

Transportation 2050 (LRTP)

Give input on the best way to allocate funds
Investment Scenarios . Phase B

Date Submitted	Rate how much you prefer the Traditional Usage package from 1-5 stars	What would you add or change in the Traditional Usage package?	Rate how much you prefer the Mode Shift package from 1-5 stars	What would you add or change in the Mode Shift package?	Rate how much you prefer the Transformative Benefit package from 1-5 stars	What would you add or change in the Transformative Benefit package?	Rate how much you prefer the Cost Effective package from 1-5 stars	What would you add or change in the Cost Effective package?	If you could only choose ONE package, which one would you prefer?				
									Traditional Usage	Mode Shift	Transformative Benefit	Cost Effective	Unsure
Apr 17, 2026, 05:46 PM	1		5		1		1			1			
Apr 17, 2026, 10:43 AM	3		5		1		1			1			
Apr 16, 2026, 06:28 PM	1	Highway should only take about 50%	3	I dont like that transit projects are ruled out based on initial capital costs.	3	This is a better way of doing things, but i prefer a system that leans i to transit and multi-modal design. Which seems like it would be cheaper in the long run.	2	I feel like this just kicks the can down the road. Roads are evaluated as individual projects, this isnt a good comparison for systems like public transportation or active transportation infrastructure. The road system is built out, everything is is fragmented and underfunded.		1			
Apr 16, 2026, 02:55 PM	1	prioritize safety and sustainability focus on projects outside of highway expansion to bring alternative transport modes	2	have higher # of high rated safety projects	5		5	have less projects score so low on safety				1	
Apr 16, 2026, 02:48 PM	3	More rail and bus investment VS highway. Make sure any highway also has a plan for noise pollution management especially as traffic grows (76 has a huge issue with noise pollution near Buford Rd)	5	Make sure the Highway investment includes noise pollution management!	1	I don't understand this. Looks like just dumping rail and other transit. Very bad.	1	We need more rail and bus! And we need sidewalks and cross walks to support those modes. Another person was killed trying to cross midlothian near 150.		1			
Apr 16, 2026, 01:55 PM	1	More rail	5	60% highway is still to high.	2	The concept is wrong.	1	Needs pedestrian changes		1			
Apr 16, 2026, 10:47 AM	4		2		4		3		1				
Apr 15, 2026, 11:13 PM	1	"Highway" projects should have an equal considerations for car and non car users. Right now anyone outside of a car is treated like a second class citizen, and it needs to end. At a minimum, projects should be expanded to include safe sidewalks and such.	5	Work together with zoning ordinances to improve TOD in the area. Investment in transit without associated adjustments in zoning and wider urban design is meaningless.	1	Theres too much emphasis on highways, which doesn't reflect the wants of the citizens or the impending climate crisis	1	Highway investment is not necessarily the most cost effective investment		1			
Apr 15, 2026, 10:24 PM	1	Complete sidewalks on Rt 1 in Chester between Osborne Rd and Rt 10.	4	Complete sidewalks on Rt 1 in Chester between Osborne Rd and Rt 10. Complete the bike lane on Rt 10 from the YMCA to Rt 1.	1	Complete sidewalks on Rt 1 in Chester between Osborne Rd and Rt 10. Complete the bike lane on Rt 10 from the YMCA to Rt 1.	1	Complete sidewalks on Rt 1 in Chester between Osborne Rd and Rt 10. Complete the bike lane on the YMCA to Rt 1.		1			
Apr 15, 2026, 09:28 PM	1		3		3		2			1			
Apr 15, 2026, 07:55 PM	3		5		2		4			1			
Apr 15, 2026, 05:23 PM	3	The Hull Street Rd/288 Interchange improvements need to be included due to the amount of new housing being built in an area that has already outgrown the current infrastructure.	1	I don't feel this plan really addresses needed improvements.	5	I would like to see more investment in Chesterfield, however this plan does the most to address the biggest problems.	3	I would add the Hull Street Rd/288 Interchange project.			1		
Apr 15, 2026, 01:07 PM	3	More toward "other travel modes".	4	Nothing	3	More for bike and pedestrian.	4	Less for transit and more for bike and pedestrian.		1			
Apr 15, 2026, 05:31 AM	2		1		4		5				1		
Apr 14, 2026, 07:39 PM	1	If traditional means investing in highways only, a necessary change is to undo some of the damage we did and are doing to the communities. This funding cannot be used for widening highways and thereby increasing traffic. It must be used to put highways underground and reconnect communities and lands.	5	Apply the same restrictions to the highway funding portion but also invest it in shared infrastructure. Meaning let's fix the roads used by everyone not just those used by cars only.	2	I would argue in most cases this means a mode shift. It is important to draw the right conclusions from traffic studies. Widening a road is almost never leading to the intended goal.	2	This package will likely not use the correct cost for driving vs. Transit. Most cost estimates do not include secondary costs to society, the environment and local infrastructure and communities.		1			

				BRT should go to Virginia Commons, then regular bus to Ashland. BRT should go to Short Pump now. Some form of public transit to Lego and development around it. Regular transit to Chesterfield Government Center. Some form of transit on Hull Street Road to Woodlake/Mosley area		BRT should go to Virginia Commons, then regular bus to Ashland. BRT should go to Short Pump now. Some form of public transit to Lego and development around it. Regular transit to Chesterfield Government Center. Some form of transit on Hull Street Road to Woodlake/Mosley area		Transit determines development. Therefore, if we want effective transit (and the more affordable living -- \$10,000 minimum after tax) that it will provide, we need to build it before the sprawl rather than after.						
Apr 14, 2026, 05:15 PM	1		3		5		3						1	
Apr 14, 2026, 04:24 PM	1		5		1		1					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:49 PM	3		5		1		2					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:47 PM	3		4		3		3					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:45 PM	2		5		1		1					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:44 PM	1		5		1		2					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:43 PM	1		5		1		3					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:41 PM	1		5		1		1	Add more bike lanes! Great for exercise. Slows down the cars.				1		
				I support the Mode Shift scenario because the plan includes more projects for bike and sidewalk. We have some roads with bike lanes that used to be 4 lanes and now are 2 with bike lanes. People are riding bikes more and cars are going slower (no longer going 45 in a 35 zone!!) Lots of families using the sidewalk and bike lanes.										
Apr 13, 2026, 01:22 PM	1		5		1		2					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:19 PM	1		4		3		2					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:17 PM	1		5		1		3					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:16 PM	1		5		1		3					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:14 PM	1		5		1		4					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 01:13 PM	1		5		1		3					1		
				I prefer to take public transit but it's either unreliable or doesn't go where I want/need to go.										
Apr 13, 2026, 01:11 PM	3		5		1		2					1		
Apr 13, 2026, 11:53 AM	3		3		2		4							1
		I would prefer to see fewer highway expansion and road widening projects, except to add additional bike or pedestrian infrastructure. Adding additional lanes to roads doesn't ultimately reduce congestion, because when a road gets more convenient, more people opt to drive on it, leaving us back where we started but at a cost of millions of dollars. Wiser roads also make me feel less safe as a pedestrian, because cars tend to drive faster on them and do risky maneuvers to swerve around each other, and they're less likely to notice a pedestrian starting a walk across from a different lane than the one they're currently driving in. There are many places only a few blocks from me that I would never dream of walking to because I don't feel safe crossing a wide road that stands in the way.		I appreciate the pedestrian, bike, and public transit infrastructure in this plan, and would like to see that even further expanded. Those are my preferred methods of getting around the city, but they're not always available. I especially appreciate the expansion of BRT.		I would prefer to see fewer highway expansion and road widening projects, except to add additional bike or pedestrian infrastructure or safety improvements. Adding additional lanes to roads doesn't ultimately reduce congestion, because when a road gets more convenient, more people opt to drive on it, leaving us back where we started but at a cost of millions of dollars. Wiser roads also make me feel less safe as a pedestrian, because cars tend to drive faster on them and do risky maneuvers to swerve around each other, and they're less likely to notice a pedestrian starting a walk across from a different lane than the one they're currently driving in. There are many places only a few blocks from me that I would never dream of walking to because I don't feel safe crossing a wide road that stands in the way.		I would prefer to see fewer highway expansion and road widening projects, except to add additional bike or pedestrian infrastructure or safety improvements. Adding additional lanes to roads doesn't ultimately reduce congestion, because when a road gets more convenient, more people opt to drive on it, leaving us back where we started but at a cost of millions of dollars. Wiser roads also make me feel less safe as a pedestrian, because cars tend to drive faster on them and do risky maneuvers to swerve around each other, and they're less likely to notice a pedestrian starting a walk across from a different lane than the one they're currently driving in. There are many places only a few blocks from me that I would never dream of walking to because I don't feel safe crossing a wide road that stands in the way.				1		
Apr 13, 2026, 11:00 AM	1		5		1		3							
		This seems a large gap in spending when other forms of transit in many of Greater Richmond regions are lacking.	3		1		2	Based on the chart, it's difficult to understand what kind of impact while actually apply. Just because the impact is broader doesn't mean it's positive. This is the highest amount of funding allocated to highway and the project scoring numbers seem the most scattered of the options so far.				1		
Apr 12, 2026, 07:44 AM	1						2	Could this mean more smaller projects benefiting pedestrians and public transit? I would worry a bit about safety because being cost effective can mean cutting some corners to save money.						

Apr 10, 2026, 10:26 AM	1	More alternative infrastructure, especially Biking to promote more commuting and less people being killed by cars. Traditional infrastructure is not working for the public good.	5	Even more toward alternative infrastructure for non-car commuting. Bike lanes that are completely separate from roads,, and also separate from pedestrian traffic. Take on more of a Dutch infrastructure encourage commuting with alternate forms versus everyone single in big huge cars.	1	You need to move Tasha because safety of 19 is incredibly poor. We should not be doing any infrastructure with very low safety score	2	Slightly better safety score than number three but still not adequate. It shouldn't all be about dollars but should be more about making communities more walkable Bike Able, and livable.	1				
Apr 10, 2026, 08:21 AM	1	Throw it away. Lock it up, throw away the key.	4	I get highways are super expensive, but it's a poor use of funds to grow the region and improve quality of life. Think this is an improvement of priorities.	3	I'd be extremely hesitant with how scoring is determined. The chart here seems to imply this is still a highways dominate plan which is not what the region needs.	2	This is stagnation. Big risk big reward. This feels like marginal benefits that won't help with the serious growth we have seen in the region and could experience if we got our transit right.	1				
Apr 10, 2026, 07:55 AM	3	More focus on safety, sustainability, and bike/pedestrian/non-highway modes.	5	Increased focus on safety.	1	Increased focus on non-highway modes and safety. This plan does not support current and future needs.	2	Increased focus on safety and non-highway modes.	1				
Apr 09, 2026, 09:36 PM	1	In general, I'd argue for a higher portion of funds going to transit and bike and pedestrian uses. The biggest specific thing missing for me is the West End South BRT that other packages have. It would be a "massive" quality of life improvement to have BRT go through my neighborhood. Many park and ride projects are missing from this package. It would also be nice to have bike lanes extend the full length of Lombardy between Broad and Chamberlayne instead of the current piecemeal lanes.	5	It would be nice to have bike lanes extend the full length of Lombardy between Broad and Chamberlayne instead of the current piecemeal lanes.	2	The "Shared Use Path: Monument Ave - Willow Lawn Dr to Bremon Rd." project would be quite beneficial for myself and likely others in my neighborhood and is missing from this package. Many park and ride projects are missing from this package. It would also be nice to have bike lanes extend the full length of Lombardy between Broad and Chamberlayne instead of the current piecemeal lanes.	3	Many park and ride projects are missing from this package. It would also be nice to have bike lanes extend the full length of Lombardy between Broad and Chamberlayne instead of the current piecemeal lanes.	1				
Apr 08, 2026, 01:10 PM	1	I don't think that the region should be prioritizing road widening and highway expansion. I think we should be investing in bus rapid transit, bike infrastructure, and safe pedestrian infrastructure.	5	I think that the Mode Shift planning scenario is the best option of the four. However, I am disappointed to see a high number of road widening projects and highway capacity expansion projects included in this planning scenario. Because of the phenomena of induced demand, increasing road capacity directly contradicts the goals of this plan -- shifting transportation modes. Instead, I think that the 'Highway' funds included in this plan should be directed towards pedestrian facilities and safety improvement (like roundabouts) on existing roads. As someone who uses a bike as their primary mode of transportation, I don't feel safe biking on wide roads that encourage speeding.	1		3		1				
Apr 08, 2026, 10:17 AM	1	We need to be shifting away from "traditional usage," not re-enforcing it. As much funding as possible needs to be put towards alternatives to driving personal vehicles.	5	It still over-emphasizes highways and personal vehicle travel.	1	The focus on "safety" is misleading, because it includes highway improvements. However in that case you are actually continuing to invest in the most dangerous form of travel - to improve safety, you need to have fewer people driving.	1	This is not a strategic way to shape our long term planning.	1				
Apr 08, 2026, 05:20 AM	1		5		2		3		1				
Apr 07, 2026, 08:03 PM	3	Remove the "shared use path" in sparsely populated areas for projects that help more developed areas.	4	Remove the "shared use path" in sparsely populated areas for projects that help more developed areas.	5	I think this plan has the best benefits package per population percentages.	1	Not enough projects.				1	
Apr 07, 2026, 08:00 PM	2	More money for mass transit	5	Unless we put serious investment into biking lanes, we will not change the number of people biking to work, or commuting with cars.	3	The driving factor should be using less cars for transport	2	Travel demand management could effectively be changed much more for little money.	1				
Apr 07, 2026, 07:58 PM	1		5		3		2		1				
Apr 07, 2026, 07:47 PM	1		5	I take the bus everyday and would greatly benefit from additional bus routes and bus frequency! Increasing road capacity and increasing lanes would increase traffic and impact bus efficiency!	1		3		1				

Apr 07, 2026, 07:43 PM	1	Spend more on transit and bikes	5	If we're already allocating budget to maintaining existing infrastructure and this is the budget for improvements, then I'd prefer to see a greater percentage of funds allocated for transit + bike + sidewalk + park and ride improvements.	1	Considerably less for highways.	2	I'd like to see less money allocated for highways.	1			
Apr 07, 2026, 02:51 PM	1	Funding for bike/pedestrian and transit is too low. Our "traditional" way of funding transportation has not made strides towards lowering our carbon footprint.	5	I would change the fact that transit costs that fall to cover large projects are defaulted to highway costs. This is ultimately backsliding in the "mode shift" option altogether and defaulting it to traditional. These funds should instead be defaulted to bike and pedestrian allocation.	1	When mode is not the driving factor, highway is going to dominate. Lane expansion is not the answer, public transit and safe bike lanes are.	1	The highway allocation here is far too large. More funds for transit, bikes and pedestrians!	1			
Apr 06, 2026, 06:20 PM	1		5		1		1		1			
Apr 06, 2026, 07:47 AM	1	more help with bike \pedestrian transportation improvements	3		1	NO - enough of the highways!	1		1			
Apr 04, 2026, 12:53 PM	1	I would remove all highway projects. It is disappointing to see the region advance expensive projects locking us further into sprawl and unsustainable development patterns that mean everything will be far and inconvenient to get to.	2	I would use the leftover funds on bike/ped instead of highway. The region has no bicycle or pedestrian network - it is disconnected and even scary walking around parts of downtown where people speed directly off the expressway with nothing forcing them to drive around people safer. Highway projects scoring 'high' on sustainability makes zero sense. How fossil fuel use for mobility sustainable or resilient?	3	What service level commitments exist for extending BRT out to the suburbs? These investments will be meaningless if GRTC won't be able to provide frequency under every 15 minutes. I would like to see more bike/ped projects on the map.	1	Seeing the projects in this package, I do not have faith in the 'cost effective' metric. New road extensions in the exurbs are cost effective? Road widening and sprawl increase costs for the counties to provide utilities and other services. The cost-benefit of new shared use paths makes sense to me for helping people live healthier lifestyles, but seeing projects like Powhite Parkway which somehow scores high on sustainability while resulting in habitat loss, increased pollution, noise pollution, and isolate nondrivers by expanding into nature gives me little faith in the analysis that led to this package.	1			
Apr 03, 2026, 02:35 PM	1	"Traditional" here means status quo, which is unacceptable. We've known for decades now that the only solution to traffic is viable alternatives to driving. Continued highway expansion will continue to put us deeper into debt (economical and ecological), while only serving to continue induced demand and suburban sprawl. This will only make things more expensive with worse health outcomes for everyone in the greater Richmond metro area. This has failed to work for decades, and will continue to fail going forward. I strongly denounce this as an acceptable vision of the future for our region.	2	This is /better/ than A, but that is an exceedingly low bar. I find it quite dispiriting that from the get-go it already prioritizes highways. But then this caveat is included, "However, because some transit projects require large investments and cannot be partially funded, remaining funds that cannot fully cover those are used for highway, resulting in a final distribution closer to 60% highway and 40% other modes." If anything, if B is going to be the methodology used: Its logic should be inverted. That is, "Remaining fund that cannot fully cover those are used for other modes, resulting in a final distribution closer to 60% other modes and 40% highway." Other modes must be prioritized over highway expansion.	1	This sounds conceptually nice (i.e. the prioritization of regional goals), but the proposal seems disastrous in effect. I'm not sure why our "regional goals" prioritize highways to such a large extent. I would've thought that as we were proactively looking towards a better, brighter, cleaner, more sustainable, more welcoming, and overall "better" Richmond metro area, we'd realize that our goals need to prioritize other modes of transformation and moving away from unexpensive and unhealthy car-centric infrastructure. In that instance, I'm not sure why "prioritizing goals" has so much money going toward that which we hope to move away from. As written on the poster, proposal C currently states, "In line for our goals to lose weight this year, we are dedicating 73% of our grocery budget towards ice cream."	1	Much like C, this /sounds/ nice, but is insane as written. I am unsure how 71.2% of our budget going towards highways is "cost effective" when we know that they are more expensive to build, more expensive to maintain, increase traffic, increase death (acute and chronic), lower quality of life, make people unhappy, and is overall ugly to look at. I question what method of accounting is being used when we consider highway expansion to be remotely "cost effective" when it is more expensive in the short "and" long term, and makes us more miserable along the way.	1			

		I don't like this package because it prioritizes highway projects. I don't want so much money going to highway projects. We already have a ton of historical investment in highways and roads. We need to reinvest in trains and transit. We need to empower people to feel safe and comfortable using more sustainable and efficient and healthy modes of mobility, like biking and walking.		This is a much much better approach than the Traditional. However, still too much money is dedicated to highway funding. I think I understand the point about large transit projects can't be partially funding. But I DON'T understand why that money has to automatically go back to highways. Please contribute that money to bike/ped projects, which are more affordable AND cost efficient and sustainable and healthy than highway projects. (Plus, if transit problems are too expensive to be fully funded, wouldn't highway projects be even more expensive and unfundable?)		What is the criteria and scoring for determining benefits? Did we look at the health benefits that biking produces as a form of cardio exercise? Did we look at the environmental benefits that non-highway projects produce by reducing carbon emissions and fossil fuel extraction? Did we examine economic benefits of diversifying our mobility options and reducing our dependence on oil, especially as we start to feel the pinch with rising gas prices due to the USA/Israel/Iran conflict? Did we look at the safety benefits of separating pedestrian traffic from vehicle traffic, thus saving lives and reducing injuries and medical bills? Did we look at the longterm cost savings of time wasted in traffic, or reductions in time spent commuting? I know these are hard to quantify. But even just recognizing the benefits is important, even if they can't be estimated in exact dollar amounts.		Please see my previous comments on the Benefits package.						
Apr 03, 2026, 10:54 AM	1		3		3		3		1					
Apr 03, 2026, 10:09 AM	2	I understand why this is broken out into this percentage. I think that we should invest a little more into transit to push for mode shift	5	This scenario feels the most balanced while also planning for mode shift for the future	4	This also feels balanced and is a good plan for funding larger and more impactful projects	3		1					
Apr 02, 2026, 09:47 AM	1		5		1		1		1					
Apr 01, 2026, 02:44 PM	4		2		4		5						1	
Apr 01, 2026, 02:07 PM	2	More funding for bike and pedestrian routes and safety.	4		1	More funding for bike and pedestrian routes and safety.	3		1					
Apr 01, 2026, 09:43 AM	1		5		3		2		1					
Apr 01, 2026, 08:20 AM	4	More funding for bikes & pedestrians, a bit less for transit	4	A bit more to bike & ped, a bit less to transit (12% / 24%)	2	Prefer more smaller projects, significantly downplays important role of transit and bike/ped infrastructure in favor of cars	1	Who and how is "cost effective" decided? seems very subjective and potentially politically-driven....	1					
Mar 31, 2026, 11:28 PM	1	This input may not be what you want, but basically I wish we did more incremental improvements to our existing transportation network to support the gradual growth of the areas closest to the urban core of our region, rather than greenfield sprawl which is prioritized in these road projects. From this same "improve what we have" ideology, the bus investments proposed here are silly at best - there is currently zero bus service on Mechanicsville Turnpike, while the GRTC Route 12 is crowded and runs infrequently connecting 4 public housing developments in the East End. What if our BRT proposals were aligned with our existing ridership? The N-S Pulse fits that criterion - the existing bus line on this route is GRTC's busiest. Look at page 2-44 of this report and focus transit investments based on this data: https://drpt.virginia.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/GRTC-TSP-Updated-2024.pdf The exception is bold projects like the Fall Line Trail that will dramatically help existing residents	5	improvements to our sidewalk network, our street grid, and the other "daily" features of trying to live in the Richmond region. What if every street within 1 mile of a commercial use had a sidewalk? From this same "improve what we have" ideology, the bus investments proposed here are silly at best - there is currently zero bus service on Mechanicsville Turnpike, while the GRTC Route 12 is crowded and runs infrequently connecting 4 public housing developments in the East End. What if our BRT proposals were aligned with our existing ridership? The N-S Pulse fits that criterion - the existing bus line on this route is GRTC's busiest. Look at page 2-44 of this report and focus transit investments based on this data: https://drpt.virginia.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/GRTC-TSP-Updated-2024.pdf While I'm usually an incrementalist, I	1	See my prior comments - i think incrementally improving what we have is a better idea! Like, what if we focused on the high injury street network and just relentlessly made all of those streets safe through traffic calming?	4	See my previous comments	1					
Mar 30, 2026, 09:18 PM	2		5		3		2		1					
Mar 30, 2026, 04:34 PM	1		5	reducing highway funding even more severely	1		1		1					

				highway capacity expansions. These do not need to be funded at such a high rate. The more highway capacity projects included, means that taking other modes of transportation (bike/bus) are more difficult and dangerous. Due to health conditions I cannot safely drive, so I rely on walking, biking, and taking the bus to get around. The more car capacity on the roads mean that it is more dangerous and difficult for me to get around, meaning that tasks as seemingly easy getting to work or the grocery store are ever more difficult. This experience with difficulty getting around is not unique. Almost 1 in 3 people in the region have a disability. Projects I'd specifically suggest getting rid of in this scenario are: P2F_026 P2F_028 P2F_029 P2F_032											
Mar 30, 2026, 03:25 PM	1	I would decrease the number of highway projects included. I had thought that the last L RTP had a highway/non-highway split closer to 65%/35%	5		1		2			1					
Mar 30, 2026, 11:44 AM	2	More money for enhancement for the region	3	No	3	No	3	Whatever is best. Four customers ambulatory or wheelchair bound	1						
Mar 29, 2026, 05:43 PM	1	Less highway! More multimodal!	4	Maybe a little more bike/ped and a little less highway if possible	1	Just no....we need bike/ped	1	Blah		1					
Mar 29, 2026, 05:25 PM	1	I would seriously reassess how much money is being spent on highway projects in the age of climate change.	4	Focus on cost-effectiveness and safety.	2		4							1	
Mar 29, 2026, 03:11 PM	1	Increase funding to protect vulnerable road users	5	Shift it to have protection of vulnerable road users prioritized even more.	1	Shift it to provide public transportation and protection of vulnerable road users over highways.	1	Once again this is a highway centric plan that should not be used. Shift to public transportation and promoting and protecting vulnerable road users.		1					
Mar 28, 2026, 08:47 AM	1		3	Need more focus on noncar transport modes. Every dollar spent building highway and incentivizing driving is guaranteeing increased maintenance costs and infrastructure debt	1	Decrease the highway funding, increase the bike and pedestrian funding massively	1	The most cost effective modes will be those that decrease future maintenance costs. Consider that we need to decrease our dependency on Middle East fuels as well. Business as usual will lock us into very expensive transport methods per person		1					
Mar 28, 2026, 04:09 AM	2		5	Replacement bridge for s-line over James river	4		4			1					
Mar 27, 2026, 06:32 PM	1		5	More lanes do not "reduce" traffic.	1		1			1					
Mar 26, 2026, 09:05 PM	1		2		2		1			1					
Mar 26, 2026, 03:58 PM	1	We have too many highways already	4	I still think this isn't aggressive enough. More % mode shift away from highways.	1	Too much highway	1	too much highway		1					
Mar 26, 2026, 10:43 AM	1	Less spending on highway projects that will have long term increased costs to maintain and on community safety and health.	5	Commit to the mode shift and further decrease spending on highway projects.	3		1	This type of project is good in the short term (make a lot of small impacts) but in a long term scenario it doesn't make any meaningful difference and you still need large projects to come through and create connections.		1					

							I'm not really understanding how >70% highway spending is "bang for your buck". That feels disingenuous. Getting people onto bikes and public transportation means fewer cars on the roads, fewer traffic fatalities, less pollution, better health outcomes, more economic activity because of a lower need for surface parking. How does massive highway funding at the expense of everything else help much of anything? I like the idea of cost effectiveness, but to me that means more bus routes, better and more protected bike lanes etc. (All of which could be done in a fraction of the time and cost to doing something stupid like adding another lane to some highway somewhere, which won't improve traffic after 6 months)							
Mar 26, 2026, 10:11 AM	1	We have had decades of heavily funding highways and car infrastructure and look where that got us. It's time to look at other successful cities, New York, Paris, etc and deprioritize cars in favor of public transit, bikes, and pedestrians	4	This is a step in the right direction, but I really would prefer more money to bike/ped infrastructure.	1	So highway spending goes up? So we put more cars on I95 and induce even more demand, which we will only have to pay more for in the next couple years? More sitting in traffic and less safe streets and roadways? Even less money towards bikaped infrastructure? Is the goal to make the city way worse?	2						1	
Mar 26, 2026, 09:47 AM	1	More funding for bike/pedestrian and transit	5		1	More funding for bike/pedestrian	1	More funding for bike/pedestrian					1	
Mar 25, 2026, 08:52 PM	2	Less to highways	5	As much money as can be put to public transit, bike lanes, walking etc.	1	Too much emphasis on highways and not other modes	3	I still believe less to highways					1	
Mar 24, 2026, 10:52 AM	1	This is full of bad and destructive projects, particularly the widenings in Hanover County and widenings in Chesterfield	5	This is the best of the packages, as it spends the least on bad conventional arterial widenings and foolish major freeway widenings	1	This project leaves out smaller, cheaper high benefit projects, such as ITS investments.	4	I would remove some of the interstate widening projects and focus more on fixing interchanges and intersections					1	
Mar 23, 2026, 01:34 PM	3		4		2		3						1	
Mar 23, 2026, 01:32 PM	4		5		3		4						1	
Mar 22, 2026, 09:46 AM	3		5		3		3						1	
Mar 22, 2026, 06:46 AM	3		5	Given the dire need for parking (see Scott's Addition), the cost of gas, and the increasing population, a more "Netherlands" view of movement around a city (e.g. by bike or one's own locomotion) will benefit both drivers and non-drivers alike while building community and supporting local business.	3		3						1	
Mar 21, 2026, 06:53 PM	3		5		2		4						1	
Mar 21, 2026, 09:18 AM	1	While we need to maintain existing infrastructure, I wish to see more pedestrian, bike and better accessible public transportation. The population f RVA and surrounding area are only going to grow and continuing the "traditional" balance is only going to grow automotive transportation infrastructure which has its place, but makes all other forms of transportation harder to utilize as well as less and less safe. In short we need the transportation infrastructure of tomorrow, not yesterday.	3	This is probably the compromising or bridge to shifting the focus of transportation investment from almost purely car based to other forms of transportation. I am much more comfortable seeing this shift than the "traditional" model. However, I implore decision makers to know that even dedicated car users have to interface with alternative forms of transportation, often having to walk from parking areas through trafficked areas to access their destination. Just because you rely on a car, does not mean you do not use other modes of travel. Given the increased dangers to pedestrians that our current infrastructure and behaviors causes, it is important to point towards the infrastructure we need vs what we can tolerate.	1	This looks like going backwards to me, and sounds the same. Maybe great for supporting suburban use of the downtown area, but what does it doe for reducing congestion and making the downtown (cityscape) safer for residents, users and workers. This plan seems myopic, and the name is a joke. This does not appear to transform much in its allocation of funds except to prop up existing infrastructure.	1	I feel similarly to this as i did for "transformative", this is not aspirational planning. I realize the irony in that this plan's name is "cost effective". This is capitulation in planning. Think bigger, think outside the moment. Think of all those that have lost their lives to the short sighted planning that has led to ill fitting transportation infrastructure.					1	

Mar 19, 2026, 06:12 PM	1	Since traditional usage is to continue to widen roads and bridges with little accommodations for pedestrians, I would be against continuing as we have. At a minimum, all traditional highway "upgrades" should include bike and pedestrian facilities with multiple safe signalized crossings. All new or improved bridges should also have bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	5	I would fund a study to investigate how funding for transit can be fully spent. All funds that must go to "highways" should be spent on bike/ped accommodations and no extensions to low density suburbs that add to sprawl and defy regular bus service.	1	Because larger projects favor automobiles and do not help create the finer grid benefits, I would not be in favor of this. If instead, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and connections to multiple transit stops along long corridors would count as one large project, this might work, but it otherwise seems very doubtful.	1	if more bicycle and pedestrian projects could improve cost effectiveness, I may be more in favor of this.	1			
Mar 19, 2026, 04:17 PM	1		4		2		1		1			
Mar 19, 2026, 04:15 PM	1		4		3		3		1			
Mar 19, 2026, 04:14 PM	1		5		2		3		1			
Mar 19, 2026, 04:13 PM	1		5		2		2		1			
Mar 19, 2026, 04:11 PM	1		5		1		1		1			
Mar 19, 2026, 04:10 PM	1		5		1		1		1			
Mar 19, 2026, 04:07 PM	2		3		2		4					1
Mar 19, 2026, 01:06 PM	1	Not enough investment in clean, sustainable modes of mass transit.	2	Still too much investment in highway, which means individual vehicle travel and fossil fuels.	1	Way too much highway	1	Still too much highway. They're all flawed in that way.	1			
Mar 19, 2026, 01:03 PM	3		5		4		3		1			
Mar 18, 2026, 01:35 PM	3	Not only would this help the global obesity rate but lower carbon emissions MORE BIKE AND WALK AREAS	5	Not only would this help the global obesity rate but lower carbon emissions MORE BIKE AND WALK AREAS	2	Not only would this help the global obesity rate but lower carbon emissions MORE BIKE AND WALK AREAS	2	Not only would this help the global obesity rate but lower carbon emissions MORE BIKE AND WALK AREAS	1			
Mar 17, 2026, 03:04 PM	2		4		1		1		1			
Mar 14, 2026, 09:29 PM	1		5	Lower highway to 50.	3	LOWER HIGHWAY	3	LOWER HIGHWAY	1			
Mar 14, 2026, 01:32 PM	3		4		2		2		1			
Mar 14, 2026, 10:26 AM	1		5		1		1		1			
Mar 14, 2026, 10:26 AM	3		4		1		4		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 08:04 PM	1	More cycling, walking, transit. I'm scared of driving on highways and I don't want more death lanes to merge across	3	More cycling, walking, transit. More bike!	1	More cycling, walking, transit. This is still a lot of highway and not a lot of bike	1	More cycling, walking, transit. But the bike ped slice got way you smaller. No. Flip it. Fuck highways.	1			
Mar 13, 2026, 07:10 PM	1	Highways don't support a strong local economy.	4	Still too much highway emphasis.	3		2	Still too much highway emphasis	1			
Mar 13, 2026, 02:33 PM	3		4		3		4		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 02:23 PM	2	I would reduce the share of funding given to highway projects and reallocate those funds to transit projects.	3	Still believe that highway funding is still too much of the pie, funding would ideally be distributed based on other factors besides SMARTSCALE-esque criteria and consider equity, accessibility, etc.	3	Could see biggest outcomes, though will still suggest a bigger share of funding for non-highway projects.	3		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 02:09 PM	3		3		2		4					1
Mar 13, 2026, 02:07 PM	4		4		1		3		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 02:05 PM	4		4		2		3		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 02:05 PM	4		5		3		3		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 02:04 PM	1	Stop prioritizing cars	5	We need to begin investing more in non-vehicle infrastructure	4	I'm ok with less projects if we can get more impactful regional projects done	2	Too little bike ped infrastructure	1			
Mar 13, 2026, 02:03 PM	2		3		5		4				1	
Mar 13, 2026, 02:02 PM	3		4		4		2		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 02:02 PM	4	With an increase for bike ped	5		2		1		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 01:55 PM	2	More transit! Cars are not the future. (I hope)	5		2		2		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 01:54 PM	1	This option does not give enough priority to sustainability, reliability, safety, or resiliency.	5	I would like to see additional emphasis on sustainability. I would also like to see additional emphasis on bike and pedestrian safety.	1	This does not allocate enough funding to transit or to bike and pedestrian. There is far too much funding allocated to highways.	2	This option does not provide enough investment in transit which is the most efficient and effective modality for moving people. Bike and pedestrian infrastructure similarly are low-cost due to lower maintenance and operating costs.	1			
Mar 13, 2026, 01:54 PM	2	More funding for bike, pedestrian and transit projects	4	This is my favorite—I would just like for extra money that can't be spent on big transit projects to go to smaller transit projects or bike/ped instead of being added to highways.	1	More bike/ped projects—they can be transformative too, like the Fall Line Trail. Some transformative projects are great, like BRT, but a lot of great change can happen incrementally.	3	More bike/ped/transit projects and less highway projects. When you take into account all the negative externalities and costs associated with highways, I'm skeptical that these projects are more cost-effective.	1			
Mar 13, 2026, 01:45 PM	1	I want to be able to safely commute by bike	5		4		4		1			
Mar 13, 2026, 01:39 PM	3	Status quo.	4	Like the idea of travel demand management	3	Could be good, wondering if transportation modes will change	2	Cost should not be the driving factor	1			
Mar 13, 2026, 01:38 PM	1		5		2		2		1			

		Continuing to invest the majority of resources in the most lethal, most polluting, least efficient method of transportation is stupid. This package wastes resources and makes our problems worse in the short and long term. I would appreciate a far greater proportion of funds go to transit and bike/ped projects as opposed to highway projects that expand current and future car dependency.		This is a far better plan for the future efficiency, sustainability, and vitality of our region's transportation network. I would still make a change. Funds that do not cover the entirety of transit projects ought to be reallocated towards bike/ped projects. Trickle the resources down, don't yank them back up.		This allocates far too many resources into highway projects. Connect the region via bike/ped and transit. Highway projects should not make up more than 50% of spending. These projects are investments guaranteeing future problems, costs, inefficiencies, and polluted air and waterways.		Far too much emphasis on Highway projects. What are we doing here?							
Mar 13, 2026, 10:49 AM	1		5		1		1			1					
Mar 13, 2026, 09:58 AM	4	Evaluate need of community.	3		3		3			1					
		It spends an enormous amount of money to benefit the fewest and the wealthiest (those who can afford cars, usually those who can afford multiple cars per household).	3	Focus on smaller and more highway projects, rather than big ones that don't directly work to address access disparities and just pour money into huge projects benefiting only remote areas.	1	I don't see that the "regional goals" meaningfully reduce reliance on personal vehicles or improve air quality for residents.	2	It's still prioritizing cars. It would help to see an environmental justice analysis as part of the weighting for these scores, to see which projects best combine equitable improvements and access with reductions in air pollution for fenceline communities and avoidance of displacement.		1				1	
Mar 12, 2026, 12:33 PM	1		3		1		2								
Mar 12, 2026, 10:25 AM	4		3		4		5								
Mar 12, 2026, 09:36 AM	3		4		2		2				1				1