



Civic Advisory Group Notes

October 30, 2025 meeting



The activity

- Provide **general guidance** on how some illustrative projects submitted by counties are reflecting **RTP priorities**, **Metro Vision**, and **solving the problem** at hand
- Your input will be included in the **evaluation process** and **presented** to DRCOG's transportation committee and Regional Review Panel.

What should the region generally consider when evaluating projects?

- Surrounding land use—current and planned.
- Quality of any accompanying pedestrian treatments (crossing distances, how much does it improve the pedestrian experience)
- Transit is preferred over widening—has a corridor eliminated transit as a first option?
- Consider induced demand when evaluating air quality impacts of a project.
- Connectivity to other projects.
- Potential users.

Context:

- Adjacent to transit station.
- Area developing.
- Residential, industrial, agricultural.
- Urban Center.

Problem:

- Severe congestion on major street due to freight train crossing.
- Increased congestion and traffic on alternate routes.
- Congestion even in off-peak hours.
- Gaps in sidewalk network.

Project:

- Separate at-grade railroad crossing.
- New accessible sidewalks.

Why:

- Grade separation will alleviate traffic delays.
- Will enhance access to transit for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists.
- Will increase bus service reliability to station.
- Reduce rear-end collisions due to stop-and-go traffic.
- Would eliminate potential collisions with freight train.
- Will reduce emissions by reducing congestion and encouraging walking, biking, and transit.

Discussion

- Reducing congestion could increase speeds, and therefore crash severity.
- Need more understanding of the surrounding population.
- Grade separation may not help non-motorized users all that much—long detours, encouraging higher traffic speeds, etc.
- Would like to see increased public transit on the route.

Context:

- Daily vehicle counts: 30,000 – 60,000.
- Major commercial corridor.
- Served by one bus route.
- Multiple Urban Centers along corridor.

Problem:

- Auto-dominated corridor does not have high-capacity transit.
- Many congestion bottlenecks.
- Corridor experiences many serious crashes.
- Area where some of most vulnerable populations live.

Project:

- High capacity transit corridor (bus rapid transit).
- Supporting safety/multimodal improvements.

Why:

- Introduction of high capacity transit will bring more connections to bike/peds.
- Bus rapid transit has potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Will reduce number of single-occupancy vehicle trips.
- Will create a balanced multimodal corridor rather than auto-dominated.

Discussion

- If the bus will repurpose an existing traffic lane or widen to get its own lane matters. Crossing more lanes, even if they are bus lanes, can be hard for people walking.

Context:

- Many bike facilities in area
- Rural, open space, residential
- Growing residential, open space, agricultural
- Corridor connecting several communities

Problem:

- No separate bikeway connecting three communities.

Project:

- Construct regional trail linking communities.

Why:

- Would link multiple communities and regional amenities.
- Would increase attractiveness of bicycling.
- Cyclists can use alternatives to on-street bike facilities, increasing safety for all road users.
- Will improve resident access to outdoor recreation.

Discussion

- Connections to the rest of the regional bike network matters.
- Land use and “connecting places where folks need to go” matters. Recreation is not as important as transportation.
- Is there data on number of commuters vs number of recreational users?
- If the bikeway is primarily residential, would the money be better spent on mass transit options? Especially if we are trying to move the needle on mode shift.

Context:

- Daily vehicle count: 35,000
- Residential
- Major corridor
- No bus service
- Within a few miles of large parks

Problem:

- Road is often congested.

Project:

- Widen from 4 lanes to 6.
- Add medians.
- Add side paths for walking and rolling.

Why:

- Surrounding area of corridor is already 6 lanes.
- Will reduce travel time and congestion.
- As demand increases, transit service may be added.
- Reducing congestion will reduce emissions as well.
- Easier access to recreation areas.

Discussion

- Would have preferred to look at transit first.
- Concerned about safety.
- Reduced congestion will incentivize driving, creating the same problem again in a few years.
- Traffic speed consistency between cross-sections matters.
- What about land use?
- Six lane roads are dangerous.

Context:

- Daily vehicle counts: Approx. 30,000.
- Major highway interchange.
- Near transit station.

Problem:

- Major interchange is not grade separated.
- Documented crash history.
- Peak hour delay.

Project:

- Construct grade separated interchange.
- Improve access for other modes.

Why:

- Will address immediate capacity needs.
- Will enhance mobility, improve community connections.
- Reduction in congestion will benefit air quality.
- Grade separation will remove conflicts with bikes/peds and improve safety.

Discussion

- Will improving traffic flow really improve air quality? Brake and tire dust also contribute to pollution.
- Will the new pedestrian routes be continuous or require long detours?
- Interchanges can isolate surrounding land uses from each other.

Context:

- Daily vehicle count: 15,000.
- Residential, commercial, industrial.
- Several bus routes.
- Near regional trail.
- Urban Center along east side of corridor.

Problem:

- Safe access to transit station.
- Corridor sees many severe injury and fatality crashes, including bike and pedestrian.
- Area where some of city's most vulnerable populations live.
- Unsafe connection from transit station to trail.

Project:

- Safer intersection and street engineering treatments.
- Pedestrian crossings.
- Enhanced lighting.
- Signal/operational changes proven to reduce serious crashes.

Why:

- Will support better access and connectivity to transit station.
- Will reduce serious injuries and fatalities, especially for bikes/peds.
- Will improve travel reliability.
- Will make corridor safer for people to choose other modes of travel.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by providing other travel choices.

Discussion

- The exact proposed design treatments matter here. Some “pedestrian crossing” improvements don’t improve safety all that much.
- What does the traffic calming actually look like?
- The project sounds important, but would like it to be analyzed well as it moves toward implementation.

Thank you for attending!

Email cklamm@drcog.org if I have documented anything incorrectly.