

ENVIRONMENT

This review will be more easily understood as annotated comments on problem areas in the 2030 RTP.* The 2030 RTP was considered from the point of view of public comment during 2001 and 2002, particularly the comment found in *Changing Direction: Transportation Choices for 2030*.**

Thematic issues that impact this section include:

- No discussion of the great degree of controversy surrounding some of the expressway and arterial projects proposed.
- Refusal to meaningfully incorporate NIPC Evaluation Measure scores. Use of a “composite” score for projects, without showing individual scores, is ineffectual and uninformative.

* Available at <http://www.sp2030.com/CommentSite/index.html>.

** Available at <http://www.cnt.org/tsp/trans/ctagc/cc/theplan.htm>

The chart below offers specific page references and quotes from the Regional Transportation Plan and commentary on why each quote is relevant or problematic

| Page | Quote | Comment |
|------|---|---|
| 10 | | Restructuring of section puts technical language about air quality issues ahead of lay language |
| 10 | The principal contribution the RTP makes to emission reductions is by promoting transportation improvements that provide: - Greater available choice among travel modes and facilities. - Increased travel speeds. - Shorter trip distances. | Fails to mention reduction of motorized trips, or encouragement of alternatives to one person/one vehicle travel. |
| 17 | NIPC, as a partner in Shared Path 2030, led in preparing a set of natural environment measures that were used in evaluating future regional scenarios. This also resulted in a graphical base of important environmental resources being prepared for inclusion on the RTP map. | Evaluation measures for selected projects, and for projects not selected, could have been listed in the text for comparison. Instead, only a "composite" score is listed (page 53), obscuring information needed for meaningful comparison. |
| 17 | Planning, design and construction of major transportation projects is subject to rigorous environmental regulation. But public and private organizations can also, through their planning efforts, promote preservation of high-quality natural areas in the region that remain unprotected by legislation or regulation. | This plan includes projects that are in opposition to land preservation policies; for instance, the Prairie Parkway is in opposition to the Kane County land use management plan. |

The Center for Neighborhood Technology

www.cnt.org

August 2003

ENVIRONMENT

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 28 | Objective: Encourage project implementation that is consistent with official environmental protection and preservation plans. | Kane County's official plan, and impact of the Prairie Parkway, is not addressed. |
| 52 | Shared Path 2030 anticipated that higher composite natural resources scores indicate a greater likely need for avoidance or mitigation of natural resource impacts. | The project scores are deliberately excluded from the draft; the public can't assess the impacts on the environment. |
| 52 | The method for analyzing Shared Path 2030 proposals employed a composite natural resource score based on the degree and type of natural resources present within the project zone of analysis. | In an earlier draft this sentence was followed with: "The composite score made the comparison of projects and alternatives possible." This draft goes to great lengths to disguise the relative costs/benefits of the projects selected. |