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Executive Summary

The West Central Municipal Conference (WCMC) is a membership-supported Council of Government representing 40 municipalities, 5 townships, 2 community colleges, and a zoo wholly located in Cook County or contiguous thereto. The western suburbs of Chicago have an extensive transportation system of expressways and arterials and are served by all three regional transit providers. Built into and alongside this network is a system of bicycle facilities planned by municipalities, forest preserves, and the county. Individually, many WCMC members have prepared excellence plans and maps for facilities within their municipal boundaries. The members of the WCMC see the opportunity to connect these smaller sets of facilities into a larger regional network.

For many years, the conference’s mayors have viewed bicycle planning as an important part of transportation planning, both as a mode of transportation and as a recreational activity. Various bicycle plans and maps have previously been prepared by the conference. As recently as 2007, a Bicycle Plan was updated for the Central Area Council of Mayors. This plan identified the key corridors that were to be considered cycling priorities, as well as digitized the region’s bicycle facilities to correspond with the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning’s (CMAP) region-wide bicycle database. There was not, however, a corresponding plan update for the North Central Council of Mayors. In an effort to correct this, and in anticipation of the 2011 WCMC Regional Bikeways Plan, the conference created a Bicycle Steering Committee.

This plan is a joint effort between West Central Municipal Conference (WCMC) member communities to promote and facilitate safe bicycling in our communities. The plan consists of both regional facility recommendations. This plan does not, however, offer design recommendations for any facility or final corridor alignments. The implementation of a regional bicycle facility would likely require a feasibility study, during which
final alignment decisions would be made. This document, on the other hand, offers suggestions which seek to link together all WCMC communities to both one another and other key regional destinations. In addition to alignment choices, the plan offers a series of program recommendations based on national best practices; these efforts include regulatory and policy tools, bicycle parking, education, encouragement, and regional signage.

By implementing this plan, the WCMC will improve the ability to travel safely by bicycle in our communities. Implementing the plan will improve the mobility options for all those who cannot drive or prefer not to drive every trip. This will have the added benefit of improving the livability of our communities by improving the safety and attractiveness of travel options that are geared towards local and regional activities. Finally, implementation of the plan will make our communities more attractive to potential residents, business owners, employees, and customers that seek a variety of options and a full life through an active suburban lifestyle.

Bicycling is most commonly comprised of short trips within local communities, thus this planning effort supplements and supports the existing bicycle planning efforts already undertaken on the local level. The 2012 Regional Bikeways Plan actively sought to create links between communities and facilitate mobility between communities. This plan, therefore, represents the most detailed bicycle planning effort yet prepared by the conference. Building on previous bicycle planning work and relying on the hard work of the Bicycle Steering Committee, the Active Transportation Alliance, municipal staff, and elected officials, this document will act as a guide for planning and implementing bicycle facilities in the WCMC service area.

The plan is broken down into six major sections:

Section 1 provides background on previous WCMC bicycle planning efforts. A plan was created in 2001, but in the 10 years since the last update the realities of the area changed and require a realignment of priorities; additionally, the previous plan focused on just one half of the conference.

Section 2 outlines the 2012 Bicycle Plan planning process. Beginning in June 2011, the WCMC held 4 regional bicycle planning meetings. 19 of the conference’s 40 members actively participated in the planning process.

Section 3 focuses on the regional corridors and contains the quantitative corridor ratings. Additionally, this chapter contains the bicycle plan map and municipal snapshot maps.

Section 4 offers recommendations and best practices. This chapter contains overall recommendations on regulatory and policy tools, bike racks, safety, education, encouragement, regional signage, and grant seeking.

Section 5 details implementation strategies for the identified regional corridors. In this chapter, the 17 regional corridors are divided into three implementation tiers based on the ratings analysis in Section 3. The WCMC supports implementation on each regional bicycle corridor. These tiers are presented to show which corridors had greater assets.

Section 6 is the plan’s appendix, which provides an overview of the various types of bicycle facilities and their proper implementation as well as a summary of the public engagement activities.
Regional bicycle planning efforts began at the WCMC in 1996 and resulted in a cohesive plan that included the basic framework for a network based on public outreach and perceived feasibility for the North Central Council of Mayors with another plan developed in 2001 for the Central Council of Mayors. The latter plan had three sections: the overall goals and policies for bicycling in the region, based on stakeholder priorities; the second section highlighted the recommended alignment for a regional network; while the third section detailed an implementation plan.

The plan was updated in 2007 in order to analyze progress in terms of the entire Chicago region. Using funding from the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), the main goals of the 2007 plan were to develop a subregional bikeways plan that was consistent with local plans as well as to provide CMAP with an update of municipal bicycle plans consistent with their Bicycle Information System (BIS), which could then be included in the Regional Bicycle Plan. Work was done compiling data from various GIS formats and digitizing those plans which were only in visual or written formats. The 2012 Regional Bikeways plans seeks to build upon the successes of the 2007 plan, but apply it to the entire WCMC area.
Typical local routes in western Cook County

B.I Accomplishments

The 2001 plan laid some important groundwork by establishing a set of corridors following major arterials. Additionally, the 2007 plan update was significant in that it was the first time that the regional network was established as a GIS file of public record through CMAP's Bicycle Inventory System. This allowed municipalities to make important connections for cyclists passing between towns.

B.II Shortcomings

The 2001 plan offered little in the way of implementation planning. While it identified preferred regional bicycle routes, the role of the conference, municipalities, and other partner agencies in turning these corridors into bicycle facilities was not defined. These two areas were given particular attention in the 2012 WMCB Bikeways Plan.

Additionally, as stated before, the previous plan included no provisions for bicycling through the North Central Council of Mayors area, a huge region that required inclusion in this plan.
BIKE ROUTE

TRAIL INFORMATION

Bicycle Riders
- Use single file - keeping to the right side of the trail
- Keep in your own lane
- Give warning before passing other trail users
- Obey all stop signs
- Trail is designed for a moderate recreational speed (m.p.h.)

NO SPEED TRAINING OR RACING PERMITTED

Hikers & Joggers
- Use the left side of the trail - facing oncoming traffic

Tips:
- Most shooting range and distance are available at the Forest Preserve District General Motors site
- Call 305-4401
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1.1 Focus of the Plan: Regional Corridors

Local bicycle wayfinding signage in Elmwood Park

In January 2011, the Active Transportation Alliance (Active Trans) and WCMC initiated an update to the regional bikeways plan as part of a Communities Putting Prevention to Work grant awarded through the Cook County Department of Health and Human Services. The project set out to create a unified document for bicycle planning throughout the two Council of Mayors that make up the WCMC (Central and North Central).

Additionally, the plan was given a new focus: rather than selecting roads that are the most appropriate for retrofitting, the plan prioritized corridors that made connections to regional destinations. This was somewhat of a departure from the traditional focus of many bicycle plans—especially municipal bicycle plans. The WCMC plan, however, is somewhat of a mixed approach; low-travelled roads are often the easiest to make changes to in order to accommodate bicycles, but they are low-travelled precisely because they do not make the most efficient connections possible. As a result, bicycle plans can propose a network to nowhere, diminishing the possibility of bicycling as a real transportation option.

For this plan, the main objective lay not in facility design recommendations, but rather in setting network location priorities based on servicing key regional destinations while building upon existing local assets and mitigating the effects of long-standing network barriers. This method of network creation is unique in that it does not prioritize those roads that are traditionally “bicycle friendly,” that is, low-speed and low-traffic roads. Rather, this plan takes the approach that bicycling is a viable transportation option that will grow in popularity if potential riders are given efficient and safe routes on which to bike to regular destinations. In this way, the proposed corridors would have a built-in audience, so to speak: bicyclists who would use the corridors from day one, simply because they offer a direct route to important locations throughout the region.

Additionally, although it is not the focus of this plan, the WCMC recognizes the importance of local bicycle and Complete Streets planning. This is especially important, as an effective regional bicycle network cannot rely exclusively on high traffic volume corridors—it will require arterials, connectors, and local networks to increase the attractiveness of bicycle travel and economic feasibility throughout the WCMC service area.

1.1.1 Regional Corridor Selection/Evaluation

Guided by municipal input, this plan provides a thorough evaluation of potential corridors. The evaluation began by identifying the most important employment, entertainment, and education centers in the WCMC region. Following this, steering committee members were asked to nominate corridors that would best knit these destinations together, regardless of feasibility issues. There are, of course, roads and intersections that are more dangerous to cyclists than others. These barriers exist for a number of reasons: complicated intersection design, high vehicle speed, a lack of signage, or rough roads beneath overpasses. By identifying these network barriers and their corresponding assets, a set of alternate alignments was created; these routes are much safer and more feasible than the corridors nominated, but still provide a comparable level of service for cyclists. In addition, each corridor was evaluated on connectivity to regional destinations, trail networks, and transit.

1.1.2 Regional Corridor Prioritization and Implementation

Equipped with the detailed knowledge gained through the corridor analysis and evaluations, the plan includes a three-tier system of corridor prioritization. The Tier One corridors are those with the highest regional impact and best opportunity to be implemented, while Tier Three should be regarded as long-term projects. All 16 corridors, however, are priorities for the region, and the plan recommends regional bicycle facilities on each of them; the plan categorizes those corridors with the highest potential for implementation as Tier One. Ultimately, implementation of these regional corridors will rely on local initiative and regional coordination.

The plan highlights specific implementation recommendations for the WCMC and member communities. This will include funding opportunities for corridor and project implementation and more municipal- and corridor-based planning work.
12 Outreach and Meetings

BEGINNING IN FEBRUARY 2011, the WCMC held four regional bike planning meetings. Upon completion and adoption of the plan, the planning process will have taken 11 months to complete. The conference encouraged all WCMC members to participate in the bicycle planning process. 19 of the conference’s 40 members actively participated in the planning process.

Active Trans spent THE EARLY PART OF 2011 building a list of municipal bike contacts and cataloging local bike plans. Additionally, after a request by Active Trans, the WCMC created a new, ad hoc Bicycle Steering Committee, whose members made up the steering committee for this plan.

On APRIL 10, 2011, the WCMC held a steering committee meeting for the planning process, and invited all member municipalities to attend. Fifteen members participated in the meeting where the WCMC and Active Trans outlined the planning process and shared the goals and objectives of the planning process. The steering committee was also given an opportunity to identify the broad policy goals and priorities that would guide the development of the plan and the recommendations outlined. Additionally, this meeting also contained an important working session, which helped to identify essential bicycle corridors, the most important destinations in the region, as well as key pedestrian zones.

On MAY 10, 2011, the steering committee met once again to review the work completed at the previous meeting. Active Trans staff created detailed maps of the ideas brought forth so that committee members could more easily visualize how their nominated corridors interacted with the regional destinations. Following this, another working session was conducted; committee members were asked to identify major physical barriers and assets towards creating a regional bicycle network. After taking note of where the largest barriers were, the committee members were asked to redefine the corridors as nominated and realign them to avoid barriers, where possible, while still taking advantage of the assets.

Following this meeting, Active Trans staff evaluated the corridors as amended and made further changes in order to maximize network connectivity and better align with other bicycle routes from the City of Chicago and other neighboring Councils of Mayors. After finalizing the corridors, Active Trans staff undertook two major plan elements: corridor analysis and public outreach. The analysis section consisted of creating a proximity study to understand what relevant community assets are within a half-mile radius of a proposed corridor. Likewise, a surveying effort was made to understand residential priorities as it related to those corridors, barriers, assets, and regional destinations. Harnessing Google Maps for surveying is a unique undertaking for both Active Trans and the field of urban planning in general. The benefits of this technology became apparent immediately. Users were able to focus on specific intersections that were not immediately familiar to them; they could zoom in to a very fine scale and even explore the area using the street view feature. In this way, it is hoped that these maps increased the quality of resident responses and decreased the frequency of “no opinion” responses. Although this was the first time that Active Trans has used this tool for surveying, it is a much more powerful and interactive tool than static mapping and is something that will continue to be built upon for future plan-making endeavors.

The next meeting occurred on NOVEMBER 2, 2011, when steering committee members reviewed both the corridor analysis and the public engagement report. Additionally, the Active Trans staff solicited comments from the steering committee regarding a series of tiered recommendations compiled by Active Trans staff. The steering committee requested that information regarding trail connections for each corridor be included in the implementation section of the plan. Steering committee members made additional recommendations for raising or lowering a corridor’s priority based on their local expertise.

On FEBRUARY 29TH, 2012, the steering committee met once again to review the final draft plan. After reviewing the document, the steering committee passed a vote recommending that the plan be formally adopted by the WCMC Transportation Board.

Finally, on APRIL 11, 2012, the steering committee-approved Regional Bikeways Plan was presented to the WCMC Transportation Board, which reviewed the draft bike plan and recommended its approval by the WCMC Board. Following that meeting the plan was presented to the WCMC Executive Board reviewed and recommended approval of the draft bike plan by the full WCMC Board.

The survey, comprised of 11 questions, asked respondents to rank a series of questions, including the importance of nominated corridors, alternate alignment changes, barriers, assets, and regional destinations. The survey, comprised of 11 questions, asked respondents to rank a series of questions, including the importance of nominated corridors, alternate alignment changes, barriers, assets, and regional destinations. Harnessing Google Maps for surveying is a unique undertaking for both Active Trans and the field of urban planning in general. The benefits of this technology became apparent immediately. Users were able to focus on specific intersections that were not immediately familiar to them; they could zoom in to a very fine scale and even explore the area using the street view feature. In this way, it is hoped that these maps increased the quality of resident responses and decreased the frequency of “no opinion” responses. Although this was the first time that Active Trans has used this tool for surveying, it is a much more powerful and interactive tool than static mapping and is something that will continue to be built upon for future plan-making endeavors.

On NOVEMBER 2, 2011, when steering committee members reviewed both the corridor analysis and the public engagement report. Additionally, the Active Trans staff solicited comments from the steering committee regarding a series of tiered recommendations compiled by Active Trans staff. The steering committee requested that information regarding trail connections for each corridor be included in the implementation section of the plan. Steering committee members made additional recommendations for raising or lowering a corridor’s priority based on their local expertise.

On FEBRUARY 29TH, 2012, the steering committee met once again to review the final draft plan. After reviewing the document, the steering committee passed a vote recommending that the plan be formally adopted by the WCMC Transportation Board.

Finally, on APRIL 11, 2012, the steering committee-approved Regional Bikeways Plan was presented to the WCMC Transportation Board, which reviewed the draft bike plan and recommended its approval by the WCMC Board. Following that meeting the plan was presented to the WCMC Executive Board reviewed and recommended approval of the draft bike plan by the full WCMC Board.
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Facing: Cook County Forest Preserve trails
Active transportation is an essential part of creating healthy communities, and the interdependence between transportation, land use, and the environment is supported by a national trend toward integrated planning and funding. In 2009, the federal government formed the Partnership for Sustainable Communities to represent the planning interests of the U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). These agencies are now coordinating funding and planning initiatives to assure a greater impact of tax dollars in communities. Active transportation planning and policy can secure transportation, housing, and environmental funding.

The benefits of investing in active transportation facilities accrue for everyone. These benefits can be profound for individuals and families who do not have access to motorized transportation. Providing active transportation facilities gives this population access to essential goods and services.

Growth in population also requires a multifaceted approach to assure quality of life in urbanized areas. The Chicago Metropolis 2020 plan estimated that population growth in the Chicago region could result in one million additional cars in the area by 2030. CMAP’s GO TO 2040 Plan aims to reduce the impacts of these trends through strategic transportation investment. The plan estimates that by 2040, the region will have 2.4 million new residents, but aims to maintain the current impact of congestion on the transportation system.

These regional trends demonstrate the need for the WCMC to implement best practices and support municipal members in implementing best practices. The following sections outline regulatory and policy tools that can help coordinate and implement new bicycle facilities. Special attention is given to Complete Streets policy, as this is a useful tool to build organizational support for the design of bicycle networks and facilities.

### 2.1 Best Practices: Active Transportation Planning

#### 2.1.1 Regulatory and Policy Tools

**Zoning, development and land use regulations**

When municipalities require new developments to be accessible by foot, by bike and by transit, more people who use the facilities will engage in healthy, active transportation. Installing features such as pedestrian routes through parking lots and bike parking facilities make it easier for residents to get moving while getting around.

**Some examples of zoning, development and land use policies that encourage active transportation:**

- Require that new multi-family housing developments provide secure and convenient bike parking, much like the parking spaces required for residents’ cars.
- Require that new retail developments provide pedestrian facilities like sidewalks that connect storefronts to the public right-of-way for safer accessibility on foot.
- Require that new industrial and office developments provide lockers and showers to encourage active transportation among employees.

Once municipalities adopt these regulations, the zoning and planning officials can develop regulations to promote accessibility, and establish compliance incentives and/or penalties.

**Steps for evaluating and creating zoning changes:**

- Analyze existing zoning.
- Identify improvements and draft appropriate language changes.
- Conduct community outreach workshops and brainstorming sessions.
- Develop procedures for implementation.
- Provide training for enforcement staff.
2.1 Best Practices: Non-Motorized Transportation Planning

A gazebo alongside a bike path in Countryside

Safe Park Zones

Under Illinois law, municipalities can set higher fines for speeding and disobeying traffic signals when children are using parks (the practice is similar to establishing Safe School Zones). Municipalities can fund infrastructure upgrades and park district pedestrian safety projects with revenue from these fines. Creating safe, accessible public parks spurs physical activity among residents by encouraging the use of recreation facilities and by making it easier for residents to visit the parks on foot and by bike.

Municipalities can adopt policies to establish Safe Park Zones on streets adjacent to parks. A good strategy is to post permanent warning signs. The municipality also can establish a code for Safe Park Zones violations and ensure that local police give priority to enforcing these zones. Municipalities may also want to create a funding transfer process to ensure that the park district benefits from the funds.


Steps to evaluate and create Safe Park Zones:

- Identify best places to designate as safe park zones.
- Draft initial safe park zone policy.
- Develop procedures for implementing policy.
- Provide training for municipal, park district and enforcement staff.
- Conduct community outreach workshops and brainstorming sessions.
- Manage the production and installation of safe park zone signage.

School Travel Plans

School travel plans analyze and develop solutions for physical and social barriers to walking and bicycling to school. Solutions may include new infrastructure, like sidewalks and crosswalks, as well as safety programming for students.

Drawing up a school travel plan is an essential step in getting funding for programming and infrastructure that encourages biking and walking to school. In order for schools to receive federal Safe Routes to School funding through the Illinois Department of Transportation, the school must have a school travel plan. Active Trans coordinates the state-wide Safe Routes to School Network, and conducts workshops for schools on how to complete school travel plans and apply for Safe Routes to School funding.


http://www.dot.il.gov/saferoutes/saferouteshome.aspx

Steps to create school travel plans:

- Create travel plans for schools and/or districts.
- Conduct community outreach workshops, brainstorming sessions and walking audits.
- Provide assistance with preparation of Safe Routes to School funding applications.
2.1 Best Practices: Non-Motorized Transportation Planning

Inter-Jurisdictional Cooperation

Fostering cooperation among governments is always important, but is especially true when planning for bicycle facilities that stretch through multiple jurisdictions. This can be accomplished in a number of ways. The first step could be to create a standing Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force which would advocate for the implementation of this Bikeways Plan and other bicycle issues at the regional level. Similarly, this Task Force would promote unified goals when applying for grants and other project applications, such as STP funding.

These cooperative efforts can also extend to agreements for joint purchasing or joint use. Purchasing agreements allow multiple governments to purchase single items, such as bicycle racks, in bulk in order to reduce the cost. Similarly, Joint Use Agreements allow municipalities to pool their money in order to construct a single facility for multiple jurisdictions.

Transportation Funding

Planning efforts are a key element to seeing bicycle infrastructure on these WCMC corridors. Both council of mayors that make up the WCMC area have access to a dedicated source of transportation funding: the Surface Transportation Program (STP), which grades potential projects and awards points to them according to criteria defined by the Council of Mayors. As it stands currently, however, projects are not rewarded for containing multi-modal or bicycle elements. There are a number of ways this could be remedied, such as reserving a certain percentage of funds specifically for multi-modal or bicycle projects. Revising the criteria to grant points for including bicycle infrastructure, however, is likely the easiest method. Doing this will help to foster the inclusion of bicycle facilities in the reconstruction of roads that would otherwise have not included them and is a positive step towards a mentality shift regarding bicycles in the region.

2.1.2 Model Complete Streets Policies

Complete Streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities should be able to safely move along and across a complete street. A Complete Streets policy ensures that transportation agencies routinely design and operate the entire right-of-way to enable safe access for all users: drivers, transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists, as well as older people, children, and people with disabilities.

Since control over roadways, roadway construction, and maintenance often crosses over multiple jurisdictions, implementing policies at various levels of government is a good way to ensure that all projects can be coordinated to meet the Complete Streets policy goals. Cook County currently has an ordinance that supports Complete Streets. The State of Illinois, the City of Chicago, and DuPage County also have policies in place. County and municipal Complete Streets policies can help to coordinate local planning with IDOT and county road planning efforts. The WCMC has a role to play in the regional coordination of the Complete Streets Policy implementation. Nationally, there are many other municipalities and counties that have supported and adopted Complete Streets policies.

The WCMC should support a Complete Streets policy and consider adopting a policy at the conference level. Some reasons to support a Complete Streets policy:

- Transportation equity – The elderly, children and economically disadvantaged do not have access to private automobiles, and are frequently underserved by traditional mobility-based transportation planning.
- Choice and accessibility – Many people want to make the choice to use active transportation but the network currently undervalues this form of transportation.
- Safety benefits – Designing streets for bicycle and pedestrian access reduces vehicular conflicts and related crashes. Improved lighting can also reduce crime.
- Health benefits – Active transportation options are the best way to integrate exercise into daily activity. These facilities can help to reduce the effects of obesity and other chronic diseases like diabetes and heart disease.
- Environmental benefits – Human power is clean power. Complete Streets allow for the shifting of trips from single vehicle occupancy to non-motorized travel, directly reducing CO2 pollution.
- Economic benefits – Many studies have shown a positive correlation between increasing land values and proximity to trails. Additionally, the federal government has been...
taking steps to integrate bicycle and pedestrian planning into livability criteria for funding distributed from the EPA, DOT, and HUD.

Additionally, the WCMC should encourage member municipalities to adopt local Complete Streets policies. This means municipalities would commit to accommodating pedestrian and bicycle traffic in all new transportation projects whenever appropriate; this includes the design of new facilities and the improvement of existing facilities. Complete Streets infrastructure examples include: building sidewalks, striping bike lanes, and designing streets for safer, slower vehicle speeds. To implement the policy, municipalities must ensure that planners and engineers are trained in the principles of Complete Streets design. Local non-motorized transportation plans should be created or revised to include the Complete Streets standards as defined by the State of Illinois and Cook County.

Whether adopted by ordinance or by executive order, Complete Streets policies are flexible, but far-reaching within a given area of governance. They can refer to detailed guidelines or be a simple statement of policy and related goals. Some key players to involve in creating a municipal policy include the mayor or city manager, city council members, and municipal transportation planners and engineers.

Following accepted best practices, the WCMC should draft and adopt a Complete Streets policy and draft model local policy language to assist member municipalities. A good policy will support professionals and decision makers when integrating the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders into day-to-day transportation planning. A Complete Streets policy allows the WCMC to “build in” access to and from the network, creating overall safer streets and encouraging residents to leave their automobiles parked, reducing car traffic throughout the WCMC. A complete street has no predefined facilities requirements, but rather supports planning initiatives and design processes.

Resources: Complete Streets Coalition’s guide to policy elements: http://www.completestreets.org/changing-policy/policy-elements/
2.2 Partners

“Wave” style bicycle racks on curb bump outs in Forest Park

Much of WCMC priority regional corridor network is controlled by IDOT or Cook County. To assist in coordination of improvements, the conference should partner with municipal agencies to integrate these corridors into local plans and encourage IDOT and county agencies to support bicycle improvements on these corridors. Success in some cases will take many years. The near-term recommendation is for the WCMC to immediately begin communicating with the counties and state its needs to better accommodate cyclists and pedestrians on the priority corridors. The WCMC should begin aggressively prioritizing the implementation of bike facilities on these corridors. It should use its influence as a regional planning organization to coordinate with county and state road improvement and maintenance priorities, and find opportunities to implement these recommendations with other agencies’ projects.
2.3 Bike Racks

Repurposing a parking space for “inverted-u” style bicycle parking in Oak Park.

Throughout the WCMC region, install inverted-u or functionally similar parking racks at public buildings and parks, and on publicly owned property near businesses and multi-unit residences. Racks should be located within clear view of the destination’s entrance way, and preferably as close as the closest motor vehicle parking space—no more than 50 feet away.

Initially, bike parking installation should focus on existing public buildings, schools, forest preserves and parks, and locations where cyclists are found to be underserved in terms of capacity, convenience or security.

Remaining rack installations should be driven by resident and merchant request. Racks should be installed on public property whenever feasible.

Communities within the WCMC benefit from adopting a bicycle parking ordinance that mandates new construction and development to include bicycle parking per WCMC specifications.
### Bicycle parking location and design.

(a) The location of required bicycle parking spaces shall be located within 40 feet of a building entrance. If there is no such feasible location within 40 feet of a building entrance then an alternate location may be utilized with the approval of the Director of Community Development or designee.

(b) Directional signage shall be provided if the parking spaces are not readily visible from a building entrance.

(c) In the spaces provided, there shall be a bicycle rack(s) which will allow a bicycle to be secured in 2 locations on the frame. The style of said rack is subject to approval by the Director of Community Development or designee. The bicycle rack that is utilized must be installed per the manufacturer's specifications and the parking pad for the space shall be constructed of concrete.

(d) The minimum size for a single parking space is 2 feet by 6 feet, with a 5-foot wide access aisle, running parallel with the short side of the required spaces. A sidewalk adjacent to the space may serve as the access aisle.

(Ord. No. 05-9-C-3383, § 7, 9-6-2005)

Sec. 118-222. - Required number of bicycle parking spaces.

(a) Bicycle parking shall be required for all new construction or when a change in use results in the requirement for additional off-street motor vehicle parking.

(b) The minimum number of required off-street bicycle parking spaces shall be determined as a percentage of the required number of off-street motor vehicle parking spaces listed in Section 118-210, according to the following use categories.

(1) Residential and lodging uses. Residences within transit oriented developments (TODs) shall provide bicycle parking spaces equivalent to 15 percent of motor vehicle parking requirements with a minimum of 1 space. Multifamily residences not in TODs and all other uses shall provide 10 percent of motor vehicle parking requirements with a minimum of 1 space. Detached, duplex, 2-unit multifamily, and townhouse residences shall be exempt from bicycle parking requirements.

(2) Schools, places of worship, institutions, auditoriums and other places of assembly. The minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required is 5 percent of motor vehicle parking requirements, with a minimum of 1 space. Schools shall provide a number of spaces equal to 10 percent of the number of students.

(3) Recreational uses, commercial or noncommercial. The minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required is 10 percent of motor vehicle requirements, with a minimum of 3 spaces.

(4) Business (office), commercial (retail) and industrial uses. The minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required is 5 percent of motor vehicle parking requirements, with a minimum of 1 space.

(5) Uses in B4 Regional Shopping district. The minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required is 5 percent of motor vehicle parking requirements.

(6) Other uses. Bicycle parking spaces for other permitted uses not listed in subsections (1) through (4) of this section shall be provided in accordance with requirements designated by the Skokie Plan Commission and, in the case of special uses, as recommended by the Skokie Plan Commission and adopted by the Mayor and Board of Trustees.

(c) Where the motor vehicle parking requirements are determined by the Plan Commission, the Commission shall also determine bicycle parking requirements.

(d) The required bicycle parking spaces for a multi-tenant commercial or industrial development may be combined at one location on the site provided that the total number of spaces is not less than the required sum for the combined square footage of all of the tenants, and the location is within 200 feet of each tenant entrance. If space is not available on a site to provide the required number of bicycle parking spaces, the Director of Community Development or designee may determine that fewer or no spaces be provided.

(Ord. No. 05-9-C-3383, § 8, 9-6-2005)
2.4 Safety/Education/Encouragement

**Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Education**

The WCMC should partner with regional bicycle education instructors to train and encourage the public to bike and walk more and to do so safely. Instructors provide face-to-face demonstrations to youth, teens, and adults at community events and special programs. Instructors can work with partners in the community to identify and address local transportation safety concerns. The plan recommends partnering with instructors for a number of demonstrations in a season.

**Safe Routes to School**

The WCMC Bicycle Steering Committee should support member municipalities in organizing Safe Routes to School teams at local schools that involve stakeholders such as parents, police, and public works officials. These teams, once established, should assess improvements to the physical walking and biking environment that are needed and determine the encouragement, education, and enforcement solutions that will increase the number of children walking and biking. Bicycle safety programs should be considered at all schools. The WCMC Bicycle Steering Committee should encourage schools to develop regular and sustainable bicycling education programs. The WCMC and local schools could partner with the Active Transportation Alliance for necessary Safe Routes to School training, facilitation, resources, and materials. The Active Transportation Alliance offers training for local committees, curriculum for integration into school lesson plans, and a biking and walking encouragement activity guide to assist with encouragement programs. IDOT and the Safe Routes to School program can also provide safety education materials to reinforce bike safety messages.

**Law Enforcement**

Enforcing traffic laws that improve the safety of bicycling is another important part of achieving a safe and comprehensive bike system. Police officers are best equipped to respond to bicycle safety and enforcement issues when appropriate training has been provided and local ordinances provide clear, reasonable guidance on enforcement issues.

The WCMC should support local police departments in providing introductory and ongoing trainings on enforcement of the traffic laws that create a safe bicycling environment. Providing such trainings at a central location would be a great way to reach many departments with one coordinated training event. The curriculum should include:

- Rules of the road for bicyclists
- Illegal motorist behaviors that endanger bicyclists
- Most dangerous types of bicycling behaviors
- Most common causes of bicycle crashes
- Importance of reporting bicycle crashes
- Importance of investigating serious bicycle crash sites
- Best ways to prevent bicycle theft
- Advantages to policing by bicycle
- Transportation, health and environmental benefits of bicycling

The WCMC should encourage municipalities to designate a police liaison to communicate with the bicycling community, coordinate bicycle safety and enforcement training to the department, and provide updates to the WCMC Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee.

In consultation with the police liaisons, the WCMC Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee could make recommendations to WCMC municipalities on ways to adapt and amend ordinances for the purpose of promoting and enforcing a safe environment. Active Trans can provide training and resource materials.
2.4 Safety/Education/Encouragement

Bicycle Map

A regional bicycle map update can encourage bicycle use by promoting existing on-street bicycle routes and identifying bicycle-friendly routes to important and popular destinations such as parks, schools, libraries, forest preserves, and business districts. Copies can be mailed to residents and included in new resident packets. Consider private-sector sponsorship for printing the map.

The WCMC can work with municipal agencies such as public works departments and chambers of commerce to design and publish free bicycle maps each spring that include recommended street routes.

Bike to Work Week

Bike to Work Week gives bicycle commuters and non-commuters alike the chance to learn more about traveling by bicycle. This is a regional promotion coordinated by Active Trans that is free and easy to participate in. Participating agencies and businesses encourage employees to bike all or part of their commutes during Bike to Work Week. Bicycle commuting enables office workers to fit regular exercise into their busy, but often sedentary, work routines. People who exercise, including walking or biking to work, are healthier and more energetic. This translates to employer cost savings: greater productivity, less sick leave time, fewer worker compensation claims, and lower overall health-care costs.

The WCMC can work with municipal park districts to create encouragement and education programs that challenge business and public agency employees to bicycle to work.

Shop by Bike

Shop by Bike programs encourage residents to take their bikes on short errands to local shops, which help add physical activity to residents’ daily routines, relieves parking issues, and supports local businesses. With Shop by Bike, retailers offer discounts and/or promotions for shoppers on bike. The Bicycle Advisory Committee should pursue partnerships with the retailers and restaurants to encourage shopping by bike in the WCMC region. Bicycle education instructors should offer Shop by Bike classes twice yearly and educate merchants on the advantages of attracting and accommodating bicycle-riding customers and staff. Adequate bicycle parking is an important prerequisite for a successful Shop by Bike program; bicycle parking needs should be assessed before the program begins. Temporary bicycle parking, provided through portable bicycle racks or by roping off monitored bicycle corrals, can be sufficient for special events.
2.4 Safety/Education/Encouragement

Car-Free Day

Car-Free Days are fun events that promote car-free travel for local errands and trips. Programming can include:

- Closing three to four streets to car traffic, and perhaps creating a rectangular network providing access to all parts of a city’s downtown
- Inviting merchants to offer special discounts to participants
- Offering bicycling classes leading up to the event through a bicycling ambassadors program

The WCIC Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee can work with several partner agencies, including municipal park districts, police departments and public works departments to designate one day each year for special programming that encourages residents to bike or walk for local trips.

Bicycle Fleets

Encouraging WCIC staff and municipal staff to use bicycles for work travel can be considerably cheaper and often more effective than using automobiles. Employees will have better contact with residents in the neighborhoods. Using bicycles for work also improves employee health and fitness. Using bicycle safety instructors, WCIC should offer annual classes for member municipality employees covering basic bike safety, simple roadside maintenance, and commuting/carrying by bike. These classes will also provide a benefit to WCIC staff.

Bicycle Sharing Program

A bicycle sharing program like the B-Cycle bike share program recently launched in downtown Chicago will encourage bicycle use for short-term transportation and recreation around the in the region, and could be a draw for visitors as well. Patrons can check out bikes from automated kiosks. A credit card or debit card is usually required as a deposit. There is commonly no charge for the first 30 minutes, and a nominal charge is applied after that. The costs for the program are covered by a combination of sponsorship, advertising and user fees.

The WCIC Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee should work to secure a vendor to manage a bike sharing program located at the commuter rail stations and regional destinations.
Bicycle Network Signage

Use accepted standards for bicycle route signage that identifies the bicycle network and communicates destination, distance and direction. A regional signage network that focuses on wayfinding for selected regional destinations and the regional priority corridors can work well with municipal signage. Municipal signage can focus on low traffic residential and collector streets, that, when combined with bicycle route signage, can become a solid basis for local bike circulation. WCMC regional signage can focus on improving arterial streets on the recommended network to improve multi-jurisdictional connectivity to expand the travel choices for bicyclists. Appropriate signage on these streets provides useful service to experienced riders and normalizes the presence of cyclists for the thousands of drivers who use the routes daily. This plan recommends signing the regional corridors as a near-term priority.

Awareness Signage

The WCMC should create and install “gateway” signage that utilizes “emotional intelligence” tactics to influence and set expectations for driver behavior. Emotional intelligence messages have proven to positively affect human behavior in many settings worldwide. The signs should be focused on placemaking at regional destinations. Signs will help indicate the areas that are prioritized for pedestrians and cyclists.

These signs are not a substitute for bicycle accommodations through good road design. But well-crafted signs can bring modest improvements in road-sharing behavior and will visibly remind residents, who often utilize all modes of travel, of the important role bicycling can play in creating livable communities.

Traffic Signal Pavement Detector Signs

Place consistent markings at signalized intersections utilizing vehicle detector loops to show cyclists where to place their bike for the loop to detect. Where detector loops in the pavement are used, consistent markings showing where to position a bicycle help increase bicycle awareness and improve service to bicyclists. Bicycle detection should be considered when replacing or installing detector loops. The proposed WCMC priority regional corridors incorporate key signalized intersections at high-traffic cross-streets to help cyclists cross more safely, quickly and conveniently. Some traffic signal loop detectors will not detect a bicyclist regardless of the bike’s position. These loop detectors should be adjusted within reasonable limits to detect most cyclists and should also be a near term priority.
2.6 Grant Seeking

2.6.1 ITEP

**Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program**

The Illinois Transportation Enhancements Program (ITEP) is administered by IDOT. ITEP funds bicycle and pedestrian facilities, traffic-calming strategies, bicycle education programs, and transportation-related beautification and restoration projects. It is an annual program, with no fixed award cycle or calls for projects. ITEP requires 20 percent local matching funds. Program information: www.dot.il.gov/opp/itep.html.

2.6.2 CMAQ

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program**

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality program (CMAQ) is an annual program administered by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning that funds transportation facilities and programs. Recently, CMAQ considered the implementation of GO TO 2040 Comprehensive Regional Plan in its program development process. Programming procedures are currently being reviewed to improve program implementation. Program information: www.cmap.illinois.gov.

2.6.3 STP

**Surface Transportation Program**

Surface Transportation Program (STP) assists municipalities with local surface transportation improvements to federally authorized urban (FAU) routes. Programmed annually, STP can be used for constructing on-street bicycle facilities and traffic-calming strategies on FAU routes, pedestrian facilities, off-street multi-use trails, and bicycle parking. This program is administered by the mayors conferences. In the WCMC, these funds are managed by the Central and North Central Councils of Mayors. STP funds can be used to prioritize funding of the projects outlined in this plan. STP typically funds up to 70 percent of project costs.

2.6.5 HSIP

**Highway Safety Improvement Program**

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is an annual grant program administered by IDOT. The program allocates funds to projects that propose solutions to correct a documented history of crashes involving serious injuries. These funds are available for all transportation projects, including bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Funds are allocated at a 90 percent level, with a 10 percent local match. Funding covers all phases of engineering, construction, and implementation, and it is available for educational activities.

2.6.6 GCPF

**Grade Crossing Protection Fund**

The Grade Crossing Protection Fund (GCPF) is an annual grant program administered by the Illinois Commerce Commission (ICC) and appropriated by IDOT. The fund was created to assist local jurisdictions in paying for improvements at highway-railroad crossings of local streets. Funds are typically allocated at 60 percent for grade separations and 85 percent for warning devices. Funds are only available for local projects.

2.6.7 Energy Efficiency Grants

**Illinois Department of Natural Resources**

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) offer grants to improve energy efficiency. Although these programs have a broad scope, some bicycle and pedestrian improvements and activities may qualify for funding. These programs can be monitored to ensure that all opportunities for funding are being explored.

2.6.8 Other

**Local and County Funding**

Many of the federal- and state-managed funding sources require local match funds. Coalitions can be built between jurisdictions with the support of county government to prioritize the network and garner the support of funding agencies. The ability to show local capacity to supply matching funds will help support applications for the above mentioned programs. These partnerships should be formed in advance. This plan provides details about the agencies that need to partner on the implementation of each of the WCMC regional priority corridors.

Please note these funding sources are current as of March, 2012.
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**Facing:** Forest Park CTA station
The WCMC Bicycle Committee developed a ratings system to present information about each of the corridors and assist with project evaluation and system context. The ratings system can be used as a reference during project implementation. Additionally, this information formed the basis for the development of priority tiers discussed in Chapter 4. This information provides a quick corridor-wide reference for municipal and conference efforts to seek funding for particular segments within the corridor.

A quick note is needed regarding the naming conventions of the plan’s recommended alignments. Each corridor is given a basic title based on the primary street it is expected to service, regardless of the final corridor alignment. The Mannheim Road corridor, for example, is largely routed on to the lower-traffic Brainard Avenue south of I-290, but is still called “Mannheim Road” throughout the document for simplicity’s sake. Should a corridor fall along two major roads they are simply assigned each corridor’s name (Cermak Road/26th Street, for example). This decision was made, in part, by the nature of this plan: specifically that these are not expected to act as final alignment choices but rather as a guide for future design decisions.
The WCMC Bicycle Steering Committee identified the following indicators:

- How many municipalities are involved? – Provides the number and list of municipalities that the corridor spans.
- How many member municipalities involved? – Provides the number and list of WCMC member municipalities that the corridor spans. Additionally, provides a percentage of members to non-member municipalities.
- Percent of corridor existing – Provides the percent of each corridor that is actually already built and can be utilized today as an anchor in the regional system.
- Percent of corridor programmed – Provides the percent of each corridor that is currently programmed for funding. This could be either in a local capital improvement plan or in the regional Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).
- Percent of corridor planned – Provides the percent of each corridor that is included in an adopted local or regional plan. Provides the percent of a corridor that is included in an adopted local or regional plan, or is currently programmed for funding. This could be either in a local capital improvement plan or in the regional Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).
- New WCMC recommendation? (yes/no and percent) – Provides the percent of each corridor that has been newly identified by this planning process. In most cases, these sections of the corridors link gaps between two previously planned or existing corridors.
- Resident rating (rating out of 4.0 and low priority/priority/high priority) – Provides a qualitative rating from the survey where residents responded to the question: “Please rank the proposed transportation corridors in terms of their importance to the regional connectivity.”
- Connections to regional destinations (good/fair/poor) – Provides a qualitative assessment of the corridor’s connectivity to the regional destinations identified by the task force and lists the destinations that fall within one-half mile of the corridor.
- Connections to trail networks (good/fair/poor) – Provides a qualitative assessment of the corridor’s connectivity to the regional trail network and lists the trails or trail systems that the corridor intersects.
- Connections to/from rail and bus transit (good/fair/poor) – Provides a qualitative assessment of the corridor’s connectivity to the transit system and lists the stations that fall within one-half mile of the corridor, as well as the bus and train lines that the corridor intersects.
- Directness (good/fair/poor) – Provides a qualitative assessment of how direct the corridor is between its termini. Corridors that follow straight paths rank higher than corridors that weave.

- Parks in Proximity – Provides the number of parks within half a mile of the proposed corridor.
- Schools in Proximity – Provides the number of elementary and secondary schools within half a mile of the proposed corridor.
- Barriers – Provides a list of the significant barriers that prevent bicycle connectivity along the corridor.
- Assets – Provides a list of the significant assets that aid bicycle connectivity along the corridor.
### 3.1 Ratings Overview

The table below summarizes the results of the ratings system. Individual corridor snapshots are presented in the following section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New WCMC recommendation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.1 Ratings Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>No Rating</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>No Rating</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3.2 Corridor Snapshots

### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: 25th Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>45.37%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>54.63%</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>Direct route with minimal alignment changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Prairie Path; Salt Creek Greenway Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace | 21     | -       | Good     | CTA Stops: None
| Connections to proposed corridors                | 9      | -       | Good     | 31st St., Cermak Rd./26th St., Chicago Ave., Grand Ave., Joliet Rd., Prairie Path/Madison Ave., North Ave., Ogden Ave., Washington Ave. |
| Schools in proximity                             | 34     | -       | Good     |                                                                                  |
| Parks in proximity                               | 5      | -       | Poor     |                                                                                  |

### 25th Avenue

The 25th Avenue Corridor (and all associated roadways) is the longest bicycle route identified in the plan, stretching nearly 15 miles. It moves through a large number of WCMC communities—nine total—although it does not lie in close proximity to any of the key regional destinations identified in the outreach. It does, however, have excellent proximity to the parks and schools of the region, as well as making 21 public transit connections.

The road itself is four lanes, with a variable median-left turn lane and an average daily traffic (ADT) count between 11,000 and 17,000, making it a strong candidate for a retrofit. There is a potentially large barrier for this corridor: The bridge over the Eisenhower Expressway (I-290) has been identified as a particularly dangerous one. Likewise, the intersection of 47th Street and East Avenue (also part of the corridor) is currently a hazard to bicyclists and would need to be addressed.
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3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: 31st Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brookfield, La Grange Park, Riverside, Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brookfield, La Grange Park, Riverside, Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>7,189.54</td>
<td>29.94%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>9,432.23</td>
<td>39.28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>7,389.49</td>
<td>30.78%</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Direct route with minimal alignment changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Brookfield Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Salt Creek Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CTA Stops: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metra Stops: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pace Routes: 330, 331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Mannheim Rd., Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor access to the Salt Creek Trail on 31st St., poor access to the Salt Creek Trail on Wolf Rd., Cook County Forest Preserve needs improved signage for safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Trail bridge over the Salt Creek near La Grange Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31st Street

The 31st Street corridor is a short but important one, as per the results of the resident survey, because it links the highest ranked destination in the area — the Brookfield Zoo — to downtown Riverside and the Salt Creek Trail and the Des Plaines River Trail. In terms of road typology, the corridor is generally well-suited for bicycle traffic, with two travel lanes in each direction and an ADT count between 12,000 and 14,000. In terms of making other connections, the corridor does not excel, lying in proximity to only four transit stops, eight schools, and three parks.

In selecting this corridor, there was only one major network barrier: poor access to the Salt Creek Trail near 31st Street. Additionally, in attempting to identify an alternate alignment, it became apparent that none of the roads parallel to 31st Street ran the length of the corridor.
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3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Cermak Road/26th Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Broadview, Cicero, Hillside, North Riverside, Riverside, Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Broadview, Cicero, Hillside, North Riverside, Riverside, Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>25,544.90</td>
<td>54.77%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>21,094.43</td>
<td>45.23%</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Direct route with minimal alignment changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>North Riverside Mall, Westbrook Corporate Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Salt Creek Trail, Des Plaines River Trail, Route 66 Heritage Trail, proposed Chicago Central and Pacific Trail is within half a mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Harlem Ave., Mannheim Rd., Ridgeland Ave., Route 66 Connector, Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor access to the Salt Creek Trail on 31st St., poor access to the Salt Creek Trail on Wolf Rd., Cook County Forest Preserve needs improved signage for safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Trail bride over the Salt Creek near La Grange Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cermak Road/26th Street

In the nomination phase, Cermak Road was identified as a potential corridor for bicycling. However, it is a well-travelled road with four lanes, a variable turning lane, and diagonal parking on both sides through Cicero, as well as an ADT count between 30,000 and 40,000. These features—especially the diagonal parking—make bicycling along this road a dangerous proposition. For this reason, the corridor was aligned along 26th Street (ADT of 14,500) through Berwyn and Cicero before being routed onto a potential rails-to-trails corridor that would reconnect it to Cermak Road west of First Avenue, where traffic is lighter. This path would take the corridor through seven WCMC communities while coming into proximity to two regional destinations, 30 schools, and seven parks, and making 19 connections to transit.

This alignment has a significant barrier given the presence of high volume and high speed on Cermak Road, issues that would require infrastructure investments to overcome—especially at the intersection of Cermak Road and La Grange Road.
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3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Des Plaines River Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>30,764.26</td>
<td>41.80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>2,103.79</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>8,635.39</td>
<td>11.73%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>32,086.51</td>
<td>43.60%</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>There are no alignment changes, although the trail itself is indirect and extremely circuitous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Brookfield Zoo, Dominican University, Downtown Riverside, Loyola University Hospital, Maywood Park, Triton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Prairie Path, Salt Creek Trail, corridor itself is part of the Des Plaines River Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>25th St., Harlem Ave., Mannheim Rd., Ridgeland Ave., Route 66 Connector, Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Trail is surrounded by Forest Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor access to the Salt Creek Trail near Brookfield Zoo, poor access to the Prairie Path off First Ave., poor access to the Des Plaines River Trail off First Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bike trail near the Des Plaines River in Lyons; connection between the Prairie Path into Forest Park; pedestrian and bicycle bridge over the Des Plaines River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Des Plaines River Trail

During the nomination process, First Avenue was identified as a key corridor that could link the region. First Avenue, however, is an extremely dangerous road for bicyclists, as it is a six-lane road with a variable left-turn lane with a high ADT count between 35,000 to 40,000. In identifying alternate alignments, Active Transportation Alliance staff felt that the best option would be to reroute the corridor to the nearby Des Plaines River Trail. Currently, the trail is as yet incomplete and extends from the WCMC’s northern border to North Avenue, although there are ongoing plans by the Cook County Forest Preserve to extend it south as far as Ogden Avenue in Lyons.

In terms of creating linkages, this corridor is one of the strongest, with the trail running through 11 WCMC communities and close to six major regional destinations, including Brookfield Zoo, Dominican University, Downtown Riverside, Loyola University Hospital, Maywood Park, and Triton College. Additionally, the trail has strong connections to schools, parks, and public transit options. The trail does have serious infrastructure issues to overcome, however. Trail access is currently poor near the Brookfield Zoo because of its large parking lot as well as off First Avenue, where traffic is especially heavy.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Des Plaines River Trail
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3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Grand Avenue/Franklin Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, River Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, River Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>33,112.92</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Direct route with minimal alignment changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Franklin Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CTA Stops: None Metra Stops: Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Mannheim, Mont Clare, River Grove Pace Routes: 307, 319, 325, 330, 331, 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Harlem Ave., Mannheim Rd., Ridgeland Ave., Route 66 Connector, Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Bridge over the Tri-State at Mannheim Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Avenue/Franklin Avenue

The original alignment of this corridor was selected to run only along Grand Avenue, but it quickly became apparent that the section west of Rose Avenue in Franklin Park had a greater ADT count, with much of it being truck traffic. Instead, the western section of the corridor was routed onto Franklin Avenue, where it could connect with existing bicycle routes in Bensenville in DuPage County. Franklin Avenue is a two-lane road with parking along each side with an ADT range of 3,000 to 7,000, while Grand Avenue, with an ADT count around 21,000, has four lanes with no on-street parking. While being safer, the new alignment also helps to make new connections to public transit by lying in proximity to two additional Metra stations, as well as skirting a potential barrier and running past a new regional destination. On the whole, however, the alignment makes fewer connections to WCMC municipalities and schools.

This corridor has a constricted right-of-way on Grand Avenue that must be addressed, although there are no significant infrastructure barriers to address.
### 3.2 Corridor Snapshots

#### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Harlem Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Chicago, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>41,889.37</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Direct route with minimal alignment changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Concordia University, North Riverside Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit – CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>CTA Stops: Harlem (Blue), Harlem(Green) Metra Stops: Harlem Ave., Oak Park, Mont Clare, Elmwood Park; Pace Routes: 302, 304, 305, 307, 309, 313, 318, 319, 320, 322, 757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Cermak Rd./26th St., Chicago Ave., Grand Ave., Lake St., Prairie Path/Madison Ave., Ogden Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Harlem Avenue

Harlem Avenue’s right-of-way measurement varies greatly—moving from four lanes down to two lanes with parking on each side—and generally has a high ADT count (around 35,000). It is, however, an extremely important corridor that links 11 WCMC communities to one another. Additionally, the corridor runs along two pedestrian areas—downtown Oak Park and the Frank Lloyd Wright homes area—and is in proximity to another—downtown Riverside. The corridor has poor connections to regional destinations—it is close only to Concordia University and North Riverside Mall—but lies within a half mile of 31 schools, 13 parks, and 17 public transit connections. Harlem Avenue makes an important connection to the Southwest Council of Mayors (SCM) region and it is included in the SCM Bicycle Plan.

This route is potentially a difficult one given its high traffic counts and status as an IDOT road. There are, however, no barriers that directly impact Harlem Avenue as a corridor.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Harlem Avenue
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## 3.2 Corridor Snapshots

### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Joliet Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Countryside, Hinsdale, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Countryside, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>6,046.34</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>28,427.73</td>
<td>82.46%</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>There are no alignment changes, although the road itself is fairly circuitous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Flagg Creek Golf Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Salt Creek Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CTA Stops: None. Metra Stops: None. Pace Routes: 307, 311, 330, 392, 669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Harlem Ave., Mannheim Rd., Ogen Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Intersection of Wolf Rd. &amp; Joliet Rd.; intersection of Joliet Rd. &amp; the Tri-State Tollway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bridge over the Des Plaines River on Ogden Ave., signalized crossing at Ogden Ave. &amp; 39th St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Joliet Road

Much like Ogden Avenue, Joliet Road is largely a new recommendation for the region and runs through eight WCMC communities. Joliet Road is largely a four-lane road with occasional left-turn lanes at key intersections, and its ADT ranges from 12,000 to 20,000, although it must be noted that many of these are trucks, as a good portion of the corridor runs through industrial areas. Unlike Ogden Avenue, however, it does not make nearly as many connections to the area; it comes into contact with only one regional destination, just eight schools, two parks, and makes five connections to public transit options. It does, however, intersect six of the proposed corridors put forth in this plan.

In implementing this corridor, it is likely that heavy truck traffic will be a serious obstacle to overcome. More specifically, the intersection of Wolf Road and Joliet Road is a dangerous one. Additionally, the underpass beneath the Tri-State Tollway is a serious barrier to cycling, especially since the corridor would end there.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Joliet Road
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## 3.2 Corridor Snapshots

### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Lake Street/Augusta Boulevard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Maywood, Melrose Park, Northlake, Oak Park, River Forest, Stone Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Maywood, Melrose Park, Northlake, Oak Park, River Forest, Stone Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>13,282.33</td>
<td>30.18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>9,935.55</td>
<td>22.57%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>20,796.56</td>
<td>47.25%</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>A direct route with some alignment changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Concordia University, Downtown Oak Park, West Point Shopping Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Harlem Ave., Mannheim Rd., Ridgeland Ave., Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Intersection of Lake St. &amp; North Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lake Street/Augusta Boulevard**

Running through six WCMC communities, the Lake Street/Augusta Boulevard corridor offers a chance to form a connection to future Chicago bicycle infrastructure. Lake Street could be a target for bicycling infrastructure, as it is a four-lane road that is occasionally two lanes with parking on both sides and has an ADT count from 10,000 to 20,000. Additionally, the corridor offers a chance to link three regional destinations, and it lies in close proximity to 30 schools, 12 parks, and 16 public transit connections.

Although Lake Avenue is largely undeveloped as a corridor, most of Augusta Boulevard (more than 30 percent of the route) is an existing bicycle route that will form a strong connection to Chicago. The intersection of Lake Avenue and North Avenue, however, is a particularly dangerous intersection that would need to be addressed if the corridor were to be successful as a primary transportation route.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Lake Street/Augusta Boulevard
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### 3.2 Corridor Snapshots

#### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Mannheim Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bellwood, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bellwood, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>7,218.37</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>47,292.39</td>
<td>62.73%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>20,875.87</td>
<td>27.69%</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Indirect route with multiple alignment changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Flagg Creek Golf Course, Melrose Crossing, Navistar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Prairie Path, Salt Creek Greenway Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Harlem Ave., Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Intersection of North Ave. &amp; Mannheim Rd.; poor access from Prairie Path on to Warren Ave.; dangerous intersection at Cermak Rd. &amp; La Grange Rd.; poor access on to the Salt Creek Trail from 31st St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Signalized crossing at Mannheim Rd. &amp; Washington Blvd.; Mannheim Rd. bridge over the Eisenhower; bridge over the Salt Creek near La Grange Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mannheim Road**

The original Mannheim Road Corridor was, undoubtedly, the route that presented the greatest challenges. On the one hand, it is a high-capacity, high-speed road—a six-lane road, at times, with a high ADT range between 20,000 and 40,000—controlled by the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). On the other hand, it is literally the only corridor besides the Tri-State Tollway (I-294) that makes a connection over the Proviso Rail Yard. Active Transportation Alliance staff largely followed recommendations made by WCMC community staff members in order to create an appropriate alternate alignment, including keeping a section of the corridor along Mannheim Road. In the end, the stretch of road was the second-longest corridor, running through 10 WCMC communities and lying in proximity to three regional destinations. Additionally, it makes some of the best connections of any corridor to schools, parks, and transit, with 39, 20, and 28 such connections, respectively.

By implementing the plan, there could be some serious barriers beyond the Provisio Rail Yard to overcome. The intersection of North Avenue and Mannheim Road is especially dangerous because of the frontage roads/off-ramps, which drivers tend to exit at a high rate of speed. Cermak Road and La Grange Road also present a dangerous intersection that would likely need to be addressed.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Mannheim Road
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### 3.2 Corridor Snapshots

#### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: North Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Elmwood Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Elmwood Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>30.951.96</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>A direct route with some alignment changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Maywood Park, Melrose Crossing, Navistar, West Point Shopping Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Des Plaines River Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CTA Stops: None; Metra Stops: None; Pace Routes: 305, 318, 319, 325, 330, 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Mannheim Rd., Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Intersection of North Ave. &amp; Lake St.; intersection of North Ave. &amp; Mannheim Rd.; poor access to the Des Plaines River Trail at North Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle bridge over the Des Plaines River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**North Avenue**

North Avenue has the highest traffic counts of any corridor identified in this process, with an ADT count topping out at more than 60,000; the road is, at times, six lanes or four lanes with on-street parking along each side. At the same time, it provides an excellent opportunity to link infrastructure of Chicago along the entire width of Cook County and into DuPage County. More locally, this route would link four WCMC communities and four regional destinations, but just 13 schools, six parks, and nine transit connections.

In creating this corridor, the largest obstacle would likely be the high traffic count and constrained right-of-way, although there are two important barriers, as well. The intersections of North Avenue and Lake Street, and North Avenue and Mannheim Road are both potentially dangerous areas that would need to be addressed in order to be safe for bicyclists to use.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: North Avenue

WCMC Corridor Planning Map

Legend

- 2012 WCMC Regional Network
- Local Bicycle Network
- Existing Trail Network
- WCMC Bicycle Plan
- CMAP Greenways Plan
- NWMC & SCM Regional Plans
- Destinations
- Network Barriers
- Network Assets
- Regional Pedestrian Areas
- Parks and Open Spaces
- Water
- WCMC Communities
- Cook County Communities
- Metra Stations
- CTA Stations
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Ogden Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Brookfield, Cicero, La Grange, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Brookfield, Cicero, La Grange, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>7,485.71</td>
<td>14.59%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>43,835.22</td>
<td>85.41%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>There are no alignment changes, although the road itself is fairly circuitous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Downtown La Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Salt Creek Trail; proposed Chicago Central and Pacific Trail is within half a mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Harlem Ave., Mannheim Rd., Ridgeland Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Underpass beneath the Tri-State Tollway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bicycle trail near the Des Plaines River in Lyons, bridge over the Des Plaines River on Ogden Ave., signalized crossing at Ogden Ave. &amp; 39th St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ogden Avenue

Ogden Avenue is nearly an entirely new recommendation for this planning process, but is nonetheless an effective one, running through eight WCMC communities. Although the ADT count can be high at times (around 25,000), it is a four-lane road with parking on both sides through the villages of Berwyn and Cicero. Although the corridor lies in proximity to only one regional destination, it does make 31 connections to schools, five to parks, and 19 to public transit.

Implementing this plan would certainly require a road diet along Ogden Avenue, something that could be difficult given that it is under federal control as part of U.S. Route 34. More locally, there is a barrier near the end of the proposed corridor where Ogden Avenue is routed underneath the Tri-State Tollway (I-294). On the other hand, three strong assets were noted in the area: an existing bicycle trail parallel to Ogden Avenue, the bridge over the Des Plaines River (both in Lyons), and a well-signalized intersection at Ogden Avenue and 39th Street.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Prairie Path/Madison Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bellwood, Berkeley, Forest Park, Hillside, Maywood, Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bellwood, Berkeley, Forest Park, Hillside, Maywood, Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>28,008.32</td>
<td>67.07%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>4,894.69</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>7,730.52</td>
<td>18.51%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>1,126.04</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>There are several breaks in the Prairie Path which coincide with poor access points and crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Des Plaines River Trail, Corridor itself is part of the Prairie Path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace | 24 | - | Good | CTA Stops: None  
Metra Stops: Berwyn, Brookfield, Cicero, Clyde, Congress Park, Harlem Ave., La Grange Rd., LaVergne, Stone Ave.  
Pace Routes: 302, 304, 305, 307, 311, 315, 330, 331, 877, 888 |
| Connections to proposed corridors        | 6      | -       | Fair   | 25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Harlem Ave., Mannheim Rd., Ridgeland Ave., Wolf Rd. |
| Schools in proximity                     | 32     | -       | Good   |                                                                                  |
| Parks in proximity                       | 10     | -       | Fair   |                                                                                  |
| Network barriers in proximity            | 5      | -       | Poor   | Poor access at First Ave. & the Prairie Path, poor access at 25th Ave. & the Prairie Path, poor bridge crossing along the Prairie Path west of 25th Ave., poor access to the Prairie Path along Mannheim Rd., poor access to the Prairie Path along Taft Ave. |
| Network assets in proximity              | 6      | -       | Good   | Bridge over the Eisenhower at Home Ave., paths through the Forest Park Park District: connection between Forest Park and the Prairie Path; bridge on the Prairie Path over Wolf Rd.; underpass beneath the Tri-State along the Prairie Path; signalized crossing at Mannheim Rd. & Washington Blvd. |

**Prairie Path/Madison Avenue**

The Prairie Path was one of the more obvious corridors, largely because a significant portion of it is already constructed and because significant infrastructure improvements are being planned for Madison Avenue. This corridor, however, does not suggest using the planned extension of the Prairie Path as the primary corridor alignment because of the unknown timeline of construction for the extension. Madison Avenue, however, is already well underway and would effectively connect to the City of Chicago’s infrastructure, allowing cyclists to safely and quickly travel from the Loop to DuPage County.

In addition to the Prairie Path’s obvious orientation towards cycling, Madison Avenue is also an appropriate road for cycling, with a lower-than-average ADT count of 16,000 and a roadway appropriate for the inclusion of bicycling infrastructure, with a four-lane road and on-street parking on each side. However, there are serious barriers to overcome—perhaps the most significant of any corridor—involving dangerous intersections or unsignalized crossings from the Prairie Path across busy roads. All of these barriers will have to be addressed if the Prairie Path is to become a serious transportation corridor.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Prairie Path/Madison Avenue
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3.2 Corridor Snapshots

### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Ridgeland Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berywn, Forest View, Oak Park, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berywn, Forest View, Oak Park, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>3,087.26</td>
<td>8.74%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>29,327.91</td>
<td>83.07%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>2889.94</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Direct route with no alignment changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>CTA Stops: Austin, Oak Park (Blue), Oak Park (Green), Ridgeland Metra Stops: LaVergne and Berwyn, Pace Routes: 302, 304, 305, 309, 311, 313, 315, 320, 322, 392, 755, 855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Augusta Blvd., Cermak Rd./26th St., Chicago Ave., Division St., Prairie Path/Madison Ave., Ogden Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ridgeland Avenue

Ridgeland Avenue—a two-lane road with parking on each side with a relatively low ADT count between 5,000 and 12,000—is an important corridor that cuts through three WCMC communities (Oak Park, Berwyn, and Stickney) and is important because of its close proximity Chicago; in fact, the proposed corridor would link the two sections of the city together. In terms of linking together key areas, the corridor is a strong one overall. Although there are no key regional destinations nearby, the corridor does pass by two pedestrian areas—downtown Oak Park and the Frank Lloyd Wright homes area. Additionally, the corridor lies in proximity to 18 transit stops, including four CTA stops, two Metra stations, and along 12 Pace routes.

In picking this route, the alignment had no major assets or barriers to deal with in creating a bicycle network, although there could be challenges in dealing with a somewhat narrow right-of-way. Another major factor in selecting this route is that nearly all of it has been previously identified in a prior planning process.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Ridgeland Avenue
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3.2 Corridor Snapshots

### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Route 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Lyons, McCook, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Lyons, McCook, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>11,436.67</td>
<td>65.55%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>6010.83</td>
<td>34.45%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>The corridor has no alignment changes although it is not a direct route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Downtown Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Salt Creek Trail, Des Plaines River Trail, corridor itself is apart of the Route 66 Heritage Trail; proposed Chicago Central and Pacific Trail is within half a mile; proposed Centennial Trail is within half a mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit – CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CTA Stops: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metra Stops: Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pace Routes: 302, 304, 307, 311, 322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>31st St., Cermak Rd./26th St., Harlem Ave., Joliet Rd., Ogden Ave., Washington Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor access to the Salt Cree Trail near the Brookfield Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Trail bridge over the Salt Creek near La Grange Rd.; underpass beneath the Metra lines along the Salt Creek Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Route 66

This alignment would be a spur of the Cermak Road corridor, splitting southeast at Harlem Avenue through Riverside along Longcommon Road – the existing Route 66 corridor. Although this is a short corridor, it would be a safe one, with ADT count around just 4,400 along the four WCMC communities it runs through. Despite being the shortest recommended corridor, it still connects the region to downtown Riverside, 15 schools, four parks, and makes six public transit connections.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Route 66
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### 3.2 Corridor Snapshots

#### 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Salt Creek Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Countryside, Hinsdale, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Berwyn, Countryside, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>29,847.68</td>
<td>97.75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>550.03</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>137.06</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>There are no alignment changes, although the trail itself is indirect and extremely circuitous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Brookfield Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Des Plaines River Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CTA Stops: None Metra Stops: None Pace Routes: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25th Ave., 31st. St., Cermak Rd./26th St., Mannheim Rd., Washington Ave., Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Trail is surrounded by Forest Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Intersection of 31st St. and the Salt Creek Trail, Intersection of Wolf Rd. and the Salt Creek Trail, Forest Preserve needs improved signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bridge over the Salt Creek, trail underpass beneath train tracks, bridge over the Salt Creek near Cermak Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Salt Creek Trail

The Salt Creek Trail is already one of the most defined and most used bicycle corridors in the WCMC region. It is a dedicated, shared-use trail that runs south of Cermak Road before it heads southbound near the parking lot of the Brookfield Zoo. In terms of other connectivity, the corridor does poorly because it runs exclusively through Cook County Forest Preserve land; the alignment makes no connections to transit stops and just five to schools and three to parks.

Although the Salt Creek Trail is already constructed, there are a number of safety issues that must be addressed if it is to become a primary transportation corridor. Specifically, signage must be improved at crossings to increase the safety of bicyclists, and significant changes need to be made to improve access to the trail near the Brookfield Zoo.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Salt Creek Trail
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# 3.2 Corridor Snapshots

## 3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Washington Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Riverside, Brookfield, La Grange Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Riverside, Brookfield, La Grange Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>10,712.56</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>7,770.60</td>
<td>31.09%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>6,508.59</td>
<td>26.04%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Direct route with no alignment changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Salt Creek Trail, proposed rails-to-trails development is within half a mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CTA Stops: None Metra Stops: Brookfield, Hollywood, Riverside Pace Routes: 304, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>25th Ave., Des Plaines River Trail, Mannheim Rd., Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor access to the Salt Creek Trail on 31st St., poor access to the Salt Creek Trail on Wolf Rd., Cook County Forest Preserve needs improved signage for safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Trail bridge over the Salt Creek near La Grange Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Washington Avenue

Washington Avenue makes key connections to the Salt Creek Trail. The Salt Creek Trail is already an outstanding corridor, and creating a corridor centered on this was a priority for the steering committee. It was eventually decided that improving the Salt Creek Trail’s connectivity with on-street facilities along Washington Avenue was the best option. Washington Avenue is well suited to handle bicycle traffic. It is two-lane road with an ADT count around 5,000. In terms of connectivity, however, the corridor is less than ideal: It connects only three communities, is in proximity to no regional destinations, 15 schools, and three parks, and makes only five connections to public transportation options.
3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Corridor Maps: Washington Avenue
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3.2 Corridor Snapshots

3.2.1 Ratings Sheets: Wolf Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many municipalities involved?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Countryside, Berkeley, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many WCMC member municipalities involved?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.71%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Countryside, Berkeley, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor existing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor programmed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of corridor planned</td>
<td>19,126.60</td>
<td>34.13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new recommendation</td>
<td>36,907.43</td>
<td>65.87%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident survey rating</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness of proposed corridor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Alignment is interrupted at the Proviso Rail Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional destinations in proximity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Flagg Creek Golf Course, Franklin Park Industrial Zone, La Grange Memorial Hospital, West Point Shopping Center, Westbrook Corporate Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing trails in proximity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Prairie Path; Salt Creek Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to public transit - CTA, Metra, and Pace</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>CTA Stops: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to proposed corridors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Metra Stops: Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in proximity</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>31st St., Cermak Rd./26th St., Chicago Ave., Grand Ave., Joliet Rd., Prairie Path/Madison Ave., North Ave., Ogden Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in proximity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor access to the Salt Creek Trail along Wolf Rd.; poor access to the Prairie Path from Electric Ave.; Proviso Rail Yard interrupts Wolf Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network barriers in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor access to the Salt Creek Trail along Wolf Rd.; poor access to the Prairie Path from Electric Ave.; Proviso Rail Yard interrupts Wolf Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network assets in proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Sidewalks along St. Charles Rd., bridge over Wolf Rd. along the Prairie Path, underpass beneath the Eisenhower along Wolf Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wolf Road

Wolf Road is an interesting corridor. In terms of infrastructure, it is an appropriate road for bicycles; it is a standard Cook County Highway Department road with two lanes in each direction, along with a variable left-turn lane, as well as a relatively low ADT count range between 5,000 and 20,000. It is, however, broken by the Proviso Rail Yard, creating a huge gap in service for a road planned on this corridor. Additionally, Wolf Road is more than a mile away from the nearest north-south corridor. In the end, however, it remained a corridor simply because there are no other appropriate roads for regional-scale bicycling west between Mannheim Rd. and the Tri-State Tollway. As a corridor itself, it is extremely effective, running through eight communities and lying in close proximity to five regional destinations, 29 schools, and 18 parks. The only area where this corridor is substandard is in making connections to public transit, intersecting just eight Pace routes and one Metra station.

Beyond the Proviso Rail Yard, there are no barriers that directly affect Wolf Road's viability as a corridor, although there are issues surrounding the safe crossing of Wolf Road along the Salt Creek Trail, which will likely need to be addressed in the near future.
The above map is a thumbnail of the "WCMC Bike Plan 2012".
The West Central Municipal Conference's bicycling corridors highlighted in this plan.
Bellwood: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors
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25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Broadview, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

PRAIRIE PATH
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Berkeley, Forest Park, Hillside, Maywood, Oak Park

MANNHEIM ROAD
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Countryside, Forest View, Forest Park, Franklin Park, Harwood Heights, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester
PRAIRIE PATH
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Forest Park, Hillside, Maywood, Oak Park
Berwyn: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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RIDGELAND AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Forest View, Oak Park, Stickney

OGDEN AVENUE
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: Lyons, McCook, Cicero, Hillside, North Riverside

CERMAK ROAD
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Broadview, Cicero, Hillside, North Riverside, Riverside, Westchester

HARLEM AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit
25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

CERMAK ROAD
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Cicero, Hillside, North Riverside, Riverside, Westchester

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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Broadview: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors
25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

31ST STREET
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: La Grange Park, Riverside, Westchester

OGDEN AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Cicero, La Grange, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside, Western Springs

WASHINGTON AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: La Grange Park, Riverside

SALT CREEK TRAIL
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: North Riverside, La Grange Park, Westchester, Western Springs
Cicero: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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OGDEN AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Brookfield, La Grange, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside, Western Springs

CERMAK ROAD
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Broadview, Hillside, North Riverside, Riverside, Westchester
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Countryside: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor

Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

WOLF ROAD
Tier One Corridor

Partner agencies: Berkeley, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester, Western Springs

MANNHEIM ROAD
Tier Two Corridor

Partner agencies: Bellwood, Countryside, Forest View, Forest Park, Franklin Park, Harwood Heights, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester

JOLIET ROAD
Tier Three Corridor

Partner agencies: Berwyn, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney
Elmwood Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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GRAND AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, River Grove

HARLEM AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit

NORTH AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest
Forest Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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**DES PLAINES RIVER TRAIL**
*Tier One Corridor*
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park

**PRAIRIE PATH**
*Tier One Corridor*
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Berkeley, Hillside, Maywood, Oak Park

**HARLEM AVENUE**
*Tier Two Corridor*
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit
Franklin Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

MANNHEIM ROAD
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Countryside, Forest View, Forest Park, Franklin Park, Harwood Heights, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester

GRAND AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Elmwood Park, River Grove
Harwood Heights: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map

Legend
- 2012 WCMC Regional Network
- Local Bicycle Network
- Existing Trail Network
- WCMC Bicycle Plan
- CMAP Greenways Plan
- NWMC & SCM Regional Plans
- Destinations
- Network Barriers
- Network Assets
- Regional Pedestrian Areas
- Parks and Open Spaces
- Water
- WCMC Communities
- Cook County Communities
- Metra Stations
- CTA Stations

HARLEM AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Lyons, Norridge, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit
Hillside: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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- **Cook County Communities**
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**PRAIRIE PATH**
*Tier One Corridor*

Partner agencies: Bellwood, Berkeley, Forest Park, Maywood, Oak Park

**WOLF ROAD**
*Tier One Corridor*

Partner agencies: Berkeley, Countryside, Franklin Park, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester, Western Springs

**CERMAK ROAD**
*Tier Two Corridor*

Partner agencies: Berwyn, Broadview, Cicero, North Riverside, Riverside, Weschester
**Hodgkins: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors**

**WCMC Corridor Planning Map**
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---

**25TH AVENUE**
*Tier One Corridor*

Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

---

**JOLIET ROAD**
*Tier Three Corridor*

Partner agencies: Berwyn, Countryside, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney

---
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Indian Head Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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**JOLIET ROAD**
*Tier One Corridor*
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Countryside, Hodgkins, Lyons, McCook, Stickney

**WOLF ROAD**
*Tier One Corridor*
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hillside, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester, Western Springs
La Grange: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

MANNHEIM ROAD
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Countryside, Forest View, Forest Park, Franklin Park, Harwood Heights, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester

OGDEN AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Brookfield, Cicero, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside, Western Springs
La Grange Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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**25TH AVENUE**
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

**31ST STREET**
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Riverside, Westchester

**MANNHEIM ROAD**
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Countryside, Forest View, Forest Park, Franklin Park, Harwood Heights, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester

**SALT CREEK TRAIL**
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Brookfield, North Riverside, Westchester, Western Springs
Lyons: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

**WCMC Corridor Planning Map**
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**DES PLAINES RIVER TRAIL**
*Tier One Corridor*
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park

**OGDEN AVENUE**
*Tier Two Corridor*
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Brookfield, Cicero, La Grange, La Grange Park, Riverside, Western Springs

**ROUTE 66**
*Tier Two Corridor*
Partner agencies: Berwyn, McCook, Riverside

**HARLEM AVENUE**
*Tier Three Corridor*
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Norridge, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit

**JOLIET ROAD**
*Tier Three Corridor*
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Countryside, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, McCook, Stickney
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Maywood: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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DES PLAINES RIVER TRAIL
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park

PRAIRIE PATH
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Berkeley, Forest Park, Hillside, Oak Park

LAKE STREET
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Melrose Park, Northlake, Oak Park, River Forest, Stone Park
Melrose Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

DESMINES RIVER TRAIL
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park

LAKE STREET
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Maywood, Northlake, Oak Park, River Forest, Stone Park

MANNHEIM ROAD
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Countryside, Forest View, Forest Park, Franklin Park, Harwood Heights, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester

NORTH AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Elmwood Park, Northlake, River Forest
Norridge: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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HARLEM AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor

Partner agencies: Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit
North Riverside: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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DES PLAINES RIVER TRAIL
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park

SALT CREEK TRAIL
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Westchester, Western Springs

CERMACK ROAD
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Broadview, Cicero, Hillside, Riverside, Westchester

HARLEM AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit
Northlake: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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LAKE STREET
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Maywood, Melrose Park, Northlake, Oak Park, River Forest, Stone Park

WOLF ROAD
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Berkeley, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Westchester, Western Springs

NORTH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Elmwood Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest
Oak Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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LAKE STREET
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Maywood, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest, Stone Park

PRAIRIE PATH
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Berkeley, Forest Park, Hillside, Maywood,

RIDGELAND AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Berywn, Forest View, Stickney

HARLEM AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit
25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Schiller Park, Willow Springs

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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Schiller Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

**WCMC Corridor Planning Map**
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**25TH AVENUE**
*Tier One Corridor*
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Willow Springs

**DES PLAINES RIVER TRAIL**
*Tier One Corridor*
Partner agencies: Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside
**Stickney: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors**

**WCMC Corridor Planning Map**
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**RIDGELAND AVENUE**  
*Tier One Corridor*

Partner agencies: Berywn, Forest View, Oak Park, Stickney

**HARLEM AVENUE**  
*Tier Three Corridor*

Partner agencies: Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Summit
Stone Park: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

MANNHEIM ROAD
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Countryside, Forest View, Forest Park, Franklin Park, Harwood Heights, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester

NORTH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Elmwood Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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HARLEM AVENUE
Tier Three Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Harwood Heights, Lyons, Norridge, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney
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**Westchester: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors**

**WCMC Corridor Planning Map**
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---

**WOLFP ROAD**
*Tier One Corridor*

Partner agencies: Berkeley, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Western Springs

---

**31ST STREET**
*Tier Two Corridor*

Partner agencies: Brookfield, La Grange Park, Riverside

---

**MANNHEIM ROAD**
*Tier Two Corridor*

Partner agencies: Bellwood, Countryside, Forest View, Forest Park, Franklin Park, Harwood Heights, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park

**SALT CREEK TRAIL**
*Tier Two Corridor*

Partner agencies: Brookfield, North Riverside, Western Springs

---

**CERMAK ROAD**
*Tier One Corridor*

Partner agencies: Berwyn, Broadview, Cicero, Hillside, North Riverside, Riverside
Western Springs: WCMC 2012 Regional Corridors

WCMC Corridor Planning Map
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WOLF ROAD
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Berkeley, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester

OGDEN AVENUE
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: Berwyn, Brookfield, Cicero, La Grange, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside

SALT CREEK TRAIL
Tier Two Corridor
Partner agencies: Brookfield, North Riverside, Westchester
25TH AVENUE
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Bellwood, Broadview, Brookfield, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, McCook, Rosemont, Schiller Park

WOLF ROAD
Tier One Corridor
Partner agencies: Berkeley, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester

WCMC Corridor Planning Map

Legend
- 2012 WMC Regional Network
- Local Bicycle Network
- Existing Trail Network
- WMC Bicycle Plan
- CMAP Greenways Plan
- NWMC & SCM Regional Plans
- Destinations
- Network Barriers
- Network Assets
- Regional Pedestrian Areas
- Parks and Open Spaces
- Water
- WCMC Communities
- Cook County Communities
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- CTA Stations
According to Illinois Complete Streets legislation, every effort should be made to include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations whenever a street is built or reconstructed. Including bicycle and pedestrian accommodations is particularly important with bridge and underpass projects due to the long life of these structures and the difficulty and expense of retrofitting them. Under current conditions in the WCMC, many of the tollway/railroad underpasses and bridges over the rivers do not accommodate pedestrians or bicycles, creating impenetrable walls across the region. These barriers have been identified along regional corridors identified here and should be prioritized to help create a regional network. Addressing these barriers is an essential element of both the short-term and a long-term vision for the WCMC.

The regional corridors identified in the 2001 WCMC plan formed the first step in looking at creating true regional connectivity in the bike system. These regional alignments have been the focus of our current 2012 update. The WCMC is committed to continuing its work with IDOT, as well as county, and local governments to create a better, more balanced transportation system that addresses the needs of all users and moves toward the implementation of the strategies outlined in CMAP’s GO TO 2040 Plan. Further, it is the goal of the WCMC to use regional planning to assist in the implementation of Complete Streets. Given current land development patterns and its overlay with existing transportation system, this WCMC 2010 update has focused on identifying feasible short-term routes that parallel previously identified regional priority alignments. In this way, the conference can achieve implementation on corridor alignments where there is a pressing need to add bicycle and pedestrian facilities. This strategy was initiated to address two primary concerns of our Bicycle Committee:

1. Support local governments to focus on prioritizing the implementation of corridors within their local street networks.

2. Put forward a list of feasible recommendations that can lead toward a reliable regional bicycle network within a short-term planning horizon.

The corridors have been grouped in three tiers based on the ratings analysis presented in Section 2. The WCMC supports implementation on all of these corridors and it should be noted that all corridors presented in this plan are considered priorities for regional system connectivity. The plan includes these tiers to demonstrate which corridors had the most positive attributes from the ratings analysis.
4.1 Implementation Tiers

Tier One Corridors

Tier One corridors generally include the following characteristics: A high percentage of existing bicycle facilities; a high percentage of planned bicycle facilities; good connectivity to destinations; transit and existing bike network; no major barriers (fatal flaws); and it serves multiple WCMC members (regional in scope). These corridors are:

- 25th Avenue Corridor
- Des Plaines River Trail Corridor
- Lake Street/Augusta Boulevard Corridor
- Prairie Path/Madison Avenue Corridor
- Ridgeland Avenue Corridor
- Wolf Road Corridor

Tier Two Corridors

Corridors included in Tier Two generally include the following characteristics: A high percentage of planned bicycle facilities; good or fair connectivity to destinations, transit and existing bike network; may have significant barriers; and it serves multiple WCMC members. These corridors are:

- 31st Street Corridor
- Mannheim Road Corridor
- Ogden Avenue Corridor
- Route 66 Corridor
- Salt Creek Trail Corridor

Tier Three Corridors

Corridors included in Tier Three generally include the following characteristics: A low percentage of existing bicycle facilities; a lower percentage of planned bicycle facilities; fair connectivity to destinations, transit and existing bike network; major barriers; and it serves a smaller number of WCMC members. These corridors are:

- Cermak Road Corridor
- Grand Avenue Corridor
- Harlem Avenue Corridor
- Joliet Road Corridor
- North Avenue Corridor
- Washington Avenue Corridor

In addition to presenting snapshots for each corridor in each tier, this chapter also presents a Short-Term Implementation Summary that highlights the implementation issues for each of the corridors and presents some of the issues that will need to be coordinated in the related jurisdictions.
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### 25th Avenue Corridor

#### 4.1.1 Tier One Corridor Implementation Summary: 25th Avenue Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS**  
  Lead Implementers  
  WCMC, Hodgkins, La Grange Park, Broadview, Bellwood, Schiller Park | The 25th Ave. corridor will connect to many of the regionally planned and existing trails. It will link to the existing Prairie Path and Salt Creek Trail providing a north/south link between the two trails. It will also connect to the planned Centennial Trail on the south end and the O’Hare Connector on the north end. |
| **ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: INTERSECTIONS**  
  Lead Implementers  
  WCMC, Bellwood, Broadview, La Grange, Brookfield, McCook | There are several intersections that have been identified as barriers for this corridor. The intersecting roads are I-290 and 47th St. The intersection with the Prairie Path has also been identified as a barrier. |
| **INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS**  
  Lead Implementers  
  WCMC, Schiller Park, Franklin Park, Melrose Park, Bellwood, Broadview, La Grange, Brookfield, Hodgkins, CMAP | 55 percent of the new corridor is newly recommended facilities. The WCMC should work with member municipalities to integrate the 25th Ave. corridor into their plans. |
| **SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**  
  Lead Implementers  
  WCMC, McCook, Countryside, La Grange, Brookfield, La Grange Park, Broadview, Melrose Park, Franklin Park, Cook County | 45 percent of the corridor is planned facilities. The WCMC should work with municipalities and IDOT to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct infrastructure along the 25th Ave. corridor. |
| **UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES**  
  Lead Implementers  
  WCMC, Bellwood, Broadview, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, McCook, Melrose Park, Schiller Park, Cook County Highway Department, IDOT | The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on 25th St. and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor. |
| **INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE**  
  Lead Implementers  
  WCMC, Bellwood, Broadview, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hodgkins, La Grange, La Grange Park, McCook, Melrose Park, Schiller Park, Cook County Highway Department, IDOT | Due to the corridor being a mix of new and planned recommendations, nothing is in an existing state. The WCMC should work with communities along the corridor to establish signs to regional trails and destinations once portions of the route are complete. |
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### Des Plaines River Trail Corridor:

#### 4.1.1 Tier One Corridor Implementation Summary: Des Plaines River Trail Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage Links to Trails</strong></td>
<td>Since the Des Plaines River Trail is in itself a major regional trail, connections to other trails are crucial for regional connectivity. Trails that could be linked to the Des Plaines River Trail include the Prairie Path, Chicago Central and Pacific Trail, and the Salt Creek Trail. However, access to the Prairie Path and Salt Creek Trail must be improved to aid corridor functionality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, Forest Park, Maywood, Riverside, North Riverside, Cook County Forest Preserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address Obstacles/Barriers, Crossings and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>There are many highway, river, and railroad track crossings that will have to be navigated as the trail is extended southward. Another barrier will also arise as portions of the trail are constructed and gaps between sections of the trail are created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, Forest Park, Maywood, Riverside, North Riverside, Cook County, Cook County Forest Preserve, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrate Corridor Planning into Municipal Plans</strong></td>
<td>The extension of the Des Plaines River Trail will require cooperation of many jurisdictions. Local municipalities, townships, Cook County Forest Preserves, Cook County, and IDOT will all need to work together to complete the Trail south of North Ave. All participating agencies should incorporate the trail in their plans to ensure connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park, CMAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seek Grant Assistance for Design and Construction</strong></td>
<td>15 percent of the corridor is either programmed (3 percent) or planned (12 percent) facilities. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct the missing trail portions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park, Cook County Forest Preserve, Cook County Highway Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilize Complete Streets Policies</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on the Des Plaines River Trail and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the trail corridor and create links to the trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park, Cook County Highway Department, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Install Regional Signage</strong></td>
<td>Large portions of the trail are not complete in the WCMC. As portions are completed, signage within the communities and along regional trails should point users towards the Des Plaines River Trail. Likewise, there needs to be signs located along the Des Plaines River Trail to point users towards local destination, regional and local trails, and neighboring communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Lyons, Maywood, Melrose Park, North Riverside, River Forest, River Grove, Riverside, Schiller Park, Cook County Forest Preserve, Cook County Highway Department, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note on the Des Plaines River Trail:**

Although a path along the banks of the Des Plaines River is proposed in this plan, an on-street alternative through both Riverside and River Forest should strongly be considered. A previously funded CMAQ study detailed a number of economic and environmental concerns associated with the continuance of the existing Des Plaines River Trail; ultimately CMAQ dropped the Des Plaines River Trail project because the Cook County Forest Preserve failed to implement the project after years of planning.
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### Lake Street/Augusta Boulevard Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage Links to Trails</strong></td>
<td>This corridor will connect to a planned portion of the Des Plaines River Trail in River Forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Maywood, River Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address Obstacles/Barriers: Intersections</strong></td>
<td>The intersection of Lake Avenue and North Avenue constitutes a major barrier along the corridor. As sections of the corridor are constructed, this intersection will need to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Northlake, Stone Park, Cook County Highway Department, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrate Corridor Planning into Municipal Plans</strong></td>
<td>47 percent of this corridor consists of new recommendations. The first section of the new portion of the corridor has been expanded westward from Mannheim Road to the new North Avenue corridor. The other new portion connects the Augusta Boulevard section with the Lake Street portion and also crosses the Des Plaines River Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, River Forest, Maywood, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, CMAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seek Grant Assistance for Design and Construction</strong></td>
<td>70 percent of the corridor is either planned (23 percent) or new (47 percent) corridor facility recommendations. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct the planned segments of the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, River Forest, Maywood, Melrose Park, Northlake, Oak Park, River Forest, Stone Park, Cook County Forest Preserve, Cook County Highway Department, CMAP, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilize Complete Streets Policies</strong></td>
<td>Fifty-two percent of the corridor is planned. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct planned segments of the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, River Forest, Maywood, Melrose Park, Northlake, Oak Park, River Forest, Stone Park, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Install Regional Signage</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Lake Street–Augusta Boulevard and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Oak Park, River Forest, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### Prairie Path/Madison Avenue Corridor

#### 4.1.1 Tier One Corridor Implementation Summary: Prairie Path/Madison Avenue Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong></td>
<td>Since the Prairie Path–Madison Avenue corridor is partly a trail itself, connection to and from this corridor are critical to the region. The Prairie Path is one of the most recognized trails in the Midwest making it important to link this corridor to other trails in the area to create a trail system. This corridor will connect to the Des Plaines River Trail Corridor once that corridor is fully completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Forest Park, Maywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: ACCESS AND CROSSINGS</strong></td>
<td>There are many points along the Prairie Path that would enhance its functionality if the access and road crossing were to improve. The intersections with poor access are at 25th Avenue, First Avenue, Mannheim Road, and Taft Avenue. Emphasizing improvements on these intersections while also improving smaller intersections will improve this asset to the WCMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Bellwood, Berkeley, Hillside, Maywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong></td>
<td>Only a very small portion of this corridor is categorized as a new facility recommendation. This portion is in Forest Park which recently adopted an Active Transportation Plan that includes this segment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Forest Park, CMAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>33 percent of the corridor is either programmed (12 percent), planned (18 percent), or new (3 percent) facilities. Seeking grant assistance to complete the sections of this missing corridor will help to connect the City of Chicago to the region and the region to Chicago since so little needs to be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Forest Park, Hillside, Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used along the Prairie Path, Madison Avenue, and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor and path route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Bellwood, Berkeley, Forest Park, Hillside, Maywood, Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong></td>
<td>67 percent of the corridor is currently existing as the Illinois Prairie Path. The existing portions of this corridor could be signed immediately or at least in the near-term. This will insure that the users can find their way from surrounding areas and Chicago to the Prairie Path, which can lead them to regional destinations, trails, and other corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Bellwood, Berkeley, Forest Park, Hillside, Maywood, Oak Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.1 Implementation Tiers

#### Ridgeland Avenue Corridor

#### 4.1.1 Tier One Corridor Implementation Summary: Ridgeland Avenue Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong></td>
<td>This corridor will connect to many planned extensions of trails including the Prairie Path, Chicago Central and Pacific Trail, and the South Branch Riverwalk. By completing this corridor, the three trails will be connected together on the east side of the WCMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Forest View, Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: I-290 AND RIGHT-OF-WAY</strong></td>
<td>No major barriers are present in this corridor. The only minor barriers that exist are the somewhat narrow right-of-ways throughout the length of the corridor and the I-290 highway crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Forest View, Oak Park, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong></td>
<td>A small newly recommended southern portion of the corridor is in Stickney and Forest View. These are municipalities in which the corridor is not included in a municipal or bicycle plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Forest View, Stickney, CMAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>91 percent of the corridor is either planned (63 percent) or new (3 percent) facilities. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct planned segments of the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Oak Park, Berwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Ridgeland Ave. and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Forest View, Oak Park, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong></td>
<td>Currently 9 percent of the corridor is complete in a small section south of the Ogden Ave. corridor. The northern portion of the corridor is planned and is part of the networks in Oak Park and Berwyn leaving lots of opportunity for near-term signage. Once signed, the corridor will also provide a link between the north and south side of western Chicago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Forest View, Oak Park, Stickney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### Wolf Road Corridor

#### 4.1.1 Tier One Corridor Implementation Summary: Wolf Road Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Hillside                                                                                   | The Wolf Road corridor will connect to two of the regional existing trails and one planned connector. It will link to the existing Prairie Path and Salt Creek Trail providing a north/south link between the two trails. It will also connect to the planned O’Hare Connector on the north end. Access to all trails will need to be improved along the corridor, especially the Salt Creek Trail. |
| **ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: RAIL YARD AND ACCESS**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Berkeley, Hillside, Melrose Park, Northlake                                                 | The Wolf Road corridor is separated into two parts by the Proviso Rail Yard. Due to the size of the rail yard, a bridge, crossing, or tunnel is not feasible to complete the route. |
| **INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Northlake, Western Springs                      | 66 percent of the corridor consists of newly recommended facilities on the north and south ends of the previously planned corridor. Integration of the newly recommended portions will provide greater access to and from Wolf Road. Wolf Road is the western-most corridor, which makes it crucial for connections since there are no other appropriate roads. |
| **SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Countryside, Hillside, Hodgkins, Westchester                                               | All of the corridor is either planned (34 percent) or new (66 percent) facilities. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct planned segments of the Wolf Road corridor. |
| **UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Berkeley, Franklin Park, Hillside, Indian Head Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Westchester, Western Springs | The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used along Wolf Road and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor. |
| **INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC                                                                                              | Currently, there is no existing portion to the Wolf Road corridor. As segments of Wolf Road are completed, the WCMC should work with communities along the corridor to establish signs to regional trails and destinations. |
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### 31st Street Corridor

#### 4.1.1 Tier Two Corridor Implementation Summary: 31st Street Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong></td>
<td>The 31st St. corridor is within several trail corridors in the WCMC. The corridor intersects with the existing Salt Creek Trail at two locations and will cross the extension of the Des Plaines River Trail. The corridor will also be within a half mile of the proposed Chicago Central and Pacific Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, North Riverside, Riverside, Westchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: ACCESS AND SIGNAGE</strong></td>
<td>The 31st St. corridor has several poor access points to the Salt Creek Trail Corridor at Wolf Rd. and by Brookfield Zoo. It is also difficult to locate Cook County Forest Preserves due to the poor signage on 31st St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, Westchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong></td>
<td>31 percent of the corridor consists of newly recommended facilities. The corridor would benefit from municipalities incorporating the corridor in their municipal plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, Westchester, CMAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>70 percent of the corridor is either new recommendation (31 percent) or planned recommendation (39 percent). By applying for grant assistance, the corridor could be completed and become an on-street alternative to the Salt Creek Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, La Grange Park, North Riverside, Riverside, CMAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on 31st St. and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, Riverside, Westchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong></td>
<td>30 percent of the corridor is currently existing. By installing wayfinding signage in the near-term on the existing section of 31st St. and applying signage to planned facilities in the mid to long-term; motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians will have an alternative to the Salt Creek Trail and be able to find their way to several Cook County Forest Preserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers: WCMC, La Grange Park, Riverside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### Mannheim Road Corridor

#### 4.1.1 Tier Two Corridor Implementation Summary: Mannheim Road Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>The Mannheim Rd. corridor would provide connections to the Salt Creek Trail and the Illinois Prairie Path. Reaching these important regional trails will provide Mannheim Rd. with quick and easy access to other corridors. However, access will need to be improved to these regional trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Bellwood, Hillside, La Grange Park, Westchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: ACCESS AND CROSSINGS</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>There are several intersections that are barriers in making the Mannheim Rd. corridor safe. The intersections of North Ave., the Prairie Path, and Cermak Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Bellwood, Hillside, La Grange Park, Stone Park, Westchester, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>28 percent of the corridor is newly recommended facilities. Most of the new portions of the corridor eliminate gaps in the previously planned portions of Mannheim Rd. By putting these portions of the corridor in municipal plans, gaps along the planned Mannheim Rd. corridor will be eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Bellwood, Franklin Park, Hillside, Stone Park, CMAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>90 percent of the corridor is either planned (62 percent) or new (28 percent) facilities. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct planned segments of the Mannheim corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside, La Grange, La Grange Park, CMAP, IDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Mannheim Rd. and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Bellwood, Countryside, Franklin Park, Hillside, La Grange, La Grange Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, Stone Park, Westchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>To date, 10 percent of the corridor is complete as the corridor joggs back and forth. These portions include existing portions of other corridors and part of the Salt Creek Trail. These areas are prime candidates for near-term signage to establish the corridor as a bike route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, La Grange Park, Bellwood, Westchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.1 Implementation Tiers

#### Ogden Road Corridor

### 4.1.1 Tier Two Corridor Implementation Summary: Ogden Road Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</td>
<td>The Ogden Avenue corridor is just south of the existing Salt Creek Trail, the planned extension of the Des Plaines River Trail, the planned Chicago Central and Pacific Trail, and the Route 66 Connector Corridor. By running along the southern edge of all four of these existing and planned trails, the corridor can act as a link between the trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementer</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Lyons, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: UNDERPASSES AND ADT</td>
<td>The major barrier along the Ogden Avenue corridor is the underpass at Ogden Avenue and I-295 at western end of the corridor. There is also an issue with high traffic counts and amount of room for on-street bike facilities along Ogden Avenue. Implementing a road-diet along Ogden would allow for more room, but would be difficult due to Ogden Avenue being an IDOT road and a truck route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementer</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</td>
<td>85 percent of the Ogden Avenue corridor is a new recommendation in all communities except Berwyn. The high ADT and IDOT control will make this corridor a long-term recommendation, but it should be included in municipal plans to insure changes are made to the roadway as it is reconstructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementer</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, Cicero, La Grange, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>All of the corridor is either planned (15 percent) or new (85 percent) corridor facility recommendations. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct the planned segments of the Ogden Avenue corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementer</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Brookfield, Cicero, La Grange, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside, Western Springs, CMAP, IDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Ogden Avenue and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementer</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Brookfield, Cicero, La Grange, La Grange Park, Lyons, Riverside, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</td>
<td>Currently, there are no existing portions along the Ogden Avenue corridor. As segments of this corridor are completed, the WCMC should work with communities along the corridor to establish signs to regional trails, neighboring municipalities, and destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementer</strong></td>
<td>WCMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Implementation Tiers

Route 66 Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</td>
<td>The Route 66 connectors provides a link to many trails in the area through the connector and the Cermak Rd./26th St. corridor. The corridor links directly to the existing Salt Creek Trail and Des Plaines River Trail. The corridor is within a half mile of the proposed Chicago Central and Pacific Trail and Centennial Trail. The corridor itself is part of the Route 66 Heritage Trail, making it an important link in the regional trail system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: ACCESS AND CROSSINGS</td>
<td>The main barrier for the Route 66 Connector is to create a better access point to the Salt Creek Trail. Currently the access point is difficult to identify and would be aided by directional signage and corridor improvements for both the Route 66 Connector and the Salt Creek Trail corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</td>
<td>None of the Route 66 Connector Corridor is newly recommended facility. Communities should continue to include this connector in their municipal plans to ensure that the corridor continues to be a priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>34 percent of the corridor consists of planned facilities along the southern portion of the corridor. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct the appropriate facilities along the Route 66 Connector Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Lyons, McCook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on the Route 66 Connector and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Lyons, McCook, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</td>
<td>66 percent of the corridor exists in the northern portion. The WCMC should work with the communities to install regional signage to transit and regional destinations. This corridor is also a part of a larger on and off street trail system traversing the state, meaning near-term signage should be a priority to direct cyclists along this system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Implementers</strong></td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Riverside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 4.1 Implementation Tiers

## Salt Creek Trail Corridor

### 4.1.1 Tier Two Corridor Implementation Summary: Salt Creek Trail Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong></td>
<td>The Salt Creek Trail is itself a major trail in the WCMC. The trail will eventually come within a half mile of the planned extension of the Des Plaines River Trail. Until the Des Plaines River Trail is completed, the Salt Creek Trail should improve it links to other planned corridors at major intersections and destinations. This includes the Wolf Road corridor and the 31st Street corridor near Brookfield Zoo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: SIGNAGE</strong></td>
<td>To be an effective corridor, the Salt Creek trail should install signage to local and regional destinations. This will allow users to use the trail for much more than just recreation, but as a way to get to destinations like shopping areas, educational facilities, and workplaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, Cook County Forest Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong></td>
<td>Less than one percent of the Salt Creek Trail will be a new recommendation. However, communities should continue to include the Salt Creek Trail into all plans in terms of linkages to the trail and amenities along the trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, North Riverside, Westchester, Western Springs, CMAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>Only 2 percent of the trail has yet to be completed in Brookfield. While this is only a small portion, it is an important connection to the 31st Street corridor that will provide a link to the Brookfield Zoo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, Cook County Forest Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used along the Salt Creek Trail and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the trail route and create links to the trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, North Riverside, Westchester, Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong></td>
<td>98 percent of the corridor is currently completed, but would benefit from regional signage to direct users to other corridors and destinations. The trail could be signed in the near-term providing trail users a quick introduction of the benefit to regional signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lead Implementers</em></td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, Cook County Forest Preserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.1 Implementation Tiers

#### Cermak Road/26th Street Corridor

#### 4.1.1 Tier Three Corridor Implementation Summary: Cermak Road/26th Street Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead Implementers: WCMC, Berwyn, North Riverside, Westchester</td>
<td>The Cermak Road/26th Street corridor provides a link to many trails in the area. The corridor links directly to the existing Salt Creek Trail and Des Plaines River Trail. The corridor is within a half mile of the proposed Chicago Central and Pacific Trail. The corridor itself splits off from the Route 66 Heritage Trail, making it an important link in the regional trail system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: IMPROVEMENTS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead Implementers: WCMC, Broadview, Hillside, North Riverside, Westchester</td>
<td>The corridor is a relatively safe corridor except that Cermak Road would require infrastructure improvements, especially at the intersection of Cermak Road and La Grange Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead Implementers: WCMC, Broadview, Hillside, North Riverside, Westchester, CMAP</td>
<td>Cermak portion of the route is a newly recommended segment for facility improvements (45 percent). By putting Cermak Road into the municipal or transportation plans, the municipalities along this section would benefit by completing the Cermak Road/26th Street corridor and open the west side of the route up to bikers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead Implementers: WCMC</td>
<td>The entire corridor is either planned (55 percent) or new (45 percent) facilities. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct the appropriate facilities along 26th Street–Cermak Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead Implementers: WCMC, Berwyn, Broadview, Cicero, Hillside, North Riverside, Riverside, Westchester</td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Cermak Road/26th Street and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead Implementers: WCMC</td>
<td>Currently, there are no existing portions of the 26th Street–Cermak Road corridor. As segments of this corridor are completed, the WCMC should work with communities along the corridor to establish signs to regional trails, neighboring municipalities, and destinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.1 Implementation Tiers

#### Grand Avenue Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, River Grove | The Grand Avenue corridor would link residents to the Des Plaines River Trail. |
| **ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: RIGHT OF WAY**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Northlake | There are no major barriers along the Grand Avenue corridor. The biggest barrier to implementation is a constricted right-of-way along portions of Grand Avenue. |
| **INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Northlake | There are no new portions of the Grand Avenue corridor in any WCMC communities. Communities should focus on local route planning to connect to the planned corridor. |
| **SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Northlake | All of the corridor is categorized as planned facilities. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct the appropriate facilities along Grand Avenue. |
| **UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Northlake | The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Grand Avenue and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor. |
| **INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE**  
  *Lead Implementers*  
  WCMC, Elmwood Park, Franklin Park, Northlake | Currently, there is no existing portion to the Grand Ave. corridor. As segments of Grand Avenue are completed, the WCMC should work with communities along the corridor to establish signs to the Des Plaines River Trail, neighboring municipalities, and destinations. |
### 4.1 Implementation Tiers

**Harlem Avenue Corridor**

#### 4.1.1 Tier Three Corridor Implementation Summary: Harlem Avenue Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong></td>
<td>This corridor will cross the planned extension of the Prairie Path and the Chicago Central and Pacific Trail. The Harlem corridor will provided the opportunity for many municipalities to reach these two trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Forest Park, Oak Park, Riverside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: ADT, I-290, AND JURISDICTION</strong></td>
<td>There are no major barriers along this corridor. However, Harlem Rd. has very high ADT and a reduced ROW due to the lane width to fit any type of bike facility. Harlem Rd. is also an IDOT road with one interstate crossing and heavy truck traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Lyons, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong></td>
<td>All of the Harlem Ave. corridor is new to the WCMC, requiring that all municipalities involved in its implementation integrate the corridor into their municipal plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Lyons, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>Currently none of this corridor exists. As municipalities incorporate Harlem Ave. in their plans, communities can apply for funding to update the roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Cook County Highway Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Harlem Ave. and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Forest View, Lyons, North Riverside, Oak Park, River Forest, Riverside, Stickney, Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong></td>
<td>Due to the corridor being a new recommendation, the WCMC should work with communities in the long-term to direct roadway users to trails and destinations along this long north/south corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### Joliet Road Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong></td>
<td>The Joliet Road corridor comes within a short distance of the Salt Creek Trail, Des Plaines River Trail extension, and Route 66 Connector corridor. By linking to these corridors, the Joliet Road corridor can create a connection to the southwest linking to the I&amp;M Canal Trail and the Centennial Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Lyons, McCook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td>The Joliet Road corridor presents a potentially hazardous situation at Wolf Road. The Wolf Road intersection is dangerous to bikers and leads directly into the Tri-State Tollway on the western end of the intersection. This leads to fast cars coming off of the tollway and as well as the end of the corridor. Traffic calming and signage could be used to alleviate the fast traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Indian Head Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong></td>
<td>Most of the corridor (82 percent) is newly recommended corridor. By integrating this corridor into regional plans, the corridor will open up the southwest Chicago area to biking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Countryside, Hinsdale, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney, CMAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>All of the corridor is either planned (18 percent) or new (82 percent) corridor facility recommendations. The WCMC should work with municipalities to apply for funding opportunities in order to design and construct the planned segments of the Joliet Road corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Countryside, Hinsdale, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Joliet Road and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Countryside, Hinsdale, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong></td>
<td>Currently, there are no existing portions along the Joliet Road corridor. As segments of this corridor are completed, the WCMC should work with communities along the corridor to establish signs to regional trails, neighboring municipalities, and regional destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Berwyn, Countryside, Hinsdale, Hodgkins, Indian Head Park, Lyons, McCook, Stickney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### North Avenue Corridor

#### 4.1.1 Tier Three Corridor Implementation Summary: North Avenue Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE LINKS TO TRAILS</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>The North Avenue corridor will provide a connection between the existing Des Plaines River Trail in River Grove to the planned portion of the Des Plaines River Trail just east in River Forest. Once completed, access to the Des Plaines River Trail will need to be improved to provide connectivity throughout the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCMC, River Forest, River Grove</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS OBSTACLES/BARRIERS: ADT, INTERSECTIONS, AND RIGHT-OF-WAY</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>There are several barriers presented with the North Avenue corridor. North Avenue also has a constricted right-of-way, high ADT, and dangerous intersections located at Lake St./I-290/I-294 and Mannheim Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCMC, Northlake, River Forest, River Grove, Stone Park, Cook County Highway Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATE CORRIDOR PLANNING INTO MUNICIPAL PLANS</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>The North Avenue corridor is a new corridor and will require full integration into all the municipalities bisected by the corridor. Full implementation by all of the communities will insure the completion of this corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCMC, Elmwood Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest, CMAP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEK GRANT ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>Once the corridor is adopted by the surrounding communities as a corridor, the communities can go ahead and seek assistance to completing the corridor with the appropriate facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCMC, Elmwood Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest, Cook County Highway Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on North Avenue and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor route and create links to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCMC, Elmwood Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest, Cook County Highway Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTALL REGIONAL SIGNAGE</strong> Lead Implementers</td>
<td>Currently, there is no existing portion to the North Avenue corridor. As segments of North Avenue are completed, the WCMC should work with communities along the corridor to establish signs to Des Plaines River Trail and other local and regional destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCMC, Elmwood Park, Melrose Park, Northlake, River Forest, Cook County Highway Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.1 Implementation Tiers

### 4.1.1 Tier Three Corridor Implementation Summary: Washington Avenue Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Implementation Activity</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage Links to Trails</strong></td>
<td>The Washington Avenue–Salt Creek Trail corridor is essentially an on-street extension of the Salt Creek Trail. The corridor will also run within a half mile of a proposed rails-to-trails project and Des Plaines River Trail extension. To improve linkage, access signage must be installed to direct cyclists and pedestrians to trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address Obstacles/Barriers: Signage</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle crossing signage must be improved along this corridor at intersections to alert motor vehicles that there are cyclists on the road. Way-finding signage to regional destinations like the Cook County Forest Preserves must also be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrate Corridor Planning into Municipal Plans</strong></td>
<td>26 percent of this corridor is classified as a new corridor recommendation. The newer sections extend the corridor westward into La Grange Park and extend the corridor northward to connect to the Salt Creek Trail. By integrating the corridor into plans, the Salt Creek Trail can be extended on-street and connect to the Des Plaines River Trail and the Route 66 Connector corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, CMAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seek Grant Assistance for Design and Construction</strong></td>
<td>57 percent of the corridor is either new recommendation (26 percent) or planned recommendation (31 percent). By applying for grant assistance to aid in design and construction, the corridor could be completed and become an on-street extension of the Salt Creek Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilize Complete Streets Policies</strong></td>
<td>The WCMC and municipalities should work with IDOT (where appropriate) to ensure that the state’s Complete Streets policy is used on Washington Avenue–Salt Creek Trail and other state jurisdiction roadways in the corridor. The WCMC should encourage Complete Streets planning in municipalities within the corridor and trail route and create links to the trail and corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, La Grange Park, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Install Regional Signage</strong></td>
<td>43 percent of the Washington Avenue–Salt Creek Trail corridor consists of existing facilities ready for regional signage. This signage will aid bikers in reaching local and regional destinations as well as trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Implementers</td>
<td>WCMC, Brookfield, Riverside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bike Lanes, Marked Shared Lanes, Side Paths and Buffered Bike Lanes

Bike lanes offer the highest level of safety for drivers and cyclists on streets with heavy traffic. On high-traffic arterial streets with vehicle speeds of 30 mph or higher and sufficient width, establish five-foot travel lanes exclusive for bicyclists’ use. Establish a policy of regular, prioritized street sweeping along bike lane routes. Bike lanes reinforce proper roadway etiquette, raise the visibility of cyclists and help bicyclists and drivers behave predictably when sharing road space. They also have proven to lower motor vehicle speeds, which results in lower crash severity. Bicycle lanes require regular sweeping to keep lanes acceptably free of road debris.

Marked shared lanes help drivers to expect and accept cyclists in the street and pass bicyclists with caution at an acceptable distance. For bicyclists, marked shared lanes encourage legal bicyclist behavior and raise cyclists’ comfort levels, helping them ride more predictably and safely. Generally, marked shared lanes are not recommended on corridors with higher than 35 mph, however. Corridors that are signed at 25 mph or 30 mph are more ideal for this marking. Marked shared lanes are best implemented with additional traffic calming techniques, like curb extensions/bulb-outs, chicanes, medians, and vertical visual cues like trees, lights, and signs. Marked shared lanes can work well on corridors that have high traffic volume, if combined with sufficient traffic calming. This condition is typical of a central business district where speeds seldom exceed 20 mph and block spacing and signal distances are more frequent.

Side paths or multi-use trails are a good option for corridors that have higher traffic counts, higher speeds, and longer block spacing. Side paths are off-street facilities that are typically shared with pedestrians. They can provide a pleasant riding experience for users that are less comfortable navigating high volume traffic and they tie in well with regional trail networks. These facilities should be a minimum of 8 feet wide, but preferably 10-12 feet. Adequate separation from the curb-face can be created by a tree row or parking lane.

Buffered bike lanes and cycle-tracks offer an alternative solution to side paths on corridors with traffic counts, higher speeds, and longer block spacing. A 2-3 foot painted buffer area to separate the vehicle travel lane from the bike lane can provide sufficient separation to improve the riding experience on heavily travelled arterial corridors. The advantage of a buffered bike lane over a side path is that it can be a more affordable solution if there is sufficient space within the curb-to-curb area.
West Central Municipal Conference
Public Engagement Report

Presented by Active Transportation Alliance, November 2011
THE PLANNING PROCESS:
creating a new way to plan for bicycles

As part of the Cook County Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) grant, the West Central Municipal Conference (WCMC) partnered with the Active Transportation Alliance in order to update its 2001 Regional Bikeways Plan, a plan that has guided the development of regional bicycle facilities for the past five years. While the 2001 Plan was a strong one and well-received by the public, it did not develop a solid guide for implementation or justification for its recommendations. As a result, many of the best ideas from the 2001 plan have not been implemented. In order to create genuine change for bicycling in the WCMC area, the Active Transportation Alliance staff felt a new approach was needed.

Traditionally, the focus of many bicycle plans—especially municipal bicycle plans—is placed on facility design recommendations based on the ease of retrofitting existing roads. This plan, however, is somewhat of a mixed approach; low-travelled roads are often the easiest to make changes to in order to accommodate bicycles, but they are low-travelled precisely because they do not make the most efficient connections possible. As a result, bicycle plans can propose a network to nowhere, diminishing the possibility of bicycling as a real transportation option.

For this plan, then, the main objective lay not in facility design recommendations, but rather in setting network location priorities based on servicing key regional destinations while building upon existing local assets and mitigating the effects of long-standing network barriers. This method of network creation is unique in that it does not prioritize those roads that are traditionally “bicycle friendly,” that is, low-speed and low-traffic roads. Rather, this plan takes the approach that bicycling is a viable transportation option that will grow in popularity if potential riders are given efficient and safe routes on which to bike to regular destinations. In this way, the proposed corridors would have built-in audiences, so to speak: bicyclists who would use the corridors from day one, simply because they offer a direct route to important locations throughout the region.

Central to achieving this task was community outreach conducted by Active Transportation Alliance staff that informed policy priorities and corridor alignment recommendations. Although the basic planning framework was established prior to meeting WCMC representatives, the goal of linking important regional destinations as defined by local residents was a central pillar of the planning process. Further expanding upon this expertise was an innovative survey process that engaged the community and gathered a massive amount of information regarding the elements nominated by the WCMC Bicycle Plan Steering Committee.

HARNESSING LOCAL KNOWLEDGE:
establishing a bicycle steering committee

In order to generate a successful Regional Bikeways Plan, it was essential to utilize the knowledge and opinions of those people who would live in the area and will be the main users of the network. As part of the plan-making effort, a dedicated Bicycle Steering Committee made up of 25-plus members of WCMC communities was formed to help guide the development. The steering committee helped to leverage the assets of the existing network through their expert knowledge of both local and regional transportation facilities. Additionally, WCMC staff members joined the steering committee in order to represent the sub-regional government as a whole.

By the time the plan-making process is completed, the Bicycle Steering Committee will have participated in four meetings between May and January, playing an integral role in defining what is important for the members of the region. Over the course of the first two meetings, the Steering Committee nominated a series of priority categories put forth by Active Trans staff, including plan goals and objectives, critical pieces of existing infrastructure, key regional destinations, and an initial series of recommendations for network corridors. Although the categories themselves were suggested by Active Trans staff, the specific nomination items were all nominated by Steering Committee members.

In addition to the information provided by members of the Bicycle Steering Committee, Active Trans staff also undertook a significant research effort to understand what bicycle planning initiatives are already underway through existing bicycle, transportation, or comprehensive plans. Additionally, Active Trans worked with the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) to gather data on existing bicycle facilities not only in the WCMC area, but
the city of Chicago and neighboring sub-regions in order to make efficient connections both in and out of the region.

**Harnessing Local Knowledge: developing an effective resident survey**

Following the second meeting, it was agreed that an outreach effort among residents would be undertaken to gauge what priorities were most and least important. Using the web-based survey tool Survey Monkey, Active Trans staff created a comprehensive survey that ranked the decisions and nominations drafted by the Bicycle Steering Committee. The survey, comprised of 12 questions, asked survey takers to rank a series of questions, including the importance of nominated corridors, alternate alignment changes, barriers, assets and regional destinations. Over the course of three weeks, 623 residents of the WCMA area completed the survey; the results of the survey are synthesized in this paper.

In approaching this survey effort, however, establishing the methodology presented serious challenges. Most significant was the wide geographic scope of an area that encompasses 30 municipalities; this presents an issue when asking a resident of Countryside about a highly specific intersection nearly 15 miles away in Oak Park. Along these same lines, it cannot be expected that any given WCMA area resident would have a working knowledge of every regional destination off of a specific corridor. In order to mitigate these issues, it was decided to present a series of maps to survey respondents whenever a question referenced a geographic element. This is not a new technique. Maps have been used in conjunction with surveying since the dawn of the multiple-choice format. Active Trans staff chose to focus on a technology that was powerful but familiar to users: Google Maps.

Harnessing Google Maps for surveying is a unique undertaking for both Active Trans and the field of urban planning in general. The benefit of this technology became apparent immediately. Users were able to focus on specific intersections that they were not immediately familiar to them; they could zoom in to a very fine scale and even explore the area using the street view feature. In this way, it is hoped that these maps increased the quality of resident responses and decreased the frequency of “no opinion” responses. Although this was the first time that Active Trans has used this tool for surveys, it is a much more powerful and interactive tool than static mapping and is something that will continue to be built upon for future plan-making endeavors.

While the benefits of this survey are tremendous, there are some limitations. In practice, this survey is more akin to a focus group because respondents were directly e-mailed the survey by a Steering Committee member. As a result, the survey did not function as a random survey for the public at large—it went to those residents who are already engaged in politics and bicycling in the area. The survey, however, still had more than 600 respondents and garnered an enormous amount of information that was not previously collected, as well as being the first time a survey effort regarding bicycle planning had been done on this scale.
GOALS AND PRIORITIES

The Regional Bikeways Plan makes practical recommendations for network alignment as well as policy reform based on priorities set by both the Steering Committee and the public at large. The first step in incorporating public opinion was the goal priority worksheet undertaken by the steering committee at the first meeting. Priority rankings are especially important because they allow both Active Trans staff and the populace at large to understand how this planning document has been framed and which policy decisions are most important to the region.

“We need spokes to downtown radiating out to communities so people can commute 12 to 15 miles by bike. It’s doable!”

In order to understand what these priorities are, committee members were presented with a goal tally sheet that listed a number of priorities in three distinct categories: “network,” “facilities and amenities,” and “policy areas.” Given these options, they were rated on a scale from high priority to low priority. From this, the five greatest priorities were:

1. Bike Network Connecting to Schools
2. Bike Network Connecting to Open Space and Trails
3. Improved Crossings and Intersections
4. Pedestrian Network Connecting to Schools
5. Pedestrian Network Connecting to Open Space

Given this information, it became clear that the residents of the WCMC’s priorities lay in connecting their streets and bikeways to parks, schools, and trails as well as decreasing the risks associated with accessing those areas via bicycling or walking. Throughout the planning process – especially when drafting the final network and the alternate alignments – steps were taken to assure that routes were both safe and efficient at making connections to schools and parks.
### WEST CENTRAL MUNICIPAL CONFERENCE STEERING COMMITTEE: GOAL PRIORITY RANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Medium Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Crossings and Intersections</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Network Connecting to Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Network Connecting to Open Space/Trails</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Network Connecting to Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Network Connecting to Open Space/Trails</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Network Connecting to Transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Network Connecting to Regional Destinations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Network Connecting to Retail/Employment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Network Connecting to Transit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Network Connecting to Retail/Employment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Priority Regional Destinations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Cross-Jurisdiction Partnerships/Projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Priority Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Funding Reform</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Bike Lanes/Paths/Other Facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Travel to Key Destinations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Encouragement for Residents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Government Practices</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist Behavior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use – Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Encouragement for Employers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Pedestrian Amenities (e.g. benches, trees, shelters)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Siting and Transportation Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Pedestrian Scale Lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: weights are 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 following from high to low rankings*
REGIONAL DESTINATIONS

Active Trans’ approach to the area’s network design was based on a foundation of linking important regional destinations, so understanding those destinations that are most important to residents of the region was a central question. Over the course of two meetings with the Bicycle Steering Committee, a list was created that defined the area’s most important entertainment destinations, job centers, and educational institutions. The following destinations comprise those destinations nominated by the Steering Committee. It should be noted, however, that while the following list contains no parks, forest preservers, or non-university schools they were assumed to high priority destinations given the results of the goal priority worksheet.

“\textit{A safe corridor to downtown Chicago should be the number one priority! It’s less than 15 miles from La Grange, but I don't know any safe way to get there.}”

This list was included as part of the survey outreach, where survey participants were asked to rank each destination on a scale from “high-priority” to “not a priority.” From the top ten, five of the “highest priority” choices were places of employment, indicating that connecting to job centers is a priority for the region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Some Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield Zoo</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Chicago</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakbrook Mall</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triton College</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University Hospital</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican University</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Hare International Airport</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway International Airport</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graue Mill and Museum</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grange Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton College</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley Field</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Riverside Mall</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Field</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s Corporate Center</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Cellular Field</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottlieb Hospital</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Center</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyota Park</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook Corporate Center</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlem-Irving Center</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Point Mall Shopping Center</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick Place</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Park Industrial Park</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Crossing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navistar</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagg Creek Golf Course</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Casino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEDESTRIAN ZONES

In addition to key regional destinations, pedestrian zones are nearly as important. Pedestrian zones are different than regional destinations in that they are not single locations; they are areas of cities marked by a wide variety and a high concentration of shopping options. In these areas, residents will generally park their cars but spend the majority of their time walking—rather than driving—from shop to shop. In short, these pedestrian zones are traditionally the downtown core of older cities. Much like with the regional destinations, the Bicycle Steering Committee drafted a set of key pedestrian zones that the bicycle network would attempt to link. Following that, residents were prompted to rank their importance to the region both as entertainment areas and economic drivers.

“These are some densely populated places, filled with retail and restaurants so connecting them with bike paths and making them more safe for pedestrians should be a high priority.”

Perhaps the most surprising is the fact that downtown La Grange, not downtown Oak Park, was regarded as the most important pedestrian area in the WCMC region. This is in spite of the fact that more residents of Oak Park took the survey than La Grange. These rankings seem, however, to justify Active Trans’ decision to remove two of the nominated corridors that almost exclusively serviced Oak Park and the immediate area.
## WEST CENTRAL MUNICIPAL CONFERENCE SURVEY RESULTS: PEDESTRIAN ZONE RANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Some Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown La Grange</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Oak Park</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Riverside</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Forest Park</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Brookfield</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright Homes</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Western Springs</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berywn Depot District</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Elmwood Park</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NETWORK BARRIERS

Simply stated, the road network in place in the WCMC area is currently oriented towards cars. While there is generally more than enough room for cars and bicycles on roads to share, there are key locations throughout the area that present significant safety hazard for bicyclists. Often, these barriers are not simple fixes and cannot be corrected without heavy investment or drastic realignment of the roads. Therefore, while it is in the interest of the network to create efficient connections between key locations, it cannot do so at the expense of cyclist’s safety. A hazardous cycling environment—or even the perception of a hazardous cycling environment—will keep riders off of the road, regardless of network alignment.

“This is not a matter of asking for a simple convenience; this is a matter of life and death and personal safety.”

During the outreach period with the Bicycle Steering Committee, members nominated the locations in the region with the most hazardous intersections, dangerous access points, and poorly signed bicycle routes. Following an analysis of these by the Active Transportation Alliance, the community at large was given an opportunity to respond to these and determine which presented the greatest dangers to bicycling in the region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Description</th>
<th>Major Barrier</th>
<th>Somewhat a Barrier</th>
<th>Minor Barrier</th>
<th>Not a Barrier</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Access to Salt Creek Trail near the Brookfield Zoo</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of 31st St. &amp; The Salt Creek Trail</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Ogden Ave. &amp; the Tri-State Tollway</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Wolf Rd. &amp; Salt Creek Trail</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Cermak Rd. &amp; La Grange Rd.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of First Ave. &amp; Forest Ave.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized Crossing at First Ave. and the Prairie Path</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Bridge Crossings at the Prairie Path</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of North Ave. &amp; Mannheim Rd.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path at the Des Plaines River &amp; North Ave.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of 47th St. &amp; East Ave.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Joliet Rd. &amp; the Tri-State Tollway</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized Crossing at the Prairie Parkway and 25th Ave.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Ogden Ave &amp; Brainard Ave</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsignalized Crossing from the Prairie Path to Warren Ave.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proviso Rail Yard</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of North Ave &amp; Lake St.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection with 25th St. and the Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Wolf Rd. &amp; Joliet Rd.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Taft Ave. &amp; the Prairie Parkway</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Grand Ave. &amp; Rhodes Ave.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While there is still a great deal of room for growth for bicyclists on the roads of suburban Cook County, there are already many excellent pieces of existing infrastructure. These make bicycling safer and more enjoyable for the residents as a whole and should be built upon as much as possible. Most often these assets take the form of well-signed intersections, excellent bicycle facilities, and trails. The existence of these assets are a significant resource for bicycling in the WCMC area and any new routes should be designed, where possible, to take advantage of their presence.

“Bike paths are a true resource which need to be maintained. The more bike routes can be separated from main auto routes while still getting to the same place, the better.”

The Steering Committee as a whole nominated the most significant assets for bicycling in the region, which were then ranked during the survey by the general population as a whole. The results show those assets that are the most effective and, presumably, the most used throughout the region.

Generally, the highest-ranked assets were trails, bridges, or underpasses, all of which have the same function: increasing the safety of bicyclists by mitigating exposure to moving cars. While it is not possible, or even desirable, to always remove bicycles from the road, Active Trans recognizes resident concerns and made attempts to create connections to off-road trails where possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Description</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>A Little Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trail Bridge over the Salt Creek near La Grange Rd.</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge on the Prairie Path over Wolf Road</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike trail near the Des Plaines River through Lyons</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpass beneath Metra lines along Salt Creek Trail</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over the Des Plaines River on Ogden Ave (IL-34)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection between the Prairie Path into Forest Park</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over the Tri-State Tollway (I-294) at Mannheim Road (IL-45)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge over the Des Plaines River near the intersection of First Ave (County Road 171) &amp; North Ave (IL-64)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpass beneath the Tri-State Tollway (I-294) along the Prairie Parkway</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpass beneath the Eisenhower (I-290) along Wolf Road</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths through the Forest Park Park District</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over the Eisenhower (I-290) on Mannheim Rd (IL-45).</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over the Eisenhower (I-290) near Home Ave.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpasses beneath the Eisenhower (I-290) along Butterfield Rd.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalized crossing at Ogden Ave (IL-34) and 39th St</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalized crossing at Mannheim Road (IL-45) and Washington Blvd</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity Pedestrian Activated Beacon at the intersection of E 47th St &amp; S 9th Ave</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks along St. Charles Road between the Tri-State Tollway (I-294) and</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE BICYCLE NETWORK

The previous sections already described – regional destinations, pedestrian zones, barriers and assets – were all used to inform the structure of the network. It was necessary to understand those elements given the overarching goal of the plan: creating an efficient bicycle network that would connect key destinations while maximizing rider safety and utilizing existing infrastructure. The process of identifying the corridors that would make up the final network began with the members of the Bicycle Steering Committee who nominated those corridors that best created connections within the region, especially to previously-identified regional destinations.

“What is important is to get to our neighboring regions without using busy roads or going far out of our way to cross expressways; train yards; canals, rivers, or creeks; industrial sites without through streets; large tracts of forest preserves; ComEd power line corridors; or gravel quarries.”

Following that, Active Trans staff took the nominated corridors and amended them where necessary to better take in to consideration safety concerns, feasibility restraints, maximizing connectivity and building upon existing bicycle facilities. This effort also entailed a detailed analysis phase to understand the geographic proximity to important areas and the extent to which they were existing or had already been planned for as part of previous planning efforts. The result was a set of corridors that firmly established a regionally serving network that connects individual municipalities.

Finally, the corridors were presented to the public at large during the survey. They were first asked to rank the how well of the corridors were in terms of making connections throughout the region. Next, the survey asked how effective those corridors that underwent alignment changes were in comparison to the original nomination. This data is especially useful in that it can show what corridors are most important to residents and, therefore, are most likely to be used should they be implemented.
WEST CENTRAL MUNICIPAL CONFERENCE SURVEY RESULTS: CORRIDORS RANKING

**NOMINATED CORRIDORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Some Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31st Street</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden Avenue (State Route 34)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlem Avenue (Cook County Route 43)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wolf Road</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeland Avenue</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wolf Road</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet Road</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Avenue (Cook County Route 64)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-25th-Rose Street</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATE ALIGNMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>A Little Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred First Avenue (County Road 171)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Mannheim Road (IL-45)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Cermak Road</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred South Cermak Road</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Madison Avenue</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Lake Street</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Grand Avenue</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Grand Ave. Corridor
2. North Ave. Corridor
3. Division St. Corridor
4. Chicago Ave. Corridor
5. Lake St. Corridor
6. Madison St. Corridor
7. North Cermak Rd. Corridor
8. South Cermak Rd. Connector
9. 31st St. Corridor
10. Washington Ave. Corridor
11. Ogden Ave. Corridor
12. Joliet Rd. Corridor
13. North Wolf Rd. Corridor
14. South Wolf Rd. Corridor
15. Mannheim Rd. Corridor
16. 25th Ave. Corridor
17. First Ave. Corridor (Des Plaines Trail)
18. Harlem Ave. Corridor
19. Ridgeland Ave. Corridor

Miles
0 0.7 1.4 2.1