



Citizen & Technical Advisory Committee Joint Meeting

NOTES

Meeting 4: January 25, 2011
 Time: 3:45 – 6:00 PM
 Location: The Offices of CH2M Hill

CAC Member Attendees:

| | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Shana Albright | Ben Niesen |
| Stephanie Co | Gerry Noll |
| David Gipson | Wes Ridgeway |
| Karen Karabell | Larry Welty |
| J. Donovan Larson | Jeremy Wolfmeyer |
| Chris Linneman | Ben Zalasky |
| Rob Mosbey | |

TAC Member Attendees:

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Jennifer Ash | Metro | Gary Padhorsky | St. Charles Co. |
| Tim Brunzman | Richmond Heights | Rachael Pawlak | EWGCOG |
| Derek Koestel | Lake St. Louis | Bryan Pearl | Maryland Heights |
| Rob Mosbey | City of Cottleville | Mark Phillips | Metro |
| Ben Niesen | Chesterfield | Ryan Thomas | Wildwood |
| Kevin Neill | Trailnet | Connie Tomasula | St. Louis City |
| | | Mike Zeltman | St. Louis County |

TEAM Attendees:

| | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Julie Padberg-White | FPA Group | Paul Wojciechowski | CH2M Hill |
| Beth Quindry | Shockey Consulting | Peter Lagerwey (on phone) | Toole Design |

GRG Attendees:

| | | | |
|--------------|-----|---------------|-----------|
| Todd Antoine | GRG | Mike Murray | GRG Board |
| Carey Bundy | GRG | Patrick Owens | GRG |



[Citizen & Technical Advisory Committee Joint Meeting](#)

[NOTES](#)

| | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|--|-----------------------|-----|
| Lonny Boring | GRG | | Susan Trautman | GRG |
|---------------------|-----|--|-----------------------|-----|

Citizen & Technical Advisory Committee Joint Meeting

January 25, 2011

1. Welcome & Update on Project Activities

- a. The meeting was brought to order by Project Manager Paul Wojciechowski of CH2M Hill
- b. Paul Wojciechowski, introduced the power point and reviewed the following meeting purpose:
 - i. Review the draft plan outline that was distributed with the meeting agenda, and provided at this meeting, to review and approve edits made by the team, and refine based on CAC and TAC input on the revised plan goals and objectives.
 - ii. Review and comment on the Bicycle Master Plan route network prioritization methodology.

2. Review of Draft Plan Outline

Peter Lagerwey of Toole Design joined the meeting via phone link to walk the group through a brief overview on the suggested changes the team made to the goals, objectives and actions crafted at the last joint meeting. Some of the actions were shifted under other goals to create a more cohesive draft plan outline. All comments were incorporated to craft the outline.

- a. The most significant change was the titling of one goal, "Increase the number of people using bicycles for transportation", into a Mission for the project.
- b. The group reviewed the edits and broke into groups to discuss and notate any additional changes, comments. The attendees individually and in groups developed comments based on two questions relating to the distributed Goals, Objectives, Actions and Draft Outline:

From the changes made, was there anything we missed?

- Add links in report to allow access to satellite, or previous reports/plans
- Some mechanism for ongoing community input/accountability ought to be built into the plan
- Chapter 7 Goal 3 – "and enforcement programs for existing & proposed bicycle facilities"
- Continued study of use of rail corridors for shared use w/bike facilities—either abandoned or currently utilized.
- Bicycle/Pedestrian accommodations for the new downtown I-70 bridge over Mississippi River
- How would an interactive, internet-based bicycle route way-finding program distinguish itself from what Google Maps & Map My Ride already offer? (Action 7.18)
- I love the idea, just interested in where this one is going.
- What is a "good bicycle project"? (8.8 & 8.9)
- Cooperation w/cityarchriver.org?
- No. There needs to be some performance measures for actions to see how they actually impact the outcomes so that either modified or eliminated.
- Action 5.6 : Italic
- Actions 5.10 – 5.13: Italic
- Action 5.12 : basis (spelling)
- Action 7.2: add "and" after curriculum
- Action 7.9: no comma after webinars
- Action 7.11: indent
- Action 8.13: "or jointly fund" duplicated

From the organizational changes that were made to the objectives, do you see any additional changes that may be necessary?

- It seems odd, for example, that Goal #2 has action items numbered 6.1 through 6.4. I would think action items for goal #2 would be 2.1 through 2.4
- It seems that redundancy has been eliminated. I'd like to see how the map relates to the implementation timeline.
- No, organization is much improved. Proposed facility types must be flexible. It seems most are based on existing roadway conditions- it would be beneficial to have some recommendations for road improvements.

General Comments Collected on the Draft:

- a. **Chapter 5 Goal 1:** Provide a prioritized system of routes that are contiguous and connected to other on and off-road facilities
- b. **Objective:** Reduce the rate of bicycle accidents by 50% by 2020 - #accidents ÷ #cyclists – do we know either of these? If not, how can we know when we have achieved this objective?
- c. **Bicycle Facility Network:** “900 mile” – changing
- d. **Objective:** Improve accessibility and “added” safety for bikes along on-street routes.
- e. **Action 5.2:** Prioritize bike facilities
- f. **Objective:** Reduce the rate of bicycle “crashes” by 50% by 2020

- g. **Chapter 7 Goal 3:** Improve safety for all modes of transportation through the implementation of educational and enforcement programs.
- h. Crash Data Map – Does this exist? It might be necessary to mention that a large # of cyclists crashes go unreported, especially cyclist crashes not involving other vehicles.
- i. Action 7.1: LAB certified instructors in Metro Area only Martin Pion actively promotes his course, and he has lost all relevancy in the discussion anymore.
- j. Action 7.2: Trailnet
- k. Action 7.3: Their educational materials need an overhaul.
- l. Action 7.6: Local P.D.'s like the city of St. Louis don't know the rules – educate the P.D.'s first!
- m. Action 7.9: APBP; PBIC; APA – Regional entities need to pitch in to host these – i.e. GRG, Trailnet, EWG, MODOT etc. – We're starting to do this now!
- n. Action 7.11: Yes!
- o. Action 7.12: Address earlier comment.

- p. **Chapter 7 Goal 4:** Expand the public's view that bicycles are a viable/acceptable mode of transportation through encouragement programs.
- q. Action 7.15: Don't encourage bicyclists to come. Instead, encourage people to bicycle to.
- r. Action 7.16: Who's challenging cities?
- s. Action 7.17: Revise (sp)
- t. Action 7.19: At what level? City, County, Region?

Citizen & Technical Advisory Committee Joint Meeting

January 25, 2011

- u. Chapter 8 Goal 5: Increase the commitment of public officials to support and / or initiate public policy for bicycling in all levels of government – state, local and regional.
- v. Action 8.2: Would this be BDAC? We're looking for some marching orders right now!
- w. Action 8.7: Tough sell, but necessary! (e.g. In Ellisville plan, city hesitant to add complete streets policy- cost of sidewalk is a major issue)
- x. Action 8.8: Different agencies have different priorities-some counties don't value this stuff!

Following review of the comments and questions, the draft outline for the bicycle master plan will be revised to address questions and comments, as well as to clarify elements. A revised outline will be provided with the notes from the meeting.

3. Plan Prioritization & Activity

Paul Wojciechowski resumed the meeting after a brief break to discuss the prioritization criteria for the network. The main goal for prioritizing routes and segments in the bicycle master plan is to create near medium and long-term priorities for the network. The list of criteria was developed consistent with public comments at the kickoff open house, as well as advisory committee comment, that the bicycle network should be provided for areas or connections to areas and destinations that have current or future latent demand for bicycle facilities. The prioritization criteria were established to identify a weighting of destinations or routes that will focus implementation in a manageable order. This level of prioritization is on a network level, and Paul noted that public entities such as MoDOT, St. Charles County, St. Louis City, St. Louis County, or municipalities will need to prioritize within their own transportation networks bicycle priorities for implementation.

Adhesive colored dots were distributed to the group. They were then asked to review the draft criterion and place a dot on a scale to weight the importance or priority with which the criterion be recommended for implementation.

The following results were collected, with 1 representing the highest priority and 10 the lowest.

| | |
|--|------|
| Transit Stations and Transfer Center | 2 |
| Roads Used Regularly by Bicyclists | 2.75 |
| Town Centers / Downtowns / Business Districts | 3 |
| Employment Centers | 3 |
| Colleges & Universities | 4 |
| On-Street Facilities that Connect Shared Use Paths | 4.5 |
| Regional Parks | 5 |

4. Session Wrap Up

The meeting wrapped up at 5:30.