1. Introductions

2. Approval Of Agenda (Action)
   Approval of the February 20, 2018 Meeting Agenda.

   Documents:
   
   2018 February ATS Meeting Agenda.pdf

3. Approval Of Minutes (Action)
   Approval of the January 16, 2016 Meeting Minutes.

   Documents:
   
   DSATS_ATS_2018_01_Meeting Minutes.pdf

4. Public Comment

5. Status Of Active Transportation Plan And Subcommittee
   With the departure of Ms. Hyink, DSATS staff is seeking a discussion and concurrence on the status of the plan and subcommittee moving forward. Discussion to be had.

   Attached is a copy of the final 2011 DSATS Bike and Pedestrian Plan for your review. Information on all the Plans can be found at:
   
   Http://Www.dsats.org/506/Active-Transportation

   Documents:
   
   Final Plan.pdf

6. Additional Business
   Subcommittee members are invited to address other items not listed on the agenda and are encouraged to propose new items for the next agenda.

7. Adjourn

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please contact:
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ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 16, 2018 – 10:30 A.M.
MEETING MINUTES
MEETING # ATS0118

ATTENDANCE

- City of DeKalb (1 votes): not present
- City of Sycamore (1 votes): Mark Bushnell
- DeKalb County (1 vote): Lisa Gonzalez
- NIU (1 vote): John Heckman
- NIU SA (1 vote): not present
- VAC (1 vote): Paul LaLonde
- DeKalb Park District (1 vote): Amy Doll
- Sycamore Park District (1 vote): Daniel Gibble
- DeKalb School District (1 vote): not present
- Sycamore School District (1 vote): not present
- Live Healthy DeKalb County (1 vote): Joel Maurer
- DSATS Staff: Brian Dickson, Jessica Hyink
- Others Present: Shareny Mota (Northwest Medicine)

(BOLD indicates main voting member. Italics indicates proxy voting member.)

1. **Introductions**

Mr. LaLonde opened the meeting at 10:31 am and asked those present to introduce themselves.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

   **Motion #ATS0118-01:** A motion was made by Mr. Bushnell to approve the January 16, 2018 meeting agenda. Second by Ms. Gonzalez and approved by voice vote.

3. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

   **Motion #ATS0118-02:** A motion was made by Mr. Bushnell to approve the November 21, 2017 meeting minutes. Second by Mr. Maurer and approved by voice vote.

4. **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.
5. Active Transportation Subcommittee Purpose

Ms. Hyink said that at the last meeting, members request that we go back at take a look at the original purpose of the Active Transportation Subcommittee. Ms. Hyink said that the purpose was to update the previous DSATS Bike & Pedestrian Plan, review the status of projects suggested in the previous plan, and identify new projects moving forward.

The primary goal of the Active Transportation Plan is to update the goals identified in the previous plan. The primary goal of the previous plan was to continuously review and update the projects and goals of the plan.

Ms. Hyink said that the 3 purposes of this plan are: 1) Update of the existing Bike Pedestrian Plan and develop a connected bicycle network in the region, 2) Identify and apply for active transportation funding opportunities, and 3) Improve the cooperation and coordination of organizations who advocate and implement active transportation projects.

Mr. LaLonde asked if the goal is to update the plan, is the idea to take all the different active transportation plans developed by the various agencies and governmental bodies and to meld them together into one overall plan? Ms. Hyink said that many of the plans focus on trail development in the region, but active transportation is more than that. There are sidewalk connections and lighting issues that connect to safety.

Mr. Gibble ask what this committee’s definition of transportation is, as it relates to this plan. Ms. Hyink said that this plan looks to address all aspects of active transportation, including safety issues. Mr. LaLonde asked if transportation is defined as anything that is not a vehicle. Mr. Gibble asked if there was some defining criteria of what is active transportation. Mr. LaLonde said that he sees this plan as identifying all aspects involved in developing connections between the various trails and walking paths throughout the region.

Ms. Hyink said that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) identifies what active transportation is. Mr. LaLonde said that we must connect the different trails in order to increase use of the entire system. Mr. LaLonde said that we must ensure that those who cannot drive have those connections. The ultimate goal is to make the DeKalb region an attractive place to live, and a better active transportation system can lead to that.

Ms. Doll said that last spring, the timeline indicated the subcommittee would work on developing goals, doing surveys, and other action items. Ms. Doll asked if that timeline had been updated yet.

6. Voting Membership

Ms. Hyink said that the timeline and goals have not been updated yet because there have been outstanding questions on how to achieve quorums for meetings and if the voting membership on the committee needs to be changed. Ms. Hyink said the committee should decide if it should meet monthly, quarterly, etc. She also said that members should identify alternates that can attend meetings in the regular member’s absence.

Ms. Doll stated the purpose of this meeting is to identify who wishes to remain a member, who would be interested in non-voting membership in the subcommittee, and what frequency the meetings should be held.
Mr. LaLonde ask members to identify if they wish to remain as voting members of the committee and asked that all members identify alternatives. Mr. Bushnell said that any recommendations made by the subcommittee will also need approval by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Committee (PC). Even if members are not voting members, they will still have a voice in the process. Ms. Hyink said that organizations that wish to have a voting membership should make a time commitment to attend most meetings or send alternates in their absence.

Ms. Hyink asked members to identify whether or not they wish to remain as voting members. She noted that issues arose which prevented the DeKalb and Sycamore School District members from attending this meeting. Ms. Hyink said the members are aware of the membership question and will be responding. Ms. Hyink said the NIU Student Association member cannot attend meetings on Tuesdays but is aware that they can send an alternate.

Mr. LaLonde said VAC wishes to remain involved on the committee.

Ms. Gonzalez said the County wishes to continue to be involved and would request meetings be held every other month.

Mr. Maurer said LHDC wishes to continue to be active on the committee.

Mr. Bushnell said Sycamore wishes to remain as an active member.

Ms. Doll said the DeKalb Park District wishes to remain as an active member.

Mr. Gibble said the Sycamore Park District wishes to remain an active member.

Ms. Hyink requested that all members work on identifying an alternate who can attend meetings. Mr. Bushnell noted that anyone appointed as an alternate needs to take Open Meetings Act (OMA) training within 90-days. Mr. LaLonde noted that the training takes about an hour.

7. Meeting Schedule

Mr. LaLonde said that based on comments received, it sounds like members prefer to meet every other month and to keep the meeting length to about 1 ½ hours. Consensus of the members was to continue to meet on the 3rd Tuesday of every other month at 10:30 AM.

Ms. Hyink said that at the next meeting, staff will bring back a revised timeline, summary of public comments, identified goals, and existing conditions, if time allows. Ms. Bushnell said members should be provided a link to the previous plan.

Mr. Gibble said that a timeline should be brought back at the next meeting for approval. Ms. Hyink said that everyone’s homework assignment would be to read the current Bike Pedestrian Plan.

Motion #ATS0118-03: A motion was made by Ms. Gonzales to change the meeting to bi-monthly starting in March. Second by Mr. Gibble. An amendment was made by Mr. Maurer to hold a meeting in February to discuss the plan implementation timeline. Seconded by Ms. Doll and approved by voice vote.
8. **Appointment of Alternate Voting Members**

Mr. LaLonde noted that alternate voting membership was previously discussed as part of other agenda items. Mr. LaLonde said all voting members should identify two alternates per organization if possible. All alternates should provide staff with an OMA Certificate within 90 days.

Ms. Hyink said that alternates do not have to be within the member's organization in order to be authorized to vote on behalf of the organization.

9. **Additional Business**

There was no additional business.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*Motion #ATS0118-04:* A motion was made to adjourn at 11:26 a.m. by Mr. Bushnell. Second by Mr. Doll and approved by voice vote.

Submitted By: Brian Dickson & Paul LaLonde
Date Approved: [Publish Date]
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Executive Summary

The purpose of the 2011 Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan is to enable safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian travel within the DSATS planning area. To accomplish this, a review of the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities was performed. The existing DeKalb-Sycamore-Cortland community trail system was inventoried and maps were created for each community.

An informational meeting was held by DSATS on June 7, 2011 to notify the public about the update to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan, answer questions, and receive input on the project. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to examine exhibits showing the existing bicycle and pedestrian network and provide feedback to be taken into consideration during the development of the Plan. Utilizing the comments provided at the public meeting, a prioritized list of projects, programs, and policies was developed to improve bicycling and walking in the DSATS Planning area.

Recommendations for facilities, programs, and policies are scheduled to be implemented over the next 10 to 15 years. Potential funding mechanisms for implementing the Plan include Federal programs like the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program, Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP), Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety (PBS) Program Grant, Recreational Trails Program (RTP), Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding.

Introduction to the DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study

The DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the DeKalb-Sycamore Urbanized Area (UA). The Urbanized Area encompasses all or portions of the City of DeKalb, the City of Sycamore, the Town of Cortland, DeKalb County, and Northern Illinois University (NIU).

Through the Safe, Accountable, Fair and Efficient Transportation Equity Act, A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and its predecessors, TEA-21 and ISTEA, each region with an urbanized area of 50,000+ population, as determined by the Census Bureau, must establish a Metropolitan Planning Organization. The purpose of DSATS, the MPO for the DeKalb-Sycamore area, is to provide ongoing long range planning that integrates and supports all modes of transportation including auto, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and freight. DSATS strives to foster the spirit of intergovernmental cooperation by coordinating projects across jurisdictional boundaries and integrating transportation planning with land use planning and development.

One of the primary ways that MPOs facilitate cooperation is the prioritization of transportation projects for federal funds. The MPO assigns Surface Transportation Planning-Urban (STP-U) funds to local transportation projects, and approves the use of all federal funds allocated towards transportation projects in a 20- to 25-year planning horizon. In most cases, the MPO is not the implementing agency for projects, but provides coordination in the planning for and programming of funding for projects. Coordination and cooperation through the MPO Process optimizes the application of limited resources to an area’s transportation needs, recognizing that such needs do not stop at municipal boundaries.
The MPO is comprised of a Policy Committee, a Technical Committee, and staff. The DSATS Policy Committee is made up of elected officials representing their respective communities. The Policy Committee and Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) jointly share the responsibility for developing and maintaining the transportation plans and programs as required by State and Federal law. The Policy Committee determines Technical Advisory Committee and Policy Committee membership and voting privileges, enacts and amends DSATS bylaws, and approves work products such as the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

The Technical Advisory Committee’s (TAC) membership is drawn from professional and technical staff from the jurisdictions represented by the Policy Committee. The role of the TAC is to provide professional and technical advice and recommendations to the Policy Committee on all matters pertaining to the technical planning functions of DSATS and other matters as requested.

The City of DeKalb is the Lead Agency for DSATS and provides the staffing for the program. DSATS staff currently consists of a part-time Study Director, a full-time Transportation Planner and a part-time graduate intern. Staff is responsible for the ongoing supervision, management, and coordination of the planning efforts of the DSATS program. This includes record keeping, correspondence, local funding disbursement and management, document maintenance, and information dissemination.

**Goals and Objectives**

**Purpose Statement:**
The purpose of the 2011 Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan is to enable safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian travel within the DSATS planning area. This Plan replaces the DSATS 2006 Bikeways Plan in an effort to maintain the Plan and meet the requirements of SAFETEA-LU.

**GOAL 1: Plan and maintain the DSATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.**

**Objectives**

1. Maintain the DSATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, which provides recommendations for facilities, policies, and programs to be implemented in the next 10+ years.
   a. Update the Plan every 5 years or as necessary to maintain eligibility for State and federal funding.
   b. Review projects that have been completed in the Plan on an annual basis.
   c. Develop the Plan as a resource and coordinating document for DSATS communities.

2. Develop a prioritized list of improvements in the DSATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
   a. Identify high, moderate, and long-term priority projects.
   b. Recommend policies and programs that may be adopted by DSATS communities.

**GOAL 2: Develop a connected bicycle network that will meet the transportation and recreational needs of the area’s citizens.**

**Objectives**

1. Build upon the existing bikeway and pedestrian facilities.
   a. Inventory the existing system and update GIS mapping.
b. Produce bicycling and recreation maps for each community.
c. Identify locations for improved bicycle or pedestrian facilities that will:
   i. Close gaps between existing facilities,
   ii. Facilitate travel between residential neighborhoods and major
       employment, recreation, and shopping centers, such as downtown areas
       and the NIU campus.
   iii. Connect neighboring communities,
2. Work with DSATS communities to improve maintenance of existing bikeways and
roadway shoulders
3. Encourage DSATS communities to identify and include Plan improvements in their
Capital Improvement Plans.
4. Identify financial resources needed to implement the actions identified in the Plan.
Definitions

Bikeway
A generic term for any road, street, path or way which in some manner is specifically designated for bicycle travel, regardless of whether such facilities are designated for the exclusive use of bicycles or shared with other transportation modes.

Bicycle Facilities
A broad term which includes bikeways, shared roadways, shoulders (which may be used by bicyclists), traffic control devices, shelters, and parking facilities for bicycles.

The following are a glossary of the most commonly found bicycle facilities:

Bike Lanes
A bike lane is that portion of a roadway that has been designated for preferential or exclusive use by bicyclists. Bike lanes provide a dedicated travel lane within the street. Bicyclists travel one-way with the flow of traffic.

IDOT Guidance
The minimum width of a bike lane varies based on the roadway cross section. For curbed streets without parking, bike lanes must be at least 4 feet wide (not including gutter pan) on each side of the road with longitudinal pavement markings, bike lane symbols, and Bike Lane signage. For roadways with no curb and gutter, the minimum width of a bike lane should be 4 ft.
If parking is permitted, the bike lane should be placed between the parking area and the travel lane, and the shared area for parking and bike lanes is 15 ft.

Shared Roadway
A shared roadway is defined as roadway where a separate bicycle lane is not designated and which may be legally used by bicyclists, regardless of whether the facility is specifically designated as a bikeway. On a shared roadway facility, bicyclists and motorists share the same travel lanes without a striped separation. Shared roadways include:
- Roads and streets with no bicycle provisions.
- Wide outside/curb lanes
- Roadway shoulders
- Designated bicycle routes

Bicycle Route/Signed Shared Roadway
Bicycle routes are specially designated shared roadways that are preferred for bicycle travel for certain recreation or transportation purposes. The 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities also refers to a designated bicycle route as a signed shared roadway and lists the following reasons for designating signed bicycle routes:
The route provides continuity to other bicycle facilities such as bike lanes and shared-use paths.
The road is a common route for bicyclists through a high-demand corridor.
In rural areas, the route is preferred for bicycling because of low motor vehicle traffic volumes or paved shoulder availability.
The route extends along local neighborhood streets and collectors that lead to internal neighborhood destinations, such as a park, school, or commercial district.

Bike route signs may also be used on streets with bike lanes, as well as on shared-use paths. AASHTO recommends that bike route signs always include destination, direction, and distance information, regardless of the type of facility on which they are used.

Sample Bike Route Signage
These types of signs would provide wayfinding to local cyclists and visitors in the area.

Source: ATA

Shared Lane Marking (Sharrow)
The Shared Lane Pavement Marking (Sharrow) shown here may be used to:
- Assist bicyclists with lateral positioning in a shared lane with on-street parallel parking in order to reduce the chance of a bicyclist’s impacting the open door of a parked vehicle,
- Assist bicyclists with lateral positioning in lanes that are too narrow for a motor vehicle and a bicycle to travel side by side within the same traffic lane,
- Alert road users of the lateral location bicyclists are likely to occupy within the traveled way,
- Encourage safe passing of bicyclists by motorists, and

Source: MUTCD, Part 9, 2009
• Reduce the incidence of wrong-way bicycling. Wrong-way riding is a major cause of bicycle crashes nationally and violates the Illinois Vehicle Code (625 ILCS 5/11-1505). Shared Lane Markings should not be placed on roadways that have a speed limit above 35 mph.

AASHTO Guidance:
If used in a shared lane with on-street parallel parking, Shared Lane Markings should be placed so that the centers of the markings are at least 11 feet from the face of the curb, or from the edge of the pavement where there is no curb.
If used on a street without on-street parking that has an outside travel lane that is less than 14 feet wide, the centers of the Shared Lane Markings should be at least 4 feet from the face of the curb, or from the edge of the pavement where there is no curb.
Shared Lane Markings should be placed immediately after an intersection and spaced at intervals not greater than 250 feet thereafter.

Bicycle Path/Shared-Use Path/ Side Path
A shared-use path is a facility physically separated from the roadway and intended for bicycle and other non-motorized transportation (e.g., pedestrians, disabled persons in wheelchairs, in-line skaters). The terms path and trail are generally describing the same facility.
Shared-use paths serve a variety of purposes. They can be located along roadway right-of-way, abandoned railroad rights-of-way, along river banks, and other similar areas.
Shared use facilities are appropriate where there are few crossings with driveways and streets, due to the increased stopping distance required by a bicycle compared to a pedestrian.

IDOT Guidance
Shared-use paths should be a minimum of 10 ft wide with a 2 ft wide graded turf or gravel area adjacent to the path. Three feet is more desirable to provide additional clearance from trees, poles, walls, fences, guardrails, or other lateral obstructions.
For urban roadways, shared used paths should be separated horizontally from motorized traffic by at least 5 ft. Paths should be no less than 10 ft from the edge of the traffic lane in a rural section.

Paved Shoulders
A shoulder is the portion of the roadway adjacent to the traveled way, for accommodation of stopped vehicles, emergency use, and lateral support of sub-base, base, and surface courses, often used by cyclists where paved. Bicycle accommodation on rural roadways includes paving a portion of the shoulder. Paved shoulders are good for motorist safety and also provide a place for bicyclists to ride.
IDOT Guidance
When providing paved shoulders for bicycle use, widths of 4 to 8 ft are recommended, depending on the posted speed limit and average daily traffic of the roadway (IDOT BDE Manual, Figure 17-2.A).

Sidewalk
A sidewalk is defined as that portion of a street or highway right-of-way, beyond the curb or edge of roadway pavement, which is intended for use by pedestrians. Sidewalks provide many benefits including safety, mobility, and healthier communities. Typical recommended sidewalk width is a minimum of 5 feet paved. Sidewalks are not usually recommended bicycle facilities.

Wide Curb Lane
A wide outside lane allows a motorist to safely pass a cyclist while remaining in the same lane. They are usually preferred in urban areas where shoulders are not provided.

AASHTO Guidance
A distance of 14 ft from the edge of pavement to the centerline or lane line is recommended for shared use in a wide curb lane.

What facilities do bicyclists use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Common Facilities Used by Bicyclists</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved Roads (not on shoulder)</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Paths/Walking Paths/Trails</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulders of paved roads</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lanes on roads</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved roads</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The 2002 National Survey of Pedestrian and Bicyclist Attitudes and Behaviors

Bikeways in DSATS Communities

The following narratives are excerpts from Community Comprehensive Plans. These plans serve to guide growth and change in DSATS communities over the next twenty years and beyond.

DeKalb County
DeKalb County Unified Comprehensive Plan, 2011

Trail System
In addition to road extensions, the County has proposed expanding the existing trail network in DeKalb and Sycamore to various places throughout the County. Existing trails include the DeKalb Nature Trail, Peace Road Trail, and the Great Western Trail.
The 2003 DeKalb County Unified Comprehensive Plan identified a proposed trail system that would connect the existing trails with many of the forest preserves in the County and would travel along roads, rivers, and some railroads. Since then, additional trail possibilities have also been developed.

Desirable hiking/biking trail locations now include:
   1) Along the Union Pacific Railroad Spring Valley line extending from the City of DeKalb southwest to the county line;
   2) A link from the City of DeKalb to Afton Forest Preserve, and then generally south/southeast into Sandwich and Somonauk;
   3) A link from the proposed Union Pacific trail to the Peace Road Trail;
   4) An extension of the Peace Road Trail north along the proposed Airport Rd. extension;
   5) Along the Kishwaukee River north from DeKalb and Sycamore, through Genoa, Kingston and Kirkland west to the edge of the County;
   6) A link from Kishwaukee College through Malta to the City of DeKalb;
   7) A link from the City of DeKalb to the Town of Cortland along Loves Road and Barber Greene Road; and
   8) A link from Shabbona to Waterman to Hinckley.

The need for alternative means of travel has and continues to increase in the light of dwindling fossil fuel resources, continuing population growth, and environmental concerns. The proposed trails will not only encourage travel to local forest preserves and parks for recreational opportunities, but facilitate bike and pedestrian travel to places of employment, public and private institutions, and retail and service locations. The proposed locations of these trails, however, are conceptual. There is no commitment to the exact location of these trails nor is there a specific time frame in which these trails will be built. There has been much support by residents for such a trail system. In fact, every individual community comprehensive plan that is part of this Unified Comprehensive Plan has identified trail development and linkages to locations through the County as a high priority.

Implementation of new trails will occur as funds become available. However, concern has been raised regarding trails crossing over private property and this issue will be discussed at length before implementation is started.

In July, 2003, the DeKalb County Greenways and Trails Coalition (GTC) was formed to spearhead development of a County-wide trail system. The GTC is an outgrowth of the Kishwaukee Kiwanis Club Pathway Committee and the DeKalb County Forest Preserve District, and includes representation by individuals, businesses and government bodies from all corners of the County.

At present, the GTC, through the office of the DeKalb County Forest Preserve District, is applying for grants to develop a comprehensive bike and trail system in the County.

A 2010 study conducted under the supervision of the DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS) identified connectivity as the major issue for the existing trail system. This suggests that available resources should first be devoted to achieving connections between all portions of the existing trails in order to maximize their utility for users. Opportunities to expand the trail system should also be pursued.
The Future Transportation Plan shows all existing and proposed roads and trails. Forest Preserves are also shown to help illustrate the accessibility of forest preserves via the proposed trails.

**City of Sycamore**  
*Comprehensive Plan, 2008*

**Goals and Objectives**
- Connect the Kiwanis bike path to the Sycamore Park and thence to the Great Western Trail through continuous overland or on-street bikeways.
- Provide bicycle paths along major and minor arterials where adequate rights-of-way already exist and where appropriate safety measures can be incorporated at intersecting streets and driveways.
- Land Use plan feature: New bicycle and pedestrian trails to link existing and future development to recreational areas and open space.

**Chapter 5: Urban Design Guidelines**

1. **Guideline:** Provide parks and open space featuring bikepaths and pedestrian paths connecting with neighborhoods and green spaces as well as neighborhood services (e.g., schools, neighborhood commercial districts).  
   **Action:** Implement through the subdivision review process using the City’s Greenway Plan as a guide. Collaborate with the Sycamore Park District and developers to identify major bikeway links with public easements before logical pathways are compromised by subdivided lot lines.

2. **Guideline:** Integrate “green” or open areas with building layouts to provide for the convenience and recreation of residents.  
   **Action:** Encourage pedestrian and bike paths throughout the development to link buildings with other buildings; buildings with parking areas; and buildings with neighborhood parks, shopping areas, or common areas. Assure that open spaces are located in safe, convenient, and observable locations.

**Town of Cortland**  
*Comprehensive Plan, 2003*

Cortland’s Comprehensive Plan Community Design Principle #2, that “neighborhood development … must complement the natural features of the landscape and respect the natural and man-made environment” includes this paragraph:

Walking and Biking: The ability to walk and bicycle to reach recreation, shopping, and job destinations in Cortland can significantly reduce the consumption of energy and pollution emissions. Walking and bicycling also allow for greater interaction with nature and neighbors, the observation of seasonal and daily changes, and an appreciation of such features as clean air and streets. Facilities and conditions to enable and enrich
walking and bicycling opportunities in Cortland must be incorporated into neighborhood development plans.

The design principle #3 for development designed “along pedestrian dimensions and distance through compact form, layout, and streetscape characteristics” states:

Bicycle Paths: Bicycle paths, although not strictly pedestrian, have a critical role in complementing the pedestrian network. Most streets in Cortland can accommodate bicycle traffic. However paths along major highways or the railroad connecting Cortland to points of interest in DeKalb (city) or more distant places such as Malta or Maple Park, or Hinckley, Genoa or the Fox River may be considered in the future.”

City of DeKalb
DeKalb 3D, 2005

Desired Development Direction: Connectivity – New developments are not created in isolation, but are additions to an existing, evolving, built environment. Physical connections between older and newer parts of the community, such as through-streets and bike/pedestrian paths, enhance DeKalb as a desirable community.

Smart Growth Best Practices:
Create walkable neighborhoods.
Provide a variety of transportation choices.
These practices are currently in practice by the City of DeKalb. All new developments are presently required to construct sidewalks and/or trails.

New developments will be designed to be interconnected with the existing neighborhoods, particularly by bikeway / sidewalk connections between residential and off-street connection between residential neighborhoods and off-street internal circulation between commercial developments.
Existing Facilities

**DeKalb-Sycamore (Peace Road) Trail**
The DeKalb-Sycamore Trail starts at Pleasant Street in DeKalb and extends north and east into the City of Sycamore. The paved trail is six miles in length with wooded and prairie features. The path follows along the east side of Peace Rd. for several miles before winding its way to Sycamore Community Park.

**Kishwaukee-Kiwanis Trail**
The Kiwanis Trail is a 6.5 mile shared use path that is owned and operated by the DeKalb Park District. The path begins at Lions Park and generally follows the Kishwaukee River north to Hopkins Park before connecting with the DeKalb-Sycamore Path and the DeKalb Nature Trail.

**DeKalb Nature Trail**
The DeKalb Nature Trail is a 1.3 mile shared use path that extends from the junction of IL Route 23, the Kiwanis Trail, and the DeKalb-Sycamore Trail. The trail goes north to First Street. The trail is owned and operated by the DeKalb Park District.
Great Western Trail

Almost 18 miles long, the Great Western Trail is located within the right-of-way of the former Chicago and Great Western Railroad. The trails are surfaced with limestone screenings and average 10 feet in width. Pedestrians, bicyclists, and horseback riders are all welcome on the trails.

Maps of the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the DSATS Planning area are attached as Exhibits 1 through 4.
Public Involvement

An informational meeting was held by DSATS on June 7, 2011 to notify the public about the update to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan, answer questions, and receive input on the project. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to examine exhibits showing the existing bicycle and pedestrian network and provide feedback that can be taken into consideration during the development of the Plan. Specifically, participants were asked:

- To identify gaps in existing conditions data;
- Identify deficiencies in the existing system (signage, safety, etc);
- Suggest improvements to local trail networks; and
- Recommend ways to improve connections, including opportunities for new on- and off-road routes.

Over 30 attendees individually marked up maps with their ideas and specific recommendations for the bike network. Based on the comments received at the meeting, there was a strong support for expanding DSATS bicycle and pedestrian network. The majority of concerns and comments from the public included the following:

1. There are many missing bike route signs. Users requested more signage so they know how to stay on the trails.
2. There were many comments made about the lack of bicycle parking at commercial centers and other destinations.
3. There were requests to maintain the trails on the current system so they remain in good condition.
4. Motorists and bicyclists are not good at sharing the road. More education and enforcement is needed.

Utilizing the comments provided at the public meeting, a prioritized list of projects, programs, and policies was developed to improve bicycling and walking in the DSATS Planning area. A copy of the flier is shown below and the handout and sign-in sheet are included in the Appendix.
POLICIES & PROGRAMS

Bicycle Parking
Bicycle parking is an essential amenity for any non-motorized transportation network. Residents will not use bikeways to reach businesses unless they can lock their bikes securely at their destinations. To promote the use of the network and to boost local commerce, DSATS can take the following steps to increase available bicycle parking:

• Work with the local chambers of commerce to identify businesses interested in purchasing and installing bicycle racks.
• Work with each municipality to adopt a zoning ordinance to require bike parking at key commercial, residential, and industrial sites.

Education
Education is a powerful tool for promoting healthy and safe behaviors. Users of an active transportation network need to be aware of how to protect themselves and others. As more people walk and bike for transportation and health, education should come in a variety of forms to reach all network users. Youth, teens, and adults alike benefit from education programs focusing on pedestrian and bicycle safety and the rules of the road. The following recommendations are meant to reach all community members:

Bike and pedestrian ambassadors program
Create a bicycle and/or pedestrian ambassador program to promote walking and bicycling safety at community events, schools, day camps, after-school programs, and other community affairs. Ambassadors are safety specialists who educate the public through direct outreach, presentations, and distribution of educational materials.

✓ Northern Illinois University could offer a course in bicycle safety and education as a way to train ambassadors. Students that complete the course would be eligible for jobs as ambassadors.

Maps
Create a smart phone application for trail maps in lieu of creating traditional paper maps. Bicycle users and pedestrians are more likely to carry their smart phone with them rather than carry a paper map.

Community education campaign
DSATS, in partnership with other local organizations, can distribute information about safety and the active transportation network to the community through a diversity of means. These may include but need not be limited to:

• Use local media outlets such as city websites, cable access station, local newspapers and online social networks to broadcast videos and publish articles on bike and pedestrian safety.
• Reprinting and/or distribution of bicycle and pedestrian information by partner agencies, utility companies and the private sector.
• Partner with bike shops to distribute publications.
• Work with local doctors, hospitals, and health care institutions to distribute information on the health benefits of cycling and walking.
• Offer bike maintenance and traffic skills classes to adults and teens through the park district, schools and other community groups.
✓ Educational materials can be requested from the League of American Bicyclists or Active Transportation Alliance.

Targeted Enforcement Efforts
No police department can aggressively enforce all laws in all locations at all times. DSATS communities can use existing crash data to identify the most dangerous locations and target enforcement at those sites. Events focused on reckless behavior by motorists have proven particularly successful in other communities. DSATS communities should target its enforcement efforts in locations with high vehicle crash rates with pedestrians or bicyclists.

Prior to holding enforcement events, officers should receive training on bicycle and pedestrian safety. This training should be focused on:
• Rules of the road for bicyclists and pedestrians
• Illegal motorist behaviors that endanger bicyclists and pedestrians
• Most dangerous types of bicycling behaviors
• Most common causes of bicycle and pedestrian crashes
• Importance of reporting bicycle and pedestrian crashes
• Importance of investigating serious bicycle and pedestrian crash sites
• Best ways to prevent bicycle theft
• Best practices for policing by bicycle
• Transportation, health, and environmental benefits of bicycling

PLANNED PROJECTS

The list of projects on the following pages is intended to improve bicycle and pedestrian access and create a more complete network. The development of the plan focused on providing connections within the existing system as well as linking adjacent communities and local and regional trail systems. In general, the DSATS Planning Area lacks options for regional east/west and north/south travel.

Projects were prioritized based on the potential for receiving funding, their ability to be constructed in conjunction with a supporting road project, cost, feasibility, and proximity to destinations such as schools, parks, commercial/institutional destinations, and employment centers. High priority projects are those than can be built within a 5-year time frame. Moderate priority projects are those that can be built between 5 to 10 years and most do not have guaranteed funding sources. Long term considerations are those that are anticipated to be constructed beyond the 11 year period, require significant funding, and will involve right of way acquisition.

All projects should be designed using current standards from the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Bicycle Facilities.
A map of recommended projects illustrating how each project is connected to the greater DSATS area bicycle network is attached as Exhibit 5.

**High Priority Projects (1-5 years)**

**H1.** Improve system-wide signage for bike routes. Riders become disoriented due to the lack of signage identifying trail names, directions, and connections to other bicycle paths. Existing paths should be signed to key destinations such as downtown areas, the NIU campus, major parks. As new connections are made and the network is improved, additional signs should be added.
- On-street signs are recommended to identify routes to each municipality's downtown and the NIU campus.
- Signage should be provided for the bicycle route through Sycamore connecting the Great Western Trail, Community Park, Southeast School, South Prairie School, and the Peace Road multi-use trail.
- Sign locally recommended routes and connection to the DeKalb Nature Trail.

**H2.** Peace Road (DeKalb Sycamore Trail) between Pleasant Street and Bethany Road—Repair the shared-use path. Participants at the public meeting noted that the path was in poor condition and had lots of bumps.

**H3.** Normal Road—Lucinda Avenue to Dresser Road: add sharrows and bike route signage.

**H4.** Bethany Road—Resource Parkway to Peace Road: Revise pavement markings to provide wide outside lane with sharrows. Provide missing sidewalk for pedestrians east of the YMCA to Health Services Drive.

**H5.** Provide connections from north Sycamore to downtown, via:
- IL 23—Peace Road to Maplewood Drive: Add bike route signage and utilize existing paved shoulders.
- IL 23—Maplewood Drive to downtown (State Street): add bike route signage and add pavement markings for bike lanes.

**H6.** Provide north-south connection from Sycamore to Cortland on Somonauk Road
- Add Sharrows and signage on Somonauk Road from Borden Avenue to Bethany Road.

**H7.** Add bike route signage on First Street from Dresser Road to Bethany Road.

**H8.** Add bike route signage on Royal Drive from Hopkins Park to First Street.

**H9.** Add missing sidewalk along IL Route 23 from Meadow Creek Drive to Electric Park Drive.

**H10.** Repair path north of Lucinda Avenue that is in poor condition (approximately 1000 feet).

**H11.** Add bike path signage on First Street from the South Branch of the Kishwaukee River to Dresser Road. The City of DeKalb is planning to add sharrows on this section in 2011.

**Moderate Priority Projects (5-10 years)**

**M1.** An abandoned railroad right-of-way leads northwest towards a trail along Bethany Road from the intersection of the DeKalb Nature Trail and First Street,. It is recommended to acquire the property or obtain an easement for a 10-ft shared-use path and to extend the DeKalb Nature Trail from First Street west to Bethany Road using the old railroad right-of-way.

**M2.** Along the major trails provide stand-alone, system wide maps showing each trail, “You are Here”, etc.

**M3.** Bethany Road—Continue side trail between First Street to Fairway Oaks Drive as trail or sidewalk exists to YMCA.

**M4.** Somonauk Road from Bethany to IL 38—construct a new shared-use path.
M5. Barber Greene Road—Peace Road to Somonauk Road: Provide east-west connection to Cortland by constructing a new shared-use path.
Loves Road—Barber Greene Road to Pine Street: Provide north-south connection to Cortland by constructing a new shared-use path.

M6. Fairview Drive—Annie Glidden Road to Macom Drive. This segment of Fairview Drive will provide bicycle access to the manufacturing centers in southeastern DeKalb. The route will also provide an east-west connection through southern DeKalb. The City is building a shared use path in 2012 from Heritage Drive to IL Route 23 using a TCSP grant. Recommended future improvements include:
- Adding Bike Route signage.
- IL Route 23 to the Macom Drive: Widen existing sidewalk to provide a shared use path on the north side of the road.
- Annie Glidden Road to Heritage Drive: Provide paved shoulder and reduce travel lanes to 11 ft.

M7. Annie Glidden Road—Fairview Drive to Bellevue Drive: construct shared-use path.

M8. Provide connection from Prairie Park to NIU Campus Path underneath the UP Railroad. Safety concerns were cited using the existing on-street connection, which makes use of the viaduct at Pearl Street. A path under the IL Route 38 Bridge was built during its construction in 2008.

Long Term Considerations (10+ years)

L1. IL 38 from Peace Road to Somonauk Road: add shared use path.
L2. The Great Western Trail is a destination for many cyclists, but there is a gap in the Sycamore trail system between Sycamore Park and the Great Western Trail. Bicyclists trying to reach the Trail must use Airport Road, which is too narrow and traffic volumes/speeds are too high to safely share the road with bicyclists. It is recommended that the Sycamore Park trail be extended north and east to provide users with a safer connection point to Airport Road. At this new connection point, the Airport Road pavement is wider and can more safely accommodate bicycle travel.

At the public meeting, participants asked for parking at the trailhead to the Great Western Trail. Parking for the trailhead could also be provided within Sycamore Park.
L3. Add a shared-use path on Peace Road from Pleasant Street to Macom Drive. A costly bicycle bridge would be required north of IL Route 38. The property owner at the southeast corner of Peace Road and IL Route 38 plans to build a path from IL 38 to 2700' south when the property is redeveloped in the future.

L4. Add centerline striping on the bicycle paths as warranted (based on trail width, traffic volumes on bicycle routes and path configurations).

L5. Sycamore Road (IL 23) at Greenwood Acres: The retaining wall and traffic signal at the corner reduce the usable path width. Participants feel this is a dangerous location and the path should be widened here.

L6. Kishwaukee River Crossing in Prairie Park: the area experiences frequent flooding and the bike path bridge traps debris adjacent to the path. A new, higher bridge over the river would alleviate trail flooding.

**State Roadways**

The *Illinois Highway Code* (605 ILCS 5/4-220 new) states that bicycle and pedestrian ways shall be given full consideration in the planning and development of transportation facilities, including the incorporation of such ways into State plans and programs. Assessment of non-motorized transportation needs and the respective appropriate accommodation is central to the fulfillment of the policy.

Portions of several State highways have been designated as a bikeway in this Plan. As the State moves forward to improve IL 64, IL 23, and IL 38 in the future, DSATS and each municipality must work with the State to review each project and determine if it is eligible for consideration of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.
Estimated Project Costs

High, Moderate, and Long Term considerations listed below have been estimated with a base cost in 2011 dollars. The table below provides the unit costs used to calculate the costs for each project. Estimates include 25% for survey, design work, and construction administration and a 10% a contingency. Project-specific factors such as grading, landscaping, intersection modification and bridge construction may increase the actual cost of construction. A description of available funding sources is provided at the end of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$1000/ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ft HMA path w/ 2ft turf Shoulders</td>
<td>$425,000/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$60/ sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-ft wide, HMA shoulder</td>
<td>$200,000/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lane striping (thermoplastic)</td>
<td>$5,280/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement marking removal</td>
<td>$2,640/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>$100/ each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>$8/ sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology

**Striping**

The lengths for bike lane and travel lane striping were estimated from the lengths of road segments as drawn in the County GIS files and then rounded to the nearest 10 feet. (Note that in most cases, the lengths and their associated costs are overestimated because lane striping is not normally provided through an intersection.)

**Bicycle Route**

According to the 1999 AASHTO Guide, bike route signage should be placed every ¼ mile, at every turn and at all signalized intersections.

**Sharrows Symbols**

The number of Sharrows (shared lane) symbols and bike lane signs for each project were estimated by applying the recommendations in the Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities and Part 9 of the MUTCD, Traffic Control for Bicycle Facilities. The MUTCD is only specific on the placement of Sharrows symbols (Section 9C.07 Shared Lane Marking) stating that the marking should be placed immediately after an intersection and spaced at intervals not greater than 250 feet thereafter." The placement of signs is not stated. The project costs in the table above were calculated using the following design parameters.

- Sharrows symbols are placed immediately after an intersection.
- Sharrows symbols are placed every 250 ft.
- Bike lane signs are placed at least every 1,000 ft.

**Shared Use Paths**

The actual cost of constructing a trail can vary significantly, depending on the surrounding land use.
### High Priority Projects (1-5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Preliminary Estimate of Cost</th>
<th>Approximate Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Sycamore Trail Peace Rd to Great Western Trail</td>
<td>Add Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb-Sycamore Trail along Peace Road</td>
<td>Pleasant St to Bethany Rd</td>
<td>Add Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis Trail</td>
<td>Prairie Park to IL 23</td>
<td>Add Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekalb Nature Trail</td>
<td>IL Route 23 to 1st Street</td>
<td>Add Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Peace Road Pleasant St to Bethany Rd</td>
<td>Repair Bike Path</td>
<td>$375,900</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Normal Road Lucinda Ave to Dresser Rd</td>
<td>Add sharrows and bike route signage</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Bethany Road Resource Pkwy to Peace Rd</td>
<td>Wide outside lane with sharrows.</td>
<td>$32,300</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>IL Route 23 Peace Rd to Maplewood Dr</td>
<td>Add sidewalk</td>
<td>$14,400</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IL Route 23 North Ave to State St, to Kishwaukee Dr.</td>
<td>Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Somonauk Rd Borden Ave to Bethany Rd</td>
<td>Add sharrows and bike route signage</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>1st Street Dresser Rd to Bethany Rd</td>
<td>Add Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Royal Drive Hopkins Park to 1st Street</td>
<td>Add Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>IL Route 23 Meadow Creek Dr to Electric Park Dr</td>
<td>Add missing sidewalk</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Lucinda Ave North side of roadway</td>
<td>Repair concrete shared use path</td>
<td>$129,600</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>1st Street S. branch Kishwaukee River to Dresser Road</td>
<td>Add Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moderate Priority Projects (5-10 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Preliminary Estimate of Cost</th>
<th>Approximate Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>DeKalb Nature Trail 1st Street to Bethany Road</td>
<td>Add new shared use path</td>
<td>$141,300</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Various Various</td>
<td>Add stand-alone, system wide maps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Bethany Road 1st Street to Fairway Oaks Dr</td>
<td>Continue shared use path to YMCA</td>
<td>$202,100</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Somonauk Road Bethany Road to IL 38</td>
<td>Construct a shared use path</td>
<td>$2,086,400</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Barber Greene Rd Peace Rd to Somonauk Rd Loves Road Barber Greene Rd to Pine St</td>
<td>Construct shared use path</td>
<td>$655,200</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Fairview Drive Annie Glidden Rd to Heritage Drive</td>
<td>Add bike route signage, paved shoulder, and reduce travel lanes to 11 ft</td>
<td>$143,800</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>Fairview Drive IL Route 23 to Macom Drive</td>
<td>Add shared use path</td>
<td>$293,300</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>Huber Park Park to IL Route 38</td>
<td>Construct new shared use path connection</td>
<td>$997,000</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long Term Considerations (10+ years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Preliminary Estimate of Cost</th>
<th>Approximate Length (mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>IL Route 38 Peace Rd to Somonauk Rd</td>
<td>Add shared use path</td>
<td>$1,009,500</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Sycamore Community Park Park to Airport Rd</td>
<td>Extend shared use path through Park to Airport Road</td>
<td>$186,900</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Peace Road Macom Dr to Pleasant St</td>
<td>Construct new shared use path along Peace Rd and over UPRR</td>
<td>$2,409,600</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Various Various</td>
<td>Add centerline striping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>Sycamore Rd At Greenwood Acres</td>
<td>Widen shared use path at intersection</td>
<td>$152,800</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Prairie Park Kishwaukee River crossing</td>
<td>Construct new bridge and approaches over Kishwaukee River</td>
<td>$209,900</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Mechanisms

Presented below are some potential mechanisms for implementing the DSATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan. A complete list of federal funding sources is available at www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped.

Federal Funding
Federal funding for bicycle and pedestrian improvements includes programs such as the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program, Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP), Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety (PBS) Program Grant, Recreational Trails Program (RTP), Surface Transportation Program (STP) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding. The programs are generally administered by IDOT or other State agencies and projects must meet federal eligibility rules. The maximum federal participation for projects varies by program and usually requires a local match. The resources for the local match may include general revenue, Motor Fuel Tax revenue, impact fees, or businesses. Some of the federal funding sources that the DSATS communities may wish to pursue are described below.

Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS)
The Illinois Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program supports projects and programs that enable and encourage walking and bicycling to and from school. The program applies to schools serving grades Kindergarten through 8th grade. The SRTS program provides funding to agencies for engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluative projects. Eligible activities are the planning, design, and construction of projects that will substantially improve the ability of students to walk and bike to school. These include:

- Sidewalk improvements,
- Traffic calming and speed reduction improvements,
- Pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements,
- On-street bicycle facilities,
- Off-street bicycle facilities,
- Secure bicycle parking, and
- Traffic diversion improvements in the vicinity of schools (approximately 2 miles)

The Safe Routes to School Online Guide is a comprehensive manual designed to support the development of an SRTS program. http://guide.saferoutesinfo.org/index.cfm

The federal funding level is 100% of the total improvement cost with no local agency match. Federal participation is limited to $250,000 maximum for up to three projects. The Illinois Safe Routes to School 2010 funding cycle concluded on December 15, 2010. IDOT received applications for 250 projects across the state, totaling almost $20 million. To date, there is approximately $11 million in federal funding for the program, which will be awarded to a number of the submitted projects.
Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP)

The Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP) is a federally-funded competitive grant program that promotes alternative means of transportation. ITEP provides funding for community based projects that expand travel choices and enhance the transportation experience by improving the cultural, historic, aesthetic and environmental aspects of transportation infrastructure. DSATS communities may receive up to 80 percent reimbursement for eligible project costs. The remaining 20 percent is the responsibility of the local agency. There are 12 eligible project categories:

1. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities
2. Historic preservation
3. Rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities
4. Landscaping and scenic beautification
5. Scenic and historic highways
6. Scenic easements
7. Transportation museums
8. Outdoor advertising control
9. Safety education for pedestrians and bicyclists
10. Rails-to-trails corridor preservation
11. Archeological planning and research
12. Mitigation for roadway runoff and wildlife connectivity

ITEP is a very popular program and many projects only receive partial funding. For projects exceeding $1 million, local agencies are encouraged to consider ways to phase their projects into logical segments should only partial funding be provided. The federal portion of eligible costs is 80% with the exception of street lighting and land acquisition which is funded at 50 percent for projects selected under the program.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety (PBS) Program Grant

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety (PBS) Program is a federally-funded grant program aimed at improving bicycle and pedestrian safety through education and enforcement. The goal of the program is to reduce the incidence of crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists and the resulting fatalities and injuries. This is accomplished through the support of research, education, encouragement, enforcement, and marketing activities. Federal funds are made available annually to IDOT's Division of Traffic Safety through the US Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). There are three grant categories:

1. Research and Training Efforts—analyzing data to determine why and where crashes are occurring. Training government staff, engineers, planners, community advocates and others to identify crash problems and engineer safe environments for walking and bicycling.
2. Enforcement Efforts—ensuring traffic laws are obeyed (including enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks, and save walking and bicycling behaviors) and initiating community enforcement activities.
3. Creating Safe Behaviors—informing the public about bicycling and walking safely, the health effects of walking and biking, the broad range of transportation choices, and events and activities that promote walking and biking safely.

More information about the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program Grant can be found at http://www.trafficsafetygrantsillinois.org/Grants_2012.asp
Recreational Trails Program (RTP)

The Recreational Trails Program (RTP) is federal-aid program administered by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both motorized and nonmotorized recreational trail uses. Examples of trail use include hiking, bicycling, inline skating, equestrian use, cross-country skiing, snowmobiling, off-highway motorcycling, all-terrain vehicle riding, and four-wheel driving. By law, the State must use 30 percent of RTP funding for motorized trail projects, 30 percent for nonmotorized trail projects, and 40 percent for diverse trail uses. Eligible applicants include federal, state, and local government agencies and not-for-profit organizations.

RTP funds may be used for:
- Maintenance and restoration of existing trails.
- Development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages.
- Purchase and lease of trail construction and maintenance equipment.
- Construction of new trails (with restrictions for new trails on Federal lands).
- Acquisition of easements or property from willing sellers for trails.

The RTP Program provides 80% federal funding assistance. There is a $200,000 maximum grant award per application for non-motorized development projects. There is no set maximum grant award amount for acquisition projects and for motorized projects.

Surface Transportation Program (STP)

The Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides States with funds which may be used for a wide variety of projects on any Federal-aid Highway including the NHS, bridges on any public road, and transit facilities.

Bicycle and pedestrian improvements are eligible activities under the STP. This covers a wide variety of projects such as on-road facilities, off-road trails, sidewalks, crosswalks, bicycle and pedestrian signals, parking, and other ancillary facilities. The modification of sidewalks to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act is an eligible activity.

STP-funded bicycle and pedestrian facilities may be located on local and collector roads which are not part of the Federal-aid Highway System. In addition, bicycle-related non-construction projects, such as maps, coordinator positions, and encouragement programs, are eligible for STP funds.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

The Final Policy Statement on the Eligibility of Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Under Federal Transit Law was made effective on August 19, 2011. It states that most grant programs administered by FTA may be used to fund the design, construction, and maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle projects that enhance or are related to public transportation facilities. In addition, "all pedestrian improvements located within one-half mile and all bicycle improvements located within three miles of a public transportation stop or station shall have a de facto physical and functional relationship to public transportation." Pedestrian and bicycle improvements within these distances are eligible for FTA funding.
It is also possible to “flex” Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding for transit purposes, including some of the projects recommended within the DSATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

The Table on the following pages provides an overview of the availability of Federal transportation funds for a wide variety of bicycle and pedestrian projects.
## Bicycle/Pedestrian Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NHS</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>HSIP</th>
<th>SRTS</th>
<th>TEA</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
<th>RTP</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>BRI</th>
<th>402</th>
<th>PLA</th>
<th>TCSP</th>
<th>JOBS</th>
<th>FLH</th>
<th>BYW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lanes on roadway</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Shoulders</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed bike route</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared use path/trail</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single track hike/bike trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot improvement program</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike racks on buses</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle parking facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail/highway intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle storage/service center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks, new or retrofit</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalks, new or retrofit</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb cuts and ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Final

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator position</th>
<th>NHS</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>HSIP</th>
<th>SRTS</th>
<th>TEA</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
<th>RTP</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>BRI</th>
<th>402</th>
<th>PLA</th>
<th>TCSP</th>
<th>JOBS</th>
<th>FLH</th>
<th>BYW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmet Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety brochure/book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### KEY

- **NHS**: National Highway System
- **STP**: Surface Transportation Program
- **HSIP**: Highway Safety Improvement Program
- **SRTS**: Safe Routes to School Program
- **TEA**: Transportation Enhancement Activities
- **CMAQ**: Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program
- **FLH**: Federal Lands Highway Program
- **BYW**: Scenic Byways
- **BRI**: Bridge
- **402**: State and Community Traffic Safety Program
- **PLA**: State/Metropolitan Planning Funds
- **TCSP**: Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program
- **JOBS**: Access to Jobs/Reverse Commute Program
- **RTP**: Recreational Trails Program
- **FTA**: Federal Transit Capital, Urban & Rural Funds
- **TE**: Transit Enhancements

*Source: FHWA Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped*
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Appendix A      Public Meeting Materials

PUBLIC MEETING
Open House Format
June 7, 2011
5:00 pm to 8:00 pm
Baxter & Woodman Office
1788 Sycamore Road
DeKalb, Illinois 60543

Hosted by:

GET ACTIVE! Do your part to help plan the future of non-motorized transportation facilities in our area.

Bike-Pedestrian Plan Open House
Tuesday, June 7, 2011 | 5:00 - 8:00 pm

We need your input!
Bikers, Runners, and Walkers...
Attention

DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study
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### Public Meeting Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN IN SHEET</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dekalb</td>
<td>35 S 3 M Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dekalb</td>
<td>301 N Green Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dekalb</td>
<td>322 August Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>210 N Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>321 N 6th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>3479 Roswell Ln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>335 N Macon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>320 N 15th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>6040 Nw Hwy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>837 N 1st Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>1258 Ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>3125 2nd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark VanSickle</td>
<td>815-750-3144</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.sickle@dekalbtransit.com">mark.sickle@dekalbtransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Miller</td>
<td>815-745-3234</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.miller@dekalbtransit.com">john.miller@dekalbtransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Brown</td>
<td>815-747-3234</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim.brown@dekalbtransit.com">jim.brown@dekalbtransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Smith</td>
<td>815-746-3234</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom.smith@dekalbtransit.com">tom.smith@dekalbtransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>815-748-3234</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.doe@dekalbtransit.com">jane.doe@dekalbtransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following are additional programming ideas geared to educating and encouraging people of all ages:

**Walk to School Day**
The first Wednesday of October is International Walk to School Day. Children in over 40 countries participate. The website provides ideas and resources for planning an event.

International Walk to School: [http://www.iwalktoschool.org/photos/index.htm](http://www.iwalktoschool.org/photos/index.htm)
The Official Website of International Walk to School features pictures, stories, best practices, downloads, resources, and who is walking around the world.

**Bike and Dine**
A progressive dinner were participants travel between restaurants on bike. Celebrate the fun and ease of getting around by bike while sampling from local eateries.

**Shop by Foot or Bike**
Shopping by foot or bike makes everything along your route more accessible. It encourages local shopping and fosters a sense of community. Local businesses can provide incentives for customers who arrive on foot or by bike.

**Open Streets**
This event takes a large, continuous public space—your community’s streets—and opens it up to joggers and cyclists, adults and kids, residents and visitors to enjoy. Open Streets provides more space for healthy recreation.

**Bike Rodeo**
A bike rodeo typically consists of a bicycle safety clinic featuring bike safety inspections, and a safety lecture about the rules of the road. This is followed by a ride on a miniature "chalk street" course set up in a parking lot where young cyclists are shown where and how to apply the rules. Optional activities include tune-ups, helmet fittings, prize drawings, and commercial activities such as booths set up by bike shops. The main focus of a bike rodeo is cycling safety for young cyclists, ages 5–14 or so.

**Municipal Staff Cycle Training**
Municipal staff using bicycles for community travel is often cheaper and more effective than automobile transportation. Staff gets up close to areas than cannot be viewed by a vehicle. The municipality should provide annual training for all staff.

**Bicycle Ambassadors**
Bicycle Ambassadors educate and encourage the public to use their bicycles more and to do so safely. The ambassadors’ focus is to reach new groups, educate riders, and show how easy cycling can be in their community.
Walk and Bike Friendly Recognition
Walk and bike friendly communities have shown a commitment to improving walkability, bikeability, and pedestrian and cyclist safety through comprehensive programs, plans, and policies.
Walk Friendly Communities: http://www.walkfriendly.org/
Walk Friendly Communities receive national recognition for their efforts to improve safety, mobility, access, and comfort. This site includes the application, resources, and information about how to get started.

Bicycle Friendly Community:
http://www.bikeleague.org/programs/bicyclefriendlyamerica/communities/getting_started.php
This site provides a step-by-step guide to turning your town into a Bicycle Friendly Community. The League of American Bicyclists provides resources, a bike friendly blueprint, and an explanation of how to apply for national Bicycle Friendly Community recognition.

Targeted Enforcement
Police inform motorists of Illinois laws with warnings and educational materials, ensuring drivers uphold their duties as motorists. Targeted enforcement improves awareness of traffic laws, increasing compliance, safety, and awareness of pedestrians and bicyclists on the road.

Advocacy Organizations in Illinois
Active Transportation Alliance
http://www.activetrans.org

League of Illinois Bicyclists
http://www.bikelib.org/
Appendix C  Bicycle Parking Recommendations

Base the number of bicycle parking spaces on 5 percent of required motor vehicle spaces (minimum 4 bicycle parking spaces/maximum 40 bicycle parking spaces, depending on proximity to bike path system). Exemptions: Single and twofamily dwellings; warehousing and distribution; mortuaries; auto service; day care centers; car washes; drive-up establishments and airports.

Location and Design Elements

- Inverted-U structure preferred
- Should accommodate U-locks/chains and shall support a bicycle at two locations
- Thermoplastic powder coating on racks and must be anchored securely to ground per manufacturers specifications
- Bicycle parking should be separated from vehicle parking grade differences, landscaping, poles, etc.)
- Spaces shall be 30” x 6’ per bicycle with a 5’-wide access aisle from behind. Sidewalk adjacent may serve as access site.
- Spaces should be within 50’ of entrance and clearly safe and convenient (lit if necessary)
- Parking areas may be shared by two venues within 50’ of one another
- Parking areas should be easily accessible from trails

Design Guidelines

Association or Bicycling and Pedestrian Professionals
Bicycle Parking Design Guidelines
http://www.apbp.org/?page=Publications

Bike Parking for Your Business
Active Transportation Alliance, 2003
Sample Parking Ordinance

The following sample bicycle parking ordinance is modeled after that found in the Code of Ordinances for the City of Durango, Colorado.

[Insert Municipal Code Chapter and Section] Bicycle parking spaces.

(A) At least two (2) bicycle parking spaces or one (1) bicycle parking space for each ten (10) of the required off-street automobile parking spaces, whichever is greater, must be provided in all districts[, except districts…].

(B) No more than thirty (30) bicycle parking spaces shall be required on any one (1) property.
DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS)
Recreation Trail Usage Study

GEOG 490/690, *Community Geography*
Northern Illinois University
Geography Department

Monashae Brownlee
Kara Haller
Dominick Lafata
and
Andrew J. Krmenec, PhD (Project Director)

December 2010
Background

The development of multi-purpose recreational trails has become an increasingly popular phenomenon in communities across the country. Since the early 1990s, numerous successful trail development projects have been employed throughout the country, and trends suggest that trail usage is increasingly popular in communities that have developed trail systems. These systems may be used for recreation, commuting, or as green space providing habitat for a variety of birds and small animals. Agencies at all levels of government have made commitments to developing viable trail systems. Within the De Kalb urban area, the De Kalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS) coordinates all transportation-related projects. This area includes the City of De Kalb, City of Sycamore, Town of Cortland, and Northern Illinois University.

Objective

As part of its transportation planning responsibility, DSATS maintains the Bike and Pedestrian Plan for the region. The current plan contains existing trails and proposed future trails based on potential residential growth. However, DSATS did not have up-to-date information on trail usage by community members, or information on current conditions of the existing recreation trails. The main objectives of this project were to: 1) provide estimates of trail usage through average daily traffic counts at select trail sites; 2) survey community members on the nature and frequency of their use of recreational trails; and 3) survey Northern Illinois University student populations on their awareness and usage of community recreational trails. This project was conducted by students in the Department of Geography at Northern Illinois University enrolled in the fall semester class, GEOG 490/690, Community Geography.

Project Design

The first objective of the project was to provide average daily traffic count data for select trails. With input from DSATS staff, three trail locations were chosen for data collection: at Hopkins Park Trail in De Kalb, along the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail (also known as the Peace Rd. trail) between De Kalb and Sycamore, and at the head of the Great Western Trail in Sycamore. Observations were conducted in two-hour intervals over a three week period, with the main focus on weekday usage. The second and third project objectives were undertaken through the use of Internet-based surveys. This mode of data collection was chosen because of its potential to reach the broadest segment of community residents, as well as Northern Illinois University student populations. The surveys were designed to collect a variety of quantitative and qualitative data. Both surveys were reviewed and approved by the Northern Illinois University Office of Research Compliance as human subjects research. The surveys were advertised on the NIU campus and at local libraries, grocery stores, and recreational facilities – including both the De Kalb and Sycamore Park Districts and the YMCA. Links to the trail usage survey were also provided online through the DSATS, De Kalb Park District, and Sycamore Park District websites.

The Surveys

Two separate surveys were created to address objectives (2) and (3) of the project. Both were created and posted online through Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com) using an account held by Dr. Krmenec. The first survey, referred to as the Trail Usage Survey, focused on...
frequency of trail use, how residents use the trails, their purpose (recreation vs. commuting), and perceived needs for trail improvement. The latter included an open-ended response item where survey participants could comment on specific improvement needs or general concerns. The second survey, referred to as the Trail Awareness Survey, targeted only NIU students. The main questions there asked whether the respondent used any of the community trails, whether they were aware of each of the main trails in the trail system, and what sorts of information or improvements would likely increase their usage of the trail system. Individual questions in both surveys are revealed, along with a summary of responses, in the Data Results section below.

Geospatial Data

The geospatial data for the maps produced in this project report came from a variety of different sources. Most of the geospatial base data were obtained from DSATS, with origin either from the City of De Kalb or De Kalb County. Though otherwise of sound quality, the trail geospatial data from DSATS were incomplete. Missing were the Dresser Road Trail, completed in 2010, and the portion of the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail running from IL-23 north to Il-64. Geospatial data for the Dresser Road Trail were compiled by Dr. Krmenec using differential GPS equipment (Topcon GMS-2 with CORS beacon correction); data for the De Kalb-Sycamore Trail were digitized by Dr. Krmenec from 1-meter resolution, 2010 NAIP imagery.

Data Results

The results from the traffic count, Trail Usage and Trail Awareness surveys are summarized in this section.

1) Recreation Trail Traffic Counts

The following charts and graphs summarize traffic count observations on three recreation trails: Hopkins Park/De Kalb Kiwanis Trail, De Kalb – Sycamore Trail, and the Great Western Trail. Before reviewing the results, it is important to note, first, that traffic counts were conducted at a single point on each trail and, second, that traffic count survey coverage was not uniform across the three survey sites. Usage of the Great Western Trail was recorded over five 2-hour blocks. Traffic counts were conducted at the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail sampling location over nine 2-hour blocks of time. Finally, traffic counts were conducted at the Hopkins Park site for a total of fifteen 2-hour sampling periods.

Bicycling was the predominant mode of usage at all three sampling sites, ranging from a high of 48% on the De Kalb-Sycamore Trail to a low of 33% at Hopkins Park on the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail. 30% of users were engaged in jogging/running on the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail, versus 23% at Hopkins Park and 21 % on the Great Western Trail. Nearly as many persons were observed walking at Hopkins Park (30%) as bicycling (33%). However, walkers constituted less than 21% of trail users on the Great Western and De Kalb- Sycamore trails. Modest numbers of skaters were observed at the Hopkins Park (14%) and Great Western trail sites (12%). Bicycling was the predominant usage mode on both the Great Western and De Kalb – Sycamore trails across all sampling periods and dates at both sites. Other than that, there is no consistent pattern in trail use mode across all sampling days and times at any of the trail sampling sites.
For planning and engineering purposes, traffic count data are usually standardized to control for variable lengths of survey observations. Such standardization is particularly important in the context of these trail usage data as the total hours spent the Hopkins Park trail site are triple the hours spent at the Great Western Trail site. The map below shows standardized traffic counts at the three trail sites in terms of # persons per hour. This measure is calculated as the total count of person traffic, across all survey days and times, divided by the total number of hours spent at each site. As is shown in the map legend, the Great Western Trail and the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail (at Barber Greene Rd) both average 7 persons per hour whereas the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail at Hopkins Park averages 31 persons per hour. The larger volume of traffic at Hopkins Park owes to several factors. First, Kiwanis Trail at Hopkins Park is easily accessible from several residential neighborhoods. Second, at this location the trail provides access to a variety of retail and other services. Third, the park itself may be a destination because of its natural settings and recreational activities. In contrast, the Great Western and De Kalb – Sycamore trails are more rural/remote and less connected to residential neighborhoods. Given its location and natural setting, the Great Western Trail is more likely to be an end-destination for users than is the De
Kalb - Sycamore Trail. However, at certain times of day and/or days of the week, commuting traffic is more likely observed on the De Kalb – Sycamore and De Kalb Kiwanis trails.
2) The Trail Usage Survey

The first question of the trail usage survey asked respondents to identify their place of residence. As is shown here, the majority of respondents answered De Kalb (63.6%). Nearly 24% of respondents answered Sycamore and less than 3% answered Cortland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Where do you reside?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Kalb</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIU residence halls</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next set of questions are similar in composition, with the first part asking if the respondent or members of their household used a specific trail and the second part asking how often they used the trail. If the respondent’s answer to the first part of the question was “No,” then the survey automatically skipped them over the second part asking frequency of use. The online survey included map images of each trail or trail section so that those unfamiliar with trail names could identify the trail in question. The trails, and trail segments, identified in these questions included: 1) the Great Western Trail; 2) the Sycamore Bike Path; 3) the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail (3 segments); the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail (4 segments); the De Kalb Nature Trail; the Dresser Road Trail; and the Mason Park – Devonaire Farms trail. Note that the percentage using or not using the trail/trail segment is based on the number of complete responses. The number skipping the question ranged from 25 to over 70. Questions relating to trails or trail segments later in the survey tended to be skipped more than those listed near the beginning of the survey.

Usage of each of the trails or trail segments is detailed in the graphics below. As these are both Sycamore trails, it is notable that the proportions of respondents reporting that they use the trails are both significantly greater than the proportion of respondents from Sycamore. Such a result is not surprising for the Great Western Trail as that facility is used by runners, bikers and nature enthusiasts from throughout the county. Note that there is nearly a 50-50 split between users and non-users of the Sycamore Bike Path. Several responses to the trail improvement question cited lack of on-road signage as an impediment to use of the Sycamore Bike Path.
2. Do you use the Great Western Trail?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 248
skipped question 25

4. Do you use the Sycamore Bike Path (Community Park to Bethany Rd)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 227
skipped question 46

6. Do you use any portion of the De Kalb–Sycamore Trail (along Peace Rd. between Bethany Rd. & IL-94) in Sycamore?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 210
skipped question 63
These graphics show that the main sections of the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail have a fairly high rate of usage. More than 50% of respondents indicated that they used the sections between IL-64 and Bethany Rd. and between Bethany Rd. and Pleasant St in De Kalb. Nearly 50% also reported using the section between Barber Greene Rd. (Tails) and IL-23. This is the one trail cited most in the improvement question as having serious maintenance problems. In fact, both the Bethany –to- Pleasant and Barber Greene –to- IL-23 trail segments were cited by respondents as needing immediate maintenance.

The next series of graphs report respondents’ usage of various segments of the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail, from Hopkins Park at its northern-most extent to Lions Park at Taylor Street. The De Kalb Kiwanis Trail is the most popular of all trails in the De Kalb – Sycamore area. Roughly 2/3 of all respondents indicated that they used segments of the trail from Greenwood Acres to Hopkins Park, from Hopkins Park to N 1st Street at Clinton Rosette Middle School, and from N 1st Street to NIU’s east lagoon. Nearly 50% also reported using that segment of the trail between Prairie Park and Lions Park. Several respondents cited the Kiwanis Trail, particularly around Hopkins Park, as the crown jewel of the community’s trail system. However, many also noted perceived safety and security concerns with the trail segment running through Prairie Park; all of those negative comments occurred in survey responses received after the report of a body discovered in Prairie Park in late October. Regardless of the unfortunate event from this fall associated with
Prairie Park, several respondents did indicate positive impressions of this latter segment of the Kiwanis Trail, and especially for its natural setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you use any portion of the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail between Hopkins Park and Greenwood Acres Dr?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you use any portion of the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail between N 1st St (Clinton-Rosette Middle School) and Hopkins Park?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you use any portion of the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail between NIU (East Lagoon) and N 1st St (CRMS)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three remaining trails for which respondents were queried on usage are the De Kalb Nature Trail, the Dresser Road Trail, and the Mason Park – Devonaire Farms Trail. According to respondent comments, these three were seen as the least connected to other community trails. Of these three, the De Kalb Nature Trail has the greatest utilization. Indeed, this trail ranks second behind the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail for proportion of respondents reporting use of the trail, at slightly more than 60%. The other two trails have the lowest usage rates, with Dresser Road at about 18% and Mason Park-Devonaire Farms at roughly 24%. Besides being two of the newest trails, they are also least accessible from other system trails.
The next series of questions in the Trail Usage Survey address how people use the community’s recreational trails. In terms of mode, the most popular usage of the trails is for bicycling. More than ¾ of all respondents indicate that they bicycle on one or more trails. Next most popular was walking, at 55%, followed by running/jogging at 41%. This question was formatted to allow more than one response; hence the response percent totals is greater than 100%.

| 24. Do you use any portion of the recreation trail between Mason Park (The Knolls) and Devonaire Farms? |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Response Percent | Response Count |
| Yes | 23.9% | 47 |
| No | 76.1% | 150 |

| answered question | 197 |
| skipped question | 76 |

The vast majority of respondents (88.8%) indicate that they use community trails primarily for exercise or relaxation. Eleven percent report that they use the trails primarily for commuting. The second graphic below shows the distribution of trip types for those reporting their primary use as commuting. Again this question was formatted to be skipped if the respondent answered exercise/relaxation as their primary use. Of the 21 survey respondents using the trails for commuting, a majority reported trips to/from work, trips for shopping, visiting friends, and travel for sports or entertainment activities as major purposes for their commutes.

| 26. How do you typically use the recreation trail? |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Response Percent | Response Count |
| Walking | 55.3% | 104 |
| Running/jogging | 41.5% | 78 |
| Bicycling | 76.6% | 144 |
| Skating/skateboarding | 3.7% | 7 |
| Other | 2.7% | 5 |

| answered question | 188 |
| skipped question | 85 |
The final question in the Trail Usage Survey asked respondents their perception of the one or two major needs for the community trail system. Possible answers included access, connectivity, maintenance, crossing traffic intersections, nearby traffic speed or volume, trail congestion, visibility, personal safety, trail maps, and other. By far the most cited need was for improved connectivity between trails. 68% of those responding to this question checked connectivity as one of their responses. The second-most cited need was trail maintenance, checked by 38% of respondents. Tied for third in terms of needs were personal safety and trail maps, recorded by 29% of respondents. Close to 1/5 of respondents noted access to trails and crossing traffic intersections as among the greatest needs. Less than 14% of respondents indicated visibility as a concern and less than 6% noted nearby traffic, trail congestion, or other as greatest needs.
Those that responded to the trail needs question were invited to submit specific comments in an open-ended response box. As one might imagine, the comments were quite varied in scope and detail. However, we were able to group respondents’ comments into three main themes: those focused on connectivity; those addressing maintenance concerns; and those relating to personal safety. Those groupings of comments, corrected in most instances for spelling or typographical errors, are presented in the Appendix to this report.

Estimates of Trail Traffic Volume

Each of the questions in the second part of the Trail Usage Survey on whether the respondent used a specific trail included a follow-up question asking how often they, or their household used the trail during an average week. Responses were collected in an open-ended question, thereby allowing all manner of numeric responses. Though not as reliable as actual traffic count data, these self-reported usage volumes provide yet another perspective on how often the community’s trails are used. So as to provide some measure of standardization, we summarize these self-reported data in a series of trail traffic maps. The following series of maps illustrate the number of respondents reporting that they used the trail, or trail segment: i) less than once a week; ii) 1 to 3 times per week; iii) 4 to 6 times per week; iv) 1 to 2 times per day (reported as 7 – 14 times per week); and v) more 2 times per day. We also include a map showing the average frequency of
trail use per week among all respondents, calculated as the total number of reported trail uses divided by the number or respondents reporting any numeric quantity of use.
This first map illustrates what might best be labeled “sporadic” users of the trails. These are individuals that use a trail or trail segment less than once a week. The map shows fewer sporadic users on the Mason Park –Devonaire Farms Trail, the Dresser Road Trail and the Sycamore Bike Path. Higher numbers of sporadic users are found all along the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail, on the De Kalb Nature Trail, on the main segment of the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail, on the Lowes –to-TAILS segment of the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail, and on the Great Western Trail.

The next two maps show the relative number of users reporting 1-3 trail trips and 4-6 trail trips per week. These could be called more regular users of the trail. In both maps, we see that the De Kalb Nature Trail and the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail between Hopkins Park and Greenwood Acres Drive have the higher volumes of regular users. Note that the data scale in the legend is unique to each map. Thus, for example, all data five categories on the 4-6 times per week map would fall in the lowest volume data category on the 1-3 times per week map. Comparing the data legends across all maps, however, shows that vast majority of respondents use any trail or trail segment at least once a week, but no more than three times per week.

The last two maps illustrate use patterns among those using the trail daily or multiple times per day. Notice the data scale in the legends of both of these maps. The overall number of very frequent trail users is small. Again the De Kalb Nature Trail emerges as having the highest number of daily users, followed by the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail between Greenwood Acres Drive and Hopkins Park and between Prairie Park and Lions Park. The De Kalb Kiwanis Trail between NIU and N. 1st Street (Clinton Rosette Middle School) has the highest number of very high frequency users (more than twice per day).

The final map illustrates average number of trail uses per week, per respondent that reported using that trail or trail segment. Here we see that the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail between NIU and N. 1st Street (Clinton Rosette Middle School) has the highest trip count per week. The De Kalb Nature Trail, the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail between N. 1st St and Hopkins Park, and two segments of the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail (from IL-23 to Barber Greene Rd. and from Bethany Rd. to IL-64) have the next highest average trip counts per week. The lowest average trip counts per user are seen on the Dresser Rd. Trail and on the Great Western Trail.
3) The Awareness Survey

The second survey was designed for NIU students to document their awareness and usage of community recreational trails. This survey consisted of five questions: one on awareness, two on usage, and two on the potential for increasing student usage. The awareness survey was posted online, similar to the Trail Usage Survey. Posters advertising the survey were distributed across campus, in academic and non-academic buildings, in residence halls, and at campus bus stop kiosks. Unlike with the Trail Usage survey, there was no opportunity to advertise the awareness survey on high volume websites frequented primarily by students. Consequently, the overall response rate to this survey was extremely low. A total of 49 individuals participated in the survey.

The first question in the survey asked the respondent how familiar they were with local recreation trails. This question purposefully did not identify any of the community’s recreation trails by name. Not surprisingly, close to 50% of survey respondents reported that they were unfamiliar with the community’s recreation trail system. 28% indicated that they were somewhat familiar and 21% indicated that they were moderately familiar with local recreation trails.

The next question in the awareness survey asked respondents if they used any of the local recreation trails. In this case specific trails were identified. Respondents were given the choice of three answer option: yes, they used that trail; no, they did not use it; and no, they were not familiar with the trail. The final answer option was included as a check against responses to the awareness question (q1) and as a means to elicit more information about awareness of individual recreation trails in the community. The summary of responses to this questions show that majority of NIU students are largely unaware of local trails. Roughly 60% indicated that they were unfamiliar with the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail and the Sycamore Bike Path. Close to 2/3 indicated they were unfamiliar with the De Kalb Nature Trail and De Kalb Kiwanis Trail. And close to ¾ indicated that they were unfamiliar with the Great Western Trail, the Dresser Road Trail, and the Mason Park – Devonaire Farms Trail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How familiar are you with the recreation trails in the area?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately familiar</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat familiar</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar at all</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next question in the awareness survey asked respondents if they used any of the local recreation trails. In this case specific trails were identified. Respondents were given the choice of three answer option: yes, they used that trail; no, they did not use it; and no, they were not familiar with the trail. The final answer option was included as a check against responses to the awareness question (q1) and as a means to elicit more information about awareness of individual recreation trails in the community. The summary of responses to this questions show that majority of NIU students are largely unaware of local trails. Roughly 60% indicated that they were unfamiliar with the De Kalb – Sycamore Trail and the Sycamore Bike Path. Close to 2/3 indicated they were unfamiliar with the De Kalb Nature Trail and De Kalb Kiwanis Trail. And close to ¾ indicated that they were unfamiliar with the Great Western Trail, the Dresser Road Trail, and the Mason Park – Devonaire Farms Trail.
The majority of respondents reported that they did not use any of the trails. The one exception was that 55.1% of the respondents reported that they used the NIU east campus trail (the portion of the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail running through campus). Smaller numbers of students reported using the De Kalb Kiwanis Trail (24%) and the De Kalb Nature Trail (22%).

The second usage question asked respondents how they used the trails (mode of use). Here, the vast majority reported walking as their primary mode (73%), followed by bicycling (51%) and running/jogging (39%). The percentages for walking vs. bicycling reported by NIU students are roughly opposite what community members reported in the Trail Usage Survey. However, the percentages indicating running/jogging are nearly equal. That more students report walking on the trail, as opposed to bicycling, probably speaks to their more limited transportation options.

The next two questions focus on students’ potential use of the community’s trails. If NIU students knew more about the trails in the area, 40.8% of respondents said they would definitely use the trails. 49% of respondents said they would possibly use the trails and the remaining 10.2% report that they would still not be inclined to use the trails.

The final question in this survey asked students what could be done to improve their awareness and usage of trails. The two most popular responses, recorded by 81% and 73% of respondents, were trail signs and trail maps. Given that most students indicated that they were unaware of
community trails and that most indicated a lack of familiarity with specific trails, this result is logical. More than half of those surveyed said that if trails were improved to incorporate connectivity between trails, usage would increase. Of those surveyed, 37.5% said adding more trails and bike paths in the area would increase usage and awareness of existing trails. This question also correlates with improving connectivity between trails. Just 20.8% reported that there is a need for bike and stroller carriers on Huskie busses. Finally, 2.1% reported that some other factor would increase awareness and usage of area trails.

| 3. How do you use the recreation trail in your area (check all that apply) |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | Walking  | 73.2%  | 30  |
|  | Running/jogging  | 39.0%  | 16  |
|  | Bicycling  | 51.2%  | 21  |
|  | Skating/skateboarding  | 7.3%  | 3  |
|  | Other  | 9.8%  | 4  |

answered question 41  skipped question 8

| 4. If you knew more about the area’s recreation trails, would you use them more? |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | Yes, definitely  | 40.8%  | 20  |
|  | Maybe  | 49.0%  | 24  |
|  | No  | 10.2%  | 5  |

answered question 49  skipped question 0

| 5. Which of the following do you feel would best increase awareness and use of the area’s recreational trail system? (please check all that apply) |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | trail signs  | 81.3%  | 39  |
|  | trail maps  | 72.9%  | 35  |
|  | more trails or bike paths  | 37.5%  | 18  |
|  | improve connectivity between trails  | 56.3%  | 27  |
|  | bike/stroller carriers on Huskie busses  | 20.8%  | 10  |
|  | other  | 2.1%  | 1  |
Project Limitations and Recommendations

This project was undertaken by a team of students in the Fall 2010, Community Geography course (GEOG 490/690) at Northern Illinois University. The project was constrained in several non-trivial ways by the timing of the semester and the availability of the students. Ideally, both the traffic count and trail usage surveys should be conducted during the summer or early fall. And separate traffic count survey should be conducted for weekday and weekend usage patterns. Should the project be extended or repeated, we would recommend the development and use of a more standardized traffic counting process on the trails. For example, traffic counts should be taken on every trail in the area. In order to get a more comprehensive viewpoint of trail usage, background literature suggests counts should be taken on each trail at the same time on multiple days. Both of these objectives could conceivably be addressed with an automated traffic count technology designed for pedestrians/bicyclists. Because of the time frame of this project (fall) and the nature of a community that contains university, traffic counts could also be repeated in the summer months to reflect changes in usage. A future project may want to focus on seasonal patterns of trail usage, particularly summer vs. fall usage.

In regards to the usage and awareness surveys, both were operationalized through an Internet (fee-based) survey service. Both surveys ran for four weeks, which should have been more than sufficient to capture a broad spectrum of targeted populations. However, the vast differential in number of responses points to questions of advertising/promotion effectiveness. Both surveys were advertised publicly via paper posters with tear-offs containing the survey URL address. The trail usage survey was also advertised on the DSATS website, as well as sites hosted by the De Kalb and Sycamore park districts. Still, the vast majority of usage respondents were De Kalb citizens. More effort could have always been made to reach out to Sycamore and Cortland community groups, including school groups, PTAs, and sports/recreational clubs in the three communities. Should the trail awareness portion of the project be repeated in the future, there should be a greater effort in reaching out to the NIU students. Background literature suggests various ways to incorporate the students’ voice. In order to get a more accurate reading of what NIU students know about the trails, surveys could be given out in all residence halls. Students could also be reached through various media formats such as official NIU email or websites, large enrollment classes like UNIV 101, or the campus newspaper.