

Public Comment Received for 9/7/23 TAC Meeting:

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Funding Consistency Analysis. I appreciate all the effort staff put into this but frankly don't see the point, except to show that one can make things look a lot better on paper than they actually are on the ground. The analysis makes it look like we have been doing such a bang up job at shifting to active transportation, decreasing injuries and fatalities, lowering VMT, and improving equitable access over the past decade that there's really no need do to consistency analysis. The numbers just don't back that up. We need a method to evaluate consistency with RTP and SSTT goals which will prioritize future projects that move the county closer to achieving them.

Simple check boxes are not enough because they don't properly reflect the magnitude or relative distribution of benefits. With a check box a project that benefits pedestrians 1% and cars 99% looks the same as one that does the converse. A project that lowers VMT because cars can drive directly through a new street connection looks the same as a project which will increase the number of trips made by walking and biking. I think there should be something quantitative, like percentages or a numeric score for each type of benefit in a project to show how they are distributed.

I'm not sure what definition of access was employed but this might need fine tuning. Every road project improves access for someone. I would like to see a definition that is about advancing racial/social and mode equity.

Thanks, Wendy Ring MD, MPH