

MAINTAINING EXISTING ASSETS

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:

- **Reduction in regional commitment to existing infrastructure, from 80% to 77%, a \$1.8 billion drain of resources from existing communities.**

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

**Available at <http://www.cnt.org/tsp/trans/ctaqc/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
4	<i>Of that (\$61 B), an estimated \$47 Billion will be needed to maintain the existing transportation system in a state of good repair.</i>	This is a significant reduction in commitment to existing infrastructure, from 80% to 77%, a \$1.8 billion dollar difference to existing communities.
21	<i>Goal: Maintain the integrity of the existing transportation system. . . . This includes maximizing existing and new transportation infrastructure and service efficiency through effective transportation management and operations practice.</i>	. . . "maximizing existing transportation" in the first draft, became "maximizing existing and new transportation" in the final draft, reducing the emphasis on existing assets and older communities.
38	<i>Most transportation facilities are constructed to last 20-50 years.</i>	There is no discussion of differing maintenance and reconstruction schedules. The average life of a sidewalk or a rail line is different than the average life of a highway.
39	<i>The RTP's goal of maintaining the integrity of the existing transportation system also recognizes the discretion necessary to keep the existing system in a state of good repair while addressing the changing mobility needs of the region with new facilities.</i>	The maintenance "priority" is always tempered by language that prioritizes new construction.
46	<i>. . . significant new segments to the region's major highway and passenger rail system were introduced with the intent of accommodating or managing forecast growth.</i>	There is no commitment to redirecting growth to disinvested communities; instead taxpayers in existing communities finance the drain of investment from their own communities.
119	<i>In a dense urban area, nearly all major project proposals are able to forecast some benefit to travelers and transportation system performance.</i>	This plan devotes a large proportion of new investment (over 50%) to the portions of the region that are sparsely populated, therefore the projects have little benefit to existing communities and may deplete resources needed for existing communities.

The Center for Neighborhood Technology

www.cnt.org

August 2003