

n=214	S3_P3_T0_Q2_ECONOMY_2
HOME Zip	Comments Economy - Comment
27701	This is worded too vaguely for me to know if I support it or not. Certainly I support better creation of locally sourced food. I support open space and I support community strength in any discussion of roads.
27607	The economy is important but does not take precedent over the health and well being of the citizenry.
27510	Objective 3 is not clear enough - will you chose inferior solutions because they are cheaper? Suggest using an ROI standard rather than cost.
27701	Infrastructure investments should be done with industry in mind but, like all public services, should not be done purely to drive direct economic growth. Targeting the most cost effective and expedient solutions will not address long term problems, which are naturally harder to quantify.
27609	Not sure what this is but I favor mass transit and connected bikeways over increases in commuter highway options
27701	"Stimulate economic vitality" is often code for "pave it all, build endless repetitive shopping plazas, and force everyone into life where they have no option but to spend hours sitting in traffic jams"
27601	3) in re: "cost-effective solutions", this should also take into account the enormous line-item cost that most households have in their budgets; the personal vehicle. Even if a public transit solution is more expensive for the city, if it rids households of the need to have a second (or even one) car, it may be saving thousands of dollars per household per year that might not show immediately in the city budget.
27604	- Strongly support items 2 and 4; question the premise of improving freight movement at the cost of negative impacts on personal travel and land use; and 3) targeting funding based on cost effectiveness strongly depends on how you define cost-effectiveness.
27607	Stop building for cars and we can improve all other modes of transit. Right now, cars dominate. Buses, walking, trains, bikes all are forced to bow to the reign of cars. This is so wasteful, costly, and inequitable. Also, give us an actual passenger rail system. Freight trains ruin travel by train right now. Seize the tracks and prioritize passenger rail.
27610	cost-effective over time, NOT just beginning investment how are we going to handle all the Amazon deliveries in the core? BRT or potentially light rail absolutely needs coordinated with higher densities of land use
27529	I admire the good thinkers who tackle this challenge. It is absolutely necessary.
27607	I would support this if the goal includes ways to more efficiently move goods in safer ways - smaller delivery vehicles and maybe even cargo bikes/motorcycles
27606	All transportation must be designed not to hinder or interfere with others' ability to safely and efficiently move about the region.
27601	1) I care (awkwardly) little about this. 2) Of course, but CAMPO can't do that. 3) All alternatives to adding additional lanes should be explored in all corridor projects-- specifically access control and innovative intersections. 4) Don't much care.

27603	I especially think we need to make sure we are coordinating land use and transportation decisions. You can't choose to bike to work if the nearest housing available to your job is 20 miles away.
27615	Yes indeed; all local jurisdictions must coordinate and cooperate to get such a huge project accomplished in less than ten long years ... or more ...
27577	Building and expanding highways in semi-rural areas encourages sprawl. Please consider the secondary impacts.
27604	I support these if they consider a greater amount of funding for non-single occupancy vehicle options.
27608	Light rail should be reconsidered for certain corridors similar to Charlotte's system.
27615	There has been so much success in larger cities like DC with low-cost safety countermeasures that would make a huge difference in Raleigh.
27312	STRONG NO on Objective 1: Leave freight movement to the private sector, other than regulating monopoly rail cos for greater public benefit. STRONG YES on Objective 2: Land use MUST be constrained for greater density in order to reduce transportation-related emissions, even EVs. Yes on 3 and 4.
27510	Under our current transportation infrastructure automobiles are often the most cost-effective solution. That must change. Do not use that as an objective when making decisions.
27707	I don't trust Durham leadership to do these things, but these are worthy goals in the hands of a good planning department and good city and county leadership.
27344	Cost effectiveness is always in the eye of the private enterprise involved. Project delivery can be controlled by the parties engaged in doing the work.
27707	This includes a multi-modal approach for freight. If you have protected micromobility lanes, advances such as automated package delivery (a MUCH lower bar than Automated Vehicles) could benefit greatly, creating private savings and public benefit!
27701	not sure what some of this means.
	Needed
27705	Self driving trucks already exist and will revolutionize the shipping industry. This will allow people to spread across this country and will allow the problems of over crowded cities be a thing of the past.
27701	For sure realigning land use and transportation goals
27517	This doesn't seem like a goal a metropolitan-level organization can do much to impact. It seems more like the domain of logistics companies or USPS. I'd be worried that local investments in this kind of thing just end up benefiting UPS or FedEx at our expense.
27601	Coordinating land use and transportation is vital. It makes no sense to try to promote biking and walking in a neighborhood if it's miles away from the closest school/grocery store/workplace/etc. On the other hand, I'm not sure "cost-effective solutions" are going to be *sustainably* cost effective, or that freight movement should take priority over people movement.
27612	Land use and transportation planning should be more closely linked.

27707	I support the economic goals, but especially want to explore ways to stop building more highways and widening streets, that work is ruining our quality of life and the character of our area. Use rail except for last mile!!!!
27215	I think the private sector should "pay" a larger role in the development and funding of infrastructure improvements. Freight carriers are experiencing low interest rates, enormous profits and tax breaks and incentives.
27278	Whose cost effective solutions. Those that pay into the right pockets
27514	I don't want GoTriangle spending tax dollars on land use.
27514	These goals seem pretty unrelated to one another but you're asking for one level of support.
27609	Important to complete 540 as soon as possible- it is a critical part of the regions infrastructure- important for people & commerce!
27705	willing to postpone cost-effectiveness to change transportation habits and opportunities
27517	Target funding for most COST-EFFECTIVE solution!!!!
27562	Freight keeps our businesses going (large, small and individual)
27587	An obvious goal but not sure how you are going to measure the success of meeting it except by keeping projects on time and within budgets.
27608	I strongly support this, but that HAS to mean less equity
27601	Targeting funding to 'cost effective' solutions is a misconception. CAMPO should LEAD to where we want to be, not follow current public opinion based on a model built over the last century based on car culture.
27610	Freight should be moved by train.
27603	The goal of transit should be to
27513	The best way to improve freight movement is to improve movement for all vehicles. The artificially low user fees (e.g. gas taxes) promote inefficient land use (e.g. sprawl).
27609	complete 540 -- would stimulate southeast wake county growth encourage density around 540 interchanges
27604	Misleading 'push poll' question Do better
27701	I support land use/transportation coordination in the extreme. Putting it in a freight context suggests that highways and arterials are the real objective for the question.
27701	strongly supportive of coordination between land use and transportation, it's key for almost all the goals
27510	This goal seems vague, but I support the part of this that discusses land use coordination if that means minimizing the amount of deforestation/miscellaneous environmental destruction required to facilitate these new modes of transportation.
27701	Not sure what "land use and transportation" refers to. But I hope this does not mean more dirty coal emitting rail lines or highways through residential areas or green spaces.

27516	Developers should not be required to provide parking, and should be forced to pay the full environmental and social costs of car-dependency. We should encourage the construction of housing in areas where people can walk, bike or access public transit.
27703	Yes, land use needs to be controlled so we don't have car-dependent developments plopped down away from services, schools, and jobs.
27609	Cost effective is a 1
27703	I don't know what parts of this mean
27712	Nice goal but sometimes the most cost-effective solutions are short term driven and create bigger issues long term. We should be looking for effective transportation solutions, with cost secondary.
27707	Are some components of this goal mutually exclusive? It might cost more to locate a freight hub away from residential housing, but to re-locate it would be intrinsically beneficial to the population...I don't think a transit goal needs to take on the objectives of the for-profit sector. There need to be more safeguards on land use, imo.
27601	This survey is too wordy for the average citizen. "Coordinate land use" ... the average citizen doesn't know what that means.
27625	Land use and transportation are very closely linked. In order to have the dense/walkable places people want, we need a transportation network that supports that. Bike and ped infrastructure can also be significantly more cost effective than more car infrastructure when placed in the right locations. A good economy is key to success.
27704	Biggest cheapest projects are not always soundest in long run. Find people's needs as the priority. Not big business requests. That time is past now! Environment first.
27526	get trucks off the road. Use more railroad facilities.
27705	Tough to balance "most cost efficient " and best for the WHOLE community.
27312	Strongly agree on coordinating land use/transportation and freight movement, but cost-effective solutions must not mean cheapest (for example, cheaply paved roads need repaving for potholes galore in no time) Get rid of concrete barriers/strips to direct traffic--a paint line or a bit of greenery can do the job instead.
27705	I don't fully understand this one and what improvements are needed.
27701	create smaller hubs with infrastructure close to where people live to reduce driving time
27278	I would prefer alternatives to moving freight, such as increased use of rail with shorter hauls via roadways
27516	Invest in rail and distribution infrastructure. How do you improve freight movement and improve safety? Does this require federal participation? Planning must include local community input.
27713	Yes to figuring out land use
27510	Strongly disagree to this point: 3) Target funding to the most cost-effective solutions.

27514	This is a trick question. Economic "vitality" is another way of saying "support growth". Growth is the fundamental problem that has produced climate change. We have enough roads to support our economy. We just need to maintain the infrastructure; we don't "need" more road infrastructure; we just need to use that infrastructure for needs instead of wants.
27703	We need to become more efficient and cleaner in our movement of freight.
27517	I don't know what improve freight movement means. I also don't know what--in practice--it means to coordinate land use and transportation. I get worried when I see targeting funding to most cost-effective solutions. Environmentally responsible solutions may not be most cost effective but they are a top priority. I advocate higher costs if that means better long-term solutions that will mitigate climate change and thus improve the safety and health of our residents.
27701	These objectives seem overly vague. I think that the most important way to support economic vitality is to to support affordable housing choice, housing density, and transit options that serve the needs of lower income workers with less control over their work hours and who are unable to work remotely.
27510	Coordinating land use and transportation seems vague, use TOD in all municipalities to focus development along transit/bike/ped corridors
27526	The ONLY THING I WOULD DEMAND IS: A FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING OF ANY TAXES, FEES, & SALARIES USED TO SUPPORT ANY OF THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES! In addition; EVERY N.C. TAXPAYER should receive a tabulated account of EVERY TAX DOLLAR TAKEN IN AND WHERE IT HAS BEEN SPENT.
12345	I'm trying to lead you down the path that fucks rocks.
27613	Targeting funding for the most cost effective solutions should be key. Spending larger sums of money to push a roadway through an area instead of looking at other options is not appropriate. Adding highways in permitted subdivision areas is not an appropriate solution. Having certain roadways designated for trucks, or reducing truck usage during certain high congestion timeframes in areas could improve traffic.
27613	As long as it can be done economically and with common sense
27527	Freight movement is essential. HOWEVER, enforce safety of motorists by ensuring freight drivers are drug-free, including proper use of legal subscriptions, alcohol, proper rest, vehicle braking and load shifts, etc. Consider restricting hours of movement to exclude rush hours. USE DRONES in traffic enforcement (add to previous comment block).
27701	This needs to explicitly enumerate the reduction of community sprawl. It is within the DCHC's purview and obligation to plan transportation resources in coordination with land use to avoid and minimize the development sprawl which is currently plaguing the Triangle. Until this goal is revised to address sprawl, I do not support it.
	This is a project that will be best addressed by expert management. Don't forget to keep a goal of high quality of work life for the people getting all our stuff to us
27609	I'm not sure I understand what all these objectives mean, but believe transport must be made cost effective.

27523	transit oriented development more regional coordination of land use policy fewer land use decisions controlled by NIMBY boomers with no big picture view of the region
27613	Sometimes the most cost effective option is not the best option. We should spend whatever is necessary to meet the previous goals.
27610	I do not understand this goal.
27604	Seems like this needs a few pages of how you plan to do each of these buzzwords linked together, but sure I agree. Please think long-term benefits to upfront costs instead of upfront costs to buzzwords.
27504	I do not support this goal as a way to increase urbanization.
27513	DO NOT BUNDLE DIFFERENT aspects into one survey question--- VERY POOR SURVEY TACTICS :-(
27519	Yes, but stimulating our economy is more at the macro level of a MODERN transportation system (airport, light rail, etc...) that will continue to woo fortune 500 HQs and major job sites for the high tech industry.
27612	This is an admirable goal, to help make the economy as a whole more efficient. It does not affect the general public as much on a day to day basis, except for reducing congestion and similar effects.
27614	We need to work toward eliminating ICE vehicles in the transportation system to ameliorate climate change
27516	Residential development should be viewed with an eye towards where resident population will be working - increasing transport capacity between new development and work sites should align.
27278	Why wouldn't this be done anyway?
27526	The most cost-effective solutions might not necessarily be the most efficient in terms of moving people to and from there locations, so I would rather research be done at finding the most effective way to transport people within the wide expanse of the Triangle area, and then from there find the most cost-effective way to accomplish that end. Not letting cost determine method.
27612	I see my little world - I want sidewalks. And I do want better produce in the stores, if it means improving the freight movement.
27701	Move freight outside of city center. It should bypass downtown. City should be used for people trains only.
27514	What about a central hub for deliveries and then a dissemination service using electric vehicles; create an entrepreneurial incentive for this for disadvantaged folks.
27278	#3 can be problematic. Sometimes the less cost-effective can in the long run be far less expensive than originally determined.
27278	It will be important to make sure this does not disproportionately impact disenfranchised communities.
27701	On point #2, it is important that coordinating land use includes indigenous tribes and both their currently recognized territories as well as sacred and/or ancestral lands.
27516	The first goal that makes sense. Support business, respect property rights. Cost-effective should be the HIGHEST priority when you are spending other people's (taxpayers') money.

27526	Lowest bid isn't always the best choice.
27606	Auto-centric project delivery is already leaps and bounds ahead of other modes. Those types of projects should be excluded from this metric somehow.
27587	Getting services vehicles (big and small) would alleviate many, many problems with the network of roads in the area.
27278	What a vague goal.
27510	I like the idea - but not the wording. Item #3 seems something NCDOT could always fall back to: Building new or widened roads is the most cost-effective. This point must be reworded to prevent us from doing the same thing over and over. ReMove large trucks from subdivisions
27705	While the Goal seems laudable, it does not indicate for whom. When we don't indicate for whom we are stimulating economic vitality, there is usually a group left behind, and that group is usually those who are Black or Brown, and at the lowest end of our income and wealth scales. If our transportation system is going to become equitable, then we need to be clear that we are stimulating economic vitality for all socio-economic groups, setting objectives toward that, and measuring our progress. Secondly, "improve freight movement" is ambiguous. Does this mean shorter freight travel times? or greater predictability of travel times? If a goal suggests the direction that we're going, an objective should communicate where we want to end up. Improving freight movement doesn't do that. Neither does the fourth objective.
27514	The land use with the biggest impact on transportation is the land use within the Right Of Way.
27517	"Most cost-effective" solutions should also consider indirect and long-term effects on the natural environment and climate crisis. Sometimes what appears to be the cheapest solution may be the worst in the long run in terms of direct and indirect costs to the natural environment. I do strongly support coordinating land use and transportation, especially if transportation has the potential to damage areas of conservation value.
27278	Again, not 100% sure how this goal should be interpreted. Although, it sounds like a good goal
27705	Need more development of apartments and condos to be accessible to bus rapid transit and rail stations. Need to remove parking minimums for businesses when they can show they are accessible by other means -- walking, busing, biking, rail, etc. Need more outdoor dining on sidewalks, parks, parking lots, and closed street lanes.
27278	often a slippery slope the most wise, not the most costeffective
27705	A lot more freight could be moved off roads and onto trains, or electric vehicles, or other modes that don't require major road infrastructure and pollution. Cost-effective freight should not be the only goal - other negative externalities need to be taken into account too.
27705	I am all for cost effective (not like the light rail project)
27704	This goal has a lot of overlap with the infrastructure goal.
27705	Questions does not meet goals u seek.
27701	I don't think future planning will be able to control all that is in this Goal.

27312	Consider job creation opportunities an objective? I don't know what you mean by 3 and 4. Too jargony
27701	Please be forward thinking in your goals here. What does the triangle look like in 20 years? Plan for that. Major cities are now testing out limiting large trucks in city and town centers for pollution, congestion and road wear. How can you start planning for that now instead of responsive in 15 years when deliveries are even higher? Could you have delivery centers at the outskirts of town that train/trailers can access from the highway that are then connected to the high density places by electric vehicles or cargo bikes?
27701	There are so many goals here hard to answer
27516	I'm not well versed on the current state of freight movement and it's limitations.
27707	This is an area that I feel less informed about. They all seem important.
27701	How would these goals be accomplished? What is included in "coordinating land use"?
27572	Strongly support all items EXCEPT item #3. The target funding is never equal among communities the richer most prominent communities always get their needs and not the poorer communities.
27704	Move more heavy freight to rail and use smaller electric trucks and vans locally.
27587	Not sure what this means
27616	Time wasted is money wasted. You need better enter and exit for highways that do not involve turn signals
27526	Take care of what needs to be taken care of- don't spread out support just so you can tick the boxes. What do we as a community need most? Complete projects that are in progress and have been projected in a timely manner, increase pedestrian and bike access they ought our community.
27591	As previously mentioned, Work to improve community pride by blending affordable housing with other residential communities. (Winston-Salem did this many years ago with great success).
27713	It depends on what cost effective means
27517	Yes, to 1) and 2) above, but improving freight movement may mean more rail, and also managing demand, delivery, etc.,
27707	Decrease unneeded road projects, ship by rail using appropriate sized vehicles for final mile.
27707	When evaluating what is "cost-effective" we must account for the economic externalities of greenhouse gas pollution, and consider long-term ROI over the next 30 years.
27701	These are all over the place. But generally good. As with my previous answer, I don't think you can approach this issue without limits on population growth. If stimulating the economy results in an increase in population, you have not achieved an improvement in the overall quality of life or the health of the planet.
27516	cost effectiveness needs to include ALL costs, environmental, social, realizing impacts of choices differently effect women, people of color, different economic groups.
27517	The objectives are wildly subjective and open to be different and competing interpretations
27510	No opinion on how this is working right now and whether it needs improvement

27526	I do not see how that can be done. The movement of freight cannot be one of the value adds unless private companies contribute to the funding.
27604	Economic vitality is important; too often, this objective has been used to reinforce status quo patterns of investment, as though nothing else could sustain economic vitality. So the concept isn't bad, but the words are tarnished. And, chunks of the land development sector are in fact totally unsustainable (sprawl, for example) and need to change. 'Stimulating economic vitality' could be okay as an objective if it is paired with full- and life-cycle cost accounting of the impacts of transportation investments; otherwise, it's just code for 'more of the same', which we don't need and can't afford.
27527	Very generalized. Increase planning period to 100 years.
27540	Intermodal transport should be minimized in Highway use rail
27565	The way this is written, it promotes money over people
27519	These are pointless statements. Soooooo open to interpretation like all these questions. I hope we aren't paying outsiders for this survey.!
27526	Take care of the people as first priority, the economic benefits will follow if the people are well-served.
27614	Germany has models where commercial traffic is separated from regular commuters. I would like to see this model applied in Raleigh
27526	Railroads need to be better partners to the communities they impact.
27516	Why are these grouped together? #2, for instance, can relate to wise housing density decisions (all engines go for TOD!)
27523	There has got to be a way to coordinate a good light rail system for the area, it could easily be the most cost effective solution.
27605	Agree with all of the above but need to make sure that the cost analyses have a long term horizon to adequately evaluate their true costs and benefits. The delayed implementation of adequate public transit systems will only increase future costs and needs.
27517	Not really sure what these imply.
27526	Cost effective??? Short term or long term?? Best money spent is product shipped in a straight line as possible no matter the cost. That's short term spent money. Long term savings is product is on time ASAP.
27278	(1), (2), and (4) are all worthy goals. (3), however, sounds like another Trojan horse. No, of course I don't want to waste money; but exactly what "solutions" do you have in mind? Many people argue, for instance, that buses are more "cost-effective" than personal vehicles; but that's ONLY true if you remove other, NON-dollar costs from the calculation - lost time, and stress, for people whose only realistic alternative is driving. In other words, if this is an excuse not to fund road repairs and upgrades because they are not DOLLAR-cost-effective, forget it.
27516	Currently deliveries in downtown area impedes safety of bicyclists and pedestrians
27312	Coordination between land use and transportation needs to be improved, given the growth rates in the Triangle area.
27705	Environmental considerations

27713	This description is quite broad. I would want more details about each objective listed.
27510	Seems like a dangerous path.
27704	These goals will destroy neighborhoods, especially low income and minority neighborhoods. Freight trains and trucks carry hazardous materials. When there are accidents the most vulnerable citizens suffer.
27607	Not sure who would disagree with this, this is a wasted question.
27510	This goal may be the "deal-breaker" for any of the other goals. I urge the decision-makers to watch out, in themselves and others, for an accepted and unspoken sense that the economy's needs come before any other goals.
27704	This will only destroy low income neighborhoods. It will also create massive danger as hazardous freight materials are transported through these neighborhoods.
27510	These are quite vague and potentially contradictory. Coordinating land use and transportation may restrict freight movement through certain areas (e.g., a state highway through a downtown that is reclassified to align more closely with the mixed and dense land uses around it).
27510	invest into EV technology / charging stations
27510	Businesses that pollute neighborhoods should contribute to their own upkeep and not further burden residents who already pay taxes and consumer prices for goods.
27510	I am not sure with the Covid 19 economic impacts what efforts would be most critical in getting people back to work. That is where I think economic efforts should be going.
27703	I think economic interests have contributed to sprawl and I think it's time we focus on the quality of life of our residents.
27510	#3 of course
27510	Yes to 3
27217	There is a lot of funding for transportation but not for the people riding with no income or passes or vouchers
27614	Private companies should invest in freight movement
27612	Promote cooperation and sharing of resources and plans among public and private components of the community.
27510	Framing transportation investments in predominantly economic terms is more harmful than useful. Values theory sheds light onto why this is so.
	Reduce vehicle size by reducing street widths. Reduced street width decreases speed on residential streets. Reduce ambulance & fire emergency vehicles because they inhibit traffic calming measures. Install water hydrants so fire trucks do not need to transport water.
27510	Again, devil is in the details. What is the measure for "improving freight movement"? What does improve project delivery for "all modes" refer to?
	New developments must be coupled with sustainable transportation planning
27705	This question is internally inconsistent. The way to improve all of these goals is to actively disincentivize privately owned cars/trucks and not to increase "all modes". We should focus on bike/ped/public transportation.

27526	Not familiar with this area. In Fuquay-Varina it would be important to someone work with RR to join the two downtowns easier either by walking bridges or adding additional crossings.
27526	Needs to be a balance. There must be an increase in providers and stores for residents. Need consideration for people who live here. Slow down the development of communities that will have no resources, infrastructure, stores, doctors, hospitals. Build that first. Sure seems like greedy developers and builders making as much as they can. Planning needs to slow it down!
27516	schedule freight drop off so that traffic can move freely around bus stops and rush hours where foot - traffic is high
27587	People and the environment are more important.
27502	Improved transportation options will naturally to more cost-effective policies and practices.
27705	Water and sewer services are the best route to more affordable housing and a broader tax base.
27608	I do not understand the statement
27606	Do we really need to belabor that rail transit is the principal answer here?
27603	Again a central city, Raleigh, approach instead of scattered site scattered brain approach. End over expenditure on building duplicate roads and duplicate mass transit that keeps us going in all types of directions just to work, live and play. We are waiting a lot of resources and environment attempting to keep this Triangle thing going just to keep egos going.
27608	The most cost-effective solutions for transportation in 2020 may not be appropriate for 2050, as we move into greater use of public transportation.
27701	Cost-effectiveness and return on investment is paramount and should supercede an all nodes goal.
27705	Again, the general public does not know what freight means for NC especially in this area. and define project delivery. I am tired of typing
27609	Land use patterns should promote more density of residential, commercial and industrial facilities
27608	Not cost effective because that would mean give everyone a bike.
27610	Planning for commuter rail now will assist in creating denser development near station locations.
27517	Allow these goal to develop naturally. Not pushed on people.
27701	ALL MODES is key
27608	Climate change should be first consideration. If it locks in climate patterns and single driver commutes, shouldn't be built.
27606	Lane use and transportation should be coordinated to ensure connectivity and safety. Sometimes prioritizing projects that cost a little more will have a larger benefit, cheapest might do more harm to neighborhoods.
27609	'Cost-effective' is not necessarily the right farming for economic vitality.
27713	Transit improvement projects should be completed on-time. Transport needs should be coordinated between different counties/cities/etc. more than they have been in the past.
27610	What I read here is "put light rail where our rich donors own real estate and want to build/sell new mixed use developments." Meh.

27704	I know it takes money to do things, however our "economy" is built on shifting sands and made of paper. I would love to see us create a local economy based on available local resources and need.
27609	All good.
27518	#3 - But what if the cheapest solution is also the worst as far as environmentally sound?
27562	It depends on how the most cost effective solutions are defined Use rails more... cut down on highway for moving goods. Improve our railroads.
27606	It's hard to imagine specific types of roads, railways, paths, zoning changes etc this is referring to for me as someone outside this discipline. I.e. does improve freight movement mean wider turns so trailers don't hit curbs?
27608	I strongly support all but #3. Cost effectiveness depends on what one includes in the calculation. Consider Texas which is now targeting climate \$ to those least able to recover rather than to the most valuable properties. How does one include factors like addressing historical inequity (which businesses get priority for transit improvement), movement of essential workers, climate resilience in cost analyses?
27526	Coordinate land use and transportation is HUGE. Currently we allow major new development in transitioning rural areas without ensuring adequate transportation redesign to handle the resulting congestion.
27514	I am most interested in expanded public transit for commuters.
27513	Cost overrun is the killer of ambitious transportation systems.
