

# Data-Driven Decisions Survey Results Analysis with Appendix

## Contents

1.0	Key Findings and Recommendations .....	1
2.0	What’s most important to you?.....	8
2.1	Economic Development.....	8
2.2	Environmental Impacts/Livability .....	8
2.3	Traffic/Congestion .....	9
2.4	Safety .....	10
2.5	Regional Rating .....	11
2.6	Other .....	11
3.0	Where should the money go?.....	14
4.0	Additional Comments for Criteria .....	15
4.1	Economic Development.....	15
4.1.1	Intermodal Accessibility.....	15
4.1.2	Major Development .....	15
4.1.3	National Highway Freight Network.....	16
4.2	Environmental Impacts/Livability .....	17
4.2.1	Environmental Justice .....	17
4.2.2	Equity.....	18
4.2.3	Level of Environmental Impact Analysis Required.....	18
4.3	Traffic/Congestion .....	19
4.3.1	Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) .....	19
4.3.2	Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled (AVMT) .....	20
4.3.3	Travel Time Index.....	21
4.4	Safety .....	22
4.4.1	Crash Frequency .....	22
4.5	Regional Rating .....	23
4.5.1	Regional Input.....	23
Appendix A	What’s most important to you?.....	25
A.1	Economic Development.....	25
A.2	Environmental Impacts/Livability .....	25

A.3	Traffic/Congestion .....	27
A.4	Safety .....	28
A.5	Regional Rating .....	29
A.6	Other .....	30
Appendix B	Where should the money go?.....	38
Appendix C	Additional comments, criteria rating. ....	41
C.1	Economic Development.....	41
C.1.1	Intermodal Accessibility.....	41
C.1.2	Major Development .....	42
C.1.3	National Highway Freight Network.....	44
C.2	Environmental Impacts/Livability .....	45
C.2.1	Environmental Justice .....	45
C.2.2	Equity .....	46
C.2.3	Level of Environmental Impact Analysis Required.....	47
C.3	Traffic/Congestion .....	48
C.3.1	Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) .....	48
C.3.2	Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled (AVMT) .....	50
C.3.3	Travel Time Index .....	52
C.4	Safety .....	54
C.4.1	Crash Frequency .....	54
C.5	Regional Rating .....	58
C.5.1	Regional Input.....	58

## 1.0 Key Findings and Recommendations

There were a total of 724 comments received via MetroQuest and email. Of the 724 comments received 651 were open ended comments submitted via the MetroQuest survey which centered around the three questions/areas of 1) What's most important to you? 2) Where should the money go? 3) Additional comments for criteria. Within these three areas there were a total of 18 opportunities to provide comment. Six opportunities for item 1), one opportunity for item 2), and eleven opportunities for item 3). The number of comments varied by question and subject, however both the lowest and highest number of comments was for the question What's most important to you. The subject of regional rating only received eight comments, whereas the other subject received 269 comments. It is important to note that the other subject was open ended with many comments touching upon goal areas as well. In addition to MetroQuest, there was an opportunity to provide comments via email. A total of 73 comments were received via email; due to the emails being open ended, the results were tabulated with the "other" section 2.6 in this document. The table below provides the breakdown of comments specific to the question "What is most important to you?" which was specific to the goal areas.

Goal Area	Number of Comments
Economic Development	24
Environmental Impacts/Livability	24
Traffic/Congestion	28
Safety	29
Regional Rating	15

\* The number of comments is the sum of the comments received per goal area, as well as any comments in the "other" category that related to that goal area

### General Themes

A review of the comments was conducted by reading each comment and then categorizing into common themes. It is important to note that due to the diverse nature of the goals and criteria, a set number of themes was not developed. Throughout most of the questions a few common themes continued to arise. These

commonalities were related to bike/ped, alternative transportation, and critique of the measure being presented.

**Bike/ped** – There were a total of 91 comments in reference to bike/ped which constitutes 14% of the total comments received. Overall, comments were that the goals and criteria do not take into consideration bike/ped impacts on project selection. Additionally, depending on the goal or criteria the comments provided specifics. For example, in safety, that the criterion only looks at crash frequency and not if a cyclist or pedestrian was involved.

**Alternative Transportation** – There were a total of 68 comments referencing alternative transportation which constitutes 10% of the total comments received. Similar to the bike/ped theme, the comments were that alternative transportation considerations are not taken. These comments included a wide range of alternative transportation options including bike/ped but also transit. For example, the question “where should the money go” was the highest commented for alternative transportation with a common notion that money should be spent on transit to remove people from vehicles and to other modes which can promote many of the goals and criteria.

**Measure Critique** – While all comments to a degree are critiques of the measure, these had pointed critiques which could not fit into a common theme. For example, for the criteria intermodal accessibility a comment was “These three criteria hardly measure the impact of what you are doing. We need to measure results not inputs.”

## **Recommendations**

Overall based off the analysis and examining all the comments it is clear that there were some general comments regarding the process as a whole. While not tied to a specific goal or criteria this should be something IDOT takes into consideration. There may need to be better messaging that the Data-Driven Decisions Tool is currently only for roadway expansion projects and at this time other modes are not being looked at utilizing this process and tool. Additionally, there were many comments on maintenance, once again messaging on how this tool is only for expansion projects could provide clarity to eliminate these types of comments. IDOT already has the TAMP program for maintenance and future messaging on that program could be beneficial to alleviate any confusion on the goal of this program.

Additionally, many of the comments from the MetroQuest survey were on why bike/ped infrastructure or transit is not being captured in the decision-making process. IDOT may want to consider expanding the Data-Driven Decisions tool to include expansion projects for all modes or, at a minimum, incorporate bike/ped or transit infrastructures considerations in project selection. An area where this could be added in is the regional rating. The regional rating already allows locals to provide input and does not have any concrete examples. Adding text mentioning alternative transportation in local input could help alleviate these concerns. It is important to note that based on the number of comments on this topic without specific criteria on alternative transportation people will still most likely continue to criticize the lack of alternative transportation.

## Specific Recommended Changes

**Safety Criteria** – Regarding safety, the Data-Driven Decisions tool currently only looks at crash frequency. There were a large portion of individuals commenting that the criterion should be changed or additional criterion added to review the type of crashes. With the understanding that not all crashes are equal, altering the existing or adding an additional criterion for the type of crashes at a specific location could be warranted.

**Definitions** - There were a handful of comments asking for clarification of definitions, specifically on what constitutes a major development. IDOT should provide a definition for better understanding. Likewise, some were unsure what the National Highway Freight Network is, as stakeholders and members of the public are unfamiliar with this terminology. An expanded definition of the National Highway Freight Network could easily address this comment.

**Congestion Criteria** – Several comments noted that travel time reliability is a better measure than AADT, or the TTI in terms of determining what’s really important regarding congestion. The same comment was made regarding considering reliability specifically as it relates to supporting freight movement. Weaving in the IDOT freight bottleneck analysis and the Statewide Freight Plan which measured reliability, could be used to measure areas of documented unreliability for the freight portion of the congestion element.

**Economic Development Criteria** – Several comments noted that the 3-mile radius for proximity to intermodal facilities should be expanded to at least 5 miles. Comments also mentioned the importance of a reliability measure for freight movements as key to supporting economic development. Additionally, comments regarding the proximity of housing, schools, hospitals and other noise or pollution sensitive areas should be considered in these criteria. Looking at adjacent land use and transportation (or comp) plans for project compatibility could be considered.

## Comments Received by Goal Area

The comments below highlight the type of comments received per goal area. These comments provide valuable insight things IDOT consider when refining the Data-Driven Decisions Tool.

### Economic Development Comment

Major Development - We recommend limiting this metric to roads on the NHS or designated truck routes to within three miles and defining what constitutes a “major development.” CMAP suggests including metrics aligned with the state’s five-year economic development plan coordinated by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. Including “high-quality” job retention and creation would also strengthen the relationship between transportation investments and economic development. High quality jobs could be

measured using the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Living Wage Calculator which provides county-level wages required to meet minimum standards given the local cost of living.

LCDOT believes that strictly using the NHFN is too limited. Suggest projects be scored on the percentage of heavy trucks using an existing facility or expand beyond the NHFN to include all roadways functionally classified as principal arterials and above. Major development metric is of limited use in evaluating potential capacity project. Intermodal Accessibility believes the 3-mile distance should be expanded to at least 5 miles. Also, should consider if a roadway intersects with a freight rail line and provide additional points for those projects that do.

The goals need a much broader definition of economic development. Major freight terminals are a very narrow definition. Will widening a road negatively affect businesses along a corridor? Will sound barriers and aesthetic improvements improve property values? How important is a corridor to the economic vitality of a community? Is traffic preventing economic activity? All these issues need to be considered.

### **Environmental Impacts/Livability**

Level of Environmental Analysis Required - We recommend that future scoring go beyond the category of environmental analysis required (CE, EA, or EIS) and instead calculate the amount of sensitive natural areas that will be affected by the project, as is the case for Virginia SMART SCALE. We recommend the criterion be changed to measure of the sensitive land affected within a buffer of the project and that points be subtracted from the score based on total potential sensitive acreage impacted. Once a travel demand model is available, IDOT should seek to also measure the impact to natural areas that is anticipated to occur based on future development.

Environmental Justice - the proposed tool outlines one environmental justice criterion related to the location of the project within environmental justice communities as defined by IEPA. While this is a useful measure, it is important to also balance it with the fact that environmental justice populations may benefit from facilities located outside their immediate home areas. For this reason, CMAP considers inclusive growth our own performance criteria by including both the location and the users of a facility. This assessment requires extra

modeling but has proven to be an important metric for leveraging CMAP's programming evaluation process to advance equity goals.

Emissions - Since the tool only deals with capacity projects, it is likely that these projects will only increase overall emissions statewide. In non-attainment areas like northeastern Illinois and East-West Gateway MPO, emissions should consider both greenhouse gas emissions, which will require additional investments, as well as particulate matter. There also are opportunities to address pollution issues in EJ communities.

This measure could evaluate whether user-fees or congestion management could keep vehicles off the road, but it makes more sense overall to consider this criterion in IDOT's multimodal investments.

### **Traffic/Congestion Comments**

Travel Time Index (TTI) CMAP feedback: The Travel Time Index (TTI) provides a useful but incomplete picture of congestion. In addition to TTI, CMAP uses Planning Time Index and Level of Travel Time Reliability to measure system reliability. Northeastern Illinois's road network is forecasted to continue to be congested. ON TO 2050 seeks to improve the reliability of the system, rather than solely focusing on reducing congestion.

AADT - We recommend elimination of the AADT measure as it is only a measure of current conditions and does not tell us about the benefits that the project will generate. Instead, we recommend measuring increase in corridor total (multimodal) person throughput attributed to the project, which will serve as a true measure of the capacity of the project to provide mobility to people. This approach can be undertaken once the statewide travel demand model is complete, potentially in a future iteration of the process. We recommend use of the Virginia SMART SCALE (Appendix B) method that estimates the future no-build vs build scenario. Until this alternative can be implemented, we recommend elimination of this measure.

Please consider truck traffic. Truck ADT can be used as a criterion under Traffic Operations/Congestion and should be specifically identified beyond ADT. For example, I-57 between Marion and Mt. Vernon, the ADT is ~40,000 vehicle day. That is nothing unusual, but when the % of traffic is 35% trucks (over 14,000 trucks per day) it can really change the comfort level, life of the pavement, traffic flow, and the dynamics & needs of a corridor. We need to capture the impacts that large truck volumes have on our roadways.

Most of the measures proposed are lagging indicators (existing AADT, existing Travel Time Index, existing crash frequency, is it on the National Freight Network, etc.). These lagging indicators are helpful for identifying where there are existing needs or gaps, but not useful in determining the actual impact of the proposed project (i.e., how is travel time index improved, how much reduction in crash frequency, how is travel delays on the freight network improved, etc.) Most of your proposed measures are excellent at showing where there is high value needs but will have significant shortcomings in showing the benefits nor show the costs of the proposed improvements. Without monetizing the benefits and costs of projects it is difficult to do any tradeoff analysis or financial optimization.

Change in annual VMT - This measure should estimate the future change in VMT anticipated because of the project, prioritizing projects that fill mobility needs while reducing VMT. Projects that provide more multimodal mobility for people to move along a corridor while decreasing VMT would be optimal in terms of equity, environmental impacts, and affordability of the system. The currently proposed measure to provide more points for projects in counties with higher VMT forecasts will have the impact of increasing VMT and environmental impacts of transportation, running counter to the State's climate goals. We also request that this criterion include a calculation of induced demand that will be created by developing new highway capacity. Illinois could use the assumptions from an induced demand calculator from another state such as California or Colorado.

## **Safety Comments**

LCDOT does not feel crash frequency is the correct metric to use for safety evaluations; the metric used should be able to advance projects that meet safety targets. Safety goal should look at severity of crashes in addition to frequency. The dept could use IDOT's safety tiers for intersections and segments to score safety or use IDOT's crash prediction tool to compare crash frequency to expected crash frequency. Ideally, potential projects would be evaluated for crash modification factors that a project is expected to have and score projects on their expected reduction in the types of crashes seen within the project limits.

Number of fatal and injury crashes in the project area - This should be a measure of the forecasted change in fatal/injury crashes projected because of the project, not the existing conditions in the study area. There should be a focus on improving safety and comfort for all users of an IDOT facility, including people biking and walking. The anticipated safety improvement of a project can be calculated based on the elements of a project for which crash modification factors exist, the extent to which VMT will decrease and thus reduce exposure and crash rates, and/or the "complete streets" elements (new or improved bike/walk/transit facilities) that will make non-auto trips safer and/or shift trips to these safer modes, as detailed in this Guidebook for Using Safety as a Project Prioritization Factor. We would also suggest an additional criterion to disaggregate crashes in which pedestrians or cyclists are injured.

## **Regional Rating Comments**

Regional rating - It is important that this rating not be developed solely by IDOT district staff - scoring should include at a minimum involve full engagement with the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and local jurisdictions in the area. This is also an opportunity for additional public engagement, including with equity stakeholders.

-Illinois' metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) play a critical role in transportation funding, and inclusion in their long-range transportation plan should be required. It is vital that the capacity projects evaluated with this tool advance the local MPO's system condition and performance targets. New capacity projects that are not included in the MPO's long range plan should not be considered for funding within the IDOT Multi-Year Plan.

LCDOT believes this metric makes sense given the diversity of project and areas within the state. LCDOT has developed and keeps an up-to-date prioritized list of improvements on the state system known as the Lake

County State Highway Consensus List, they believe projects prioritized by local partners should be priorities for inclusion in the MYP.

## 2.0 What's most important to you?

### 2.1 *Economic Development*

There was a total of **12 responses** to the question “What’s most important to you?” for the economic development goal. There was no common theme as responses varied with comments **on land use, bike/ped, and equity**. A full list of comments can be viewed in section A.1. Examples of comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Land Use** - Economic development seems to bring on more sprawl which increases the cost of maintenance. What can we do to discourage further sprawl?

**Bike/ped** - Consider ease with which pedestrians can navigate roads, particularly to and from areas of commerce. Consider availability of bicycle parking. Consider accessibility for pedestrians and people with disabilities, particularly in winter (snow and ice clearance at intersections and on sidewalks and in bicycle lanes!)

**Equity** - New transportation projects should focus on revitalizing historically neglected communities and areas and providing economic growth and development to these areas.

#### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                                   |                          |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Land Use x 2                   | 6. Passenger Rail x 1    |
| 2. Miscellaneous x 2              | 7. Recreational Uses x 1 |
| 3. Environmental x 1              | 8. Equity x 1            |
| 4. Bike/Ped x 1                   | 9. Freight x 1           |
| 5. Alternative Transportation x 1 | 10. Multimodal x 1       |

### 2.2 *Environmental Impacts/Livability*

There was a total of **19 responses** to the question “What’s most important to you?” for the environmental impacts/livability goal. The most common theme for this goal was **bike/ped** with **5 comments**, these comments centered around encouraging cycling and walking through incorporating bike/ped infrastructure in roadway designs. Additionally, other comments complemented the bike/ped theme, there were comments on **complete**

**streets** and **alternative transportation**. A full list of comments can be viewed in section A.2. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Bike/Ped** - Consider the needs of cyclists and pedestrians when designing and planning changes.

**Complete Streets** - We need stronger actions to clean and protect our environment. How can the transportation industry reduce and eventually reverse the damage that has been done. Taking equity and other modes into consideration can help to reduce the impacts. Everyone needs to think holistically and adopt a complete street concept. The state has a law, but it has not been truly adopted in the way the transportation system is planned out. Everyone is still too dependent on motorized trips.

**Alternative Transportation** - We cannot continue to focus on auto development and leave a livable climate for future generations.

### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                         |                                   |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Bike/Ped x 5         | 6. ADA x 1                        |
| 2. Miscellaneous x 3    | 7. Alternative Transportation x 1 |
| 3. Complete Streets x 2 | 8. E-Bikes x 1                    |
| 4. Design x 2           | 9. Natural Events x 1             |
| 5. Worst First x 2      | 10. Transit x 1                   |

## 2.3 *Traffic/Congestion*

There was a total of **16 responses** to the question “What’s most important to you?” for the traffic/congestion goal. The most common theme for the goal was **alternative transportation** and **congestion mitigation**. The alternative transportation comments centered around the need to increase investment for other modes to decrease traffic and congestion. The congestion mitigation comments centered around suggestions on specific strategies and observations on how to reduce congestion. A full list of comments can be viewed in section A.3. Examples of the comments and category breakdown are below.

**Alternative Transportation** - This needs to be balanced with safety, the environment, and other modes. For too long the transportation industry has focused efforts on reducing congestion by building more capacity for motorized vehicles, without considering safety or the environment. Other modes of travel have also been neglected. Providing other modal options, can reduce motorized vehicle miles traveled, emissions, dependence on oil, while promoting healthier lifestyles. Build safe walking and biking options into the system.

**Congestion Mitigation** - Decades of transportation research makes it clear that roadway expansion and capacity projects do not reduce congestion in the long-term, often as soon as within a 3–5-year timeline. It is time to stop advancing the long-debunked myth that new traffic lanes reduce congestion, stop wasting taxpayer dollars, and prioritize investments in walking, biking, and public transit infrastructure alongside relevant land use reforms.

### **Comment Theme Breakdown**

- |                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Alternative Transportation x 4 | 6. Safety x 1                     |
| 2. Congestion Mitigation x 4      | 7. Technological Improvements x 1 |
| 3. Bike/Ped x 2                   | 8. Transit x 1                    |
| 4. Goal Critique x 1              | 9. Miscellaneous x 1              |
| 5. Rural Investment x 1           |                                   |

## **2.4 Safety**

There was a total of **20 responses** to the “What’s most important to you?” for the safety goal. The overarching theme was on the **safety measure**. Respondents had specific thoughts on what the measure should be. The next theme was on **bike/ped** with comments requesting additional precautions for those vulnerable users. A full list of comments can be viewed in section A.4. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Safety Measure** - Emphasis on the TYPES of crashes (fatal, pedestrian-involved, bicyclist-involved) and the CAUSE of crashes (impeded sightlines, speeding, signal confusion, etc.) are important. Prioritization is required.

**Safety Measure** - Safety should far and away be the number one priority for all transportation projects.

**Bike/ped** - Particularly safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. It is terrible that so many suburban communities are unworkable due to lack of sidewalks, safe crossings for wide roads, and lack of bike lanes.

### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                         |                                   |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Safety Measure x 11  | 6. Equity x 1                     |
| 2. Bike/Ped x 3         | 7. Alternative Transportation x 1 |
| 3. Design x 1           | 8. Complete Streets x 1           |
| 4. Rural Investment x 1 | 9. Miscellaneous x 1              |

## 2.5 *Regional Rating*

There was a total of **8 responses** to the question of “What’s most important to you?” for the regional rating goal. The common theme was on **IDOT staff** involvement, specifically critiques on if staff should or should not be in this measure. A full list of comments can be viewed in section A.5. Examples of the comments and category breakdown are below.

**IDOT Staff** - IDOT regional staff should not be responsible for allocating points without a permanent and transparent mechanism for community input. For example, each region could have a standing committee with equitable representation from community-based organizations and other key stakeholders who are compensated for their time, which would [as a committee] vote on regional alignment. Otherwise IDOT staff should not have unilateral discretion.

**IDOT Staff** - State office seems more attuned to issues like equity, livability, environment, safety, etc. than district offices. Also, would IDOT district offices be required to engage RPOs and other orgs in a more meaningful, deliberate way?

### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                      |                         |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. IDOT Staff x 3    | 3. Rural Investment x 1 |
| 2. Miscellaneous x 2 | 4. Congestion x 1       |

## 2.6 *Other*

There are a total of **269 comments** received under this category, **196 responses** of them were responses to the MetroQuest question of “What’s most important to you?” for the “other” category. In addition to the MetroQuest survey there was an option for people to submit comments via email, there were **73 comments** received via email. Since this section outlines what included in the “other” category from MetroQuest, and the comments IDOT received by email, the responses varied dramatically, however there were a large amount of

comments on the topics of **bike/ped**, **alternative transportation**, and **maintenance**. A full list of comments can be viewed in section A.6. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Bike/Ped** - Prioritize pedestrians and bicyclists first.

**Alternative Transportation** - I drive but also bike and use public transportation as much as possible and would like to see a more equitable transportation network that puts the needs of people walking, biking, and riding public transit first.

**Maintenance** - Repair of existing declining infrastructure

**Congestion** – Use of travel time reliability is a better measure than the Travel Time Index or AADT

**Economic Development** - National Highway Freight Network - In isolation, this measure does not tell us about the extent to which the project would improve travel conditions. Therefore, we recommend the criterion be modified to be a measure of the anticipated improvement in travel time reliability/level of efficiency on the national freight network resulting from the project. An input to this calculation could be federal truck speed data.

### **Comment Theme Breakdown**

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Bike/Ped x 48                   | 13. Regional Rating x 7                  |
| 2. Alternative Transportation x 26 | 14. Environment x 6                      |
| 3. Maintenance x 26                | 15. Environmental Impacts/Livability x 5 |
| 4. Misc. x 19                      | 16. Resiliency x 5                       |
| 5. Equity x19                      | 17. Rural Investment x 5                 |
| 6. Transit x 15                    | 18. Technological Improvement x 5        |
| 7. Multimodal x 14                 | 19. Passenger Rail x 5                   |
| 8. Traffic/Congestion x 12         | 20. Local Input x 4                      |
| 9. Economic Development x 12       | 21. Land use x 3                         |
| 10. Design x 11                    | 22. Connectivity x 2                     |
| 11. Safety x 9                     | 23. Rail x 2                             |
| 12. Funding x 7                    | 24. Electric Vehicles x 1                |

### 3.0 Where should the money go?

There was a total of **63 responses** to the question “Where should the money go?” The top themes for “Where should the money go?” was **alternative transportation, bike/ped,** and **maintenance.** While these were the top three themes, other comments also echoed the idea of alternative transportation, more specifically transit and multimodal. A full list of comments can be viewed in Appendix B. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Alternative Transportation** – Money toward congestion should only be spent on getting people out of cars and into other modes of transport.

**Bike/ped** – filling the many gaps in our trail and side path networks will also improve safety and reduce congestion and improve air quality.

**Maintenance** - Maintaining the current transportation system should be a priority. Existing roads and bridges are at a critical state of disrepair and now is the time to invest in future maintenance.

#### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                                    |                                    |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Alternative Transportation x 12 | 10. Technological Improvements x 2 |
| 2. Bike/Ped x 10                   | 11. Bridges x 1                    |
| 3. Maintenance x 9                 | 12. Connectivity x 1               |
| 4. Equity x 6                      | 13. Economic Development x 1       |
| 5. Transit x 6                     | 14. Funding x 1                    |
| 6. Multimodal x 4                  | 15. Local Bridges x 1              |
| 7. Miscellaneous x 3               | 16. Safety x 1                     |
| 8. Design x 2                      | 17. Walkability x 1                |
| 9. Rural Divide x 2                |                                    |

## 4.0 Additional Comments for Criteria

### 4.1 Economic Development

#### 4.1.1 Intermodal Accessibility

There was a total of **15 responses** providing additional comment on the intermodal accessibility. The common theme was related to expanding the mileage threshold to be greater than the current threshold of three miles. Additionally, there were some comments criticizing the measure. Common themes were **access and proximity**, **expand mile range**, and **measure critique**. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.1.1. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Expand Mile Range** - I think 3 miles is too small perhaps something more like 5 miles.

**Access and Proximity** - If the project doesn't provide access to that facility, what does it matter how close it is? Suggest refining this to criteria

**Measure Critique** - These three criteria hardly measure the impact of what you are doing. We need to measure results not inputs.

#### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. Measure Critique x 4     | 5. Intermodal x 1                          |
| 2. Expand Mile Range x 3    | 6. Commodity Flows x 1                     |
| 3. Rail Investment x 2      | 7. Commercial & Industrial Development x 1 |
| 4. Access and Proximity x 2 | 8. Miscellaneous x 1                       |

#### 4.1.2 Major Development

There was a total of **25 response** providing additional comment on major development. The main theme was **development definition**. Most of the comments centered around what constitutes a major development. Another theme was **alternative transportation**, looking for consideration for other modes of transportation to major developments. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.1.2. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Development Definition** - Is this defined somewhere? Our region may have major development that does not seem like much in other portions of the state. Do all projects in Cook County take precedence?

**Development Definition** - I like this idea but don't want it to simply refer to an intermodal facility or to an urban area. You should be looking at 1) how much economic activity is located within 1/2 miles of corridor, 2) how many daytime employees are located in that area, 3) is the corridor underperforming economically? 4) Types of employment (blue collar), 5) is it a life safety corridor?, 6) Does the corridor support transit now or in future?

**Alternative Transportation** - Access must include micro-mobility, public transport, and walking.

### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                                   |                         |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Development Definition x 8     | 7. Local Input x 1      |
| 2. Alternative Transportation x 5 | 8. Measure Critique x 1 |
| 3. Developer Responsibility x 3   | 9. Multimodal x 1       |
| 4. Design x 2                     | 10. Rural Divide x 1    |
| 5. Economic Development x 1       | 11. Small Business x 1  |
| 6. Equity x 1                     |                         |

### **4.1.3 National Highway Freight Network**

There was a total of **14 responses** providing additional comment on the national highway freight network. There were a variety of comments. Most commented themes include **rail** and **equity**. Additionally, there were questions on the **definition**. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.1.3. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Rail** - Highways have to be maintained, but freight should increasingly be shipped by rail where possible. Get freight off the highways as soon as possible.

**Equity** - IDOT must also include safeguards to ensure additional freight investments do not further burden low-income communities of color with increased diesel and other heavy-duty vehicle emissions given the long legacy of pollution burdens, especially within Black communities in Chicagoland.

**Definition** - Why is this a criteria. Who knows if the National highway is based on sound criteria and has the right objectives?

### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                         |                           |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Rail x 4             | 5. Limited Network x 1    |
| 2. Equity x 3           | 6. Small Developments x 1 |
| 3. Definition x 2       | 7. Truck AADT x 1         |
| 4. Measure Critique x 2 |                           |

## 4.2 *Environmental Impacts/Livability*

### 4.2.1 **Environmental Justice**

There was a total of **20 responses** providing additional comment on environmental justice. The main themes were on **project location** and **measure critique**. The project location comments centered around concerns of its impact on low income or impoverished communities. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.2.1. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Project Location** - It's incredibly important to remove highways from urban settings, especially when they run through economically sensitive minority populations.

**Project Location** - I think every project's location should be heavily scrutinized to determine if it is truly worth displacing communities for (most of the time) more vehicles and driving.

**Measure Critique** - You're using IEPA as your source of demographic data? Strange. But you know that (1) project impacts are often far removed from project location; and (2) if you make a poor area really nice it will be gentrified.

### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                               |                   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Project Location x 7       | 5. Definition x 2 |
| 2. Measure Critique x 5       | 6. Economics x 1  |
| 3. Negative Externalities x 2 | 7. Linkages x 1   |
| 4. Equity x 2                 |                   |

## 4.2.2 Equity

There was a total of **21 responses** providing additional comment on equity. The main themes were **alternative transportation** and **measure critique**. The comments on alternative transportation stressed the investment in public transit and cycling. The measure critique comments varied greatly. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.2.2. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Alternative Transportation** - There is no mention of transit or pedestrian infrastructure in the livability section? We need to start caring less about people who live in exurbs and commute huge distances and more about supporting communities that are affordable/livable and contain both jobs and residences. No more subsidizing our unsustainable development pattern.

**Measure Critique** - Equity (racial, economic, modal) should be an embedded assessment of every single question you ask, not its own separate question.

**Measure Critique** - Equity and environmental impacts should be separate goal areas, and equity should have multiple criteria accounting for the inclusivity of the project planning process, likely pollution and multimodal accessibility burdens resulting from a given project, and potential additional risks, for example project contributions to increased displacement risks (or, worse, the likelihood of direct displacement for a capacity/expansion project)

### Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                                   |                         |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Alternative Transportation x 8 | 4. Gentrification x 1   |
| 2. Measure Critique x 8           | 5. Project Location x 1 |
| 3. Multimodal x 2                 | 6. Rural Divide x 1     |

## 4.2.3 Level of Environmental Impact Analysis Required

There was a total of **14 responses** providing additional comment on level of environmental impact analysis required. The main themes were **measure critique** and **alternative transportation**. The comments on measure critique varied, however they centered specifically around environmental review and how that positively impacts a project selection. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.2.3. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Measure Critique** - While I agree doing an environmental study is important. I do not agree that a project requiring a higher level of environ. impacts should be ranked lower than one that does not. Traffic and Safety should be the determining criteria.

**Measure Critique** - Just because a project goes through these impact reviews does not mean it negatively impacts the environment - a project requiring these reviews likely is required to provide more environmental benefit/restoration as part of construction.

**Alternative Transportation** - Will these measurements be designed in a way that prioritizes non-vehicle mobility options like pedestrians and bike facilities and transit?

### **Comment Theme Breakdown**

- |                                   |                        |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Measure Critique x 6           | 6. Quality of Life x 1 |
| 2. Alternative Transportation x 3 | 7. Regulations x 1     |
| 3. No Impact x 1                  | 8. Miscellaneous x 1   |
| 4. Project Location x 1           |                        |

## **4.3 Traffic/Congestion**

### **4.3.1 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)**

There was a total of **34 responses** providing additional comment for annual average daily traffic (AADT). The main themes centered around **AADT**, both in that the aim should be to **reduce AADT**, and the metric should look at **people trips** instead of strictly AADT. There were also comments on **alternative transportation** and some specifically regarding **bike/ped**. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.3.1. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Reduce AADT** - Annual Average Daily Traffic counts and projections have historically been focused on the sole objective of increasing capacity which has invariably made congestion worse. We need to have a more nuanced approach to the use of this metric.

**People over AADT** - Measures need to identify all forms of transportation. We should find a way to measure the number of people going through not just vehicles. Our current approach ignores how many people go through a space instead focusing on full powered engines this measure fails if we don't see low-impact transportation numbers.

**Alternative Transportation** - Encouraging people to get out of their cars to reduce AADT is incredibly important. Anything IDOT can do to encourage this I fully support as being very important.

### **Comment Theme Breakdown**

- |                                   |                            |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Reduce AADT x 7                | 7. Rural Divide x 1        |
| 2. Measure Critique x 7           | 8. Suburban Divide x 1     |
| 3. People over AADT x 4           | 9. Transit x 1             |
| 4. Alternative Transportation x 4 | 10. Development (Wind) x 1 |
| 5. Design x 4                     | 11. Miscellaneous x 1      |
| 6. Bike/Ped x 3                   |                            |

### **4.3.2 Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled (AVMT)**

There was a total of **32 responses** providing additional comment for annual vehicle miles traveled (AVMT). More than half the comments were centered around the theme of **decreasing AVMT**. Additionally, there were many **measure critiques**. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.3.2. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Decrease AVMT** – Every dollar of road investment should be aimed at reducing VMT. Goal should always be moving people to their destinations, not moving them more and more miles more quickly. By prioritizing transit, walking, and biking people can get where they're going safer, quicker, and more affordably than ever-widening roads.

**Decrease AVMT** - our infrastructure needs to encourage less miles driven to do the same function. shop and work close to home

**Measure Critique** - The word vehicle is not defined here, and photos and language imply this survey is car centric. These measures must account for different forms of transportation, because plenty of people use things other than cars

### **Comment Theme Breakdown**

- |                                   |                            |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Decrease AVMT x 18             | 5. People Not Vehicles x 2 |
| 2. Measure Critique x 4           | 6. Miscellaneous x 2       |
| 3. Alternative Transportation x 2 | 7. Maintenance x 1         |
| 4. Bike/Ped x 2                   | 8. Land Use x 1            |

### **4.3.3 Travel Time Index**

There was a total of **29 responses** providing additional comment for travel time index. Common themes were multimodal and **transit**. These comments were focused on the need to look at all modes and not just vehicles. Additionally, there were comments on **measure critique**. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.3.3C.3.2. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Multimodal** - Travel time calculations should include users of all modes, not just motorists.

**Transit** - Time divided by people. The more people that move, the less average time per person. Busses and trains are a lot more efficient and effective.

**Measure Critique** - I like this one but think it's also important to try to capture the total time spent - I would rather Illinois residents spend 15 minutes in congestion versus 35 minutes on a longer uncongested trip.

## Comment Theme Breakdown

1. Measure Critique x 8
2. Multimodal x 6
3. Transit x 6
4. Miscellaneous x 3
5. Bike/Ped x 2
6. Alternative Transportation x 1
7. Design x 1
8. Land Use x 1
9. Reduce Congestion x 1

## 4.4 *Safety*

### 4.4.1 **Crash Frequency**

There was a total of **76 responses** providing additional comment for crash frequency. The major common theme was regarding **crash type**. Respondents' comments centered around the need to not only look at crash frequency but also crash type. An additional theme was specific to **bike/ped** crashes. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.4.1C.3.2. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Crash Type** - Injury and severity should also play a role in the safety discussions. You may have a high number of crashes with little to no injuries in one location but a low number of crashes with fatalities and incapacitating injuries at another. The injury factor in that selection should weigh higher than crash frequency

**Crash Type** - Not number, severity.

**Bike/Ped** - This is insufficient. How can we measure safety using this metric when the needs and challenges for non-vehicle road users is different from vehicle users? Also how does this assess and take into account that safety viewed by US traffic engineers has historically resulted in more dangerous roads? What about Vision Zero?

## Comment Theme Breakdown

- |                         |                                 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Crash Type x 29      | 6. Local Input x 3              |
| 2. Bike/Ped x 16        | 7. Transit x 1                  |
| 3. Design x 13          | 8. Equity x 1                   |
| 4. Measure Critique x 6 | 9. Behavior Crashes Removed x 1 |
| 5. Miscellaneous x 6    |                                 |

## 4.5 *Regional Rating*

### 4.5.1 **Regional Input**

There was a total of **41 responses** providing additional comment for regional input. The majority of comments centered around who will be providing the input. These comments referenced **local officials, community, MPO's, and advocacy organizations**. There were also some **measure critique** comments. A full list of comments can be viewed in section C.5.1C.3.2. Examples of the comments and category breakdowns are below.

**Local Officials** - Regional input needs to give more weight to smaller municipalities. Too often we are overrun by the larger bodies and left to pick up the scraps or to try and figure out how to redefine our goals around what others have decided for us.

**Advocacy Input** - IDOT needs to listen to local transit advocacy organizations when they work in the city of Chicago. They must do everything possible to improve the flow of pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Measure Critique** - Rather than this be a separate criterion, consider having local agencies submit their criteria and "rating" for each project and see how it matches up to IDOT's criteria. The local agency will know the area and needs of the project very well and can maybe act as a "scaling factor" for projects.

**Comment Theme Breakdown**

- |                               |                       |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Local Officials Input x 19 | 5. Advocacy Input x 4 |
| 2. Criteria Critique x 8      | 6. District Input x 1 |
| 3. Miscellaneous x 5          | 7. Everyday Users x 1 |
| 4. Community Input x 3        |                       |

## Appendix A What's most important to you?

### A.1 Economic Development

Theme	Comment
Alternative transportation	Efficient movement should include prioritizing short trips shifting to non motorized modes.
Bike/Ped	Consider ease with which pedestrians can navigate roads, particularly to and from areas of commerce. Consider availability of bicycle parking. Consider accessibility for pedestrians and people with disabilities, particularly in winter (snow and ice clearance at intersections and on sidewalks and in bicycle lanes!)
Environmental	economic development will occur in the form of eco tourism, unique entrepreneur local businesses that will favor like minded generations that see saving the environment now, keeping a healthy active lifestyle, and looking out for the average taxpayer, and not the big box developers
Equity	New transportation projects should focus on revitalizing historically neglected communities and areas and providing economic growth and development to these areas.
Freight	...and to the extent workable, reduces the travel and freight movement necessary for ordinary daily life
Land Use	Area parking lots (on vacant land) and parking protected bike lanes to give motorists the ability to shop and not contribute to congestion. These area lots should be publicized with businesses.
Land Use	economic development seems to bring on more sprawl which increases the cost of maintenance. What can we do to discourage further sprawl?
Multimodal	on traffic/congestion must consider multi-modal options and how transit benefits in a roadway project for example. Roadway improvements should be the default solution, transit and rail must be considered
Other	IL needs a business tax base to help support infrastructure. However, businesses are moving out of state because state taxes to repay our debt left from misspending by previous administrations are high. It's a vicious circle. Somehow though, we must keep and add to our job base.
Other	If new development shows up, a mechanism to upgrade a road or roads would be extremely beneficial.
Passenger Rail	Would like to see how this includes improvements to passenger rail options such as Amtrak and Metra. Moving goods is important but moving people should be more important!
Recreational Uses	Canoe access. This could be done in conjunction with bridge maintenance.

### A.2 Environmental Impacts/Livability

Theme	Comment
ADA	Consider accessibility for people with disabilities.
Alternative transportation	We cannot continue to focus on auto development and leave a livable climate for future generations.
Bike/Ped	Making cities less car dependent will undoubtedly help the environment. A walkable place would have less noise pollution along with pollution.
Bike/Ped	Connectivity and encourage walking by creating safe crossing of Rt 47 that divides our community is 2nd only to the safety of our residents. Protecting our aquifer recharge areas while planning traffic improvements lead our decisions.
Bike/Ped	Livability more focused toward adding or reallocating space for bicycles, pedestrians, and transit users.
Bike/Ped	Consider the needs of cyclists and pedestrians when designing and planning changes.
Bike/Ped	more car lanes on our interstates and state roads does not solve traffic problems. More lanes result in more cars, more traffic. Focus on local access to business districts via save bike lanes, walking paths, and signage (traffic lights reflecting cyclists/pedestrians, better road markings (sharrows, painted crossing lanes)
Complete Streets	Bike, Bus, Can and Walkability on all through streets in all neighborhoods.

Complete Streets	We need stronger actions to clean and protect our environment. How can the transportation industry reduce and eventually reverse the damage that has been done. Taking equity and other modes into consideration can help to reduce the impacts. Everyone needs to think holistically and adopt a complete street concept. The state has a law but it has not been truly adopted in the way the transportation system is planned out. Everyone is still too dependent on motorized trips.
Design	Mine subsidence issues that affect drainage, repair, and local living conditions.
Design	Projects that do not create induced demand
E-Bikes	We need to account for the increasing use of eBikes and eScooters as major means of low-environmental impact by creating safe lanes/trails for them.
Misc.	Not interested in pursuing "local goals" as much as I would like to see Environmental improvements address "regional goals", including how Transportation contributes to climate change.
Misc.	Effectiveness of "livability"-driven solutions should ultimately net positive outcomes in the subsequent three categories (safety, economic development, traffic/congestion)
Misc.	IDOT should keep possible environmental impacts at the forefront of every new transportation project in order to combat climate change, make communities healthier, and reduce the impact of these projects on communities as a whole.
Natural Events	I think flooding will become a more important issue in Illinois and air pollution will become a more important issue as time goes on.
Transit	We need to reduce our greenhouse emissions. Investing in transit and biking allows us to do that. Road noise has been implicated in the development of Alzheimer's. Is IDOT working to reduce road noise?
Worst First	Other - condition of the infrastructure. Bridges and Roads in poor condition should be at the top of the list for investment.
Worst First	From experience driving in inner city type communities, some streets in them are very worn down.

### A.3 Traffic/Congestion

Theme	Comment
Alternative transportation	This should focus on alternate forms of transportation including public, bicycles, scooters, or walking.
Alternative transportation	Reduce traffic by investing in other means of transportation other than cars!
Alternative transportation	Keep traffic bad so people naturally seek non-car methods of transportation.
Alternative transportation	This needs to be balanced with safety, the environment, and other modes. For too long the transportation industry has focused efforts on reducing congestion by building more capacity for motorized vehicles, without considering safety or the environment. Other modes of travel have also been neglected. Providing other modal options, can reduce motorized vehicle miles traveled, emissions, dependence on oil, while promoting healthier lifestyles. Build safe walking and biking options into the system.
Bike/Ped	Providing more accessible protected bike lanes and elevated bike trails within the city. Allowing more people to take bicycles to the downtown area.
Bike/Ped	Particularly, reducing congestion to make it safer for bicyclists.
Congestion Mitigation	Traffic and congestion should take into account removing cars from the road and maximizing use of efficient travel (buses, trains, bicycles, etc). Instead of tracking only VMT or vehicles at a certain point, count all modes employed at a point and opportunities to reduce VMT by replacing with bicycling or public transportation.
Congestion Mitigation	In favor of adding tolling to reduce congestion
Congestion Mitigation	Decades of transportation research makes clear that roadway expansion and capacity projects do not reduce congestion in the long-term, often as soon as within a 3-5 year timeline. It is time to stop advancing the long-debunked myth that new traffic lanes reduce congestion, stop wasting taxpayer dollars, and prioritize investments in walking, biking, and public transit infrastructure alongside relevant land use reforms.
Congestion Mitigation	Efforts to reduce congestion only seem to bring on more congestion which then requires more congestion mitigation
Goal Critique	Alleviating congestion for people cars should not be placed above safety of people walking, biking. Traffic has been given far too much attention by IDOT.
Misc.	Current traffic, not projected traffic
Rural Investment	I'm concerned that rural interstates and highways will not be considered due to lower traffic volumes. Will all projects occur in Chicago area?
Safety	Congestion slows traffic and makes roadways safer in many instances. The increase of roadway fatalities during the pandemic is a good example of the danger of uncongested roadways build for higher speeds.
Technological Improvements	More speed limit signs and red lights that coordinate the flow of traffic to mitigate congestion.
Transit	building more lanes only creates more congestion. Work with public transportation companies that can have great schedules and access to many of the most dense multi/home developments

## A.4 Safety

Theme	Comment
Alternative transportation	Why only highways? What about other roads and people moving outside of cars/trucks? IDOT's charter is far more than just being a highway department.
Bike/Ped	Include number of safe crossing points, visibility of pedestrians, road design to inhibit speeding and crashes, protections for bicyclists and pedestrians, etc. Stop being so car-centric, please!
Bike/Ped	Particularly safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. It is terrible that so many suburban communities are unworkable due to lack of sidewalks, safe crossings for wide roads, and lack of bike lanes.
Bike/Ped	Police bike patrolling along street bike lanes.
Complete Streets	when fixing existing roads, include "complete streets" policy, allowing for safer access whether walking, biking, or driving
Design	Emphasis on inspection of street design after accident to find way to make street safer. Dutch do excellent job at reducing accidents after their style of redesigns on inspected streets.
Equity	Equitable development
Misc.	Better strips on roads for full self-driving software
Rural Investment	Our small community is directly affected by a State Truck Route mere feet from an elementary school. Our #1 priority when planning with IDOT is safety for this location and to encourage safe ped-crossing in the future (via bridge/underpass/crosswalk)
Safety Measure	This should reduce the number AND severity of crashes.
Safety Measure	I'm most concerned about crashes involving vulnerable road users.
Safety Measure	Emphasis on the TYPES of crashes (fatal, pedestrian-involved, bicyclist-involved) and the CAUSE of crashes (impeded sightlines, speeding, signal confusion, etc) are important. Prioritization is required.
Safety Measure	Why do we have to count bodies before something is done to a road? Isn't there a way to predict crashes/fatalities?
Safety Measure	Safety should far and away be the number one priority for all transportation projects.
Safety Measure	Pedestrian and bicycle safety
Safety Measure	...and reduce pedestrian deaths/injuries.
Safety Measure	This should say reduce fatalities on Illinois roadways, not just highways.
Safety Measure	Safety for cyclists and pedestrians as well as vehicles.
Safety Measure	include safety improvements for pedestrian, crosswalks, mid-block street crossings
Safety Measure	A clear focus on preventing fatal and serious injury crashes needs to be stated. A clear Zero Death message and it's everyone's responsibility, needs to be laid out for all citizens and visitors to our state. A mind set change needs to take place in the whole transportation industry. We all need to think of ways we can contribute to safety. Design and build to accommodate human fragility and fallibility. Build a safe transportation system for all users.

## A.5 Regional Rating

Theme	Comment
Congestion	To a certain extent, economic development must include review of congestion as too much congestion impedes viability of new endeavors.
Goal Critique	Rather than regional rating be a criteria treated similarly to safety and economic development, etc. - What if local agencies select the important factors associated with each project? This will adjust the overall "scaling" of each project compared to IDOT's criteria.
IDOT Staff	IDOT regional staff should not be responsible for allocating points without a permanent and transparent mechanism for community input. For example, each region could have a standing committee with equitable representation from community-based organizations and other key stakeholders who are compensated for their time, which would [as a committee] vote on regional alignment. Otherwise IDOT staff should not have unilateral discretion
IDOT Staff	State office seems more attuned to issues like equity, livability, environment, safety, etc. than district offices. Also, would IDOT district offices be required to engage RPOs and other orgs in a more meaningful, deliberate way?
IDOT Staff	Compared to district offices, the state office appears more likely to engage in topics related to equity, livability, environment, multi-modal access, etc.; district office outreach to RPOs and other interest groups apparently limited or perfunctory
Misc.	Those who would give their input likely to not be representative of their town, so it gets the bottom rating
Misc.	What is this?
Rural Investment	It appears so much of this tool is driven towards high growth areas and less populated areas with little chance for growth could be left out. Those of us in regions of minimal change to capacity need a voice from those at IDOT in our region.

## A.6 Other

Theme	Comment
Bike/Ped	bike lanes are wonderful and they make biking much less stressful.. Protected bike lanes are the best! However, as a long time Divvy user, going from the Metra to the medical center area, I have noticed that when the going gets scary, the bike path always ends. If there is a narrow bridge where the cyclist really really does not want to deal with cars,, suddenly there is no bike path. This could stand some attention to improve it.
Bike/Ped	LCDOT would ask the depart to consider a category for projects that include non-motorized infrastructure as well. Projects that would extend or connect to municipal or regional trail networks should be given additional points during the evaluation stage.
Connectivity	<p>The most important measure of transportation's value is its ability to enable people to access destinations where they can meet their daily needs. This includes both non-work and work destinations. Therefore, we believe it is critical that the criteria include a measure of accessibility.</p> <p>In summing available opportunities, it makes sense to count those that are easily reached more than those that are harder to reach, a technique similar to the gravity model used in travel demand models. By "decay weighting" opportunities based on travel behavior, we can produce metrics that include all the reasonably available opportunities, rather than excluding those beyond an arbitrary travel time threshold, and we can talk in terms of "the number of jobs accessible," without an arbitrary time cutoff.</p> <p>The accessibility measure should be calculated both for all users and for EJ populations to demonstrate the extent to which accrual of those benefits differs from the population overall. If the project benefits EJ populations less, it should receive fewer points.</p>
Design	2. Please use realistic projection, including induced demand. Widening a road will lead to more cars using the road. Furthermore, if widening a road reduces other cross access, traffic may go up on other roads.
Design	Changing how roads are managed and operated, rather than expanding the system, should be the first option in considering how to improve reliability in the region. In addition, enhancing operations is often more cost effective. Including measures of cost effectiveness can help direct limited dollars toward the most productive uses.
Economic Development	<p>Major Development - We recommend limiting this metric to roads on the NHS or designated truck routes to within three miles and defining what constitutes a "major development." CMAP suggests including metrics aligned with the state's five-year economic development plan coordinated by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity.</p> <p>Including "high-quality" job retention and creation would also strengthen the relationship between transportation investments and economic development. High quality jobs could be measured using the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Living Wage Calculator which provides county-level wages required to meet minimum standards given the local cost of living.</p>
Economic Development	Intermodal Accessibility - Prioritizing projects serving intermodal facilities is important; however, projects within three miles of an intermodal facility, may or may not impact the intermodal facility. Consider additional criteria that would reflect the actual impact of a project on freight movement, such as vertical and horizontal clearances, turn radii, and other geometric features.
Economic Development	3. A good tool for measuring economic impact is TREDIS software out of Cambridge Mass. REMI can also be used especially if it is already used by the Illinois Department of Commerce. Support to proposed major developments is beneficial, but those benefits and costs need to be quantifiable.
Economic Development	3. The goals need a much broader definition of economic development. Major freight terminals are a very narrow definition. Will widening a road negatively affect businesses along a corridor? Will sound barriers and aesthetic improvements improve property values? How important is a corridor to the economic vitality of a community? Is traffic preventing economic activity? All of these issues need to be considered.
Economic Development	<p>"Economic Development" aligns well with</p> <p>Unless you consider sprawl a goal, pull the criteria for access to a major development. This sort of project happens on its own well enough without including it in a Decision Tool.</p> <p>Add criteria for freight (not only trucks) delay and reliability</p>
Economic Development	Economic Development – intermodal facility, 1 or 3 miles may not be expansive enough – consider 5 miles and talk to Will County.

Economic Development	<p>Economic Development - LCDOT believes that strictly using the NHFN is too limited. Suggest projects be scored on the percentage of heavy trucks using an existing facility or expand beyond the NHFN to include all roadways functionally classified as principal arterials and above.</p> <p>Major development metric is of limited use in evaluating potential capacity project</p> <p>Intermodal Accessibility believes the 3 mile distance should be expanded to at least 5 miles. Also should consider if a roadway intersects with a freight rail line and provide additional points for those projects that do.</p>
Economic Development	<p>Economic Development - should consider the importance of transportation project to accessing markets and maintaining and improving the economic vitality of the region. Access to intermodal facilities is important for agriculture, but the emphasis on intermodal facilities within 3 miles may put rural projects at a disadvantage. Projects may provide value to reaching intermodal facilities from longer distances away, especially in rural areas.</p>
Economic Development	<p>National Highway Freight Network - In isolation, this measure does not tell us about the extent to which the project would improve travel conditions. Therefore, we recommend the criterion be modified to be a measure of the anticipated improvement in travel time reliability/level of efficiency on the national freight network resulting from the project. An input to this calculation could be federal truck speed data.</p>
Economic Development	<p>Major Development - We recommend that this measure be replaced by a new multimodal access measure described below. Use of this measure as proposed is too likely to result in unanticipated consequences, such as high ratings to greenfield projects that result in significant destruction of natural areas or support of projects that will have many negative externalities to communities.</p>
Economic Development	<p>Intermodal accessibility - For this measure, points should not be awarded only for proximity to existing facilities - the project sponsor should describe how it will benefit operations/efficiency of transport to the intermodal facility in order to receive points.</p>
Economic Development	<p>National Highway Freight Network - in D1 the freight network often intersects with low-income communities and has historically created safety, air quality and other negative impacts locally. Extra care should be taken to not increase impacts on existing environmental justice communities through this scoring. One way to do this could be to zero out points for this criterion if the project is determined to add new burdens. On the other hand, if the project will add new benefits (e.g., forecasted decrease in congestion/idling time, movement of trucks off residential streets), the criterion could stand and potentially be weighted more strongly.</p>
Environmental Impacts/Livability	<p>4. Proposed measures for Environmental Impacts: i.e. Environmental Justice – is project located in a minority population and/or low income area needs to be measured in benefits vs costs, just the presence of the project does not describe its impact. Similar analysis can be made for Equity – access to transit by itself does not measure equity.</p>
Environmental Impacts/Livability	<p>“Environmental Impacts / Livability” could just be called Livability</p>
Environmental Impacts/Livability	<p>Environmental Impacts/Livability - LCDOT believes both EJ areas and buffer areas should be used when scoring projects</p> <p>Level of Enfirn Impact Analysis required - LCDOT believes this is a reasonable metric</p> <p>Equity - LCDOT believes equity should be an important consideration when evaluating projects for inclusion in the MYP</p> <p>Resiliency - agree it is an important consideration but encourage the dept provide more detail on how this would be utilized</p> <p>Emissions - support the use of this metric in the tool</p>

Environmental Impacts/Livability	Level of Environmental Analysis Required - We recommend that future scoring go beyond the category of environmental analysis required (CE, EA, or EIS) and instead calculate the amount of sensitive natural areas that will be affected by the project, as is the case for Virginia SMART SCALE. We recommend the criterion be changed to: measure of the sensitive land affected within a buffer of the project and that points be subtracted from the score based on total potential sensitive acreage impacted. Once a travel demand model is available, IDOT should seek to also measure the impact to natural areas that is anticipated to occur based on future development.
Environmental Impacts/Livability	H&T cost index - We would like to engage in more discussion about how this measure would be used as it is not clear at this point. We suggest that priority be given to projects that reduce transportation and housing costs for residents in the project area, most likely by reducing the need for car ownership by providing other transportation options.
Environmental Impacts/Livability	Emissions - Since the tool only deals with capacity projects, it is likely that these projects will only increase overall emissions statewide. In non-attainment areas like northeastern Illinois and East-West Gateway MPO, emissions should consider both greenhouse gas emissions, which will require additional investments, as well as particulate matter. There also are opportunities to address pollution issues in EJ communities. This measure could evaluate whether user-fees or congestion management could keep vehicles off the road, but it makes more sense overall to consider this criterion in IDOT's multimodal investments.
Equity	Environmental Justice - the proposed tool outlines one environmental justice criterion related to the location of the project within environmental justice communities as defined by IEPA. While this is a useful measure, it is important to also balance it with the fact that environmental justice populations may benefit from facilities located outside their immediate home areas. For this reason, CMAP considers inclusive growth our own performance criteria by including both the location and the users of a facility. This assessment requires extra modeling but has proven to be an important metric for leveraging CMAP's programming evaluation process to advance equity goals.
Equity	Transportation investments have a critical role to play in stimulating equitable reinvestment in disinvested areas. For this reason, project selection, in northeastern Illinois, should consider projects that support development in existing areas that are infill supportive. Infill makes communities more livable and sustainable by promoting walkability, housing and transportation choices, as well as access to schools, jobs, services, and basic amenities. CMAP divides northeastern Illinois into 3 categories based on the existing levels of infill supportiveness. Several other data considerations are also worth raising related to the proposed EJ and equity criteria: the definition of an EJ community should be expanded beyond low-income and minority populations to include other groups that have been historically marginalized in the transportation planning process specifically. Groups to consider include immigrant and refugee populations, people living with disabilities, limited English proficiency populations, youth and seniors; data should be disaggregated to the greatest extent feasible while maintaining privacy; qualitative data obtained from public engagement activities should be easily accessible and how that data informs the data-driven decision-making process should be transparent.
Equity	Equity should be embedded through the process and not be isolated as a separate criterion. We recommend for several measures the criterion be calculated for both the general population and EJ populations, if the project has fewer benefits for EJ populations or creates harm to them, the project should receive the lowest score on that criterion.

Equity	<p>An overarching consideration is that equity should be prioritized as a primary goal of this process and individual equity criteria should not only be embedded within the environmental impacts/livability section. Equity should be measured separately via multiple criteria, such as anticipated reductions in transportation costs for low-income households, reducing air pollution in communities near major highways, and increasing accessibility to jobs for low-income communities of color. For the “Environmental Justice” equity-oriented measure proposed, we suggest this be considered a livability benefits measure. We wish to highlight that conducting only a buffer analysis around the project area to calculate the EJ population within a certain distance of the proposed project will not provide an indication of the amount of benefits that population will receive from the project nor the negative impacts that may result (i.e. noise, vibration, air quality, safety) from a project that would harm them. We believe the approach should at a minimum include both a benefit and burden measure. Ideally the benefit measure could include both proximate population and some estimate of expected use of the facility. Measures of burden should account for all negative impacts of transportation facilities, and should consider both cumulative impacts of other past and ongoing projects as well as underlying population vulnerabilities.</p> <p>The relevant IDOT District should report that if the project is in an EJ area, and to get full points for the project, they must provide examples of engagement that has occurred with EJ communities and how that has informed project development.</p>
Equity	<p>Equity/Emissions - note that this criterion is fundamentally at odds with a program that narrowly focuses on adding general purpose lanes to state highways, since any roadway expansion will increase these emissions over time. In order for this criterion to be meaningful, it must be applied in a context where multimodal projects are eligible to be funded by the relevant funding source.</p> <p>Emissions of particulate matter should be part of the overall emissions calculations - the calculations should be done separately for both the overall population affected by emissions and EJ populations, so differential impacts can be understood. A project should receive a point deduction if a large EJ population would be negatively impacted by particulate matter/emissions.</p> <p>These calculations must also include a separate measure of forecasted greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Projects should receive fewer or no points if they increase GHGs. If a project reduces overall emissions (i.e. shifts trips to low and zero-emissions modes) it should receive points based on the extent of the reduction.</p>
Equity	<p>Equity -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project add access to get people to job, hospitals, shopping, etc</li> <li>Does the project connect other projects or roads together</li> <li>Coordination with multimodal connections and how they connect to each other</li> </ul>
Land Use	<p>We recommend that IDOT work toward development of a tool to coordinate land use and transportation so that an assessment of future transportation-efficient land use is possible. Virginia’s SMART SCALE is a good example.</p>
Maintenance	<p>IDOT and the State of Illinois should ensure they have achieved and can maintain a state of good repair of the state highway system prior to expansion, capacity or other enhancement types of projects. As far as the tool itself, I would suggest a requirement that all IDOT districts throughout the State of Illinois receive an equitable share of expansion and enhancement project funding.</p>
Misc.	<p>1. First, applaud the efforts to develop a public facing data driven process and believe, over time, IDOT will see significant benefits.</p>
Misc.	<p>4. Take a look at Virginia’s Smart Scale program. It is a good model to use.</p>
Misc.	<p>Stewardship should really, really be included here as its own goal, but almost as a counter-goal because maintaining existing facilities, including criteria for bridge / structure / pavement / infrastructure condition, and investing toward state of good repair are going to detract from new capacity expansion. No ribbon-cuttings, but still a good thing.</p>
Misc.	<p>Happy to share information on mobility and economic hardship index.</p>
Misc.	<p>Happy to see the tool and applaud IDOT for developing it and seeking such extensive feedback on it.</p>
Misc.	<p>LCDOT would encourage the department to give traffic operations/congestion and safety goals higher weighting than the other categories of metrics</p>
Misc.	<p>IDOT should clearly define which projects in the MYP are capacity projects of the type that will go through the DDD tool.</p>

Misc.	<p>IDOT should establish a process and timeline for making updates to the DDD tool. It should evaluate what is working well and what should be improved and seek to adjust the process to get closer to achieving desired outcomes. This should occur at least every 1-2 years.</p> <p>IDOT should publish the data and methodology that is used in the DDD tool.</p>
Misc.	<p>We recommend that an additional measure be added to enable comparison of benefits as related to the project costs. This will encourage each project to deliver the highest level of benefit for the public dollars invested. A relatively easy way to do this would be to follow the example of Virginia's SMART SCALE and divide the total points awarded to the project by the costs, yielding a points per dollar measure.</p>
Misc.	<p>We recommend that IDOT take an iterative process sharing the revised criteria and asking for weighting at that point. At an overarching level, we believe that safety, equity, and environmental impacts are very high priorities, and should be weighted accordingly. We encourage you to allocate significant weight to these categories, especially in relation to the remainder divided among economic development, traffic/congestion, and 'regional rating'. We encourage IDOT not to weight congestion too heavily, particularly before the Data-Driven Decisions Tool can mature into considering other modes' ability to address congestion, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
Misc.	<p>New capacity is often added to the system as only part of a project's goals. Projects that address capacity as part of a larger lifecycle reconstructing should be scored differently than capacity projects that stand alone. While it can be difficult to separate, identifying the portion of a project that is related to capacity can clarify the other goals of the project and the cost effectiveness at achieving those goals.</p>
Misc.	<p>Look at other states to see what they are doing  Seek feedback from districts  How does the delivery of projects play into it - Design Build, P3, bundling  Look at other areas that use data driven decisions</p>
Multimodal	<p>1.Please realize that IDOT roads and corridors are used by more than motor vehicles. The goals and metrics must include other users.</p>
Multimodal	<p>The Tool goal of "Traffic Operations / Congestion" could just be titled Mobility  The criteria shouldn't be so biased toward auto capacity expansion as they are. AADT and AVMT are essentially double counting and steering toward already built up infrastructure.  This mobility item needs to be broadened to non-auto modes. Consider measures of person-travel and access (not accessibility) as essential components of mobility.</p>
Multimodal	<p>IDOT should reconfigure the approach to define "capacity expansion" projects as encompassing any project that increases the person-throughput of state-owned or state-managed public rights of way, rather than the current approach which more narrowly considers vehicle throughput alone. We suggest IDOT develop a multiyear plan that includes all surface transportation projects, including roadway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian. IDOT should use mode-neutral performance measures to prioritize investments.</p>
Regional Rating	<p>"Regional Rating" isn't a goal but a political override, we understand</p>
Regional Rating	<p>willing to be part of the conversation; a clear synergy is whether a project is included in an MPOs long range plan</p>
Regional Rating	<p>Regional Rating - LCDOT believes this metric makes sense given the diversity of project and areas within the state. LCDOT has developed and keeps an up to date prioritized list of improvements on the state system known as the Lake county State Highway Consensus List, they believe projects prioritized by local partners should be prioritized for inclusion in the MYP.</p>
Regional Rating	<p>IFB asks that the efficiency of rural roads be an influential factor in the subjective portion of the regional rating to ensure farmers can continue to access local, national and international markets.  IFB has concerns that a "one size fits all" matrix may not reflect the diverse transportation needs of all regions of Illinois.</p>

Regional Rating	Regional rating - It is important that this rating not be developed solely by IDOT district staff - scoring should include at a minimum involve full engagement with the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and local jurisdictions in the area. This is also an opportunity for additional public engagement, including with equity stakeholders.
Regional Rating	Regional Ranking -Illinois’ metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) play a critical role in transportation funding, and inclusion in their long-range transportation plan should be required. It is vital that the capacity projects evaluated with this tool advance the local MPO’s system condition and performance targets. New capacity projects that are not included in the MPO’s long range plan should not be considered for funding within the IDOT Multi-Year Plan.
Regional Rating	Input on criteria to use: political influence/feedback; cot of project; long term maintenance cost of projects; leveraging other state/fed/local funding for projects; different weights for regions of state; return on investment; EDP- ability to create new development in the future; tourism; priority corridors
Resiliency	Resiliency and Stewardship are still lacking in the Tool, and they’re both important IDOT strategic goals.
Resiliency	Resiliency - We suggest that a project not receive points only because it’s located in an area that has sustained storm damage in the past 30 years. Indeed, the fact that a project is in an area prone to flooding may indicate that it should NOT be built. At a minimum, information should be provided by project sponsors on how it will be designed to reduce flooding in nearby areas by retaining water within the facility - such as through the installation of green infrastructure - and in a way that will withstand forecasts of higher rainfall and flooding, to receive points.
Resiliency	Resiliency - Beyond existing storm and floodplain requirements, this criterion should add an additional component that favors preservation of green infrastructure. It would be prudent to consider natural areas affected by an expansion, as natural areas offer green infrastructure benefits as well. For projects in metropolitan Chicago, IDOT can apply the green infrastructure vision dataset that CMAP developed with partners.
Rural Investment	Agriculture is a leading industry in Illinois in terms of economic impact contributing \$8.85b annually to the state's economy and employing 1.5 million ll workers in the food and fiber system. IFB wants to ensure the evaluation criteria proposed doesn't put rural infrastructure issues at a disadvantage.
Safety	“Safety” would be part of Mobility per the LRTP, but given the context of the Tool I’m with you on keeping it separate. Frequency-only further biases toward high volume facilities. At a minimum include criteria for rates and severity. Another is to include an allowance for crash type and potential for improvement (i.e. to not miss out on the low hanging fruit like a guardrail, better lighting or marking, etc)
Safety	I offer a few comments regarding the Safety Goal and the crash frequency criteria. I recommend IDOT consider not including all crashes in the evaluation, but only fatalities and serious injuries. These two categories of crashes have the largest impact on society and the individuals involved. There may advantages to also including minor injuries, but I don’t see much value with including property damage only crashes. I also recommend IDOT utilize five years of safety data (if available) in evaluating crashes. Typically, a five year period is selected to provide a large enough sample of data, while minimizing the chance of a outlier in the data. For example, either a year with excessive number of fatalities or an unusually low number of fatalities. Also, when selecting the time period, it is important to use whole years to avoid cyclic or seasonal variations in the crash and traffic data.

Safety	<p>Safety - LCDOT does not feel crash frequency is the correct metric to use for safety evaluations; the metric used should be able to advance projects that meet safety targets. Safety goal should look at severity of crashes in addition to frequency.</p> <p>The dept could use IDOT's safety tiers for intersections and segments to score safety or use IDOT's crash prediction tool to compare crash frequency to expected crash frequency. Ideally, potential projects would be evaluated for crash modification factors that a project is expected to have and score projects on their expected reduction in the types of crashes seen within the project limits.</p>
Safety	<p>The most effective safety strategy for reducing fatalities is changing roadway design to reduce speeding and protect pedestrians and cyclists, who are the most vulnerable users of the transportation network. Special care should be taken not to increase capacity in a way that results in unsafe speeds and more injuries or fatalities. Projects should be compared on the crash rate or potential to reduce crashes rather than the raw number of crashes.</p> <p>We recommend IDOT invest in improved safety data collection.</p>
Safety	<p>Number of fatal and injury crashes in the project area - This should be a measure of the forecasted change in fatal/injury crashes projected as a result of the project, not the existing conditions in the study area. There should be a focus on improving safety and comfort for all users of an IDOT facility, including people biking and walking. The anticipated safety improvement of a project can be calculated based on the elements of a project for which crash modification factors exist, the extent to which VMT will decrease and thus reduce exposure and crash rates, and/or the "complete streets" elements (new or improved bike/walk/transit facilities) that will make non-auto trips safer and/or shift trips to these safer modes, as detailed in this Guidebook for Using Safety as a Project Prioritization Factor.</p> <p>We would also suggest an additional criterion to disaggregate crashes in which pedestrians or cyclists are injured.</p>
Traffic/Congestion	<p>2. Most of the measures proposed are lagging indicators (existing AADT, existing Travel Time Index, existing crash frequency, is it on the National Freight Network, etc). These lagging indicators are helpful for identifying where there are existing needs or gaps, but not useful in determining the actual impact of the proposed project (i.e. how is travel time index improved, how much reduction in crash frequency, how is travel delays on the freight network improved, etc.) Most of your proposed measures are excellent at showing where there are high value needs, but will have significant shortcomings in showing the benefits nor show the costs of the proposed improvements. Without monetizing the benefits and costs of projects it is difficult to do any tradeoff analysis or financial optimization.</p>
Traffic/Congestion	<p>Please consider truck traffic. Truck ADT can be used as a criteria under Traffic Operations/Congestion and should be specifically identified beyond ADT.</p> <p>For example, I-57 between Marion and Mt. Vernon, the ADT is ~40,000 vehicle day. That is nothing unusual, but when the % of traffic is 35% trucks (over 14,000 trucks per day) it can really change the comfort level, life of the pavement, traffic flow, and the dynamics &amp; needs of a corridor. We need to capture the impacts that large truck volumes have on our roadways.</p>
Traffic/Congestion	<p>What year is AADT taken from, with COVID causing havoc on our traffic, it may not be wise to use the past year or two years as a measure.</p>
Traffic/Congestion	<p>Traffic Operations/Congestion - AADT TTI - LCDOT is supportive of these metrics; Change in AVMT- LCDOT is supportive of this metrics as long as the same time period is used for the change in AVMT for all projects</p>
Traffic/Congestion	<p>AADT - We recommend elimination of the AADT measure as it is only a measure of current conditions and does not tell us about the benefits that the project will generate. Instead, we recommend measuring: increase in corridor total (multimodal) person throughput attributed to the project, which will serve as a true measure of the capacity of the project to provide mobility to people. This approach can be undertaken once the statewide travel demand model is complete, potentially in a future iteration of the process. We recommend use of the Virginia SMART SCALE (Appendix B) method that estimates the future no-build vs build scenario. Until this alternative can be implemented, we recommend elimination of this measure.</p>

Traffic/Congestion	<p>Change in annual VMT - This measure should estimate the future change in VMT anticipated as a result of the project, prioritizing projects that fill mobility needs while reducing VMT. Projects that provide more multimodal mobility for people to move along a corridor while decreasing VMT would be optimal in terms of equity, environmental impacts and affordability of the system.</p> <p>The currently proposed measure to provide more points for projects in counties with higher VMT forecasts will have the impact of increasing VMT and environmental impacts of transportation, running counter to the State's climate goals.</p> <p>We also request that this criterion include a calculation of induced demand that will be created by developing new highway capacity. Illinois could use the assumptions from an induced demand calculator from another state such as California or Colorado.</p>
Traffic/Congestion	<p>Travel time index - We recommend that instead of a travel time index, IDOT use a planning time index, a measure of system reliability, given that predictable travel times are most important to travelers. we recommend that in the future IDOT use a measure of reduction in person hours of delay, a mode-neutral measure that will assess the potential benefit of the project. An approach to calculating this measure is detailed in the Virginia SMART SCALE technical guide (Appendix B).</p>
Traffic/Congestion	<p>Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) and Change in Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled (AVMT) CMAP feedback: AADT and AVMT capture if a road use has changed, but not if that level of use is problematic. Roads with chronic issues may be missed and may result in the focus being placed on areas with greenfield development. This runs counter to ON TO 2050's goals to support infill development and inclusive growth. CMAP recommends incorporating measures of reliability such as the Planning Time Index and Level of Travel Time Reliability (described below) to better capture the need for system enhancements.</p>
Traffic/Congestion	<p>Travel Time Index (TTI) CMAP feedback: The Travel Time Index (TTI) provides a useful but incomplete picture of congestion. In addition to TTI, CMAP uses Planning Time Index and Level of Travel Time Reliability to measure system reliability. Northeastern Illinois's road network is forecasted to continue to be congested. ON TO 2050 seeks to improve the reliability of the system, rather than solely focusing on reducing congestion.</p>
Transit	<p>For now and the future, public transportation is vital, to reduce carbon emissions, become electric buses, trains etc, and quality bus drivers too.</p>
Transit	<p>Access to transit - We request that instead of this measure, an access measure be developed that calculates multimodal accessibility (see below).</p>

## Appendix B Where should the money go?

Theme	Comment
Alternative Transportation	Design future projects with alternate forms of transport just as important as automobiles, including public, bicycles, scooter, walking, etc.
Alternative Transportation	Promoting use of transit, bicycling, and walking.
Alternative Transportation	The most cost-effective way to reduce traffic/congestion is to make it safe and viable to walk, bike, or take public transit. Expanding roads only induces more driving and makes it less safe for anyone who isn't in a big metal box to get around. It's a vicious circle that benefits no one and costs us all too much. Congestion solutions = bike lanes, safer intersections, sidewalks, dedicated bus lanes, etc.
Alternative Transportation	Money toward congestion should only be spent on getting people out of cars and into other modes of transport.
Alternative Transportation	Other - Non-motorized modes of transportation
Alternative Transportation	Other should include goals on shift to sustainable modes: transit, walk, and bike.
Alternative Transportation	livability near large roads is so poor. noise, pollution, danger & broken neighborhoods. it is about impossible to safely travel via anything but car in both rural and city areas. making more space for cars will just make the problems worse. our infrastructure needs to be aimed at eliminating cars
Alternative Transportation	Focus on people who sometimes don't use their cars to get around. I'm disappointed to see no mention of pedestrian safety, trail connections, improving public transit, protected bike lanes, or other transportation that isn't just cars and highways. Do better and plan for a carbon-free future, not more cars.
Alternative Transportation	Prioritizing walking, biking and public transit methods to reduce cars on the road, thereby improving the environment and public health
Alternative Transportation	Transit and Active Transportation
Alternative Transportation	More protected bike lanes and bus only lanes
Alternative Transportation	Other: walking and biking infrastructure; public transit.
Bike Ped	Bike and Pedestrian Improvements
Bike Ped	Bike infrastructure (reflective paint, dedicated lanes, more protection, bike preference infrastructure)
Bike Ped	Other: improve safety, connectivity, and quality of non-motorized and vulnerable road users. Specifically, pedestrians, seniors, people on bicycles, and public transit riders.
Bike Ped	Protected bike lanes! More train routes to go further south and west
Bike Ped	Other = Bike improvements/lanes
Bike Ped	Cost effectiveness--Some bicycle projects are very expensive. More reasonable solutions should be used so that funds could be spent on additional projects
Bike Ped	filling the many gaps in our trail and side path networks will also improve safety and reduce congestion and improve air quality.
Bike Ped	Safety for cyclists and pedestrians
Bike Ped	Please allocate funds to build the East Branch DuPage River Trail - we need about \$7 million to make it happen.
Bike Ped	Motorist education to yield to pedestrians.
Bridges	Other = replacing structurally deficient bridges and providing pavement upgrades to support 80,000 lb traffic
Connectivity	Other: connectivity (people, not just cars, moved per hour)
Design	For "Other," removal of speed and red light cameras and speed bumps.
Design	For my Other, removal of red light and speed cameras, speed bumps, and bike lanes.

Economic Development	As the objective is to economize, the net cost should be less than zero. However, the priority of economizing should be high, and some planning money will be needed to accomplish it. Also possibly some bribes to local officials to get them to surrender pet projects..
Equity	Other: Equity impacts on marginalized communities
Equity	Social Justice
Equity	Equity
Equity	Equitable distribution of access
Equity	Equity and accessibility
Equity	Other: recognizing and addressing diversity and equity
Funding	TBP Funding needs to be increased since it has not been increased since its inception in the 70's.
Local Bridges	Local bridges and small structures.
Maintenance	Maintain what we have before adding more
Maintenance	Resurface roads worn out with humps in the roads by digging them out and rebuilding. Centralia, Illinois is a prime example. Nothing in future road plans for us here. Horrible, have tried with the City of Centralia and IDOT Dist. 8, little help, like pulling teeth. Why. Why. Why.
Maintenance	Other: Same as Feedback screen. This include maintaining good infrastructure in good repair...maintenance of existing assets.
Maintenance	Other - 50% or more of the funding should go to keeping up with ongoing maintenance, and reconstruction roadways that have exceeded their useable life span.
Maintenance	Condition
Maintenance	Repair of existing declining infrastructure
Maintenance	Maintaining the current transportation system should be a priority. Existing roads and bridges are at a critical state of disrepair and now is the time to invest in future maintenance.
Maintenance	Stewardship
Maintenance	Maintaining the existing highways in good or better condition.
Misc.	This interface should have copied over what I entered in the "Other" comment from the previous screen into this one.
Misc.	Instead of this ridiculously complicated device to set percentages; how about focusing on delivering results for the people of Illinois instead of being an obstacle of positive change
Misc.	It is really hard to do this as I have no idea what the current distribution is. So not much attention should be paid to this. Cool presentation though!
Multimodal	Accessibility - To population centers, jobs, multi-modal hubs.
Multimodal	multi-modal choice
Multimodal	Other - promoting multimodal and transit -including non-vehicular transportation - in planning and infrastructure.
Multimodal	Comprehensive planning for all users: pedestrians, bikes, motorcycles, cars, etc.
Rural Divide	Rural communities that have been historically under served with local and state highways designed for commercial truck traffic should be given priority.
Rural Divide	Existing Rural Road and Bridge construction
Safety	Safety should always be the number one priority, even ahead of traffic/congestion. Improving livability/mobility could also be considered safety-related under the Safe System approach now being encouraged by the FHWA.
Technological Improvements	Redo all planning to incorporate climate change goals and minimize the need for electric or other cars, and prioritize the safety of bike and ped. Put 20% of funds and efforts to bike and pedestrian systems off the top first like the UN suggests. 30% to electrify all transit and fast speed rail. 20% toward infill and no sprawl to reduce the need for car travel. Put 20% of \$\$s to build bicycle highways. Put 10% toward road maintenance.
Technological Improvements	Resiliency: Innovative Technology/materials use; Cybersecurity components; Resiliency coverage: meteorological, climatic, geologic, manmade. Importance to response and recovery from an event

Transit	focus on equity and investment in underserved communities related to increasing access to jobs, transit and affordable housing. Transit has to be a MAJOR priority!
Transit	Public Transit in the form of light and heavy rail
Transit	Other: IDOT should focus on large scale and regional public transportation initiatives, since these are more environmentally friendly/produce lower emissions, can provide economic development to communities, are safer than highways, can reduce traffic and congestion on said highways, and can better connect the state as a whole.
Transit	Transit
Transit	Other = Public Transportation
Transit	public transit
Walkability	I am using "Other" to refer to walkability.

## Appendix C Additional comments, criteria rating.

### C.1 Economic Development

#### C.1.1 Intermodal Accessibility

Theme	Comment
Access and proximity	If the project doesn't provide access to that facility, what does it matter how close it is? Suggest refining this to criteria to incorporate both access and proximity to facilities
Access and proximity	Access to inter modal facilities is antiquated. Better access to intermodal reduces the need for long haul & multi trailer trucking which is dangerous and clogs the Interstate Highway system.
All Commercial and Industrial Developments	This is important but local economic development does not only include intermodal facilities. Economic Development is all commercial and industrial development.
Commodity Flows	Weight by some sort of impact value - commodity flow amounts at the intermodal facility for example.
Expand Mile Range	I think 3 miles is too small perhaps something more like 5 miles.
Expand Mile Range	3 miles seems very close for criteria
Expand Mile Range	consideration also for movement of workers and design. impacts on local roads beyond 3 miles.
Intermodal Measure Critique	intermodal avoids many bottlenecks. This measure could also be more sophisticated
Measure Critique	I don't believe the average person will understand these measures.
Measure Critique	I don't think freight access is an important driver of economic development in current times
Measure Critique	These three criteria hardly measure the impact of what you are doing. We need to measure results not inputs.
Misc.	The areas of the State that don't have access to an Intermodal facility need even more highway development.
Rail Investment	My belief is that Class II and Class III railroads that are presently hauling intermodal traffic should be able to access State infrastructure funds to enhance the safety and reliability of that route. Investing in rail removes trucks off of State and local roads which will greatly benefit the taxpayer, combats climate change with decreased CO 2emissions and enhances safety on the State and local roadways.
Rail Investment	Access to a rail freight, where most freight shipping should be directed as soon as possible. Freight should not be shipped long-distance on highways.

## C.1.2 Major Development

Theme	Comment
Alternative Transportation	Access to all forms of transportation and not just cars.
Alternative Transportation	Access by all modes, not just auto
Alternative Transportation	Important to clarify and disaggregate for which road users the proposed project improves access, and to ensure that this access measurement captures not only drivers but people walking, biking, or riding public transit. Improvements to the latter three modes should be prioritized more strongly than for driving accessibility improvements
Alternative Transportation	Ensuring that the development has appropriate, safe access for pedestrians and cyclists
Alternative Transportation	Access must include micro-mobility, public transport and walking.
Design	not if it's a new development of more urban sprawl
Design	Street design should not just provide access to major developments, it should promote additional businesses to congregate near it.
Developer Responsibility	In a perfect world, developers would pay for transportation facilities, not look to spend public tax dollars on them
Developer Responsibility	New developments should be responsible for funding capacity improvements to serve them
Developer Responsibility	What are the timeline requirements for large scale renewable projects to notify IDOT of their road use intentions? Industrial wind projects take an enormous toll on local/regional roads, and getting wind developers to pay for road repairs post-construction, even with local Road Use Agreements, has been challenging for some local jurisdictions. Is IDOT having some of the same issues? What are the actual costs to Illinois taxpayers for road repairs at these sites?
Development Definition	I like this idea but don't want it to simply refer to an intermodal facility or to an urban area. You should be looking at 1) how much economic activity is located within 1/2 miles of corridor, 2) how many daytime employees are located in that area, 3) is the corridor underperforming economically? 4) Types of employment (blue collar), 5) is it a life safety corridor?, 6) Does the corridor support transit now or in future?
Development Definition	Who will define what a "major" development is? Not all proposed developments are worthy of IDOT spending to improve their access... tie this criterion to the equity and livability measure
Development Definition	Weight by an impact value - ex: number of employees
Development Definition	Will there be a threshold and / or definition for "major"?
Development Definition	How will this be defined? Seems ambiguous.
Development Definition	Municipalities need good access to their developments as well, not all projects need to be major in order to make a positive impact for a community.
Development Definition	Small businesses and retail should be considered as well, not to mention how workers get to work and how far they must commute.
Development Definition	Is this defined somewhere? Our region may have major development that does not seem like much in other portions of the state. Do all projects in Cook county take precedence?
Economic Development	Consideration should be given for projects that could spur development in a given area once upgraded infrastructure was constructed.
Equity	Put money into parts of the State that need economic development.
Local Input	Major developments that don't conform to local community plans need to be carefully vetted before transportation dollars are spent on them. Communities that don't have plans should be encouraged to develop plans that address land use, environment, livability, etc. before major investments in transportation infrastructure are made.
Measure Critique	Does it need to? It depends on the situation.

Multimodal	need consider multi modal access not just roadways and cars but transit access and the design of facility and land use to support transit
Rural Divide	The majority of the state has rural/local roads that serve rural communities. By prioritizing economic development rather highly, these communities and roads might be missed with funding going to larger regions such as Chicago or St. Louis.
Small Businesses	Must also consider minor and existing businesses. Should also consider property values.

### C.1.3 National Highway Freight Network

Theme	Comment
Definition	I don't know what this means. It would have been useful if you had explained the measure more.
Definition	Why is this a criteria. Who knows if the National highway is based on sound criteria and has the right objectives?
Equity	Develop the underserved areas of the State and economic development will follow in those areas.
Equity	IDOT must also include safeguards to ensure additional freight investments do not further burden low-income communities of color with increased diesel and other heavy-duty vehicle emissions given the long legacy of pollution burdens, especially within Black communities in Chicagoland.
Equity	Fast Act is great and provides funding. But IDOT has to ensure that those funds are used to improve the local economy equitably.
Limited Network	This is a limited network that doesn't really consider all of the freight issues across the region. Other thoughts: is the project in a corridor where there are multiple at-grade rail crossings? Is there a CREATE project or identified grade-separation project?
Measure Critique	I think that could be one indicator. But what if there are multiple ways to get to National Highway Freight Network that it doesn't necessarily need to be on it.
Measure Critique	I don't think freight access is an important driver of economic development in current times
Rail	what happened to rail?
Rail	Highways have to be maintained, but freight should increasingly be shipped by rail where possible. Get freight off the highways as soon as possible.
Rail	Invest more in trains and existing infrastructure we already have, not in new truck infrastructure.
Rail	also consideration for passenger movements either on road or rail
Small Developments	These measures are geared towards large scale industry. The vitality of an economy also relies on how well all of its people and businesses are doing, not just big business.
Truck AADT	Truck AADT values or something similar may be better here

## C.2 Environmental Impacts/Livability

### C.2.1 Environmental Justice

Theme	Comment
Definition	Is the score higher because these communities are getting a project in their area, or lower because the project may harm these areas? Need to clarify this!
Definition	Nor clear... a good rating will result from avoiding such areas, or by minimizing impacts to them?
Economics	Transportation development needs to improve the lives of all people, but especially the poor. Ethnic minorities don't always coincide with those most in need of improvements, so I'd concentrate on the economic aspect.
Equity	Important to equalize access to increase social mobility, such as avoiding making street decisions that force people to stay in certain areas.
Equity	Everyone living everywhere in the state should have equal access to a good transportation system.
Include Negative Externalities	This measure needs to include negative externalities from any project
Include Negative Externalities	This should reflect that some projects have greater local negative impacts than others (e.g., a bike path won't have significant negative externalities, but a wider road might).
Linkages	Perhaps consideration could also be given to a project which may not be geographically located in an EJ area, however is part of a corridor which provides transportation linkages from those EJ geographies to employment, services, and other opportunities
Measure Critique	You're using IEPA as your source of demographic data? Strange. But you know that (1) project impacts are often far removed from project location; and (2) if you make a poor area really nice it will be gentrified.
Measure Critique	This criteria depends - is it to improve accessibility for disadvantaged populations or negative points if it results in adverse impacts on those communities.
Measure Critique	Where does livability, quality of life, climate change and other environmental concerns enter in the equation?
Measure Critique	A transportation project should be selected on the merits of impacts to transportation, access, and environmental impacts. Not discriminating, well intended as it may be, based on a person's income or race. The equity selection component already looks to improve access and reduce emissions where there are deficiencies in the transportation network which are predominant in low-income populations. This component will help eliminate EJ issues.
Measure Critique	There needs to be a criteria for improving quality of life. Access to bike paths for example. Doesn't have to be low income or equity based. Just improving quality of life for all residents.
Project Location	Remove highways that destroyed minority-centered businesses and communities. These include the Dan Ryan, the Kennedy, and the Eisenhower expressways.
Project Location	Is a project in a low income area a good or bad thing? I really don't see construction staff being filled with "locals" that change with the project site.
Project Location	Relocating highways that have contributed to impoverishing these areas it's important he
Project Location	I think every project's location should be heavily scrutinized to determine if it is truly worth displacing communities for (most of the time) more vehicles and driving.
Project Location	It's incredibly important to remove highways from urban settings, especially when they run through economically sensitive minority populations.
Project Location	important to focus on local communities. it is so important to ensure quality of life and protect our environment. Once our earth is destroyed, no one will benefit by development
Project Location	Specifically needs to show benefits to the communities. Being in an EJ area may not necessarily benefit the communities

## C.2.2 Equity

Theme	Comment
Alternative Transportation	By improving roadways and other forms of transportation such as providing better infrastructure for pedestrians, can increase mobility and decrease fatal and severe injury crashes.
Alternative Transportation	Making other forms of transport, such as public transit, will increase livability for everyone.
Alternative Transportation	Consider adding a criterion: Equity convertibility. These projects would provide more access for people to use bicycle and pedestrian ways to access their first and last mile trips.
Alternative Transportation	The benefits and burdens of our infrastructure investments are not justly distributed. We can write this historical wrong by focusing on equitable investments in transit, walking, and biking while still accommodating freight and industry.
Alternative Transportation	Keep the highway dollars for highways. Public transit with volumes of people is not the choice people are making.
Alternative Transportation	There is no mention of transit or pedestrian infrastructure in the livability section? We need to start caring less about people who live in exurbs and commute huge distances and more about supporting communities that are affordable/livable and contain both jobs and residences. No more subsidizing our unsustainable development pattern
Alternative Transportation	Increased access to public transportation and bike infrastructure.
Alternative Transportation	consideration for land use, transit supportive design, pedestrian access
Measure Critique	What is the definition of "equity" here?
Gentrification	Improvements in transportation need to go hand in hand with economic development so that low-income populations aren't priced out of areas once they become more accessible.
Measure Critique	Equity (racial, economic, modal) should be an embedded assessment of every single question you ask, not its own separate question.
Measure Critique	That's a lot of different impacts grouped under equity. How would this be quantified?
Measure Critique	Perhaps consider removing emissions from this criterion and replacing with another element as emissions is identified as standalone criteria in Goal #5
Measure Critique	Reduction in vehicle usage should be a key metric as well. If you rank well in this metric, expect traffic congestion to go down as well and possibly an increase in economic development, safety, resilience, and regional rating. It's a capture all type of metric.
Measure Critique	Equity and environmental impacts should be separate goal areas, and equity should have multiple criteria accounting for the inclusivity of the project planning process, likely pollution and multimodal accessibility burdens resulting from a given project, and potential additional risks, for example project contributions to increased displacement risks (or, worse, the likelihood of direct displacement for a capacity/expansion project)
Measure Critique	Equity is not just about improving access but about improving opportunity. If, for example, a road widening project tears down existing homes or businesses or makes a street seem unsafe to pedestrians who might need to cross it, that's an equity issue regardless of how it impacts commutes.
Measure Critique	How is this different from the first one? None of these measures evaluate the full impact of the projects. In almost every case, the impact on the climate and on the health of citizens are downplayed or ignored. Externalities are usually out of scope.
Multimodal	Every project must insure any mode of transportation is supported equally. So any highway must have a dedicated path for micro-mobility along with it. And measures put in to assess usage.
Multimodal	This is #1 above all else. We have a lot of work to do in Illinois to catch up with much of the rest of the world on having clean, safe, enjoyable multi-modal access that doesn't prioritize the personal car first above all else.
Project Location	Remove highways from cities because they create health problems for the surrounding communities.
Rural Divide	as it applies to our rural community, we don't really have an issue with this now.

### C.2.3 Level of Environmental Impact Analysis Required

Theme	Comment
Alternative Transportation	Too often environmental analyses become impediments to smart transportation solutions, because the underlying premise is broken. If the project will support safe walking, biking, and public transit, thereby giving people options to not drive, then it should have priority for consideration, since it will have more big-picture impact on reducing environmental hazards. That matters far more than whether or not there's green space included in project designs.
Alternative Transportation	Will these measurements be designed in a way that prioritizes non-vehicle mobility options like pedestrians and bike facilities and transit?
Alternative Transportation	Also include how nonmotorized transportation is incorporated to accommodate bike commuters, walkers, runners, and wheelchairs
Measure Critique	Not quite sure what this would end up capturing
Measure Critique	While I agree doing an environmental study is important. I do not agree that a project requiring a higher level of environ. impacts should be ranked lower than one that does not. Traffic and Safety should be the determining criteria.
Measure Critique	Just because a project goes through these impact reviews does not mean it negatively impacts the environment - a project requiring these reviews likely is required to provide more environmental benefit/restoration as part of construction.
Measure Critique	This is more of a Federal standard and I feel it is necessary but is a bit too extensive.
Measure Critique	This seems like it is too process-oriented to be a good way of establishing the environmental/livability impacts.
Measure Critique	Not sure of the relevance of the level of environmental review. An EIS project may have better environmental results than a CE project depending on the circumstances. Projects that result in projected lower GHG emissions should score higher. Projects that require less ROW should score higher, projects that reuse brownfield sites should score higher, projects that support the state's sustainability objectives should score higher
Misc.	These assessments are carried out by notoriously biased organizations with a strong corporate push. They are not reliable.
No Impact	Ideally you only want projects with no significant impact. But one hopes you will estimate the impact correctly and choose projects where the benefit/impact ratio is high.
Project Location	Remove highways from cities because they're toxic to the neighborhoods surrounding the highway.
Quality of Life	Criteria should also include something about the quality of life for adjacent neighborhoods like walkability, path/sidewalk connections, stormwater management and pollutant reduction, native landscaping. etc.
Regulations	Environmental impacts of projects are way over-regulated.

## C.3 Traffic/Congestion

### C.3.1 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)

Theme	Comment
Alternative Transportation	You need to count bicycles and pedestrians, buses and other forms of transportation beyond cars. Then get people out of cars.
Alternative Transportation	What if the count goes down because people have been given a safe biking option or a convenient transit option? How does that figure in?
Alternative Transportation	Encouraging people to get out of their cars to reduce AADT is incredibly important. Anything IDOT can do to encourage this I fully support as being very important.
Alternative Transportation	IDOT normally prepares Traffic Studies to define what improvements are needed to address road capacity. Maybe a suggestion for Traffic Studies to be multimodal, analyzing pedestrians, transit and others to evaluate what improvements are need for these modes. projects could evaluate transit friendly improvements such as TSP, queue jumps, etc.
Bike Ped	Always look for downward trends of AADT to reallocate space for bikes and peds. Do not just take current year AAADT and project up at x% for 15-20years.
Bike Ped	Too many bike lanes when you consider that bikes are far outnumbered by motor vehicles.
Bike Ped	where are measures of pedestrian and bicycle traffic figured in? These aspects need to be included. Does the project improve connectivity? What do heat maps of bicycle use look like?
Design	None of the traffic/congestion criteria accounts for traffic at intersections, which can have congestion issues leading to an increase in severe injury crashes, nor does it account for heavy vehicle traffic which can lead to congestion issues.
Design	You can't out-build congestion.
design	widening roads just attracts more cars and encourages longer road commuting
Design	In cities, IDOT should focus on making sure that a low number of cars are spread out across multiple roads rather than a large number of cars encouraged to travel on certain routes. Large, heavily trafficked roads divide neighborhoods, cities, and towns.
Development (Wind)	Industrial scale wind development projects can have a massive impact on local roads, and that congestion is usually not captured. This year a major road improvement project was done on Rt 10 between Clinton and Lincoln just as a major wind development was ramping up. Requiring wind developers to notify IDOT at least 24-36 months in advance of project work might help IDOT better plan to do road improvements post-construction of these facilities to better assess the damage from the OW/OS loads.
Measure Critique	Total traffic doesn't equal improvements. Score should be driven by projected improvements from implementation.
Measure Critique	None of these measures look at the factors contributing to the congestion/traffic volume. That is more important.
Measure Critique	Increasing traffic volume capacity will lead to it inevitably being filled to capacity every discouraging cars while encourage all others forms of transportation or walking will ease traffic congestion while not dragging on economic development. Dutch infrastructure are an excellent example of making excellent decisions on this and anything infrastructure related.
Measure Critique	This doesn't sound like quite the correct definition for AADT.....
Measure Critique	Accounts for induced demand.
Measure Critique	all modes or just cars you cagers?
Measure Critique	AADT are undesirable
Misc.	Key in noting growth areas, route-specific congestion, and impacts of proposed projects
People Over AADT	prefer to measure people/passengers rather than vehicles
People Over AADT	How many people are moved safely is my major criteria. People, not vehicles.

People Over AADT	Measures need to identify all forms of transportation. We should find a way to measure the number of people going through not just vehicles. Our current approach ignores how many people go through a space instead focusing on full powered engines this measure fails if we don't see low-impact transportation numbers.
People Over AADT	We need to start looking at numbers of people and goods moved rather than vehicles. Ideally we can create a system that moves large numbers of people and goods while reducing the AADT, creating a cleaner, healthier IL.
Reduce AADT	Goals should be to reduce AADT. Projects must factor in induced demand.
Reduce AADT	AADT metrics should be measured by how many trips or VMT is taken *off* the roadway network.
Reduce AADT	Given the climate crisis, aim to do projects that discourage people from making trips that use private vehicles. This will decrease traffic.
Reduce AADT	If there's a high amount of traffic, that means we need more transit options, safe sidewalks, and bike infrastructure. That's it, no more car lanes. Every single project should be designed to reduce the number of cars on our roads.
Reduce AADT	Number of vehicles increasing is bad, means more people are driving, number of vehicles decreasing are good means they are using other roadways or changing their mode of transportation.
Reduce AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic counts and projections have historically been focused on the sole objective of increasing capacity which has invariably made congestion worse. We need to have a more nuanced approach to the use of this metric.
Reduce AADT	Measures of traffic/congestion listed here could be used to justify construction that induces demand and has the result of increasing traffic/congestion.
Rural Divide	Only makes sense if using sliding scale scoring based on rural/urban and other area characteristics. Don't spend all \$\$ on high volume roads
Suburban Divide	This favors suburban development. This makes it hard for newer higher density downtowns or developments to emerge will make great use of existing infrastructure. Illinois needs money. Stop making it hard for developments that make money to occur.
Transit	Success mlic transit and less need to travel to work/more work from home and traffic goes down due to increased use of pub

### C.3.2 Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled (AVMT)

Theme	Comment
Alternative Transportation	Stop focusing on motor vehicles so much and put your energy into improve transportation options! Count bicycling miles and feasibility, walkability and density (to improve walkability), could mass transit stops and access. ANYTHING but VMT.
Alternative Transportation	Less AVMT means less driving per vehicle. This could be due to having less of a need to drive because of other quicker modes of transportation (walking, biking, buses). Also means things that one needs are closer and doesn't require as much driving.
Bike ped	You all don't get it. Traffic isn't just cars. We need same metrics for walking and biking
Bike ped	Miles on motorized vehicles far outnumber those of bikes, so widen the roads by eliminating bike lanes.
Decrease AVMT	Score needs to be highest for projects that decrease VMT, not those that encourage it
Decrease AVMT	Goals should be to reduce AVMT
Decrease AVMT	Investments in infrastructure should lower VMT ,not increase it.
Decrease AVMT	Every project should be aimed to decrease this number as significantly as possible.
Decrease AVMT	Work to reduce VMT
Decrease AVMT	Every dollar of road investment should be aimed at reducing VMT. Goal should always be moving people to their destinations, not moving them more and more miles more quickly. By prioritizing transit, walking, and biking people can get where they're going safer, quicker, and more affordably than ever-widening roads.
Decrease AVMT	Our state's mobility goals should focus on reducing AVMT across the board without reducing access to mobility options. We can achieve this by investing in passenger rail, local and regional transit, and cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. All future mobility investments should de-prioritize driving as a mobility option.
Decrease AVMT	prioritize projects that reduce VMT (promote amide shift to transit)
Decrease AVMT	as long as the goal is to minimize vmt, then this is preferable
Decrease AVMT	Good infrastructure and city development should decrease this
Decrease AVMT	The measure should be REDUCTION in VMT
Decrease AVMT	our infrastructure needs to encourage less miles driven to do the same function. shop and work close to home
Decrease AVMT	Accounts for induced demand. Goal should be to minimize miles traveled.
Decrease AVMT	This is the best metric - assuming the goal is to reduce this number as much as possible.
Decrease AVMT	We need to use this metric as a benchmark with the goal of reducing AVMT.
Decrease AVMT	Priority should be on reducing VMT.
Decrease AVMT	AVMT are undesirable
Decrease AVMT	Success means less miles traveled , not more miles
Land Use	Reducing the amount of needed car travel and distance is very important for sustainability of the environment and the state's fiscal budget.
Maintenance	This is good for the Chicago region. We cannot just keep expanding out leaving areas to decay. New suburban developments require a lot of new infrastructure that cannot always be afforded. Illinois might get some money when new developments occur but it is too expensive to maintain. Money should be used to improve the infrastructure in places it already exists. Illinois should not be building new infrastructure that we cannot afford. New infrastructure in older areas support new development.
Measure Critique	Total traffic doesn't equal improvements. Score should be driven by projected improvements from implementation.
Measure Critique	This measure makes more sense to me for the Environmental Impacts/Livability goals. A reduction in AVMT means improvements in emissions and therefore air quality.

Measure Critique	The word vehicle is not defined here, and photos and language imply this survey is car centric. These measures must account for different forms of transportation, because plenty of people use things other than cars.
Measure Critique	Although these 3 have been our traditional congestion measures, we have been tracking the wrong things. These promote more motorized trips. We need to shift to numbers of people and goods moved.
Misc.	Good aggregate view in changes to regional demand
Misc.	Reducing the amount of vehicle miles on a roadway will increase congestion. Raising fuel taxes and implementing congestion pricing will help in this regard.
People not Vehicles	prefer to measure people/passengers rather than vehicles
People not Vehicles	Miles matter more of they account for how many people are moving. One person moving 1 miles should count less than 2 people moving 1 mile. That's a better measure.

### C.3.3 Travel Time Index

Theme	Comment
Alternative Transportation	bad congestion encourages alternate transportation like public transport, walk, bike
Bike Ped	Peak hour factors should be analyzed along with level of stress for bikes and peds.
Bike Ped	When the number and width of lanes for motorized traffic are decreased travel times increase, so widen the lanes and eliminate bike lanes.
Design	IDOT should stop designing roads solely for peak period use. Focus on day, week, and year round use, and design the road for what it is used most frequently for.
Land Use	BUT- travel time from place to place using many modes. This would include things like land use and the affect IDOT projects will have on land use.
Measure Critique	This is a helpful stat but mostly when used at peak times of day; suggest that most of urban and suburban areas have delays due to intersections and not due to lack of corridor capacity. Time in delay, VHT, is also probably also a better metric.
Measure Critique	Would caution that these could lead to over-building if only one or two hours is an outlier.
Measure Critique	I don't think this matters at all. Cars are comfortable, so adding time to a vehicle commute to improve road safety for vulnerable users shouldn't matter. This being said, dedicated BRT infrastructure is a must in most situations.
Measure Critique	Too much emphasis on the peak. We need to change the peak, not cater to it.
Measure Critique	Most important in determining what percent of the time roadways are underperforming and drivers are experiencing delay
Measure Critique	I like this one, but think it's also important to try to capture the total time spent - I would rather Illinois residents spend 15 minutes in congestion versus 35 minutes on a longer uncongested trip.
Measure Critique	Prefer to measure the time to accomplish common tasks rather than miles traveled
Measure Critique	This metric doesn't account for induced demand. A dumb metric because implicit in its use is the idea that time should always be the same at all hours, regardless of demand.
Misc.	We need to put this metric in the context of the ratio of destinations per trip. Promoting development, planning and infrastructure that leverages multiple destinations per trip will improve travel efficiency. Simply measuring and building for continued single destination trips single occupancy vehicles will not improve anything.
Misc.	Peak period should include busy weekend periods. Many city or city to suburb trips are actually worse on the weekends than during the week.
Misc.	Achieve the above goals and Travel time index will automatically improve.
Multimodal	Travel time calculations should include users of all modes, not just motorists.
Multimodal	Count travel time by default as using public transportation or a bicycle or on foot. Cars should be a last resort.
Multimodal	Travel time is the only criteria that really matters but needs to be evaluated across all modes, not just private auto.
Multimodal	Auto travel time should only be compared to sustainable modes such as transit, walk, and bike. Congestion is a good problem, use it to for mode shift, fund reliable/safe alternatives.
Multimodal	This must be broken out by transportation forms. Bikes, buses, scooters, walking, etc. Pedestrians being forced to wait 2-4 minutes is inexcusable when they are the least protected of all road users.
Multimodal	The goal should not be to optimize travel time for cars around dense areas like Chicago. It should be to prioritize safety of people walking/biking/taking transit and encouraging more people to reduce their car use.
Reduce Congestion	This is the most important metric in reducing congestion. It doesn't matter how many vehicles travel as long as time is low.
Transit	This is backward without ANY mention of transit. The implication is that road expansion is the only way to address congestion. That is WRONG.

Transit	If it takes longer to get somewhere by car during rush hour, then that's a good indication to folks that they shouldn't choose to drive. This index should never be used to justify adding more lanes, because it will only induce more driving, but it could be a good justification for a dedicated bus lane.
Transit	This is a good indicator of how reliable travels on a roadway. The larger the difference the more volatile and less reliable it is. Trains and other transit with dedicated lanes are some of the most reliable forms of travel when not blocked by vehicular traffic.
Transit	Time divided by people. The more people that move, the less average time per person. Busses and trains are a lot more efficient and effective.
Transit	also passenger thru put not simply measure of vehicles but the usefulness of those vehicles, i.e.: 1 bus =35 people vs 1 SOV = 1 person
Transit	In urban regions where public transit is more feasible, projects should demonstrate how the investment will incentivize or improve the use of trains, buses, or transportation alternatives.

## C.4 Safety

### C.4.1 Crash Frequency

Theme	Comment
Behavior Crashes Removed	okay only if behavior-based crashes are removed from the counts. drunk drivers are everywhere and don't necessarily crash in places that are unsafe by design
Bike Ped	Can you walk or bike through this intersection without risking death? Or is it necessary to be encased in a big metal box just to get to your destination? High crash rates involving pedestrians & bicycles are key to consider, but it's also worth wondering why people aren't using an intersection if it's just that unsafe. How does it fit into the wider system? Does it connect important community assets like grocery stores, schools, or housing? Then folks should have a safe option not to drive.
Bike Ped	There also needs to be a way for vulnerable road users to report near misses/close calls. Just because there's a low crash rate doesn't mean people feel safe walking or biking. A high number of vehicles suppresses walking and biking trips.
Bike Ped	This is insufficient. How can we measure safety using this metric when the needs and challenges for non-vehicle road users is different from vehicle users? Also how does this assess and take into account that safety viewed by US traffic engineers has historically resulted in more dangerous roads? What about Vision Zero?
Bike Ped	Please focus especially on crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists, who are much more vulnerable than drivers.
Bike Ped	also should factor other non-motorized accommodations
Bike Ped	Should be multimodal. Or split out additional criteria for bike/ped safety.
Bike Ped	Every crash especially one with a pedestrian or bike should be looked at by a highway engineer to see how can we improve the safety. For example, if there is no ped crossing across a road and someone gets hit when j walking maybe a safe ped crossing should be added. Small improvements like that can save someone's lives. Most accidents can be preventable. People make mistakes. The road should be able to force people to do the right thing & help prevent those mistakes.
Bike Ped	Seems not to consider non-vehicle road users?
Bike Ped	This may be good for vehicles but safety for pedestrians and cyclists is ignored with this data. Walking and biking studies along roadways should be conducted by industry planners and designers to determine if this is safe for all users, not just vehicles.
Bike Ped	I would also encourage a specific focus on crashes that impact bicyclists and pedestrians, and something about the number of fatalities due to crashes.
Bike Ped	Should also consider measurable perception of safety by pedestrians and bicyclists
Bike Ped	BUT, there are many other ways to ascertain this... how many people DON'T ride bikes because they they think the roads are too unsafe? How many don't WALK to the store because there are no sidewalks or safe road crossings?
Bike Ped	Again, pedestrian and bicycle related aspects need to be included. If multimodal/complete streets is to be followed, you need to be looking at more than just vehicles. Heat map data is available for recreational bicycle use
Bike Ped	IDOT needs to look at the safety of all users, such as pedestrians. If a city or town road is so wide or so busy that no one is willing to walk across it, it is an unsafe road regardless of how many vehicle accidents occur.
Bike Ped	document who is in the crash- ped, bike, car
Bike Ped	include pedestrian bike
Crash Type	Property-only crashes should take a far lower precedence than injury/fatal crashes and should be considered separately.

Crash Type	National guidance and literature from the FHWA and NHTSA encourage focus on reducing fatal and severe injury crashes, not all crashes. For example, converting an intersection to a roundabout might result in an increase of rear end crashes at a location, but such crashes would most likely result in property damage only crashes. Meanwhile high injury crash types such as angle and turning are reduced, therefore saving lives. The criteria/goal for safety needs to be rewritten.
Crash Type	Crashes measurements should not include fender-benders that result in no deaths or injuries and minimal property damage (defined under \$10,000 and adjusted for inflation).
Crash Type	Fatal and serious injury crashes should matter more.
Crash Type	Not number, severity.
Crash Type	Fatalities and serious injuries
Crash Type	This is criterion is good, but should be combined with crash severity. By themselves, the two criteria don't paint the whole picture.
Crash Type	Should also measure crash intensity, i.e. speed of vehicles involved, damage to life and property, etc.
Crash Type	Seriousness of the crash and/or fatalities should be a measure as well.
Crash Type	There needs to be more detail on the types, causes, and outcomes of the crashes. Fender-benders are not the same as fatalities.
Crash Type	the intensity of the crashes and who is involved (drivers, peds, bikes) is also important here
Crash Type	also at what time of day and peak/not peak hours
Crash Type	Perhaps consider the additional analysis of crash severity as well as bicycle & pedestrian crashes as part of this criteria evaluation.
Crash Type	along with the severity of crash. fatal crash should require immediate action and specific solutions to avoid another loss life
Crash Type	Is there a way to quantify other incidents than just crashes? Ideally find other way to define dangerous areas.
Crash Type	consider crash severity in addition to frequency
Crash Type	Also, the severity of the incident and local feedback (some folks just avoid stretches of road that feel unsafe)
Crash Type	(1) More important than frequency is severity -- how common are crashes that cause severe injuries are death?
Crash Type	(2) Neither of these metrics captures whether people feel safe walking or biking on or across these corridors. IDOT must also include other metrics to capture comfort for all road users, especially those walking and biking.
Crash Type	Measure and actively count all crashes. Use all to help quantify unreported crashes.
Crash Type	Crash Rate would be a better measure
Crash Type	Crash rates instead of frequency should be considered. Also, focus should be on crash rates for fatal and injury crashes.
Crash Type	What about crash severity?
Crash Type	Does not account for severity
Crash Type	Add crash severity
Crash Type	With no mention to the severity of the crash, this item becomes difficult to compare across multiple projects being considered.
Crash Type	This addresses all crashes. Will this make fora safer system? The focus needs to be on fatal and serious injury crashes.
Crash Type	Severity of crash is valuable factor for evaluating safety.
Crash Type	Injury and severity should also play a role in the safety discussions. You may have a high number of crashes with little to no injuries in one location but a low number of crashes with fatalities and incapacitating injuries at another. The injury factor in that selection should weigh higher than crash frequency

Crash Type	collect data on near missed reported
Design	Build streets that force drivers to drive under 30mph. That way, drivers are less likely to crash, and if they do crash, less likely to be injured or killed.
Design	Assess visibility, sidewalk width, barriers between modes (protected bike lanes, bollards and trees along sidewalks, etc); you should also be narrowing streets to control speed so measure street width! Assess safety from the perspective of the most vulnerable road users first.
Design	Granted crash frequency is an important data point but other factors should weigh heavily also with regard to railroad crossing's such as geometry in the vicinity of the crossing, vegetation, type of warning system present, and most important is the crossing one that is not essential and should be closed. Most local road authorities do not have the political will to voluntarily close any crossings so the State needs to be more aggressive in its authority to close non-essential crossings.
Design	Crashes are helpful data, but why just be reactive to bad design? Learn from high-crash areas and community feedback to redesign dangerous roads *before* people are hurt or killed. Be proactive. And include pedestrians, bikers, and public transit riders in these assessments and designs!
Design	Just crashes? So you wait until people die to fix bad roads? What about road design standards, or community input, or pedestrians/bikers in the area? This is an incredibly disappointing survey - all about cars and death, nothing about improving quality of life for *everyone.*
Design	Lane reduction, speed reduction, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle traffic and public transportation
Design	Crashes are important to count. However, we also need to consider safely accommodating multiple modes of transportation. A facility that is safe to drive but too dangerous to walk isn't necessarily safe.
Design	Widening roads is the wrong way to reduce crashes - it will only increase traffic and increase the amount of crashes.  Have a Vision Zero policy to focus on the causes of crashes, and thus reduce needless pedestrian, cyclist, and motor vehicle deaths.
Design	This measure is extremely incomplete. Rather than waiting for crashes to happen, we should be analyzing streets and roadways based on potential for safety incidents. I haven't seen a single mention of bicycles or pedestrians yet in this survey, and that says a lot.
Design	Safety is incredibly important and to do this we need to design streets and roads that have appropriate speed limits for their context. City streets should be designed to encourage drivers to naturally feel like going 20 mph or less. Roads in the middle of nowhere should be designed differently than in the middle of a dense, livable Chicago neighborhood.
Design	Other criterion: speed kills, so does project reduce speed in residential, commercial, and/or main street corridors?
equity	You should take into account local funding levels when determining where to spend safety funds. More affluent communities can shoulder a larger cost share of a safety improvement than a community with a small tax base.
Local Input	Local Input needs to be weighted higher than crash data so improvements can be funded without waiting for crash data to support them.
Local Input	There needs to be more standards here. Best practices? changes other municipalities have made that have decreased injury. Community input about trouble areas rather than waiting for more people to die there to fix it.
Local Input	Crashes are a good way to measure safety, however there should be an opportunity to consider local input on the actual safety. An area can be known to be dangerous and drivers just change the way they drive meaning less to no crashes. While anecdotal data is challenging to quantify it should play some role.
Measure Critique	Would be more effective if based on propensity for project to improve safety. Total crashes doesn't equal improvement.

Measure Critique	Crash frequency isn't the only measure of safety. This must also include users who may not be using the road because it's dangerous, particularly bike and pedestrian uses. Crash severity must also be considered- I'd rather have more minor crashes than fewer severe ones.
Measure Critique	Crash Rate would be better.
Measure Critique	Crash frequency should be the number of crashes as a ratio of the number of vehicles that travel the segment or intersection. If it's strictly the number of crashes then that doesn't give a true indicator of the safety of the roadway.
Measure Critique	Consider adding another criterion for crash severity. I would weigh severity over frequency.
Measure Critique	There must be a way for people to reports dangerous areas and that reporting be weighed. It can't require massive \$\$\$ and loss of life to acknowledge an area is dangerous. Especially since so many crashes involving bikes are not reported.
Misc.	See comment under previous section on frequency and severity, and urban/rural discriminators.
Misc.	seems reactive rather than proactive
Misc.	safety should also measure the potential for a devastating crash - how likely is an accident to occur and how much potential damage could happen (high-speed routes located near schools, hospitals, parks)
Misc.	Safety is so simple. Just manage speeds.
Misc.	More sophisticated tools are available (IDOT has them) — basically need empirical Bayesian analysis plus top-to-bottom inventory of roadway characteristics and how they may contribute to crashes
Misc.	Need to use professional judgment to consider other factors in addition to just crash data. Crash data does not always correlate directly to safety.
Design	High car crash frequency should be an indicator that a road/street needs a meaningful redesign to prevent future accidents. I bring the Dutch again because they do an excellent job at this and have few accidents per capita.
Design	Safety should prioritize lower speeds and all types of road users. Traffic fatalities are the #1 cause of death for kids. We can change that reality by slowing cars down.
Transit	This doesn't have anything to do with transit, which I think is a #1 priority. Transit safety matters too, not just cars!

## C.5 Regional Rating

### C.5.1 Regional Input

Theme	Comment
Advocacy Input	IDOT needs to listen to local transit advocacy organizations when they work in the city of Chicago. They must do everything possible to improve the flow of pedestrians and bicyclists.
Advocacy Input	It only matters if IDOT listens to what these groups say. We want livable communities but IDOT continues to widen roads with no end in sight.
Advocacy Input	How can you best include not just staff input but the voice of local Ped/Cycle clubs groups and organizations?
Advocacy Input	include transit agencies in review
Community Input	Also allow community input. Doesn't need to be meeting just an online survey thing. Publicize the survey and the area where you are looking for input so people know about it.
Community Input	While I believe local input is critical, there has been a historic bias toward able-bodied cis-het men in our infrastructure design. I got has to find a way to get input assessments and evaluations from individuals that better represent the community not this one singular point of view.
Community Input	Not just IDOT cal staff. Full consideration must be given to the citizens impacted by the projects. They need to be considered from the beginning, and not just brought in at the final stage when most of the main decisions have been made.
Criteria Critique	Rather than this be a separate criterion, consider having local agencies submit their criteria and "rating" for each project and see how it matches up to IDOT's criteria. The local agency will know the area and needs of the project very well and can maybe act as a "scaling factor" for projects.
Criteria Critique	This should be a very high priority. The way some of the data is proposed to be utilized may skew a project's priority and regional input could assist in mitigating any errant interpretations of data.
Criteria Critique	This can be good at times when it comes to hearing the concerns and needs of the community, but it can also be bad in terms of project schedule and feasibility. Some communities will die on a hill of false information that they think a certain project will negatively affect their community when the technical experts have proven otherwise. There should be a delicate balance because it can hold up necessary projects due to a small group of individuals.
Criteria Critique	As written this sounds like it would give IDOT regional staff unilateral decision-making power. See earlier comment RE importance of including a permanent mechanism for community input, e.g. via standing regional committees with equitable community representation.
Criteria Critique	It is more important to listen to qualified experts with education on a topic. Local input is subject to bias and corruption. The loudest voice does not necessarily deserve the most attention.
Criteria Critique	The squeaky wheels have been getting the grease. Do what's needed to move traffic efficiently and not listen to an organized minority.
Criteria Critique	Networks should be looked at holistically, and there shouldn't be efforts to make regions equal in money spent if the needs are unequal.
Criteria Critique	IDOT officials can have biased opinions
District Input	District personnel should have a large voice in projects that are needed...they live it every day and have first hand knowledge.
Everyday Users	While it's important to listen to stakeholders, focus should be given to meeting the needs of local roadway users and their concerns over businesses or companies who might prioritize their wants/needs over the everyday roadway user.
Local Officials Input	This only works if the district staff actually talk to locals. Would be stronger if these criteria were about truly local input and not just an internal department of IDOT. Some district HQs are very far from the actual locality of projects, so do the district employees actually get out to the project areas to talk to the local officials?

Local Officials Input	More local control/decisions less from Springfield
Local Officials Input	Important to look at the smaller areas to be able to look more clearly at the big picture.
Local Officials Input	These are the people who know how the resources to know when roads need to be worked on.
Local Officials Input	local value is key
Local Officials Input	Local leaders know their transportation system and its needs better than anyone. Listen to them.
Local Officials Input	Local input is what should be driving the needs statewide
Local Officials Input	Important to get local input
Local Officials Input	regional "rating" is unclear in the former pages. I would have selected differently. PLEASE Listen to the locals.
Local Officials Input	This is one of the most important factors as the people who live and work near the project area know best as to its impact on the community, local context and needs.
Local Officials Input	Locals probably know much more about the reality of decision impacts than Springfield.
Local Officials Input	Local context is incredibly important, we shouldn't be doing one-size-fits-all transportation design across the entire state. Chicago area is completely different than most of the rest of the state.
Local Officials Input	Regional input ought to be of greater scope than IDOT staff
Local Officials Input	this may be a good idea to get feedback from local municipalities ONLY if the needs and preferences of the community are honored.
Local Officials Input	Regional input needs to give more weight to smaller municipalities. Too often we are overrun by the larger bodies and left to pick up the scraps or to try and figure out how to redefine our goals around what others have decided for us.
Local Officials Input	Feel like we would need our Region 2 office to weigh in and help us justify projects in our primarily agricultural community.
Local Officials Input	Input must be from local/county agencies - not from IDOT staff
Local Officials Input	Should getting info from IDOT district staff should be the only measure? What about direct outreach to RPOs, local officials, etc.? It sometimes feels harder to collaborate with the district office than with the state office, and the state office seems more attuned to issues like equity, multi-modal planning, traffic calming measures, etc.
Local Officials Input	Very important to get local input. Often times reconstruction project will only occur once in someone's lifetime, so it is important to get input from local communities and to plan for all modes of travel.
Misc.	You really should have defined this sooner, what an insider way to refer to the basic commonsense idea that a transportation project should benefit the whole system and not just the square mile around a place. We all contribute to transportation infrastructure, and we all either benefit or face repercussions if it's bad.
Misc.	This is a critical component of creating a seamless and effective transportation system as data/metrics alone do not tell a full story.
Misc.	It's unclear how regional/statewide priorities may be different
Misc.	blow up LSD please.
Misc.	IDOT has a poor track record on this