

# Safe by Design Comment-Response Matrix

Section	Subsection	Comment	Response
General	-	The safe system approach is cited, but missing including all pieces in discussion as beneficial	Added context
General	-	Redundancy is important - not just infrastructure but other pieces like post crash care	Added context
General	-	Increase resources and references citations - where did the safe system pyramid come from? Feds, etc?	Added referenced citation
General	-	There is an appendix for the regional safety messaging framework, but unintentionally minimize education/messaging in the text in comparison to infrastructure.	Noted
Guiding Principles	-	Generally very heavy focus on infrastructure and how it is the solution to addressing safety in many statements throughout document, not necessarily a holistic approach that has multiple approaches to address safety.	Focus intentionally spelled out in "How We Got Here" section through health impact pyramid
Guiding Principles	-	Signs are a part of street design as is striping	Edited for clarification
Guiding Principles	-	Preventing deaths requires changing conditions AND improving human behavior	Agreed. Focus is on most impactful changes in reference to health impact pyramid
Guiding Principles	-	Reword emergency response bullet - both response and infrastructure improvements will save lives overall - about redundancy to on all fronts to address.	Edited for clarification
Guiding Principles	-	Recommend shifting tone to a holistic approach like the FHWA Safe System Approach rather than unintentionally minimizing the other pieces of a safe system approach and putting most of the emphasis on infrastructure. If you compare the City to surrounding localities that also experience crashes, Richmond has more infrastructure and still sees similar amount of serious injuries/deaths on its roadways highlighting how we must address from multiple approaches.	Focus intentionally spelled out in "How We Got Here" section through health impact pyramid
All Safety Investments are Not Equal	Safe System Pyramid	Just noting that not all are infrastructure related; even items at the widest point aren't all infrastructure improvements (land use decisions, vehicle manufacturer improvements, etc).	Noted
All Safety Investments are Not Equal	Designing Roads that Work for People	Raised crosswalk doesn't make a vehicle automatically slow down; a vehicle can drive over the raised crosswalk at a fast speed (even if it damages their vehicle). Drivers respond to built environment by slowing down. Advanced warning signs helps driver be aware. Etc etc.	Edited for clarification
All Safety Investments are Not Equal	Designing Roads that Work for People	Don't like the comparison of the "stop for pedestrians" sign. As alluded above, it is still a driver's decision/responsibility to respond to the built environment and be educated how to navigate roadway elements.	Noted
All Safety Investments are Not Equal	A Clearer Way to Set Priorities	If people are on their phones, listening to music, do not know how to navigate innovative intersection, changes to the road itself will not work for everyone without approaching it from all sides.	Noted, mentioned in #4
All Safety Investments are Not Equal	A Clearer Way to Set Priorities	What's the difference between vehicle safety technology and vehicle collision warnings/seatbelts? How is one an active measure vs just a measure?	latent vs active; edited for clarification
All Safety Investments are Not Equal	A Clearer Way to Set Priorities	Post crash care? Enforcement?	Edited for clarification, included as active measures
All Safety Investments are Not Equal	A Clearer Way to Set Priorities	All approaches necessary to build redundancy into the transportation system	Edited for clarification
Public Engagement	-	Highlights the need for addressing from multiple approaches	Added table in Actions section to address
Public Engagement	-	Lack of infrastructure	Noted
Public Engagement	-	Human behaviors like running red lights/stop signs (cant make them stop - can only improve intersection to hopefully have them stop)	Noted
Public Engagement	-	Aggressive and reckless driving culture	Noted
Public Engagement	-	Maintenance of roads, sidewalks, bike lanes	Noted
Public Engagement	-	Cars do not yield to pedestrians at crosswalks (even though the infrastructure is there)	Noted
Public Engagement	-	Socioeconomic factors - free fare transit	Noted
High Injury Network	Informing RSAs	Should mention that near-term quick build treatments are low cost compared to the long term capital improvement	Edited for clarification
Safety Actions	Action 1	It would be good to have VDOT approved options for localities where VDOT maintain their roads. Looking for something above and beyond VDOT normal guidance/standards that they would be agreeable to and localities don't need to go to jump through hoops every time they want to use.	Added context
Safety Actions	Action 2	What is the fund source for these RSA's and other items. Is it a part of the UPWP or will another fund source need to be used like STBG, etc?	Edited for clarification
Safety Actions	Action 2	Agree that RSA has a multidisciplinary team to address safety from all fronts. Disconnect to overall text of plan since limited discussion regarding enforcement or emergency response, etc	Noted
Safety Actions	Action 3	Agree that need pre-approved toolkit, especially on VDOT maintained roads that go above and beyond their minimum standards/guidance.	Noted
Safety Actions	Action 4	How are we funding implementation projects? CMAQ, etc? Money does not always show up right away and new project applications are accepted every other year.	Added context
Safety Actions	Action 5	Would staff consider assisting rural localities with limited staff on creating their own safe street 4 all action plan to advance more complementary safety plans?	Yes, that has been addressed
Safety Actions	Action 5	Roadway lighting and ADA compliance are street design elements just like signage and striping. So in one sentence you say elements are necessary but not sufficient. Then start mentioning the street design elements.	Edited for clarification
Safety Actions	Action 5	What about post crash care/enforcement. Is that falling under public health?	Yes
Implementation	Oversight	Regional Safe Streets Task Force - Someone from Schools world?	Edited for clarification
Implementation	Measuring Progress	Isn't the LRTP updated every 5 years, not 4?	Typo fixed
Appendix	HIN Methodology	Were any updates to the HIN made post comments from localities? Is there a link to the final? The bottom of page 2 says it is on the engagement site, but had no luck locating.	Will be added to engagement site after edits
Appendix	HIN Methodology	No longer mentions years of crash data that is being used, which think is important.	Added to appendix
Appendix	HIN Methodology	I may be thinking of another effort (LRTP, etc), so forgive me if I am misremembering, but didn't we land on the same weight being applied to K and A crashes?	No change made
Appendix	Priority Safety Corridors	Mentions Branders Bridge, but I do not think I see it on the map. Same with River Rd, Belmont Rd, Jahnke Rd, Walmsley	Removed; from previous draft of PSCS

Executive Summary	-	I think there also needs to be an acknowledgement that the highway users also bear some level of responsibility for their safety and the safety of others. Texting, not buckling up, driving while impaired, excessive speeding, drowsy driving are all personal choices that are contributing factors.	added text to opening paragraph
Safe System Pyramid	-	from what I can gather, this is a relatively novel theory that has not been tested or proven. So why was this selected over the more accepted "E's" framework (engineering, enforcement, education)? I'm skeptical of the pyramid because I believe the safety investments should be more balanced and not generalized this way in which it's weighted most heavily bottom to top. For example, the "Move Over" and "Click It or Ticket" campaigns (education investment) have been very effective resulting in lives saved, and it's more difficult to see the nexus between zoning reforms (socioeconomic factors investment) and highway safety. Has any other metropolitan region in the country adopted the Safe System Pyramid approach?	responded through email
Survey	-	half of the survey respondents live in Richmond, but Richmond only makes up about 10% of the region's population so the survey responses are biased toward an urban environment whereas the region is comprised of rural, suburban, and urban environments. This should be noted and the survey results need to be considered with that in mind. With 50% of the respondents being in the city, it's not surprising that pedestrian safety got the top mention in the word scramble. But is that really representative of the region?	addressed in Engagement Report
Survey	-	I like that you note the responses that have the strongest disagreement and agreement. You should also note that for Enforcement and In Your Community. In the Behavior category, all of the question except the question about yield to pedestrians are ones in which a low score is the preferred response, so that should be addressed in some way. On face value, it would appear to be the worst or least preferred because it got the highest score. So also think about changing the color of the markers to make desirable responses green and undesirable responses red. Also, in addition to plotting the average, plot all scores along the graph which will give a more representative view of the results. The average can be a bit misleading.	Added context
High Injury Network	-	are interstates included in the HIN? Please consider adding a link to view all maps. Very difficult to see at this scale.	Added context
High Injury Network	-	The map which shows 70% of the crashes occurring on 1% of the network, doesn't include interstate crashes. Why aren't interstate crashes being considered? I suggest labeling the map to note that only crashes on primary and secondary routes are represented. I think it's important that the same data set be used throughout the report for consistency, so interstate crashes should be excluded from all other tables, charts, maps, graphics, etc. or addressed separately.	added text to give more context
General	-	MPO's Role as a Convener and a Funder The plan does not sufficiently articulate the MPO's critical function as a funder for transportation safety projects. Clearly defining this role will help set expectations since counties and city have different implementation parameters (e.g. design guides). The MPO plays a critical role in setting the table for how we evaluate projects eligible for Regional, State and Federal dollars. See below for more on this.	Added text about revisiting funding framework to action 6
General	-	Regional Safety Action Team The plan would benefit significantly from leading with and emphasizing the need to establish a Regional Safety Action Team that convenes on a regular, structured basis (e.g., quarterly meetings and an annual event similar in scope and purpose to the RVA Speed Management Symposium).	Emphasized Regional Safety Task Force
General	-	Regional Funding Prioritization The plan should include transparent narrative on how funding prioritization decisions are made across the region. There is a persistent and legitimate concern that some projects funded through regional processes do not meaningfully advance safety outcomes. Addressing this directly, including a commitment to safety-focused scoring criteria, would strengthen the plan's credibility and give member localities a chance to prove they're willing to deliver on that commitment.	Added text about revisiting funding framework to action 6
Regional Spotlight	Localities	Acknowledgment of Existing Local Work — City of Richmond The plan largely overlooks the substantial safety planning and implementation work already undertaken by the City of Richmond. We have a budget of \$1.2 billion in Vision Zero and Complete Streets projects over the next few years. At minimum, the plan should incorporate and cross-reference: - The Vision Zero Action Plan. The draft of our 3rd edition is expected in 2026. - The Safe and Healthy Streets Commission, which represents an active, institutionalized structure for advancing safety priorities.	Acknowledged in Regional Spotlight
Public Engagement	-	p. 13: on the word cloud, it appears the word "vegetation" is misspelled (above and to the left of "speeding")	fixed
Public Engagement	Moving Freely	p. 18: A minor note on my section--would it be important to mention that my accident was not in Richmond? It's such a widespread issue that location isn't necessarily important (but could be more transparent to say "in Minneapolis, MN" or "in a Midwestern city"). I'm fine either way but just wanted to flag it for you to consider.	added context
General	-	I think it's great, and while I didn't do it from the perspective of technical editing, I don't have any suggestions. I really appreciate the youth spotlight! Thanks for working on this, and thanks for sharing.	noted