

TRANSIT

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:

- Refusal to “flex” funds; persistent use of the old 60/40 highway/transit split, in spite of overwhelming public support for more transit and almost universal controversy on major highway projects.
- Failure to provide a dedicated revenue stream to transit service integration/coordination, which was universally desired in all types of public involvement processes.
- Forces all modes using arterials to compete with the road interests for the \$5 billion pot for “Strategic Recommendations,” a competition destined to favor the road lobby and to obscure the amount of funding used for other modes. Expanded and improved bus service needs to be given priority.

* 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
33	<i>Proposals to improve the passenger level of service by reconfiguring rail yards and stations as well as improving rail access and operational performance were also evaluated.</i>	Transit coordination, which was a universal priority in all public involvement processes, is rarely mentioned; no allocation is made to accomplish transit coordination.
39	<i>Committed projects include: Highway projects with construction approval in the State’s current 5-year transportation program. Rail transit projects with FTA New Start approval.</i>	Earlier draft included "Service, management and operations improvements that are approved and budgeted by the implementing agency." Transit coordination might have been given higher priority if this category was retained.
44	<i>Transit oriented development (TOD) is in the Service Intensive alternative</i>	Decision about which strategies to include in which alternative seems arbitrary. Strategies that are a priority, like TOD, paratransit improvements, transit coordination or context sensitive design could be built into all models.
55	<i>In the case of auto access to transit, accessibility will also change with prevailing highway congestion.</i>	There is no discussion of existing inexpensive parking at transit stations as a subsidy to a small number of individuals, as opposed to expanded Pace bus access which could serve a larger number of people. Transit-to-transit access would also leave land around stations available to generate jobs and revenue for municipalities.

TRANSIT

76	<i>As a regional community planning strategy, the RTP places special emphasis on "transit-oriented" development patterns (TOD).</i>	The plan never makes clear how it emphasizes TOD or makes a financial commitment to TOD.
91	<i>Passenger rail providers have developed "key station" plans identifying stations to be retrofitted first. As stations are rebuilt, they are built to ADA accessibility standards.</i>	A regional plan should provide an inventory or information on how many stations are accessible, how "key stations" will be retrofitted and in what order.
96	<i>Congestion management: The RTP's goal of improving transportation system performance recognizes the need to manage both highway and transit congestion.</i>	"Transit congestion" is an unfamiliar concept. Does this mean that buses are trapped in heavy auto congestion? We should not imply that transit creates congestion when what we mean is that transit is harmed by congestion.
97	<i>The RTP supports the ongoing development and implementation of a regional transit coordination plan.</i>	This "support" does not include a financial commitment to regional transit coordination.
97	<i>Often, adjustments to service or additional traveler information at key junctions can make transit use more appealing.</i>	These are also very inexpensive relative to the cost of new projects and would generally serve existing communities, yet the RTP makes no financial commitment to any type of transit coordination.
108	<i>Regional Transit</i>	This section heading was originally "Strategic Regional Transit System."
110	<i>The RTP recognizes that additional high-quality bus service has the potential to be a cost effective way to increase the transit options available regionwide.</i>	The statement was originally "The RTP recognizes that additional high-quality bus service is a cost-effective way to increase the transit options available regionwide," a much more affirmative statement.