphasized that lapsing could still occur and should be of concern, while rescissions – at least for the time being – have already (recently) been decided upon by IDOT.

Mr. Nunes asked whether “obligated” means, essentially, “safe from rescission”. Mr. Kopec replied that, no, although obligated funds may be thought of as “spent”, they may be taken against future appropriations. He added that obligation and authorization are technically different steps or processes, but that in practice they happen at essentially the same time. Finally, Mr. Kopec added that states with higher unobligated balances will be tapped by the federal government for more, or greater amounts of, rescissions.

4.3 Project Updates

No project updates were presented.

5.0 Policy Planning

5.1 Complete Streets / IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) Manual Revision

Mr. Murtha drew the attention of the Task Force to several handouts, including copies of:

- Complete Streets bill (SB013),
- Original text of Chapters 5 and 17 of the BDE (on ‘Local Agency Agreements’ and ‘Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation’, respectively)
- Revised text of Chapters 5 and 17 of the draft update of the BDE
- Active Transportation Alliance and League of Illinois Bicyclists’ review of IDOT’s revised versions of Chapters 5 and 17 of the BDE
- CMAP recommendations for implementation of Complete Streets legislation

(N.B. – these documents are available online at <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/bikeped/minutes.aspx>.

Mr. Murtha stated that the bottom line is that CMAP staff does not feel IDOT's BDE revision meets the requirements (in letter or in spirit) of the Complete Streets legislation.

Mr. Barsotti gave the Task Force a brief background or history of both the Complete Streets legislation and the BDE update. He added that it was his opinion that there needs to be more review and further revision of the BDE to make Complete Streets a reality. He added that a big concern to IDOT in terms of implementation is the "local share" – that is, who will pay for the (anticipated/perceived) added costs to building Complete Streets, as opposed to traditional, obsolete, automobile-centric streets?

Mr. Neufeld stated that there are two separate issues here, which need to be discussed separately:

1. Design – The BDE could easily and fruitfully follow AASHTO guidance on the design and inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian accommodation in all roadway projects. AASHTO's guidance could be slightly 'tweaked' by IDOT to fit local conditions and then put directly into the BDE.
2. Cost-sharing – This issue could and should be worked out separately from the issue of design guidance.

The first issue, Design guidance, could in fact be 'implemented' more or less immediately – putting design guidance into the BDE doesn't 'cost' anything – but it would save lives. Mr. Neufeld informed the Task Force that all studies that address this issue show clearly that including elements for the accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists into roadway construction and reconstruction projects in urban areas increases safety for those users – the most vulnerable users in fact: children, seniors, mobility-challenged, transit-dependent.

As regards the local match, or cost-sharing, issue, Mr. Neufeld stated that there has to be an open, transparent discussion if we hope to find an acceptable, rational, sustainable solution. He added that clearly – and something all parties can surely agree upon – the fact is that we – here in northeast Illinois and probably elsewhere in the state – do have a problem getting pedestrian accommodation and sidewalks installed where we desperately need them.

Mr. Neufeld proposed that the Task Force pass a motion recommending that this discussion about adhering to the law and implementing the Complete Streets legislation take place and that the Task Force is part of that discussion. He added that the Task Force should strongly express its concern and consternation that nothing has happened yet as regards implementing the Complete Streets law.

Mr. LaPlante added that it is important, as mentioned above, to separate 'design guidance' and 'cost sharing' issues.

After some discussion of the exact language of the motion, Mr. Kopec suggested that the Task Force simply request that this topic be put on the Transportation Committee agenda.

The motion was made and seconded that an agenda item to discuss concerns about the lack of implementation of Illinois' Complete Streets legislation – separating the inclusion of design

guidance for pedestrian and bicycle accommodation into the BDE from the issue of ‘cost sharing’ – be added to the next (post June) Transportation Committee meeting. The motion includes a request for the Transportation Committee’s full consideration of the BDE Manual revision.

6.0 Public Comment and Announcements

Mr Lazzara of Will County informed the Task Force that the Will County Highway Department had finished its 2030 Transportation Plan, which references the South Suburban Bikeway Plan, the Midewin Land and Resource Management Plan, and the Soles & Spokes Reports.

The City of Des Plaines informed the Task Force that they had kicked off Phase 1 of their Bike Plan, which would consist of public meetings.

Mr. Recker informed the Task Force that there would be a ground breaking on June 6 with shovels for the Burnham Centennial Cal-Sag Trail project. The contact was: Diane Banta at the National Park Service or Steve Buchtel at Active Trans.

Ms. Keasler informed the Task Force that the City of Aurora will pass its first Bike-Ped plan in June.

Mr. Murtha stated that, while not on the agenda for today, the Task Force had asked IDOT to address the issue of including “dooring” type crashes in their public crash data. Without such data, Mr. Murtha added, CMAP staff and Task Force members feel that safety analyses for the region are deficient, not allowing planners and policy makers to fully identify and understand all relevant issues.

Mr. Murtha suggested that, since it appears a legislative action needs to take place in order to redress this problem, IDOT itself should propose such legislation.

The Task Force asked Mr. Nunes to discuss this issue with IDOT’s Highway Safety department and report back to the Task Force at its next meeting.

7.0 Next Meeting

Wednesday, August 12, 2:00 PM.

8.0 Adjournment: 3:30PM