

Minutes of Meeting
MULTI-USE TRAILS JURISDICTIONS COMMITTEE
December 16, 2015

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Elliott McKinley, Chair	Springfield Park District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lori Williams	City of Springfield
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brian Wright	Sangamon County Highway Department
	Deb Elderton	Village of Rochester
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Andrew Werner	Illinois Department of Transportation – District 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pat McCarthy	Village of Chatham

Staff

Linda Wheeland – Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning
Commission
Neha Soni – Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning
Commission

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Elliott McKinley called the meeting of the Multi-Use Trails Jurisdictions Committee to order at 10:30 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF 11/18/2015 MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Elliott McKinley asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the November 18, Multi-Use Trails Jurisdictions Committee meeting. Hearing none, the minutes were approved.

III. EMERGENCY RESPONSE SUPPORT SIGNAGE PLAN

A. Jurisdictions Updates on Adoption

Linda noted that the Emergency Response Support Signage Plan was finalized at the last meeting. As each jurisdiction is responsible for putting their signage on the trails, committee members with trail ownership were going to take the plan back to their boards for adoption. (The City of Springfield and IDOT District 6 would not be adopting the plan.) The 9-1-1 Office had also requested that the plan be adopted by each jurisdiction to establish it as the official way of addressing the trails for 9-1-1 purposes. Linda informed the committee that Deb Elderton had reported that the Village of Rochester had adopted the plan at their board meeting on Monday night. Elliott reported the plan had been submitted to the Springfield Park District Board for review and would be on their January meeting agenda for approval. Brian reported that the plan had not yet been taken to the County Board for adoption, but would be on their agenda for January. Pat McCarthy reported that the plan would go to Committee on January 12th and to the Village of Chatham Board on January 25th for adoption.

B. Grant Application Discussion

Linda discussed the potential for a joint application for funding the signs. FHWA representatives in an earlier meeting had provided information that the Recreational Trails Program grant would cover this type of signage and the application deadline was March. The funding is 80:20 and there is an application fee for the grant, unless the grant request is under a certain amount of money.

Linda was not sure of the total cost but the signs are pretty standard and are taken from the MUTCD Manual.

There was further discussion on the details of the signs in terms of determining the number of signs needed, their cost, if they could be made in house for all the jurisdictions, and if there was interest in developing a joint application for all the signs. There could be an intergovernmental agreement regarding the application and the creation of the signs. These could also include wayfinding signs, the ones that the communities would put up for points of interest and not the ones that would be paid for by businesses.

Pat McCarthy asked for an estimate of the cost for Chatham. Brian would provide the estimate of the cost for the signs at the next meeting.

Linda asked Lori about research she had done on the size of the signs. Lori informed that the mile markers can be anything from 6'x12' to 12'x18' and she recommends the bigger size 12'x18'. Brian would look into the sign sizes that are used by the county.

Linda asked Pat McCarthy to find out the number of wayfinding signs that Chatham would need and a list of signs that would be needed could be compiled. Lori informed that the color for the mileage marker signs allowed under MUTCD Manual is green, blue, brown, white and black.

Linda recommended that we move forward with documenting the type and number of mileage markers, street name signs, and wayfinding signs that are needed. Brian will check on whether the county could take the lead with the grant application for signage.

IV. ADVERTISING/SPONSORSHIPS ON TRAILS POLICY

A. Continuing Review

Linda discussed the changes made to the document as per the last meeting which included making the Sponsorship signs and the Adopt-a-Trail signs green. The signs would be in two parts with the type of sign identified on top and the sponsors' names below.

Elliott recommended an addition of language in the policy document regarding tracking the contribution account for the sponsors. Linda would make the changes. Linda mentioned that the sponsorship set up for the trails would include commitment for \$1,000 per year for three years. The sign with sponsor name would be put up at two access points. The sponsor's name and/or logo would be posted on the trail jurisdiction's website and included on the multiuse trails brochure. The Adopt-a-Trail sponsorship would be standard including cleaning and would cost \$50 per year. The Amenities sponsorship includes sponsoring a bench, a bike repair station, a trash can, a toilet and like. The sponsor would pay for the cost of the item and the installation. Any sponsor whose contribution was \$1,000 or more would also get their name/logo on the trail jurisdiction's website and the multiuse trails brochure.

Linda asked Elliott if he had been able to provide information on the type of amenities that are donated to the Park District. Elliott responded that they are pretty open to the type of amenities that are donated, except for Washington Park, which has a bench policy for a single style. At the other places, the concrete benches are made in house and the sponsor pays for it.

Linda talked about having information online to make it easy for people to see what kind of amenities they could donate. Elliott suggested checking some trade sites and seeing what types of amenities are available like the concrete benches that are not easy for people to move. Linda suggested deciding on the locations and types of amenities for the next meeting.

V. TRAIL HEADS, ACCESS POINTS, AND AMENITIES PLAN

A. Initial Discussion

Linda discussed the document that had been put together by SSCRPC staff over a long period of time. The staff went out and documented various access points, official and non official ones along the trails. The plan also indicates the areas served by the access points and any existing as well as proposed amenities at those points. At the beginning of each trail section in the document, there is a map showing locations of the access points. The existing ones are the black dots and the proposed ones are the white dots. Proposed locations are generally the ones which people are already using to access the trails.

Lori informed that the city does not want to advertise the access point to Electric Substation No. 11 on the Sangamon Valley Trail as public access since it is gated. CWLP does not want people parking or accessing the trail from there. They had issues in the past with people parking and blocking the way for their trucks. Linda noted that a path had been created around the gate and people were accessing the trail this way. Lori will check back with CWLP regarding the posting of No Parking signs or moving the gate.

Elliott provided information handouts on the permitting process for walks and events on Park District property. There were 13 points of permit information. This information could be useful in developing consistent policies for the use of trails.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Lost Bridge Trail Spur

Andrew discussed the Lost Bridge Trail Spur where there used to be a railroad, identified in the Sangamon County Greenways and Trails Plan and the Springfield Comprehensive Plan as part of the trail system. The people who own the land surrounding it would like to purchase the abandoned rail corridor currently owned by the State. Linda discussed the current plans that are in place that would leave this spur completely open for hiking, preserving tree line, and providing access to the Sugar Creek Greenway. The City owns the other part of the spur that connects to the trail.

There was some discussion regarding the usefulness of the spur for accessing the Lost Bridge Trail as users would have to cross Route 29.

Linda suggested that as Springfield is going to update its Comprehensive Plan next year, this could be addressed through that process since it is included in the current plan. Lori suggested to investigate a little bit and to wait for the comprehensive plan update. Andrew agreed to wait until the plan update as well, since this is already included in both plans.

B. Maps

Linda showed a new app that was recently made by SSCRPC staff, showing the various amenities of the trails. One can click on the certain amenities like parking lots, rest rooms, trash cans and the like to see their locations. One can also look at more than one amenity at a time. The app is posted on the SSCRPC website.

Neha discussed one new map that was created. It showed locations of SMTD bus stops with the bus route services that are closest to the access points on the trails. It also indicated bike routes connecting the bus stops and the trails at certain locations. The map is helpful to understand the connection of bus stops and the multiuse trails network in the MPA.

Next Meeting Date – Wednesday, January 20th at 10:30 AM

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Elliott McKinley called to adjourn at 11:35 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Neha Soni
Recording Secretary