



Central Virginia Transportation Authority

CENTRAL VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF MEETING

Friday, April 29, 2022, 8:30 a.m.

PlanRVA James River Board Room and Zoom

Members Present:

| Jurisdiction/ Agency | Member | Present | Absent | Designee | Present | Absent |
|--|--|----------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Town of Ashland | John H. Hodges | X | | Daniel McGraw | | X |
| Charles City County | Byron Adkins | X | | Vacant | | |
| Chesterfield County | Kevin P. Carroll, Vice Chair | X | | Leslie Haley | | X |
| Goochland County | Neil Spoonhower (virtual) | X | | Susan F. Lascolette | | |
| Hanover County | W. Canova Peterson | X | | Sean M. Davis | | X |
| Henrico County | Frank J. Thornton, Chair | | X | Patricia S. O'Bannon | X | |
| New Kent County | Patricia A. Paige | X | | Vacant | | |
| Powhatan County | Michael W. Byerly | X | | Steve McClung | | X |
| City of Richmond | Mayor Levar M. Stoney (virtual) | X | | Cynthia Newbille | | X |
| VA House of Delegates | Delegate Delores McQuinn (virtual) | X | | N/A | | |
| Senate of Virginia | Senator Jennifer L. McClellan (virtual) | X | | N/A | | |
| Commonwealth Transportation Board | Carlos M. Brown (virtual) | X | | N/A | | |

Non-Voting Ex-Officio

| Agency | Member | Present | Absent | Designee | Present | Absent |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| VDRPT | Jennifer DeBruhl | X | | Tiffany Dubinsky | | X |
| VDOT | Stephen Brich | | X | Shane Mann | X | |
| | | | | Mark Riblett | | X |
| Virginia Port Authority | Stephen A. Edwards | | X | Cathie J. Vick (virtual) | X | |
| | | | | Barbara Nelson | | X |
| GRTC Transit System | Julie Timm | X | | Sheryl Adams | | X |
| RMTA | Joi Taylor Dean | X | | N/A | | |

The technology used for this meeting was a web-hosted service created by YouTube Live Streaming and was open and accessible for participation by members of the public. Voting record tables are attached to the action meeting minutes in Appendix A. A recording of this meeting is available on the [Plan RVA YouTube Channel](#).

CALL TO ORDER

The Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA) Vice Chairman, Kevin P. Carroll, presided and called the April 29, 2022, Central Virginia Transportation Authority meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

ATTENDANCE ROLL CALL & CERTIFICATION OF MEETING QUORUM

Janice Firestone, Program Coordinator, took attendance by roll call and certified that a quorum was present.

A. ADMINISTRATION

1. Consideration of Amendments to the Action Meeting Agenda

Mr. Parsons asked that Item 2.-a. - Innovation Funding - 288 Northbound Hard Shoulder Project be removed from the agenda.

On motion of Patricia A. Paige, seconded by Michael W. Byerly, the Authority unanimously approved the April 29, 2022, meeting agenda as amended (voice vote).

2. Approval of March 25, 2022, CVTA Meeting Minutes

On motion of W. Canova Peterson, seconded by John H. Hodges, the Authority voted to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2022, CVTA meeting as presented (voice vote).

3. Open Public Comment Period

There were no requests to address the CVTA.

4. CVTA Chairman's Report

Vice Chair Carroll reported that Mr. Thornton participated in a podcast with Chesterfield County this past week on behalf of Henrico County and the CVTA. The video will be available later this week. He invited other representatives to participate in future podcasts.

a. Appointment of CVTA Nominating Committee Members

Vice Chair Carroll reported that Chairman Thornton is recommending John H. Hodges be appointed as Chairman of the Nominating Committee. Mr. Hodges reported that the recommendation is that Michael W. Byerly and Cynthia I. Newbille also be appointed to the committee.

On motion by W. Canova Peterson, seconded by Patricia S. O'Bannon, the Authority unanimously approved the recommendations for Chairman and members of the Nominating Committee (roll call vote).

b. Annual Joint Meeting Invitation

Mr. Parsons distributed a flyer detailing the annual meeting.

c. Public Outreach Update

This item was covered in the Chairman's report.

B. PUBLIC HEARING - FY2023 CVTA ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET

Mr. Parsons reported that there was a public comment period from April 13 to April 28th. No public comments were received on the matter.

Vice Chair Carroll opened the public hearing and asked that anyone wishing to speak on the matter come forward. As there were no individuals present, in-person or virtually, who indicated they wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

On motion by Levar M. Stoney, the Authority unanimously adopted the FY23 Administrative and Operating Expense Budget (roll call vote; see Appendix A, page 6).

C. PUBLIC HEARING - REGIONAL DRAFT FUNDING SCENARIO –

Mr. Parsons presented this matter. There was a public comment period from April 13 to April 28th. The comments received were compiled and distributed to Authority members (See Appendix B, page 10).

The application process was initiated in the fall of 2021. TAC and the Authority approved a framework for consideration of projects. The I-64 widening project was not recommended for funding, but all others were. The projects span eight of the nine jurisdictions.

Vice Chair Carroll opened the public hearing and asked that anyone wishing to speak on the matter come forward. As there were no individuals present, in-person or virtually, who indicated they wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

John H. Hodges had questions about the criteria being reviewed and changed going forward. Mr. Parsons reported that TAC will be reviewing necessary adjustments. Todd Eure, Chair of TAC, clarified that this will be a yearly process. This allocation is for four years of funding, but some projects will ultimately receive funding from other sources. In those cases, those funds will be reallocated.

There was an in-depth discussion of the I-64 widening project not being recommended for funding. Members shared their concern that traffic conditions in New Kent County have worsened to the point that it is causing safety issues even on nearby secondary roads and the project is critical to address that. Members were concerned that not including the project in the funding scenario now will prevent it from scoring well in Smart Scale. There was further discussion about the likelihood of some funds for the project being included in the state budget but no clarity on the amount.

Senator Jennifer L. McClellan made a motion, seconded by Representative Delores McQuinn, that the Authority direct the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Finance Committee to reexamine the regional funding scenario, seek input from PFM, the financial services advisor, on possible bonding, and bring a recommendation to the Authority that includes some funding for the I-64 widening project. (Motion failed by roll call vote; see Appendix A, page 7).

On motion by Patricia S. O'Bannon, the Authority voted to approve the Regional Funding Scenario as presented. The motion failed on a split vote, taken by roll call. (see Appendix A, page 8).

Ms. O'Bannon left the meeting at 9:49 a.m.

Members discussed amendments to the scenario being allowed and possible ways to have the I-64 widening project receive some funding.

W. Canova Peterson made a motion, seconded by Kevin P. Carroll, that the Authority Direct the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Finance Committee to examine an additional funding scenario and bring it to the Authority for consideration. (Motion failed by roll call vote due to lack of meeting the following rule: "4/5 population in affirmative"; see Appendix A, page 9).

There was further discussion on the matter. Eric Gregory, Legal Counsel, advised that the Finance Committee and TAC could both look at the matter without a vote/direction from the Authority. In order to have the matter reviewed and acted on in the necessary timeframe, the Authority will need to schedule a meeting in May or June.

D. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. CVTA Finance Committee Update

a. Finance Committee membership and Bylaws amendment

Mayor Stoney reported that the proposed amendment did not result from a recommendation by the Finance Committee and should not be on the agenda in this location. There was discussion about the bylaws amendment to add additional members to the Finance Committee and to add the July 1, 2022, addition of Capital Region Airport Commission representative on the Authority.

No action was taken because the "4/5 population in affirmative" rule could not be met.

2. CVTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Update

b. Fall Line Working Group Update (Eure)

Mr. Eure provided an update on the working group and reported that they are meeting next Wednesday and will continue to develop a schedule and spending plan.

3. CVTA Staffing Update

Ms. Paige reported that recruitment was open from March 1st to March 31st and 21 applications were received. They were ranked and split into tiers. The Committee plans to bring a recommendation to the Authority in June. Mr. Spoonhower commended on the outstanding qualities of the applicants.

E. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Proposed FY23 CVTA Meeting Schedule

There was discussion about scheduling a meeting in May or June at which the FY23 schedule could be reviewed and confirmed.

2. GRTC FY23 Regional Public Transportation Plan

No action was taken because the “4/5 population in affirmative” rule could not be met.

3. Member comments

Vice Chair Carroll commented on moving forward and the ability to work with the financial advisor, TAC and FC to have alternate for consideration. He asked that funding be kept in the state budget.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Carroll adjourned the meeting at 10:09 a.m.

Motion as presented: Motion to approve FY23 Administrative and Operating Expense Budget .

First: Levar M. Stoney

Second: Committee recommendation; no second necessary.

Select location of proposed service/facility = N/A

| Members | Population* | Weighted Votes | UNWEIGHTED | | | | Voting Check | Population "Yays" | WEIGHTED | |
|---------------|-------------|----------------|------------|-------|---------|--------|--------------|-------------------|----------|-------|
| | | | "Yay" | "Nay" | Abstain | Absent | | | "Yay" | "Nay" |
| Ashland | 7,873 | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | 7,873 | 1 | 0 |
| Charles City | 6,773 | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | 6,773 | 1 | 0 |
| Chesterfield | 364,548 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 364,548 | 4 | 0 |
| Goochland | 24,727 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 24,727 | 2 | 0 |
| Hanover | 102,106 | 3 | 1 | | | | Ok | 102,106 | 3 | 0 |
| Henrico | 334,389 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 334,389 | 4 | 0 |
| New Kent | 22,945 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 22,945 | 2 | 0 |
| Powhatan | 30,333 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 30,333 | 2 | 0 |
| Richmond | 226,610 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 226,610 | 4 | 0 |
| Delegate | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| Senator | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| CTB Member | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| * Census 2020 | 1,120,304 | 26 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1,120,304 | 26 | 0 |

OVERALL VOTE = PASS

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Voting Check | VALID |
| Quorum Present | YES |
| Weighted Vote Simple Majority | PASS |
| 4/5 Population in Affirmative | PASS |

Motion that the Authority Direct the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Finance Committee to reexamine the regional funding scenario, seek input from PRM, the financial services advisor, on possible bonding, and bring a

Motion as presented: recommendation to the Authority that includes some funding for the I-64 widening project.

First: McClellan

Second: McQuinn

Select location of proposed service/facility = **N/A**

| Members | Population* | Weighted Votes | UNWEIGHTED | | Abstain | Absent | Voting Check | Population "Yays" | WEIGHTED | |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|
| | | | "Yay" | "Nay" | | | | | "Yay" | "Nay" |
| Ashland | 7,873 | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | 7,873 | 1 | 0 |
| Charles City | 6,773 | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | 6,773 | 1 | 0 |
| Chesterfield | 364,548 | 4 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 4 |
| Goochland | 24,727 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 24,727 | 2 | 0 |
| Hanover | 102,106 | 3 | 1 | | | | Ok | 102,106 | 3 | 0 |
| Henrico | 334,389 | 4 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 4 |
| New Kent | 22,945 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 22,945 | 2 | 0 |
| Powhatan | 30,333 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 30,333 | 2 | 0 |
| Richmond | 226,610 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 226,610 | 4 | 0 |
| Delegate | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| Senator | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| CTB Member | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| * Census 2020 | 1,120,304 | 26 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 421,367 | 18 | 8 |

OVERALL VOTE = **FAIL**

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Voting Check | VALID |
| Quorum Present | YES |
| Weighted Vote Simple Majority | PASS |
| 4/5 Population in Affirmative | FAIL |

Motion as presented: Motion to approve the regional funding scenario as presented.

First: O'Bannon

Second: Committee recommendation; no second necessary.

Select location of proposed service/facility = N/A

| Members | Population* | Weighted Votes | UNWEIGHTED | | | | Voting Check | Population "Yays" | WEIGHTED | |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | "Yay" | "Nay" | Abstain | Absent | | | "Yay" | "Nay" |
| Ashland | 7,873 | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 1 |
| Charles City | 6,773 | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 1 |
| Chesterfield | 364,548 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 364,548 | 4 | 0 |
| Goochland | 24,727 | 2 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 2 |
| Hanover | 102,106 | 3 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 3 |
| Henrico | 334,389 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 334,389 | 4 | 0 |
| New Kent | 22,945 | 2 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 2 |
| Powhatan | 30,333 | 2 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 2 |
| Richmond | 226,610 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 226,610 | 4 | 0 |
| Delegate | | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | | 0 | 1 |
| Senator | | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | | 0 | 1 |
| CTB Member | | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | | 0 | 1 |
| * Census 2020 | 1,120,304 | 26 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 925,547 | 12 | 14 |

OVERALL VOTE = FAIL

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Voting Check | VALID |
| Quorum Present | YES |
| Weighted Vote Simple Majority | FAIL |
| 4/5 Population in Affirmative | PASS |

Motion as presented: Motion to approve the regional funding scenario as presented.
 First: O'Bannon
 Second: Committee recommendation; no second necessary.

Select location of proposed service/facility = N/A

| Members | Population* | Weighted Votes | UNWEIGHTED | | | | Voting Check | Population "Yays" | WEIGHTED | |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | "Yay" | "Nay" | Abstain | Absent | | | "Yay" | "Nay" |
| Ashland | 7,873 | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 1 |
| Charles City | 6,773 | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 1 |
| Chesterfield | 364,548 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 364,548 | 4 | 0 |
| Goochland | 24,727 | 2 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 2 |
| Hanover | 102,106 | 3 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 3 |
| Henrico | 334,389 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 334,389 | 4 | 0 |
| New Kent | 22,945 | 2 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 2 |
| Powhatan | 30,333 | 2 | | 1 | | | Ok | - | 0 | 2 |
| Richmond | 226,610 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 226,610 | 4 | 0 |
| Delegate | | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | | 0 | 1 |
| Senator | | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | | 0 | 1 |
| CTB Member | | 1 | | 1 | | | Ok | | 0 | 1 |
| * Census 2020 | 1,120,304 | 26 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 925,547 | 12 | 14 |

A "Valid" vote requires all 12 members to have their vote marked "Yay", "Nay", "Abstain" or marked "Absent".

OVERALL VOTE = PASS

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Voting Check | VALID |
| Quorum Present | YES |
| 4/5 Population in Affirmative | PASS |

Quorum:

A majority of the voting members of the Authority (or designees) shall constitute a quorum. There are 12 voting members, therefore at least 7 members must be present to constitute a quorum

Quorum Present YES

Rule:

Decisions of the Authority shall require an affirmative vote of those present and voting whose votes represent at least four-fifths of the population embraced by the Authority; however, no motion to fund a specific facility or service shall fail because of this population criterion if such facility or service is not located or to be located or provided or to be provided within the county or city whose chief elected officer's or elected official's, or its respective designee's, sole negative vote caused the facility or service to fail to meet the population criterion

- A. Four-fifths of the pop. embraced by the Authority = 896,243
- B. Pop. of voting members (cities & counties) present & voting in the affirmative = 925,547

If B. is less than A., vote FAILS.

896,243
925,547 ← PASS

If B. is greater than or equal than A., motion PASSES.
 If B. is less than A., motion FAILS.

**If pop. criteria is not met, check to see if exception described in the rule applies

Motion as presented: Motion that the Authority Direct the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Finance Committee to examine an additional scenario and bring it to the Authority for consideration.
First: Peterson
Second: Carroll

Select location of proposed service/facility = **N/A**

| Members | Population* | Weighted Votes | UNWEIGHTED | | | | Voting Check | Population "Yays" | WEIGHTED | |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|
| | | | "Yay" | "Nay" | Abstain | Absent | | | "Yay" | "Nay" |
| Ashland | 7,873 | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | 7,873 | 1 | 0 |
| Charles City | 6,773 | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | 6,773 | 1 | 0 |
| Chesterfield | 364,548 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 364,548 | 4 | 0 |
| Goochland | 24,727 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 24,727 | 2 | 0 |
| Hanover | 102,106 | 3 | 1 | | | | Ok | 102,106 | 3 | 0 |
| Henrico | 334,389 | 4 | | | | 1 | Ok | - | 0 | 0 |
| New Kent | 22,945 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 22,945 | 2 | 0 |
| Powhatan | 30,333 | 2 | 1 | | | | Ok | 30,333 | 2 | 0 |
| Richmond | 226,610 | 4 | 1 | | | | Ok | 226,610 | 4 | 0 |
| Delegate | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| Senator | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| CTB Member | | 1 | 1 | | | | Ok | | 1 | 0 |
| * Census 2020 | 1,120,304 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 785,915 | 22 | 0 |

OVERALL VOTE = **FAIL**

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Voting Check | VALID |
| Quorum Present | YES |
| Weighted Vote Simple Majority | PASS |
| 4/5 Population in Affirmative | FAIL |

Public Comment Received

FY 2023-2026 Regional Funding Scenario

| | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Nick Johnson | Date: | 4/16/22 |
| <p>Please find all the bike/pedestrian projects.</p> <p>Also, please put a sidewalk on every street in Richmond.</p> <p>Also, please add crosswalks on Laburnum Ave so my kids can more safely navigate our neighborhood.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | John David Krug | Date: | 4/16/22 |
| <p>Why isn't this in the Top 5? I see nepotism for the city of Richmond. City of Richmond-no police protection & among the worst public schools in the United States of America.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Joe Whiteman | Date: | 4/16/22 |
| <p>Repairing our bridges, roads, and pedestrian thoroughfares is great and all, but it's really just putting a band-aid on the real underlying problems!</p> <p>We need to build new commuter rail systems and help save our future and move people around more efficiently. Light rail, trams, trains, you name it. New roads are not the way forward.</p> <p>Driving sucks because most people aren't very good at it. De-stress everyones lives (yes, even you, politicians) and start creating excellent modern rail systems!</p> <p>Don't waste time pretending you can't. Think about "what if we did?" and all of the jobs creating new and BETTER infrastructure could generate.</p> <p>Do the right thing. Patch up that which is crumbling, and create new, better options for transportation for Virginians.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|-------|--------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Joseph Mensh | Date: | 4/16/22 |
|-------|--------------|-------|---------|

My advice for specific projects:

1 Connect and expand cannon creek Greenway, up the Richmond-Henrico turnpike, to meadowbridge road into Hanover/Mechanicsville. A separate bicycle lane should have plenty of space to exist next to route 627 through the chickahominy River swamp. Sidenote, but I don't know who allowed Amazon to build the abomination of a concrete fortress right off the side of the road there, that was probably one of the worst decisions anyone working in government offices could have allowed.

2 connect cannon creek Greenway to downtown Richmond through Gilpin Court or via 5th street. Gilpin should see redevelopment and it would be amazing to have actually good bike lanes included in redevelopment for once. Make the building density high and keep roads small. Protect the bikelane on Oliver Hill way and 17th street all the way to the VA capital trail. Being able to bike to the city from outlying suburbs helps decrease car traffic and promotes good cardiac and physical health, not to mention tremendous recreation accessible by bike to many residents who live in the city and county, without the need to drive to the capital trail which requires a car and parking.

3 connect the mixed use hiking/biking buttermilk trail of the James River park system to the pony pasture trail which connects to Huguenot flatwater. I understand wealthy people absolutely need 10 different choices to tee off in the city. Willow oaks needs to 1.) create a better riparian buffer along it's waterfront with the James River and 2.) allow public access via a hiking path for the good of the city and its inhabitants. The JRPS is currently the largest attraction of recreation in Richmond. We should treat it as the crown jewel with support and plans for its beautification and conservation well into the future, not pander to watered, fertilized, non biodiverse glorified lawn grass next to a protected waterway. Other cities in America have absolutely amazing recreational trails along their rivers (c-o canal walk along the potomac). If willow oaks is [unwilling] to play ball, chart and plan a trail around their land parcel. It's one of the worst uses of land anyone could imagine.

More generic comments on how we should be spending funding for transportation-

Safety is a large concern for all cyclists. More people will bike if we build protection for them. Cars get heavier and heavier every year(an awful trend by the way) causing higher property damage and more injuries and casualties as their kinetic energy continues to increase, and drivers attention toward the road decreases (regardless of driver safety aids).

We should build bicycle highways, paths, protected lanes, throughout the city and surrounding counties of Richmond. Make conscious decisions and plans to connect and design new paths to match current paths, that are very beautiful rides through Richmond. The capital trail, and the cannon creek Greenway are both very nice examples of bike paths that should exist throughout Richmond. Many of these bike path plans don't bode well for current or [non existent] city and county density planning. Current zoning laws make an average bicycle trip up to five times longer in Richmond as it would in a city with good bicycle infrastructure. VA DOT and Richmond, surrounding counties, must work together in revising zoning laws to benefit people, not

automobiles. Single family homes and suburban sprawl is how we end up like Atlanta, which has some of the worst traffic, worst public transportation system, and the absolute worst planning and density I've come across.

We should absolutely discontinue automotive lane additions or widening, full stop. Car and automotive related infrastructure is damaging the planet, environment, and even our own populace, with varying and increasing forms of pollution. Richmond doesn't have emissions testing, I personally witness many vehicles with exhaust leaks, poor operating conditions, modified exhaust systems, removed emissions equipment, all of which contribute to the development of, or severity of respiratory illnesses in people and children in the area. Exhaust and road noise from tire friction alone contribute to an inane amount of stress induced to people. There are multiple studies and research correlating noise with stress levels. Some of the roads in and around Richmond are treated like the straightaway at various NASCAR tracks, people exceed the speed limit, use turning lanes to pass, encroach into paint divided bike lanes, etc. Unprotected bike lanes (solid painted lines with or without plastic floppy pylons) is kinda like a swimming in a pool lane next to sharks. The painted lines don't keep cars from encroaching on cyclist space just like a pool lane rope doesn't prevent sharks from swimming in your lane. The end goal here isn't to just make more bike lanes, it's also to make car travel less attractive because it is so dangerous and encroaching on the daily lives of people.

Tire dust, oil, other fluids from automobiles end up in water and riverways, poisoning wildlife, tainting land, and lower the James River water quality enough to be unfit for recreation. If the James River was deemed too toxic to swim in, Richmond would lose a ton of visitors every day during the summer.

Also whomever keeps trying to get a casino voted into the city AFTER PREVIOUS VOTES HAVE ALREADY FAILED should be tarred and feathered.

| | | | |
|---|---------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Conner Kasten | Date: | 4/17/22 |
| Please prioritize bike transit and pedestrian projects wherever possible over car-centric options. Moving trips to non-car modes is a critical piece of climate strategy, and necessary for the future of our region. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Daniel Robinson | Date: | 4/16/22 |
| It would be great if Richmond could implement a light rail transit train connecting the airport with downtown Richmond and the Staple Mills Amtrak train station. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Matthew Via | Date: | 4/17/22 |
| <p>I am a resident of the Forest Hill Neighborhood and I strongly support the Forest Hill Avenue Phase II project. I frequently bicycle from my home in Forest Hill to the shopping district in Stratford Hills and the section of Forest Hill Avenue between Dorchester Road and the Powhite Parkway is currently extremely hostile to cyclists. The current speed limit on the road is currently 35 miles per hour which makes the road extremely uncomfortable to ride on, and due to the lack of parallel roads, the only feasible way to avoid this section is to take a lengthy and hilly detour down Riverside Drive.</p> <p>This route, while scenic, is not optimal for someone that is riding to reduce their reliance on personal automobile use.</p> <p>The need for the proposed bicycle infrastructure on this segment of Forest Hill Avenue is critical, because under the current built environment only the most confident cyclists would attempt to ride on this segment of road. If this project were built as proposed, it would make it much more feasible for residents of the Forest Hill, Forest Hill Terrace, Cedarhurst and Westlake Heights Neighborhoods to replace short car trips with more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Basile Nkeng | Date: | 4/17/22 |
| <p>I am a resident of Richmond VA, and I am writing in support of the Forest Hill Ave Phase II Project. This project would create a nearly continuous bike path from Manchester to Stratford Hills. This five-mile stretch would allow residents in this area to access a wide range of amenities such as grocery stores, restaurants, parks, health services and many more. Investing in the infrastructure that allows citizens to replace short car trips with other forms of transportation such as biking and walking has substantial benefits to the community ranging from reduced wear on city infrastructure, better air quality, to increasing the health of the community.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Heidi Robertson | Date: | 4/17/22 |
| <p>I would love to see Richmond fix it's brick sidewalks, and start a pedestrian safety campaign to promote residents to use the sidewalks, or walk opposing traffic if there is no sidewalk.</p> <p>I would also like Richmond to start a campaign to stop the littering of our city. We need more trash cans in public spaces, punish those who litter, and educate the children in schools what they can do to help the environment.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Jerome Gilbert | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| <p>I am in full support of the \$276.4 million for infrastructure. I am particularly pleased with the funds to support the Fall Line Trail. These projects will advance Richmond as a progressive city with a commitment to the needs of its citizens.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------|---------|
| From: | Alan T. Shaia, VA License Broker, Charter Realty, L.C. | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| <p>Please explain to me why under your "CVTA Regional Funding Scenario - Summary" report on pages 1 and 2 you do not list or show the I-64 Widening, Exit 205 to New Kent/James City County Line? This is a very important project because of the increased reliance on the port and transportation of goods from the port throughout the east coast. While all the states are racing ahead to complete the development of the Interstate to accommodate this increased traffic, we are lagging behind. Thus the Port traffic and economic benefits that would have been achieved will go to other states.</p> <p>This is why I think your Benefit number must take into consideration the economic benefits achieved by each project.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Jerry Andrews Maers | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| <p>Please fund all the bike & pedestrian projects. We have had lifetimes of funding for car projects, but very little for bike & pedestrian projects. I use my bike more then my car, yet due to poor road design, I'm forced to deal with crazed car drivers who routinely pass illegally close, or fall into road rage over the fact that someone on a bicycle is using to road too.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | John Martin Owens | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| <p>I would question the prioritization of the Magellan Bridge and GreenCity bike/pedestrian bridge over the Staples Mill improvements that are only partially funded. I understand wanting to support these new developments (GreenCity and Retreat@One), however, I feel the need is much greater for the Staples Mill improvements. The I-64:ramp to Staples Mill road is dangerous. The development of Libbie Mill and Westwood zone is much further along than those other two, planned to be fully funded projects, and the need is greatest at Staples Mill and I-64.</p> <p>I'm not opposed to eventually doing the Magellan and GreenCity projects.</p> <p>Now, if other funding from other sources can be used to complete the Staples Mill work expediently, then I can support it.</p> <p>Thank you</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Dave J. Brogan | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| Lower the gas tax. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Ray Roakes | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| <p>Hello, thank you for all the work on everything. I strongly support all bike and pedestrian improvements - especially any that further the goals of vision zero. Biking throughout the metro area is especially dangerous, I know from first hand experiance. I would encourage future projects to create a more interconnected protected bike lane system as well as expand the reach for bikeshare. Further, any pedestrian improvements along Hull Street and Hull Street Road would be especially powerful as many communities along that route are historically marginalized and underinvested, more likely to depend on walking for transport, and I have numerous personal experiences where residents are forced to walk directly on the street because there are no sidewalks. This creates an especially dangerous situation along Hull Street Road as vehicles are prone to higher speeds. It is needless to say, as well, that I would support any transfer of funding from projects designed to increase vehicle usage or increased vehicle speed/ease of conveyance transferred to bike and pedestrian centered projects. Thanks, Ray.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|-------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Andy Clarke | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| <p>I have reviewed the CVTA Regional Funding Scenario Summary. I am a resident of Henrico County and live in the Libbie Mill area.</p> <p>I fully support the four projects identified as Bike/Ped Projects, as well as the G Broad Street Streetscape with Pulse Expansion Phase III. These offer significant opportunities to encourage and facilitate transportation alternatives by providing safer, better connected, higher-quality facilities for people on foot, bike, and transit.</p> <p>I understand the need to replace the Mayo Bridge and support maintenance of existing infrastructure. I would be even more supportive if the opportunity were taken to increase opportunities to safely walk, bike, and take transit over the new bridge.</p> <p>There is insufficient information on the detail of the B Forest Hill Avenue Phase II project. I support the changes that are proposed/described but I am unclear what changes are being made to the travel lanes for motor vehicles and would not support increases in capacity for motor vehicles on this road.</p> <p>I appreciate that there are pedestrian and bicycle changes proposed that would add sidewalks, crosswalks and some bicycle infrastructure in the remaining projects identified as Highway projects. However, as all of these projects are basically designed to add or increase capacity and/or speed for motor vehicles I cannot support their funding -- the cost of adding more and more traffic outweighs the changes made for walking and biking at individual locations and overall.</p> | | | |

I am shocked and disappointed that the Funding Scenario contains so many new highways, highway capacity increases, and other projects designed to increase motor vehicle traffic -- this flies in the face of the reality of the climate crisis and directly contradicts the explicit goals of Connect 2045 and the stated preferences of people who participated in that planning process. It is particularly disappointing to see a total absence of projects that address inequity and inaccessibility in our transportation system -- instead, the overwhelming majority of the funding continues to support suburban and exurban car-commuting for the predominantly wealthy white suburbs.

I do not see any details about the proposed Diverging Diamond Intersection proposed for I-64 and Ashland Road -- I know that these are appalling intersections for walking and biking and are little more than resume-builders for traffic engineers with no regard for the community, health, safety, accessibility, air quality, sustainability or any other sensible growth policy. I also do not see any additional detail on the proposed changes to the intersection of W Broad Street and Parham Road.

As far as I can tell, every highway project other than Forest Ave and Broad Street/Pulse ones mentioned above add capacity in the vain hope of relieving a few minutes of actual or perceived congestion that at worst is moderate for a short time. The resulting projects create known dangers for people walking and biking, making the system and community more hostile and unpleasant (for example, continuous right turn lanes) 24/7, 35 days a year.

Is the Broad Street Streetscape project the only one that serves transit, in the entire metro region? I don't know what to say except there has to be greater investment in transit than this in the region.

Finally I object most strongly to any funding for the proposed changes to the Staples Mill-I-64 interchange -- they are not improvements at all. There is absolutely no need for the proposed changes to add through-and turn lanes as proposed and this project creates even more hostile, noisy, polluting conditions at an area that is currently being transformed into an area of growth where people are going to be walking, biking and taking transit in greater numbers. This project is a complete waste of money and should be stopped immediately. As a reminder, Connect 2045 has safety, equity, connectivity, sustainability, and other worthy goals at its core -- please tell me how widening a huge intersection, adding dual left and TRIPLE right turn lanes, and widening all surrounding roads achieves any of these goals? If capacity is an issue, why are you proposing to add a signalized intersection? I walk, bike, and drive through this intersection practically every day (and take the bus to Amtrak on occasion) and I see no evidence of any problems that warrant this level of community destruction and unnecessary spending.

Indeed, the issues at Bethlehem and I-64 I see are that traffic is traveling way too fast and weaving across too many lanes of traffic already without adding more to the mix. There have been pedestrian fatalities and crashes here that would not be prevented by these changes. Future development is only going to increase the number of people walking and biking here and the proposed changes are totally incompatible with that future. I would much rather see a project to reduce the number of lanes on Staples Mill

south of the intersection to two in each direction with the addition of wide sidewalks, protected bike lanes, a slower speed limit, and more signalized crosswalks.

So, to recap. I support inclusion of the following projects:

FY23-32
 FY23-33
 FY23-21
 FY23-35
 FY23-34

I have qualified support for the following projects:

FY23-31
 FY23-37
 FY23-36

I am generally opposed to all the other proposed projects and take particular exception to the following projects:

FY23-14
 FY23-25

Thanks for your attention.

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Flora Valdes-Dapena | Date: | 4/18/22 |
|-------|---------------------|-------|---------|

I'm a resident of the City of Richmond. Highway widening projects (US-360, US-1, etc) are a waste of time and money. Studies have repeatedly shown that adding traffic lanes creates induced demand, increasing congestion and air pollution from personal vehicles. Emissions from transportation are one of the biggest contributors to climate change, and widening highways guarantees that those emissions will continue unabated. Redirect funding from these highway projects into improvements to bike and pedestrian infrastructure to make active transportation easier, safer, and more attractive than driving.

Please also consider increasing funding for GRTC. Currently many of GRTC's routes are running at extremely low frequencies, making it an unreliable mode of transportation for many who have no other options. Increased funding for operations would allow GRTC to hire more operators and mechanics, increasing frequency and reliability by adding more buses to high-demand routes and keeping them in service consistently. I'm aware that funding for GRTC is not a part of the Draft Funding Scenario, however it is too important to leave out of my comments.

Thank you.

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Jonathan Wright | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| <p>I am excited to see CVTA commit some funding for active transportation projects, but the disparity in funding between highway projects and pedestrian-oriented projects is disappointing. I do appreciate continued funding towards the Fall Line trail mentioned in several of the project descriptions. I would like to see CVTA provide higher scores for projects that provide safer infrastructure for individuals not using cars for transportation, especially raising bike lanes to curb level. Forcing cyclists or cars to "share the road" is a recipe for disaster and narrow bike infrastructure doesn't really provide any better feeling of safety than a sharrow marking. Providing physically separate and parallel infrastructure is the way to maximize the current road network for new uses and users.</p> <p>If there is any additional documentation available for the project titled, "B Forest Hill Avenue Phase II," I would love to see it. Thank you!</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Carl Schwendeman | Date: | 4/18/22 |
| <p>Could they add extending the Powhatan Village Sidewalks to the Central Virginia Transportation Authority master plan. Such as could they extend the Powhatan Village sidewalks from the intersection of General Scot Boulevard and Old Buckingham Road a 1,000 feet to the intersection of Old Buckingham Road and Fighting Creek Lane. They also need to fund the 900 foot long Skaggs Road Spur sidewalk and extend the Mann Road Sidewalk by 1,500 feet.</p> <p>Also could they extend the Powhatan Village Sidewalks from the intersection of Mann Road and Old Buckingham Road to the intersection of US Route 60 and US Route 522 by the post office.</p> <p>And extend the Powhatan Village Sidewalks from the intersection of General Scot Boulevard and Old Buckingham Road to the intersection of US Route 60 and Academy Road.</p> <p>They need to get moving on building new sidewalks along US Route 60 from the intersection of the Woolridge Road and Route 60 to the Richmond City limits that whole section of Route 60 is a pedestrian dumpster fire.</p> <p>Huguenot Road needs new sidewalks from the James River Bridge to the intersection of Midlothian turnpike and Huguenot Road.</p> <p>Thank you Carl</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Shawn Scott | Date: | 4/19/22 |
| <p>I support funding for the fall line trail in the tune of as much \$\$\$ as possible My vote goes to this as an avid runner walker an cyclist we need more Outdoors to escape to Yours truly va resident</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Katelyn Scott | Date: | 4/19/22 |
| <p>I vote for fall line trail</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Karl Zweerink | Date: | 4/19/22 |
| <p>Thanks for supporting improved bike access of James River from Manchester Semmes Ave area. I am a bike commuter and feel opening up the T Pott bridge will improve pedestrian and bike access. Mayo Bridge - please consider bike lanes. Bridge is not safe for cyclists and pedestrians and is an important link between Capitol Bike Trail and the new proposed Fall Line Bike Trail</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Michael Keegan | Date: | 4/19/22 |
| <p>Please fund all the bicycle and pedestrian projects first.</p> <p>While I understand the need to maintain existing roads, please do not fund any new roads or highways. Due to global warming caused by fossil fuels, we need to discourage the use of roads until we eliminate the use of fossil fuels. Even worse is that creating new roads causes more heating of the earth as roads store heat and replace land that would otherwise absorb some heat.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Jack-Henry Bush | Date: | 4/20/22 |
| <p>Hi CVTA,</p> <p>I am writing to support the proposed Forest Hill Ave Phase II Project. I wanted to say that I wish for the project to focus on improving pedestrian and cyclist viability rather than prioritizing vehicle transportation. Access to the Eastbound Route of the 2A bus, which travels along Forest Hill Ave from Stony Point Medical Center to Downtown Richmond is currently extremely difficult for cyclists and pedestrians. There are four eastbound bus stops in the proposed project area and each of the bus stops have a safety issue.</p> <p>Four of the stops have no sidewalk access and do not have direct access via crosswalk. This has created a situation where not only is walking to the bus a danger but waiting for the bus is a hazard as well. Even at the low current posted speed limit, a collision between a pedestrian and a vehicle would be crippling if not outright fatal. Completion of the Forest Hill Ave Phase II Project would improve the quality of the travel for all kinds of travelers and also mitigate a long-standing traffic risk. On top of having the added benefits, this project will protect the lives of cyclists and pedestrians alike.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Bill & Linda Dismore | Date: | 4/21/22 |
| <p>To the Central Virginia Transportation Authority,</p> <p>My wife and I are homeowners who reside in New Kent County, VA, about one mile from exit 211 off I-64. As a result we frequently utilize the Interstate.</p> <p>We are strongly in favor of allocating the necessary funding to widen the stretch of I-64 within the CVTA district to complete the overall I-64 widening project between the Hampton Roads and Richmond areas. The section of I-64 that runs through New Kent County is the only remaining stretch that is still 2-lanes in each direction.</p> <p>In its current state I-64 between exits 205 and 227 represents a “bottleneck” that often becomes highly congested during peak periods. When this occurs, it produces overflow congestion on our local roads creating not only inconvenience but safety concerns as well. It also serves as a vital connector between coastal Virginia and the rest of the state which is particularly important for continued economic growth as well as emergency/disaster evacuation and relief efforts necessitated by natural disasters such as hurricanes. With the increasing usage of Virginia ports and the resulting truck traffic the congestion will only worsen in the coming days and weeks.</p> <p>Thank you for giving consideration to our comments. We are available at the phone and address provided below.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|----------|-------|---------|
| From: | Tom Ryan | Date: | 4/21/22 |
| Complete the job, I-64 at least three lanes from Richmond to the sea ASAP. I can't see how the traffic numbers won't support this. | | | |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Shirley Perrin | Date: | 4/22/22 |
| <p>Good Morning,</p> <p>As a resident in New Kent, Va. I'm asking that you support any effort to prioritize the I-64 road widening between the Hanover/Henrico/New Kent Corridor to James City County. We are so excited with the commercial and residential growth in New Kent but the interstate situation is getting more dangerous due to the lack of additional travel lanes..</p> <p>Please call me if you have any questions.</p> <p>Respectfully, Shirley Perrin</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Gloria Hanchey | Date: | 4/22/22 |
| <p>Please accept this as my request to have the following interstate situation be put on a "high" level of funding:</p> <p>I-64 between exits 205 and 227 represents a New Kent County "bottleneck" that often becomes highly congested during peak periods. When this occurs, it produces overflow congestion on New Kent's local roads creating not only inconvenience but potential safety concerns as well. It also serves as a vital connector between coastal Virginia and the rest of the state which is particularly important for continued economic growth as well as emergency/disaster evacuation and relief efforts necessitated by natural disasters such as hurricanes.</p> <p>Respectfully, Gloria Hanchey</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|-------|--------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | C. Samuel McDonald | Date: | 4/25/22 |
|-------|--------------------|-------|---------|

I disagree with the City's decision to replace the Mayo bridges (Mayo). I believe that the stated basis of deteriorating condition comes mainly from the City traffic engineers' projections of a significant increase in traffic over Mayo in years to come.

I think this major assumption (*which has been used as the basis for making such an important decision*) is the opposite of what should be done and therefore is the wrong approach. Traffic should not be the tail wagging the important dog in this situation. As a City, we should be planning to significantly decrease Mayo traffic, eliminate the current stress on the structure, and rehabilitate the historic character and welcoming aspects that are Mayo at a significant savings when compared with the increasing cost of replacement.

Here's why:

1. Manchester will soon be at a critical stage in its development. All of the young and fragile businesses, sticking their necks out in a less established neighborhood than Scott's Addition, need customers and cannot weather the two year shut-down for a complete bridge replacement.
2. The neighborhood is increasingly pedestrian dependent. Encouraging increased traffic down Hull divides and threatens a newly thriving neighborhood even with the planned Hull Street Streetscape scheduled for 2025. The already heavy and increasing commuter speeding traffic from the merge of 60 and 360 onto Hull Street as a feeder into downtown endangers pedestrians and creates a very unfriendly and unwelcoming environment at the entrance of and center piece for our rapidly growing neighborhood.
3. One lane of the Mayo Bridge should be closed to traffic and converted to pedestrian, bicycle, and fishing use. Out of all the bridges, the Mayo bridge is closest to the surface of the James River, our tourists' and residents' jewel. Creating a pedestrian/bike lane completes the James River Park system loop.

Here's how:

1. Prohibit heavy truck traffic across Mayo Bridge. Trucks can use I-95, the Lee Bridge, and the Manchester Bridge to cross from Manchester into downtown. All are wide, sturdy, and built for more traffic than they currently serve. Trucks and pedestrians don't mix. The other 3 bridges keep trucks away from heavy pedestrian traffic, while the Mayo Bridge does not.
2. Coming into the City, allow left turns from Hull onto Cowardin and Commerce so that traffic can use the bigger bridges going into downtown. City Traffic Engineering says they would have to expand the lanes for turning, but there are no expanded or separate lanes for the current left turn traffic leaving town at those intersections. Currently, from 22nd Street to Commerce, which is a 12-block stretch, there are only 3 places traffic can turn left to get cars to those big bridges. Those are at 21st, 11th, and 9th, all of which put you into the thick of neighborhoods, and not on the path to a bridge crossing.

3. Push up the implementation of the Hull Street Streetscape improvement plan to increase pedestrian safety in the growing neighborhood. Use some of the bridge replacement funds already in hand to finance this project earlier than is currently planned for 2025. The current plan tries to keep pedestrians safe in a heavier traffic scenario when it could ensure safety in a true, undivided neighborhood environment with less traffic obstacles. Greatly increasing the traffic expectation with additional pedestrian crossing measures is a recipe for disaster.

Sincerely,
C. Samuel McDonald

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Justin Palanchi | Date: | 4/25/22 |
| <p>I just wanted to give my support for the widening of I 64 from 2 lanes to 3 lanes from the 205 MM to the 233 MM. I am a State Trooper, and worked the widening projects in Williamsburg and Newport News over the last few years. I can say first hand how much the 3rd lane greatly improved traffic slow and reduced the amount of crashes on that stretch of the Interstate. To only have 2 lanes in between Williamsburg and New Kent, with 3 lanes on each end, creates so much extra traffic and so many extra crashes, especially during peak rush hours and holidays.</p> <p>Please prioritize the funding for the widening of I 64 from the 205 mm to the 233 mm from 2 lanes to 3 lanes.</p> <p>Thanks for your time Justin Palanchi</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Michael Grabow | Date: | 4/25/22 |
| <p>The Secretary General of the UN said 4/23/22 that the main carbon emitters must drastically cut emissions starting this year (36 weeks left) to avert climate catastrophe. Over 100 people are killed by drivers every single day in the US with *many* more seriously injured. We absolutely must get away from privately owned automobiles as much as possible and dramatically improving public and active transportation will play a critical role in that. Put this money into public and active transportation.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Steve Gude | Date: | 4/25/22 |
| <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>Please consider moving the "I-64 Widening, Exit 205 to New Kent/James City County Line" Project up on the priority list.</p> <p>It is a tremendous bottleneck and impatient drivers make it very dangerous as they weave in and out of traffic. I drive this stretch of interstate daily, and have been passed several times on the emergency shoulder by drivers. I have received a chipped windshield from the deterioration of the road.</p> <p>Plus the number of vehicle accidents and traffic fatalities among this stretch of road is sad.</p> <p>Please expand the road.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Steve G.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Jason Walters | Date: | 4/25/22 |
| <p>I did not see investments/projects in New Kent County. Are there future plans to expand safe multiuse trails to connect New Kent to the Capital Trail?</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Elle De La Cancela | Date: | 4/25/22 |
| <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>On behalf of the Chesapeake Climate Action Network and our members in the Richmond and Central Virginia region, I offer the following feedback on the draft documents.</p> <p>Alternative modes of travel have become a flagship for the federal administration, namely bike/ped infrastructure and public transportation, and the majority of our resources should be dedicated to these carbon-mitigating and safer alternatives to transportation in a personal vehicle. We support the proposed changes to increase bike/ped infrastructure, the proposals for installing medians as a safety measure, the proposed plans for Brook Road Streetscape for pedestrian accessibility and the Broad Street Streetscape of the Pulse system. CCAN takes issue with the construction of new roads and lanes, even if they are to include the needed amenities, and highway widening projects. Widening projects do not relieve any congestion, as evidenced by this Transportation for America study and overall incentivize a way of life that we must transition away from if we are to continue to sustain the planet and ourselves.</p> | | | |

The total investment in car supportive infrastructure to bike/ped is over \$230M to around \$27M for the next 3 years. Highways are receiving almost 10x the amount of funding with 5x as many highway projects to bike/ped. CCAN encourages the CVTA to reconsider the priorities that would benefit the highest number of people in the commonwealth with a focus on equity, and not just serving those in wealthier suburbs. This would mean greater investment in public transit operating dollars and capital improvements in sidewalks and bike lanes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Elle De La Cancela

| | | | |
|-------|------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Christian Schick | Date: | 4/25/22 |
|-------|------------------|-------|---------|

I support all of the Bike/Ped projects on the project list but I really like the improvements under the C Commerce Road - FLT Phase I project. Last year, my wife and I lived in Manchester and often went into the city. While I am a confident cyclist and would bike on any road that I'm allowed to, my wife was not comfortable using the Manchester Bridge cycling lane because of how it connected to Commerce Rd. Very understandable. On Cowardin, there's a similar setup and I had a bad experience with road rage driver honking and making threatening gestures because I briefly took up space in the right lane from Cowardin + Semmes to the Robert E. Lee Bridge bike lane. If the Commerce Rd project had been completed a few years but, there would have been many trips that we could have ridden our bike for instead of driving. In particular, a once weekly trip at around 6:30p every Thursday. So I can testify that projects like this can make an impact on relieving congestion during peak traffic times.

| | | | |
|-------|-----------|-------|---------|
| From: | Evan Moog | Date: | 4/26/22 |
|-------|-----------|-------|---------|

The 2023-2026 regional revenue draft funding scenario is entirely too highway focused. Of the \$765 million project funding requests, 89% of them are for highway improvements, whereas only about 4% are for bike/pedestrian projects. To truly be focused on how the region can plan better for the future much more should be considered for bike/pedestrian funding. I also don't see any mention of railway improvement or train infrastructure improvement in any of these proposals. As a transportation planning authority, one would think that trains would be a part of the solution of the future, instead of just adding new exits and more lanes to highways. Induced demand and continued pollution into the environment don't seem like they were a part of any of this "planning".

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Michael Palmen | Date: | 4/26/22 |
| <p>Concerning the potential widening of I-64 east of exit 205:</p> <p>As a ten year resident of New Kent County I have had an opportunity to witness the explosion of traffic where I-64 bottlenecks just east of exit 205. Our county has become one of the fastest growing counties in Virginia, and with the arrival of our new Advance Auto facility just off of exit 211, the congestion will only continue to become an issue. Particularly concerning times are Fridays heading east (toward VA Beach), and Sunday evenings heading west (during beach traffic returning home time.)</p> <p>I have witnessed ambulances and fire trucks backing up on the interstate leaving our exit 211 fire station, frustrated vehicles driving the shoulder to escape an hour long stand still, and an abundance of traffic leaving the interstate at both exit 211 and 214, creating a very dangerous level of traffic through our residential areas.</p> <p>Please consider the widening of this stretch of I-64, as it necessary now, and will only become increasingly necessary in the short years to come.</p> <p>Thank You!</p> <p>Michael Palmen</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--------------|-------|---------|
| From: | David McCray | Date: | 4/26/22 |
| <p>Repave Mill road between Route 5 and Varina Road.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Barbara Ferrara | Date: | 4/26/22 |
| <p>In Ettrick (South Chesterfield) Please consider extending the bus line on River Road just 1/2 mile further to the Ettrick-Matoaca Library. The library serves many diverse and marginalized residents of the region.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Bob Patton | Date: | 4/27/22 |
| <p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>This is NOT the time to raise taxes of any type particularly the gas tax.</p> <p>I stand solidly against this proposal.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Bob Patton</p> <p>New Kent County resident</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Beth Wood Whitley | Date: | 4/27/22 |
| <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing to share my thoughts and concerns on the funding for the widening of I 64 from exit 205 to James City County line. I have been reading material on this issue and have heard from local businesses that this project rates very low on the project list. I am concerned that with the # of vehicles that travel this section and with two truck stops at my exit 211, we will have a bottle neck sooner rather than later. We experience many delays in traveling on I 64 East bound after mile post 205 due to the narrowing of I 64. Since New Kent County is the 2nd fastest growing county in the state (behind Loudoun), we need to ensure that this project (FY23.29) is a top priority in order to keep up with the population growth.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Cheryl Myers Johnson | Date: | 4/27/22 |
| <p>Please consider low cost train fare to Washington DC from Richmond. It is a win/win for all. Less cars on 95 and less air pollution.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Sarah Weisiger | Date: | 4/27/22 |
| <p>CVTA is missing an opportunity to create the transportation system of the future that won't require the region's residents to own and operate a private motor vehicle to get around. [The price of the average new vehicle is \$47,000 and used is \$28,000 (Kelley Blue Book, 1/22/22).] Why not use CVTA funds to improve mobility for all?</p> <p>The regional highway projects which appear to be good models include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Hull Street Phase II B Forest Hill Ave Phase II C Broad Street Streetscape (250) with Pulse Expansion Phase III <p>Projects that don't improve regional mobility and do not promote equity - example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1)Woolridge Road (Route288 – Old Hundred Road) Extension 2)Anything that doesn't explicitly allow for well-designed bicycle and pedestrian accommodations including safe crossings | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Mike LaBelle | Date: | 4/28/22 |
| <p>I am totally against any additional funds being used for Pulse, I am up and down broad street just about every day and rarely see more than a handful of riders on any pulse bus, this has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars already and the disrupted traffic from the dedicated pulse lanes on Broad street . Seems like another Richmond, Va. Boondoggle.</p> <p>I also do not see the benefit of all this money being proposed for bike trails, bike lanes in the city, I just do not see that many people using them to see the benefit of the massive costs associated with their construction.</p> <p>I am totally against any additional funds being used for Pulse, I am up and down broad street just about every day and rarely see more than a handful of riders on any pulse bus, this has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars already and the disrupted traffic from the dedicated pulse lanes on Broad street . Seems like another Richmond, Va. Boondoggle.</p> <p>I also do not see the benefit of all this money being proposed for bike trails, bike lanes in the city, I just do not see that many people using them to see the benefit of the massive costs associated with their construction.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Robert Sullivan | Date: | 4/27/22 |
| <p>There are far too many road widening projects and not enough bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure. We cannot keep building more roads and underfunding transportation modes that can encourage reduced emissions and personal safety. We need to building infrastructure that takes cars off the roads.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Wyatt Gordon | Date: | 4/28/22 |
| <p>Hello,</p> <p>The fact that your transportation planning process resulted in a \$680 million list of highway projects compared to a much, much smaller \$28 million list of bike and pedestrian projects tells me everything I need to know about the CVTA. You don't care about safety. You don't care about access to opportunity. You don't care about the climate. We have no need for wider roads in our region. What we need are safe spaces to walk and bike and more frequent buses to get us out of our cars. Have you heard of induced demand? You're building the future traffic you claim to want to alleviate. You know this though. Your organization is furthering the exclusion of low-income communities and people of color in order to subsidize suburban sprawl and strip malls. Until you change your funding proposals, don't pretend that you're interested in community feedback.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-------|---------|
| From: | Zach Outzen | Date: | 4/28/22 |
| <p>This comment relates to the FY 2023-2026 Regional Revenue Draft Funding Scenario. As currently proposed, over 80% of the FY 2023-2026 Regional Revenue Draft Funding Scenario is allocated toward highway funding. While highway improvements in Central Virginia are necessary, the Draft Scenario unnecessarily prioritizes highway funding at the expense of public transit, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure.</p> <p>Spending on public transit, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure, would greatly increase accessibility to employment and education for Central Virginia residents. Crucially, it would also make living in Central Virginia significantly safer and more enjoyable for those who do not rely solely on cars for transportation. One example of an area that could benefit from such spending is the area surrounding Kanawha Plaza in downtown Richmond. This area exists to connect downtown Richmond with the James River, but it is extremely dangerous for pedestrians to do so due to the lack of pedestrian infrastructure. As a result, very few people even know that Kanawha Plaza exists, despite being located adjacent to the Federal Reserve, Dominion, and several prominent Richmond-area employers. As someone who has worked in downtown Richmond and frequently walks around the area, I know that I would not feel safe trying to get to Kanawha Plaza.</p> <p>While this is one specific example of how Richmond could benefit from increased spending in transit, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure, I want to emphasize that every locality in Central Virginia would be well-served by such investment. This type of infrastructure makes it easier and safer for people to commute to work without a car, increasing residents' satisfaction and the economic growth of the region. I strongly urge CVTA to reexamine the FY 2023-2026 Regional Revenue Draft Funding Scenario and reallocate funding towards projects that make it easier and safer to get around via bus transit, biking, or walking. As stated earlier, highway spending may be necessary, but that doesn't mean it needs the overwhelming majority of the proposed budget. Thank you for the opportunity to submit this public comment.</p> | | | |



ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

April 20, 2022

Central Virginia Transportation Authority
Attn: Rashaunda Lanier-Jackson
VIA EMAIL: RLJackson@planrva.org

RE: CVTA Regional Funding Public Comment – Project FY23_14 – I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange
- DDI

Dear Central Virginia Transportation Authority:

Please accept this letter as support for proposed funding of the I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange Divergent Diamond Project.

As Chairman of the Goochland Economic Development Authority, I am supportive of the project as it will improve a strategic economic development corridor that is extremely important to Goochland County. Furthermore, completion of the project will increase safety for businesses and citizens of Goochland County.

On behalf of the Goochland Economic Development Authority, I fully support the funding as described for the improvements proposed for I-64 at Ashland Road interchange. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Curt Pituck, Chairman
Goochland County Economic Development Authority

Ph: 804.556.5862

2931 River Road West • P.O. Box 103 • Goochland VA 23063

www.GoochlandForBusiness.com

P.O. Box 5363
Glen Allen, VA 23058
804.364-0500
804.364.1753 (Fax)
coxreadymix.com



April 21, 2022

Central Virginia Transportation Authority
Attn: Rashaunda Lanier-Jackson
VIA EMAIL: RLJackson@planva.org

RE: CVTA Regional Funding Public Comment – Project FY23_14 – I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange - DDI

Dear Central Virginia Transportation Authority:

Please accept this letter as support for proposed funding of the I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange Divergent Diamond Project.

As President of S.B. Cox Ready Mix, Inc., I am very concerned about the safety of our employees and visitors who work at our facilities off Ashland Road. I am confident that I am not alone in my concern about traffic safety and congestion at the I-64 and Ashland Road interchange as there are other corporate neighbors and surrounding residential neighborhoods who also use Ashland Road as a primary thoroughfare.

On behalf of the employees and management of S.B. Cox Ready Mix, Inc., I fully support the funding as described for the improvements proposed for I-64 at Ashland Road interchange. Thank you:

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Morgan Nelson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping "M" and "N".

Morgan Nelson
President
S.B. Cox Ready Mix, Inc.



April 27, 2022

Central Virginia Transportation Authority

Attn: Rashaunda Lanier-Jackson

VIA EMAIL: RLJackson@planrva.org

RE: CVTA Regional Funding Public Comment – Project FY23_14 – I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange - DDI

Dear Central Virginia Transportation Authority:

Please accept this letter as support for proposed funding of the I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange Divergent Diamond Project.

As President & CEO of Luck Companies, I am very concerned about the safety of our employees and visitors who work at our facilities off Ashland Road. I am confident that I am not alone in my concern about traffic safety and congestion at the I-64 and Ashland Road interchange as there are other corporate neighbors and surrounding residential neighborhoods who also use Ashland Road as a primary thoroughfare.

On behalf of the employees and management of Luck Companies, I fully support the funding as described for the improvements proposed for I-64 at Ashland Road interchange. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Charlie Luck". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Charlie Luck
President & CEO
Luck Companies

April 27, 2022

Central Virginia Transportation Authority
Attn: Rashaunda Lanier-Jackson
VIA EMAIL: RLJackson@planrva.org

RE: CVTA Reginal Funding Public Comment – Project FY23_14 – I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange - DDI

Dear Central Virginia Transportation Authority:

Please accept this letter as support for proposed funding of the I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange Divergent Diamond Project.

As a Senior Development Manager for Panattoni Development Company, I've seen first hand the amount of development happening in the Ashland Road corridor, and am supportive of the project. This infrastructure improvement will enhance a strategic economic development corridor that is extremely important to Goochland County. With current projects in the pipeline this corridor has proved fruitful for new job growth, high capital investment, and new development in the County. Furthermore, completion of the project will increase safety for businesses and citizens of Goochland County.

On behalf of the development community, I would appreciate your careful review and funding for the improvements proposed for I-64 at Ashland Road interchange. Thank you.

Sincerely,



William A. Hudgins

Panattoni Development Company, Inc.

April 27, 2022

Honorable Frank J. Thornton
Chairman
Central Virginia Transportation Authority
9211 Forest Hill Avenue, Suite 200
Richmond, VA 23235

Re: Comments on Proposed FY23 - FY26 CVTA Funding Plan

Dear Chairman Thornton:

On behalf of the Greater Washington Partnership (the Partnership), we thank the Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA) for the opportunity to comment on the draft CVTA Regional Funding Scenario and proposed FY23- FY26 funding plan.

The Partnership is a civic alliance of leading employers in the Capital Region of Baltimore, Washington, and Richmond, who together employ more than 300,000 residents and are committed to making this region one of the best places to live, work, and build a business. In 2018, the Partnership released the [Blueprint for Regional Mobility](#), an action-oriented strategy to transform the Capital Region's transportation system into an asset that ensures our global competitiveness, which included a call for better regional governance and funding embodied by the new CVTA structure and funding process.


The draft CVTA Regional Funding Scenario is a comprehensive list of 30 projects that will help transform the Richmond region with more than \$276 million of investment over the next four years. We are pleased to see the process and draft list is inclusive of the broader region and ranges from roadway improvements to bridge replacements and bike and pedestrian projects.

The Partnership respectfully submits the following comments:

1. We are especially pleased to see the inclusion of the Fall Line Trail, GreenCity Connector Trail and Bridge, the Mayo Bridge Replacement, Hull Street Phase II, and the Broad Street Streetscape with Pulse Extension Phase III projects included for their potential to increase multimodal access and safety across the region.
2. In future years, we encourage the CVTA members to work with GRTC staff and the GRTC board, as the primary provider of transit services in the region, to identify funding opportunities and additional roadway improvements that can help enhance the performance and reliability of the transit system and expand the internationally recognized Pulse Bus Rapid Transit network.
3. The final summary document could be strengthened by the addition of a summary chart that shows the funding broken down by project type category as well estimated timelines for each project.

The Greater Washington Partnership would like to thank and commend the members of the CVTA and the staff of the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission for their leadership in advancing a regionally coordinated, multimodal transportation network that ensures the Richmond metro area and the Capital Region will remain one of the best places to live, work, and build a business and can become a showcase for inclusive mobility.

Sincerely,



Joe McAndrew
Vice President, Government Affairs & Infrastructure
Greater Washington Partnership



GREATER WASHINGTON PARTNERSHIP
1200 17th St NW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20036

greaterwashingtonpartnership.org
202.765.2024
info@greaterwashingtonpartnership.org



Old Dominion Landfill
2009 Charles City Road, Henrico, VA 23231
o 804-479-0194 www.republicservices.com

April 28, 2022

Central Virginia Transportation Authority
Attn: Rashaunda Lanier-Jackson
VIA EMAIL: RLJackson@planrva.org

RE: CVTA Regional Funding Public Comment – Project FY23_14 – I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange - DDI

Dear Central Virginia Transportation Authority:

Please accept this letter as support for proposed funding of the I-64 at Ashland Rd Interchange Divergent Diamond Project.

As General Manager of Republic Services, I am very concerned about the safety of our employees and visitors who work at our facilities off Ashland Road. I am confident that I am not alone in my concern about traffic safety and congestion at the I-64 and Ashland Road interchange as there are other corporate neighbors and surrounding residential neighborhoods who also use Ashland Road as a primary thoroughfare.

On behalf of the employees and management of 623 Landfill, I fully support the funding as described for the improvements proposed for I-64 at Ashland Road interchange. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Wade Bailey".

Wade Bailey
General Manager
Republic Services