

L RTP 2050		
Goal Feedback Phase A		
Goal A-Safe		
Date Submitted	Response	ZIP Code
Jul 09, 2025, 11:17 PM	I agree with sentiment expressed by GM, particularly as it relates to item AS2. I am especially concerned about potential lobbying from corporations like Waymo trying to sell the city on driverless taxis as "safer" alternatives and letting our streets and public places be captured by private interests. We should be prioritizing accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists above other users of public spaces. We certainly don't need to eliminate all car traffic, but local car-free and multi-modal travel should be a priority. We can only facilitate that with safe and robust infrastructure. PAINT IS NOT INFRASTRUCTURE; we need truly protected bike lanes and raised pedestrian crossings to slow drivers down and protect individuals from hazardous drivers. I think this is especially true as it relates to item AS3, as education campaigns have been a decades long effort that have only had minimal success. The laws of physics are far more persuasive than a "drive safe" billboard. The more we can physically slow down drivers in areas where there are dangerous interactions between motorists and non-motorists, we make collisions both less likely and less deadly when they do occur. This goal is all talk - no walk - and is insufficient without ensuring that "Strategy" items include robust, data-driven infrastructure improvements. Items AS1 and AS4 I think speak to this the most, and those strategies should be emphasized and expanded. For item AS2, I am willing to accept it if we modify it beyond "vehicle technologies" and include things like speed and redlight cameras to ensure there is enforcement and compliance with existing road safety laws. We should be thinking beyond just vehicles themselves to achieve the Objectives. Overall, I think the Objectives are solid, but we need to beef up the Strategies if we actually want to achieve the admirable goal of Vision Zero.	23223
Jul 09, 2025, 10:09 PM	While I understand the reasons behind it. I do question it. Where is personal responsibility in this? Why don't we hand out on other jurisdictions traffic vest just as Henrico County has done? Why are we not writing tickets for bicycles for riding against traffic. That is illegal and extremely dangerous! All over 16 who ride a bike need to be licensed and have a bike inspection and a road test be done.	23116
Jul 07, 2025, 02:03 PM	I'm concerned about the metrics used to measure "safe". I worry that we're setting up for capture by car-focused interests. For example, a common stat is that cars are more safe than they were a generation ago, when the opposite can also be true depending on the denominator in the safety equation. If the equation is "fewer crashes per mile driven = safe", then cars are in fact much safer because we have more miles driven as we've become more car-dependent. "Safe" and "100% reduction in crashes" can be mutually exclusive and I feel as though when faced with the aspirational goal of 100% reduction, policymakers will reach for the attainable "safe".	23231
Jul 02, 2025, 09:30 AM	1) For safety's sake, Virginia must consider "photo enforcing" speeds on all Interstates, major highways and school zones. Speed kills and causes billions of dollars in property damage and liability claims. this contributes to the ever-increasing cost of automobile insurance. Due to the shortage of enforcement officers throughout the state, this technology will assist them by allowing our Virginia law enforcement and first responders staff make better use of their time protecting public safety. 2) Any paved road that does not have a proper shoulder that allows a vehicle to pull over off of the main travel lane should cap speed limits to no greater than 45 mph. A 55-mph speed limit on a shoulder-less paved road is life threatening.	23124
Jul 02, 2025, 08:36 AM	This is an excellent priority goal for the L RTP. If we can prove to people that they can reach their destination safely every time, then that would likely increase their desire for more active trips, improving quality of life and boosting the local economy. Along with transportation infrastructure strategies and traffic calming, I think that sufficient lighting should be considered as a safety improvement as well to make pedestrians feel safe and improve driver visibility of pedestrians.	23226
Jul 02, 2025, 01:37 AM	This feels like it's heading towards the right step, I personally agree with the implementation of the street and safety tech. I've personally seen a lot of buses speed to speeds on Cowardian, also there should be a street light before and after getting on the bridge towards the war memorial.	23225
Jul 01, 2025, 09:58 PM	absolutely a great goal. Speed limits need to be lowered and enforced. Without human enforcement speed cameras are the only option. They work. I don't buy that they're too expensive. Surely they would pay for themselves. Keep in mind what has not been mentioned at all. Not everyone is physically capable of riding a bike or walking. Do not neglect the disabled.	23221
Jul 01, 2025, 03:05 PM	Yes it does. Bravo. Goal is perfect. Objectives need to be met sooner and also make it clear that while bikes and peds are the most vulnerable and worthy of particular focus and attention, Vision Zero is not just a bike and ped initiative. Strategies are honestly too tame...need to talk about speed and lowering default vehicle speeds and speed limits, especially on all non-limited access roadways. I'd welcome an explicit reference to adoption of the Safe System Approach in the region.	23230
Goal B-Clean		
Date Submitted	Response	ZIP Code
Jul 09, 2025, 11:47 PM	I love the overall Goal, bit of feedback on the Objectives: B3. Love the directionality of this one, but "increase by 10%" seems awful small-scale when thinking 25 years out. How is this being quantified? Why is the Objective only 10%? Can the Objective be more context dependent based on density? Because 10% is an incredibly aspirational goal for more rural areas of Hanover or Chesterfield, yet seems incredibly insufficient for Richmond City or urban Henrico. B4. Similar concerns as with Objective B3, should we try to better distinguish between the density of areas for what goals they should strive to achieve? 10% seems ambitious for some areas in the region, yet seems woefully inadequate for others. For the Strategies: Love B51 and B52! These are great strategies that prioritize what's needed to encourage modal shifting away from personal vehicle travel. I especially love B52, as I think there's a lot of regional rail possibility. B53: Would recommend a subtle verbiage shift of "Prioritize rail, port, and highway improvements..." to ensure our Strategy emphasizes that we want to invest in freight and logistic supply chains that are more efficient and less emissions heavy. Completely agree that highway infrastructure is still a critical part of our supply chains that needs continued investment, but rail and port should be prioritized where feasible. B54: I hope that "needed charging infrastructure" isn't limited to just Level 3 "high speed" chargers. In order to encourage mass adoption of vehicles with less emissions, we need to make it easier for more people to charge at home and/or work. There should be incentives for workplaces and apartment buildings to have more Level 2 chargers available to employees and residents. Going out of the way to access a Level 3 charger should be something that's mostly relied on for longer road trips, not something that's required multiple times a week. B55: Fantastic goal, "reliable" is a key word here. And would love more multimodal connection opportunities to greatly expand the reach of our regional transportation networks. I think B56 and B57 are a great pair, emphasizing the need to ensure new developments are transit-friendly and transit-first from the get-go. It's extremely hard to retrofit good multimodal transit into a finished development that's already car-centric. The more we can be proactive with transit-oriented development, the easier, cheaper, and better it will be. I'd propose and an additional B58 Strategy that emphasizes more "holistic" environmental reviews when evaluating new projects. I think they can get too dogmatic by only looking at things like traffic disruption in isolation, without considering broader impacts like the creation of modal shifting and how that will dramatically reduce carbon emissions and help us meet our climate goals. It's better to pursue the opportunity to remove a vehicle from the road entirely, rather than reflexively assume any reduction in car capacity will result in increased idling and emissions. Overall love this Goal and love the Strategies. Could do with some tweaking on the nitty gritty, but I love what's being proposed here.	23223

Jul 07, 2025, 02:45 PM	I would like to understand what "intermodal freight" means. If railroads, that's good from an emissions perspective, but tough from a multi-modal travel perspective because it's so hard to cross rail lines. More rail traffic means it's tougher to build safe biking, walking, etc. paths because there aren't ways to get across rail lines economically unless you use existing road crossings, which brings ped/bike/car/truck/bus all into the same intersections. I'm also not understanding the math if intermodal includes trucking, because increasing truck traffic by 50% would seem to be inequal to cutting car traffic 10% in terms of net emissions.	23231
Jul 02, 2025, 09:34 AM	Increase in the use of rail to move commercial goods and reduce the use of trucks on the highway will promote a cleaner environment. Rail should also be considered for commuter transport between Hampton Roads, Williamsburg, Richmond, and the Northern Virginia corridor. Many businesses are experiencing employee commutes of 45 minutes or greater which increases employee stress and promotes employee displacement.	23124
Jul 02, 2025, 08:55 AM	Yes, this seems like a necessary goal. We should be responsible stewards of our environment and encourage each generation to pass this goal along. While trees are not specifically a transportation element, they do promote more active transportation by reducing temperatures on our streets and sidewalks and improving street aesthetics that increase desire for active transportation all while cleaning our air. Perhaps one of the objectives can be geared towards an increase in street trees.	23226
Jul 02, 2025, 01:39 AM	This feels like the correct goal. I agree with the reduction in vehicle use especially off of broad street as well as the coordinate transportation with land use. I personally feel sidewalks need to be build as previously stated by mayor Avaula.	23225
Jul 01, 2025, 10:03 PM	what is intermodal freight? Not an everyday term. We need a much better public transit system. We are so far behind other places. I'm sick of having to drive my car as the only option. I cannot ride a bicycle or walking very far. But I can ride a bus. Except there aren't any nearby.	
Jul 01, 2025, 03:10 PM	Goal is fine, a bit underwhelming or understated but ok. I really like the specificity of the objectives but they lack true ambition if 2050 is the end date and I would dearly love to see each and every proposed projects scored against their ability to deliver on these kinds of targets. the 50% increase in intermodal freight worries me a bit...unless it's shifted from road freight. Strategies again lack a certain bite: improve, support, and coordinate dont really put the hammer down on discouraging car trips and driving a real mode shift towards more sustainable means of travel.	23230
Goal C-Consistent		
Date Submitted	Response	ZIP Code
Jul 10, 2025, 12:33 AM	I like the overall Goal, but echo Andy Clarke's insight: "Consistent" and "predictable" are necessary but not sufficient. "Comfortable" and "dignified" seem like extremely appropriate adjectives to include here, to ensure the Goal is more specified and better aligned with the values being implicated by the broader LRTP.Objectives:C4. How is this being quantified? Does this include improvements to existing biking and walking infrastructure that technically exists, but isn't used due to being incredible hazardous to use? Depending on how this is defined and quantified, 25% seems incredibly inadequate. Too many areas in the City, much less the broader region, are hostile to getting around by any means that isn't in a car. We need more serious investment in this kind of infrastructure, and this should be committed to as a quantifiable Objective.I like the approach of Goal B Objective B3, that emphasizes how many opportunities are available to how many people within a given radius. In alignment with the goal of Consistency, would it make sense to rephrase C4 to focus on increasing the number of residents that have access diverse amenities near them? E.G: "By 2050, the number of residents with access to employment, education, recreation, and groceries within 15 minutes of their via safe walking and biking networks will increase 25%." I just think it's important we better quantify what Objective we're measuring, to better work towards this Goal.C6. Should this Objective include a Strategy to employe "road diets" where appropriate? Walking and biking infrastructure is much cheaper to build and maintain, so there are many areas where we could get a "win-win-win" by reducing the amount of car infrastructure we need to maintain (Reducing cost and breadth), using reclaimed space to improve multimodal infrastructure (Reducing wear and tear on NHS pavements, reducing maintenance costs), and creating more accessible and livable areas. Not sure if this is directly on point, as NHS might refer exclusively to things like the Interstates. But still seems worth considering and quantifying if we which to reduce costs and make alternate transportation more "Consistent" for everyone.Strategies:CS1: I think this is a good strategy, and we're headed in the right direction with GRTC working on signal priority for the buses to ensure they run faster and more efficiently. On this point, maybe it's time to ditch the inadequate GRTC app, and direct people to use the (far superior) Transit app? This would recover some resources, and help people feel more empowered and more comfortable with using transit everywhere.C2: Fantastic goal. "Build it and they will come", we need to actually invest in and build out the infrastructure before people will switch over. CS3: This seems like a great strategy. In terms of "bridging the gap" and helping encourage mode shifting, would it be possible to create means to help people from farther out mode shift to public transit as they approach the city core? E.G: WMATA has parking decks available on the outlying suburban Metrorail stations, allowing commuters who don't live near public transit to still ride into DC. A similar approach for GRTC and other multimodal transit might be helpful for those who live too far out to be directly on our transit networks, but still would like to drive less. Certainly, other modes should still be prioritized over things like car parking infrastructure (I.E: Parking should be a bit "off to the side" so the system still prioritizes other means of travel; Cars should be compatible but not a priority).CS4: Can we include similar maintenance and repair commitments for other forms of transportation? For example, new building projects frequently close public sidewalks for extended periods, reducing consistency for pedestrians, and potentially making things far more dangerous for cyclists. Maintenance and accessibility should also be concerns beyond car infrastructure if we want to facilitate the modal shifting that LRTP envisions.	23223
Jul 07, 2025, 02:47 PM	Once again really like the directionality of this one, would just appreciate more clarification to ensure our overarching values are more explicit in the Goal. What does "dedicated infrastructure" mean? Does that mean more roads dedicated to cars? Improving pavement sure sounds car-focused.	23231
Jul 02, 2025, 09:39 AM	1) Expand GRTC access from Richmond, VA down to Quinton and Providence Forge in New Kent County, VA. GRTC recently announced expansion to Southern Henrico County (Sandston, VA). Next stops eastbound should be Quinton and Providence Forge Park-n-Ride lots.2) Need a clear and consistent definition of what a bike/pedestrian path is and how it should be constructed. Labeling a road shoulder as a bike/ped path without proper road markings is both confusing and a safety hazard. To be considered a true Bike/Pedestrian path, it must be constructed according to clear and rigid standards.	23124
Jul 02, 2025, 09:17 AM	Absolutely a good goal. Car-dependent people are not going to engage in a culture of mode shift if they cannot find a convenient and reliable bus route or a safe bike path that suits their cycling comfort level. People would also be more likely to consider alternate modes of transportation the more that they understood and felt comfortable with them. Education would go a long way to teach people what tools are available to them (websites, route maps, how to guides, etc.) and how to use them for a successful multimodal experience.	23226
Jul 02, 2025, 01:44 AM	This feels a bit more towards the correct direction, personally the GRTC app can be updated tremendously especially in the interface. The GRTC text-number can be included in the app as well with stop signs being updated to reflect the stop signs. I feel that certain stops especially at the transfer stations need to have Uber/Lyft stops to make it more convenient for the user with the awkward parking lot across from the one by VCU. Also, a lot of the buses need to be cleaned as well. A simple power-wash and vacuum would be great. I am also recommending for the A/C to be of use on the bus currently due to the heat, it's a bit obnoxious to have to continuously open the window, smell the neighbor next to you, or feel as if the transit made you sweat more than if you were walking there.	23225
Jul 01, 2025, 10:09 PM	how to achieve a 75% increase in transit ridership when the system is so lacking. There is no bus service anywhere near my house. There was once but it was discontinued about 7 years ago. And I'm in the heart of the city. Most of the bike lanes around here are truly treacherous. There has been zero driver education about sharing safely. What about people who are unable to ride bikes or walk very far? This part of the plan sounds great but unrealistic.	23221

Jul 01, 2025, 03:18 PM	Consistent and predictable are OK goals but safe and comfortable and dignified might be worthy of consideration as well. I mean, my bike and walk trips are very predictable today...but not necessarily in a good way. Objectives: same comments as before, love the specificity and much shorter timeline would be better. More bike/ped infrastructure is clearly necessary and a welcome target...and yet the true measure of success is whether people use the infrastructure or not, and that comes back to safe, comfortable, connected networks not just lane miles of painted bike lanes. Strategies could be more pointed again...no increase in lane miles for motor vehicles, no more parking spaces until we are maintaining the infrastructure we already more efficiently and equitably.	23230
Jun 30, 2025, 04:35 PM	This is a test. I want you to know this is a test.	23221
Goal D-Prepared		
Date Submitted	Response	ZIP Code
Jul 15, 2025, 02:36 PM	I like the broadest implications of this Goal, but as others have commented, this one feels the most "fuzzy" of all the Goals. I agree with the sentiments expressed by Andy Clarke, Eliza, DanielleBrown, Bill Dismore, and GM. Namely, that I think it would be helpful for public consumption and participation if the terms could be better defined, ideally in a way that aligns better with common vernacular. The reduction of jargon can be helpful for more public "overview" documents like this.Objectives:D1: How is this 10% being defined? Was is the threshold for "improved"? 10% in 25 years seems incredibly unambitious, especially when we know we're going to be facing more climate events that are more extreme. Would it be appropriate to try to change how we're measuring the Objective? E.G: "By 2050, the top 25% of the highest capacity infrastructure in the Capital Region will be hardened to resist likely threats with minimal to no disruptions (<24hr recovery time). 'Likely threats' are weather and other natural events that have a more than 50% chance of occurring in the next 50 years." Obviously consultation with SMEs to define exact numbers would be necessary here, but I feel like this would better clarify what it is we're trying to achieve, and add more insight into how we're actually trying to execute on the Goal.D2: How is "redundant capacity" being defined? Once again 5% seems low from an outside perspective, but I don't know how this is being measured. Should the Objective be reframed to focus more on execution rather than just theoretical standby capacity? After all, it doesn't help me if "redundant capacity" means three busses come within 5 minutes of each other, but then the fourth bus takes 45 minutes to get there. Sure, that still represents an "average" lead time of 15 minutes between buses, but I'm stuck waiting 45 minutes for that last bus if I miss the first three. As such, would some verbiage along the lines of, "By 2050, the redundant capacity of the Transportation Network in the PM Peak Period (4:30-6:30) will be increased to ensure that 95% of trips do not experience delays of more than 15 minutes from scheduled times" be appropriate? Once again I feel like such a rewrite would better convey what our hard Objective is, rather than a more fuzzy and abstract Goal.D3: What does "connectivity" mean here? Should it be something like, "By 2050, the overall average systemwide Transportation Network connectivity will ensure there are at least two redundant routes to 80% of destinations within 1 hour Transportation time of a resident's home"? Again, better clarifying what we're actually trying to aim towards with our Objectives, as the way this is currently written feels more like it's just a concept of a plan.Strategies:I overall like the Strategies here, I think they make more sense and overall have better directionality than the Objectives. I think DS4 is especially important. As GM mentioned, it's important that - if existing infrastructure should be rendered significantly damaged or unusable by natural disaster - that we make the appropriate investments to ensure the rebuild meets the needs of tomorrow, rather than the needs of yesterday. It would not be appropriate to just rebuild things "as is" to get it done quickly.On this point, would it be appropriate to add another Strategy that aligns the intentions of DS2, DS4, and DS7? That is, something like, "DS8. Develop Infrastructure Rebuild Mechanisms for highest-risk and highest-impact infrastructure. Have plans that are ready to pull 'off the shelf' to begin rebuilding quickly after a disaster. Ensure that these plans are current and incorporate community feedback, to ensure they meet future community needs and goals, and align with broader Richmond300 initiatives." I think by proactively planning by what we'd want our infrastructure to look like if we were starting over from scratch will give us a much better scaffold and template to work from, rather than reactively trying to replace things "as-is" when the worst has already happened. Let's be proactive, not reactive.D55: I'd be remiss to not mention that robust protected bike lane infrastructure is "multimodal" and can be used by fire and EMS if necessary (when designed and implemented properly). And it's easier and more flexible to maintain and clear quickly.DS6: This one seems great, I'd like to see this Strategy brought into alignment with other Goals to provide for more public greenspaces and conservation. This means we can have beautiful public spaces for recreation and enjoyment when the weather is mild, while also providing natural buffers to protect life and property, and to help absorb rain and flood waters. I think the recently opened Dock Street Park is an amazing example of this, and I'd love to see more investments like this. Seems like a win-win to me.DS7: I already touched on this above (In terms of consulting with communities for our "on the shelf" infrastructure replacement plans), but I also think the recent flood tragedies really emphasize the need to be able to reliably communicate with the public and meet them where they are when disaster strikes. Some members of our community might not have smartphones and thus might not use social media, but conversely many others might not watch local cable or listen to local radio broadcasts. I'd be interested in some public survey work to try to figure out how to best meet most of our community where they already are, and develop reliable means to communicate critical safety info when there might be a time-sensitive disaster in progress.Overall I think there's a solid foundation here, but it really needs to be tightened up and better specified. Because this Goal currently feels the most "vibes based" of all four. Especially when we're talking about proactive disaster prevention, mitigation, and recovery, it really seems like we'd have something far more concrete and defined.	23223
Jul 10, 2025, 12:59 AM	I concur with sentiments expressed by Bill Dismore, DanielleBrown, Eliza, and Andy Clarke. This Goal feels far more sparse and lacking than the other three. The terms used here seem like the most poorly define and impenetrable to a lay public audience, I'm not sure how to understand how these Objectives are being quantified. I like the directionality here, but this could use a lot of tightening up.Objectives:D1: As others have expressed, what does "10%...improved" mean here? What is "at risk"? Harder to comment on the Objective when it is not easily understood by a public audience.D2: How is "redundant capacity" defined? Should the Objective focus more on the ability to respond and operationalize that redundancy when needed? For example, 5% more redundant transit capacity if it is unable to be effectively deployed when and where it's needed. An analogy would be that a backup generator does me no good during a power outage if it fails to start up; Sure, that redundancy "exists" as "capacity", but it's not useful. Is there a way to rework this Objective to capture the intention, with increased emphasis on where "the rubber meets the road"?D3: How is "Network connectivity" defined here? 2% seems low over at a 25-year span, but hard to say without better understanding of the terms. Assuming it's in reference to the number of routes or paths that exist between Point A and Point B, and thus multiple and redundant options for making those connections: I'd hope we can do better than 2%. The denser Downtown regions tend to have multiple overlapping bus routes, so it can be easier to hop between lines to make more bespoke connections as needed. But at the extremities, options are far more limited, and a single missed bus or transfer can dramatically delay travel and impede reliability. In consideration of natural disasters, having more of this increased connectivity seems critical for giving people alternates and backups when the system might be experiencing disruptions. Strategies:I overall think there's good alignment on the strategies, they broadly make sense and align with the Goal, even if the Objectives are less clear.DS4: Echoing sentiments expressed by others. When considering the "investment" where there's a need to rebuild damaged or destroyed infrastructure: I hope there are more opportunities to consider what the future needs are, and to make sure the rebuild fits the needs of the community going forward rather than just being an "drop in" replacement for the needs of the past. While we obviously don't want to see infrastructure damaged, it seems sensible to "make lemonade" out of such unfortunate situations and ensure the rebuild matches the quality and community engagement that we'd expect if we were doing the infrastructure project anew.DS6: This one makes a lot of sense. I love the ongoing watershed initiatives to turn these reclamation areas into public parks. They increase beauty, accessibility to public spaces for people, help restore environment and habitat and can absorb excess flood waters and reduce the loss of life and property during flood events. Would love to see these initiatives expanded and deployed strategically, as I think they achieve many goals at once.DS7: This is really important, it oftentimes feels difficult to get critical local information and communications. More accessibility, engagement, and meeting people where they are is critical. I feel like I've been seeing lots of steps in this direction, which is greatly appreciated, and I hope it will be continued going forward.	23223
Jul 07, 2025, 02:55 PM	THIS ^^ completely agree. I worry that there are a lot of buzzwords in these goals that aren't necessarily clear to the public at large.	23231

Jul 07, 2025, 02:54 PM	I like the word "improve" in "improve at-risk infrastructure", but am dismayed at how many local projects consider "improve" to mean "new" rather than "improved" in the sense that it serves the community better than the existing conditions. We should commit to community-focused design processes that don't simply replace in-kind the old design (e.g. Nine Mile bridge over I-64 in Richmond, or two bridges costing over \$1m on East Richmond Road that don't have sidewalks). This might sound more expensive, given design and engineering costs, but might actually cost less if we figure out that the improvement can be smaller, more efficient, or will last longer because (for example) it will work to reduce vehicle trips. I would also like to see a higher connectivity number, there are so many opportunities to do this better.	23231
Jul 02, 2025, 09:45 AM	The objectives use small percentages to prepare, withstand and recover from disruptions. a) What does each objective represent a percentage of (i.e., available money, cost of construction, source of revenue)?b) Do the objectives represent a yearly increase or from 2025 through 2050?c) Provide definitions of what is considered to be infrastructure, network redundancies and connectivity.	23124
Jul 02, 2025, 09:08 AM	I think that this goal and it's associated objectives could be better clarified for the public, i.e. what is meant by disruptions, at-risk infrastructure, network redundancy, and vulnerable zones? I think that this goal should focus on maintenance as well. We can't keep building more new infrastructure and leave behind that infrastructure that is already in-place. We need to have the appropriate amount of staff and a plan in place so that our existing assets aren't rendered useless while we focus on new assets.	23226
Jul 02, 2025, 01:48 AM	These feels more spot on with accomplishing the actual goals at hand. I would love if Wi-Fi was something that was exclusive to the buses and transfer stations. In terms of avoiding vulnerable zones, some stops can be changed or readjusted and Southside Plaza can also be seen as a transfer station along with the one being built on broad street and the one available by VCU. With taking public transit more regularly, I feel more safer taking the next bus at the transfer station than at a stand alone stop. Also, a lot of the stops can be prioritized to make the transit more faster, I personally don't mind having to walk two or three blocks to be picked up at an actual stop I'll be acknowledged at and not the constant stop and go.	23225
Jul 01, 2025, 10:15 PM	this just seems lackluster. Why such a paltry increase in infrastructure? I guess funding is the answer. The other terms mean nothing to me. What is meant by connectivity? What is network redundancy?	23321
Jul 01, 2025, 03:23 PM	This seems like the weakest and least convincing of the goals. The Objectives seem counter to earlier goals..."adding redundancy" seems like code for building more unnecessary highway infrastructure but five feet higher off the ground. Maybe as a strategy we could agree not to keep building outwards on greenfield sites when we could be reusing and infilling existing disturbed areas.	23230