Mr. Ardussi:

These preliminary comments are presented on behalf of the I-5 Users Coalition, I-90 Users Coalition, I-405 Users Coalition, SR 167 Users Coalition and SR 520 Users Coalition in order to identify and to make a public record respecting the Puget Sound Regional Council’s rather-remarkable failure to incorporate the central-and-quintessential finding of PSRC’s own Regional Freight Panel into its “Draft” Regional Freight Strategy document – much less to organize its nominal so-called “freight strategy” around that PSRC-convened Panel’s *sine qua non* determination – namely, that **no existing freight capacity in any current rail, road or water corridor should degraded** due to the patent centrality of freight movement for real economic viability, over time, both within the central Puget Sound region and also for the state as a whole, including but certainly not limited to the needs of vital agricultural interests in central Washington highly reliant upon freight mobility in and through the I-90 corridor for delivery of perishable products to the Port of Seattle for international export and to the greater Seattle area for retail sales to residents here.

Simply stated, these five user groups find it hard to understand any logical reasons for this glaring omission except for intentional suppression of this principal concern as developed by the freight community, based on PSRC convening its own Regional Freight Panel, because this explicit priority of **no degradation of any existing capacity in any current rail, road or water corridor** implicates an inconvenient truth that in fact conflicts with PSRC’s higher values on bicycles and on other recreational-and-amenity interests that appear to drive its planning process much more than fundamentals essential for regional-and-state sustainability.

Further, PSRC’s discontinuation of meetings by the Regional Freight Panel, shortly after formulation of its guiding principle that **no existing freight capacity in any current rail, road or water corridor should degraded**, buttresses the appearance that actual suppression is involved, rather than mere inattention or incompetence since, as noted both by Oliver Wendell Holmes in the 19th Century and also by Will Rogers in the 20th Century, even dogs can tell the difference between being simply tripped over and being kicked.

These facts are particularly implicating of intentional suppression after the Transportation Policy Board specifically instructed PSRC staff of inadequacies as to freight needs within the evolving Transportation 2040 Plan in December, 2009 and explicitly instructed that staff should focus on upgrading this thus-indicated failure.

Beyond PSRC’s likely outright suppression of the centrality of freight movement for economic viability, its “Draft” also appears greatly inadequate due to marginal-to-nonexistent documentation of key adverse impacts on freight mobility from various alternative scenarios, despite PSRC’s nonpareil modeling capacities, and despite Hon. Richard Ford’s repeated belittling of the inadequacy of documentations of adverse impacts on the I-90 corridor when presented to the Transportation Policy Board by the undersigned, over the last several years, in graphical formats as prepared by the Eastside Transportation Association from WSDOT’s materials in an effort to highlight what your “Draft” appears intent on continuing to cover up still further to this day.

This is especially critical since Secretary Paula Hammond has squarely stated on the public record, as a Sound Transit Board member, that she lacks adequate information in order to allow her make core decisions pursuant to her fiduciary duties about the full extent of adverse impacts on freight movements in the I-90 corridor (were that regional agency allowed to convert I-90’s center roadway to fixed-rail transit rather than another form of high-capacity transit).

The five user groups generally endorse comments made during the study session on January 8, 2010 by way of major concerns expressed about the inadequacy of PSRC’s boiler-plate heavy and substantively light “Draft” (including but not limited to critical discussions initiated then by senior managers with critical freight obligations within the state Department of Transportation and in the state Department of Agriculture).
Further, as a part of the official record, these five user groups hereby formally request that PSRC retain an independent review team to investigate and to report on whether core freight mobility needs of the region and of the state are being intentionally suppressed by PSRC through you and through more senior members of its staff reporting to Bob Drewel, as appears to be the case based on several particulars provided hereinabove, as well as due to the “Draft” document’s failures to supply core data and other quintessential information on those reasonably detailed bases required to allow complete responses by the undersigned or by any other person required to comment on its hide-the-ball machinations.

Additionally, these five user groups request opportunity to supplement their preliminary comments herein if and when a document responsive to the **no degradation of any existing capacity in any current rail, road or water corridor** imperative of PSRC’s Regional Freight Panel is eventually forthcoming (perhaps through Barbara Ivanov’s generous offer to you, last Friday, simply to rewrite pivotal elements of the completely inadequate “Draft,” for you, due to its patent failures as noted by one person after another in pointing out one major inadequacy after another core inadequacy).

Finally, if bad faith intentions by PSRC implicated by its highly questionable “Draft” up to this point are apparent but not actual, then these five user groups would be pleased to assist further as to improving freight mobility rather than to be compelled to preserve freight capacity despite PSRC’s seeming preferences for amenities over essentials.

Respectfully yours.

Will Knedlik
Executive Summary
This Regional Freight Strategy (Strategy) represents the freight component of Transportation 2040, the central Puget Sound region's long-range transportation plan. This Strategy represents PSRC's efforts to understand and quantify the importance of freight movement to the economic functioning and quality of life of the central Puget Sound region. The outcome of this Strategy is a set of recommendations that strive to recognize the importance of freight, while at the same time recognizing PSRC's commitments to supporting strong, healthy communities, inclusive growth patterns, and protection of the natural environment. These recommendations (which are summarized in Section 5 of this Strategy) will be carried forward within the Transportation 2040 framework and will form the basis of a long-term regional freight strategy that both supports freight, while minimizing its impacts on communities and the natural environment.

Why is Freight Important in the Puget Sound Region?
Following the policy commitments made in VISION 2040, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) recognizes the important economic and quality-of-life contributions that freight transportation makes to the central Puget Sound regional economy, including:

- **Goods movement-dependent industries support a healthy regional economy.** Together, goods movement-dependent industries such as wholesale and retail trade, manufacturing, construction, agriculture and mining contributed roughly $62 billion to the Gross Regional Product (GRP) of the Metropolitan Area in 2006 (roughly 31% of the total GRP).1

- **Goods movement-dependent industries provide regional jobs.** These goods movement-dependent industries provided almost 700,000 jobs in the central Puget Sound region, or roughly 37% of total regional employment. These jobs and employment sectors in the region are dependent on the regional transportation system to bring goods to market.2

---

1 The Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis distributes information on GRP by Metropolitan Statistical Area, adjusted by PSRC.

2 Washington State Department of Employment Security, PSRC

3 Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis
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The Puget Sound Region serves as a vital international gateway that supports the national economy. The region’s deepwater ports and air cargo facilities support international and national trade movements that connect international markets to the region and throughout the U.S. Together, the marine and air ports of the central Puget Sound region provide direct and indirect statewide employment to over 200,000 people, contribute almost $1 billion dollars in state and local tax revenues, and generate billions of dollars of revenues through their real estate activities and tenants.

Freight movement supports the daily functions of every business and household in the central Puget Sound region through regional distribution. Everything that we use in our day-to-day lives—including the furniture we use, food we eat, paper and office products we use or clothes we wear—were brought to us using the region’s freight system. Simply put—the region could not enjoy its current quality of life without a fully functioning and efficient freight transportation system.

Why Is Freight Movement Growing in the Puget Sound Region?

Freight transportation is often described as a derived demand, because it is driven by factors such as industry growth or decline, shifting population patterns, and changing regional income. The central Puget Sound region is growing in many of these demand categories, with population expected to reach 5 million by 2040, along with an accompanying employment of 3.1 million jobs. These new residents, and the jobs that are created by and for them, will all depend on the region’s freight system to deliver the goods and services that they need on a daily basis, as well as to support the industries and businesses where they work. In addition, the region’s goods-dependent businesses—such as manufacturing, construction, warehousing, and mining—are all projected to see robust growth by 2040. These industries are heavy users of the freight transportation system because they depend on it to receive raw materials and send their finished products to market. Their continued prominence and growth in the central Puget Sound region is another factor driving the projected strong demand for freight.

Regional Growth Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Truck Tonnage >400 million

Population: 5 million

Jobs: 3.1 million

Forecast

---


5 Truck tonnage adjusted by PSRC based on the Freight Analysis Framework II

6 PSRC, Washington State Department of Employment Security
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2
In 2006, <strong>The Port of Tacoma and the Port of Seattle moved 3.6 million TEUs</strong>, making them the third largest U.S. ports in terms of TEUs (19 million TEUs). Individually, the Port of Tacoma and Seattle were combined, the third largest U.S. port in terms of TEUs (19 million TEUs). As of 2008, the region's total TEU throughput is 25.6 million TEUs, which is equal to roughly 33% of TEUs handled at the Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach combined. The Port of Seattle expects to handle over 12.7 million TEUs by 2040, which is only about 5% over 2006 levels. The Port of Tacoma is expected to handle over 22 million TEUs by 2040.

The Port region's seaport trade includes <strong>major trade corridors as well as national and local roadway</strong> links to support local businesses and industries. In 2006, the Port of Tacoma and Seattle were combined, the third largest U.S. port in terms of TEUs (19 million TEUs). As of 2008, the region's total TEU throughput is 25.6 million TEUs, which is equal to roughly 33% of TEUs handled at the Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach combined. The Port of Seattle expects to handle over 12.7 million TEUs by 2040, which is only about 5% over 2006 levels. The Port of Tacoma is expected to handle over 22 million TEUs by 2040.

The region's truck network includes major trade corridors as well as national and local roadway links. These trade corridors are fed by a number of industries and communities connecting population centers and facilities that serve to support local businesses and industries. In 2006, the Port of Tacoma and Seattle were combined, the third largest U.S. port in terms of TEUs (19 million TEUs). As of 2008, the region's total TEU throughput is 25.6 million TEUs, which is equal to roughly 33% of TEUs handled at the Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach combined. The Port of Seattle expects to handle over 12.7 million TEUs by 2040, which is only about 5% over 2006 levels. The Port of Tacoma is expected to handle over 22 million TEUs by 2040.
and the Port of Seattle was the ninth largest (1.7 million TEUs). The 2009 Marine Cargo Forecast projects a steady 4.1% growth rate each year for the next 20 years, reaching a projected 9.7 million TEUs in 2030. In terms of tonnage, in 2007, the ports of the Puget Sound moved over 88 million tons of waterborne cargo. This is expected to increase to 155 million tons in 2040. The majority of this growth is expected to be in imports, which are predicted to grow from 23.6 million tons in 2007 to 81.2 million tons in 2040.

**Rail System and Commodity Volumes**

The Regional rail system includes the Class I rail facilities of the Burlington Northern / Santa Fe (BNSF) and the Union Pacific (UP) mainlines and intermodal yards, all of which provide vital long-haul rail capacity to feed the needs of international cargo and regional businesses alike. A handful of short line railroads support key regional industries by providing short-haul connectivity to markets within and beyond the central Puget Sound region. Approximately 106 million carload tons and 23 million intermodal tons moved inside the Puget Sound Region in 2007. Rail volumes are anticipated to rise substantially by 2040 and are expected to top 145 million carload tons and 88 million intermodal tons moved within the region.

**Air System and Commodity Volumes**

Vital to international trade as well as to high value domestic goods including aircraft and agricultural products, the region’s air cargo facilities offered at Sea-Tac, Boeing Field, and Paine Field play an important role for freight. In 2007, the Puget Sound region’s airports moved an estimated 429,000 tons of cargo. Sea-Tac International Airport (operated by the Port of Seattle), is the nineteenth busiest air cargo facility in the nation, and carried nearly 320,000 tons of this total. In 2040, it is expected that over 650,000 tons of cargo will be handled by these airports. Approximately 475,000 tons of cargo is expected to be handled by

---

12. Ibid. Forecast was adjusted to account for economic downturn by assuming 0% growth 2007-2010 and was extended to 2040 by assuming a continuation of predicted 2007-2030 growth rates.
13. WTC Statewide Rail Capacity and Needs Study
14. Estimate based on the WTC Statewide Rail Capacity and Needs Study. Assumes no growth 2007-2010 and expected growth rates 2010-2025. Growth after 2025 was assumed to be 1.0% for carload tons and 4.6% for intermodal tons—equal to predicted 2015-2025 growth rate.
15. Forecasts are based on the PSRC Air Cargo Strategy. In order to account for the effects of the current economic downturn, 2010 forecasts for both airports were adjusted. 2007 and 2008 Sea-Tac cargo totals source: SEA-TAC International Passenger, Cargo, & Operations Summary, December 2009. 2009 Sea-Tac cargo total estimated based on totals through August 2009, contained in SEA-TAC International Passenger, Cargo, & Operations Summary, August 2009. 0% growth assumed in 2010 for Sea-Tac International. PSRC Air Cargo Strategy forecast for King County International Airport was adjusted downwards in equal proportion (38.6%) to the revised Sea-Tac 2010 forecast. Two% annual growth in cargo tonnage at both airports is assumed after 2010.
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What Issues and Problems Are Starting to Affect the Movement of Freight?

Each industry, freight transportation provider, shipper, or community in the central Puget Sound region experiences a unique set of freight transportation issues and constraints. To gain a better understanding of these issues, this Strategy relied on a freight stakeholder outreach process that was informed by a quantitative look at the commodity flows, volumes, modes, and infrastructure that comprises the region's freight system. The stakeholder outreach process completed for this Strategy interviewed a range of transportation system stakeholders in order to identify key issues that freight stakeholders perceive as impacting freight mobility in the central Puget Sound region. Issues raised during this process are organized into the four categories that have been outlined throughout the rest of the Transportation 2040 process: sustainable funding, congestion and mobility, environment, and general. They are discussed fully in Section 2 of this Strategy and summarized briefly here:

**Congestion and Mobility**

- Increasing congestion on the roads means more wasted truck time, growing transportation costs, and increased emissions from idling on congested facilities. In 2006, congestion resulted in 201,000 hours of daily delay on freeways and 900,000 hours of daily delay on arterials, and average delay of 14 minutes per trip. Considering that 2040 the average daily number of trips is projected to increase by 40% for all vehicle types, there will be a corresponding increase in time wasted to congestion for passenger and freight vehicles alike.

- Congestion creates more congestion. As unpredictability and congestion rise, companies are forced to send more trucks on the roads to make the same number of deliveries, further adding to the region's problems with congestion.

- Limited Port Connectivity. There are limited arterials and rail lines by which to access the ports, and many of the access facilities are congested or deteriorating. This may seriously impact the ability of the ports to expand or adversely affect the movement of vital regional goods into or out of the port facilities.

- Growing congestion on key freight corridors. Many of the main corridors that the region's transportation system contributes to the national system, such as I-5, I-90, and 520, are on the list of most congested infrastructure as per the region's Metropolitan Transportation System definition.

- Challenging "Last Mile" Connectivity. In some places, the region's arterial system that serves to connect businesses and homes to the national freight system is deteriorating or congested with passenger vehicles. The ability to access the region's interstates and highways from local facilities that make up the supply chain is an important link that needs to be considered.

**Sustainable Funding**

- Tolling and freight considerations. In general, private-sector freight transportation stakeholders have concerns about tolling. One of these concerns is that, if a toll is to be collected, there needs to be a demonstrable benefit to the freight providers. For example, tolls collected on a particular facility should be used to pay for improvements on that facility, rather than being used on other investments that provide less direct benefit to freight movement.
- Most freight stakeholders interviewed are concerned with the lack of dedicated freight funding for infrastructure improvement. There was some frustration expressed that the level of investment in transportation projects that benefit freight does not seem to be commensurate with the importance of freight as an essential function of the transportation system.

**Environment and Land Use**

- Decreasing industrial land supply. The gentrification of commercial and industrial lands as population centers grow at times creating land use conflicts between freight and non-freight land uses. With population expected to reach 5 million people by 2040, these land use conflicts will grow more common. In addition, many industrial land uses are being pushed out of the urban core—sometimes with negative regional transportation system and environmental impacts.

- Urban design that does not consider freight uses. Many shippers and carriers interviewed in this effort feel that freight’s needs are not reflected in urban design or urban management, leading to conflicts with other land uses such as commercial or residential development.

- Environmental planning and regulations should be introduced in a cooperative manner—as was the case for the Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy. Though there is widespread support for rising environmental standards and environmental protection measures, stakeholders interviewed urged public agencies to act in collaboration with the freight community.

- Inconsistent local land use restrictions. A growing number of cities and municipalities are enforcing local restrictions on trucks, including delivery time, and routing restrictions. These restrictions can often have a negative impact on regional mobility by forcing trucks onto the road at peak periods in order to reach their destinations before evening delivery cut-off times.

### Responding to Delivery Restrictions—Impacts on One Company

A large grocery retailer interviewed in this effort has about 200 trucks in circulation in the central Puget Sound Region every day. Since the same company owns the trucks and the stores that the goods are delivered to, the company has some potential to perform late-night deliveries and keep their trucks off the road during peak travel times. However, local noise restrictions in some cities limit delivery hours. Most cities have a cut-off time at 8 p.m. or 9 p.m., and do not allow deliveries again until after 7 a.m. This means that this grocery retailer has to run their trucks during peak travel times to make the necessary re-stock trips to keep store shelves filled with fresh produce and other goods. Congestion has increased the transportation costs of this company, due to time lost to congestion and the need to purchase additional trucks to counteract increasing travel/delivery time. In this case, costs are quickly passed onto consumers in the form of the rising costs of grocery items.

### General

- Lack of public understanding of some of the positive benefits of freight. Despite the best efforts of several state and regional agencies, there is still a public misconception about freight movement. For example, some do not realize that the vast majority of truck traffic on the region’s roadways (at least 68%, according to FAF2) is either being carried into the region for consumption, or being carried out from the region’s businesses for destinations on the national market.

---

17 Federal Highway Administration, Freight Analysis Framework 2.
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• Companies deal with rising costs in different ways. The companies interviewed in this effort are all experiencing rising transportation costs. Some companies (in particular those who own both the retail facilities and the truck), can pass these costs on to consumers in the form of higher costs of goods. Other times, the truck makes the delivery is an independent operator or a leased fleet operator. These businesses will have very little ability to pass on their rising costs of operations.

What Can Be Done to Support Efficient Freight Movement in the Central Puget Sound Region?

This Regional Freight Strategy provides reasons for supporting and investing in the regional freight system. The freight system supports vital industries within the Puget Sound region, as well as the international trade functions of the region’s deepwater marine ports and air cargo ports. In addition, the freight system is responsible for delivering goods and services to support the quality of life for residents and businesses within the region.

There are actions that can be taken to help support this system, as well as to ensure that it is developed in a manner that has minimal consequences to the communities and natural environment within which it operates. Though the full set of recommendations developed in this Strategy is available in Section 5, they are summarized here. They are organized into the categories used during the Transportation 2040 planning process: congestion and mobility, sustainable funding, environment, land use, safety and security, economy, preservation and maintenance, and planning and policy.

Congestion and Mobility

• The region should prioritize key strategic Capacity improvements that have been recognized by the freight community. Many infrastructure capacity and operational projects have been identified by regional freight stakeholders as being important for the mobility of freight. These include projects that support:
  o East-west mobility—including Stampede pass, the FAST projects, as well as improvements to SR 18, 512, 531, 160, 704, U.S. Highway 2, and others.
  o North-south mobility—including the I-405 interchange improvements, I-5, and improvements on SR 522, 167, and 509.
  o Connectivity to existing and growing manufacturing and industrial centers—including SR 167, 99, 509, 704, and Tukwila International Boulevard.

• Support for truck routes—All T1 and T2 facilities as designated by the WSDOT FGTS including all projects on SR 512, 161, 99, the 167 and 509 extensions, and SR 9 capacity enhancements.18

• Complete the remaining FAST Corridor Projects. Continue working collaboratively towards completing strategically selected freight mobility projects as identified by the FAST Corridor Partnership.

• Continue to evaluate capacity and efficiency improvements, and operation and management strategies that serve the growing demand for regional deliveries and distribution. Ensure that the region’s most important freight needs are identified as conditions change.

18 2007 FGTS Classification, WSDOT, T1 facilities carry more than 10 million tons annually, and T2 carry more than 4 million tons annually.
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Sustainable Funding

- Monitor the status of SAFETEA-LU reauthorization. There are possible opportunities for dedicated federal funding for freight investments in the next surface transportation bill.

- Ensure that as tolling is implemented in the region, that it is done in a manner that minimizes diversion onto local routes and other facilities that are not tolled. This includes the specific consideration of truck freight needs to be made as tolling strategies are developed for the region.

- Consider demonstrating a clear nexus between user fees paid by freight, the service, amenity, or long-term improvement received. This will ensure that freight system users can see the benefit of their investment into the system.

When considering tolling or user fees for truck freight, investigate the ability of different truck operators to pass such costs on to the consumer. This will recognize that shippers and carriers have varying abilities to set rates for their goods and services.

- Investigate possible means to prioritize freight projects through the regional scoring process. The region should recognize that freight movement and freight industries are beneficial to the regional economy, and include their needs in the project prioritization and scoring process.

Land Use

- Build on the policies established in VISION 2040 to ensure that there are statements to support active retention of industrial and freight-intensive land uses within the urban core.

- The region should continue its efforts to encourage industrial and manufacturing land development into the eight designated Manufacturing and Industrial centers (MICs). Ensure that new growth in manufacturing facilities is focused on intensification of use within the existing MIC locations. The existing and future concentrations of goods dependent employment are served by the regions multimodal freight and goods transportation system.

- Prioritize Investments in Manufacturing Industrial Areas. Actively pursue transportation projects and investments that enhance safety and the mobility of freight moving in the eight designated MICs.

Environment

- Continue to work with the private freight community to plan and implement measures to ensure environmental protection. Including regional freight stakeholders from the start in future efforts (such as the Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy) to help ensure that the strategies are palatable and implementable.

- Ensure that the impacts of growing environmental regulations and guidelines are understood and recognized in the region’s planning efforts. Developing environmental regulations and guidelines may have significant impacts to freight stakeholders. It is important that the region recognizes these upcoming changes in its planning efforts.

- Ensure that regional long range plans and implementation strategies are created within a framework that reflects growing global environmental concerns and issues. Global issues–including climate change and energy availability—may have a considerable impact on the freight transportation industry and should be included in long range planning and research functions.
Preservation and Maintenance

- Prioritize "Last Mile" or "First Mile" freight connectivity. Recognize that the region's arterial network plays an important role in regional freight mobility and often serves as either the last or first mile in the supply chain. Consider creating a prioritization framework to include these facilities in funding discussions.

Planning and Analysis

- Identify Gaps in regional Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS). Gaps in the system should be identified as the FGTS is updated.
- Pursue opportunities to collect Commodity Flow Survey information. Since such data are integral to regional freight planning activities, special consideration should be given to collecting or collaborating with others on the collection of this important data.
- Routinely evaluate the effectiveness of region's regional freight stakeholder coordination opportunities (Freight Mobility Roundtable, etc.), as well as the type of stakeholders included in each one. Ensuring a correct balance of participation on these regional coordination opportunities is essential. Continue to take an active role in the region's regional freight stakeholder coordination opportunities.
  - The region should continue to support the work with multi-regional and multi-state coalitions to form a cohesive freight strategy that could benefit from the involvement of Federal and State partners. For example, the work of the West Coast Corridor Coalition (WCCC).

Safety and Security

- Consider studying the issue of truck safety on the region's roadway network. Growing volumes of freight will mean more trucks on the region's road in the coming years, and more opportunities for truck/passenger vehicle incidents.
- Ensure that the impacts of growing transportation security efforts are understood and recognized in the region's planning efforts. Including new security acts such as SAFETEA-LU and Implementing the Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission (IRC) Act of 2007.
- Ensure safety in designated Manufacturing Industrial Centers. Projects that increase safety in these areas play an important role in a successful centers strategy.

Continue to build a multi-regional and multi-state freight strategy that actively participates in coalitions. This coalition level strategy will enable the partners to leverage the strengths of each partner at the state and federal levels.
Section 1: Introduction

This Regional Freight Strategy represents the freight component of Transportation 2040, the central Puget Sound region’s long-range transportation plan.

Following the policy commitments made in VISION 2040, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) recognizes the important economic contributions that freight transportation makes to the central Puget Sound regional economy. Goods movement-dependent industries contributed roughly $62 billion to the Gross Regional Product (GRP) of the Metropolitan Area in 2006 (roughly 31% of the total GRP), as well as providing almost 700,000 jobs in the central Puget Sound region, or roughly 37% of total regional employment. In addition, the region’s freight system-and the goods that move across it-support the daily functioning of every resident and business within the central Puget Sound region. Simply put, the region could not enjoy its current quality of life without a fully functioning and efficient freight transportation system.

However, freight is a derived demand—it grows when populations, incomes, and employment grow. The central Puget Sound region is growing in all three categories, with population expected to reach 5 million by 2040. This rising local demand, as well as accompanying projected growth through the region’s global gateways (i.e., the deepwater marine ports and airports), means that freight’s presence in the region will increase. This will place even more pressure on the region’s freight transportation system on the roads, rail lines, and intermodal connectors that provide vital mobility to personal and freight transportation alike. Unless action is taken, this growing pressure will threaten the efficiency and reliability of the region’s transportation system, as well as contribute to undesirable environmental and community impacts.

This Strategy represents the PSRC’s efforts to create recommendations that will support the continued efficiency and productivity of the regional freight transportation system. These recommendations recognize the importance of freight, while at the same time recognizing PSRC’s commitments to supporting strong, healthy communities, inclusive growth patterns, and protection of the natural environment. These recommendations (which are summarized in Section 5 of this Strategy) will be carried forward within the Transportation 2040 framework and will form the basis of a long-term regional freight strategy that both supports freight, while minimizing its impacts on communities and the natural environment.

VISION 2040, adopted in 2008, includes the Regional Growth Strategy for the four-county region and establishes an overarching framework for land use, transportation, and economic development objectives and goals for the next 30 years. Transportation 2040 will not only fulfill federal requirements to have a long-range transportation plan, but will also articulate the ways the region shall fulfill the goals and objectives from VISION 2040.

This Regional Freight Strategy has been developed to support Transportation 2040 by providing a more in-depth look at freight in the region and to make recommendations as to how the region can plan for freight movement through 2040. This Regional Freight Strategy has been developed as a component of Transportation 2040 to:

- Highlight the issue of freight and recognize its importance in the regional transportation system.
- Outline the existing conditions related to freight here in the central Puget Sound region.

1 FHWA FAF; Ports of Seattle and Tacoma; PSRC Air Cargo Strategy; Washington Public Ports Association, 2009 Marine Cargo Forecast; Sea-Tac International Passenger, Cargo, & Operations Summary, August 2009; WSDOT State Rail and Marine Office
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• Call attention to some of the emerging issues and uncertainties facing freight industries as they relate to the regional transportation system.
• Provide recommendations to accompany the long-range transportation plan, Transportation 2040.
• Serve as a starting point for freight planning to evolve and adapt as conditions change.

VISION 2040 Freight-Related Multicounty Planning Policies:

Transportation Policies
MPP-T-17: Ensure the freight system meets the needs of: 1) Global gateways 2) Producer needs within the state and region, and 3) Regional and local distribution.

MPP-T-18: Maintain and improve the existing multimodal freight transportation system in the region, to increase reliability and efficiency, and to prevent degradation of freight mobility.

MPP-T-19: Coordinate regional planning with railroad capacity expansion plans, and support capacity expansion that is compatible with State, regional, and local plans.

Other policies in VISION 2040 about freight and goods movement relate to a broad range of goals and objectives such as land use, the environment, and the economy. A more detailed look at the multicounty planning policies can be found by reviewing VISION 2040.

1.1: Key Themes guiding this Regional Freight Strategy

There are several key themes which emerged throughout the creation of this Regional Freight Strategy, they will be referenced throughout the remainder of this document as the key, organizing themes.

The importance of the region as a global gateway for international trade. The central Puget Sound region is home to a number of strategically advantageous facilities including several deepwater marine ports, Class I rail lines, and air cargo facilities. Much of the region's economic growth has been driven by these transportation connections to the nation and the world. Together, the marine and air ports of the central Puget Sound region provide direct statewide employment of more than 115,000 people, contribute over $900 million dollars in state and local tax revenues, and generate billions of dollars of revenues through their real estate activities and tenants.2 Ensuring that these resources are integrated in the rest of the transportation system is essential to maintaining the strength of the central Puget Sound economy.

The importance of the facilities that offer connectivity to the regional transportation network and support regional businesses and population. The region's arterial network plays an important role in regional freight mobility and often serves as either the last or first mile in the supply chain. It connects the region's vital industries to the regional and national transportation system, and provides residents and


DRAFT Transportation 2040, Regional Freight Strategy 11-20-2009
businesses with the goods and services that they need to thrive. The region should ensure the protection and maintenance of those connector facilities that are of particular regional importance for the movement of the region’s freight.

The benefits of retaining manufacturing and industrial centers within the urban fabric, and ensuring that they are developed in a manner that is supportive of freight while lessening freight’s impacts on communities. PSRC recognizes that it is important to retain freight and industrial land uses within the urban region. Doing so has proven to have regional benefits, including economic development, jobs, tax revenues, and easy access to goods and services for a rapidly growing regional population. However, freight-intensive land uses are often involved in conflicts with adjacent land uses if proper buffers or land use controls are not applied. The region can proactively avoid conflict by continuing to support the clustering of freight businesses in the designated Manufacturing and Industrial Centers (MICs), as well as following best land use and freight integration practices that allow for the incorporation of freight-intensive land uses into regions in a manner that both maximizes the benefits of freight while minimizing their impacts.

The necessity of creating sustainable funding mechanisms that allow freight users to see the benefits of their investments into the system. In addition, the funding mechanisms should recognize that different types of freight operators will respond to rising costs differently. Some have the ability to pass on costs, while others will have to absorb the higher transportation costs. If benefits received from the funding mechanism (i.e., time saved or added reliability) do not outweigh the rising transportation costs, the funding mechanism may be viewed as inequitable.

The necessity of continued collaborative work that protects the natural environment. Developing environmental regulations and guidelines, such as the 2008 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency diesel reduction program and the Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy, may have significant impacts on freight stakeholders. It is important that the region supports both the need to preserve and improve the efficiency of freight transportation systems, and environmental protection.

The need to be aware of and responsive to the rapidly changing context for freight. At the time of this writing, the nation is in the midst of a significant economic recession, and at the same time is coming to terms with increasing energy costs as well as emerging environmental issues, all of which have the potential to impact the quality of life in the central Puget Sound region. To be successful, the region will need to be responsive and adaptable as it faces these and other emerging uncertainties. Some of these issues include the consequences of increased transportation security regulation, changing supply chain patterns, possible new greenhouse gas regulations, and fluctuating energy costs and energy supply uncertainty. Though the region may not be able to control any of these factors, it can begin to think of potential impacts of them, and prepare to proactively protect the region from potential impacts and changes.

It can influence the impacts of these factors by proactively preparing an option to handle the potential impacts and change on the region.
Section 2: Development of the Regional Freight Strategy for Transportation 2040

The development of this Regional Freight Strategy drew on much of the work previously completed by regional and state freight stakeholders to assess statewide freight volumes, infrastructure, issues, and policies (as is summarized in Table 2). In addition, region-specific qualitative and quantitative data sources were used throughout the process, in order to “drill down” into the statewide data and identify information and data relevant to the central Puget Sound region. The creation of this Strategy relied solely on publicly-available data and information, which, for the most part, is reasonably good and recent. A discussion about the limitations of some of these data sources is summarized in Section 2.3. Also included is a summary of the types of information and data sources used. A full listing of data sources is included in Appendix 3C.

In addition to analysis of a variety of data and published information, the Strategy included a regional freight stakeholder outreach process, as well as occasional feedback from organized groups, such as the Regional Freight Mobility Roundtable and the FAST Corridor Partnership, in order to generate more targeted local information about stakeholder needs, issues, and recommendations. A general discussion of the types of stakeholders included in this process, as well as the major findings from this effort, is included here. A list of stakeholders interviewed during this process is included as Appendix 2A, and copies of the survey instruments used are included as Appendices 2B, 2C, and 2D.

2.1: Who Did We Talk To?

Freight planning in the Puget Sound region is facilitated by the existence of several well-defined regional (and state) freight stakeholder coordination opportunities. Groups such as the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB), the Freight Action Strategy for the Everett-Seattle-Tacoma (FAST) Corridor Partnership, and the Regional Freight Mobility Roundtable offer venues for public and private freight stakeholders to coordinate on setting regional priorities, to discuss ongoing freight projects, and to plan for future regional freight mobility. This ongoing freight discussion also means that there are many regional freight stakeholders who are knowledgeable about the planning process and willing to assist in long-range planning projects such as this Regional Freight Strategy.

This PSRC Regional Freight Strategy capitalized on this expertise through a stakeholder outreach effort that focused on a series of one-on-one interviews with regional freight stakeholders. Stakeholders were asked about the challenges, issues, and opportunities involving freight mobility in the central Puget Sound region. Interviewee guides were created for “Shippers,” “Carriers,” and “Agencies,” in order to tailor the questions and responses to different types of freight stakeholders. (These interview guides are available as Appendix 2B, 2C, and 2D to this Regional Freight Strategy). The following types of stakeholders were interviewed in this effort:

Table 1: Types of Stakeholders Interviewed for the Regional Freight Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewed Stakeholder Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Local city government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional motor carrier owners and operators, including short-haul, long-haul, local delivery and on-call / moving services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Class I railroads
• Short-haul intermodal carriers
• Shippers, including those who own their own trucks and those who do not
• Industry associations
• Marine ports
• Ocean carriers / terminal operators
• Labor unions

In addition to the stakeholders interviewed for this effort, this study benefited from the feedback and guidance of the Freight Action Strategy for the Everett-Seattle-Tacoma Corridor (FAST) Partnership, as well as the Regional Freight Mobility Roundtable. Both of these groups, and their role in the regional freight planning process, are profiled in Section 3.5 of this Strategy.

2.2: What were the Main Messages of the Regional Freight Stakeholders?

Each industry, freight transportation provider, shipper, or community in the central Puget Sound region experiences a unique set of freight transportation issues and constraints. The stakeholder outreach process, by speaking to a range of transportation system stakeholders, was able to identify a number of issues that the freight stakeholders perceive as impacting freight mobility in the central Puget Sound Region. Issues raised during this process are organized into the four categories that have been outlined throughout the rest of the Transportation 2040 process: sustainable funding, congestion and mobility, environment, and general.

Sustainable Funding

Tolling and freight considerations: While none of the private-sector interviewees was enthusiastic about tolls, there was an increased understanding that at some level they are going to be a part of the future funding picture. Freight stakeholders feel that tolling must be considered very carefully so that it does not create disproportionate impacts on freight system users. Important points made by various interviewees include:

• If freight is to be tolled, a demonstrable nexus needs to be made between the fees paid, and the benefits received for freight users.
• A preference that tolls should be used to pay for the infrastructure where they are collected, and not to be used for other facilities or modes that do not have a direct benefit for freight users.

Lack of dedicated regional freight funding and a sense of freight issues as warranting priority in funding decisions: Many freight stakeholders interviewed are concerned with the lack of dedicated freight funding for freight infrastructure improvements. These stakeholders feel that historically, the public sector agencies have invested in a manner that directly benefits passenger mobility but less so when it comes to goods movement. There is feeling among many in the freight community that some freight businesses should be considered as providing public benefit similar to that of a utility.
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As well as supplying the region with every manner of essential personal and business goods and services, local freight companies generate local jobs and tax benefits.

**Congestion and Mobility**

Increasing congestion: Increasing congestion on the region's road system has consequences for motor carriers that negatively impact the region—growing transportation costs, and increased emissions from idling on congested facilities. Congestion has worsened across the board during the last 5-10 years, and is now perceived to be problematic at all hours of the day (as opposed to peak hour times) in heavily-used sections for I-5 including near downtown Seattle and Tacoma, as well as significant chokepoints at the southern boundary of the four-county region between Tacoma and Olympia near Tumwater. Other chokepoints on I-405 were identified by stakeholders, particularly near Renton. State routes 167 and 99 were also identified as being important to freight mobility, and increasingly susceptible to increasing congestion. Depending on the products carried by a given company or driver, the congestion locations of greatest concern vary. Drivers conducting business related to the ports of Seattle, Tacoma, or Everett need to contend with congestion bottlenecks on local roads that serve as connectors to the port facilities in addition to congestion on the highways. Other drivers and operators serving the needs related to the Boeing Company must contend with chokepoints for congestion that occur between their company's facility's in Everett and Renton. Drivers and operators have indicated that they will consider using alternate routes such as arterials if they are available.

**Congestion creates more congestion:** Many of the trucking interests we spoke with agreed that the response to increasing congestion is, in many cases, to send more trucks out on the road. Longer travel times and greater unpredictability affect profits, prices, and business decisions. As these factors continue to increase, companies are forced to send more trucks on the roads to make the same number of deliveries, further adding to the region's problems with congestion.

Every kind of business interviewed is experiencing rising transportation costs: For the most part, increased costs are incurred as congestion increases the time required to perform each delivery or trip. Therefore, companies perform fewer trips in a given amount of time with a fixed number of vehicles (reducing revenue), run heavier vehicles, or purchase or lease additional vehicles to meet their delivery / trip needs. In addition, there are wasted labor costs, truck operation costs, and fuel costs incurred by vehicles stuck in congestion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding to Congestion – One Courier Company’s Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of the parcel/courier companies interviewed in this effort has almost 250 trucks in circulation in the central Puget Sound region every day. These trucks are serving the region’s population and businesses, bringing materials to and from the region on a highly time-sensitive basis. Rising congestion has caused this company to make several adjustments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delivery trucks heading to Sea-Tac for the evening flights have had to make their last pick-up times in downtown Seattle earlier and earlier to give them enough time to make their way to Sea-Tac. This is very unpopular with customers, but was necessary to fight congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More routes, trucks, and drivers have been added to the region’s roadways. Since the same truck can no longer make as many pick-ups in the same amount of time, additional trucks have been added to the region’s roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Since this company’s rates are set nationally, the local branches do not have the flexibility to pass on costs to their customers. Therefore, the costs of operating their business in the Puget Sound region have increased.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Limited Port Connectivity: Both public and private stakeholders discussed the growing problems interrupting efficient access to port areas. There are limited arterials by which to access the ports from any major highway. The location of several of the region's ports within urban areas means that these limited arterial access routes are often congested by passenger vehicles. Rail access to the main deepwater ports also tends to become congested, resulting in shipping delays.

Challenging "Last Mile" Connectivity: Both public and private sector interviewees expressed dissatisfaction with the region's ability to invest in the arterial system that makes up the vital "last mile" portion of many regional freight movements.

"Last Mile" Connectivity - The City of Auburn

The City of Auburn has long recognized the value of industrial land uses, such as warehousing and distribution centers, because they provide good-paying jobs to people living within the city. However declining tax revenues (from the state's "Streamlined Sales Tax" initiative and the pull back of the vehicle excise tax), accompanied by rising volumes of trucks, is putting significant strain on the city's roadways. Heavily used roadways, such as those connecting warehouse and distribution clusters to nearby highways and interstates, are literally falling to pieces, with no money in the city budget to repair them. By early 2009, the situation was dire enough that the city is contemplating closing three major freight arterials to large trucks, and possibly rezoning some of the industrial land to higher-value uses such as residential.

Environment and Land Use

Dwindling industrial land supply: The gentrification of commercial and industrial lands as population centers grow is a problem at many levels. Conversion of these lands for housing brings new residential restrictions, such as noise ordinances, which may be incompatible with existing businesses. As industrial property is converted to residential land use, the displaced industrial uses must often move farther from central locations, adding to travel times and costs that make businesses more expensive to operate, and contributing to the regional congestion problem with more and longer truck trips on the transportation system.

Inconsistent local land use restrictions: A growing number of cities and municipalities are enforcing local restrictions on trucks, including delivery time, and routing restrictions. These restrictions can often have a negative impact on regional mobility. For example, one shipper interviewed in this effort would like to make nighttime deliveries to their own 24-hour facilities in order to avoid congestion and peak travel times. However, evening delivery time restrictions in certain cities force their trucks onto the roads during peak travel time, so that they can finish their routes before the evening delivery time cut-off. The fact that these cut-off times may differ from city to city can also force shippers and carriers to lengthen their routes in order to first visit those cities with earlier evening delivery cut-off times.

Urban design that does not consider freight uses: Many shippers and carriers interviewed in this effort feel that freight's needs are not reflected in urban design or urban management. For example, several cited the difficulties in parking commercial vehicles, either in the urban core or in the south Seattle industrial area. Others cited geometric limitations, such as roundabouts placed on truck routes or turns that are too tight to allow for the safe maneuvering of trucks.
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Environmental planning and regulations should be introduced in a cooperative manner: Though there is widespread support for rising environmental standards and environmental protection measures, stakeholders interviewed urged public agencies to act in collaboration with the freight community. As was shown by the successful “Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy,” working in collaboration can have mutually beneficial results to freight stakeholders, local communities, and the natural environment.

General

Lack of public understanding of some of the positive benefits of freight:

Though many of the regional and state agencies are beginning to regularly include freight in their planning and land use discussions, there is still a public misconception about freight movement. One stakeholder mentioned the fact that most people talk about trucks as merely carrying international cargo from the ports to out-of-state markets. Though some truck trips are associated with port operations, many of the trucks using the region’s roads every day are either delivering goods to the region’s population, or carrying local businesses’ goods to market.

Companies deal with rising costs in different ways: The companies interviewed in this effort are all experiencing rising transportation costs. Some companies (in particular those who own both the retail facilities and the truck) these costs can be passed on to consumers in the form of higher costs of goods. Other times, the truck making the delivery is an independent operator or a leased fleet operator. These businesses have very little ability to pass on their rising costs of operations. Though they may be able to negotiate higher delivery fees from the shipper, the highly competitive truck carrier market makes this very difficult.

Rising costs to truck operators may have negative safety or industry affects: Many times, increased transportation costs will be absorbed by the trucking company itself. Some evidence suggests that this is forcing small trucking companies to restructure, go out of business, or defer the upgrading or maintenance of their trucks.

Lack of understanding of freight’s needs: If public investments are to be made in order to improve the regional freight system, public agencies need to make sure these investment decisions are based on a clear assessment of regional freight benefits, such as access to transload facilities and local manufacturing / industrial areas. Currently, there is a lack of knowledge and tools by which to measure and assess regional freight needs and impacts.

Author may be mixing 2 ideas here:

1. Understanding freight needs
2. Identifying benefits + who should pay for improvement
3. Matching initial benefits + how public benefits

Responding to Delivery Restrictions—Impacts on One Company

A large grocery retailer interviewed in this effort has about 200 trucks in circulation in the central Puget Sound Region every day. Since the same company owns the trucks and the stores that the goods are delivered to, the company should be able to easily perform late-night deliveries and keep their trucks off the road during peak travel times. However, local noise restrictions in some cities limit delivery hours. Most cities have a cut-off time at 8 p.m. or 9 p.m., and do not allow deliveries again until after 7 a.m. This means that this grocery retailer has to run their trucks during peak travel times to make the necessary re-stock trips to keep store shelves filled with fresh produce and other goods. Congestion has increased the transportation costs of this company, due to time lost to congestion and the need to purchase additional trucks to counteract increasing travel / delivery time. In this case, costs are passed onto consumers in the form of the rising costs of grocery items.
Section 3: Existing and Future Freight Conditions in the Puget Sound Region

3.1 What is the Role of the Region’s Freight System?
The region’s freight system, and the goods that it carries, support the basic functioning of every resident and business within the central Puget Sound region. Whether it is carrying manufactured goods from local businesses to international export, or delivering food to a grocery store for local consumption, the freight system provides the mobility necessary for the region to thrive. The Washington State Department of Transportation’s Washington Transportation Plan\(^1\) organized the functions of the freight system into three main components:

1) Global Gateways, which recognizes that international and national trade flows through the state of Washington, connecting international trade flows to the U.S. economy and the Pacific West Coast markets,

2) Made in Washington, which recognizes that regional economies—i.e., their manufacturers and farmers—rely on the freight system to ship Washington-made products to local customers, as well as to markets in the remainder of the U.S. and world.

3) Delivering Goods to You, which recognizes the important role of the system to distribute food, clothes, supplies, goods, and services to the people and business that need them.

All three functions of the freight system depend on the same regional freight transportation system. International cargo entering through the region's marine ports uses both the arterial system and the interstate system to access regional and national markets. Goods destined for home delivery may arrive at a regional air cargo facility before traveling to the household via the interstate system and local roads. However, the three different functions of the freight system identified by WSDOT offer a good structure by which to discuss impacts and implications of the region’s freight system. In addition, they tie directly into several of the key policy themes for the Regional Freight Strategy presented in Section 1.1. Namely: 1) the importance of the region as a global gateway for international trade, and 2) the importance of the facilities that offer “last mile” connectivity to the regional transportation network and therefore support regional businesses and populations.

Much of the material presented in this chapter is presented in order to quantify the regional impact of the different freight system components for the central Puget Sound region. For example, the discussion of regional industries and their contribution to Gross Regional Product (GRP) and employment is focused on offering data to support the importance of “last mile” connectivity to support regional businesses and population needs. Likewise, information about the economic impact of the Puget Sound region’s global gateways (such as the Port of Tacoma and Port of Seattle) reinforces their role as regional economic drivers, as well as their contributions to the regional economy. Understanding more about the functions of the regional freight system helps to build a strong case for planning and investing in the preservation, improvement, and expansion of the region’s freight system.

3.2 What Facilities Comprise the Regional Freight System?
All of the functions of the central Puget Sound region’s goods movement system are provided by a multimodal network that includes highway, rail, air, marine, and pipeline operations. The facilities are

---
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summarized in Figure 1 and 2 (Seattle-Tacoma detail shown in Figure 2) below. Briefly, the types of facilities shown in these figures include the following:

**Roadway facilities** include major trade corridors, as well as national, state, and local roadways links. International trade for the central Puget Sound region is served by infrastructure including interstate 5 and 405, which provide north-south connectivity in and from the Puget Sound region and the other major economies on the west coast including the greater Vancouver, Canada region, and northern and southern California. Interstate 90 provides east-west connectivity across the region and links the region to major national and international markets. These trade corridors are fed by a number of national, state, and local roads, and connecting facilities that serve to support local businesses and population by connecting population centers and industries to outlying markets. Facilities included in the freight system include all state, county and local routes that carry more than four million tons per year (T1 and T2), national highway system and state routes (regionally significant freight corridors) that do not meet the T1 or T2 threshold, state county and local principal arterials that are part of the metropolitan transportation system and intermodal connectors.

**Marine and air cargo facilities** are key regional economic drivers, and provide vital "global gateway" links to the nation and world. These facilities include the ports of Everett, Seattle, and Tacoma, and air cargo facilities at Sea-Tac, Boeing Field, and Paine Field.

**Rail** includes the Class I rail facilities of the Burlington Northern / Santa Fe (BNSF) and the Union Pacific (UP) mainlines and intermodal yards, all of which provide vital long-haul rail capacity to feed the needs of international cargo and regional businesses alike. A handful of short line railroads support key regional industries by providing short-haul connectivity to markets within and beyond the Puget Sound region.

**Pipeline** capacity is provided by the Olympic pipeline, which carries gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel along its 299-mile alignment that connects Blaine, Washington with Portland, Oregon. Though pipeline planning is generally left to the private sector, it is included in the regional transportation system discussion because of its important role in increasing the modal choices available to ship commodities in the central Puget Sound region (and likely decreasing the number of trucks using the main North-South and East-West highways).

The PSRC region's **military goods movement system** (shown in Figure 3) consists of the Strategic Highway Network (SRAHNET), Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET), military bases, and sea ports of embarkation. SRAHNET and STRACNET system overlap with many of the vital freight corridors already identified, including interstates 5, 405 and 90.

*Check how BNSF writes their name.*
Figure 1: Existing 2007 Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS)

Source: Washington State Department of Transportation, PSRC.
Figure 2: Existing 2007 FGTS—Seattle/Tacoma Area.

Source: Washington State Department of Transportation, PSRC.
Intermodal Military System

The PSRC region's military goods movement system consists of the U.S. Department of Defense's designated Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET), and Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET), as well as military bases, and sea ports of embarkation. Among other military bases, the Puget Sound is home to Fort Lewis, the only Department of Defense Power Projection Platform (PPP) on the West Coast. PPPs are defined as Army installations that strategically deploy one or more high priority active component brigades or larger and/or mobilize and deploy high-priority Army reserve component units with a 96-hour response and two full divisions in five to eight days. The Port of Tacoma serves as a sea port of embarkation, whose functions include unloading and temporary storage of munitions from depots, and loading and shipping munitions from the port. If mobilization became necessary, the port would need to handle around 600 containers, and 1,100 vehicles daily. The Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) is a system of public highways that is a key component of U.S. strategic policy. It provides defense access, continuity, and emergency capabilities for movements of personnel and equipment in both peace and war. In the Puget Sound, STRAHNET is primarily comprised of interstates 5, 405 and 90. Similarly, STRACNET rail lines are critical for movement of essential military equipment to ports located around the country as well as to connect one facility to another.

![Map of Military Goods Movement System](image)

Figure 3: Military Goods Movement System²

² Source: PSRC
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3.2 Commodity and Modal Profile for the Central Puget Sound Region

There are several key reasons why it is important to understand the commodity flow profile of the region. First, understanding the types of commodities being carried in the region helps to determine which producers and consumers are driving demand—for example, high volumes of construction materials into a region (including gravel, sand, and lumber) might suggest that the construction business is strong and the region is growing. Likewise, growing volumes of electronics being shipped outbound from the region may suggest a growing cluster of electronic manufacturing industries. Second, understanding the types of commodities that are moving on the regional system can help to explicitly determine the economic value of the regional goods movement system. Ultimately, this can be used to determine the economic impact of transportation system performance, as well as disruptions and breakdowns in transportation system performance. Finally, commodity type is one of the key determinants of modal demand. Understanding the types of commodities (and volumes) carried on the regional transportation system is a way to provide insight into the specific function of each of the modal systems within the central Puget Sound region.

What Factors Determine Modal Choice?
Transportation modal choice is often a complicated process that includes considerations of the product characteristics, trip characteristics, supply chain needs, and the availability of a particular transportation mode. For example:

- **Product characteristics**, including the size, weight, value, and perishability of the commodity. Commodities that are perishable, high-value, or small tend to be carried by air cargo or truck modes, but will likely not make sense as a rail commodity. Similarly, heavy, low-value, or bulky materials will likely be carried by rail, barge, or truck but are highly unlikely to be an air cargo commodity. Time sensitivity is important, with products that require delivery time is less important taking slower choices such as rail, but with products where delivery time is most important taking some form of truck or air freight. High-tech manufacturing components will likely favor truck or air cargo modes in order to provide safe shipment for the high-value, lightweight materials used in the production process.

- **Trip characteristics**, including the length of the trip being made and how “in-demand” a product is. According to the 2002 Commodity Flow Survey, the average length haul of U.S. freight shipments was about 300 miles. However, the average rail shipment was almost 700 miles in length, air-truck combination was just over 1,400 miles in length, and truck trips were 200 miles or less. Shippers that need to send goods longer distances may be more likely to consider rail freight while those with shorter distances may find trucking to provide the flexibility that is needed.

- **Supply chain characteristics.** Many companies now operate on a “Just in Time” strategy, where on-site inventory is very small and a constant supply of goods serves to replenish raw materials. A product that is part of a “Just in Time” supply chain process will need be shipped with a transportation mode that is fairly fast and reliable, such as truck or air. Materials that are

---

3 United States Department of Transportation’s Bureau of Transportation Statistics. This data retrieved from: http://www.bts.gov/publications/freight_shipments_in_america/html/figure_10.html
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supplying a more traditional, inventory-rich industry will not be as time-sensitive, and could potentially be shipped with a slower transportation mode such as rail or barge.

- **Availability of transportation mode choice.** Often times, there are not a wide variety of transportation modes available. The class 1 railroads have been abandoning or selling right-of-way that have been less profitable than previous times, leaving many communities previously reliant upon rail service without this option.

With this in mind, this section presents an overview of the Puget Sound region’s modal freight transportation systems, including truck, rail, marine, air, and pipeline. For each, the extent of the system is briefly outlined, as well as current and future commodity volumes and emerging issues and problems affecting modal system performance. Understanding this information allows us to draw some preliminary conclusions about the functions that each mode is providing within the central Puget Sound region. Ultimately, this can be used to help target transportation system improvements to those projects supporting regional business and population health or the region’s global gateway functions.

**Truck Facilities, Commodity Movements, and Implications for the Central Puget Sound Region**

**Roadway Infrastructure**

Regional roadway infrastructure includes 2,110 freeway and 6,612 arterial lane miles. Of particular importance are heavy tonnage routes, those that carry more than four million tons annually: interstates 5, 405, and 90 and State Routes 2, 3, 7, 16, 18, 99, 161, 167, 169, 410, 509, 512, 515, 518, 522, 526, 599, and 900. In addition, state routes defined as regionally significant freight corridors that do not meet the T1 or T2 threshold, as well as state, county, and local principal arterials that are part of the metropolitan transportation system and intermodal connectors, are also included.

**How Many Trucks Use the Region’s Roads?**

- In 2006, 285,000 daily truck trips used the region’s roadway system

- Even assuming very conservative 1.2% growth, by 2040 this means 423,000 truck trips every day on the region’s roads

**Truck Volumes: Current and Future**

In 2006, the roadway network carried an average weekday volume of roughly 285,000 daily truck trips. Of those, nearly 68,000 are medium trucks, and 217,000 are heavy trucks. A small portion (3%) of daily truck trips are characterized as through trips—i.e., those trips that start and end outside of the Puget Sound but still utilized the roadway system. For example, these may be trips that use Interstate 5 to travel between California and Canada but do not stop in the region. Assuming a very conservative 1.2% annual growth rate in truck trips, approximately 423,000 daily truck trips would be expected to be using the regional road network in 2040.

**Commodities Carried by Truck**

---

4 PSRC Transportation 2040 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Chapter 4. PSRC, 2009

5 Defined as single unit, six or more tires, two to four axles and 16,000 to 52,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight

6 Defined as double or triple unit, combinations, five or more axles, and greater than 52,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight

7 This is a conservative growth rate to reflect the current economic slowdown and anticipated recovery. Growth rates in FAF2 are almost double this rate.
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The 285,000 trucks traversing the region’s roads every day are carrying a wide variety of commodities. Though 2007 commodity information is not available, Freight Analysis Framework data (FAF2) from FHWA contains forecasts for commodities carried in 2010 (Figure 4) and 2035 (Figure 5). FAF2 reveals that trucks carry a wide variety of commodities. By volume, the dominant commodities carried into and out of the central Puget Sound region in 2010 include gravel, cereal grains, waste and scrap, machinery and gasoline. In 2035, according to FAF2, commodities by truck will remain a diverse mixture of commodities that are largely supporting regional goods-movement dependent businesses, including gravel, waste and scrap, machinery, cereals and grains, and gasoline. In both cases, the share of “Other Commodities” includes all commodities which comprise less than 2% of truck shipments. This diversity of commodities, and the types of commodities carried, suggests that much of the material carried by truck is to support regional goods-dependent businesses such as construction, manufacturing, and agriculture. Whether it be providing inbound shipments of raw materials (gravel, gasoline, etc.) or carrying finished products to market (machinery, cereal and grains, etc.), a large percentage of truck movements are supporting regional businesses and population growth.

Figure 4: Top Truck Commodities by Volume in the Puget Sound Region: 2010 and 2035

Note: Coal-n.e.c. includes natural gas, selected coal products, and refined petroleum products, excluding gasoline, aviation fuel, and fuel oil.

What causes the change in proportion of waste/scrap + machinery as compared to 2010? There should be an explanatory comment added to explain this divergence from the 2010 projection's.
FAF2 data was also used to calculate the top ten commodities, by value, carried by truck into and out of the central Puget Sound region in 2010 (Figure 6) and 2035 (Figure 7). This reveals a very different commodity mixture than those ranked according to volume. In 2010, the top commodities carried by truck in the region include machinery, mixed freight, and electronics. By 2035, machinery and mixed freight together will account for a full half of the commodities carried by truck in the region. In FAF, “mixed freight” includes individual shipments that are being delivered to homes and businesses—the essential goods needed to support regional business and household operation. The growing presence of mixed freight shipments is therefore consistent with a growing population base. Likewise, the relatively large shares of machinery and electronics points to a strong manufacturing and industry base that relies on truck to transport their goods outside of the region. “Other Commodities” includes all commodities that comprise less than 2% of regional inbound or outbound trucked value.

By value, the market for commodities moving by truck suggests that the trucking mode supports global gateway commodity movements, as well as those supporting regional industries and population growth. As shown in Figure 8, FAF2 estimates that 68% of commodities carried into, out of, or within the region by truck are carrying commodities to and from domestic markets, whereas 26% is international cargo.
being transported to or from the region's international ports and 6% is carried to land borders with Mexico and Canada. This trend is anticipated to roughly continue until 2035 (as shown in Figure 9).

**Figure 6:** Markets Served by Truck Mode (by Value): Central Puget Sound Region, 2002

**Figure 7:** Markets Served by Truck Mode (by Value): Central Puget Sound Region, 2035

Please provide explanatory paragraph on modal change from 2002 to 2035.

Truck Movements and Impacts-Congestion and Safety Concerns
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Truck movements on the region’s roadways—whether carrying cargo to and from the global gateways or regional businesses and populations—are constrained by congestion. Table 1 lists the region’s most congested corridors identified through the Congestion Management Process (CMP). The affected roadways are all part of the freight and goods transportation system and include many of the most vital north-south and east-west freight corridors.

The congestion on these and other roadways has an impact on speed and delay for all users. In 2006, daily freeway speeds were only 41 miles per hour (mph), while arterials moved at an average speed of 22 mph. On average, truck speeds are 10% slower than those of passenger cars on freeways—meaning that truck speeds are likely even lower than these facility averages. This congestion resulted in 280,000 daily hours of delay on freeways and 560,000 on arterials, an average delay of over 14 minutes per person. In addition, slow speeds and congested facilities mean that trucks are spending more time idling in traffic, emitting increased amount of air pollutants (including diesel particulate matter) and contributing to negative impacts for regional air quality and public health.

By 2040, average daily trips for all vehicles are expected to increase by 40%, leading to a 14% decline of speed on freeways and 8% decline of speed on arterials, which could result in an increase in hours of delay by 82% on freeways and 67% on arterials. Current truck volumes on the regional roadway system are shown in Figure 10, below. Similar to average daily trips, truck trips too will grow by 2040. The daily truck hours of travel are expected to increase by 60% over 2006 conditions. Further, truck miles of travel are anticipated to grow by 44%, though only representing a 2% increase in per capita truck miles of travel. The increase in delays have broad implications to trucks using the system, especially on highways with existing high truck volumes (see Figure 8) and those into the future see Figure 9.

Table 1: Congested Travel Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Major Roadways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Lake Washington</td>
<td>SR 520, I-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>SR 3, SR 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Seattle</td>
<td>I-5, SR 99, Greenwood/15th Avenue NW, Roosevelt Way, Lake City Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South King County</td>
<td>I-5, SR 99/Pacific Highway South, SR 509, SR 518, SR 167, West Valley Highway, Auburn Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East King County</td>
<td>I-405, SR 522, Coal Creek Parkway, SR 900, NE 14th Ave, Lake Washington Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County West</td>
<td>SR 512, 1-5 south, SR 7, SR 167, Meridian Street (SR 161), S. Tacoma Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County East</td>
<td>SR 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast King County</td>
<td>SR 169, SR 164, SR 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 In order to identify the congested locations, a screening process is used. This process starts with the region’s Metropolitan Transportation System and then considers multimodal and freight congestion information for the region.

9 Congestion issues are identified using several data sources: Metropolitan Transportation System definition, travel time data collected from state-owned loop detectors, Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data, Regional Traffic Operators input, Regional Transit Agencies input and Freight T1 and T2 route definitions. A full discussion of this methodology is included as Appendix I of the Transportation 2040 DEIS.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Routes/Transit Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Snohomish County</td>
<td>I-5, SR 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Snohomish County</td>
<td>SR 9, SR 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Puget Sound</td>
<td>Ferries, Tacoma Narrows Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Northeast King County</td>
<td>SR 202, I-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8: 2006 Average Weekday Highway Truck Volumes

Source: PSRC
Figure 9: Placeholder for 2040 Preferred Alternative Truck Volume Map

Source: PSRC
Another transportation system impact caused by growing numbers of freight trucks is truck-related accidents. In 2006, slightly over 3,000 truck incidents (or 1% of total incidents) were reported on State Routes in the Puget Sound region, as shown in Figure 10 below. The highest number of truck incidents appears to be in those segments of highway that have facilities with high truck volumes intersecting each other, such as the intersection of I-90 and I-5, the intersection of I-405 and 167, and the intersection near I-405 and I-5. Though no figure exists to forecast truck related incidents in the future, it can be assumed that the growing number of trucks on the region's roadway network offer a greater number of opportunities for truck-related incidents to occur.

Figure 10: 2006 Average Weekday Highway Truck Volumes and Truck Related Incidents

Source: Washington State Department of Transportation, PSRC

**Truck Mode—Key Impacts on the Central Puget Sound Region**

- Truck volumes are anticipated to increase greatly by 2040, from 125,000 trucks daily (2008) to 207,000 trucks daily by 2040.
- Many of these truck trips are supporting regional businesses and populations, carrying raw materials to and from the goods-dependent industries in the central Puget Sound region, as well as delivering goods to households and businesses.
• By 2040, truck traffic is expected to grow and exacerbate congestion along many of the key freight north-south and east-west corridors, as well as on many of the local connector links (as identified in Table 1).

• This rising truck congestion will have many potential impacts, including delays in goods delivery, rising transportation costs, increased emissions of air pollutants, and increased truck/vehicle safety considerations.

**Rail Facilities, Commodity Movements, and Implications for the Central Puget Sound Region**

**Rail Infrastructure**

Though there are several short line railroads operating in the central Puget Sound region, the vast majority of rail commodities are connected with the global gateway functions of the region's deepwater marine ports. In fact, just over 75% of all rail movements in the region are related to port activities. Long-haul rail capacity is provided by two Class I railroads: the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) and Union Pacific (UP). The BNSF and UP operate four east-west corridors that connect the Pacific Northwest to points east and Chicago, as well as a north-south corridor, integral to connecting the sea ports with the east-west lines. As well as supporting the global gateways of the central Puget Sound region, the railroads themselves contribute to the regional economy. Combined, the two major rail companies employed nearly 4,000 people, accounting for roughly $200 million in wages in 2006. Figure 14 shows a map of the region's rail network, including Class I and shortline rail lines.

**Rail Volumes: Current and Future**

Approximately 106 million carload tons and 23 million intermodal tons moved inside the Puget Sound region in 2007. Rail volumes are anticipated to rise substantially by 2040 and are expected to top 145 million carload tons and 88 million intermodal tons moved within the region.11

---

10 *WTC Statewide Rail Capacity and Needs Study*

11 Estimate based on the WTC Statewide Rail Capacity and Needs Study. Assumes no growth 2007-2010 and expected growth rates 2010-2025. Growth after 2025 was assumed to be 1.0% for carload tons and 4.6% for intermodal tons—equal to the predicted 2015-2025 growth rate.
Commodities Carried by Rail
The rail commodity profile for the central Puget Sound region was assessed using the 2007 Surface Transportation Board’s (STB) Waybill sample. This sample provided commodity types and volumes that originate in or are destined for the four-county Puget Sound region. This includes those commodities that are carrying goods to the region’s deepwater ports for export (which will show up as inbound

---

12 This data was assembled by the WSDOT State Rail and Marine Office to preserve its confidentiality.
Commodities being carried into the region by rail are dominated by farm products, which comprise almost 60\% of inbound rail commodities (Figure 4). This figure reflects Washington State agricultural products imported into the region to be exported internationally through the Port of Tacoma and the Port of Seattle, as well as those being consumed by the population concentrated in the central Puget Sound region. Similarly, 55\% of the products carried outbound from the region (Figure 5) are miscellaneous mixed shipments, reflecting international containerized shipments being imported into the ports of Tacoma and Seattle and carried outside of the region. This belies the importance of the regional rail system in supporting the global gateway functions of the regional economy\(^{13}\).

\(^{13}\) For more detailed commodity information, including the origin and destination county with the central Puget Sound region, please see Appendix 3B of this report.
Figure 12: Top 10 Inbound Commodities Carried by Rail in 2007

- Farm Products: 59%
- Misc. Mixed Shipments: 7%
- Food and Kindred Products: 4%
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- Transportation equipment: 2%
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- Other Commodities: 12%

Move chart to previous page or move next chart to this page.
Figure 13: Top 10 Outbound Commodities Carried by Rail in 2007

Rail Movements / Impacts
The growing commodity volumes on the regional rail system will continue to strain an already over, or near-capacity rail system. All of the major rail corridors that connect the region to the rest of the nation are currently operating at or near their operational capacity (see Table 2). The demand for rail service (especially east-west movements) is expected to double by 2025, further straining the network. BNSF's line over Stevens Pass currently operates at 123% of practical capacity (defined as 60% of full capacity). Though the Stampede Pass line is currently operating below its practical capacity, it cannot be used to divert goods from Stevens Pass since it cannot accommodate double-stack containers. Similarly, though the north-south line along the I-5 corridor also operates below its practical capacity, it is marked by congestion and choke points as trains access ports and industrial areas, as well as scheduling conflicts with the region's passenger rail system.

These existing bottlenecks, especially when coupled with the anticipated demand for rail movements, will have considerable impacts on the global gateways of the central Puget Sound region. Increased congestion on the vital east-west and north-south rail lines will cause increasing delay of freight rail shipments, and may seriously diminish the ability of the deepwater ports to continue to grow.


DRAFT Transportation 2040, Regional Freight Strategy 11-20-2009

[Handwritten notes and comments on the page]
Alternatively, though many different factors contribute to transportation modal choice, it is possible that the congestion and delay on the rail system will cause certain commodities imported or exported through the ports to switch to trucks, exacerbating the truck transportation system impacts already anticipated to occur by 2040.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainline Segment</th>
<th>Estimated Sustainable Capacity</th>
<th>2004 Operations (Trains per Day)</th>
<th>Projected 2025 Operations (Trains per Day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Pass</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stampede Pass</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett to Seattle</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle to Tacoma</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Rail Mode-Key Impacts on the Central Puget Sound Region

- Rail volumes are anticipated to increase greatly by 2040, 106 million carload tons and 23 million intermodal tons moved inside the Puget Sound region in 2007. By 2040, rail volumes are expected to top 145 million carload tons and 88 million intermodal tons.
- The vast majority of these volumes are carrying goods to and from the region’s deepwater ports for import or export to international markets. Therefore, rail transportation is a vital component of the global gateways functions of the regional transportation system.
- Several of the most important east-west and north-south rail lines are already very constrained. They will not be able to accommodate the anticipated growth in freight rail traffic. In addition, localized bottlenecks (along the Seattle to Tacoma line) and geometric constraints (over Stampede Pass) prohibit the full utilization of other rail lines in the region.
- The lack of available rail capacity could have serious consequences for the region’s deepwater ports. Alternatively, it is possible that some of the cargo could be absorbed by trucks, which would further exacerbate the negative transportation system impacts already projected for the truck mode.

---

Marine Facilities, Commodity Movements, and Implications for the Central Puget Sound Region

Marine Port Facilities

The Puget Sound region includes three deepwater marine ports: Everett, Seattle, and Tacoma. Together with the region's air cargo facilities, the marine ports comprise a vital component of the region's economic engine, providing international trade gateway connectivity between the central Puget Sound region, Washington state, and the rest of the world. In addition, the ports support the regional economy by providing considerable employment, tax revenues, and revenues from real estate dealings and tenants.

In economic impact studies performed in 2005 (Port of Tacoma) and 2009 (Port of Seattle), the ports reported direct statewide employment of over 200,000 people. In addition, the two seaports contributed just over $1 billion dollars in state and local tax revenues, as well as billions of dollars in additional revenues generated by their real estate activities and tenants.

Marine Volumes: Current and Future

In 2008, the ports of Tacoma and Seattle were, combined, the third largest international TEU (Twenty-foot Equivalent Units) container loading facility, handling almost 3.6 million TEUs (shown in Table 3 below). Individually, the Port of Tacoma was the seventh largest U.S. port in terms of TEUs (1.9 million TEUs), and the Port of Seattle was the ninth largest (1.7 million TEUs). The 2009 Marine Cargo Forecast projects a steady 4.1% growth rate each year for the next 20 years, reaching a projected 9.7 million TEUs in 2030.

In terms of tonnage, in 2007, the ports of the Puget Sound moved over 88 million tons of waterborne cargo. This is expected to increase to 155 million tons in 2040. The majority of this growth is expected to be in imports, which are predicted to grow from 23.6 million tons in 2007 to 81.2 million tons in 2040.

Table 3: 2008 Total Port TEUs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Total TEUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Los Angeles / Long Beach (CA)</td>
<td>14,200,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York / New Jersey (NJ/NY)</td>
<td>5,265,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seattle / Tacoma (WA)</td>
<td>3,568,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Savannah (GA)</td>
<td>2,616,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oakland (CA)</td>
<td>2,236,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hampton Roads (VA)</td>
<td>2,083,278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Ibid. Forecast was adjusted to account for economic downturn by assuming 0% growth 2007-2010 and was extended to 2040 by assuming a continuation of predicted 2007-2030 growth rates.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City (State)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charleston (SC)</td>
<td>1,635,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Honolulu (HI)</td>
<td>1,124,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Port Everglades (FL)</td>
<td>985,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Miami (FL)</td>
<td>828,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Association of Port Authorities

Commodities Shipped through the Puget Sound Regional Ports

As shown in Table 4, the ports exports are dominated by food, natural resource products, and machinery—all products of Washington state businesses including agriculture, natural resource extraction, and manufacturing. Conversely, imports are dominated by manufactured consumptive goods—e.g., vehicles, clothing, and electronics (see Table 5), that are in demand by central Puget Sound residents as well as other U.S. markets. International trade (both export and import) is predominantly related to Asian nations (see Table 6). Interestingly, the State of Alaska is the fifth largest trading partner in terms of value among the two ports and accounts for 1.9 million tons of trade through the Port of Seattle. As mentioned in the rail section, nearly three quarters of international imports travel east to Chicago and elsewhere utilizing the Class I main rail lines (BNSF and UP).

Table 4: Top Ten 2008 Exports by Port

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Seattle ($ Millions)</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Tacoma ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Misc. Grain, Seed, Fruit</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>Grains and cereals</td>
<td>2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Machinery</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Cereals</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>Iron and steel products</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Fish and Seafood</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Dairy, Eggs, Honey, Etc.</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Paper, Paperboard</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>Inorganic parts</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Meat</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Vehicles and auto</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Preserved Food</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Prepared</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Vehicles, Not Railway</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Vegetable</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mineral Fuel, Oil, Etc.</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Animal feed</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ports of Seattle and Tacoma

Table 5: Top Ten 2008 Imports by Port

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Seattle ($ Millions)</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Tacoma ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Toys And Sports Equipment</td>
<td>5,680</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>5,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Machinery</td>
<td>4,427</td>
<td>Industrial machinery</td>
<td>4,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Electrical Machinery</td>
<td>3,827</td>
<td>Vehicles and auto parts</td>
<td>4,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Vehicles, Not Railway</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>Footwear</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Knit Apparel</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>Toys and sports equipment</td>
<td>1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Seattle $ (Millions)</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woven Apparel</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Footwear</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>Clothing and apparel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Furniture and Bedding</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>Iron and steel products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>Plastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Iron/Steel Products</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Optical and photo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Top Twenty 2008 Trading Partners by Port (Two-way)

Source: Ports of Seattle and Tacoma

Marine Facilities—Key Impacts on the Central Puget Sound Region

- Cargo transported through the region’s ports is expected to grow significantly by 2040. The ports predict that they will be handling 9.7 million TEUs by 2040, as well as 155 million tons of cargo.
- Together with the region’s air cargo facilities, the marine ports comprise a vital component of the region’s economic engine by providing gateway connectivity between the central Puget Sound region, Washington state, and the rest of the world. In addition, the ports support the regional...

19 Shown to highlight importance of domestic trade.
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economy by providing considerable employment, tax revenues, and revenues from real estate dealings and tenants.

- The constraints on the rail and truck systems will have direct, significant impacts on the marine ports. Increasing congestion and bottlenecks may slow the travel times to and from the port regions, which would negatively affect the travel time of international shipments, as well as shipments intended for consumption by local and regional markets. Off peak opportunities for movement of international cargo is constrained by a number of factors including labor requirements, ability to receive shipments, as well as community response.
Air Cargo Facilities, Commodity Movements, and Implications for the Central Puget Sound Region

Air Cargo Facilities
Together with the region's marine ports, the air cargo facilities comprise a vital component of the region's economic engine by providing global gateway connectivity between the central Puget Sound region, Washington state, and the rest of the world. In addition, the air cargo facilities provide regional benefit in terms of jobs and tax revenues. Sea-Tac International Airport provides an estimated 90,000 jobs and $400 million in state and local taxes through its passenger and air cargo operations.

Air Cargo Volumes: Current and Future
In 2007, the Puget Sound region's airports moved an estimated 429,000 tons of cargo. Sea-Tac International Airport (operated by the Port of Seattle), the twentieth busiest air cargo facility in the nation, carried nearly 320,000 tons, while the remainder (109,000 tons) was handled by King County International Airport. In 2040, it is expected that over 650,000 tons of cargo will be handled by these airports. Approximately 475,000 tons of this is expected to be handled by Sea-Tac International with approximately 175,000 tons handled by King County International Airport.

Figure 14: 2007 Air Cargo Tonnage at Sea-Tac Airport

![Diagram showing air cargo tonnage at Sea-Tac Airport]

Source: Port of Seattle

---

How Much Air Cargo Moves Through The Region's Airports?
- In 2007, the region's cargo airports moved 429,000 tons of cargo.
- By 2040, these numbers are expected to climb to 650,000 tons of cargo—an increase of about 50%.

20 Forecasts are based on the PSRC Air Cargo Strategy. In order to account for the effects of the current economic downturn, 2010 forecasts for both airports were adjusted. 2007 and 2008 Sea-Tac cargo totals source: SEA-TAC International Passenger, Cargo, and Operations Summary, December 2008. 2009 Sea-Tac cargo total estimated based on totals through August 2009, contained in SEA-TAC International Passenger, Cargo, and Operations Summary, August 2009. 0% growth assumed in 2010 for Sea-Tac International. PSRC Air Cargo Strategy forecast for King County International Airport was adjusted downwards in equal proportion (38.6%) to the revised Sea-Tac 2010 forecast. 2% annual growth in cargo tonnage at both airports is assumed after 2010.
Air Cargo Commodities

As shown in Figure 14 above, over half of air freight commodities originate or are destined for domestic locations, meaning that regional businesses and residents rely on air cargo to provide fast, reliable, and safe transport for a variety of high-value, time-sensitive commodities into and out of the central Puget Sound region.

An analysis of the types of commodities carried into and out of the region by air cargo reveals what industries may be using air cargo. Though 2007 commodity information is not available, FAFZ contains forecasts for commodities carried in 2010 and 2035. These forecasts reveal that some of the primary air cargo commodities in 2010 (Figure 15) and 2035 (Figure 16) are electronics and transportation equipment that are likely related to crucial central Puget Sound industries including airline manufacturing and computer and electronics. Other commodities carried by air cargo—including printed matter, base metals, meats/seafood, and pharmaceuticals—are all commodities that are likely supporting a growing regional population that demands instant access to high-value goods.

Figure 15: 2007 Puget Sound Regional Air Cargo Tonnage in 2010

![Pie chart showing commodity distribution in 2007](image)

*Again, need to explain reasons / assumptions that caused shift in commodities % between 2010\+ 2035*
Air Cargo Facilities–Key Impacts on the Central Puget Sound region

- In 2007, the Puget Sound region’s airports (dominated by Sea-Tac) moved an estimated 429,000 tons of cargo. In 2040, it is expected that this will grow to over 650,000 tons of cargo.

- Together with the region’s air cargo facilities, the marine ports comprise a vital component of the region’s economic engine by providing global gateway connectivity between the central Puget Sound region, Washington state, and the rest of the world. In addition, over half of the cargo handled at regional air cargo facilities is traveling to or from domestic locations, meaning that regional businesses and residents rely on air cargo to provide fast, reliable, and safe transport for a variety of high-value, time-sensitive commodities into and out of the central Puget Sound region.

- Sea-Tac International Airport provides an estimated 90,000 jobs and $400 million in state and local taxes through its passenger and air cargo operations.

Pipeline

The Olympic Pipeline crosses through the Puget Sound region roughly parallel to Interstate 5. The pipeline, which operates at capacity, is the predominant mode for transporting gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel, accounting for more than half of the fuel originating in Puget Sound refineries and all of the jet fuel
to Sea-Tac airport. With a throughput capacity of 4.6 billion gallons, the nearly 300-mile line serves
distribution terminals in Renton, Seattle, SeaTac, and Tacoma. Pipelines are generally managed by
private-sector interests and are not generally included in the regional transportation planning process.
However, they are mentioned here because their existence likely absorbs commodity movements that
would otherwise be made by trucks.

Summary

Over the next 30 years, annual freight tonnage is expected to increase from 430 million tons to 755 million
tons, an increase of 76%. It is notable that all freight modes are expected to witness significant growth (see
Table 7). Tonnage carried by trucks is significantly larger than all other modes currently and is expected
to continue to dominate the other modes into the future.

Table 7: Growth in Freight Tonnage by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail (2007 and 2040)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carload</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>283%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEUs (2008 and 2030)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>169%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonnage (2007 and 2040)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The continued growth in demand for freight movements has a wide variety of implications for specific
facilities and goods movements that may warrant preservation or enhancements in the current system. In
terms of rail, consideration should be given to the previously identified chokepoints and passes,
especially where they already exceed practical capacity. Further, intermodal rail movements will be
nearly four times greater in 2040 than they are today. This suggests that consideration should be given to
facilities that connect rail yards, those related to major last mile movements, especially with respect to
drayage activities. The intermodal rail movements related to drayage activities are of particular import
since activities at the region’s ports will also increase substantially. Similarly, last mile connections to the
region’s airports, especially Sea-Tac, should be considered.

There are two distinct yet related considerations that should be made related to the truck portions of the
goods movement system. First, the impressive growth in the demand for truck freight movement
requires consideration for those facilities that experience both the highest truck volumes and also
roadway congestion. In addition, the locations of last mile connections to the ports, airport, rail yards and
other major freight generators should be given special attention. Since the demand for particular
commodities are anticipated to grow at a substantially higher rate than others, special care should be
given to freight generators that concentrate gravel, waste and scrap, machinery, cereals and grains, and
gasoline-related activities.
15 Paige Wagner
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2010 8:58 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Paige Wagner

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: I would like the project of widening the Issaquah-Fall City Road in Issaquah to be added to your Draft Plan. The road is only a one lane, two way road that has constant construction going on. With the new houses that are being added by the Freshman Campus, the new church and all the traffic the Freshman Campus itself adds, the road is way overloaded. Many of us that live in Klahanie and the neighborhoods past that bottleneck area are constantly backed up! There needs to be some relief for that section of road with all the population growth that has happened since that small road was made. Please widen the road for us. Thanks!

signup:
From: Paige
Posted At: Friday, January 22, 2010 9:53 PM
Conversation: Issaquah-Fall City Road Phase 3
Posted To: Transportation 2040

Subject: Issaquah-Fall City Road Phase 3
I am a homeowner in Klahanie area of Issaquah. Every day we have to travel down that Issaquah-Fall City Road. There have already been 2 phases that have widened portions of it. However, with the increase in housing in the area, a new school and church right on the road, it needs to be completed. The church hasn't even open yet and I fear to see what the road will be like when it does. There is a lot of congestion on the last section of road that is still only one lane each direction. Rush hour and school times near the Freshman campus are awful! The addition of many new neighborhoods on that section of road as well as just past it has increased the traffic immensely and really justifies the necessity to have that road widened in the very near future.

As you know this road is in the unincorporated area between Issaquah and Sammamish and we have no one to take on this project! It will be years before this area can be annexed and this is an issue that needs to be dealt with now. It's only going to get worse!

We would appreciate you seriously considering putting the Third Phase of the Issaquah-Fall City road on your 2040 Draft!
Thanks!
Paige Wagner
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2010 9:13 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Morgan Alexander

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: I don't believe T2040 goes far enough in prioritizing local intra-city transportation infrastructure. A strong regional system is only as good as its smaller local components. For example, there has been a growing movement in Tacoma to build a citywide streetcar system, but there is no local transportation department or authority to make something like this happen. And it is not reflected in T2040. More tools and more assistance are needed by smaller municipalities lacking in capacity and a formal transportation department.
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2010 4:02 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Steve Scott

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: I see only one tiny mention of SR18. Completion of the upgrades for Highway 18 from Holder Creek to I-90 has been ignored for far too long. This segment has potential to relieve a great deal of traffic on SR167, I-405 and I-90 and local arterials such as the Issaquah-Hobart Road. This segment of SR18 is also horribly unsafe. This project would merit being given a much higher priority in the PSRC's transportation plan.
From: Dick Burkhart  
Posted At: Sunday, January 24, 2010 5:49 PM  
Conversation: Comment on the PSRC Draft Transportation 2040 Plan  
Posted To: Transportation 2040  
Subject: Comment on the PSRC Draft Transportation 2040 Plan

Comment on the PSRC Draft Transportation 2040 Plan

This plan is heading in the right direction. Yet a key assumption is highly questionable, making some of the numerical predictions equally questionable. The assumption that population and job growth will continue as usual ignores two paradigm shifts that are already being felt and will soon accelerate. These are (1) Peak Oil and (2) Climate Change.

Peak Oil says that a civilization based on cheap fossil fuels can’t continue for much longer – there simply won’t be enough fuel to go around. Climate Change says that the longer we try to maintain a fossil-fuel based economy, the greater the damage to ecosystems and the future generations that depend on them. Taken together, human civilization faces possible ecological overshoot and collapse in this century without a radical restructuring of the global economy and reduction in global population.

Though blessed with a mild climate, the economy of Washington State is very dependent on the global economy. All this could play out in unexpected ways. For example trade and air travel are very dependent on fossil fuels, which could hurt our seaport and aircraft business, but increased global demand for food and resources could help some exports even as transportation costs increase. And will Washington State become a destination for climate refugees? Will high technology come to the rescue by finding much cheaper ways to harness renewable energy? Or will it whither since the true value of technology is in developing better ways to exploit cheap energy, energy that will no longer be so cheap?

What seems most certain are coming upheavals, led off by the recent global financial crisis. Therefore, rather than just extrapolation from the past, a variety of scenarios would be a much better method. I would expect most of these would lead to much less SOV driving over time, not just from much higher fuel costs but also from much higher costs for fuel efficient vehicles and from lower real wages. This will translate into much higher demand for alternatives, but will our funding mechanisms be up to the task?

Dick Burkhart
Subject: Reallocating Small Areas on Streets without Sidewalks

Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

I am writing to suggest that the draft Transportation 2040 plan include reallocating of small pavement areas on streets without an adequate sidewalk to walkers in addition to building more sidewalks.

Puget Sound transportation on the majority of roads in all jurisdictions gives the near-exclusive priority to motor vehicles. Walkers should be accommodated in the same way as other travel modes.

In some cases that means narrowing streets without adequate sidewalks for vehicles because there is no money to build the amount of new infrastructure that has been demonstrated to be required. This may necessitate a change in the Washington State policy and law. In short, we should either build required improvements or otherwise change the untenable safety predicament of pedestrians. In some cases sidewalks are poorly maintained. Elsewhere the sidewalk was never constructed, although currently recognized standards for urban planning promote walkways even for low-impact developments. Educational programs are needed to accompany the change.

First, we need to distinguish between light rail and other forms of public transit in making pedestrian improvements. Light rail is a fixed mode that merits adequate sidewalks or the equivalent within 1 mile of train stations rather than 3/4 mile. Buses have less impact to improve congestion and pollution. Bus routes are regularly changed to a degree that the lesser walking improvements of 3/4 mile may be effective. In addition, for light rail a far greater number of marked crosswalks are required than is typical. As a last resort, traffic calming measures must be considered where light rail patrons are walking to a station and those other improvements are infeasible.

Secondly, it is common is most areas to define sidewalks as existing legally whether actually constructed or not as we do in Seattle. In any event, the Revised Code of Washington, Part 46.61.250, states where sidewalks are not provided any pedestrian shall move clear of the roadway upon meeting an oncoming vehicle. On low activity streets, this law places inordinate responsibility on walkers and needs to be changed as has been done in other states. This is consistent with current best practices for walking. Approaching vehicles might be required to move around walkers that are present or even hold short of pedestrians for a moment to avoid other cars on the roadway.

Best wishes to you in improving oversight of the natural environment and public safety by reviewing sidewalk priorities, alternatives to sidewalks, crosswalk policy, and traffic calming methods.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Beisse
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2010 12:16 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Aili LePard

02_Address:

03_City: Seattle, WA  98126

05_comment: Huh. This basically just says that bike stuff will be worked on; the usual spiel of connecting up the routes which is great and already begun, but come on! This plan dates out to 2040 and all that cyclists get are two sentences?! What about improving infrastructure for cyclists across the region: adding bike lanes, MUPs, what specific bike routes will be extended, promoting cycling as a transportation option (since all the improvements will make cycling more attractive, no?) and providing education about bicycling to ALL transportation users - motor vehicle, bus, train, etc.
Marina King
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave., Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

Marina:

I have had the opportunity to review the Regional Freight Strategy element of the draft Destination 2040. Congratulations on producing this Strategy as part of the regional plan. In the final drafts the public might benefit further from concise attention to specific performance measures for the often freight modes: highway, maritime, rail and air cargo. Attached to help in this step are particulars drawn from a former Regional Council working paper. My recommendation, which I trust will be advanced undiluted to the Transportation Policy Board on March 11, 2010, is to work these concepts into the Strategy and, therefore, directly into the performance measure element of the Destination 2040 document itself.

Even if not routinely monitored, it is still necessary to recognize in Destination 2040 the concepts used by the affected private sector in evaluating freight system performance and public or private capital investments/operating improvements. The freight modes are either (a) clearly public (the highway system for auto, mass transit and bike, and freight), or (b) partly public as in the air and maritime trip segments, or (c) serve the public interest privately (rail with agreed track concessions to Sound Transit and Amtrak). The following measures are drawn from the shipper and carrier industries who have been consulted through the Regional Freight Mobility Roundtable since 1994. In general, these measures suggest a regional and systemic approach (like the FAST Corridor: more than an aggregate project list) to multimodal and often interconnected (inter-modal) freight and goods supply chains in and through our Pacific Rim region.

Highway (trucking) congestion

- Defined as hours of “excess” delay, including both recurring and non-recurring delay.

- For every travel mode, technical measures include duration of peak congestion and trip time (and primarily for personal mobility: vehicle/capacity ratio, and level of service). Note that as peak congestion spreads on major highway/truck routes, systemic performance measures relevant to trucks must give attention to the shortening of trough periods between these peaks, or to shared lanes at bottlenecks during critical periods.

- For freight, special attention is given to non-recurring delay, that is, trip reliability (the daily variation around the average delay) – accounting for fully half of total delay – versus average speed, travel time and so on.

- By 2020 total freight tonnage might grow by two-thirds, while international trade might double (measured from 2005). Roadway capacity will increase by less than one percent/year (suggesting a needed shift of more freight to long-haul rail, below). Some 40 percent of the total highway delay of four billion hours per year would
Maritime congestion

- The major port issue is landside congestion. The ports are nodes—they interconnect marine shipping lanes to the two major overland freight modes: the public National Highway System (NHS) and the private Class I railroad systems.
- Within the ports, surge management for ship unloading is a concern, leading to proposals for greater efficiency as under the “agile ports” proposals to increase capacity (especially where the port footprint is encroached by urban development) by increasing throughput/hour.
- At the Roundtable in January 2005 the ports reported that in specific circumstances the “velocity” (rail container throughput) at the ports can be enhanced in large part by improved operations—how container trains egress from the ports—and not only by alternative infrastructure investments.

Rail congestion

- The delay ratio is the ratio of delay divided by total running time for any long-haul rail trip (e.g., 20 percent would be five hours out of, say, fifty hours from Seattle to Chicago),
- The disruption ratio is the percent of trains actually disrupted from their schedules.

Air congestion

- FAA reports regularly on the percent of air operations at each major airport that are delayed by more than fifteen minutes.
- An accepted threshold for average annual delay, e.g., seven minutes per operation at an airport. However airlines actually use a different metric—is the particular scheduled flight profitable (including reliability), or not?
- Security requirements will probably cause a larger share of air cargo (in 2005 about 50 percent) to be shipped by integrated carriers (door to door air cargo service like UPS and Fed Ex), rather than by passenger planes.

Thank you for clearly reporting this recommendation to the Transportation Policy Board and for seriously considering freight mobility performance measures (possibly as text boxes) in both the Regional Freight Strategy and in the Destination 2040 document.

Sincerely,

Peter D. Beaulieu
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council members,

As someone who cares deeply about the future of transportation and landscape in our region, particularly in light of climate change, I am writing to urge you to remove the Cross-Base Highway from your preferred alternative project list. The Cross-Base Highway has no place in our region's plans for responsible transportation. Its construction would likely increase, not minimize, greenhouse gas emissions.

There are several important reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project:

* We should fix existing roads and invest in new modes of transportation before building any new highways.

* Construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly.

* Only 3% of our state's oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would flatten 162 acres and fragment 1,600 acres of habitat that Pierce county considers "the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in the lower elevations of Pierce County."

* People don't want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

* It conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

Brent Small

brent small
01_contact: d field

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: We need to break the cycle of not having the transportation infrastructure to meet current needs. By the time most of the "planned" projects are completed the demand has exceeded the capability. By 2040 we should plan on reducing the human transportation and increase the intellectual transportation. Intellectual transportation means we can transport ideas and work via electronic networks rather than transporting humans. This can be accomplished by requiring all middle and above schools to be on-line only. Also require businesses to justify why their workers can not tele-commute. These 2 items would greatly reduce the demand on road capacity which will be freed up for freight and deliveries.

signup:
I would like to see some real planning. We need a bypass that starts south of Olympia and ends north of Marysville. Maybe a highway from highway 12 in the south to highway 20 in the north. This new highway needs to be limited access. This would have to be minimum of 4 lanes. If we started this now it would probably not be enough 30 years from now so it should be started as 8 lanes now.

We need to plan on using the existing railroads and stop taking rails out. More freight and people need to use the existing rails.

We need to stop wasting money on "Social engineering" projects like HOT lanes and HOV lanes. Extra lanes reduce commute times not HOV & HOT lanes.

Reduction of the demand for commuting should be the number 1 project. This can be done by killing the economy and jobs or by enabling the future of tele-commuting. A poll from workers indicating how many days per week they could accomplish their job by tele-commuting would indicate how much saving could be achieved. As a start all meetings for "Transportation 2040" should be online only. If need be the local library should have access capability.

Simple immediate things like enforcing the laws so the slow cars are not in the left lanes would help the flow of traffic and increase the capacity of the existing infrastructure. Look at the ratio of speeding tickets versus impeding the flow tickets, anyone with basic math knowledge knows this ratio should be 1.
From: Don Yantzer  
Posted At: Saturday, February 13, 2010 8:36 AM  
Conversation: Looking backward to Forward Thrust circa 1971  
Posted To: Transportation 2040  

Subject: Looking backward to Forward Thrust circa 1971  
The failure to make the right choices nearly 40 years ago with respect to mass/rapid transit are the reason for Puget Sounds traffic mess. The forces in motion at that time and continue today are grounded on the unwillingness of anyone connected to the automobile industry to consider alternate means of transporting the masses. The ultimate decision to opt for freeways was in the hands of the Washington State Highway Department. Its about fuel taxes to support their way of life, income and retirement. The transportation corridors are now so congested and property acquisition so expensive that we will choke on vehicle traffic for the life of all of us. Here is a start..... convert Highway 99 to a mass/rapid transit corridor from Everett to Olympia. The waterfront sans the viaduct should be a major hub/throughway to and from everywhere in the region.

Go to Work!

Donald J. Yantzer  
Shelton, WA
I am a councilmember for the City of Shoreline, although I am sending this email as an individual citizen. I was just reviewing the web version of transportation 2040 and noticed there was no mention in the unprogrammed projects list of the intersection of SR523 (145th Ave NE) and I5. The form of this intersection is that 523 runs as an overpass on I5 with turns both left and right at either end. This intersection is incapable of passing the traffic that already comes west on 523 at morning rush hour. There can be backups for 4 to 5 blocks and it often takes as long as four lights to get across. Furthermore there are three things that may make the traffic at that intersection worse in the near to medium term.

1. An area on 5th ave NE, 1 mile north of the intersection, has been rezoned so that a development of up to 110 du/acre can be built.
2. SR 523 has been designated part of the emergency EW route in case SR520 is damaged.
3. A Light Rail Station will be built on I5 at 145th (SR523). Shoreline may be mandated to rezone to higher density near that station.

I testified about this issue in front of the Transportation Policy Board last fall, and it was indicated that the overpass would be added to the unprogrammed projects list in case improvements were warranted by developments in the next 5-15 years. However, I do not see it on this list. I would urge you to add it.

I might add that any large increase in traffic, such as from item 2 listed above, will overwhelm the carrying capacity of SR 523 from Lake City Way (SR 522) to I5, and in my opinion improvements may be necessary along the that entire length. SR523 may not have been flagged up to now as a potential project because it is jointly owned by King County and the state, but neither has a large current interest in traffic along that corridor and the two cities who are separated by SR523 have no ownership. I would urge that you consider adding it to the unprogrammed projects list so that if necessary it also can be considered for improvements in the near to mid term.

Chris Eggen
01_contact: Stonewall Bird
02_Address: 
03_City: 

05_comment: Growth is neither necessary nor desirable. In fact, by now it is creating an environmental -- and therefore human -- catastrophe. The only organisms that make a policy of unlimited growth (besides bankers and real estate developers) are cancer cells and plague bacteria.

In the short life of the United States, financial institutions have been dominant. Their interests -- measured in the abstraction by which they rate themselves, namely money -- require growth. No one else does, nor do any other interests. For everyone else, growth is a burden, detracting radically from the quality of life.

Their interests also require the continuing rape of the planet, and the continuing misery of the so-called war on terror, which is itself the most blatant terror operation on the planet.

Putting control of the financial system in private hands, as we have done, is the largest single institutional threat to our well-being. The environmental excesses that they have mindlessly induced are converting the planet to a desert of pavement and mine tailings, which include all the end products of the petroleum-petrochemical-consumer waste system.

The overwhelming needs for our transportation system are a) to discourage the use of cars, and b) to improve the local and regional public transportation systems.
01_contact: Kirk McEwan
02_Address:
03_City: Bellevue

05_comment: Hello,
I believe we have 3 options to address Congestion and Mobility. 
1) Make roads bigger - Expensive and not too green
2) Get more people to use mass transit and/or carpool - Even in cities where it works at it's best, it doesn't solve the problem and it's very expensive
3) Get people to use smaller cars - Check out http://www.commutercars.com/ If we made HOV lanes accessible to cars of this size (2 fit in one lane), it wouldn't take too long for them to be mass produced inexpensively and people would buy them to avoid the back-ups. Then at some point we could start to convert what is now one lane into 2 lanes for these types of cars giving us more road without widening. These cars happen to be electric, but any of this size would still be much greener than most of the cars during rush hour with only 1 person in them. The roads would also last longer because the cars are lighter. When the rest of the country sees it start working in Washington, they'll be quick to follow.

Don't let what has always been dictate how we move forward. People don't want to give up their freedom. This solves the issues and doesn't create another Tax burden.

signup:
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2010 8:11 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

01_contact: Jerry Verhoff

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: As I see it, the major choke points on the interstate systems that flow through the Puget Sound can be significantly reduced by building offramps and onramps for the HOV lanes. As cars enter the freeway and have to cross two to three lanes of traffic to get to the HOV lane or worse when cars are moving from the HOV lane across lanes to reach an exit, that is where the choke points occur. New offramps and onramps were built near S. 320th street in Federal Way on I-5 and these have greatly reduced congestion at that exit. The state could start by addressing exits at major intersections such as where I-90 meets I-405, where I-405 meets 520, I-405 meets 167, and so forth. All of these other construction measures that have taken place in these intersections have done nothing to help the congestion because they left the major problem there!

signup:
From: wp.quattro
Posted At: Monday, February 22, 2010 10:46 PM
Conversation: Ballard (Shilshole) to Downtown Passenger Only Ferry Service
Posted To: Transportation 2040

Subject: Ballard (Shilshole) to Downtown Passenger Only Ferry Service
The proposal to add passenger ferry service between Ballard (Shilshole) and Downtown Seattle is not viable. Only a small handful of households live within walking distance of the southern end of the marina. The northern part of the marina does not provide any easy access (walking), as most of the houses sit on top of the bluff. Additionally, employment centers downtown are primarily between 1st and 6th avenues, which would require another commute once the people arrived downtown.

The consumer's cost: The Seattle-Vashon passenger-only run is slightly longer than the Ballard-Downtown run would be. The Vashon run charges $4.50 per trip. Do you think someone living in Ballard would pay $4.00 for a boat trip downtown when they could pay $2.25 for a peak trip on a bus which was more convenient?

The taxpayers cost: Twelve million dollars is a good sum of money for a route which offers limited service to a limited number of people. What is the cost of offering the service to a couple hundred people if you were to say buy another bus, or add a commuter rail platform near the Ballard Locks so that the same users could simply board the existing sounder train service. What kind of fare would be needed to be financially viable without a government subsidy, and would the consumer really pay that fare?

Logistics: The boat would simply not just "leave Ballard and dock Downtown." This isn't like a bus where it is going 30mph, stops, and lets all passengers off. Consider the additional time needed for commuters to get from their home to Shilshole, to depart the dock at Shilshole, go slow until clear of the no wake zone, travel time to downtown, dock, and have the passengers transfer transportation modes to get to their workplace.
01_contact: Nina Busch

02_Address: Magnuson Park employee

03_City:

05_comment: whenever a new major road is due to be built, how about adding enough space for 2 narrow lanes; one on each side - one for pedestrians, the other for cyclists
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2010 10:40 AM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: erin stamper
02_Address: 
03_City: 
05_comment: bike boulevards! (separated from cars)

signup:
We Would Like Your Comments

You are encouraged to submit your thoughts, ideas and comments about the draft Transportation 2040 Plan and the draft Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.

Your comments may be mailed to the attention of Marina King, 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA, 98104-1035.

You may also submit an email to transportation2040@psrc.org, or comment online: http://psrc.org/transportation/t2040/t2040comment

Comments in writing received by March 9, 2010, will be forwarded to the Transportation Policy Board.

1) Still looking for ideas on how to resolve the problem with perehsnil cross-jurisdictional restrictions. Are we looking at more frequent connections? How to fund?

2) Telling equity will be very important, especially for low income populations.

2/24/2010
Kitsad E.J. Meffly
Contact Information

Please provide your name and ZIP Code. If you would like to be added to the Transportation 2040 mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information.

Name ____________________________
Organization ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City, State, ZIP ____________________________
E-mail ____________________________

Other Ways to Comment and Participate

- Subscribe to the Regional VIEW Newsletter — subscribe me ____
- Visit the Transportation 2040 webpage at psrc.org
- Attend any PSRC board or committee meeting (opportunity for public comment is offered at each meeting)
- Send an e-mail to transportation2040@psrc.org
- Contact the PSRC Information Center at 206-464-7532 or info@psrc.org
What is a “smart corridor”?

Why are only Silverdale and Downtown Bremerton considered “regional growth centers”?

Are you aware that nearly 80% of Bremerton only goes to the downtown area (West Bremerton) to catch the ferry and never stop to look at the limited shopping there? (And that they bristle when you mention the “core area”?)

Why isn’t East Bremerton considered a RGC, specifically along Hwy 303?

Why isn’t Kitsap Way looked at? Or Charleston (Callow Ave)?

Has any thought been given to Northern Poulsbo (where there is already a Super Walmart, the Olympic College Poulsbo Satellite campus, and a mixed use housing development) or to areas in Port Orchard (specific to Sedgwick and Bethel Rd)?

Transit in the “core” of Bremerton is cumbersome at best (too narrow roads, poor pedestrian view, too many parking issues; the busses run on a “ferry schedule” as opposed to a “transit schedule,” etc); how would that be addressed?

There is no shopping in Downtown Bremerton, aside from high end boutiques and specialty stores; the Regional Growth Strategy calls for more people living there, yet the area lacks basic stores such as grocers; how is this being addressed? (The closest grocery store of any kind is almost a mile away in the Charleston district to the WSW, and roughly a mile due N in East Bremerton.)
Questions specifically pulled from the VISION 2040 Plan:

Page 78, paragraph 4: “…improvements and programmes need to focus on establishing a more sustainable, user-oriented, and balanced transportation system, along with maximizing existing system capacity and managing demand on the system.” I would draw attention to the user-oriented phrase; how do you make a system, such as we have in Kitsap County, user-oriented when the agency will not utilize their resources so that their customers (the users) can use the system.

Possible Solution: A few places in California have begun to use “feeder routes” to reach those in the suburbs and rural areas; they run roughly every 35-45 minutes (depending on the area they are heading to); these routes then bring the transit customers into the outskirts of a core area (i.e.: a transfer center) where the customer can then access the regular routed system. Is there a place in your vision for such a system, and if not, why are you willing to exclude such a large part of our county from reasonable access of services they technically pay for?

Page 80, paragraph 2: “Efficient management of existing transportation facilities …can affect how well the region’s transportation system performs.” How do we know if the agency is being run efficiently if we can’t see anything going on (no real transparency)? Are there provision in you vision for oversight? How do we trust an agency when we are blatantly ignored (spending money on the research vessel for the foot ferry, after the county voted twice “no Kitsap Transit foot ferry”)?

Possible Solution: An independent oversight panel, or a “watchdog” group? Are there provisions made in the vision for independent, outside, unannounced audits of the system and its management?

Page 80, paragraph 4: “…demand management strategies aim to increase transit ridership…and reduce the duration of some trips…of people driving alone.” This only works if the system exists in the first place; how is this too being addressed in light of the Kitsap Transit Agency continually cutting routes due to so-called “budget issues” (yet still finding money for non-ground services)?

Possible Solution: The plan later mentions that “New public and private partnerships are needed” (pg. 85 pa. 1). A solution could be to look at a fulltime grant writer for each agency. Are there proposals being made to major corporations in the area? Have any private foundations been contacted? Could CDs or Annuities be an option for “rainy day” funding?
Page 84, paragraph 8: "...to consider its investments carefully, prioritize its needs, and concentrate funding where it brings the greatest net benefits in supporting the Regional Growth Strategy." Are there suggestions to ensure this? Is there a way to make certain transit agencies prioritize appropriately (oversight)?

Possible Solution: Per Kitsap Transit's website, "Integrate the growth of the bus system (Kitsap Transit) with higher-level transit options; Lower costs of high-end alternatives by sizing stations correctly the first time, preserving and/or securing sites/key pieces of right-of-way (ROW); Get transit and land-use planning to reinforce each other." Most funds have gone to administration and a research/foot ferry vessel, against the needs of the citizens who must rely on the Transit system for everyday living and working. Perhaps independent, outside, unannounced audits of the system and its management could help to maintain this local vision and ensure that the transit agency prioritizes appropriately?

Also, low rent homes are out-laying. There's no transit here. Rent in the "core" areas is $1500-$2600 a month. What help is there or solutions to address their needs? People must have 2-5 roommates just to have a home.
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council members,

As someone who cares deeply about the future of transportation and landscape in our region, particularly in light of climate change, I am writing to urge you to remove the Cross-Base Highway from your preferred alternative project list. The Cross-Base Highway has no place in our region's plans for responsible transportation. Its construction would likely increase, not minimize, greenhouse gas emissions.

There are several important reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project:

* We should fix existing roads and invest in new modes of transportation before building any new highways.

* Construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly.

* Only 3% of our state's oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would flatten 162 acres and fragment 1,600 acres of habitat that Pierce county considers "the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in the lower elevations of Pierce County."

* People don't want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

* It conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

Michael Foley
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2010 1:16 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Richard D. Huey

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: My comment is simple, but complex to achieve. I have lived in Seattle's Fremont neighborhood for 18 years. The volume of traffic has steadily increased in Fremont--with most of the trips being cars passing through to somewhere else. Now it is to the point that the main roads feel like the bars of a cage, keeping those who bike or walk from enjoying the neighborhood. The number of individual car trips through Fremont have to be reduced, so the neighborhood can be returned to it's residents.
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2010 11:49 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Bob Jeffers-Schroder

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: While the current preferred alternative is an improvement over past policy, it still falls short on provisions to reduce reliance upon motorized transportation. Greenhouse gas emissions must be drastically reduced within the coming decade. Nonmotorized transportation will be an important contribution of this change. It is not a good idea to continue to support motorized trips.

signup:
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2010 8:30 AM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Bob Jeffers-Schroder

02_Address:
03_City:

05_comment: Having read the Cascade Bicycle Club comments and attached analysis I favor alternative 5.

signup:
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council members,

As someone who cares deeply about the future of transportation and landscape in our region, particularly in light of climate change, I am writing to urge you to remove the Cross-Base Highway from your preferred alternative project list. The Cross-Base Highway has no place in our region's plans for responsible transportation. Its construction would likely increase, not minimize, greenhouse gas emissions.

There are several important reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project:

* We should fix existing roads and invest in new modes of transportation before building any new highways.

* Construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly.

* Only 3% of our state's oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would flatten 162 acres and fragment 1,600 acres of habitat that Pierce county considers "the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in the lower elevations of Pierce County."

* People don't want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

* It conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

nicolette ludolphi
Marcia Navajas

From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2010 6:05 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Marcia Navajas

02_Address:

03_City: Bainbridge Island

05_comment: I bike to the ferry and walk/bus to work. Safety is a real concern: walking downtown Seattle, safety on public transportation. Need more and well marked crosswalks, need aggressive enforcement of drivers who run red lights. Buses in Seattle on some routes are a disaster: dirty, aggressive gang bangers, too crowded.
From: form-submitter@example.com  
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 7:55 AM  
To: Anne Avery; Marina King  
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Michael Stiber
02_Address: 
03_City: 

05_comment: The current plan takes an overly narrow view of transportation and its impact on the community. In particular, it makes the clearly erroneous assumption that people will continue to want and be able to travel by private car. It therefore places excessive emphasis on expanding roadways and reducing driving congestion. It ignores, or gives short shrift to, much of the impact of driving on our environment or public health. Most importantly, it does not create a future in which it is convenient for people to make healthy choices about transportation -- it provides minimal investment in non-motorized transportation infrastructure (walking or bicycling). Fifty-five percent of Americans would prefer to drive less. Please give us what we want.

We need to stop investing in the past. We need to look at world-class cities in countries where the price of auto fuel most closely matches it's likely future level here.
I read the article about regional transportation planning. My favorite old testament quote, "Where there is no vision the people perish." I voted for rapid transit in 1968, and every time since. I lived in San Francisco while doing graduate work at San Francisco State. I rode the Muni and BART. I forever wished that Seattle could get the vision. As a public school teacher I rode my bike to the East side from Seattle for 30 years. Now retired, I still ride to substitute and run my errands. I average over 5000 miles a year. My 65 year old friends all say they wish they had done the same. Many are out of shape and have health problems related to lack of exercise and over weight. It wasn't easy to ride all those years. I was in peril many times as drivers crowded me off the road, shook fists and made other gestures. The old floating bridge was a nightmare particularly going through Mount Baker Tunnel, WOW killer. Things are better 35 years later but we have a long way to go. Light rail and Sounder are great new transportation assets, my new folding bike and public transportation will get me to many places, but we still need to work on the vision. Bike lanes always seem to be an after thought.

As of late one of my favorite bike routes has disappeared without any alternate route to replace it. The Green River Trail is full of sand bags and black plastic,. The routes through South Center are full of speeding shoppers who crowd a bike off the road and make biking a hazardous experience. Keep the vision alive. More public transportation, more bike friendly streets, more healthy people traveling safely.

Sincerely

Ron Adams

All e-mail correspondence to and from this address are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, which may result in monitoring and archiving, as well as disclosure to third parties upon request.
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 1:39 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Donna Hegstad

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: The March 2 Opinion piece titled "Health reform through healthier transportation" (by Chuck Ayers, James Hereford and Anne Vernez Moudon) did a terrific job of explaining the connections between transportation alternatives and individual and community well-being. Their concluding paragraph: "Let's adopt a regional plan that's visionary in building compact, well-connected and vibrant communities with transportation options."
From: John Tatum
Posted At: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 10:39 AM
Conversation: Arlington Airport Disposition
Posted To: Transportation 2040

Subject: Arlington Airport Disposition
I was surprised to see the Snohomish airport as regionally significant and not see the Arlington airport at all. Is the Arlington airport going away? If so, Marysville could substantially change both the planned density and uses of the industrial area in the airport flight path.

Or is the non status of the Arlington airport an oversight?

John Tatum
Traffic Engineer
City of Marysville
01_contact: Julia Bach
02_Address:
03_City:

05_comment: You say that you are interested in giving users more "choices." However, you then dismiss the single-occupancy vehicle as a valid choice, instead forcing users to choose between forms of mass transit or biking/walking. This is not giving people a choice. You should either drop the word "choice" from your literature, or start considering single-occupancy vehicles again as one of the choices.
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 12:24 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Julia Bach

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: If you move away from gas tax funding and implement some sort of mandatory 24/7 tolling system (installed in my car) for using our roadways, I will leave the state of Washington, and I don't think I will be the only one.
Hello, I am a Klahanie resident and would like to encourage you all to add the Issaquah Issaquah-Fall City Rd Phase III to your PSRC 2040 Plan. We as residents would like to be considered for annexation by either Sammamish or Issaquah, but because of this road improvement mandate, neither city is interested. Also, as a resident, it would be nice to have this road improved for the safety of all around with hopefully federally funded monies.

Thanks for your consideration on this issue.

Lynn Decker
Costco Wholesale
From:
Evan Siroky

To:
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

Please accept my following comments on the recently revised Draft Transportation 2040 Plan. Overall I am fairly satisfied with the plan, but still think that it could be improved. I have separated my comments into the requested sections.

As has always been the case with these plans, it appears that PSRC’s goal is not so much to strive for an excellent transportation system, but to make do with what revenue it is projecting the region will receive. I have heard many complaints from people about a lack of a “Vision” for transportation. For a good example of what a vision looks like, please refer to Seattle Likes Bikes Vision for 2020 (http://seattlelikesbikes.org/wordpress/?p=161).

While I would love to see a lot of the items occur in the Seattle Likes Bikes Vision, I am not suggesting PSRC endorse or adopt that vision, I just wanted to provide it as an example. In the Seattle Likes Bikes Vision, the end result of a lifestyle is something that is strived for, whereas with PSRC it is mainly just a continuation of the status quo transportation practices with a few adjustments. I urge the PSRC to dream big in a similar way that Seattle Likes Bikes did. I also urge the PSRC to do some big-picture quantification of “such and such people will have access to a regional trail/15 minute bus service/freeway entrance within a mile” in addition to your regular output measures.

* Addressing Congestion and Mobility

The current plan still leaves out so much that could be built. While there were trails added and light rail extended, this region wants more of that. Most people in this region also want better bus service and coverage. At a minimum, each regional center should be connected with either BRT or Light Rail and a system of trails. On the highways side it is important that we maintain our existing infrastructure as a lot of it is in need of replacement.

One other item is that the CTR law needs teeth. This program has been a proven success for more than a decade. The simple act of actually requiring large companies to reduce their vehicle trips and imposing a fee if they don’t meet targets would work wonders for reducing vehicle trips with minimal effort.

The ITS section lacks parts about parking management. I feel that so much of our parking supply is not managed well. Free on-street parking is over-utilized while off-street parking nearby is still under-
utilized. This region needs a good ITS System to help provide drivers with information on which parking garages are empty and where to find on-street parking. In-vehicle information such as this could significantly cut down on vehicle traffic searching for parking.

* Protecting the Environment

Firstly, I must point out that the projected 9% Per Capita VMT while respectable is still not enough in order to meet established Washington State Goals. In the RCW 47.01.440 section 1 that establishes that the statewide goal for VMT reduction should be 18% by 2020 and 30% by 2035. These exact words are also stated in the draft document, yet these goals are not met. Why are these goals not met? The transportation plan that we develop should be consistent with these statewide goals.

Secondly, it seems that the majority of the reason for decreased vehicle emissions is expected to come from an enhanced and cleaner fleet of vehicles. However, what incentives are being pursued to ensure that this will actually happen? It does not appear that anything is being established to ensure this. Also at the time of the draft publication an appendix describing the likely technology scenario isn’t even published. Over the past decade, we have not seen a significant fleet-wide reduction of vehicle emissions and if we have another federal administration that weakens the EPA there could be very little incentives for people to lower their transportation emissions.

Some monetary incentives should be given to people who choose to upgrade their vehicles to a cleaner model and better yet further incentives should be given to those that give up driving entirely. And to complete the circle, these incentives could be provided by providing disincentives including monetary penalties or taxes to those that keep using vehicles that produce a certain amount of emissions.

Overall, any PSRC plan should pursue an aggressive implementation of electric vehicle infrastructure. Not only would an electric fleet reduce emissions, but the smart grid potential of all the batteries would be of great benefit to this region and perhaps others that don’t implement our technology. The establishment of charging stations that connect to the regional electric grid and any necessary infrastructure improvements to make that happen should be included in this transportation plan.

* A Sustainable Funding Plan

As we have recently seen, not all financial sources of funding are stable. As with any investment, it is good to diversify. Thus multiple means of collecting revenues should be established for all types of transportation. Moving to a tolling system is a good step, but having that replace the gas tax or other taxes will lead to the same issue of having a lack of diversified income. What will happen if there again is a funding crisis from relying too heavily on collecting revenue from tolls? We should still keep the gas
tax especially since it helps function as a disincentive for those who drive vehicles the produce more emissions.

Diversity of revenue streams should be pursued in a number of ways and it should be fair when it is done. A common complaint is always regarding the use of the sales tax for use in funding transportation projects. Not only is the sales tax viewed as regressive, but the revenue it generates can fluctuate significantly. And furthermore, the linkage between the sales tax and transportation is not direct. More direct items such as tolls and parking fees should be established to directly collect revenue in order to improve the service from which the activity is based.

Parking fees are an item that should see more use. The abundance of parking and especially of free parking is a major contributor to vehicle ownership and vehicle ownership leads to use of roadway facilities. Thus what would be useful in this situation is to assess a tax on parking to collect revenue to help pay for the infrastructure needed to support vehicles traveling from parking spot to parking spot. A simple tax per number of parking spots on a property should do the trick very well. Similarly, all cities should have parking fees for on-street parking.

One other thing that needs serious revision is Washington State Ferries fare structure, but only in coordination with what happens at the Tacoma Narrows Bridge. In today’s system passengers are not charged going eastbound, but there is a toll going eastbound over the bridge. On the way back going west, passengers must pay, but there is no toll going westbound over the bridge. And with all of these new HOV lanes we’re building and lack of highly frequent sailings, what outcome might result from this? This should be studied in greater detail to determine a fair solution applicable to all travelers.

* Preserving the Existing Transportation System

The current plan in terms of projects does seem to include a number of preservation projects, including the replacement of aging infrastructure and increases in efficiency. However, the big question mark lies with funding. Funding must be secured in order for even the maintenance projects to be successful. This funding problem is of a critical nature for local transit agencies. The region must work to ensure that transit agencies have enough revenue to operate on. On another note, it was a great move by the state legislature last year to fund the replacement of a number of WSF vessels.

* Enhancing Safety and Security

No major comments here except that the Alaska Way Viaduct and the 520 bridge should be replaced since they run the risk of structural failure. Similarly other structures in poor condition should receive a higher priority for funding allocations.

* Investing in a Balanced Mix of Investments

I have a number of Pierce County project-specific comments in a later section. Primarily these comments are focused on the Pierce County area since that is what I studied in most detail in these documents. A big complaint I have is that the exact figures or even a range of figures are missing for the future cost of a number of transit projects. These should be quantified as soon as possible since without
them it is hard to make an exact comparison of the total amount being investment and whether this is perceived to me as balanced.

At initial glance it is good to see that there is a much greater investment in public transit. Of course this is to be partially expected with the passage of ST2. Finally this region will experience a dramatic investment in capital transit infrastructure and I believe that there is great demand for it.

In terms of non-motorized improvements, I was really pleased to see this round of the transportation plan move all those bike trails from Alternative 5 that were out in the middle of nowhere into the cities where they would could actually be used for transportation purposes and not exclusively for recreation. As for transit, the amount of improvement is weak.

It is good that the plan does include Light Rail extension to Tacoma, the Sounder extension to Lakewood and 3 BRT Lines. However, there are gaps in the system, or rather gaps lacking quality transit service. Specifically, it lacks a transit line from South Hill to Lakewood and from Lakewood to Tacoma Community College via University place, both of which are even in Pierce Transit’s current funding scenario which includes dramatic service cuts. And really, why is the Tacoma Streetcar extended just a mile in this 20 year plan? Redraw that map and include the Tacoma streetcar extension to TCC as a constrained project.

As far as local roads go, why are there so many road projects in mid-Pierce County? The Canyon road project goes through a rural area as does the 72nd street, 96th street projects and part of the 112th project. These road projects although they connect other centers of Pierce County seem to me to be a risky undertaking in terms of providing better access to a rural area. It may only be a matter of time before sprawl overtakes this area or a city develops in this area since it is a very central location geographically speaking. Now it’s a little different with 176th since it serves a designated manufacturing center, but that whole place is really close to the edge of the urban boundary. Why aren’t there more roadway investments happening in our existing urban centers? Tacoma could especially use more roadway investment in terms of fixing our streets.

For the highways, this is quite dramatic to see all highways except for part of the 512 completely highlighted. As for the I-5 section from the 512 to DuPont, this is an unquestionable case where a widening of the freeway should occur. It is my personal impression that this is the worst bottleneck in the entire state. Yet as for the other Pierce County highway projects, I start to wonder if the level of investment in the rest of these projects are really worth it. The costs stated in this document of these highway projects and the proposed extensions of our light rail system are comparable in cost, yet a new light rail line adds much more person-carrying capacity than does an extra 4 lanes of highway. The focus of these highway projects should be primarily of maintenance purposes.

* Addressing Equity and Special Needs

The issue of equity quite often comes down to geography in this region. Is this area receiving as much as the other or its fair share? When it comes down to allocation of reasons I would hope that this region
focuses its investment into Metropolitan centers and regional centers so as to not require so much investment in transporting people and goods from isolated areas.

* Supporting the Economy and Regional Growth Strategy

At all times, try to prioritize and encourage projects in urban cores as opposed to those in the middle of nowhere. Our plan is full of regional centers with populations predicted to grow substantially. These areas will need increased investment in transportation facilities in order to support this growth. If money is spent to provide better access to the middle of nowhere, growth can be expected there. Thus if there is ever a shortage of funds the PSRC should prioritize projects along I-5, those in metropolitan areas and then those connecting metropolitan areas to regional centers first.

* Supporting health and livable communities

Very succinctly put, the more vehicles that get off the road that are replaced with walkers and bicyclers will mean a healthier population. Actions taken related to this goal will vary greatly from city to city, but the best thing the PSRC can do is to help facilitate the development of an extensive regional trail system.

* Project Specific Comments:

**Arterial

113,134,135 - Canyon Road
This project is in the middle of a rural area. This would support sprawl. Pierce County must ensure strict land use laws are followed to not make it next strip mall road.

1221, Tacoma, D Street Overpass.
This project is already completed. Please remove this from the list and distribute the funds elsewhere.

3550, Lincoln Overpass
This project is already under construction. Please remove this from the list and distribute the funds elsewhere.

296, DuPont-Steilacoom Rd widening
This road is already 4 lanes wide, does it really need more widening?

1473, 72nd Tacoma-Puyallup widening
This project is in the middle of a rural area. This would support sprawl. Pierce County must ensure strict land use laws are followed to not make it next strip mall road.

1474, 96th widening
This project is in the middle of a rural area. This would support sprawl. Pierce County must ensure strict land use laws are followed to not make it next strip mall road.
129, Shaw Rd E - Corridor Study
This project is in the middle of nowhere and should not be given any funds.

**Bike/Ped

2827 - Trail from Tacoma to Orting
This would be fantastic! Thank you for including this in the constrained plan.

2847 - Water Ditch Trail
This project is already mostly completed, at least where the line has been drawn on the map. Please redraw the line on the map to extend north from 40th along the Sounder corridor to Downtown Tacoma.

2816 - I-5 Trail Corridor
What is this? A bridge from Sprague to South Tacoma, cause that would be awesome! Would is only cost $1million though?

2688 - Prairie Line Trail
Thanks for including more trails in urban areas.

5507 - Train to the Mountain Trail
This would be an epic project. Please find the funds for this.

5514 - Walk the Water Front Trail
Thanks for including more trails in urban areas. This is an especially good project since it links the Downtown Waterfront with the Old Town Waterfront.

**Highways

4194 - I-5: NB and SB Auxilary Lanes (Fort Lewis Rd I/C -Thorne Lane I/C)
Absolutely needed.

1659 & 1722 - SR 167 Extension Phases 1 & 2 (SR 509 - Puyallup) - New 4 lane freeway (Port of Tacoma - I-5), new 4 lane freeway (I-5 @ Fife - SR 167 @ Puyallup)

I know that the Port of Tacoma heavily desires the I-5/SR-167/SR 509 interchange, but I’m against it. In the end, the majority of trips that it will serve will be SOVs. This project should be done only once system-wide tolling is implemented and at that point, a higher toll for SOVs and/or non-commercial vehicles driving on this particular facility should be explored because it is the freight community that desires this project the most.
Dan Larkin

From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2010 1:53 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Dan Larkin
02_Address:
03_City:
05_comment: Transportation 2040 is an important step in planning for the long term livability and economic viability of the Central Puget Sound region. Thank you for the work that has been thoughtfully laid out in this plan.

My comments pertain specifically to the prioritization placed on the movement of motor vehicles in the plan, rather than movement of people.

We are missing an opportunity to build in improvements necessary to support a shift from motorized to non-motorized traffic where possible. Bicycle accommodations in particular are not adequately addressed.

The plan calls for bicycle facilities near transit centers, completing missing links and for embracing complete streets in all urban areas. These are necessary but insufficient.

The greatest obstacles to wider adoption of bicycle commuting are services available at endpoints; direct, interconnected, separated routes; and safe shared access on roads to reach separated routes.

These need to be addressed through new trail development, commute trip reduction requirements for adequate shower and storage facilities, and extension of complete streets throughout suburban centers feeding the trails.

Regards,

-Dan Larkin
From: Rick Olson
Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2010 11:12 AM
To: Marina King
Subject: T 2040 Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red
Generated by the op-ed in the Seattle Times yesterday.

From: randall schwab [mailto:rand1555@whidbey.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 7:00 PM
To: Rick Olson
Subject: Advanced public transportation system

Atten: Chuck Ayers & James Herford

Although this transportation plan does not directly involve bicycles it would be very advantageous to ride your bike a mile or 2 to a terminal rather than a car or bus. This like all other aspects of this proposal is to eliminate 50% of the cars.

In his State Of The Union Address on 27 January 2010, President Barack Obama stressed a need for and invited innovative inputs from the American people relative to clean, energy-efficient operations and high speed transportation. An Industrial Designer friend (40 Yrs Experience) just published a book titled "Wind Spirit - A TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR THE 21st CENTURY" that responds to that request precisely. It is brief, 45 pages text & 17 Engineering Drawings; however, it is written to be understandable to the layman public and hopefully elicit questions/suggestions/prototype development & implementation through coordinated efforts of engineers and developers. The authors personal description of the books purpose, its content and his email contact for questions etc. follows:

Wind Spirit A TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR THE 21ST CENTURY
The transportation concept described here employs 20 passenger cars that can change lanes on an elevated track at 80 miles per hour. This permits an extraordinary improvement in public transportation, up to 70,000 passengers per hour per line. This book details the construction of the cars and the commuter system as it might be installed in Minneapolis, Minnesota as well as a convincing critique of light rail in general. This type of system has never been proposed before. In Minneapolis it would consist of four triangle shape lines that meet at town center. they will have about a ten mile outside radius which encircles the town, each quadrant would be about 40 miles long. (See drawing COM-15 in the book). Running in both directions the 4 lines could transport 560 thousand people an hour. And the most remarkable thing is that most people will have to stop no more than twice before they get to their destination regardless of the trip length!
It seems reasonable to expect public transport should carry 50% of commuters an average distance of 20 miles each. That would be 133 thousand people an hour for a 3 hour period morning and night in Minneapolis*. That number of people would require 22 light rails. Where will you put those? If the cost is $300 million a mile and is the same length as this proposal the cost would be 132 billion dollars. Reminder: This is only for Minneapolis/St Paul.
This book was written with the intent of instructing the general public in the futility of pursuing light rail as the solution to their transportation problems and to encourage them to demand something better. The book includes 17 engineering drawings to illustrate how it will be constructed. Finally there is a description of personal auto transport and also a cargo carrying system that can replace the long haul trucking industry within the next half century.

It is immediately apparent that this issue is more political than technical. Where do we go from here?

CONTENTS
CHAPTER 1 A view of light rail
CHAPTER 2 Take a ride with me.
CHAPTER 3 How it works
CHAPTER 4  How the system is constructed
CHAPTER 5  How it works in Minneapolis
CHARTER 6  How to get 40,000 people an hour off of this thing. (downtown)
CHAPTER 7  The future looks good.
Plus 17 engineering drawings.

Author; Randall J Schwab

*These numbers are extrapolated from a Time magazine article of November 26, 2007 titled: “One day in America”

Ask for it at your favorite bookstore. Also available at Amazon.com

All e-mail correspondence to and from this address is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, which may result in monitoring and archiving, as well as disclosure to third parties upon request.
From: Charles Redell
Posted At: Wednesday, March 03, 2010 10:29 AM
Conversation: Transportation 2040 comment
Posted To: Transportation 2040

Subject: Transportation 2040 comment
To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to voice my concern that PSRC's current focus in transportation planning for the next 30 years focuses on building more highways and provides only minimal investment for non-motorized forms of transportation.

I urge you to please put the council's full support behind a more-aggressive Alternative 5. The plan you are currently looking at adds up to 950 new highway miles to our region at a time when we as a nation, region and world are in dire need of REDUCING vehicle miles travelled. Numerous studies have shown that adding highway miles reduces congestion in the short term does nothing to ease congestion and actually INCREASES emissions AND congestion ([http://www.sightline.org/research/energy/res_pubs/climate-analysis-gge-new-lanes-10-07/?searchterm=highway%20congestion](http://www.sightline.org/research/energy/res_pubs/climate-analysis-gge-new-lanes-10-07/?searchterm=highway%20congestion)) in the long term.

The weak alternative 5 that you are now looking at ignores the the percentage of trips in our region that are currently taken on foot or by bike and will exacerbate the traffic congestion and dependence on automobiles that, in the long term, will prove to be an economy killer for our region. Other metropolitan areas in the West and all over the world are moving away from a car-dependent culture and will end up as the economic drivers of the future. Cities that plan for more cars by adding more highways and ignoring non-motorized forms of transportation as well as mass transit risk being the Detroit's of tomorrow.

Please take heed of the studies out there that say adding highway miles does no good over the long term, and others that report that 55 percent of Americans say they prefer to walk more and drive less. Finally take note of the numerous comments you received last summer (and I am in this process) calling for a strong commitment to funding more infrastructure for non-motorized forms of transportation.

Our future is in your hands. What we want is fewer cars and fewer roadways, not more.

Sincerely,
Charles Redell
Alternative 5 does not go far enough in providing infrastructure for bicycling and walking, and goes too far to accommodate the status quo regarding high rates of driving. More people would bicycle and walk more frequently if it were safer and there were many more and vastly improved facilities for these modes. We must recognize that driving is currently far too convenient and cheap, and as long as this mode remains this way the vast majority of people will continue to drive. While convenient, this outcome is not what we want for our health, our social equity (As of the 2000 Census fully 30% of Americans were not licensed to drive due to age, economics, disability or choice), our climate and our region's livability. We must create an Alternative 5 that truly moves us toward the outcome we want- a city that encourages clean, active transportation.
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Sunday, March 07, 2010 3:41 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Daniel Weise

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: Please remove the Cross-Base Highway from the plan. More roads are not the solution to the problems we will face in the future. We can no longer sacrifice God's gifts to us in our attempt to take dominion over all that he has provided. We must care for creation, not destroy it in a mad rush.
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Sunday, March 07, 2010 4:34 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Virginia Gunby
02_Address:.
03_City:

05_comment: The 15 SMART Corridors in 2040 are an innovative, needed and a great addition to the regional transportation2040 Plan. My recommedation is that the PSRC staff use the information in the WSDOT 1992 TEEM SR 520 Report to improve the 2040 SMART corridor process.

The new state GMA regulations for Local Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan updates require that the cities and counties collaborate regionally on the improving, monitoring the multi-modal performance major transportation corridors. So this GMA planning process supports the 2040's direction.

The Translake SR 520 study by WSDOT called TEEM contained many TDM Corridor management improvements, and when commenting on the SR 520 SDEIS, circulated until 4/15/10. The PSRC should inform WSDOT of the new SMART Corridor element, particularly the new 2040 SR 520/I-90 Cross-lake corridor that the PSRC staff are intending to monitor and report on corridor performance objectives on in the future.

This is a great step toward overseeing and improving the multimodal performance of all regional corridors and particularly the current and rebuilt SR 520 corridor by an independent agency.

It is important that the information gained be shared and reported regularly and in collaboration with the corridor communities, employers, and adjacent cities. They must be involved, so that they can be knowledgeable, and supportive of PSRC's oversight for achieving improved and sustainable, mulimodal corridor performance objectives. The monitoring reports should not be only technical reports that are kept within the PSRC staff and local transportation agencies, but should be planned to explaing and maintain contact with those who can be directly involved in using and improving the long-term urban corridor performance, for moving more people instead of only SOVs, as has been the direction in the past. The SMART Corridors will move help to move us into reducing GHG Pollution in our region in the the future. Thanks to staff for this great improvment!
I am writing to voice my concern that PSRC's current focus in transportation planning for the next 30 years focuses on building more highways and provides only minimal investment for non-motorized forms of transportation.

I urge you to please put the council's full support behind a more-aggressive Alternative 5. The plan you are currently looking at adds up to 950 new highway miles to our region at a time when we as a nation, region and world are in dire need of REDUCING vehicle miles travelled. Numerous studies have shown that adding highway miles reduces congestion in the short term does nothing to ease congestion and actually INCREASES emissions AND congestion (http://www.sightline.org/research/energy/res_pubs/climate-analysis-gge-new-lanes-10-07/?searchterm=highway%20congestion) in the long term.

The weak alternative 5 that you are now looking at ignores the the percentage of trips in our region that are currently taken on foot or by bike and will exacerbate the traffic congestion and dependence on automobiles that, in the long term, will prove to be an economy killer for our region. Other metropolitan areas in the West and all over the world are moving away from a car-dependent culture and will end up as the economic drivers of the future. Cities that plan for more cars by adding more highways and ignoring non-motorized forms of transportation as well as mass transit risk being the Detroit's of tomorrow.

Please take heed of the studies out there that say adding highway miles does no good over the long term, and others that report that 55 percent of Americans say they prefer to walk more and drive less. Finally take note of the numerous comments you received last summer calling for a strong commitment to funding more infrastructure for non-motorized forms of transportation.

Our future is in your hands. What we want is fewer cars and fewer roadways, not more.

Sincerely,
Jennifer More
I urge you to remove the Cross-Base Highway from your project list. I have dedicated my nearly 35 year professional career to environmental protection and am horrified by this proposal.

I understand that if built, this highway would destroy prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction on the Ft. Lewis-McChord military base, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly. I understand that only 3% of Washington's oak woodland prairies remain, and that this highway would destroy 162 acres of this valuable habitat and fragment 1,600 acres of one of the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in Pierce County. I cannot believe that the benefits of any highway would justify such significant and irreparable environmental losses.

Please choose to protect biodiversity in a world where Nature is fast disappearing. It is what I live for.

Sincerely,

Ann Prezyna
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

Please remove the Cross-Base Highway from all preferred alternatives on your project list.

There are many good reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project and no good reasons to build it.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ms. Peggy Printz
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

Please remove the Cross-Base Highway from all preferred alternatives on your project list, particularly alternative 5, which is the most transit friendly.

As a youth growing up in Ohio, where its pocket prairies were completely extinct, I got involved in prairie restoration efforts and became keenly interested in prairies. Our efforts involved going through Ohio, Indiana and Illinois and finding small stands of prairie in old unkept cemeteries and road/rail road crossing where neither "kept up" the right of way, to collect seed and plant plugs from these tiny remnants.

I went on to Wisconsin, where more prairies were somewhat intact, but were also quite threatened. I was involved with more prairie restoration work.

I can tell you that restoration is extremely expensive compared to restoration. The prairie habitat that would be destroyed is extremely rare and few other intact prairies in in Western Washington.

Then moving to Washington, I was a field ecology student in the 70s. The most prized trips were the rare and special military allowed field trips to McChord to see its uniquely protected prairie habitat.

Over the years, I watched as Washington's rare prairies have disappeared. In the late 80s, I watched the Chehalis Industrial park expand across a historic camas prairie, a major digging ground for the Chehalis River. I got permission and organized people to dig thousands of camas bulbs and distributed them to arboretums and private reserves.

I watched the prairies of Yelm get paved and constructed over by Prairie Market, Prairie Bank, and other "Prairie" named businesses.

I've collected camas seed and bulbs from alongside McChord, where it looked like they were about to be destroyed. It was always an odd thing to know that what was protected the remaining habitat was a military base, and the habitat was protected because no one else could enter of develop that area.

Except the Cross-Base Highway apparently.

There are many other good reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project, but I wanted to share my particular background and perspective on the matter.

Please remove it from your lists.

Sincerely,

Sego Jackson
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

The Cross-Base Highway in Pierce County is a bad idea. It's too expensive at half a billion dollars. It will destroy prime wildlife habitat for no less than 19 endangered plant and wildlife species. And it will increase greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging more driving. The public seems to understand this, as this project was ranked last of all Pierce County projects in a 2003 public opinion poll. Please remove this project from the Destination 2040 project list.

Sincerely,

Mr. James Davis
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

Only 3% of the oak woodland prairie remains in our state. We have more old growth doug fir than Oak woodland. It needs to be protected because there is so little undisturbed habitat west of the Cascades. 25 years ago things were different. Long years into the future maybe that would become a park with a legacy to all of you. But right now is the time to think 100 years into the future...will a highway be useful? Maybe but doubtful. What would be the value of a nice chunk of an already rare habitat? Can you imagine what it will be worth to science and our grandchildren's grandchildren. Now that would be cool, and it can be YOUR legacy. As a citizen and voter deeply concerned with the future of transportation and quality of life in our region, I urge you to remove the Cross-Base Highway from all preferred alternatives on your project list, particularly alternative 5, which is the most transit friendly.

As a brand-new limited access general purpose highway, the Cross-Base Highway has no place in our region's plans for responsible transportation. Its almost half a billion dollar construction cost for less than six miles of new pavement would likely increase, not minimize, greenhouse gas emissions.

There are many good reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project:

* We should fix existing roads and bridges and invest in new modes of mass transportation before building any new highways.

* People don't want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

* Construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction on the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly.

* Only 3% of our state's oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would flatten 162 acres and fragment 1,600 acres of habitat that Pierce County considers "the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in the lower elevations of Pierce County."

* The proposed highway, through encroachment, risks closure of the airstrip at the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base. It puts a highway barrier between Pierce County's two largest employers, while not reducing traffic on I-5.

* The Cross-Base Highway conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and to protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

Mr. Peter Loft
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

Please concentrate on maintaining and upgrading the road system we currently have. We don't want the cross-base highway and we don't need it. Every day we are learning more about the negative consequences of our vehicle addictions. Building yet another highway will only add to our problems. We have very little oak-woodland prairie left in Washington (only 3% of what we once had). We don't know what effect climate change will have on our remaining 3% - we can't afford to lose any of it to a new highway. Please reconsider this ill-conceived plan.

Sincerely,

Ms. Jeanne Miller
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council, Cross-Base Highway will not relieve ongoing traffic congestion. The roadway would actually increase travel distances for drivers. In the words of the environmental impact statement for the project, "Overall, people would travel farther to use the new Cross-Base Highway project to avoid other congested highways and roads; this would increase miles driven? (Cross-Base Highway FEIS, p. 4-201)."

I just attended a UW Faculty Lecture by Dr. Peter Ward on global warming. Alarming. We are a runaway train. Trading a pristine prairie for more "miles driven" is short sighted selfish. Please reconsider. Lori Watts.
From: Ann Heneghan
Posted At: Sunday, March 07, 2010 9:07 PM
Conversation: Remove the Cross-Base Highway from Transportation 2040
Posted To: Transportation 2040

Subject: Remove the Cross-Base Highway from Transportation 2040

Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

Please remove the Cross-Base Highway from all preferred alternatives on your project list, particularly alternative 5, which is the most transit friendly.

I live near the junction of Meridian and 176th. This would only make traffic worse in the area, and lead to more sprawl. I urge you to work on improving the north-south arterials!

As a brand-new limited access general purpose highway, the Cross-Base Highway has no place in our region's plans for responsible transportation. Its almost half a billion dollar construction cost for less than six miles of new pavement would likely increase, not minimize, greenhouse gas emissions.

There are many good reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project:

* We should fix existing roads and bridges and invest in new modes of mass transportation before building any new highways.

* People don't want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

* Construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction on the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly.

* Only 3% of our state's oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would flatten 162 acres and fragment 1,600 acres of habitat that Pierce County considers "the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in the lower elevations of Pierce County."

* The proposed highway, through encroachment, risks closure of the airstrip at the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base. It puts a highway barrier between Pierce County's two largest employers, while not reducing traffic on I-5.

* The Cross-Base Highway conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and to protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,
Ann Heneghan
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

I was surprised to hear that the Cross-Base Highway was still being considered after being rejected by voters a couple of years ago. I'm very concerned about how it will affect the quality of life in the area and devastate natural habitats. Please consider removing this project from the project list.

I don't feel that this is responsible transportation and doesn't even seem economical. I feel it would be a better alternative to repair existing roads and bridges and focus on mass transportation in our region before building any new highways.

I am also concerned about the natural habitat and, as I understand it, construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction on the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base. It seems criminal to do this for such a low-ranked transportation priority.

My daughter is a horse rider and I have been out to the Woodbrook Hunt Club several times. It is one of the few natural areas in a populated area. It is also the only hunt club in the county and is enjoyed by both members and guests. There are so few open areas to ride safely in our area and it would be a shame if this was taken away for a highway that nobody wants.

The DOT requires analysis and reduction of our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity. The projects seems quite the contrary.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. I ask that you make a responsible decision and appreciate you looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and to protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

Monica Gaub
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

As a Pierce County homeowner and voter, I believe the Cross-Base Highway should be removed from all preferred alternatives on your project list, particularly alternative 5, which is the most transit friendly.

WSDOT studies show that it will not reduce traffic on I-5 going into Ft. Lewis, as cars must still stop and be checked in at the gate. The Frederickson Employment Center is almost full, and does not need a half-billion dollar road (for less than six miles) for a few more warehouses. Most of all, how much sense does it make to put a six-lane highway with 10 foot sound walls on each side, in the middle of two military bases that are getting ready to be merged? McChord is already so heavily encroached on that this may be the last nail in the coffin to having the airstrip relocated to a less densely populated area.

And Ft. Lewis and McChord are Pierce County's number one and three largest employers, so we should try and protect them from encroachment, which is the number one reason the Department of Defense closes military bases.

We should be urging developers to build master planned communities close to transportation hubs, not as far out as the planned communities in Orting and Bonney Lake like Cascadia. And the crossbase highway's almost half a billion dollar construction cost would likely increase, not minimize, greenhouse gas emissions. As a brand-new limited access general purpose highway, the Cross-Base Highway has no place in our region's plans for responsible transportation.

There are many good reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project:

* The Cross-Base Highway conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity

* We should fix existing roads and bridges and invest in new modes of mass transportation before building any new highways. Perhaps Perimeter Road, which parallels the crossbase highway and is located less than 1/2 mile from it, could be made into four lanes, and add bike lanes. One would think the military would prefer enlarging that road as opposed to cutting the two bases off from each other.

* And most importantly, people don't want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

As a council, you are deciding the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options, preserve our military bases and employers, and to protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

Melody Fleckenstein
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council

I grew up around highway construction. When I was in grade school in Boise, ID, I rode my horse on the construction of hwy 84. Later on, in high school, I rode another horse on the construction of I-205. These highways eat up a colossal amount of acreage, and what happens to the land around them over the years, is that even more land gets paved over by highway-oriented development.

Highway building is always bad for the ecology of the areas in which they are built (wildlife dare not cross it, and pollutants wash off the impermeable surfaces and pollute the soil and groundwater). Making life easier for the single driver in a car is passe. It's time to come up with better plans for getting people from place to place.

* We should fix existing roads and bridges and invest in new modes of mass transportation before building any new highways.

* People don't want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

* Construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction on the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly.

* Only 3% of our state's oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would flatten 162 acres and fragment 1,600 acres of habitat that Pierce County considers "the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in the lower elevations of Pierce County."

* The proposed highway, through encroachment, risks closure of the airstrip at the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base. It puts a highway barrier between Pierce County's two largest employers, while not reducing traffic on I-5.

* The Cross-Base Highway conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and to protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

Nancy Curtis
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

As stated time and again by the majority of people, please remove the Cross-Base Highway from your project list. This is not going to be a long-term solution for growth in Puget Sound and it certainly will harm our last remaining oak-woodland prairie in Puget Sound and will likely add even more to greenhouse gases.

Please plan for a healthy and sustainable future for transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and to protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jodi Broughton
From: Paul Wittrock  
Posted At: Monday, March 08, 2010 9:51 AM  
Conversation: NIX Cross-Base Highway!  
Posted To: Transportation 2040  
Subject: NIX Cross-Base Highway!  

PS Council members,  

As a driver needing to fix my front-end from existing rough "paved" roads, I find it really hard to comprehend a new highway project where:  
a) few want it  
b) we can't afford basic service state services  
c) enviro impact is too great  
d) how many BILLION are we in debt?  

How bout fixing SR-203 duh?  
Speed limit has been reduced to 50mph due to sink holes, wrong banked curves, more crashes etc.  

Or how bout separating the lanes of SR-522? the "Highway of Death"?  

respectfully,  

Mr. Paul Wittrock
As a professional biologist with many years of experience working with natural habitats in the Pacific Northwest I am voicing my intensely strong opposition to constructing a highway across the Ft. Lewis/McChord base. The habitat that will be disrupted is not replaceable plain, period, simple. I have fought this for years already and this is apparently my last chance to voice an opinion. If you proceed with this ill conceived proposal that benefits the special interests who could really give a damn you can expect me for one to lie down in front of the bulldozers and volunteer for arrest – again and again and again. This is just plain wrong - and it is time for politicians to listen for once!!!! Get it right or face civil disobedience protest at your front door.

Mark Darrach
Professional Botanist

Mark Darrach MS
Botanist / Geologist
Corydalis Consulting
From: form-submitter@example.com  
Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 12:49 PM  
To: Anne Avery; Marina King  
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Ryan Sandstrom

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: With regard to transportation in South Kitsap County - SKIA to the Narrows Bridge:
The intersection of Highways 3 and 16 in Gorst is a notorious bottleneck and generates pollution that discharges to Sinclair inlet, with very little or no space for water quality treatment. A recent article in the Kitsap Sun newspaper suggests that the long range plan is for the highway to become eight lanes. It is my feeling that alternative transportation routes should be considered that will divert traffic away from Gorst as much as reasonable, reducing the need for pollution generating impervious area. Moreover, within 30 years, it seems quite likely that the South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) and the Bremerton airport will have significantly greater demand for freight hauling and commuting between the deep-water port areas of Tacoma and Seattle.

There are existing road systems that can be utilized to alleviate the Gorst intersection of this traffic, and Sinclair Inlet from the pollution. Lake Flora Road provides one option. However, I'll outline another option that is oriented more directly between SKIA and the Narrows Bridge, and joins Highway 16 five miles south of the Sedgewick exit where Lake Flora connects. Traveling from SKIA toward the narrows bridge, the existing road segments are Lake Flora, J.M. Dickenson, Lake Helena, Glenwood, Wildwood, Lakeway, and Bethel-Burley, to the new interchange at Burley-Olalla Road and Highway 16. It is possible that a new road extension could connect Lake Helena with Lakeway without turns. This is a well traveled corridor among commuters that live throughout southwest Kitsap County. This corridor should receive consideration as a designated arterial in the Transportation 2040 Plan. Maintaining and preserving this existing corridor for future expansion seems to fall in step with the goals of the Transportation 2040 Plan. Currently there are wide buffers from structures in most areas, and large parcels are owned at a few of the intersections where road realignments would be required to smooth curves and maintain flow along the arterial.

In addition to SKIA traffic, this would provide a secondary route for freight, commuters, and vacation traffic going to and from Mason County, Shelton, and the Hood Canal. As manager of a timber company in South Kitsap, I hear first hand the trials of trucking to and from the Port of Tacoma without roads that provide good flow. Extra miles per trip affect the bottom line when moving heavy freight with tractor and trailer. Shaving miles off the many trips that will move between SKIA and the Tacoma Narrows Bridge will be significant financially and environmentally over time. The aforementioned route would cut 2 miles off the existing route from SKIA to Tacoma along Highway 3 and 16 through Gorst.

Feel free to contact me with questions or comments.

Ryan Sandstrom  
General Manager  
Alpine Evergreen Co., Inc.
From: John Garner  
Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 1:48 PM  
To: Marina King  
Subject: Cross Base Highway & Transportation 2040

Hello – I’m writing to request that the PSRC please consider removing the Cross Base Highway from the Transportation 2040 plan. I am personally familiar with the area that the proposed Cross Base Highway would occupy. It is an area of rich biological diversity, harboring one of the few intact stands of oak-prairie that still exists in the south Sound.

We simply cannot afford the expense of this highway and the environmental damage that it would inflict on our county. There are other sound alternatives to this proposal that need to be evaluated. The inclusion of the Cross Base Highway simply introduces a “flash point” that unnecessarily attracts negative response to transportation planning for our region.

Thank you.

John Garner, Conservation & Education Coordinator  
Metropolitan Park District of Tacoma

serving Point Defiance Zoo & Aquarium, Northwest Trek  
Wildlife Park, and the Tacoma Nature Center
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 2:21 PM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Susan Evans
02_Address:
03_City:
05_comment: To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to voice my concern that PSRC's current focus in transportation planning for the next 30 years focuses on building more highways and provides only minimal investment for non-motorized forms of transportation.

I urge you to please put the council's full support behind a more-aggressive Alternative 5. The plan you are currently looking at adds up to 950 new highway miles to our region at a time when we as a nation, region and world are in dire need of REDUCING vehicle miles travelled. Numerous studies have shown that adding highway miles reduces congestion in the short term does nothing to ease congestion and actually INCREASES emissions AND congestion (http://www.sightline.org/research/energy/res_pubs/climate-analysis-gge-new-lanes-10-07/?searchterm=highway%20congestion) in the long term.

The weak alternative 5 that you are now looking at ignores the the percentage of trips in our region that are currently taken on foot or by bike and will exacerbate the traffic congestion and dependence on automobiles that, in the long term, will prove to be an economy killer for our region. Other metropolitan areas in the West and all over the world are moving away from a car-dependent culture and will end up as the economic drivers of the future. Cities that plan for more cars by adding more highways and ignoring non-motorized forms of transportation as well as mass transit risk being the Detroit's of tomorrow.

Please take heed of the studies out there that say adding highway miles does no good over the long term, and others that report that 55 percent of Americans say they prefer to walk more and drive less. Finally take note of the numerous comments you received last summer (and I am in this process) calling for a strong commitment to funding more infrastructure for non-motorized forms of transportation.

Our future is in your hands. What we want is fewer cars and fewer roadways, not more.

Sincerely,
Susan Evans
Dear Counsel,

I would have thought that by now you would have realized that the Cross Base Highway project is the kiss of death for any transportation budget.

With the region’s obvious inability to repair and maintain existing roads that are instrumental to commuting voters, there is simply no room for a new road project designed to improve projected future growth in and near the proposed “Cascadia” region.

Compared to the entire region, Cross Base is a waste of taxpayer dollars. The new interchange at 176th and SR7 has gone a long way to improving congestion at that choke point and is solution enough considering the other huge transportation issues the region is faced with.

I'll also jump on the tree hugger bandwagon for a minute and say that as a land owner adjacent to the proposed project, the destruction to the surrounding irreplaceable environment is unconscionable.

Please consider utilizing the funds earmarked for any Cross Base project to further the necessary improvements in our region before building roads that we cannot afford.

With a deep appreciation for your efforts,

Tanja M Oliver

Mrs. Tanja Oliver
From: form-submitter@example.com  
Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 7:18 PM  
To: Anne Avery; Marina King  
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Dale Hendersen

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: Thank you for all the hard work and thought that went into this huge plan. I think it's a very ambitious one and a bit out of touch with reality. I think your population and employment forecasts are overstated. I do not believe that this region will see the amount of increase that you predict. Especially not if you persist with a transportation plan which cripples economic activity.

I believe your pricing plan will be unacceptable by the majority of people who travel on all the modes and I think you are not adequately preparing for the future. Fast growing areas need expanding infrastructure that supports automobile and truck transportation as well as public transport modes of travel. It's not a matter of choosing one over the other but rather of distinguishing when and where to invest in each.

This plan is too Seattle Centric and too public transit heavy. It is not sustainable. It needs much more investment in road infrastructure and much more investment in suburb to suburb connections. This is where the jobs and the people are now and will be in the future.

Transportation is a public good and should be funded as such. Stop relying on gas taxes and user fees. It should be funded as a utility and paid for by everyone whether they drive, walk, take the bus, or stay at home but use goods and services which are delivered by others using the transportation system.

Good work but I think it is way off the mark. I give it a C–
01_contact: Michael Nygaard

02_Address: 

03_City: 

05_comment: (From and Issaquah-Seattle bicycle commuter) The draft addresses funding for non-motorized transportation but is not nearly aggressive enough. We need significant funding for safe and efficient corridors for non-motorized travel. This is achieved not with money simply for painted stripes on roadways. Routes must be safe and efficient for human-powered vehicles and foot travel. Surface maintenance and cleaning must be budgeted for, but in relation to the return in environmental benefits and reduced carbon output to the atmosphere the plan is not proportionately supporting this method of travel.

Consider human-powered travel as a key factor in our success here in the Puget Sound region, not as a marginal component. The plan does consider it, but planned investment is not in proportion to the magnitude of non-motorized travel that has already been developed in this region.
From: lmarsh
Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2010 12:04 AM
To: Transportation 2040
Cc: Marina King
Subject: Cross-base highway

Dear Councilmembers,

As you consider Transportation 2040, please take the cross-base highway proposal off the list. It would be of so little use to so few people while doing so much damage as to be an egregious misuse of highway dollars. I'm a naturalist, native plant steward, and GIS Analyst, and very concerned about habitat fragmentation and degradation. I've participated in restoration projects and vegetation and bird monitoring studies, attended restoration conferences, and studied and presented public programs on ecological succession. There is consensus that preservation of existing habitats is always better at preserving ecosystem functions than restoration and mitigation projects. As well intentioned as they are, many of these fail completely. The existing prairie-oak woodland and wetlands the highway would cross are refugia for some of the state's rarest species, one of the best remnants of the state's most endangered habitat type, and most importantly, contain functioning interconnected elements of unique and rare ecosystems. A highway would alter the hydrology the wetland depends on and fracture, not just fragment, the prairie-oak habitat. I've visited the area, and I want to see it preserved and enhanced. Please, put this highway away for good.

Sincerely
Linda Marsh
Dear Council,

Please remove the Cross-Base Highway from consideration in the Transportation 2040 plans. It is an unnecessary and destructive boondoggle that will destroy some of the best remaining low elevation natural areas in Pierce County. Only three percent of Washington State's oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would eviscerate one of the best remaining examples, which is home to at least 19 rare and threatened organisms. While the EIS for the project claims to provide mitigation, the long term success rate for such "dig the pond over here instead" fixes has been pathetically low.

Highway supporters claim that it is necessary to facilitate travel across Pierce county. All it would really do would be to encourage more suburban sprawl, smog, and greenhouse gas emissions. In this day of tightened budgets, the money would be better spent investing in transit and fixing existing roadways.

The Cross-Base Highway is a bad idea. Please put it to rest for once and for all.

Thank You,

Jana Hobbs
I find this plan to be very timid in terms of increasing transit ridership, and therefore difficult to believe that it will reduce traffic congestion. Given the large increase in population and jobs, I don't see how having < 5% of trips by transit, and more importantly < 12% commuting will not result in significantly worse congestion since there will be minimal increases in highway capacity barring major technical innovations.

Even if this were possible, I still don't see how in an increasingly dense urban core ridership could not increase to say, 20% of all trips in 30 years if the transit system were of the caliber of (for example) Boston. I know many people who don't have cars now who manage despite Seattle/King County's marginal bus system. I know many other who regularly commute by bus even though they have cars. (I used to be one until I realized it took twice as long with far more uncertainty about arrival time).

Until transit has dedicated lanes & right-of-way, I don't see it as a serious solution.

I also find it very discouraging that two smaller neighboring cities (Vancouver BC and Portland OR) already have the type of system "envisioned" for Puget Sound in 2040.

I find the current plan lacking enough initiative and scope to make me want to pay for it, especially given that I will be retired or dead by the time it actually becomes useful. I'd rather pay twice as much for something substantial.

From the executive summary:

As the region adds 1.5 million more people and 1.2 million more jobs by 2040, the investments in Transportation 2040 will reduce peak hour freeway delay by 32%. Transportation 2040 will also achieve a better balance of travel among modes, with transit capturing an increasing share of riders. Compared with 3% in 2006, by the year 2040 transit will account for 4.9% of the region's total daily trips, an increase of 63%. For work trips, transit will increase its share from 10% in 2006 to 11.4% in 2040, a 14% increase. With its focus on transit and non-motorized investments, combined with increased user fees, Transportation 2040 will result in a 9% decrease in per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) between 2006 and 2040.
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

I'm writing to request that you delete the Cross-Base Highway from all your project list's preferred alternatives, especially alternative 5. Building more highways does not show foresight at a time when we should be devoting all resources possible to mass transit for environmental and economic reasons.

I'm doubly opposed to the Cross-Base Highway idea because of the impact it would have on the now very rare Oak-Woodland Prairie habitat. Dissecting the remnant of this once much more extensive habitat with a road would severely degrade the land's ability to support its array of rare species.

Please do the right and sensible thing and delete this idea from your recommendations.

Sincerely,

Timothy Manns
Please remove the Cross-Base Highway from our regional transportation plan. As an unnecessary new highway, it will encourage more driving, thus more greenhouse gas emissions and more sprawl. It will damage our oak woodland prairies, which are rare, beautiful, and ecologically rich. The cross-base highway does not encourage responsible transportation and should not be part of our plans.

Michelle Plesko
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

In these times of dire budgets, decision-making has never been more difficult. But this Cross-Base Highway seems like a no-brainer to me: Save millions of taxpayer dollars and preserve a biologically rich ecosystem that's unique in the state? Yes! Yes! Please take this proposed highway off the alternative 5 project list forever. The state doesn't need it. If there's extra money available, use it on existing roads and bridges that need work, and on mass transit projects.

The cost of building it would be too high in many ways: Encourage more greenhouse gases Spend money the state doesn't have Heavily damage and fragment an ecosystem that is unique and beautiful. Take funds from other more worthy projects. Wouldn't reduce traffic on I-5.

A 2003 poll showed most people aren't interested in it being built.

thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ramona Gault
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

As a citizen and voter I urge you to remove the Cross-Base Highway from all preferred alternative project lists particularly alternative 5 which is the most transit friendly. Bundling an unneeded highway project with transit options is not good policy and presents the public with false choices. We do not want policies which on the one hand give alternatives to cars and then on the other hand encourage the use of automobiles, particularly in areas that have high ecological value for local communities.

The Cross-Base Highway would greatly diminish the ecological value of the last 3% of our remaining low land woodlands. Any putative gains created by the partitioning of this ecologically valuable area in Pierce county must be fully weighed against the harm such partitioning will bring to local communities. As the population of Pierce county grows there is more and more need to maintain the quality of life in this area. High quality high of life is deeply tied to maintaining ecological systems in which people live. A community's sense of place, identity and culture are nurtured by the environmental endowment in which they inhabit. Development programs that have a strong environmental stewardship component create places that people want to live, take care of and have increased value over time.

Building infrastructure does create jobs. The goal needs to be creating infrastructure that values human needs as well as biological systems. Just as many jobs can be created restoring waterways, improving transit and planning and building communities that are not dependent on autos for everything. In filling and connecting already existing communities with transit only systems would help to preserve and restore already stressed ecosystems. Living in a place with robust natural systems creates better people and creates strong economies too.

As human populations grow the need for nature will increase greatly, thus removing the Cross-Base Highway will be a huge economic benefit as we plan smarter for a denser future.

An additional reason to remove the Cross-Base Highway is that it conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system’s contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity. Climate change is a current threat to the hydrology of Washington state. Many businesses including agriculture and skiing depend on our snow pack, and climate change is reducing our snow pack and threatening the state’s large agricultural export economic sector. Building a highway will only increase the use of cars and increase our auto dependence which makes it harder to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and to protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region. The people of Puget sound will thrive for generations to come if the decisions you make today have environmental stewardship and sustainable development at their center. This is a paradigm shift in the way we consider development for human communities, but is necessary as our biological assets on which we depend become increasingly degraded by old ways of doing things. Thank you for considering a new vision for our future and our children’s future.
Dear Sir or Madam,
I urge you to protect Washington's Rare Oak-Woodland Prairie by removing the Cross-Base Highway from the "Transportation 2040" plan.

Construction of this highway would endanger some of the last, best remaining oak-woodland prairie in Washington.

"Transportation 2040" is meant to "identify the best ways to get people where they need to go while making our communities, environment and economy stronger as the region grows."

Yet, instead of looking forward, this new plan attempts to revive a destructive, expensive, and unnecessary highway construction project rejected by voters in 2007.

Thank you for considering this comment.
--
Tad Anderson, PhD
Attention Robin Mayhew, AICP/ Puget Sound Regional Council Bicycle-Pedestrian-Advisory-Committee

Major Issue: Addressing in particular the Nonmotorized section (pp.86-88), it is well-agreed that current nonmotorized travel demand in the region -- for bicycle travel in particular -- has been and continues to be significantly underestimated in measure of existing usage and demand, and is even moreso the case for projection of future potential demand growth.

1. This should be prominently stated at the outset of the Nonmotorized section.

Further, unlike the other modal elements of the plan report, the Nonmotorized section presents the reader with no numerics other than two year 2040 plan mileage numbers for future Regional Trails.

2. Accordingly I strongly recommend that the Nonmotorized section of the January 22, 2010 draft of the 2040 regional transportation plan explicitly address and at least partially remedy the exposition by providing, a small table of existing mileage (circa 2006-09) of Regional Trails and both the Constrained element mileage and the Unprogrammed Plan mileage for the 2040 Plan -- somewhat in the manner of Figure (table) 36 -- Roadway Investment Summary.

3. In addition the table should also present the counterpart milages for the the on-street/on-road/on-highway bicycle facilities -- at a minimum for the Metropolitan Transportation System routes/corridors, and desirably -- including as much as possible of the region's other major bicycle routes/corridors which are off the MTS.

Doing all of the above will provide the reader with a quick overview of vital elements of the Nonmotorized component of the plan. It can also will offset somewhat the severe graphic depiction challenges of the small size (8.5x11-inches) of the report's map Figure 36 -- Nonmotorized Transportation (which only shows regional trails) -- it being generally too small to depict much of the on-street/on-road/on-highway bicycle-facility-improved route network discussed above.

I strongly recommend that PSRC prepare as soon as possible a much-needed wall-sized map of the above for BPAC and general public review.

Thank you!

Dennis Neuzil, Dr.Eng., P.E
Puget Sound Regional Council
Regarding the “2040” Proposed Transportation Alternatives

To whom, etc;

The proposed State Highway 704- “cross-base” highway- is a “solution looking for a problem”, in my opinion. But it is much more than that: it is an example of regional planning by a body of professionals, with expertise, credentials, and at least a modicum of “vision” being totally managed by a self-serving politician to his ends… which are all about HIS vision only… and whatever value may accrue to him personally from his leverage upon the planning process.

John Ladenburg’s single-handed campaign in favor of this ill-thought-out expedient way of providing I-5 access to an undeveloped housing (& “planned community”) proposal is the epitome of “Political Pork”. Despite its flaunting of environmental concerns (which the 2 unfavorably-reviewed EIS studies graphically provide), its willingness to disregard issues of “carbon footprint”, its sullying of intact oak prairie & ecologically significant wetlands, & its terminus into a chronically congested stretch of Interstate highway all should be enough to deny it a “place at the table” of future transportation projects. None of this seems to matter to planners, though.

When I asked John personally about this, and why a different route wouldn’t serve his “constituency” better, he denied that Cascadia (where he presently works) had ANY effect or impact on this proposed New State Highway. When I asked about the proposed State Highway 161 expansion (favored by Councilman Bunney at the time) he bragged about getting it pulled, saying that he was doing the people of Orting & nearby farmers a favor. When I pointed out the “stepping stones” of new projects along 176th E. through Frederickson & beyond, he ceased to respond.

It appears to me that these projects, which were outlined to me at my request for information by staff at PSRC (meaning that they weren’t some overlooked anomaly) are as obvious as anything short of a fat red line drawn on a map from Tillicum on I-5 to a bridge across the Carbon River near Orting. How blatant is THAT?

The last time I checked, Cascadia was in deep financial difficulty. Very little infrastructure exists there, after more than a decade of boosterism & ‘inside politics’. The Port of Tacoma industrial park was developed to a point that demanded almost no “East-West” infrastructure. The most likely benefactors of a “Hwy. 704” would be local builders who have already begun the “culdesac village” housing in the general area… which fragments what is left of the oak prairie outside Ft. Lewis (as one sees in the Lacey-Yelm axis) and further diminishes agricultural lands in S. Pierce County.

I understand the stresses & strains of working in the shadow of politicians, as a former King County/Metro employee, myself. However, there ARE ways of making clear the folly of simply allowing “the boss-man” to run roughshod over an important regional planning process… or at least I HOPE there are!

Please, PLEASE, make a “transportation option” available that is free from the willful degradation of land, air, water, and Sensible planning that is embodied in “State Highway 704”. Thank you. ^..^

John Browne
Don Willott

Wednesday, March 10, 2010 8:11 AM

Robin Mayhew

Joel Pfundt; Amy Shumann; Tessa Greegor; Dennis R. Neuzil; Mel Roberts; Bob Scales; Kim Brackett; Hilary Franz; Debbi Lester; Kirsten Hytopoulos; Linda Berry-Maraist; John Willett; Mary McClure; Aubrey Davis

Subject: Comment on Non-Motorized Transportation section of draft "Transportation 2040"

Attention Robin Mayhew, AICP/ Puget Sound Regional Council Bicycle-Pedestrian-Advisory-Committee

Subject: Comment on Non-Motorized Transportation section of draft "Transportation 2040"

Please note my comments below recommending modifications to the draft Transportation 2040 plan.

Thank you!

Don Willott

On p. 88, paragraph 2: Bicycle and pedestrian trails are important community amenities that can help spur economic development, and can promote physical activity and public health.

Recommend modifying this to read: Bicycle and pedestrian trails are important community amenities that provide safety, and can help spur economic development, and can promote physical activity and public health.

Explanation: The term “amenity” denotes something done for attractiveness, comfort, or convenience. The connotation is that it is something which might be desirable, but not necessary. In the spirit of complete streets, it would be better to recognize trails as one form of basic transportation for cyclists and pedestrians.

On p. 88, paragraph 4: Limited revenues for expensive transportation capacity projects will require the region to exploit the full capacity of its existing roadway infrastructure for moving people. Investments...

Recommend modifying this to insert an additional sentence: Limited revenues for expensive transportation capacity projects will require the region to exploit the full capacity of its existing roadway infrastructure for moving people. For example, state highway rights of way can be used to provide key sections of regional trail system where other opportunities such as rail to trail conversion are not available. Investments...

Explanation: It is important to provide practical guidance on how our current practices can shift to accomplish regional non-motorized transportation goals with particular attention to regional trails.

On p. 88, Recommend inserting a new paragraph between the 5th & 6th paragraphs:

The plan describes an interconnected system of regional trails that provide efficient and safe separated facilities as a network in the same way highways systems have been developed for motor vehicles. This is key to shifting mode shares to increase active forms of transportation for environmental, health, and transportation cost efficiency. It describes a vision for regional trails which includes those which are constrained, unconstrained, or conceptual.
Explanation: This text should be complimented with a large map showing current and envisioned regional trail corridors, and the legend should indicate that additional corridors are likely to emerge as staff and committees evaluate how best to provide this interconnected system and its interconnection with other forms of transportation facilities. For example, we should be showing the vision for regional trail connecting from the Burke-Gilman Trail to Edmonds/Kingston and the Sound to Olympics Trail connecting to the Olympic Discovery Trail. Similarly, regional trail connections should be shown as envisioned between Pierce and Mason counties up to the Sound to Olympics Trail.

On p. 89, String of Pearls Trail (Kitsap County)

Correct to read: Sound to Olympics Trail String of Pearls Trail (Kitsap County)

Explanation: As noted in a comment being made by the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council, the regional trail concept, originally submitted by the City of Bainbridge Island as the "Puget Sound to Hood Canal Trail", is now being termed the "Sound to Olympics Trail" and would include regional trail branches from both the Bainbridge and Kingston ferries to the Hood Canal Bridge. The "String of Pearls" is a broader concept of creating trails between community centers in northern Kitsap County. Figure 35 should be revised to show the Kingston to Hood Canal branch of the Sound to Olympics Trail.
I appreciate the hard work that has been put into the Transportation 2040 plan, but I believe that it is severely lacking in planning for bicycles.

I would like to see the plan include a bicycle boulevard network connecting every city in the county.
I would like to see the plan include safe routes to school by bicycle and foot for every child.
I would like to see the plan go beyond Seattle's bicycle network plan for 2015. Seattle should not be idle for the next 25 years.
I would like to see the plan replace freeway lanes with bicycle lanes.
I would like to see the plan replace highway and freeway lanes with rail.
I would like to see the plan include bicycle safety education.
I would like to see the plan address cross-region bicycle wayfinding.
I would like to see the plan call out ways to track fire and EMT responses to traffic crashes and build better data on bicycle crashes.
I would like to see the plan reduce speed limits in residential areas for bicycle and pedestrian safety.
I would like to see the plan put a sidewalk on every city street.
I would like to see the plan have a secured long term bicycle parking structure at every rail station.
I would like to see the plan add bicycle sharing and car sharing programs to every city.
I would like to see the plan measure and attempt to reduce average daily radius distances to walkable levels.

As it stands, the 2040 plan is a vision for more cars and stagnant bicycle facilities while bicycling is undergoing tremendous growth and single occupancy vehicle use is on the decline.

Sincerely,
Michael Snyder
From: Douglas Tooley  
Posted At: Tuesday, March 09, 2010 6:47 PM  
Conversation: Comments  
Posted To: Transportation 2040  

Subject: Comments  
Unfortunately due the malfeasance of PSRC executive director Bob Drewel this plan is not valid, nor any of the transportation projects coordinated by the Puget Sound Regional Council.

Planning is not an opportunity to call citizens Nimbys or the like, it is the process by which we allow all citizens to be involved. Although substantial efforts have been made to portray citizens as obstructionist, such as with unfunded projects like the Seattle viaduct or the spending of 220 million dollars on the faulty comparison of citizen inspired alternatives on 520 regarding options K and M (which I can conceptually claim credit for in a 1988 letter to an elected member of this body.)

This is not a get it done process, it is an attack on our constitutional system of government for profit where the cost is the benefit.

My particular case is one of the worst examples of this – being accused of harassment for insisting through lawful means on government employee action. This is no less than establishing a civil standard of second class citizenship for nothing more than responsible and constructive involvement.

These actions are coordinated by the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce and the law firms which control it, including the Jack Abramoff firm of K and L Gates and the financial scammers of WAMU, Foster, Pepper and Shefelman. Mr. Drewel was informed of these problems in the mid 90’s by myself while he chaired committees of the PSRC and was still Executive of Snohomish County. Mr. Drewel’s response to this effort was to drive from participation in this body, a status which continues to this day. I believe a case can be made that Mr. Drewel’s qualifications for this position include this illegal action, subsequent to his rejection by the citizens of Snohomish County.

Please note that I am not challenging the establishment of a common law civil law second class citizen status as developed under the due process authority of the King County Courts, I am however insisting that it be consistently applied to those that abuse the planning process by whatever pretext.

The cycle of abuse is a dangerous thing. The baby boomer generation has done much to address many of these sexual and racial issues, however the leadership of this generation through much of the United States, including Washington State, has found it profitable and useful to recreate such hate upon younger individuals without evidence – as such these action constitutes second degree extortion under Washington State law.

The legal counsel of the elected members of this body may well advise you that you have the authority to determine what is right and what is wrong, but don’t forget that our constitution makes it very clear who the owners are. As such, as an owner of the United States of America, and its subsidiary corporations in the Puget Sound Region I request that the elected representatives of this body make good on that contract within ten days, or leave.

You may find this ‘pay rent or quit’ notice harsh, but the facts merit it. I understand that some of you have come to this effort with good faith, and that there is much of this plan that is good. But equally as certainly it is less than it could have been and you have allowed yourselves to be manipulated by corrupt legal practitioners and there minions.

You are responsible, regardless of what legal counsel tells you. Fulfill that responsibility now by removing Mr. Drewel, and, at a minimum, the law firms of K & L Gates and Foster Pepper Shefelman, and, at least temporarily, all
of their clients, from any further involvement in any PSRC involved projects at the planning or construction phase.

Thank you for your time.
I am writing to you as a concerned, frustrated and frightened member of the South Park community of Seattle. We have recently been informed that the South Park Bridge - a crucial lifeline for the survival of our community and Washington's economy - will be shut down in June, and that no funding has been allocated for its replacement, despite more than 20 years of forewarning that the bridge's demise was imminent.

I will not repeat here the long and troubled history of the bridge - poorly built with substandard materials, anchored in little more than mud, straddling a no-man's land of city and county land and so ignored for decades by city, county and state government as someone else's problem. I trust that you, as our representative, are familiar with the logistical details of the situation.

Allow me instead to share with you the devastating impact that this bridge closure will have, not only on the people of South Park, but the surrounding neighborhoods of Georgetown, White Center, and Tukwila. I would also call your attention to the killing blow this closure will deal to the South end industrial and freight complexes that drive our economy at local, city, county and state levels.

I must first raise the issue of emergency services, which is the most urgent and time sensitive problem created by the bridge closure. At the very least, emergency response from police, fire and ambulance services will be terribly delayed in reaching South Park, putting lives, homes and businesses at unnecessary risk. At the worst, when the 1st Avenue South bridge is raised, South Park will be completely cut off from all emergency services, essentially guaranteeing the loss of life and property when emergencies do arise. I should not need to explain to you that such a situation is immoral, illegal and unconstitutional.

On a personal level, I call your attention to the plight of South Park homeowners such as myself and my family. As if recent declines in home prices were not hitting us hard enough, the bridge closure will devastate home values in neighborhoods served by the bridge, putting many of us "under water" on our mortgages and destroying the local economy that sustains our vibrant, diverse and beautiful community. To bring such suffering upon the citizens of these neighborhoods would not only be unconscionable, it would make a shameful waste of so many recent and wonderful investments made in libraries, community centers, schools, and local roads in and around South Park.

Since the failure to replace the bridge is essentially an economic issue - though it is also one of equity, equal representation and justice - let me shed some light on the economic impact of the bridge closure, both locally in South Park and throughout the industrial district that surrounds it. On a local level, the bridge opens onto 14th Avenue, which is the "downtown" of South Park. Our retailers, restaurants, and service businesses are all located along this corridor, and every single one of these businesses depends on the bridge to connect them to their customers and clients, especially those from the Boeing complex across the river. It is obvious to us all that most of these businesses will be shut down by the bridge closure, destroying the local economy and unraveling the social fabric of the community at the same time.
Beyond the boundaries of South Park itself, the bridge is an economic lifeline to hundreds of businesses serving the Seattle area. The bridge connects manufacturers, warehouses, distribution centers and freight carriers to their customers — in fact, the South Park bridge carries a higher percentage of freight traffic than any other bridge in the region, nearly 25 percent. The businesses served by the bridge are not only small local operations, but major multinationals such as Boeing, who depend on the bridge as a shipment route and commuter passage for thousands of employees every day. All of these businesses face harmful — in some cases fatal — increases in operating costs without access to the bridge. This is, of course, in addition to the loss of clientele they will also face. These businesses and industries are the primary employers in the region, and many are already planning pre-emptive layoffs, to begin immediately upon the bridge closure. As businesses suffer, so do employees, their families and their communities.

Though it is a minor issue compared to those of public safety and economic survival, I would be remiss if I neglected to address the issue of traffic congestion, which does in fact also carry a significant public health impact. Simply put, the bridge closure will redirect thousands of commercial vehicles every day onto South Park’s residential streets, never intended for commercial or freight traffic, destroying what little air quality the community presently clings to, and making our streets more dangerous for us and our children. During recent temporary bridge closures in February and March, most freight and commercial traffic redirected down 8th Avenue, directly in front of our new elementary school. The noise and exhaust is harmful to our children, and the streets themselves far more dangerous than ever before. This is not a sustainable traffic pattern in any long term context.

After ruining our streets and endangering our school children, commercial and freight traffic will continue on, snarling Route 509 and the 1st Avenue South bridge in the worst traffic the city has ever seen. During recent bridge closures, traffic from the 1st Avenue South bridge backed up all the way through South Park and across the boundary into Tukwila! Commutes were extended by 20 additional minutes and more. This is especially harmful to local businesses, who come and go from the neighborhood as many as ten times every day — this delay alone will cost thousands of dollars a day just in wages paid to drivers sitting in traffic, not to mention the impact on public and school buses, and thousands of daily commuters.

Which brings us to the issue of public transit. The South Park bridge is currently used by five Metro routes: the 60, 130, 131, 132 and 134 buses all cross the bridge, and no plan has been made public concerning the replacing or rerouting of these buses. South Park is a low-income neighborhood, and many residents depend on reliable public transit to commute to and from work and school in other parts of the city. In addition, the rerouting of buses onto residential streets will only exacerbate the above mentioned issues of road safety and damage. South Park simply cannot withstand the onslaught of 20,000 additional vehicles on its residential streets, even less so when many of them are commercial, freight and transit vehicles.

South Park, as you should well know, is not the only community threatened by the loss of the bridge. Georgetown, White Center, Tukwila, and even communities as far South as Burien, Des Moines and Normandy Park will all be hurt by the loss of business and exploding traffic congestion. To the North, Dozens if not hundreds of Seattle businesses operate and rely on manufacturing, warehousing, storage and transshipment facilities on the South end, and the bridge closure will bring incalculable losses to these businesses and employees throughout the Seattle area, not only in the industrial neighborhoods themselves.

I hope I have illustrated for you exactly how the failure to replace the South Park bridge will have a devastating impact on families, communities, businesses, public safety, and economic health at local, city, county and state levels.

It is only reasonable that we who live in these communities, and who depend
in so many ways on the South Park bridge to run our businesses, attend our jobs, raise our families and send our children to school, should demand and expect of you immediate and practical action to replace the South Park bridge without delay. Our lives, and the survival of our community, depend on it. We have had our fill of excuses and procrastination for 25 years now, and our time – and our patience – is at an end.

Respectfully yours,

Jacob Savishinsky
From: form-submitter@example.com
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 11:01 AM
To: Anne Avery; Marina King
Subject: T2040CommentForm2 form submitted

01_contact: Bret Stewart

02_Address:

03_City:

05_comment: As an employer of folks who use ACCESS vans to come to work and leave, I have seen/heard of wide ranges of service. For example, some service issues have been serious enough to effect the user/rider's employment. I did read in the plan that a potential quality measurement would be "Transportation service customer comments" (chapter 5 page 60) and I just wanted to highlight that I think that is a very important part of planning and having the ability to get feedback from customers to measure against service standards and implement changes/improvements if needed.

Thanks,
Bret Stewart
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council members,

As someone who cares deeply about the future of transportation and landscape in our region, particularly in light of climate change, I am writing to urge you to remove the Cross-Base Highway from your preferred alternative project list. The Cross-Base Highway has no place in our region's plans for responsible transportation. Its construction would likely increase, not minimize, greenhouse gas emissions.

There are several important reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project:

* We should fix existing roads and invest in new modes of transportation before building any new highways.

* Construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly.

* Only 3% of our state's oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would flatten 162 acres and fragment 1,600 acres of habitat that Pierce County considers "the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in the lower elevations of Pierce County."

* People don't want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

* It conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system's contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

Dr. Patricia Coffey
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

As a citizen and voter deeply concerned with the future of transportation and quality of life in our region, I urge you to remove the Cross-Base Highway from all preferred alternatives on your project list, particularly alternative 5, which is the most transit friendly.

As a brand-new limited access general purpose highway, the Cross-Base Highway has no place in our region’s plans for responsible transportation. Its almost half a billion dollar construction cost for less than six miles of new pavement would likely increase, not minimize, greenhouse gas emissions.

There are many good reasons to remove the Cross-Base Highway project:

* We should fix existing roads and bridges and invest in new modes of mass transportation before building any new highways.

* People don’t want it! In a 2003 public poll on regional transportation planning and projects contracted by the Regional Transportation Investment District, the Cross-Base Highway ranked last of all proposed Pierce County projects. Only 10% of those polled stated it was a project of importance to the region.

* Construction of the Cross-Base highway would harm prime habitat for 19 plants and animals facing extinction on the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base, including streaked horned lark, water howellia, Mazama pocket gopher, and Taylor’s checkerspot butterfly.

* Only 3% of our state’s oak woodland prairies remain, and the Cross-Base Highway would flatten 162 acres and fragment 1,600 acres of habitat that Pierce County considers “the most biologically and ecologically rich areas remaining in the lower elevations of Pierce County.”

* The proposed highway, through encroachment, risks closure of the airstrip at the joint Ft. Lewis-McChord military base. It puts a highway barrier between Pierce County’s two largest employers, while not reducing traffic on I-5.

* The Cross-Base Highway conflicts with new Washington Department of Transportation policies to analyze and reduce our transportation system’s contributions to climate change and to protect and restore biodiversity.

As a council, you are deciding on the future of transportation for our region. Thank you for looking ahead to promote cost-effective and sustainable transportation options and to protect rare wildlife and habitat in the Puget Sound region.

Sincerely,

selma dale
Cross Base Highway  Comments – similar

110-Eric Burr
111-Mike Keary
112-Lee Fellenberg
113-Mary Rawlins
114-Mark Blitzer
115-Ruth Roth
116-Laurie DeYoung
120-Emily Brown
121-Erik Hagstrom
122-Jessica Paige
123-Eva Vincent
124-James Kenney
125-Peggy fisher
126-Kristin Cernak
127-Maggie Rogers
128-Theodore Wilcox
129-Zandra Saez
130-Edward Mills
131-Cathy Wickwire
132-Lois Meng
133-Lyris Anderson
134-Coleen Pidgeon
135-Lise Grace
136-Mark Johnston
137-Donna Snow
138-David Robinson
139-Keith Cowan
140-Heather Anderson
141-Lee Wales
142-Melissa Martin
143-Janna Ost
144-White Bear
145-John & Julie Ross
146—Colby Chester
147-Jetta Hurst
148-Scott Rankin
149-Peter Rimbos
150-Steffen Fanger
151-Peter Impara
152-Bridget McNassar
153-Phillip Joyner
154-Susan Morgan
155-Dorothy Jordan
156-Lenny Chrostowski
157-Rita Sammons
158-Pamela Engler
159-Thomas Juelson
160-Bob Aegerter
161-Colleen Curtis
162-Shannon Druckrey
163-John Woolley
164-Steve Royal
165-John Weatherman
166-Brian Sullivan
167-Vivian Gross
168- Yinghua Zhang
169-Jeanne Barrett
170-John B. Pearce Sr.
171-Carolyn Morillo
172-Laura Ackerman
173-Jeff Stewart
174-Jim Mulligan
175-Linda Bergen
176-Jeanne Kinnard
177-Pico Cantieni
178-Laura Spehar
179-Vito Zingarelli
180-Shane Daugherty
181-Brenda Lewis
182-Vladimir Ushakoff
183-Shirley Smith
184-Fred Neil
185-Victoria

Beschenbossel

230-Carlene Deits
231-Eric Stiemert
232-Raymond Gill
233-Patrice Roberts
234-Christian Fulghum
235-Sally Neary
236-Sue Danver
237-Laura Drennen
238-Daniel Streiffert
239-Kathy Johnson
240-Travis Scott
241-Ben Gardner
242-Jason Heaverlo
243-Keith Schackmuth 193-Ann Heneghan
244-Aimee Reichert 194-Monica Gaub
245-Jami Bodonyi 195-Melody
246-Steve Aslanian Fleckenstein
247-Heather Gary 196-Nancy Curtis
248-Jacqueline Fritz 197-Jodi Broughton
249-Karen Hensley 198-Paul Wittrock
250-Rebecca Buell-Silsbee Washington Native Plant Society
251-Allison McLean 200-Steve Erickson for
252-Nicole Fleckenstein 201-Mark Darrach
253-Dave Simpson Whidbey Environmental Action Network
254-Mary Simpson ----
255-Mackenzie Stanley 204-John Garner
256-Jennifer Mecum ----
257-Edward Lawler 206-Susan Evans
258-Charlotte Persons ----
259-Michael Garrity 207-Charlotte Persons
260-Marjory Swalley ----
261-Tanja Oliver
299-Dave Werntz ----
300-Debra Jaqua 213-Linda Marsh
301-John Poggi 214-Jana Hobbs
302-Stephen Amy ----
303-Elise Richman 220-Timothy Manns
304-Robby Bessey 221-Mary Jokela for
305-Corrin Brecha Spokane Audubon
306-Robin Munson 222-Michelle Plesko
307-Margaret Rivard 223-Krystal Kyer for
308-Yvette Goot Tahoma Audubon
309-Nichole Rip 224-Ramona Gault
310-Susan Kay 225-Arvia Morris Morris
311-Lisa Olsen ----
315-Dr. Patricia Coffey 266-John Browne
312-Steven Puddicombe for Willapa Hills Audubon Society
313-Sebastian Helm

**Individualized Comments**

186-Ann Prezyna
187-Peggy Printz
188-Sego Jackson
189-James Davis
190-Peter Loft
191-Jeanne Miller
192-Lori Watts