

PUBLIC COMMENT

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***

The mismatch between this plan and the public's priorities is evident in CATS' own documentation.

December 2002 *Shared Path Reporter*: "Residents said they wanted more public transportation choices (particularly between suburbs), safe options for bicyclists, pedestrians and the disabled, and to maintain and expand the transportation system."

CATS Powerpoint Presentation for July 17, 2002 public meeting: "Common Themes Heard Around the Region (referring to NIPC, CNT and CM2020 results)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More public transit service• Integrate public transit systems• Better linkages between transportation and land use• More bike and pedestrian options | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintain and expand existing system• Improve existing roads and intersections• Better service for seniors and people with disabilities• Improve freight capacity" |
|---|--|

* 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

2 *Perhaps most of all, Shared Path 2030 benefited from the direct involvement of many residents of the region. Making long-range planning interesting and relevant to someone who simply wants to "get there" is a challenge. In addition to two sets of traditional community meetings, Shared Path 2030 included focused outreach among community leaders in minority and low-income neighborhoods, an expanded presence on the World Wide Web and a direct telephone hotline. Production of two widely aired videos describing the transportation planning process and the RTP recommendations resulted in several hundred residents taking the time to register their opinions regarding the region's transportation future. Each comment received was made available to all Shared Path 2030 participants.*

Comment

CATS spent \$1.4 million on public involvement in fiscal year 2003, with little to show for it. Comment from the April-May 2003 public meetings was not analyzed. CNT conducted a preliminary analysis [Analysis of Public Comments\comment analysis june 03.doc](#) because the Regional Transportation Committee said that: 1) they would each read all 585 comments; 2) there were not enough comments to be significant in spite of the public involvement dollars invested; and 3) subjective impressions of the data were preferable to analysis that computed the relative weight of different priorities.

PUBLIC COMMENT

105	<i>Each of these (SRA) studies was conducted with the participation of state, regional and local agencies, overseen by a steering committee comprised of government and citizen members, with most of the recommendations being approved by local government resolution.</i>	This statement obscures the mini-revolts by citizens in many counties against IDOT plans to widen and speed up arterial roads. It implies that there is widespread participation and support for all road projects.
-----	--	---