

From: [Rory Gilchrist](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: Transportation Program Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 4:16:45 PM

Do not expand highways. Do not expand highways. Do not induce further demand for fossil fuel infrastructure.

Every dime spent on it is money not spent on other modeshares.

The Gulf of Mexico is (was) on fire. It was 133 degrees in Death Valley this week. Siberia is in the 120 range.

The cause of all of this is anthropogenic climate change through the burning of fossil fuels. It will kill people. It has killed people. It will continue to kill people. It will kill people in Chicago. It will kill people across the globe. It will threaten food supplies and cause immense migrations orders of magnitude larger and more disruptive than the planet saw after WW2. And there is already a set amount of this suffering and death we have baked in because of emissions we have already made and fossil fuels we have already burned. Decisions contributing to this and enabling this were made by the person who had your job before you, maybe even by you yourself. Do not cling to a mistake just because you've been a long time making it.

Do not expand highways. Do not expand highways. Do not do it. It's a suicidal idea. FFY 2022 already has \$20M+ dedicated to roadway projects.

This has been my public comment.

Rory Gilchrist, resident of Chicago. Drinker of water and breather of air.

--

—Rory Gilchrist

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Ethan Saltzberg](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: CMAQ, TAP-L and STP Share Fund Feedback
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 10:26:51 AM

Good morning,

Thank you for allowing public comment on these project proposals. Considering our region & nation's current challenges, including environmental crisis, as well as the ON TO 2050 priorities, here are my recommendations for these projects.

First, target the highest return on investment, where the most people will gain the most benefit. Projects that improve public transportation, while some of the most costly, end up improving the daily lives of hundreds of thousands of people, so those costs are more worth it. In contrast, projects to update traffic signals & road widening will only bring modest benefit for drastically fewer people, most of whom are in single-occupancy vehicles (which stands against CMAP's goals of reducing car dependency and increasing climate resiliency).

Secondly, target projects that reduce emissions & climate impact. This means unreservedly prioritizing public transit improvements, bike trails and protected bike lanes, and pedestrian facilities (this includes projects like adding sidewalks, such as in Berkeley (04-21-0005)). CMAP cannot claim to take climate change & air pollution seriously while simultaneously approving road widening and intersection expansions, especially if they are favored over climate-friendly projects that improve public transit, for example.

Lastly, I'm wary of projects that will spend millions of dollars on re-constructing and widening a road or intersection by touting the importance of ADA compliance as a side-benefit. There are many ways to add & improve ADA compliance alone that don't involve millions to widen the road, and in fact many proposals that include ADA and pedestrian safety would create road geometry that encourages speeding and more traffic, which would make it less safe for vulnerable pedestrians or anyone outside of a motor vehicle (plus added air pollution). Perhaps, focus more on projects that narrow roads instead, to decrease vehicle speeds, make pedestrian & bike crossings safer, and discourage traffic through pedestrian areas.

Thank you again for your consideration. I hope to see projects that are truly future-forward, instead of more asphalt & 20th-century planning.

-Ethan Saltzberg

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Comments on the proposed FFY 2022-2026 STP shared fund program

July 30, 2021

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed STP shared fund active and contingency programs, and on the project selection process in general. MPC and CMAP share the goal of ensuring that transportation investments align with and help move the region toward its mobility, climate, and equity goals. We applaud CMAP on developing and continuing to adapt the innovative, performance-driven process used to select projects for the STP shared fund.

MPC takes special interest in how existing statewide programming practices fail to challenge the auto-oriented status quo. We were pleased to see the multimodal nature of the projects selected in this round, which is a notable improvement over the inaugural STP shared fund program.

Looking at the range of scores, it was notable that 12 projects received less than 40 points, and 57% of all projects received less than 50. This begs the question as to whether there should be a scoring threshold for projects to be considered for the STP shared fund. This is unlikely to ever be a major issue with the active program, but all qualifying projects not in the active program are automatically included on the contingency program. We recommend limiting the contingency program to projects above a certain point threshold. Projects which score poorly for transportation impact factors should also face additional scrutiny. While the primary motivating factors for establishing the STP shared fund was to ensure the region fully obligates all federal funds, we believe the shared fund can be most impactful by championing projects that are most closely in alignment with the region's policy goals and, in doing so, encouraging sponsors to develop higher-quality projects that will more quickly help us achieve regional goals. Projects with very low scores, therefore, should not be considered.

We also have concerns about sponsors being able to request that projects be scored in multiple categories. It was clear from the preliminary scoring that the same project could have significantly different scoring based on its categorization. This seems to invite the possibility that projects could be developed to "game" the system. We recommend that CMAP develop a methodology to assist sponsors in picking a single category that most accurately reflects the project's purpose and goals. This is also important for transparency and public accountability.

Lastly, we encourage CMAP to continue refining how a project's safety benefits are measured. For example, if a project reduces the likelihood of a crash but also induces more VMT, then it may have a neutral or even negative impact on overall safety. This should be reflected in the scoring. While decreasing the rate of crashes is important, it is much more important to reduce the total number of injury crashes. This is especially true in a region seeing low population growth but growing per capita VMT.

MPC looks forward to assisting CMAP and the STP shared fund project selection committee in continuing to refine and strengthen this innovative program.