

**TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – SUMMARY OF DRAFT PLAN PUBLIC COMMENTS  
August 21 – October 21, 2005**

*Note: In the following table, “Agree” means change the draft plan, and “No Action” means do not change the draft plan.*

COMMENT	RECOMMENDED ACTION
1. Spending for highway maintenance and preservation is flat; increase funding in 25-year plan and 10-year program.	No Action: 25-year plan funds 100% of identified needs; <b><u>Agree: Increase maintenance funding in 10-year program by \$370 million.</u></b>
2. Funding for highways in SIP should be increased; should be used to “3-lane” all Interstates.	See Comment #1 above; No Action: Future interstate capacity to be determined through corridor planning.
3. Level of funding for congestion is lowest category in SIP; inconsistent with documented highway needs.	See Comment #1 above.
4. Percentage funding increase for highways is less than any other mode; increase to a level that reflects anticipated capacity needs.	No Action: 25-year plan funds 81% of highway capacity needs (represents 91% of expansion/enhancement funds for all modes).
5. All Interstates should be designated as strategic corridors.	<b><u>Agree: Change corridor map.</u></b>
6. Opposed to bonding; delete references to it in 10-year program and 25-year plan.	No Action: Implementation issue.
7. Support increase in user fees to finance improvements.	No Action: Implementation issue.
8. Opposed to raising the gasoline tax.	No Action: Implementation issue.

<p>9. TDOT should commit to ensure that their vehicle fleet is as fuel efficient as possible.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered under Policy “E”</p>
<p>10. Projects or services undertaken by public partnerships should have a documented need and an implementation plan.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>11. Decisions regarding the design, operation, safety, etc. of the transportation system need to ultimately be made by licensed professionals.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise Policy “T”</u></b></p>
<p>12. The word “balance” implies equality; for example, safety and aesthetics are equally important. Substitute a word such as “consideration”.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise Policy “R”</u></b></p>
<p>13. Final LRTP document should address relatively low cost improvements such as signal operation and maintenance. Projects such as ITS should be the first to be considered.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise Policy “G”</u></b></p>
<p>14. If funding doesn’t increase, resources should be focused on critical services, as opposed to starting new programs.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered under Policy “P”</p>
<p>15. “Safety” is our highest concern and should be separated from “Modernization”.</p> <p>16. Combine improvements to structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridges into new Safety category.</p> <p>17. Place ITS, Bike/Ped, Safety &amp; Geometric Improvements, Local System Modernization, and Class I RR Safety &amp; Modernization into new Safety category.</p> <p>18. Public safety should be the first priority in all phases of long range planning by TDOT.</p>	<p>No Action: Maintain categories for process continuity.</p> <p>See Comment #15 above.</p>

<p>19. “Status Quo” sends the wrong message; change to “Basic Level” of safety and service.</p>	<p>No Action: Not referenced in draft plan.</p>
<p>20. Safety category should add programs specifically designed to improve driving for senior citizens.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise Policy “X” to include high risk groups such as teens and seniors.</u></b></p>
<p>21. TDOT needs to re-evaluate high priority safety problem areas as they relate to emergency management.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered under Policy “K”</p>
<p>22. Partner with private interests to build truck rest areas, truck lanes in hilly areas, etc. to address large truck safety issues.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise policy statement “X” to include truck safety.</u></b></p>
<p>23. New Priority – Maintain traffic flow during construction.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered under Policy “Q”</p>
<p>24. Include language that mitigates some of the Plan’s assumptions (i.e. population and job growth, increase in VMT growth rate, truck traffic, etc.).</p>	<p>No Action: Covered on p. 8 and revision to Policy “W”</p>
<p>25. No mention of federal AQ standards and difficulty with compliance given growth rates.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered on p. 6 and under Policy “T”</p>
<p>26. The SSC, at their June 23 mtg., raised a number of objections to the assumption that despite the existence of alternatives, people will prefer to travel by automobile.</p>	<p>No Action: Refers to resource document, not carried over into draft plan.</p>
<p>27. How will TDOT ensure that the policies and principles in the Plan are adopted and applied?</p>	<p>No Action: Covered in text box on p. 13.</p>

<p>28. A community visioning process, including local/regional planning coordination, needs to be part of the LRTP and take place before CSS.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered under Policy “I”</p>
<p>29. CSS should be standard policy for TDOT.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered under Policy “R”</p>
<p>30. The plan should include examples of local initiatives that relieve congestion without added lanes.</p>	<p>No Action: Referenced on p. 6 and under Policy “U”</p>
<p>31. Alternative transportation modes are minimal in the basic plan, and are dependent upon additional funding.</p> <p>32. Plan puts too much emphasis on roads and not enough on transit.</p> <p>33. Divert funding from highways for the enhancement of other modes of travel.</p>	<p>No Action: 25-year investment goals applied to base funding.</p> <p>No Action: 25-year plan funds 80% of identified transit needs.</p> <p>No Action: 25-year plan funds 75% of all identified modal needs.</p>
<p>34. The principles/policies don’t say anything about transportation/land use planning and preventing sprawl.</p> <p>35. TDOT, the Legislature, and local land use planning entities should work more closely to link land use and transportation planning in order to reduce VMT.</p> <p>36. The priority for future transportation needs should be based on more community, town, and city oriented needs.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered on p.6 and under Policy “R” and “U”</p> <p>See Comment # 34 above; Agree: Revise Policy “W” to address VMT</p> <p>See Comment #34 above.</p>
<p>37. Develop strategies to mitigate negative impacts (i.e. sprawl) of ring roads and bypasses.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered under Policy “U”</p>
<p>38. Develop plan to assess cost-effectiveness of county seat connector program.</p>	<p>No Action: Legislative directive</p>

39. The option of selling bonds to fund projects ought to be included in the Plan.	No Action: Bonding included as financing option
40. Policies don't address multi-state transportation planning.	<b><u>Agree: Revise Policy "J"</u></b>
41. The LRTP should establish a joint effort to work with surrounding states on highway safety issues.	See Comment #40 above.
42. Projects should be performance based, meeting needs while lowering cost.	No Action: Implementation issue.
43. Does funding in the LRTP satisfy national mandates for ADA and bike/ped?	No Action: Plan addresses multimodal and accessibility goals.
44. Support Plan and concept of Strategic Corridors.	No Action
45. Plan promotes public transportation but doesn't mention that it's financed by taxpayer dollars.	No Action: Plan based on state funding.
46. Eliminate downtown interstates in Knoxville and Nashville.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
47. Support high speed rail network from Nashville and Knoxville to Atlanta.	No Action: Planning funds identified in 25-year plan.
48. Expand express bus service from suburbs to city centers.	No Action: Implementation issue.
49. Supports bond financing, county seat connector program, and short line rail system. Opposed to financing plan that would use an equity formula.	No Action
50. Public transportation is underutilized due to poor scheduling, poor connections, and security concerns.	No Action

51. Better use of alternate routing during construction and better project scheduling.	No Action: Covered under Policy “Q”
52. Supports ITS, suggests stationing roadside assistance at high accident areas.	No Action: Covered under Policy “V” and “X”
53. Toll booths slow down traffic; fuel tax is better revenue source.	No Action
54. Inform major employers of construction plans and schedules so that they can implement flex hours.	No Action: Implementation issue.
55. 7% of TDOT funds should go to bike and pedestrian projects.	No Action: 25-year plan funds 72% of bike/ped needs.
56. 15% of funding should go to transit, with remaining 78% going to various highway programs.	No Action: 25-year plan funds 80% of identified transit needs and 84% of highway needs.
57. Strong consideration should be given to developing a functioning RR option for east-west freight movements from Memphis to Bristol.	No Action: Depends on future financial feasibility and/or cost/benefit study
58. Seek innovative ways to reduce freight transportation volume that do not harm the movement of goods.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
59. TDOT should cease all work on TN segments of I-69.	No Action: “High Priority Corridor of National Significance.”
60. The I-40/I-81 Corridor initiative should be immediately supported through the \$22 billion baseline spending element which can be built from existing revenue streams.	No Action: Corridor study planned.
61. Are the Guiding Principles equal in value or, for instance, does congestion	No Action: Guiding principles are not prioritized; public

relief hold more importance than accessibility and mobility?	input emphasized maintenance and safety.
62. It does not appear that the LRTP is consistent with SAFETEA-LU's emphasis on safety and the Guiding Principle of "Maximize Safety and Security".	No Action: 25-year plan funds 74% of safety/modernization needs.
63. The LRTP should focus more on walkable communities, transit, and the use of rail rather than trucks for shipping. These changes are necessary for energy conservation, environmental purposes, and health concerns.	No Action: 25-year investment goals, policies, and 10-year program emphasize land use/transportation relationship, multimodal corridor planning and transit funding.
64. Regional freight airport improvements should be a high priority by TDOT.	No Action: 25-year plan funds 100% of identified needs.
65. The LRTP needs to incorporate review points every 5 yrs. to assess on-going efforts.	No Action: See p. 27 in draft plan.
66. TDOT should adopt ecosystem management and a "Watershed Approach Framework" as part of the LRTP.	<b><u>Agree: Revise Policy "T"</u></b>
67. Implement an open communication system with the TN Dept. of Economic Development to meet the state's economic needs while balancing negative community aspects.	No Action: Covered under Policy "D"
68. Support increasing revenues for transportation investments throughout the state.	No Action: Implementation issue.
69. Support regional multi-state planning efforts, particularly as it relates to I-81, 40 and 75 and the proposed I-3 corridor.	No Action: Plan emphasizes corridor planning; Agree: Revise Policy "J"
70. Support the implementation of the priorities established by the Knoxville TPO.	No Action: Implementation issue.

71. Support TDOT's multimodal approach in developing this 25-year plan.	No Action: Implementation issue.
<p>72. We believe that all of our Interstates should be included (as strategic corridors)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upgrade I-65 from Kentucky to Alabama to at least 6 lanes with the left lane reserved for automobiles only.</li> <li>- Upgrade I-24 from Kentucky to Chattanooga to at least 6 lanes with the left lane reserved for automobiles only.</li> <li>- Upgrade I-40 from exit 172 in Dickson County to exit 258 in Putnam County to at least 6 lanes with the left lane reserved for automobiles only.</li> </ul>	See Comment #5 above. No Action: Future interstate capacity to be determined through corridor planning.
73. Develop a strategic regional commuter transit plan and network.	No Action: Implementation issue.
74. Implement the relocation of Donelson Pike and reconfiguration of its interchange with I-40 to improve access to the Nashville International Airport.	No Action: Plan does not include specific projects.
75. My concern is that when the final plan is approved and presented to the public, it will be presented as if the regional and state groups did in fact come up with and have endorsed the budgets and the final plan. I want to go on record that that was not the process, and that the Memphis group did not endorse the budgets or the final plan ... Please help ensure that it will not be presented as being unanimously endorsed and the sole work product of the public groups.	No Action: Plan will not be presented as unanimously endorsed and the sole work product of the public groups.
76. We suggest you consider including a summary of the issues, policies and conclusions developed through the efforts of the technical committees as documented in the various technical reports.	No Action
77. We suggest providing specific references to the appropriate technical reports and plans throughout the document.	<b><u>Agree: Reports are currently referenced throughout draft document; will increase visibility of references.</u></b>

<p>78. Capitalize on the Department’s extensive public involvement efforts by providing more detailed information about the public support and/or the public comments received throughout the plan development.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise “Public Involvement” section of draft plan, pp. 28-30.</u></b></p>
<p>79. Revisit the pictures used and the captions under each picture to make sure that the message presented clearly supports the planning document and plan’s message.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Review pictures and captions.</u></b></p>
<p>80. The Department may want to consider adding a section ... that clarifies the Department’s next steps toward implementation.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise draft plan, p. 27, “How We Will Measure Our Progress.”</u></b></p>
<p>81. We suggest consideration be given to including a discussion that summarizes the applicable changes under SAFETEA-LU, the Department’s role to support the new requirements and future Department actions toward implementation of the new law.</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise draft plan, p. 31, “Surrounding States Survey.”</u></b></p>
<p>82. If we are really serious about building a balanced and diverse transportation system in our state, funding for transit and other multimodal options must be increased substantially.</p>	<p>No Action: Non-highway investments depend on partnerships and they will be evaluated on a regular basis; 25-year plan will be updated every 5 years; 10-year program reviewed every 2 years.</p>
<p>83. A cost-benefit analysis of highway spending versus congestion levels in other states should be conducted before we commit significant funding to this (\$580 million, 10-year investment in congestion relief) effort.</p>	<p>No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.</p>
<p>84. Weighting of the [Project Evaluation] criteria should be considered.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue. Weights will be assigned to criteria.</p>
<p>85. Consider other modes for the County Seat Connector Program. A 4-lane highway may not be the best way to promote economic development in all rural county seats.</p>	<p>No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.</p>
<p>86. While annual ridership for transit projects should be considered, potential</p>	<p><b><u>Agree: Revise project evaluation criteria.</u></b></p>

ridership is much more important than current ridership.	
87. The “Context Sensitive Solutions” policy should be an implicit part of the evaluation (Livable Communities, Public and Community Support) criteria.	No Action: Covered under “Public and Community Support” and “Environmental Impacts”
88. The completed Project Evaluation System should be made public each year, so citizens can see how transportation projects are being ranked.	No Action: Implementation issue.
89. An informative statistic to include in the Trends section of the plan would be the percentage of Tennessee’s current population that cannot drive.	<b><u>Agree: Research availability of statistic.</u></b>
90. Recommend a re-evaluation of financial expenditures and categories to better support alternatives in order to lessen the increase on expensive new road infrastructure.	See Comments #82 above.
91. We maintain that standard infrastructure and its associated costs could be greatly reduced by studying this effect, by increasing the alternatives and doing it earlier.	See Comment #82 above.
92. Much more emphasis on transferring major amounts of truck freight to rail.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
93. Re-analyze and re-prioritize all projects, old and new, under new [smart growth] criteria.	No Action: Implementation issue.
94. Develop strategies to mitigate the sprawling impacts of ring roads or bypass roads.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
95. Create a statewide sprawl plan and lead the way for communities to plan their land use for livable communities.	No Action: See Policy “D”

96. Use better pre-assessment and evaluation of options.	No Action: See Project Evaluation System Report.
97. One means for insuring the recommended funding levels are available for public transportation is to dedicate the funds in TDOT's budget (e.g., specific number of pennies of the state gas tax.	No Action: Implementation issue.
98. The funding program should reflect the likelihood that these start-up systems (in growing cities) may require a larger share of funding in their initial years of operation.	No Action: Implementation issue.
99. Establishment of a State Infrastructure Bank could be helpful, especially if (transit) agencies could use it as a line of credit.	No Action: Implementation issue.
100. Development of an east-west intercity passenger rail line is a worthwhile project to pursue.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
101. The highway expansion promoted in the draft LRTP would seriously harm our natural heritage, our environment and our economy, and would create a dangerous and nightmarish highway driving experience for both the public and commercial drivers.	No Action: 75% of identified highway safety needs addressed in draft plan; See Policy "R" and "T"
102. The draft plan should be revised to include discussion of the benefits of a revitalized rail service.	No Action: See discussion in Modal Needs Report.
103. Look even more into TDM and the promotion of other modes of transportation.	See Comments #82 above.
104. TDOT should place fuel efficient/alternative fuel vehicles within their fleet wherever possible.	See Comments #9 above.
105. Please consider a self-imposed halt of any new or reconstruction highway projects until reviewed in light of the LRTP principles.	No Action

<p>106. We question the strategic importance of this (county seat connector) corridor project, and would like to have it re-examined in a cost-benefit analysis.</p>	<p>See Comment #38 above.</p>
<p>107. We request that TDOT be given the discretion to provide more than the minimum 10% state share [on New Starts transit projects], determined on a project-by-project basis.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>108. Transit agencies should be eligible to compete for funds in the categories that historically have been set aside for highway projects (e.g., ITS, TDM)</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>109. User fees should be increased.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>110. Too much money is allocated to mass transit and not enough for maintaining and building highways.</p>	<p>No Action: 25-year plan funds 100% of identified maintenance need needs, and 81% of highway capacity needs (represents 91% of expansion, enhancement funds for all modes).</p>
<p>111. Information gathered about the availability barriers faced by mental health consumers should be shared with transit providers.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>112. Projects receiving Section 5310 funding should include people with mental disabilities when they provide services to older adults and people with disabilities.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>113. An assessment tool appropriate for mental disabilities should be developed to aid in determining mental health consumer eligibility for paratransit.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>114. The half-fare statute or regulations should incorporate a more inclusive definition of disability so that all people with disabilities who also experience hardship qualify.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>

115. The half-fare statute or regulations should extend reduced fares to rush hour and commuter vehicles, recognizing that many people with disabilities want to work but cannot, due to transportation costs.	No Action: Implementation issue.
116. Materials should be developed for training travel trainers who want to help mental health consumers use public transit independently.	No Action: Implementation issue.
117. State Medicaid agencies should receive technical assistance on implementing Medicaid transit passes, and should be encouraged to provide them whenever feasible.	No Action: Implementation issue.
118. States should receive technical assistance on using Community Mental Health Services Block Grant funds to provide transportation through innovative programs such as consumer-run, volunteer-augmented, and voucher programs.	No Action: Implementation issue.
119. States should follow the federal lead in coordinating transportation resources to eliminate waste.	No Action: Covered under Policy “D”
120. Mental health consumers, family members, and advocates should receive technical assistance on becoming involved in transportation planning within Metropolitan Planning Organizations and other planning bodies.	No Action: Implementation issue.
121. More multimodal connections and more conscious use of alternatives to stem the tide of increasing traffic and sprawl.	No Action: Covered under Policy “J” and in proposed investments.
122. Develop plans to reduce air pollution.	No Action: Implementation issue.
123. Strategize on how to get the LRTP more progressive with less dependence on roads/suburban growth, more on smart growth/smart design.	No Action: Covered under Policy “R” and “U,” proposed investments and Project Evaluation System

124. Separate local from through traffic on interstates surrounding communities by increasing number and connectivity of local streets.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
125. Hire consultants to look at meeting transportation needs with less growth in roads and more alternatives.	No Action: Implementation issue.
126. The “no-build” option should always be considered, weighing costs and impacts as well as narrowly conceived benefits.	No Action: Implementation issue.
127. Bonding, under these (acquiring land, bridge construction, rail transportation), deserves careful study.	No Action: Implementation issue.
128. Toll roads should be approached cautiously, with careful analysis of differential costs and benefits.	No Action: Implementation issue.
129. It would make sense for TDOT to adopt the policy that it will plan roads and other transportation facilities only when long-range, land use policies are in place.	See Comment #34 above.
130. One solution (to increasing truck traffic) is to move toward electric powered rail lines that could carry eighteen-wheelers over these long distances at speeds up to 80 miles an hour and at a lower net cost.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
131. We need more and improved public transportation concepts.	See Comment #82 above.
132. The Long-Range Plan should be a blueprint for identifying the limited number of projects that our State can afford.	No Action: Implementation issue.
133. The Project Evaluation System is a laudable goal ... TDOT should temporarily halt ALL current Tennessee highway projects in pre-construction phases and apply the new evaluation methodology.	No Action: Implementation issue.

134. To gain support for new funding, TDOT must first illustrate a strong commitment to both; cut wasteful spending and plan a more responsible financial direction for the future.	No Action: Implementation issue.
135. An updated process in the APRs is necessary to parallel effectively with the LRTP.	No Action: Implementation issue.
136. Industry should be encouraged to locate where there is already access (costly infrastructure) and where vehicle miles are not added by building-out into new territories.	See Comment #35 above.
137. The assumption that adding width to lanes increases safety mentioned on page 7 in this report should be re-assessed based on current research.	No Action: Implementation issue.
138. The statement in the Plan Summary (p. 5) that we have more congestion since road construction as not kept pace with the number of vehicles miles traveled is at best partly correct. As stated more accurately in the Challenges and Opportunities Report, the difference in VMT and construction rates has contributed to congestion.	<b><u>Agree: Revise text on p. 5.</u></b>
139. We recommend a broader approach and terminology that emphasizes accessibility, which has been defined as “the ease with which desired activities can be reached from any location.”	No Action
140. The sections on environment and energy should be broadened, particularly the opportunities to address these trends.	No Action: Covered under Policy “B,” “C,” “D,” “I,” “J,” “M,” “R,” “T,” and “U”
141. We would recommend expanding the principle of “Build Partnerships for Livable Communities,” perhaps to “Promote Livable Communities.”	No Action
142. A number of the proposed policies ... should be strengthened.	See Comments #11, 12, 13, 20, 22, 35, 40 and 66 above.

<p>143. The projections of future driving demand and congestion that underlie much of the call for significant spending on highways should be re-evaluated.</p>	<p>No Action: 25-year plan will be updated every 5 years; 10-year program reviewed every 2 years.</p>
<p>144. The bottom line is that the various plans contained in the draft do not contain enough funding for providing a greater range of transportation choices and for addressing the transportation-land use link.</p>	<p>See Comment #82 above.</p>
<p>145. I think “3-laning” the interstate should be one of the top priorities.</p>	<p>See Comment #2 above.</p>
<p>146. The completion of Highway 64 across the bottom of the state should also be a priority.</p>	<p>No Action: Included among “Proposed Corridors for 10-year Strategic Investments Program.”</p>
<p>147. Please don’t take the money needed to service this system and conduct social experiments with mass transit.</p>	<p>See Comment #4 above.</p>
<p>148. The Department should emphasize the need for broad promotion of these opportunities [public involvement] by the metropolitan community planning agencies and for an enlarged, citizen advisory presence in their planning process.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>149. The Tennessee government should find and support means of partnering with the private sector toward re-development of viable and modern, cross-state rail transport options.</p>	<p>No Action: Covered under Policy “B” and proposed investments.</p>
<p>150. Tennessee should exercise its authority and options in interstate transport matters to plan for freight diversion to rail within its borders.</p>	<p>No Action: Implementation issue.</p>
<p>151. Glaringly missing from this section [Environmental Trends], as well, is any mention of transportation related carbon emissions and the significant threats that Tennessee’s and the nation’s landscape, environmental resources and economy face from global climate change.</p>	<p>No Action: Refer to p. 7, “New Types of Fuel and Vehicles,” and Policy “E” and “T”</p>

152. The state should place a far greater proportion of funds into bike and pedestrian, mass transit, multi-modal access, rail-to-trail and other, alternative means of travel.	See Comment #82 above.
153. Increase public transportation options, including commuter rail service, both within cities and reallocate funding to accommodate these alternative modes.	See Comment #82 above.
154. There is no need for any new roads or expansion of roads to four-lanes, on the Cumberland Plateau or the Highland Rim.	No Action: Implementation issue.
155. Decrease truck through traffic on highways by completing the Memphis-Bristol freight rail corridor and work with adjoining states toward a seamless alternative through-state freight rail.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
156. The final LRTP should include a large funding component supporting freight and intercity passenger rail, and a commensurate reduction in proposed expenditures to expand the present highway system.	See Comment #82 above.
157. TDOT should decline to entertain project suggestions from communities that do not have a “Transportation Element” in their Chapter 1101 Urban Growth Limit Plan.	No Action: Implementation issue.
158. TDOT should become the advocate for a new paradigm of smart growth and economic competitiveness based upon energy efficiency and cost savings achieved through combined land use and transportation planning.	No Action: See Policy “C” and “D”
159. TDOT should aggressively work directly to deter the trend toward more single passenger vehicle miles and toward more movement of goods by truck.	No Action: See Policy “C,” “J” and “W”
160. One goal of the LRTP and of the next ten years Strategic Investment	See Comment #82 above.

Plan should be that a majority of Tennesseans living in SMSAs have a choice to forgo the increasingly expensive ownership of a personal vehicle.	
161. We do not accept the presumptive validity of the needs determination for any project made prior to the CSS process.	No Action: Implementation issue.
162. ... it [TDOT] should devise a system to reevaluate these [backlog] projects and be prepared with a full rationale and priority explanation of any that are later restored to the three year projects list.	No Action: Implementation issue.
163. Will the three-year projects list sent to the Legislature divide projects along the lines of the three categories in the LRTP Summary?	No Action: Last year's three-year project list did not divide the projects according to the investment categories in the LRTP Summary; Implementation issue.
164. ... fully re-evaluate whether the proposed expenditure of \$18.0 billion on highway projects will actually reduce congestion and do so in the quickest least costly manner.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
165. Cumulative and interactive effects on the environment are not adequately addressed in TDOT policies.	No Action: See Policy "T;" Implementation issue.
166. ... discussion of environmental impacts is remarkably short of benchmarks. Only air quality is mentioned.	<b><u>Agree: Revise draft report.</u></b>
167. TDOT should make an explicit commitment to a whole state mobile air emissions reduction plan, coordinated with the Department of Environment and Conservation.	No Action: Implementation issue.
168. Maintenance of existing facilities should have priority over building new facilities. Furthermore, we believe that up-grading and improving existing roadways should, in most cases, have priority over building new highways.	No Action: See Policy "P," and Comment #1.

169. TDOT needs a stronger emphasis on mass transport than the agency seems currently poised to do.	No Action: See Policy “P,” and Comment #1 above.
170. East-west rail connections across Tennessee need to be restored from Cookeville to Crossville.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
171. Expresses its approval of and support for the Context Sensitive Solutions mode of highway planning.	No Action: See Policy “R”
172. We call particular attention to the 286 capacity issue [shortline railroads]. In the drafts of the Plan it is clear that you understand the issue and are proposing a plan to fund the issue.	No Action: 25-year plan funds 100% of identified short line rail needs.
173. Encourage continued cooperative efforts between TDOT, TDA and TDEC for promotion of biofuel usage.	No Action: See Policy “D” and “E”
174. Encourage utilization of Tennessee sourced horticulture products in road construction projects.	No Action: Implementation issue.
175. Encourage TDOT to require utilization of as many Tennessee sourced straw and other farm products to the construction process.	No Action: Implementation issue.
176. Urge you to approve this sign [winery signage] for use on TN highways.	No Action: Implementation issue.
177. Encourage ... department to establish reasonable and permissive regulations relative to these temporary [road] signs.	No Action: Implementation issue.
178. Encourage ... ways in which road signage can be used to assist the growth of these farms and community income activities.	No Action: Implementation issue.
179. It is important that these farmlands be protected to the extent possible and that highway development consider agricultural production as an	No Action: See “Trends,” p. 6, and Policy “R” and “U”

important usage.	
180. It is important that locks and bridges within the state remain functional and able to accommodate appropriate shipping for agricultural products.	No Action: 25-year plan funds 70% of identified waterway needs.
181. It is important that rail lines and bridges, including those on short line facilities, remain in good condition.	See Comment #172 above.
182. Ensuring our state and other bridges, particularly in rural areas, can accommodate heavy loads is important to ensure that farm products can move	See Comment #1 above.
183. The State should not develop a financing plan using some sort of equity formula.	No Action: Implementation issue.
184. Bond financing is acceptable for new construction if the roads to be built are identified and the financing method is established by legislation prior to any construction.	No Action: Implementation issue.
185. The county seat connector program, or at least good access to every county, is a critical ingredient for future economic development in Tennessee.	No Action: Legislative directive.
186. Short line rail systems should be preserved as an alternative to heavy traffic on roads.	See Comment #172 above.
187. The State must develop user friendly mass transit options.	No Action: Implementation issue.
188. The State must develop rail transit for freight.	No Action: Depends on future corridor planning.
189. The State must develop “walkable communities” by using land use planning in conjunction with transportation planning.	No Action: See Policy “R” and “U”

<p>190. The State must anticipate the environmental consequences of all transportation projects as part of the planning phase.</p>	<p>No Action: See Policy “T”</p>
<p>191. It is crucial that TDOT commit to spending at least 7% of its budget on bicycle and pedestrian programs.</p>	<p>No Action: See Comment #82 and #55 above</p>
<p>192. Please ensure that passenger rail receives renewed and continual emphasis in the LRTP.</p>	<p>No Action: Funding for passenger and freight rail improvements depends on public-private partnerships and federal rail policy.</p>