



**Citizen Advisory Committee  
May 6, 2010  
5:45 – 8:00 p.m.**

**The Heights  
8001 Dale Ave.  
Richmond Heights, MO 63117**

Attendance

Members

Benjamin Niesen  
Benjamin Zalasky  
Chris Linneman  
David Gipson  
Gerry Noll  
Jennifer Ash  
Jeremy Wolfmeyer  
John Cameron  
John D'Agostino  
Karen Karabell  
Kylie Roth  
Larry Welty  
Peter Hovey  
Rob Mosbey  
Robert Maltby  
Seth Teel  
Shana Albright  
Shelley Smith  
Thomas Finan  
Wes Ridgeway

Project Sponsor and Core Partners Staff:

Susan Trautman, Executive Director, Great Rivers Greenway  
Todd Antoine, Deputy Director for Planning, Great Rivers Greenway  
Carey Bundy, Project Manager, Great Rivers Greenway

Project Team:

Paul Wojciechowski, Project Manager, CH2MHill  
Beth Quindry, Public Engagement, Shockey Consulting  
Julie Padberg-White, Public Engagement, FPA Group

### **Welcome and Agenda Review**

Paul Wojciechowski welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda for the meeting telling CAC members this was a meeting where they were going to roll up their sleeves and get to work on a vision statement as well as goals and objectives for the plan.

### **Review of Meeting Notes and TAC Meeting on May 4**

Paul asked the group if there were comments on meeting notes from the first CAC meeting. Notes had been sent to CAC members in April for their review and comments received had been incorporated prior to the meeting. No additional changes were suggested.

Paul presented information comparing the feedback received so far between the TAC and the CAC. He began by reminding members of their role as CAC members (details available in PowerPoint presentation). He noted that there was significant overlap between the two groups regarding goals for the Bike Plan – both groups included the following among their most frequent comments:

- More people on their bikes
- More facilities
- Safer bicycle facilities
- Education for cyclists, motorists

Next, Paul presented information explaining the TAC's emphasis on coordination and planning since the CAC did not emphasize this area as much. Paul reminded the group of who is on the Technical Advisory Committee saying the TAC includes municipal planning directors, municipal public works directors and core stakeholder representatives. The reason they emphasize planning and coordination is that there are over 100 municipalities in the region and roadways are managed by a number of different entities.

As background to the TAC comments, Paul provided a brief overview of roadway classifications and their significance to planning bicycle facilities. Four roadway types were defined: principle arterials, minor arterials, collector streets and local streets. Paul discussed the entities responsible for managing each type and stated that the Plan will focus on arterial roadways. A key point is that ownership and management of roadways is complex; in most cases, roads are owned and managed as a combined effort of several agencies including municipalities, counties and the Missouri Department of Transportation. The Bike Plan will be the most successful if all the players are on the same page. More details on roadway classifications are available in the PowerPoint presentation.

### **Vision and Small Group Activity**

Beth Quindry facilitated a large group discussion and small group activity on development of a vision statement for the Bike Plan. Prior to the meeting, the CAC project team drafted three vision statements based on previous feedback from both the CAC and the TAC. Beth asked the CAC members to review them in small groups. These draft vision statements included:

A - The St. Louis region will offer bicyclists of all skill levels a safe and consistent bike network of on road bike facilities that complement the off road system.

B - The St. Louis region will feature a bicycle network that fosters connectivity and multimodal travel.

C - Bicyclists of all skill levels can travel safely to major destinations throughout the St. Louis region safely by bicycle.

In full group discussion afterwards, most groups reported liking A and B the best but all four groups opted to write new vision statements rather than just adopt or critique those that were offered. Below are the statements they drafted in small groups and a fifth statement offered during group discussion afterwards. The group as a whole voted on which statements they preferred. The fifth statement was by far the most popular (as indicated by the number of votes in brackets).

1. The St. Louis region will offer bicyclists of all skill levels a network that fosters connectivity and multimodal travel. [4]
2. The St. Louis region will feature a bicycle network where bicyclists from all skill levels can travel safely. [2]
3. The St. Louis region will feature a bicycle network that will foster connectivity and multi-modal travel – safely and consistently. [2]
4. The St. Louis region will offer bicyclists of all skill levels a safe and consistent bike network of on-road bicycle facilities that foster multi-modal travel and complement the off-road system. [0]
5. The St. Louis region will have a transportation network that accommodates all users. [11]  
\*there was discussion (but not agreement) regarding the possibly of adding some reference to bicycling, or including a list of all types of users – motorists, cyclists, pedestrians and transit riders.

General comments from small groups stressed the importance of including the concept of integration with other modes of transit and overall connectivity of the bike network.

### **Refinement of Goals and Objectives**

Beth Quindry facilitated a discussion of goals and objectives. Draft Goals and Objectives were offered to the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) for review based on feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. Objectives were also presented to the Citizen Advisory Committee reflecting feedback provided by both TAC and CAC in previous meetings. Black text indicates objectives as initially presented; blue text indicates additions based on group discussion. Following discussion of the goals, CAC members were asked to rank their top 5 objectives. Results are indicated in brackets.

Goal 1: Consistent application of bicycle facilities guidelines and standards.

- Objective: Educate staff in planning, design, maintenance, construction and enforcement. [14]

Goal 2: Expand the public's view that bicycles are a viable/acceptable mode of transportation.

- Objective: Increased educational programs for motorists and cyclists. [17]
- Objective: Establish ongoing regional encouragement programs. [3]

Goal 3: Provide a prioritized system of routes that are contiguous and connected to other on and off road facilities.

- Objective: Improve accessibility for bikes around barriers like intersections, rivers and highways. [9]

Goal 4: Increase the number of people using bicycles for transportation.

- Objective: Increase the # of available bike facilities including on road facilities as well as support facilities like bike parking. [15]
- Objective: Improve upon existing facilities. [1]
- Objective: Improve the safety of bicycle facilities. [2]
  - Performance Measure: Reduce the rate of bicycle accidents by 50% by 2020.

Goal 5: Increase commitment of public officials to support and/or initiate public policy for bicycling in all levels of government – state, local, and regional.

- Objective: Establish funding sources for implementation and ongoing maintenance. [12]
- Objective: Increased intergovernmental cooperation on bicycle policy and projects. [7]
- Objective: Improve the consistency of enforcing traffic laws for motorists and bicyclists. [2]
- Objective: Designate regional entity to enhance, promote, and oversee cross-county collaboration to ensure continued planning and implementation success. [10]
  - Performance Measure: Implementation of bicycle facilities by all public entities in the region by 2015.

### **Session Wrap-Up and Next Meeting**

Paul Wojciechowski, Susan Trautman and Todd Antoine thanked the group for attending and for the great discussion and feedback on vision, goals and objectives. Paul Wojciechowski said that their work would be shared with the TAC and reviewed again in a future meeting. He said the group would be notified as soon as the next meeting date is set. Meanwhile, the process of mapping existing routes and plans is underway and the project team looks forward to bringing that information back to the CAC for review and comment.