



MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: March 7, 2019

Re: Summary of public comment on the Proposed Amendment to ON TO 2050 – O’Hare Express System

The following summarizes feedback regarding a proposed amendment to ON TO 2050 submitted by the City of Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) regarding [the O’Hare Express System \(OES\)](#).

The public comment period for the O’Hare Express System was open from January 25, 2019 to February 25, 2019. This aligned with the public comment period for a second amendment request from CDOT for the Roadway Improvements to Support the Update to the South Lakefront Framework Plan. Comments were collected via two dedicated e-mail addresses that were set-up expressly to receive comments on the amendments: jacksonpark@cmap.illinois.gov and ohareexpress@cmap.illinois.gov. Links to these e-mail addresses were included on [a dedicated webpage](#) that contained more information on the proposals. Feedback was also solicited in CMAP’s weekly e-mail newsletter and via social media posts. Residents were also invited to provide comments by mail and in-person at the CMAP Board and Transportation Committee meetings.

O’Hare Express System Public Comment Summary

Overall, 28¹ comments were collected for the OES. Of these, 25 comments offered concerns about the project, two supported it, and one expressed support only under the condition that the project use no public dollars. A total of 26 comments were received from individual residents, one from an Alderman, and a joint comment was received from the Center for Neighborhood Technology and the Metropolitan Planning Council.

Residents in support of the project applauded the innovation and the convenience a high-speed transportation connection to the O’Hare Airport could bring, as well as its potential to advance

¹ One comment was received on March 5, 2019, after the close of the comment period.

Chicago as a global city. Those concerned about the project suggested that the concept, technology, and feasibility are uncertain and have not been adequately tested or analyzed. They felt this could lead to a stalled project or allocation of city resources to a project that remains unfinished. Others stressed apprehension about unforeseen costs and high fares, and recommended proceeding with fiscal caution. Others indicated a lack of equity in the market for the project and called for ensuring that the system is affordable for all residents of the region.

Others presented transportation-related concerns. One strain of comments stated that there are more urgent transportation and infrastructure needs that should be prioritized. Others suggested the alternatives of increasing the capacity of the CTA Blue Line and Metra North Central Service, which offer existing connections to O'Hare. Some advocated use of the highway network and increasing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routing as alternatives for faster airport access. Commenters noted their concern about congestion at the entry and exit points of the proposed system and its effect on road traffic. Finally, commenters indicated concerns about the evaluation process and whether sufficient time and information has been available to appropriately evaluate the project.





SCOTT WAGUESPACK

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF CHICAGO

COUNCIL CHAMBER

CITY HALL—ROOM 300
121 NORTH LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60602
TELEPHONE: 312-744-6567

ALDERMAN, 32ND WARD
2657 NORTH CLYBOURN AVENUE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60614
TELEPHONE: (773) 248-1330
FAX: (773) 248-1360

COMMITTEES, RULES AND ETHICS
EDUCATION AND
CHILD DEVELOPMENT
HOUSING AND REAL ESTATE
HUMAN RELATIONS
SPECIAL EVENTS AND
CULTURAL AFFAIRS

March 5, 2019

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Attn: Elizabeth Schuh
233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, IL 60606

Re: O'Hare Express System

I am writing to express my opposition to the Chicago Department of Transportation's (CDOT) request to amend On To 2050 to include the proposed O'Hare Express System. The proposed tunnel is not a potential public transit asset, but rather a highly speculative luxury transportation service that would require high fares in order to be financially feasible. No reasoned assessment of the City's current transit service would conclude that the proposed O'Hare Express System is warranted or worthy of inclusion as a public priority.

If the service ultimately is implemented and successful, despite the impediments noted in the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning assessment and elsewhere, the primary result would be to reduce fare revenue on the existing Chicago Transit Authority's Blue Line. The high fares necessary to make the service financially feasible would preclude any substantive improvements to traffic congestion. If the service is unsuccessful, the City of Chicago would end up assuming the financial liability associated with either subsidizing service operation or retiring the asset.

CDOT's rationale for submitting the O'Hare Express System for inclusion in On To 2050 is that it is necessary for National Environmental Protection Agency review as a regionally significant project. This is at odds with the fact that, as noted in your memo analyzing the proposed amendment, this review is already underway.

I have substantial concerns with the City's feasibility report on the O'Hare Express System. The primary basis for ridership estimates is potential customer surveys asking respondents whether they would use the service. The same methodology was employed in multiple feasibility analyses leading up to the implementation and underperformance of the airport express train in Toronto. Further, as noted in your memo, the City's feasibility analysis includes assumptions about future airport passenger counts that appear to clearly exceed the functional capacity of the airport.

Thank you for considering my input on this proposed amendment and for your continued efforts on behalf of metropolitan planning and policy in the Chicago region.

Sincerely,

Scott Waguespack, Alderman 32nd Ward

February 20, 2019

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Attn: Elizabeth Schuh
233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, IL 60606

RE: Proposed Amendment to ON TO 2050 – O’Hare Express System

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed addition of the O’Hare Express System to ON TO 2050, the region’s federally-required coordinated transportation plan. The Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) and Metropolitan Planning Council (MPC) are strong proponents of CMAP playing a guiding role in the region’s growth and share CMAP’s commitment to a vibrant public transit system. That leads both our organizations to express our shared concerns about the precedent set by fast-tracking the addition of this project to ON TO 2050.

ON TO 2050, adopted in October, is the culmination of more than three years of work, including rigorous analysis of major capital projects, thoughtful strategy development, and intensive public and stakeholder engagement. In ON TO 2050, the O’Hare Express project was included as an “unconstrained” or unbudgeted project, noting that “Additional study and financial information is needed before consideration for fiscal constraint.” While CNT and MPC acknowledge that projects and priorities evolve over time, it is concerning that the process for amending the plan to add the O’Hare Express System, which began within a month of plan adoption, has not involved a level of performance-based analysis and engagement consistent with the process for development of ON TO 2050.

While CMAP’s memo about the project provides some estimates of potential impacts, it also notes a lack of information about capital and operating costs, final project alignment, and other critical project elements. More detail about these elements is needed to determine the project’s impacts on transportation and land use in the Chicago region. It also is not clear how this project was chosen over other alternatives to improve transit access to O’Hare International Airport.


That the O’Hare Express System is proposed as a public-private partnership (PPP) does not lower the bar for rigorous analysis of its costs and benefits. The strategy “[Use public-private partnerships strategically](#)” in the mobility chapter of ON TO 2050 states that “projects must help implement regional priorities for transportation, land use, and other issues before being considered for a PPP.” In addition to incomplete information about project impacts, limited access to the details of the public-private partnership makes it difficult to assess the amount of public risk associated with the project.

Consideration of the O’Hare Express System as an amendment to ON TO 2050 will set an important precedent for future plan amendments. It is therefore particularly critical to conduct thorough analysis, public engagement, estimation of full costs and impacts, and analysis of alternatives to set a high standard for transparency and rigor. The O’Hare Express System has not yet reached this standard. CNT and MPC request that CMAP commit to its usual thorough review process before considering an amendment to ON TO 2050.

Sincerely,



MarySue Barrett
President
Metropolitan Planning Council



Robert Dean
CEO
Center for Neighborhood Technology

Heather Armstrong

2/22/2019, Public Comment – Transportation Committee Notes

Heather Armstrong stated she believes most people don't want O'Hare Express Service and due to the cost would just take the Blue Line. She suggested more to improve North Central service to O'Hare or to add an O'Hare stop on the Milwaukee District-West line would be better than using taxpayer dollars on something people won't use. She added that she is concerned about bridge conditions and stated they need to be fixed before they fall apart.

Additional: From Transportation Committee Notes

Justin Bandy

2/7/2019, email

Subject: Comment in support of the O'Hare Express System (OES)

I am writing to express my strong support for the O'Hare Express System (OES). I am a frequent business traveler who would likely heavily use the OES, as well as a resident of Chicago who views the OES as a positive project for the city. I have gone through the CMAP memorandum as well as the "O'Hare Express System Ridership Report" by WSP from September, 2017 and I believe these studies underestimate the potential benefit of the project in a few critical ways. First, I believe the ridership figures for the project are understated. The WSP report clearly states in the first paragraph of the report that its "ridership estimates do not represent investment grade forecasts," so anchoring on these forecasts is clearly inappropriate. There are two methodological issues in this study that I believe are flawed and lead to ridership projections that are too low. First, the report estimates that congested auto travel times from the CBD to ORD will evolve from 50 minutes in 2015 to 56 minutes in 2045. Really? Unless there is a major expansion of the Kennedy Expressway, I would expect this to increase much more than 6 minutes, especially given probable new developments along this artery such as Lincoln Yards, increased traffic from O'Hare to the Loop from the upcoming O'Hare expansion and natural growth in air traffic, as well as (hopefully) increasing affluence in the city of Chicago over the next 30 years that will lead to more car usage. Second, the report assumes travelers to O'Hare from the CBD are comparing transportation options relative to average travel times. We all know there is no such thing as an "average" travel time on the 90/94, and no rational traveler in Chicago is planning a car journey to O'Hare to catch a flight based on average travel times. Travelers are basing schedules on worst-case-scenario travel times on the freeway so they have a buffer to make it to O'Hare in case traffic is terrible (which it often is!). Because the OES should be a predictable way to travel to O'Hare, a traveler would be comparing a known travel time on the OES to a worst-case travel time on the freeway. This makes the OES much more attractive to time-conscious travelers compared to vehicle transportation, and, in my opinion, would lead to greater switching from vehicle transportation to utilization of the OES. Second, the evaluation of Planning Factors on page 18 of the CMAP memorandum does not take into account ancillary benefits that the OES would enable from reduced congestion on the 90/94 and on the Blue Line. While I agree that at the discussed fare level, usage of the OES by residents of EDAs would be negligible, these individuals would benefit from shorter travel times from reduced congestion on the 'L' and road/freeway networks in Chicago. In addition, the evaluation says the study would have a low benefit from a reduction in greenhouse emissions given the ridership projections for the project (which I believe are too low). However, there would be a significant benefit on greenhouse gasses from reduced congestion on the 90/94 that is not factored into this evaluation. Third, the OES would have significant economic benefits that do not appear to be taken into account in the CMAP memorandum. The Planning Factors analysis says there is no economic impact due to industry clustering. While this could be true, it is a narrow definition of economic impact and I think this verdict lacks vision. If Chicago can become an early innovator in electric-vehicle mass transportation, I see the potential for companies and jobs related to this emerging sector to look to Chicago as a place to set up business. Moreover, the project would enhance the city's "economic brand." This would be a project that would likely receive significant and favorable press coverage, and visitors to Chicago who use the project would no doubt leave with the impression that Chicago is an innovative city that is at the technological forefront. While these are "soft" economic benefits, brands

have real value and the economic success of a region is linked to people's perception of that place; this is often based on superficial factors. For a city with an unjustly tarnished image like Chicago, having a marquee project to rebuild its brand is hugely important. Moreover, there are immediate economic benefits for the city. This would represent a \$1 billion investment, which would create jobs. The project would also create recurring employment after the construction phase related to operations and maintenance. How could somebody oppose these things? Fourth, the project will be fully financed without taxpayer dollars. That's amazing. While the contract with the Boring company must be thoughtfully written to prevent any potential financial burden on the city of Chicago in the case of an adverse scenario, there are various ways to prevent this such as requiring significant upfront deposits from the Boring Company or surety bonds to neutralize any potential liability for public entities. In other words, an effective legal team can take financial risk for Chicago off the table. Fifth and finally, what will be the consequence of rejecting this proposal? Future entrepreneurs and innovators will remember Chicago as a place that turned down a proposal to add an innovative transportation option to the city at no cost to the taxpayer because it required relatively minor tweaks to planning frameworks. Surely a city acting in this manner is not a friendly place to do business or one that is forward thinking and innovative! Why would somebody set up shop in such a place? Is this really the message we want to send to the world about Chicago? We are supposed to be "the city that works." Let's not jeopardize this hard-earned reputation.

Additional: Co-Portfolio Manager, Global Value Strategies, Artisan Partners Limited Partnership, 1 North Wacker Dr, Suite 4100, Chicago, IL 60606, 312.964.4301, 415.283.1826 fax

Eric C. M. Basir

2/1/2019, email

Subject: No to boring

I am going to say it ain't worth it. We WILL have to pay for it in more ways than one. The fares are only affordable for rich people. I think its better to take risks on improving the current transit system

Additional: none

Jim Bethune

2/1/2019, email

Subject: Please do not add O'Hare Express to ON TO 2050

Please do not add the O'Hare Express to the ON TO 2050 plan. This project uses non-existent technology with no working prototypes, and even if it were feasible, it takes resources and attention away from far more impactful projects that should be pursued in Chicago.

Additional: 1950 N Campbell Ave Apt 419S Chicago, IL 60647

Michael Bingaman

2/5/2019, email

Subject: Do NOT amend ONTO 2050 plan with O'Hare Express

We've known for over 100 years that transit systems need to be publicly owned. Boring company's proposal for an O'Hare express is nothing more than graft. Please do not spend any more time doing analysis of this proposal or include it in the ONTO 2050 plan.

Additional: none

Austin Busch

2/1/2019, email

Subject: Why should we encourage Chicago's mono-centricity?

It is unwise to put a questionable technology in a plan meant to last 30 years. Chicago should not make exceptions to reason for a side project of a billionaire, especially one who has expressed distaste for public transportation and a desire to leave this planet. Beyond the eccentricities of this particular technology and company, the very idea of an O'Hare express to downtown is already dubitable. Such an express is built to strengthen a mono-centric vision of the city, which in turn exacerbates the region's transportation issues. Our city's transportation system is designed around a central node, both in public transportation and through the freeway system. Expanding connections outside of the central core would encourage poly-centric growth, which allows for denser overall development and more efficient use of two-way travel patterns. Instead of an O'Hare express, it would be more beneficial to increase efficiency along the Blue Line, add a bypass to the Brown Line or Red Line, and consider a through-routed Metra service. While the airport express would reduce commutes from downtown, a bypass between the North Shore and the Kennedy Expressway corridor would have a greater overall benefit. While an extension of the Brown Line to Jefferson Park is preferable, a stopgap could be multiple East-West BRT routings, such as along Belmont. These community-oriented improvements would speed travel times on the entire north side of the city, and benefit non-airport users as well. Likewise, an extension line through Schaumburg, much like the Purple Line and Yellow Line, would also relieve much of the traffic congestion in this area, as well as tie the CTA system in with a major employment center and possibly with Pace's bus hub. Lastly, building out the O'Hare Metra transfer station with the new rental car facility and increasing frequency would serve a similar purpose for downtown business travelers. A short-tracked route with a turnaround soon after would make proper use of the existing infrastructure, and could be built out with a through-routing to another Metra line. This is regional planning. Feeding a small plot of downtown is not. Please do not entertain this desperate political plea, but instead be an advocate of our current system's missed connections.

Additional: none

Sara Disney Haufe

2/25/2019, email

Subject: Public Comment on O'Hare Express Train

As a lifelong Cook County resident, I respectfully ask that CMAP deny the request to add the O'Hare Express Train to ON TO 2050 and its list of RSPs. The utility of this transit service is highly questionable given its limited convenience from a single Loop station and our existing rail connection via the CTA Blue Line. Additionally, adequate information regarding the financial viability of this "self-funded" project under the proposed fee structure has not yet been provided, and so we as constituents of the MPO should not be expected to allocate State and Federal resources to this endeavor when other transportation projects have gone through a rigorous, transparent process to assure their benefits to the region. I have the utmost respect for the CMAP team and its mission and trust you to do the right thing to represent our region's best interests.

Mike Erickson

2/23/2019, email

Subject: Public Comment

The following statement (made by the City of Chicago) constitutes a false application statement that renders the request for inclusion null and void regarding request for amendment to ON TO 2050's list of fiscally constrained regionally significant projects (RSPs): quote... "d. The Project is expected to be funded solely by Project-generated revenues and financed entirely by the Developer. The City and the CIT will not provide funding for the Project." Given a \$billion per mile for drilling costs alone the City's statement is bogus. It is obvious that human-powered transportation efforts would be negatively impacted by taking resources for the Boring Tunnel.

Additional: Adjunct Professor of Earth and Environmental Science, MVCC, 708-625-2597

Michelle Flagg

2/22/2019, Public Comment – Transportation Committee Notes

Michelle Flagg introduced herself as a real estate attorney and owner of a woman-owned business enterprise (WBE) and disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE). She asked what considerations would be given in the O'Hare Express Project for WBE and DBE companies. Ms. Hamilton stated that the specific provisions are unknown and suggested that Mr. Burke, who had left the meeting earlier, may be able to provide more information.

Additional: From Transportation Committee Notes

Shaun Jacobsen

2/5/2019, email

Subject: No to O'Hare express train

I am registering my opposition to an O'Hare express train being added to the regional plan.

This project was promised no public funds for its construction and it should remain a fully privately-financed project. Not a cent of public funds should be spent on a project that will not benefit a majority of the public.

Our region's transportation needs are extensive, but in no way is an express train necessary for an airport already served by 24-hour public transportation. The public's contributions should not be used for private pet projects that benefit the wealthy.

Do not put this project in the plan.

Bob Johnston

2/22/2019, email

Subject: I urge you to reject the OES Amendment

The O'Hare Express system as envisioned by the Boring Company, dramatically fails in every way to be consistent with ON TO 2050's goals.

- A. An all-underground route does not foster "inclusive growth"
- B. It completely lacks resiliance in the event of an accident, with passengers trapped
- C. It can't be a prioritized investment if it doesn't serve the whole community.

It is inconceivable that this system was selected when there are two viable alternatives using upgrades of existing technology rather than relying on unproven and untested promises.

They are:

1. The Cross Rail Chicago Plan of upgrading Metra, Canadian Pacific, and Canadian National rail lines between Chicago Union Station and a southern entrance to O'Hare with an on-the-airport terminal. Offering a one-seat ride from downtown also opens up connectivity options from intercity passenger rail and suburban areas and connections to McCormick Place and the southern suburbs
2. A plan utilizing existing but unused freight railroad right-of-way south from downtown, then west and north to O'Hare. Stadler Diesel Multiple Unit equipment, now running as TexRail between Fort Worth, Tex., and DFW Airport, was proposed, but this proposal was inexplicably rejected in favor of the Boring Company's pod plan. This route could also offer connectivity to other modes in the city and west suburban areas.

These are viable alternatives that not only serve more than just the narrow needs of O'Hare to downtown travelers but fulfill CMAP's ON TO 2050 goals. You must reject the Boring Company/City of Chicago plan

Additional: Bob Johnston, 623 West Oakdale Ave., Chicago, IL 60657, Bob.johnston1111@gmail.com, (312) 402-8876

Harvey Kahler

2/8/2019, email

Subject: O'Hare Express

I have no objection to the O'Hare Express proposal as long as The Boring Company assumes all financial and liability risk.

The one condition I ask is for planning and easement to allow for a regional and intercity rail station with convenient landside access to the terminals and CTA Blue Line in coordination with Metra, Amtrak, and the State.

Trains could be extended from Union Station and provide a comfortable and convenient feeder service from many smaller destinations within 150-200 miles and relieve both air and road congestion.

Provision should be made to allow extension to an O'Hare western access terminal and connections to the railroad network to other regional destinations. This will reduce roadway congestion approaching and at the terminals.

A secure airside shuttle system could share the same rail tunnels between separate secure terminal and satellite concourse stations. Regional, intercity, and shuttle trains may require layover and service facilities at or near the airport.

Michael McCarthy

2/24/2019, email

Subject: Comment re: O'Hare Express System

I am writing to oppose the addition of the "O'Hare Express System" to the fiscally constrained regionally significant projects list in ON TO 2050. The city of Chicago and Mayor Emanuel have repeatedly stated that OES would be entirely funded by private investors, therefore it should not be made eligible for any federal funding. This request is a waste of MPO time and resources that could divert federal resources away from other projects more deserving of funding. The project is not fiscally constrained because the total amount is unknown or the city and the Boring Company are unwilling to disclose this information. It is not regionally significant because there is already a heavy rail system connecting the termini with short headways and reasonably fast service known as the CTA Blue Line. I see no reason for adding this project to ON TO 2050 and many reasons against this proposed addition.

Additional: Master's student in Urban Planning and Policy (MUPP), University of Illinois at Chicago,
mccrthy3@uic.edu

Kiernan McCloskey
62 Kellogg Dr.
Pomona, CA 91768
(619) 247-7996
kemccloskey@cpp.edu
February 4, 2019

Elizabeth Schuh
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
233 S Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, IL 60606

Dear Elizabeth Schuh:

As you can tell from my address, I am not a resident of Chicago, nor do I live anywhere nearby. However, I have recently learned about the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning's interest in adding Elon Musk's "O'Hare Express" project to its list of priorities for federal funding. I live in Pomona, CA, a suburb of Los Angeles. On the other side of the city is the community of Hawthorne, where the headquarters of his companies SpaceX and the Boring Company are located, and where he has dug a minuscule tunnel without the consent or knowledge of the homeowners above it. It is imperative that the Agency does not move forward with this act for three key reasons: Elon Musk has no interest in public transportation, he has no interest in the communities he tunnels under, and he has no interest in those who do his bidding.

Musk cited his reasoning for the creation of the "Boring Company" in a tweet: essentially that "traffic" was "driving [him] nuts" and that he would "just start digging". The tunnels he created under Hawthorne, a suburb of Los Angeles not far from me, have been proven to have a much lower capacity than a conventional rapid transportation rail system, such as a subway. Musk's tunnel originally meant to transport pods of 16-20 people. He later revised this such that cars will be driving through the tunnels at a supposedly higher speed. The typical passenger capacity of a car is 5 people, and most commuters in Los Angeles drive alone. This means the tunnels are essentially an underground freeway. Another issue that arises is that of the entry and exit "elevators", where cars are lowered into or lifted out of the tunnels. This bottleneck will create traffic far, far worse than any freeway, according to an article by planner Angie Schmitt for Streetsblog (<https://usa.streetsblog.org/2018/12/19/elon-musks-tunnel-project-in-los-angeles-is-bad-joke/>). Although his project had some elements of a public transportation system at first, Musk's tunnel has devolved into essentially a toll road for the rich to (seemingly) avoid traffic in their cars.

Elizabeth Schuh
February 4, 2019
Page 2

Another key argument against Musk's project is his disinterest in the communities he tunnels under. His test tunnel under Hawthorne was not subject to an environmental review process, according to an article in the Atlantic (<https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/11/los-angeles-elon-musk-tunnels-under-neighborhood/575725/>). Thus, the residents above his tunnel had not been "informed ahead of time that a private company would be digging a tunnel beneath the street." Additionally, when Musk learned another tunnel would be subject to an environmental review process, he abandoned the project (according to the earlier cited Streetsblog article).

Musk, as a businessman, does not have a great track record with his employees. He has fired workers without rhyme or reason (a Wired article begins with a great example of this practice: <https://www.wired.com/story/elon-musk-tesla-life-inside-gigafactory/>) and he has prevented unions from forming at his Tesla factories. Unions have been proven as a way to give workers fair representation with their employers to ensure they are treated fairly and humanely, yet Musk is against them.

As shown above, Musk cares not for public transportation, he cares not for the average Joe who gets a tunnel under his house, and he cares not for his workers. Musk's disinterest in these concepts and people proves he is not fit to receive federal funding for a public transportation project – he does not care for the very stakeholders he would be in the position to benefit. He is not worthy of being involved with such a project, and I urge you and the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning to reject his proposal.

Sincerely,

Kiernan McCloskey

Shane Misztal

2/15/2019, email

Subject: CMAP Amendment Public Comments

I am writing to express my opinion on the O'Hare Express project being added to the ON TO 2050 Plan. I would like to state that I am NOT for the express. My reasons for this is because:

(a) I think it will be a waste of city resources, even if it is coming from private funding. Time from our city workers will be spent on this and take away from more important needs and projects going on in the city.

(b) The City has not even provided the contract or agreement between them and the Boring Company. If they can't even be transparent about that and the details surrounding that then they shouldn't be allowed to have it adopted into the plan.

(c) It doesn't even make sense right now because the technology for this project doesn't even exist. Being able to bore a tunnel to the proper standards and safety regulations at this little of a cost has never been done. We expect it to all of a sudden actually happen because we are giving the developers free reign. That's not feasible. Also, being able to run these transportation pods on skates to 120-150 mph has yet to be seen. Shouldn't the developer have to prove this technology is possible before he starts digging up Chicago and we start prioritizing this in our regional development plan.

If anyone thinks this is a good idea it's based off optimism and hope that everything will come together in the best case scenario. If you take a look at it from a realistic standpoint, common sense will tell you that it will more likely fail than succeed on the framework it is promised on. Chicago and Illinois lack the funds to be entertaining these ideas without a proven track record. Lastly, Chicago has a sufficient option to get to the airport and it's the Blue Line. Money should be invested in improving Blue Line operations and capacity instead.

Additional: none

Michael Morrissey Podgers

2/4/2019, email

Subject: Do Not Incl'd Musk's OHare Tunnel in On To 2050

Streetsblog Chicago recently reported that's CDOT is pushing to include Elon Musk's proposed tunnel to O'Hare in the On To 2050 plan. Please do not include it. First, the plan Musk and CDOT put forward claims no tax payer funding will be needed for this. Having it in On To 2050 gives the distinct impression this will require government funding. So, CDOT and Musk seem to be lying—don't Endungen the lie. Furthermore, it's a terribly conceived project that is potentially saddling Chicago with an unproven technology that would be near impossible to alter to make a useful transit option: too expensive, too little utility, too small, too little capacity. It's a version of Toronto's UPX that could only be made worse not better. Finally, it's hugely problematic for a number of reasons: 1) when did Chicagoans ask for this? 2) it won't serve Chicagoans not provide access to more areas than the Loop, 3) cheaper and better options exist (please love Crossrail Chicago forward instead), 4) nobody knows what the contract for the plan says. All in all, it'd be a joke and insult to include this project in On To 2050.

Additional: University of Illinois at Chicago, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, B.A. History, German, Masters of Urban Planning and Policy, (773) 899-2571, [linkedin.com/in/mmpodgers](https://www.linkedin.com/in/mmpodgers)

Jacob E. Peters

2/4/2019, email

Subject: Do Not Approve This Boring Company Boondoggle

Firstly, if we're going to let private entities build tunnels under the city. Then those tunnels should be compatible with the existing tunnels that we have, or with existing above grade infrastructure that could be realigned to use the tunnel if the private entity fails. Based on what Musk has demonstrated thus far, this is a low capacity, hyper elitist, extremely dubious, vanity project. That if successful will dump huge amounts of private vehicle traffic at two of the most congested points in our region. It is a priority lane for the rich, without generating public funds to upgrade transit for the rest of us. Secondly, I am pro O'Hare Express, but it should be built via improvements to either of the two rail connections that currently run 90% or more of the way to O'Hare from most parts of downtown. Either:

—Build bypasses of the existing choke points on the NCS and MD-W (which would have priority use by Metra trains), and maybe build a tunnel from Rosemont to the future western access terminal so that a future service could loop through O'Hare in both directions.

—Repurpose the Kennedy Express Lanes for Express L Trains, and build a relatively short tunnel from Clinton to Ohio. Turning Montrose into a transfer station and splitting the existing Blue Line into a local branch that Terminates at Montrose, and an express branch that goes to O'Hare.

Both of these repurpose underutilized existing infrastructure (NCS could have higher frequencies if not for freight imposed bottlenecks, and the Kennedy express lanes are low capacity because they are mostly used by single occupancy cars) to provide a more flexible (and functionally faster for most residents) network of regional connections to and from O'Hare. Thank you for your time. I do not want this private project to be legitimized in a way that can be exploited to grab TIF funds or Federal New Start Funds away from projects that would benefit the public and not just the rich.

Additional: architect, designer, urbanist, cyclist, environmentalist, (773) 870-1987, 2156 N. Kedzie Blvd. Apartment #1R Chicago, IL 60647

Justin Root

2/11/2019, email

Subject: O'Hare Express system – Against

I wish to share that I believe the O'Hare Express System amendment should not be approved for the ON TO 2050 plan.

Additional: none

Ethan Saltzberg

1/31/2019, email

Subject: Public Comment on New RSP 01-19-0009 – O'Hare Express Service

I noticed that an undefined "O'Hare Express Service" between Block 37 and O'Hare has been opened as a slated project, with funding not yet identified. I would just like to remind CMAP of the large opposition to this project in many of its current forms, including a high-speed shuttle car proposed by Elon Musk and Mayor Emmanuel's administration. Not only are there already two rail options to get to O'Hare (CTA Blue Line and Metra NCS), these services can and should be improved and expanded, substantially. The Loop-O'Hare corridor needs investment that benefits everyone who lives along the route, not just a tunnel (and especially not one that has yet to be proven viable in any way). I plan to be as communicative about my opposition as possible until Musk's proposal is taken off the table, and better options for this kind of service are selected.

Additional: none

Harry Solomon

2/10/2019, email

Subject: No to inclusion of O'Hare Express in ON TO 2050

Additional: past member, CMAP Citizens Advisory Committee, Harry Solomon, 96 Blackhawk Rd,
Highland Park IL 60035, harry.solomon@ieee.org

David Stanford

2/4/2019, email

Subject: Don't prioritize the musk O'Hare express

Without the contract being public, it appears quite foolish to prioritize any plans for an O'Hare express plan of Elon Musk. Without details, how can any risk or benefit be fully assessed? Without that, why prioritize an idea that is less currently realizable than using heavy rail tracks already in existence?

Additional: Chicago, IL

Kyle L. Terry

2/5/2019, email

Subject: Please don't add this non-existent tech to On To 2050

Please don't bow under the pressure from CDOT/City Hall regarding the Musk Tunnel. If Rahm and Grimes' boyfriend really believe that they can dig a tunnel for 14x cheaper than any other tunnel ever, invent this nonexistent technology, and operate the whole system with no public funds, AS HAS BEEN PROMISED ALL ALONG, then please do not give them the safety net of federal funds by putting this stupid project in On To. I've (mostly) always respected the work CMAP has done, from the LTA work to the comp plans. Please don't change that by putting Rahm's fantasy skates in what is supposed to be a serious document. You have enough smart transportation folks on staff, many who I know, to talk you out of this. So please, keep the priorities of On To 2050 focused on what's important and what will impact the most people in our communities.

Additional: 5400 S Harper Ave, Chicago, IL 60615, (209) 829-9278

Melanie White

2/16/2019, email

Subject: O'Hare Express System

I am in favor of the O'Hare Express System. I am a resident of the 35th ward and strongly support this initiative.

Additional: Melanie White, 3627 N Hamlin Ave, Chicago IL 60618

Terry Witt

1/26/2019, email

Subject: O'Hare Express

The purpose of this project is to continue funneling everybody into Chicago as fast as possible. I believe we have more significantly important priorities to fix our current infrastructure as well as build western access if we are to build anything new. I also offer that bicycle facilities are recognized around the world but unfortunately minimized in the U.S. and not even given a sentence in this proposal.

Additional: Bicycle Advocate, Bartlett, IL, 847-712-1845

Owen Worley

2/6/2019, email

Subject: Against including the ORD express in the list of priority projects

I'm writing to encourage your organization not to add the O'Hare Express to the ON TO 2050 plan. Despite assurances to the contrary, I find it implausible that that project would not wind up attracting significant government subsidy, whether it is in station construction, fare subsidy, or some other aspect. And regardless, the idea of creating a parallel route from the Loop to ORD, to save a tiny number of wealthy people from the experience of sharing a train car with their fellow citizens, is repulsive.

Additional: 1117 N Spaulding Ave, Chicago, IL 60651

Bryan Young

2/25/2019, email

Subject: ON TO 2050 Plan

I understand you are planning to consider adding the O'Hare Express electric sled to the future transit plan. Please realize that this magic carpet ride is ridiculous, unrealistic and a boondoggle. Improvement should be made to the CTA Blue Line instead of trying to invent a new way to waste funds for the privileged few. All citizens would benefit from a better CTA instead of those on an expense account riding from the airport to the loop.

Additional: Bryan Young, 1708 N Orchard St #B, Chicago, IL 60614