

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 9:38 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: IDOT's proposed expansion for Circle Interchange

From: Alex Hartzler [<mailto:alex.hartzler@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 4:10 PM
To: Info
Subject: IDOT's proposed expansion for Circle Interchange

Dear Sir/Madam,

I don't support IDOT's proposed expansion for the Circle Interchange. The project prioritizes car travel over travel by mass transit, bicycle, and walking, when we should be doing the opposite.

Sincerely,
Alex Hartzler

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 9:27 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: plan and tip amendments

From: Anne Alt [<mailto:anne.alt@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 18, 2013 11:09 AM
To: Info
Subject: plan and tip amendments

Spending this much money and causing major construction disruption just isn't worth it for an estimated savings of 1.2 seconds per trip. This looks like a *colossal* waste of money, which would be better spent on *alternatives* to driving - more frequent Metra service, investing in track and station improvements for CTA, bike facilities (lanes and parking), pedestrian improvements near transit, etc.

More frequent night and weekend service (especially where runs are now at 2 hour intervals) would help to make *Metra* a more attractive alternative for those traveling to/from suburbs and city neighborhoods that don't connect efficiently to the Loop via CTA. This would be especially helpful during CTA's upcoming red line shutdown, which has the potential to greatly increase car traffic between the south side and the Loop. Potential schedule changes should be considered for the Rock Island, *then* the Metra Electric (which currently has the most frequent service of any line).

Anne Alt

--

"If frogs couldn't hop, I'd be Gone With the Schwinn"
--Kermit, The Muppet Movie

Ross Patrosky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 9:28 AM
To: Ross Patrosky
Subject: FW: Plan and TIP amendments - Circle Interchange

From: Christopher Ziemann [<mailto:ciemann@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 18, 2013 11:02 AM
To: Info
Subject: Plan and TIP amendments - Circle Interchange

Dear CMAP,

I urge you to not approve the funding for the Circle Interchange work that IDOT claims is necessary. Expansions of highways, especially in central urban environments, creates more congestion by inducing demand on the roadway freeway, which brings more vehicles into the central city where capacity cannot, and should not, be expanded. It will increase carbon emissions by increasing traffic in the area, reduce public transportation ridership (especially bus ridership) by increasing congestion and by creating the perception of easier driving conditions. This will necessitate larger subsidies to our transit agencies that are already stretched thin. It will lead to more sprawl, just as highways have since the 1950s. It will also increase the number of bridges and highways that will require future repairs and tie the hands of future administrations. Finally, the housing and employment trends for the area, and the country as a whole, are leaning towards less car ownership, less driving, and more people moving back into cities. A project that will primarily benefit people driving who most likely do not live in cities is backwards and doesn't fit future demographic realities.

For these reasons, I urge CMAP to reject the Circle Interchange project.

Thank you, Christopher Ziemann, Chicago

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 9:29 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: Plan and TIP amendments

From: John Krause [<mailto:jck@chicagostreetcar.com>]

Sent: Monday, February 18, 2013 10:01 AM

To: Info

Subject: Plan and TIP amendments

\$400 million to induce more driving and congestion?

I would rather you invest in providing attractive alternatives to driving.

We cannot grow the population and the economy of the city by encouraging people to drive into the Loop. Let's decide instead that the number of cars and the number of parking spaces downtown has already peaked. Let's work on providing alternatives to driving. This is the model for growing a more convenient, efficient, and attractive city.

1. Congestion pricing.
2. Park and ride.
3. Reduce the number of cars downtown enough to make space for effective alternatives to driving: dedicated lanes for transit and protected bikeways.
4. Convert parking to mixed-use transit-oriented development.
5. Invest in a cost-effective expansion of the rapid transit system by upgrading some of our busiest bus routes to high-capacity modern streetcars running with priority in their lane and at intersections--transit that anyone would ride. For \$400 million you could criss-cross downtown Chicago with several miles of streetcars, offering a really attractive alternative to driving.

John Krause, Executive Director
Chicago Streetcar Renaissance
2754 N Hampden Ct No 804
Chicago, IL 60614
+1 312 810 1525
chicagostreetcar.com
[CSR blog](#)

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 9:32 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: Plan and TIP amendments

From: Kathy Schubert [<mailto:kangarookathy@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Saturday, February 16, 2013 3:49 PM
To: Info
Subject: Plan and TIP amendments

Please not more highway construction. We need less driving to make less congestion.

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 9:33 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: Plan and TIP amendments

From: Mark Finger [<mailto:mark.j.finger@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 6:08 PM
To: Info
Subject: Plan and TIP amendments

I am in favor of adding the Circle project to GOTO2040. A distinction as one of the country's worst freight interchanges is one award we don't need!

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 9:31 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: Plan and TIP amendments

From: Martin Menninger [<mailto:menninger@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, February 17, 2013 10:56 PM
To: Info
Subject: Plan and TIP amendments

I am writing to oppose the the inclusion of the circle interchange until a plan is presented that supports the community goals of a less auto dependent community. I feel that any urban highway project should include an aspect of returning land to the community. Cincinnati's Fort Washington Way project is an example of what could be done with I 90 north of the circle to reduce congestion and return land to the city by reducing exit ramps. The Circle Project also reinforces the high speeds of the congress expressway west of the circle. This area should be more of a boulevard - with a pedestrian orientation.

The Circle is located at the heart of the most important urban scar on the city. To pass this opportunity to correct it could mean that the city does not have another chance to fix our pedestrian environment for another 50 years.

While the goal of reducing accidents is noble, this project does not do enough to forward the goals of the region and reinforces poor decisions of the past and should be rejected for inclusion in GOTO2040.

Thanks,
Martin Menninger
Bucktown Resident

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 3:23 PM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: Plan and TIP amendments

From: Scott A. Sanderson [<mailto:ssanderson@marshallip.com>]

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 3:20 PM

To: Info

Subject: Plan and TIP amendments

Hello, I am writing to express my opinion regarding the proposed Circle Interchange Expansion project. I have serious concerns over whether increasing road capacity is an appropriate solution to the traffic on this highway. I believe that induced demand created by this project will lead to a greater reliance on cars in this area without a long term reduction in traffic. Instead, I would favor a congestion-based toll system to introduce a market mechanism to regulate the traffic. I therefore believe that it would not be advisable to include this expansion in the GOTO2040 plan.

If the expansion does go forward, I would urge you to consider increasing the capacity for pedestrians and cyclists.

Thank you,

Scott Sanderson
2044 W. Roscoe Street, Unit 1N
Chicago, IL 60618



Scott A. Sanderson
Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP
233 South Wacker Drive
6300 Willis Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-6357
Direct: (312) 474-6607
Mobile: (773) 213-9544
Firm: (312) 474-6300
Fax: (312) 474-0448
ssanderson@marshallip.com
www.marshallip.com

The material in this transmission may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure or use of this information by you is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please delete it, destroy all copies and notify Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP by return e-mail or by telephone at (312) 474-6300. Thank you.

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 9:34 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: Plan and TIP amendments

-----Original Message-----

From: Shaun Jacobsen [<mailto:shaun.d.jacobsen@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, February 16, 2013 8:26 AM
To: Info
Subject: Plan and TIP amendments

To Whom It May Concern:

I am commenting on the Circle Interchange project proposed by IDOT. I do not find this to be a project that is necessary. It will likely not reduce congestion or save time for drivers.

The best way to reduce congestion would be to take the 3 existing freeways feeding into the interchange and toll them. By tolling you would reduce the incentive for people to drive alone in their cars unless they are willing to pay the price. Perhaps this may even reduce the traffic congestion so that a multi-hundred million dollar project isn't even necessary. At the same time, the revenue could be used to pay for better transit service to make up for the extra cost of driving (i.e. make it more attractive to take Metra or CTA by running trains more often or to more places).

We already have a lot of infrastructure for cars. We should focus on long-term sustainability that improves the quality of life for all in the region by not building this interchange upgrade and focus the money elsewhere.

Sincerely,
Shaun Jacobsen

Shaun Jacobsen

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 9:27 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: Circle Interchange Improvement plan

From: Timi Koyejo [<mailto:timikoyejo@uchicago.edu>]
Sent: Monday, February 18, 2013 10:38 PM
To: Info
Subject: Circle Interchange Improvement plan

Please, look carefully look over the analysis that CMAP has engaged in with regards to the project, and hold off approval until it is clearer that this project will improve efficiency and reduce congestion.

The CMAP memo highlighted various valid concerns with the project, like the fact that this project wasn't identified as a priority in the Go Chicago 2040 plan, and especially the fact that funds have only been found to pay for \$24 million of the total \$400 million cost.

I hope that CMAP won't approve this plan, until the concerns CMAP have identified in the memo concerning the Circle Interchange and the Importance of Setting Transportation Priorities"" are addressed.

Thanks,
Timi Koyejo

Metropolitan Planning Council

February 15, 2012

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Transportation Committee
ATTN: PLAN and TIP Amendment
233 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 800
Chicago, IL, 60606

The Metropolitan Planning Council strongly objects to the manner by which the Circle Interchange project is being considered for inclusion in the regional transportation improvement plan. The Chicago region has made a collective commitment to create and advance a coordinated regional plan based on evaluation measures tied to advancing the region's economy. A five-year effort, the GO TO 2040 Comprehensive Regional Plan is the best, most comprehensive and pragmatic plan our region has ever had. The development of the plan was unprecedented in its public input and transparency.

Working together, the seven counties and 284 communities that make up the CMAP region set clearly defined strategies to influence future growth policies, informed by direct input from thousands of residents. Major capital projects were considered for inclusion in the plan based on how well they implemented the regional vision. It would take more than \$80 billion to implement and operate all of the region's proposed major capital projects need through 2040. A prioritization process was needed to select the best projects within the \$10.5 billion the region had remaining after addressing maintenance needs. GO TO 2040 prioritized fiscally constrained projects based on their support for the Preferred Regional Scenario, the results of the individual evaluations, and information from other project analyses. These projects will result in economic growth, reduced congestion, shorter commutes, and improved job accessibility. Also, the environmental justice impacts of the constrained project list were calculated to ensure that the benefits of the region's transportation investments are shared fairly among socioeconomic groups. The results demonstrate that job accessibility will improve, particularly in terms of transit.

The process was fair and transparent, based on the projects' merits and reflective of CMAP's emphasis on basing investments on accountability and transparency with a results-driven project selection process. The Circle Interchange was not among the 52 regional transportation projects that advanced to the evaluation stage during the GO TO 2040 process, which included input from the Ill. Dept. of Transportation. In spite of this, the reconstruction of the Circle Interchange is suddenly a top priority of the state, with \$40 million committed to engineering and planning at a time when the state faces unprecedented fiscal constraints.

If CMAP adds the Circle Interchange reconstruction to the GO TO 2040 plan, its \$400 million projected costs must be added to the Chicago region's Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). Thus, the state is asking the Chicago region to forgo resources allocated to other projects prioritized by GO TO 2040 — such as the CREATE freight improvement project — in order to allocate

Board of Governors

Joseph A. Gregoire •
Chair

Ann M. Drake •
Vice Chair

Jesse H. Ruiz •
Vice Chair

Paul C. Carlisle •
Vice Chair—Development

James P. Stirling •
Vice Chair—Development

Kathy Hopinkah Hannan •
Secretary

Lisa Snow •
Treasurer

John M. McDonough •
General Counsel

King Harris •
Past Chair

J. Tyler Anthony
Rita R. Athas
Karen M. Atwood
John W. Baird
Kyle Barnett
Lawrence T. Borgard

Byron Brazier
Carole L. Brown
Todd C. Brown •
John A. Buck
Christopher B. Burke
Nora Moreno Cargie
Ellen Carnahan
Pedro J. Cevallos-Candau
Lester Crown

Jon B. DeVries
Sidney R. Dillard
Derek Douglas
Robert V. Fitzsimmons •
James C. Franczek, Jr. •
John S. Gates, Jr.
Linda Goodman
Jacques N. Gordon, Ph.D. •
M. Hill Hammock •
David Hiller

Lawrence I. Ilowe
Bernard Loyd
Mary K. Ludgin
Peter C. Malecek
James E. Mann •
Lee M. Mitchell •
Paul E. Nowicki
Robert T. O'Brien

J. Scot Pepper •
Stephen M. Porras
Quintin E. Primo, III
Jorge Ramirez
George A. Ranney, Jr. •
Matthew R. Reilein
Kevin C. Richardson
Jean Rudd
Martin Stern
Bruce W. Taylor
Michael A. Thomas
Mary White Vasys
Paula Wolff •

President
MarySue Barrett •

Executive Committee •

Executive Advisors

Laurent Auguste
Veolia Water Americas

Raymond Bachant
Bombardier Transportation

Carol L. Bernick
Polished Nickel Capital Management

Lawrence T. Borgard
Integrus Energy Group

Marsha Cruzan
U.S. Bank

Craig J. Duchossois
The Duchossois Group, Inc.

Colin Dyer
Jones Lang LaSalle

Mitchell S. Feiger
MB Financial Bank, N.A.

Paul S. Fisher
Centerpoint Properties

Joseph A. Gregoire
PNC

Stephen J. Hagge
AptarGroup, Inc.

Patricia Hemingway Hall
Health Care Service Corp.

Edward R. Hamberger
Association of American Railroads

Eric Hirschfield
Goldman Sachs

Frederick A. Krehbiel
Molex Incorporated

Matthew Levin
Aon Corporation

Raymond J. Lewis
Ventas, Inc.

David J. Neithercut
Equity Residential

Robert L. Parkinson, Jr.
Baxter International Inc.

J. Marshall Peck
InterPark Holdings LLC

Thomas Pontarelli
CNA

Judith C. Rice
BMO Harris Bank

Larry D. Richman
The PrivateBank

Jim L. Stanley
NIPSCO (NISource)

Robert A. Sullivan
Fifth Third Bank

Frederick H. Waddell
Northern Trust

Edward J. Wehmer
Wintrust Financial Corporation

funding for the Circle Interchange reconstruction. Further, because the Circle Interchange did not go through the GO TO 2040 evaluation process, there was no initial consultation with community stakeholders, which has led to significant community push-back on such elements as the proposed flyover. One comment raised at a Circle Interchange Working Group meeting was that, at a time when many cities are taking down concrete flyovers because they segregate neighborhoods, create safety concerns, and hinder community development, this plan would build yet more in Chicago and could potentially have detrimental impacts on the Greektown neighborhood.

The CMAP region has united around its transportation priorities. Though the Circle Interchange reconstruction may be merited in the future, the overriding concern is that it did not go through any evaluation process. The Metropolitan Planning Council strongly believes all proposed projects need to work through a common evaluation process, and we object that the Circle Interchange renovation has not done so but is being considered for insertion into the GO TO 2040 plan.

Unilaterally adding a major project to this agreed-upon plan demeans the GO TO 2040 effort and sends a message to the public that criteria and transparency do not matter. The public deserves to know that their dollars are being spent wisely, effectively, and according to a well-thought-out plan. At a time when CMAP, MPC and other regional stakeholders are calling for merit-based budgeting at IDOT, the proposal to add the Circle Interchange renovation to the fiscally constrained list is another dramatic example of why we need to take this approach for ALL transportation investments in Illinois. We simply cannot afford to arbitrarily add and allocate funds to projects that haven't been fairly evaluated.

MarySue Barrett

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "MarySue Barrett". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

President

Ross Patronsky

From: John Allen
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2013 9:18 AM
To: Ross Patronsky
Subject: FW: Plan and TIP amendments - Circle Interchange Proposal Comments

From: Andrew Herman [<mailto:andrewherman9@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 10:36 AM
To: Info
Subject: Plan and TIP amendments - Circle Interchange Proposal Comments

Good Morning-

This is an email re: the Chicago circle interchange (I-90/94, I-290) proposal by IDOT as today is the last day in the comment period.

I fully believe this is a bad proposal and should never be built. Expanding highway capacity will not reduce traffic and only lead to increased car/truck use to fill the extra capacity. Highways have zero place in cities. IDOT should not be spending hard to come by funds on such a project. Funds instead should be used to increase pedestrian livability / accessibility, public transportation, and bikeways in and around Chicago. The \$400 million to build the interchange could go a lot further with transit, bikeways, pedestrian uses, etc. By focusing on those other needs and encouraging alternative transportation modes, IDOT may be able to reduce congestion by getting single occupancy vehicles off the road.

I understand there are other complete streets improvements in this plan. I believe those should be implemented in the area independent of the circle interchange.

Thank you.

Kind Regards,
Andrew Herman

Andrew Herman
(631) 379-6081 (mobile)
andrewherman9@gmail.com