

The Regional Transportation Plan — 2018

Appendix C

Public Engagement and Outreach



May 2018

Funding for this document provided in part by member jurisdictions, grants from U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration and Washington State Department of Transportation. PSRC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see <https://www.psrc.org/title-vi> or call 206-587-4819.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information:

Individuals requiring reasonable accommodations may request written materials in alternate formats, sign language interpreters, physical accessibility accommodations, or other reasonable accommodations by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Thu Le, at 206-464-6175, with two weeks' advance notice. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact the ADA Coordinator, Thu Le, through TTY Relay 711.

Additional copies of this document may be obtained by contacting: Puget Sound Regional Council
Information Center
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, Washington 98104-1035
206-464-7532 • info@psrc.org • psrc.org

Appendix C. Public Engagement and Outreach

I. Overview

This document provides an overview of public engagement and outreach efforts undertaken by the Puget Sound Regional Council for the Regional Transportation Plan. PSRC originally developed the plan in 2010 to identify the region's transportation needs out to the year 2040 and to lay out a course to sustain and improve the transportation system to meet the region's anticipated growth. Since 2010, PSRC has conducted limited-scope updates to bring the regional transportation plan into compliance with new state and federal planning requirements. The scope of these updates addressed new policy topics to make the plan current and to update the project list, cost estimates, and forecasts of anticipated revenue.

This plan will continue to ask and answer this central question:

How can the region best provide the mobility required to support more people and more jobs while it also sustains the region's natural environment and its economic vitality, and as it improves system safety and efficiency and enhances the region's overall quality of life?

The PSRC *Public Participation Plan for the Puget Sound Regional Council* (adopted in 1994 and most recently updated in 2017) specifically outlines the public review process the agency must conduct to prepare the Metropolitan (Regional) Transportation Plan pursuant to state and federal laws including the FAST ACT, the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

According to the agency's public participation plan, PSRC may employ a variety of notification and participation procedures to encourage "early and continuous" involvement of citizens, jurisdictions, communities, and other interests in the planning and decision-making processes of PSRC. The agency's public participation plan also allows PSRC to conduct additional outreach efforts as appropriate to provide opportunities for engagement including such activities as workshops, open houses, forums, and other events.

Public engagement in regional transportation planning is essential for making good decisions that uphold the region's quality of life and ensure that future needs are met as the region grows. To that end, PSRC is committed to providing opportunities for the public to express concerns and issues during the development of the regional transportation plan. This commitment relies on a variety of methods and techniques to reach out to the wide range of people, groups, organizations, partner agencies, stakeholders, and member agencies with an interest in transportation decisions.

Federal and State Compliance

The outreach effort complied with established and recently adopted federal and state requirements:

- Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), Public Law as passed by Congress and signed by President Obama on December 4, 2015.
- Executive Order 13166 Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency
- Title VI and Executive Order 12898 addressing environmental justice populations
- The 1994 United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Order to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
- The 1998 Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

- The 1999 FHWA and Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Memorandum Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan Planning
- Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) - Individuals requiring reasonable accommodations may request written materials in alternate formats, sign language interpreters, physical accessibility accommodations, or other reasonable accommodations by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Thu Le at 206-464-6175, with two weeks advance notice. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact Thu Le through TTY Relay 711.
- FTA C 4703.1 – Environmental Justice Policy Guidance
- FTA C 9070.1G - Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities
- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), RCW 43.21C
- SAFETEA-LU Section 6001 (2005) addressing resource agencies

Consistency with PSRC's Public Participation Plan

1. Ensure notification and participation of all populations, including people of color, low-income and special needs groups.
2. Plan review 45-day public comment period

Addressing Resource Agencies and Tribes

Section 1201 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) for addressing resource agencies and tribes was carried forward into the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. The following identifies the fundamental principles of Section 1201:

- Planning process shall be continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive
- Develop plan in consultation with federal, state, tribal, and local agencies in charge of:
 - Land use management
 - Natural resources
 - Environmental protection
 - Conservation
 - Historic preservation
- Review and compare the evolving transportation plan with:
 - State and tribal conservation plans and maps
 - Inventories of natural and historic resources
- Discuss potential mitigation activities in consultation with Federal, State, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies
- Include Equity as one of the criteria for evaluating plan alternatives

Environmental Justice Requirements

FTA/ FHWA joint planning regulations for public engagement require seeking out and considering the needs of those historically underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income, minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services. This includes requirements for where to hold public meetings and the methods of engagement to use:

- Hold public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times
- Employ visualization techniques to describe plans
- Make public information available in electronically accessible formats

Special Needs

FTA C 9070.1G - Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities must include participation by stakeholders identified in the law: seniors; individuals with disabilities; representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human service providers; and other members of the public.

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

Per federal statutory requirements, the Regional Transportation Plan must be updated in 2018 to reflect changes in the region since the plan was adopted in May 2014 and amended in June 2015. This will be done within the framework of the current plan and existing Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and will continue to support the adopted VISION 2040 regional growth strategy and economic objectives through an integrated mobility, environmental, and financial strategy.

PSRC uses SEPA to guide its environmental review for key decision-making. SEPA procedures adopted by PSRC require that whenever PSRC issues a determination of non-significance (DNS) under WAC 197-11-340(2) or a determination of significance (DS) under WAC 197-11-360(3), PSRC shall give public notice of the availability of those documents on PSRC's website, give notice to the entities listed in WAC 197-11-340(2)(b), and give notice to anyone who has specifically requested in writing to be notified about the particular proposal. Those notification steps will also be followed whenever PSRC issues a Draft EIS under WAC 197-11-455 or a Supplemental EIS under WAC 197-11-620, or whenever PSRC proposes to change its adopted SEPA procedures.

Whenever PSRC issues an Addendum to an EIS under WAC 197-11-625, notice of the availability of the Addendum shall be given on PSRC's website and provided to recipients of the initial Draft EIS or Final EIS being addended. For this update, PSRC intends to issue an Addendum to the 2010 Transportation 2040 EIS.

The PSRC SEPA notification procedures listed above may be supplemented by issuing a news release to major newspapers and news outlets and other notification techniques, such as sending a postcard, newsletter, publication, or email. When undergoing a SEPA process, PSRC often works with an environmental planning group to gain an understanding of the environmental issues and implication of planning process. This group has consisted of representatives from federal, state, local and tribal environmental and resource agencies.

II. Goals and Objectives

The following goals and objectives guided the outreach activities. They are subject to revision as appropriate. In some cases, they apply to a wide range of audiences; in others, specific ones.

Goal 1: Inform, involve, and collaborate with multiple audiences during the preparation of the regional transportation plan.

Objectives:

- Ensure that the public and the media have access to available information
- Involve appropriate groups in the data collection, policy and technical analysis, recommendations, plan preparation, and plan adoption stages of the process
- Provide information to PSRC committees and boards for review and feedback
- Keep the public informed about the schedule, tasks, and opportunities for input

Goal 2: Take public inquiries, comments, suggestions, and ideas into account during the review and decision-making process.

Objectives:

- Let participants know how their comments will be used in the process
- Use a variety of methods to obtain comments
- Provide information in easily understood, accessible formats that take into consideration language and literacy needs.
- Provide periodic summaries of input that represent the issues and considerations
- Include a feedback loop for those commenting to know how their comments will be addressed.

Goal 3: Use a variety of communication techniques to reach diverse audiences and publish all proceedings and records for public review

Objectives:

- Employ these and other types of techniques to publicize events, activities:
 - Internet to accept comments, to stream meetings and public service announcements, publish email newsletters or bulletins
 - on-line and print display advertisements in area publications as appropriate
 - postcard mailings as appropriate
 - fact sheets, website updates, and display boards
 - one-on-one community briefings, meetings with groups, open houses, public events, and presentations to jurisdictions in accessible and convenient locations at convenient times
 - tie-ins with partner agencies, social service organizations
 - visualization techniques including maps, displays, hands-on exercises
- Make all proceedings available in both written and electronic formats

Goal 4: Provide the public with many different ways to access information and participate in the process.

Objective:

- Ensure that this outreach effort is in place to provide information to stakeholders, elected officials, partner agencies, interest groups, and the public.

III. Meeting the Goals and Objectives

To meet these goals and objectives, PSRC employs a range of tools and techniques which are standard procedure for regional outreach and are consistent with the PSRC Public Participation Plan.

Communication and outreach activities are organized under four headings: 1) Presentations and Meetings / Interagency Consultation, 2) Written and Printed Materials, 3) Digital and Electronic Materials, and 4) Direct Engagement with Special Needs and Environmental Justice populations.

Summary of Methods and Techniques

Presentations & Meetings / Interagency Consultation

Boards and Committee Meetings

PSRC provides regular briefings and presentations to boards and standing committees throughout the planning process. The Regional Staff Committee plays a key role in this process which is composed of the region's lead planning, public works, and transportation professionals. This body provides valuable insight and recommendations to PSRC staff, as well as providing direct input to the Transportation Policy Board. In addition, PSRC engages subject matter experts and working groups to develop, review, and provide feedback on data and technical materials. Subject matter experts and working groups are also employed during plan updates and often continue to meet at regularly scheduled times to assist with data collection, analysis, and other technical and policy issues.

A list of key PSRC boards, committees, and groups is included in Table 1.

Table 1. PSRC Boards, Committees, and Advisory Groups

<u>PSRC BOARDS</u> General Assembly Executive Board (EB) Operations Committee (OC) Transportation Policy Board (TPB) Growth Management Policy Board (GMPB) Economic Development District Board (EDD)	Model Users Group (MUG) Regional Food Policy Council Regional Freight Mobility Roundtable Regional FTA Caucus Regional Open Space Conservation Plan Advisory Committee Regional Traffic Operations Committee (RTOC) Regional Transit-Oriented Development Advisory Committee Special Needs Transportation Committee (SNTC) Transportation Demand Management Steering Committee Transportation Operators Committee (TOC)
<u>PSRC ADVISORY GROUPS AND COMMITTEES</u> Regional Staff Committee (RSC) Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC) Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) FAST Freight Advisory Committee (FASTFAC) Land Use Technical Advisory Committee (LUTAC)	

Regional Forums

In addition to consulting with the agency's organizational and advisory committee structure, PSRC staff regularly attends other regional policy and advisory group meetings. PSRC staff give regular briefings to the subarea transportation planning forums in the region: Pierce County Regional Council (PCRC), Regional Access Mobility Partnership (RAMP) Pierce County, Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC), Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT), and the three King County sub-groups: SeaShore Transportation Forum (SeaShore), South County Area Transportation Board (SCATBd), and Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP). These forums are composed of elected officials and staff who address transportation planning issues in their subareas. Each of these forums may also have technical and policy subcommittees or advisory groups that inform their work. PSRC staff regularly presented to and met with both the formal forum groups and their subgroups.

Information Center

PSRC maintains an Information Center at its offices to keep its documents, publications and other significant material on file for public inspection and use. The Information Center is open to the public weekdays from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. at 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104. A librarian is available to help answer questions and find requested documents and data. Find out more by calling 206-464-7532 or TTY Relay 711, or by emailing info@psrc.org, or online at psrc.org.

Written and Printed Materials

Environmental Documents

Notification for the original FEIS Addendum when the plan was first developed and adopted in 2010 was mailed and emailed to interested parties and stakeholders, and published on the PSRC website.

Public Comment

Public comment is encouraged throughout the entire plan update process and the final adoption of the plan will include a 45-day public comment and review period. Comments are generally received by email, mail, and fax.

Media Relations

PSRC uses media relations to get the word out to a broad and diverse audience of readers throughout the four counties. Press releases are distributed to area media outlets and to PSRC's mailing list.

Periodic Mailings and Postings

When the Draft Plan and SEPA Addendum are released during plan updates, PSRC distributes the documents in hard copy and electronic form as needed. Electronic copies of the draft documents are emailed to Executive Board, Transportation Policy Board, and Growth Management Policy Board members. Regional Staff Committee members were also emailed the draft plan in electronic format. All documents are made readily available on the PSRC website. The five major area libraries receive hard copies of Draft and Final Plan and SEPA documents.

Digital and Electronic Materials

PowerPoint Presentations

PowerPoint presentations are generally the primary visual medium for communicating information about the plan to boards, committees, and outside stakeholder groups. Throughout the planning process, PowerPoint slide presentations featuring bullet points, diagrams, tables, and charts were used to illustrate information about the process, schedule, analyses, and decisions. These presentations are posted on the PSRC website.

Blog and Social Media

PSRC maintains a blog and social media accounts to provide up-to-date information to the public:

- Blog: <https://www.psrc.org/whats-happening>
- Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/PugetSoundRegionalCouncil>
- Twitter: <https://twitter.com/soundregion>
- Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/soundregion/>

Email

PSRC maintains an email list of members and interested parties, including environmental justice populations, resource agencies and community based organizations. This list of nearly 7,000 receives updates on PSRC's work nearly every week.

Email is widely used as the primary communication tool to inform and remind members of meeting times, distribute agendas and documents, announce the release of important documents and request their review and comment during comment periods, direct members to the website, and provide additional information related to the process.

Web Site

The PSRC website at www.psrc.org offers a variety of resources to inform the public and invite participation in the outreach effort. In addition to using the website to announce meetings, events and key junctures in the planning process schedule, PSRC also uses the website to solicit written comments and distribute online surveys to solicit public input. In addition, the website offers links to related background materials, and draft and final reports and plans.

Web Streaming of Meetings

Since 2009, PSRC has offered web streaming of board meetings.

Visualization Techniques

PSRC uses visualization techniques, such as maps, charts, graphs, illustrations, presentations and videos in web, email, and print communication to explain concepts behind actions and decision making. PSRC may also use handouts and posters to display visual information. PSRC uses style guides for data presentation and PowerPoint presentations to present a consistent, streamlined, and easy to understand visual message.

Direct Engagement with Special Needs and Environmental Justice Populations

In order to meet the requirements for Title VI and Executive Orders addressing environmental justice populations and FTA's requirement for engaging with special needs populations, PSRC has employed a variety of direct engagement tools and activities to engage more directly with these populations.

Online and Print Questionnaires

Questionnaires are a useful tool to gain feedback from people that may not be able to attend an in-person or public event or when these events do not warrant enough time to gain meaningful feedback through conversation or other forms of direct communication. These can also be useful tools when gaining feedback from people who speak other languages as these can be easily translated. For some populations, paper questionnaires provide a tool to engage when reaching them on-line or in-person may be most challenging. Some examples would be for youth, aging adults, immigrants, people who speak English as a second language, etc.

In-Person Events

In-person events are highly valuable when communicating with the populations mentioned above. These can be in the form of round-table events or presentations to particular groups. Best practice for this type of engagement when targeting the general public or EJ populations is to find opportunities where people already congregate such as attending existing meetings that people already are engaged with. Working with Community Based Organizations (CBO) is key to finding these opportunities as they are often trusted by local communities and often the convener of events or meetings.

Working with Community Based Organizations

For outreach targeting environmental justice populations or special needs populations, working with CBO's can be a great asset when a relationship is built with them. These organizations are often trusted in local communities and can spread the reach of public engagement. CBO's are often willing to send information or questionnaires to their distribution lists or are willing to push social media posts. Some may provide additional assistance when resourced.

Additional Public Meetings, Workshops and Forums

PSRC continuously strives to improve access to information for all. Public meetings on specific issues are held as needed. If required, formal public hearings are conducted, and notice of these public hearings is distributed through a news release and posting on PSRC's webpage. Key documents and materials are placed on file in PSRC's Information Center and may also be sent to public libraries throughout the region. PSRC may also conduct public workshops, community forums, conferences and other events to keep the public informed and involved in various high-profile transportation projects and plans, and to elicit feedback from the public and PSRC's stakeholders. PSRC may work with radio or TV stations to get the word out about additional public meetings, workshops or forums. PSRC may also mail postcards or a newsletter to notify the public about events or public comment periods.

Alternative Formats and Limited English Proficiency

PSRC's agendas, news releases, and publications are available in alternative formats and in other languages with advance request. Notification about alternative formats and TTY Relay 711 are on agendas, psrc.org, and all publications, along with contact information for obtaining translation services. PSRC has contracted the services of a telephone translation provider, which can instantly connect anyone in the office to over 100 different languages. PSRC's website also offers a translation widget with dozens of languages available for instant translation. PSRC has a language assistance plan, a list of staff who speak other languages, and the receptionist keeps an "I Speak" card at the front desk in case someone with limited English proficiency enters the office. PSRC maintains a Language Assistance Plan as part of its Title VI Plan and Program.

IV. Outreach Effort for the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan Update

The regional transportation plan was originally developed and adopted in 2010. During this time, PSRC conducted an environmental review along with specific outreach. The goal of the outreach effort was to promote the update process as a regional effort in collaboration with many partner agencies, PSRC members, interest groups, and the general public. The objectives to strengthen relationships with partner agencies with a stake in the regional transportation plan were met by ongoing involvement to encourage continued public participation in preparing Transportation 2040. Outreach activities continued as the plan was updated both in 2014 and in 2018. In addition, several studies and surveys have been conducted throughout to continue to seek feedback throughout the planning process outside of plan updates. These outreach efforts include:

1. Transportation Public Opinion Survey (Fielded Jan 27-Feb 4, 2014)
2. Pacific Northwest Values & Priorities Quantitative Study (Fielded May 18th– June 1st, 2015)
3. Transportation Futures 2015 Survey - Public Opinion Research (Fielded Nov 30 to Dec 13, 2015)
4. Equity and Transportation Funding: Transportation Futures Outreach (December 2015)

These efforts have contributed to the development and updates to the plan. The remainder of this report will summarize the outreach efforts and the resulting feedback obtained in the development of the updated Regional Transportation Plan. This preliminary information will be supplemented with additional information obtained in the public comment period for the draft plan (December 14, 2017-January 31, 2018), and as the plan is finalized.

Engagement Activities for 2018

Public outreach for the 2018 update began in late 2016 and will continue through the adoption of the plan update in May 2018. The outreach effort was designed to build upon existing relationships among partner agencies, enhance understanding of regional transportation planning, and increase participation during the plan development and review process. These meetings, briefings, and presentations built on the extensive outreach work that goes back to the original scoping process in 2007, and has continued through to the latest adoption scheduled for spring 2018.

Boards and Committee Meetings

Throughout the process, staff regularly made presentations to the PSRC Boards and Committees to develop the update work program, to gain feedback on content and various planning and policy related topics and for general briefings. There were also several working groups that were formed specifically to advise this plan update. In addition to engagement and presentations with the boards and committees, the Transportation Policy Board held eight board engagement sessions where they broke into smaller groups and focused a larger amount of time on a specific topic related to the plan update at each forum. These were highly successful board engagement activities. More information and summaries of these sessions can be found on the PSRC website.

Table 2. Transportation Plan Update Presentations to PSRC Policy Boards

Board	FORUM	Count
Executive Board		1
Growth Management Policy Board		1
Transportation Policy Board		18
Board Total		21

Table 3. Transportation Plan Update Presentations to PSRC Committees

PSRC Committee	
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee	15
FAST Freight Advisory Committee	7
Regional Access Mobility Partnership	2
Regional Freight Mobility Roundtable	1
Regional Project Evaluation Committee	4
Regional Staff Committee	11
Regional Traffic Operations Committee	6
Regional Transportation Demand Management Steering Committee	4
Special Needs Transportation Committee	10
Transportation Operators Committee	1
Transportation Operators Committee	11
Transportation Operators Committee Finance Workshop	1
Transportation Technical Advisory Committee	1
T2040 Finance Working Group	9
T2040 Finance Working Group Special Meeting	1
T2040 Finance Working Group Special Workshop	1
T2040 Maintenance & Preservation Working Group	9
T2040 Update - Regional Outcome Evaluation Framework Workshop	1
PSRC Committee Total	95

Member Jurisdictions and Regional Forums

In addition to engaging with PSRC's Boards and Committees, staff regularly made presentations to member jurisdictions and interest groups to keep them aware of the status of the planning process and to gather input.

Table 4. Transportation Plan Update Presentations to Regional Forums, Sub-Area Groups and Member Jurisdictions

FORUM	Count
Subarea Group	
American Society of Civil Engineers	1
Bothell City Council	1
City of Duvall	1
Community Partners	4
Eastside Transportation Partnership	2
Eastside Transportation Partnership	1
Environmental Resource Agency Coordination	1
Infrastructure Coordination Committee	2
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Washington Board Meeting	1
King County Project Evaluation Committee	2
King County Regional Transit Committee	1
King County Regional Transportation System Initiative Elected Officials Meeting	1
Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council	1
Pierce County Coordinated Transportation Coalition	1
Pierce County Regional Council	2
PRO All-Staff Meeting (King County Metro)	1
Regional Alliance for Resilient and Equitable Transportation Group	1
SeaShore Transportation Forum	4
Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce	1
Snohomish County Tomorrow	2
Snohomish County Transportation Coalition	1
South County Area Transportation Board	2
South King County Mobility Coalition	1
Transportation Coordinating Committee (Pierce County)	1
Transportation Coordinating Committee Roundtable	1
Tribal Transportation Planning Organization	1
Washington Transportation Commission	2
Subarea Group Total	35

Tribal Outreach

PSRC continues to seek ways to improve engagement with Tribal Nations consistent with the Tribal Consultation Best Practices Guide for Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations in Washington State. During the course of the 2018 Plan Update, PSRC reached out to the tribes via email several times by sending information and soliciting opportunities for PSRC to present or engage further. This resulted in conversations with a member of the Stillaguamish Tribe and with the Suquamish Tribe to discuss various aspects of the plan that was of interest to them. PSRC also presented at the September Tribal Transportation Planning Organization (TTPO) to brief them on the elements of the plan update. In addition, PSRC had a consultation with one of the Puyallup Tribe members who advised PSRC on better methods for tribal engagement in the future, building on the recommendations noted in the aforementioned guide. This meeting was incredibly informative and will shape how PSRC engages Tribal Nations in the future.

Engagement with Community Partners

As part of the scoping and update process, PSRC engaged with advocacy, community based organizations, public health and other community partners. The purpose was to engage with these groups early and often throughout the planning process. This groups specifically gave PSRC feedback on topics such as public engagement and equity related aspects of the PSRC work program.

Environmental Resource Agencies

PSRC initiated an outreach effort to state and federal environmental and resource agencies by inviting agencies to participate in one meeting to inform the scope of work and another will be held prior to plan adoption. Staff from state and federal agencies participated in these meetings providing technical and policy input on their specific areas of interest.

Outreach for Environmental Justice and Special Needs

Overview

Between March and October 2017, PSRC conducted outreach to environmental justice and special needs populations. The following summarizes those outreach efforts and the resulting feedback obtained in the plan development period. This preliminary information will be supplemented with additional information obtained in the public comment period, and as the plan is finalized.

Goal

Gain meaningful feedback from environmental justice and special needs populations to inform the update of the regional transportation plan and the Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan appendix (Coordinated Plan).

Objectives

- Build awareness of regional transportation planning
- Educate about the role PSRC plays in transportation planning
- Show how community partners can help to inform this process
- Make connecting and engaging with PSRC simple and easy to understand
- Provide opportunities for people to engage in a variety of ways
- Leverage existing relationships to aid robust outreach effort
- Help build long-term relationships, particularly with new community groups

Audiences

This early engagement focused on gaining meaningful feedback from the environmental justice and special needs populations identified below. The general public were also offered the opportunity to provide feedback although no specific efforts were aimed at general audiences.

- People of color
- People with disabilities
- People with limited English proficiency
- People with limited literacy
- People with low-income
- Residents in highly impacted communities (identified by Puget Sound Clean Air Agency)
- Rural populations
- Seniors and seniors aging in place
- Veterans
- Youth

Approach

The project team collaborated with local community based organizations (CBOs) to conduct outreach how, when and where it was most convenient for key audiences. The team identified three general outreach approaches designed to engage these audiences; each approach allowed variability in execution to help the project team align outreach activities with specific CBOs and their audiences.

Online and Print Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed that allowed individuals to respond online and using print versions. CBOs assisted in sharing the questionnaire with key audiences through sharing the online version on their websites and via existing email lists. CBOs also shared the print version through physical communication channels.

The questionnaire was initially shared online through PSRC and Community Partners websites and social media. In response to public feedback, the initial questionnaire was refined and simplified in August and shared with CBOs who had not yet participated in outreach. The questionnaire was available in multiple languages online and in print form. Print copies were provided to CBOs as requested.

In-Person Events

The project team coordinated with CBOs to participate in existing meetings and/or events. Outreach during events varied but options included presentations, print questionnaires and facilitated “dot-exercises” where participants used dots to prioritize topics on large posters.

The “dot-exercise” was specifically used for outreach with special needs focused groups to vet the needs and gaps as well as prioritized strategies for the Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. Participants were provided with a total of six dot stickers and two sets of posters (or handouts) of existing Coordinated Plan excerpts during selected outreach meetings—one set addressed mobility needs and gaps for people with special transportation needs and one set addressed the Coordinated Plan’s prioritized strategies for addressing those needs and gaps. The project team gave a brief presentation to provide overview of the Coordinated Plan update and requested that participants indicate their top three mobility needs and gaps and top three associated prioritized strategies by placing three dots on each set of posters (or handouts). Each respondent was allowed to place all three dots on a single category or spread the dots around to multiple categories.

Direct CBO Outreach

The project team considered the possibility of sub-contracting with CBOs to conduct outreach directly, on behalf of PSRC. The result was that many CBO’s were willing to distribute information or host PSRC at a meeting but staff and time capacity limited CBO’s from accepting sub-contracting opportunities.

Community Based Organizations (CBOs)

Community Based Organizations can be a great asset to community engagement because they offer the networks to people and can offer feedback on the best approach to communicate with certain populations. Based on research of organizations in the region and an assessment of their ability to reach focused groups, the project team identified an initial list of 32 potential organizations. The project team then attempted to contact and interview each of the organizations. All organizations were contacted at least three times, at minimum once via email and once via phone. PSRC also leveraged existing relationships with regional mobility coalitions and sub-regional groups who offered time on standing agendas to provide updates and solicit feedback.

The table below summarizes the 14 organizations who agreed to support outreach activities and how they participated.

Table 5. Transportation Plan Update Engagement Activities with Community Based Organizations

Organization	Outreach	County(ies)
Bellevue Network on Aging	Questionnaire, dot-exercise	King
Chinese Information and Service Center (CISC)	Presentation, Questionnaire	King
Eastside Easy Rider Collaborative	Questionnaire, dot-exercise	King
HomeSight	Questionnaire	King, Snohomish, Pierce
King County Mobility Coalition (KCMC)*	Presentation, dot-exercise	King
Kitsap Continuum of Care	Presentation, dot-exercise	Kitsap
Kitsap County Parent Coalition (KCPC)	Presentation, Questionnaire	Kitsap
Korean Women's Association (KWA)	Questionnaire	Snohomish, Pierce
Pierce County Coordinated Transportation Coalition (PCCTC)*	Presentation	Pierce
Refugee Women's Alliance (ReWA)	Questionnaire	King
Snohomish County Transportation Coalition (SNOTRAC)*	Presentation, dot-exercise	Snohomish
South King County Mobility Coalition*	Presentation, dot-exercise	King
The Coffee Oasis	Questionnaire	Kitsap
The Mustard Seed Project	Presentation, dot-exercise	Kitsap

**Standing mobility coalition*

In addition, four organizations provided substantial feedback regarding outreach strategies and opportunities, and/or offered to share information electronically in the future. Schedule limitations limited the ability to work with these organizations during this phase.

Table 6. Community Based Organizations that Offered Feedback on Process

Organization	County(ies)
Easterseals Washington	King, Pierce, Kitsap
Lutheran Community Services Northwest (LCSNW)	King, Snohomish, Pierce, Kitsap
South Sound Military & Communities Partnership (SSMCP)	Pierce
Tacoma Community House	Pierce

Final 45-Day Public Comment Period

V. Outreach Results

Early Engagement

Outreach prior to the 45-day public comment period produced two types of results. The questionnaire, both print and digital, produced tabular, quantifiable results that can be parsed in a variety of ways. Overall results are not statistically significant due to the nature of distribution methods. However enough data were collected to highlight trends and other observations as indicated below.

In-person outreach, using the above-mentioned dot-exercise, produced qualitative results that informed the update to the Coordinated Plan.

Response Totals

In total 1,103 complete or partial responses were received. Table 7 summarizes print and online questionnaire totals for target populations and Table 8 quantifies questionnaires submitted via languages other than English.

Table 7. Completed print and online questionnaires by population group (based on demographic questions)

Segment	Total responses (percent of total)
Language other than English	137 (12%)
People of color	270 (24%)
People with disabilities (relies on specialized transportation services)	196 (18%)
People with low income (less than \$25,000)	154 (14%)
Seniors and seniors aging in place (65 or more)	194 (18%)
Veterans	91 (8%)
Youth (Under 18)	17 (1%)

Table 8. Completed print questionnaires by language spoken

Language	Total responses (n=137)
Chinese	79
Korean	33
Vietnamese	24
Spanish	1

Key Findings

Feedback from in-person events compared similarly to online and print surveys – highlighting several key themes.

General Understanding of PSRC's Mission/Role

Based on feedback from both CBO representatives and individuals, many from these target populations shared a lack an understanding of the role PSRC plays and how these planning documents affect their day to day lives.

More Transportation Options

Participants expressed a need for more transit options and increased frequency throughout the region. Participants noted cuts in transit services have been impactful and that some areas have not transit options whatsoever, particularly in more rural areas where more transit options are desired.

Improved Transportation Options

Respondents generally feel like transportation options have improved in the last four years and that planned improvements will continue this trend. This finding is consistent with the Transportation Public Opinion Survey conducted in 2014.

Transportation improvements that are most important to support growth

Increased/more frequent transit was ranked highest almost ubiquitously across income groups. A safer walking environment also ranked consistently high. Although seen as less important, maintenance and preservation ranked consistently across income groups. Adding or expanding roads ranked very low for low income groups and increased in importance with income. Other demographics did not demonstrate a marked trend. These findings are consistent with the Transportation Futures Survey conducted in 2015 where one of the key findings was that there is need to upgrade and expand transportation infrastructure and services (throughout the state, in Puget Sound and including transit) is understood and people are willing to pay more to do so.

Transportation improvement ranking results

- 1. Increased/more frequent transit*
 - 2. Safer walking environment*
 - 3. Maintaining and preserving the existing system*
 - 4. Access to a safe and connected bike network*
 - 5. Adding or expanding new roads or roadway lanes*
 - 6. Improving traffic flow*
 - 7. More carpool options such as vanpool or HOV lanes*
-

Climate change

Although the questions regarding climate change were modified over the course of the two questionnaire iterations, approximately 80 percent of all respondents believe that climate change is important for planning agencies to address. There were no apparent trends when comparing responses across demographics.

Special Needs Transportation Services

Approximately 18 percent of questionnaire responses indicated a reliance, either “sometimes” or “always”, on specialized / special needs transportation services due to age and ability. In general, higher incomes were less likely to require specialized transportation services. The need for specialized transportation services generally increase with age, however younger respondents are more likely to “sometimes” require these services. Responses to this question did not vary markedly base on racial demographics or veteran status.

The ‘dot’ exercises revealed that two mobility gap categories—awareness and institutional gaps—were highlighted as the most urgent mobility needs in the region: 1) the need for closing gaps in awareness which occur when people who need a ride or social service agencies are not fully informed on available transportation options; and 2) addressing institutional gaps which include requirements that may make a person with special transportation needs ineligible for a service, or may create barriers to complete cross-county travel. Moreover, developing and delivering accessible and innovative specialized transportation services continued as a high priority strategy voiced throughout the meetings. More detailed results of the dot-exercise can be found in Appendix K (Coordinated Plan) of T2040.

Awareness Gaps

Specifically related to special needs services, participants at nearly all events expressed a lack of general understanding of what transportation options are available and specifically how to use them. Participants added that training is needed to better educate users reliant on these options.

Paratransit Services

Users of paratransit services noted a need for increased access to paratransit. In addition, some users noted experiences with drivers who lack proper training for working with people with mental disabilities.

Needs for specialized transportation services

Users of specialized transportation services identified the following needs as most important.

1. Increase transportation services that connect rural/suburban areas to urban services
2. Increase awareness of appropriate mobility options
3. Being able to schedule and take trips in the same day
4. Increased connections to areas outside of major activity hubs

Formal 45-Day Public Comment Period

Overview of Comments Received:

Formal public comment period ran from December 14, 2017 – January 31, 2018, but comments through plan adoption were also accepted. A notification for the release of the draft plan was sent to PSRC Boards and committees, community partners, environmental resource agencies and a variety of other groups via email. This also went to local newspapers, was posted on social media and PSRC's blog as well as being posted on the PSRC website.

In total, there were 152 respondents which came from:

- 25 PSRC member agencies
- 19 other organizations – non-profits, community groups, advisory boards, chambers of commerce, business groups, state agencies, etc.
- 108 individuals

The comments and letters from these respondents equated to 842 individual coded comments.

Agencies and Organizations That Submitted Formal Public Comments	
City of Bellevue	Port of Seattle
City of Bonney Lake	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department
City of Burien	WA Department of Ecology
City of Des Moines	WSDOT
City of Issaquah	350 Seattle
City of Kenmore	ACES Northwest Network / Cascadia Center
City of Kent	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce
City of Marysville	Bellevue Downtown Association
City of Monroe	BNSF Railway
City of SeaTac	Cascade Bicycle Club
City of Seattle	Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions
City of Shoreline	Eastside Transportation Association
City of Snoqualmie	Hopelink
City of Tacoma	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils
City of University Place	NW Seaport Alliance
Community Transit	Puget Sound Sage
Kitsap Transit	Seattle Freight Advisory Board
Pierce Transit	Sierra Club Washington
Sound Transit	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation
Pierce County	Snoqualmie Valley Transportation
Snohomish County	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition
King County Department of Transportation	Transportation Choices Coalition
Kitsap County Public Works Department	

Major Themes from the Public Comment Period:

842 Comments coded were into **26** separate categories

Comment Category	Count	Comment Category	Count
Analysis results	12	Health	1
Analysis tools and documentation	13	Maintenance and preservation	10
Aviation	33	Miscellaneous / other	45
Bicycle / pedestrian	84	Multimodal system	11
Climate change / air quality	36	Parking	3
Congestion / roadway capacity	38	Performance measures	19
Emerging technology / Intelligent Transportation Systems	37	Project specific	99
Equity	52	Public engagement	11
Ferries	8	Safety	8
Financial strategy	132	Special needs transportation	15
Freight	50	TDM and CTR	8
General plan support	19	Transit	43
Growth management / VISION	54	Water quality	1



Key Themes:

Financial Strategy

- general **opposition** to tolls / road usage charge (15%)
- general **support** of tolls / road usage charge (14%)
- concerns or suggestions for **implementation** of the road usage charge and other aspects of the financial strategy (23%)
- miscellaneous comments on other aspects of the financial strategy (e.g., local options, specific funding needs) (48%)

Bicycle / Pedestrian

- general **opposition** to bicycle / pedestrian planning and investments (11%)
- general **support** of bicycle / pedestrian planning and investments (17%)
- addressing **safety** (17%)
- corrections and miscellaneous comments (55%)

Project Specific

- general **support** of existing projects
- requesting **new or additional** investments in specific areas

Equity

- general **support** for equity lens approach in performance measures
- work to **integrate equity** more fully in plan – people and geographies
- address equity in **implementation** of future **user fees**

Freight

- broad diversity of comments on **variety of topics**, from rail to trucks to technical corrections
- in general, continue to **support freight networks** & recognize importance

Actions Taken on Comments Received:

Attachment A is a spreadsheet cataloguing all 842 comments and PSRC responses. The 842 comments were classified into three categories:

General Comments – 723 comments

There were 723 general comments where no plan changes were necessary. These were summarized for the PSRC Transportation Policy Board by the key themes as noted above. Each specific comment was also available in detail on the PSRC website.

Technical Corrections – 98 comments

There were 98 comments that required a minor change, correction, or clarification to the plan with no policy implications. These were also summarized for the PSRC Transportation Policy Board. Staff applied those changes to the final version of the main plan document and appendices. Each specific comment and staff response was also available in detailed spreadsheet document (Attachment A), which was made available to the Transportation Policy Board and interested parties on the PSRC website.

Board Review – 21 comments

There were 21 comments that had some potential plan or work program implications. Each of these were summarized by theme and brought to the board for direction. The Transportation Policy Board

directed staff to address these issues in future PSRC work program items. These comments were also available in detail on the PSRC website with the other detailed comments.

Lessons Learned and Opportunities for Future Improvements

This section outlines lessons learned while planning and executing outreach with community based organizations (CBOs) and mobility coalitions, and identifies opportunities for how to incorporate these lessons into future outreach to specific populations.

Connecting with CBOs is time intensive; direct introductions streamline and facilitate

CBO response to outreach efforts are often delayed and time consuming. Connecting with CBOs often required several rounds of follow-up communication. Generally, conversations initiated by direct introductions from mutual colleagues and partner organizations progress more quickly.

This could be for a variety of reasons. For example, staff at organizations that do not regularly work with agencies such as PSRC may find initial requests unusual and may not know how to respond. In addition, staff changes, busy workloads and non-traditional work schedules can complicate sustained dialogue.

Opportunities

- Continue to build long-term, synergistic relationships with willing partners by fostering relationships established in Phase 1 so that future outreach efforts benefit from on-going trust and familiarity
- When reaching out to new CBOs leverage introductions from mutual colleagues and partner organizations whenever possible
- Expect coordination with CBOs to be time intensive and plan outreach schedule and scope accordingly

Willingness to partner was highly variable for a variety of reasons

Most CBOs who respond to outreach requests are interested in helping but highly constrained in their ability to do so. Constraints include:

- Staff capacity: More than funding, staff capacity proved to be a limiting factor. In order to help with this short-term project, CBOs needed to utilize their existing staff who are generally very busy already.
- Administrative (e.g. invoicing, contracting) requirements: CBOs are often unfamiliar and/or uncomfortable with traditional contracting and invoicing processes required. Even when willing, CBOs may still lack the resources required.
- Timing. Some CBOs (for example, the South Sound Military and Communities Partnership) had existing in-person opportunities that did not align with outreach timing.

Opportunities

- Establish simplified approaches to contract work with CBOs.

Organizations that offer self-improvement programming were most willing to help

CBOs that offered self-improvement lectures or classes were more likely to see this as an opportunity because it fits into the scope of planned meetings and aligned with organization and meeting goals. Small incentives, specifically the \$10 Orca cards, go a long way.

Opportunities

- Understand the core mission of CBOs and target outreach that aligns with their objectives.
- Leverage successful work with new partners (successful examples make conversations with new partners much easier)
- Offer incentives, such as \$10 Orca cards

Preferred methods of engagement for specific communities

The CBOs who agreed to participate chose to do so in the following ways (in order of most requested):

1. Sharing online materials, including the questionnaire, via email or social media – this is by far the simplest method for CBOs
2. Hosting PSRC at existing meetings or events for presentations and group discussions
3. Administering materials, including the questionnaire, in person to the people they serve

Opportunities

- Plan for multiple methods of engagement, ensuring outreach materials work in a variety of environments.
- Prepare translated materials in a variety of languages, based on feedback from partner CBOs – this is especially important for print materials.

Plan for short engagement periods

Special needs population, likely more so than much of the population, may only have the capacity to engage for a brief amount of time. By engaging these populations where it is most convenient we are also asking them to divert attention from some other important task.

Opportunities

- Plan for engagement that last only a few minutes
- Simplify questions and materials that need to be consumed during or prior to participation

Language needs

Six of the CBOs communicated with indicated translated materials* as critical to reaching the communities that they serve. The most frequently requested languages were Chinese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog. Other languages requested included Vietnamese, followed by Arabic, Farsi / Persian, French, Cambodian / Khmer, Swahili, Ukrainian and Somalia. Approximately 12 percent of questionnaire responses were submitted via translated questionnaires.

**Note: the CBOs are Chinese Information & Service Center, Lutheran Community Services, Asian Counseling and Referral services, Korean Women's Association, Homesite, Tacoma Community House.*

Opportunities

- Continue to seek guidance from CBOs in addition to other resources such as the American Community Survey, in order to determine language needs for future outreach.
- Prepare translated materials in a variety of languages, based on feedback from partner CBOs – this is especially important for print materials.
- Simplify questions where possible to minimize translation needs when reporting data (e.g. multiple choice vs. open-ended or text).

Social Media and On-line Portals

The use of an on-line platform to receive public comments significantly increased the number of comments received. The ability for people to submit through a form instead of having to draft an email a formal letter was more equitable for the general population and did result from an increase in the number of individual comments from past plan updates. Likewise, the use of social media, blogs and on-line forums also increased the reach of the notification for the formal public comment period.

Accessible On-Line Materials

The creation of documents in accessible formats for people who have visual impairments requires some thought and care when making them publicly available, specifically regarding tagging and handling of images, graphics and charts. While great effort has been made to create documents and a website that accommodate people with visual or other impairments, there have been some lessons learned through this update process. To address these concerns, PSRC conducted an accessibility review for the agency website and documents, including the RTP update documents. This resulted in recommendations for improvement which will be part of improvements moving forward in order to provide appropriate accommodation for people with accessibility needs.

Conclusions

The cumulative outreach efforts documented above successfully gathered meaningful feedback from each of the identified environmental justice, special needs populations, from the general public and from PSRC member organizations, which resulted in specific changes to the content and shape of the plan. These conversations and outreach efforts helped build awareness of PSRC, its mission and the updates to the Regional Transportation Plan. In addition, this outreach identified valuable lessons learned, identified new connections and began to set the stage for future outreach.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
277544	1	[anonymous]		This is the biggest waste of time and resources you all have put out. Your planning is not planning, only putting useless words on paper meant to benefit your lackeys who continue to make money off the public trough. Quit wasting our money.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Federal law requires that the region update its transportation plan every four years as a prerequisite for receipt of over \$500 million in federal transportation funds each year. These capital funds are critical to preserving and improving the region's transportation system.
277545	1	Denice Carnahan		I would like to see a park and ride at the intersection of HWY 169 and 405.	Project Specific	General Comment	King County Metro has proposed investments in park and ride capacity along the SR 169 corridor as part of the draft plan. Please refer to project #5656 on the Regional Capacity Projects List (Appendix G).
277545	2	Denice Carnahan		I would also like to see water taxis that run from Renton to Bellevue, Kirkland, Leschi and Seattle. This will take pressure off South 405 and help make amends to those who live in the SE area of Lake WA area, that got left out of light rail!	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The concept of additional waterborne transportation is under consideration at various locations around the region.
277545	3	Denice Carnahan		It would also be a great idea to run a bus through Fairwood down 140th to the Maple Valley Hwy and North on 405, without the time delay of going into Renton.	Project Specific	General Comment	The proposed Regional Transit Network contains a transit route in this location.
277545	4	Denice Carnahan		We have got to find safe options for those making left hand turns off a two way road. It is a safety issue and left hand turns delay traffic.	Safety	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
277598	1	Miranda Benson		We desperately need light rail expanded throughout the region!	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
277598	2	Miranda Benson		I fully support this plan and know it will make life better for the community in the long run, even if many are against it right now.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
277604	1	Jeff Lykken	Kennydale Neighborhood	<p>After reading the proposed improvements and there are some major problems.</p> <p>I405 from Renton to Bellevue has been neglected and is one of the worst stretches of freeway in the nation. We were originally promised 2 additional general purpose lanes in each direction. Adding extortion toll lanes is a HUGE mistake. The extortion toll lanes on the northern section have been one of the biggest mistakes in transportation history as well of one of the biggest ripoffs of the public in recent memory. The tolls on the northern section of I405 has caused so much congestion and diversion that they are sending cars into neighborhoods where there has never been an issue before. Leaving I405 from Renton to Bellevue with only 2 general purpose lanes in each direction is wrong and just plain stupid. If these toll lanes are added instead of the general purpose lanes that we desperately need, it will create a traffic catastrophe sending thousands of cars through neighborhoods. WE CANNOT LET THAT HAPPEN. Tolls create congestion and diversion. We need the general purpose lanes we were originally promised in the master plan!!</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Several projects are proposed for the I-405 corridor, see the RTP webmap, https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html .
277604	2	Jeff Lykken	Kennydale Neighborhood	This is also the case on Hwy 167 which also needs additional general purpose lanes in each direction.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Several projects are proposed for the SR 167 corridor, see the RTP webmap, https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html .
277604	3	Jeff Lykken	Kennydale Neighborhood	Highway 520 needs to be an 8 lane facility as it is completely jammed when it was completed. It seems as there is enough room to repaint as you did on I90.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
277604	4	Jeff Lykken	Kennydale Neighborhood	I5 at the convention center needs to be addressed at it is a bottle neck where it goes down to 2 general purpose lanes. This has been an issue for years.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Washington State Department of Transportation is proposing a variety of improvements along I-5; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
277604	5	Jeff Lykken	Kennydale Neighborhood	Once again extortion toll lanes on I405 need to be abandoned as they are a complete failure. If you continue with these extortion tolls, the area as a whole will experience catastrophic congestion. I am positive with the grass roots campaign of the community, we will have these tolls removed before the general purpose lanes we desperately need are completed in 2024.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
277606	1	Jon Mathison		<p>Road use charges should be applied not only to moving cars on our streets but also to parked cars on our streets. Cities, counties, and the state should not provide free parking along public streets. Road use charges should be applied to all who park their cars on public streets. Free parking on public streets has become an entitlement for drivers... that needs to end.</p> <p>Road use charges should be used to move people from single-occupancy vehicles to high-occupancy vehicles and into public transportation. This goal should be aggressively pursued.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
277606	2	Jon Mathison		Until gasoline and diesel are obsolete and banned, gas taxes should bear the brunt of the costs to fund our infrastructure. Tax these hazardous, carbon emitting fuels into the stone age!	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
277663	1	John Mishasek	IC EDC and Port of Coupeville	<p>It helps that Island County Commissioner Helen Price-Johnson is involved as the maps show how "close" Whidbey Island is to the nightmare that is metro-Seattle traffic.</p> <p>As a person living on Whidbey Island that moved here 4 years ago from Colorado with its own interstate nightmare, my wife and I thought that being close to Seattle was important. The traffic hassles have created a situation that going to Seattle is something to avoid unless absolutely necessary.</p> <p>A couple of months ago, we went to SeaTac area to buy an used 2016 rental car from Hertz. We spent six hours getting there and back. Yes, there was a commute to the ferry and the ferry ride (timed it just right that there was virtually no wait to get on ferry) but 75-80% of that time was sitting on I-5 in bumper to bumper stalled traffic, having cars pull in front of us if we backed off just slightly from the rear bumper of car in front of each of our cars.</p> <p>Sorry to say, but we cannot risk that type of hassle to go eat, to shop, to enjoy Seattle. I wonder how much the traffic/transportation mess is costing Seattle in sales tax revenues. We would love to have an easy, fast, reasonably price way to get from Mukilteo to U district, etc.</p>	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
277675	1	Tad Doviak		Wondering why an alternate route to Granite Falls is even worth mentioning. The lack of adequate expansion of actual lanes on the freeway system is also troubling. If there are so many more jobs and people, why aren't we expanding the transportation system that people actually use? The problem with mass transit is that it takes so much time to use. The vast majority of people won't use it.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
277675	2	Tad Doviak		I'd love to see appendix G and what the plans are for increasing capacity. And there it is! It is heartening to see that 405 and 167 are getting much needed additional lanes. I-5 improvements through the JBLM area are also welcome. Not a single expansion of I-5 between Everett and Tacoma, though. The toughest traffic and no plan to expand the most used roadway.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Washington State Department of Transportation has proposed a variety of investments on I-5; please refer to the projects web map at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
277675	3	Tad Doviak		Overall, it's about what I expected. A continued push to get people to use an inconvenient transportation system (mass transit) while largely ignoring the fact that there are not enough roads to move people around. Added lanes will do more to improve mobility than mass transit will in my inexpert opinion.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
277680	1	Dan Soderlind	City of Tacoma	I would like to see an emphasis on traffic signal upgrades and coordination. Perhaps a regional traffic signal system that is managed from one location with the ability to make changes in real time to make our transportation system more efficient.	ITS	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
277680	2	Dan Soderlind	City of Tacoma	Can this document address the management of traffic accidents? My understanding is that in Europe any traffic accident is quickly moved off of the freeway system. Traffic accidents in the Puget Sound region are cause for significant delay.	Safety	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
277794	1	Donald Padelford		<p>"Fix the HOV lanes. High Occupancy Vehicle lanes on the region's highway system have long provided a reliable commute for transit and carpools. Recent data shows that 10 of 14 HOV lanes are so congested that they no longer provide the time advantage they did in the past. The plan commits the region to work with WSDOT."</p> <p>OK, but what does this mean? The only real way to make the HOV lanes work is to turn them into HOT lanes. While there are different formats for HOT lanes, the best format is: transit (including officially constituted vanpools) goes free, everyone else pays the "market clearing price", with no upper limit on what that price might be: after a snowstorm it might be \$99.</p> <p>This ensures that rubber-tired transit (largely buses) always travels free of congestion.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Improvements to the HOV system are anticipated in the plan. See Chapter 2, State Facilities Action Plan, p.45, and Appendix I, State Facilities Action Plans.
278107	1	[anonymous]		I am disappointed that among all of the improvements planned, nothing is mentioned of improving Access service by increasing the fleet or investing in new dispatch system and increased driver training. If the population is aging as described, these are all needed improvements being ignored.	Special Needs Transportation	General Comment	Investments in ADA paratransit fleet, dispatch/communication technology and driver training are incorporated into programmatic investments found within the Plan.
278107	2	[anonymous]		Very distressing to see NO ONE on the Transportation Policy Board to represent the needs of people with disabilities or the elderly. It is hubris and just plain WRONG to think a bunch of able-bodied, resourced people can adequately plan for or meet the needs of people with disabilities or the elderly - or those who live in poverty. No wonder the system is largely inequitable - you don't allow those voices at the decision-making tables. Inexcusable in this day and age.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
278107	3	[anonymous]		I was unable to send this Plan out for comment to my disability groups because it is not in an accessible format. I see there is an option to request an accessible format, but there is a comment deadline and there isn't time to do that and then get it out to everyone with enough time to read and comment. These documents should just be accessible from the beginning. As someone who "fixes" inaccessible PDF's, I know it takes time, skill, and the right software. if you haven't already made this PDF accessible, making a request to do so would be rather useless - it would take too long to allow for an adequate review and comment period (for someone with visual disabilities, for example, as this comment form is not accessible either.) Why not just make the document accessible from the start?	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. In response, the PSRC quickly developed accessible documents for the draft Regional Transportation Plan and made accessible documents available at the launch of scoping for VISION 2050. In addition, PSRC initiated an accessibility review -by accessibility specialists -of the agency's website and on-line publications that is expected to be complete by the end of March 2018.
278107	4	[anonymous]		"The plan supports accessibility and mobility for walking, biking, and transit to and within centers. See Appendix A, MPP-D-5 through MPP-DP-13." This stuff does not belong in an Appendix - it should be integrated into the Plan throughout. People with access and functional needs are not after-thoughts or "appendixes" - and by using Universal Design Principles throughout, you improve the system for EVERYONE. It undermines the stated values of equity and inclusiveness when these issues are only addressed in "appendixes".	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Accessibility and mobility improvements for a variety of modes are anticipated throughout the plan. See Chapter 2, pp. 35-61, Improve Mobility through Strategic Capacity. Also see Appendix H, PSRC Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.
278107	5	[anonymous]		You talk of updating your membership - it also needs to include those voices that are now being unheard - people with access and functional needs. They need to be at these tables of power or you will NEVER achieve the equity you say you desire.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278107	6	[anonymous]		"Social equity also means that those affected by poverty, communities of color, and historically marginalized communities are engaged in decision-making processes, planning, and policy-making." Then they need to be at the table - this table - this group need specific representation on the PSRC! and special needs populations. I DO NOT have "specific needs" - I have THE SAME NEEDS as everyone else and you demean and disrespect me when you use that term. I DO have "specific needs" - an accessible bus/train and usable curb ramps, for example. This is NOT SPECIAL - IT IS SPECIFIC. You would take a HUGE step in meeting your stated values if you changed the language that is used!	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278107	7	[anonymous]		From pg. 23: "The plan includes best practices that serve all people safely, including those of all ages and abilities." This is a good example of integrating access and functional needs into the main body of a Plan. By including these groups in this section (instead of just in an "appendix"), it begins to meet inclusivity goals. Please do a lot more of this! From page 25: "The regional vision for transportation is to have a safe, clean, integrated, sustainable, highly efficient multimodal transportation system that supports the regional growth strategy, promotes economic and environmental vitality, and enhances public health." Another example of a place where access and functional needs can be easily integrated into the main document. This list should include "accessible"! Yet another example - page 32, section "PROVIDING INFORMATION PEOPLE NEED" - Adding the needs of people with disabilities, for example, is another way of fully integrating access and functional needs into a base Plan. Noting that accessible communications is necessary, for example, or information on accessible transportation options. All of these are examples of information people with access and functional needs require. This language belongs here and not in an appendix. Again, on page 32, the section with this sentence: "Programs and services should be actively marketed as these new facilities are implemented." Add language that acknowledges the need to include accessible transit options, and commit to accessible communications so that the messages also reach people with access and functional needs. Under "Transportation Technology and Operations" on page 33, you could include the ability to see digital information in multiple languages, voice-over announcements on trains and busses announcing stops and other	Equity	General Comment	Than you for your comment.
278107	8	[anonymous]		Page 71 - "Sales tax revenue volatility will continue to be a monitoring issue for the Sound Transit capital program as well as for near-term operations." I would ask you to consider the disproportionate impact of the sales tax on people on the lower end of the income scale. By relying on these inequitable revenues, you undermine efforts towards equity overall, and place a disproportionate burden on those least able to afford it. I would argue that businesses, who benefit monetarily from the transportation investments made, should be shouldering a higher portion of the costs.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Diversification of transit revenue sources was a key objective of the general funding scenario in the plan's financial strategy. In later years of the plan, certain transit revenues are augmented and replaced with user fees and other sources. See discussion of transit revenue sources in Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, pp. 20-21.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
278107	9	[anonymous]		<p>Page 77 - "Equity considerations of interest for transportation include those of income, race, and place. By including these new categories, PSRC goes beyond identification of one or two measures related to equity, and has begun to evaluate as many measures as possible through what is sometimes characterized as an 'equity lens.'" Considering how large a population has access and functional needs - and the rates at which that segment is growing due to multiple factors - that category deserves a place in these measurement evaluations. Please do not get hung up on the myth that you can't ask questions related to disability (for example) - you can! And the data is vital to have.</p> <p>Appendix B - The Equity Analysis is pretty well done, although it would benefit from a discussion of the intersectionality of race, disability, and poverty. The thing about disability is that it crosses all lines and can happen to anyone at any time - and it can be temporary or permanent. Having access to lots of resources can make living with disability easier - but doesn't remove barriers like no curb ramps, inaccessible transit options, or planning documents not accessible to screen readers. Another reason disability should be included comprehensively and not in an appendix.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278107	10	[anonymous]		<p>Regarding: "The USDOT Order requires agencies to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide meaningful opportunities for public involvement by members of minority populations and low-income populations during the development of programs, policies, and activities. • Provide the public, including members of minority and low-income populations, access to public information concerning human health or environmental impacts of programs, policies, and activities. Such information must address the concerns of minority and low-income populations for the proposed action." <p>I do not see any evidence of "meaningful opportunities for public involvement" by members of the communities of people with disabilities - or others, really. Was specific outreach to the Deaf population done, for example? A meeting held with ASL and CART planned for and advertised as being available? Were all public meetings held in accessible buildings? Was childcare provided so people with limited resources could participate without added cost burden? Were notices provided in alternate languages? Was this Plan made available to the public in alternative formats and languages without having to request those "specially"? - having to do so put additional burdens on the public that could be addressed with good planning and outreach practices.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC conducted extensive direct engagement with members of the public during development of and review of the draft Regional Transportation Plan. For a summary, see Appendix C, Public Involvement and Outreach.
278107	11	[anonymous]		<p>Appendix B page 17: "As a region, the number of persons with one or more disabilities as a share of total population is declining. This is consistent with King and Snohomish counties which have declined by 5 and 4 percent respectively. The shares in both Kitsap and Pierce counties have risen between 2011 and 2015." PLEASE be very careful about assumptions made with disability data. It is widely recognized - especially within the disability field - that this data is highly unreliable. Most of it is coming from the American Community Survey - self-reported data that is highly under-reported. In addition, there has been a decline in collecting disability data on the more local levels, due to misunderstanding of HIPPA and other health/security-related regulations. For example, the City of Seattle does not collect any disability-related data, making it very difficult to quantify citizen needs or document that it is appropriately including people with disabilities in its planning, outreach, services, or other activities. Additionally, given that anyone can become disabled at any time, projecting that rates of disability are going down in a region is misguided and inaccurate, at best.</p>	Special Needs Transportation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278107	12	[anonymous]		<p>Regional Forums - please consider participating regularly with RARET - Regional Alliance for Resilient and Equitable Transportation - covers King, Snohomish, and Pierce Counties and addresses transportation issues for the whole range of people with access and functional needs. Staffed by Hopelink.</p>	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278107	13	[anonymous]		<p>"Digital and Electronic Materials PowerPoint Presentations" - I was at a couple of those. PowerPoint presentations are pretty pictures for people who can see - but at the ones I attended, the presenter did not make the presentation accessible, completely leaving out audience members who were blind or low-vision. At the very least, they should be describing the visuals and the information/context meant to be conveyed.</p>	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC is committed to continuing to improve the accessibility of our materials.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
278107	14	[anonymous]		Oh - and - nice that a Library is open to go and ask for documents, but people living in poverty are likely not able to get downtown M-F 9-5 (when they are working) - so, that is not very helpful. The website is also not accessible for screen readers - try taking the "no mouse" test - it is impossible to navigate without sight. (It is Federally required to be WCAG 2.0 AA complaint - but is not!) This might help: https://www.boia.org/ada-compliant-website-are-required-to-meet-wcag-2.0-aa-guidelines?utm_campaign=Bing%20Paid%20Search&utm_source=ppc "Since 2009, PSRC has offered web streaming of board meetings" - AWESOME! Is it captioned?	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278107	15	[anonymous]		Re: "Direct Engagement with Special Needs and Environmental Justice Populations" Here, I expected to see that you: included notices of public accommodation in all outreach materials; understood the need for ASL/CART/ALD at meetings; provided for captioned videos and broadcasted meetings; held meetings in accessible locations and at accessible days and times; identified and removed other barriers to participation like the need for transportation, childcare, or other supportive services. I saw none of that information, and therefore no evidence you accomplished inclusive outreach.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC conducted extensive direct engagement with members of the public during development of and review of the draft Regional Transportation Plan, and made materials available in alternative formats upon request. For a summary, see Appendix C, Public Involvement and Outreach.
278109	1	[anonymous]		1) This plan is incredibly Seattle centric and does next to nothing to relieve known geographical choke points in Snohomish County nor does it address West/East travel except by more buslines that will transit the known unimproved Choke points,	Congestion	General Comment	There are a variety of investments proposed in the locations you reference; please refer to the projects web map at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
278109	2	[anonymous]		2) Where road improvements are identified, the estimated capacity guess does not seem to reflect reality and since I am not seeing the method for estimating trips and there is an overly reliant wish that someone living in Everett will want to go to Redmond via Seattle (single trip taking longer than paying the HOV toll today), I believe this to be unrealistic given this northern areas historic reluctance to give up cars, lack of meaningful infrastructure improvements and total disregard for moving individuals from West to East.	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278109	3	[anonymous]		3) This plan reads like a well constructed PR work and makes mention of involving the public in the planning process but since the meetings all seem to be held either during the commuting hours, in places relatively inaccessible to the users, and extreme lack of advertising as to when and where these meeting are/located, this will continue to be a Seattle Centric plan especially with the almost total lack of Northern representation on the boards.	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The PSRC's boards include representatives from all four counties: King, Pierce, Snohomish and Kitsap. In addition, the plan is developed input from transportation agency staff throughout the region. Data used to support the plan is based on the transportation surveys conducted by people who use the system throughout the region - data that is used to develop the plan and forecast future needs.
278109	4	[anonymous]		4) Why is this plan not taking into account increased use of heavy rail with stops in Stanwood and Marysville/Tulalip? Or even commuter trains from Everett Station to Boeing using existing rail lines?	Freight / Rail	General Comment	The 2040 regional transit network and the passenger rail components of the plan incorporate the latest plans of the region's public transportation providers. These plans include expansion of Sounder commuter rail service on heavy rail and WSDOT is planning for additional intercity passenger rail service. However, the specific heavy rail services noted in this comment are not included at present.
278109	5	[anonymous]		Additionally, not improving Lake Stevens (Granite Falls (Affordable housing)) east west transit before 2025 will not help if the goal is really to improve transit to work centers.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278109	6	[anonymous]		With the greatly increased numbers of commuters from Sultan/Monroe/Snohomish, there seems to be very little in this plan to accommodate or improve those daily commutes to eastside locations of Redmond or Boeing Everett.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
278179	1	Robert Ortblad		<p>Seattle Times Op Ed</p> <p>Commute like a Scandinavian in a tunnel under Puget Sound Originally published October 27, 2017</p> <p>Imagine crossing from Seattle to Bainbridge Island in less than 10 minutes for a toll of less than \$10. Twin two-lane tunnels would cost commuters less and allow 6,000 vehicle trips per hour for 24 hours a day. It would reduce crossing times from hours to minutes. The six ferries serving central Puget Sound to Bainbridge, Bremerton and Kingston can carry only 1,100 vehicle trips per hour.</p> <p>Although a Seattle to Bainbridge trip for a vehicle and driver costs only \$11.80, the true cost is closer to \$30, because fares cover only 42 percent of state ferry costs, if you include capital expenses. The Washington State Department of Transportation’s biennial budget projects a \$506 million dollar loss for the ferry system.</p> <p>A tunnel that entered at Smith Cove, near the Magnolia bridges, and emerged directly west on Bainbridge Island’s State Highway 305 would be six miles long. It would descend more than 700 feet below Puget Sound. Scandinavian contractors have proved subsea tunnels can be economically built for \$37 million per two-lane mile. Twin two-lane tunnels to Bainbridge, at \$50 million per mile, would cost \$600 million. A replacement of ferries by a tunnel often doubles crossings in a few years. Projecting only a 25 percent increase would give 15 million annual crossings, at \$10 per person it would produce \$150 million in toll revenue. In addition, a tunnel could help solve waterfront traffic congestion at the Alaskan Way ferry terminal by relocating traffic away from the central business district.</p> <p>A tunnel would allow the reassignment of six ferries, with a replacement value of \$950 million, eliminating annual capital costs of \$200 million for years. This alone would offset the costs. These six ferries account for 50 percent of all crossings. Their replacement by a tunnel could reduce annual operating expense by \$100 million.</p> <p>Last summer I drove around Iceland’s scenic ring road. Just north of Reykjavick I entered the subsea Hvalfjorour</p>	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278181	1	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	The PSRC was the driving force behind the third runway at SeaTac Airport. Residents who would be directly affected by the runway were told that it was constructed to permit simultaneous landings during low-visibility weather. Residents were told that because of this, it would only be used during low-visibility weather. Given that this was an outright lie, why should anyone believe anything published by the PSRC?	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278181	2	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	How do you plan to keep the user-based funding system from being regressive? As it is, the wealthy can afford express toll lanes while those of low income cannot. Moreover, many people who are relegated to low-wage jobs cannot afford to live near where they work. User fees will penalize them, providing a disincentive, if not an outright barrier, to working.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.
278181	3	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	The document desperately needs a glossary of terms. It is unreasonable to assume that the reader will know many of the terms and organizations that are referenced. The first occurrence of a glossary entry should be hyperlinked, or better yet, show a "balloon" callout when the mouse pointer hovers over it (thus saving the reader the need to directly consult the glossary).	Other / miscellaneous	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will work to provide a glossary or other source of clarification to be more helpful to the reader.
278181	4	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	The document should incorporate hyperlinks where it cross-references material beyond that incorporated in the document.	Other / miscellaneous	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will work to provide direct hyperlinks where appropriate in the final document.
278181	5	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	3. Caption the photos!	Equity	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. PSRC will add photo captions in the final document.
278181	6	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 1: P1: Define "sustainable." It's a word that can mean many things. What does it mean in this context?	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Please note that on page 2 of Chapter 1, the description of a sustainable transportation system is provided in greater detail.
278181	7	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 1: P4: Physical design guidelines 8-10 are nebulous. What does "manage parking" mean? What are the "benefits" of on-street parking?	Parking	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. See Chapter 2, pp. 40-41 for a brief discussion of parking management. Transportation planning literature widely cites a number of benefits of on-street parking, e.g. https://www.planning.dot.gov/documents/transplanning/onstreetpkg.htm , and https://www.planetizen.com/node/31274
278181	8	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 1: P10: What is the "Growing Transit Communities Partnership?"	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Additional background on the Growing Transit Communities partnership is provided in that section of the draft plan.
278181	9	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 1: P13: The term "Amazing Place" is an example of something that needs a hyperlink and a glossary entry.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Amazing Place is the recently adopted regional economic strategy.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
278181	10	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 1: P15: Although "Federal environmental justice guidelines define minority populations to include Black, American Indian and Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and Hispanic people and low-income populations to include anyone who is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines," environmental justice also applies to the operation of SeaTac Airport, whose neighboring communities bear a disproportionate level of the deleterious effects of its operation.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278181	11	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 1: P17: There is a reference to a "regional travel model." Is this described anywhere?	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	Appendix R provides a summary of the analysis tools used by PSRC, and the PSRC website contains background information on our models in much greater detail.
278181	12	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 1: P19: "Air Quality" assessments should also include particulates and aerosols generated by aircraft operations.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	PSRC is responsible for estimating emissions from on-road vehicles. We do partner with and assist other regional and state agencies on broader air quality issues and other sources of emissions. There are regional and state emissions inventories that include aviation sources developed by these partner agencies.
278181	13	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 2: P26: “All agencies and jurisdictions should be encouraged to demonstrate the use of maintenance management systems and, for roadways, pavement management systems.” What are these? Provide examples.	Maintenance and Preservation	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will provide additional clarifications in the final document.
278181	14	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 2: P33: There don’t appear to be any references to Figures 6 and 7.	Other / miscellaneous	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will work to provide additional clarity in the final document.
278181	15	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 2: P46-49: Figures such as 8, 9, 10, and 11 should be interactive. Tapping on a project call out should take the reader to more information about it. (There should also exist a link back to the document.)	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
278181	16	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 2: P54: “The region should maximize aviation capacity within the existing regional airport system before constructing new airports.” This implies that PSRC is advocating a “do nothing” strategy until we’re faced with a capacity crisis. PSRC should advocate a policy that seeks to get out in front of the problem.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning.
278181	17	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 2: P54: “The state will play a lead role in addressing aviation capacity needs and place a priority on funding and planning the state’s air transportation system.” And just how is this supposed to happen?	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The Washington State Department of Transportation will coordinate with PSRC in preparation of the study.
278181	18	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	The entire section on aviation makes zero mention of the considerable surface transportation impacts associated with SeaTac Airport. If PSRC genuinely cared about “environmental justice,” this would have been given serious attention.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The anticipated regional aviation baseline study will include an assessment of multimodal ground access to airports. The plan includes support for the roads, bridges, bus and rail systems that connect the region to SeaTac Airport.
278181	19	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	PP58-60: Consider moving freight through Grant County instead of SeaTac. Let Eastern Washington share in the goodness.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The regional aviation baseline study will include cargo and will benefit from the statewide cargo study being conducted by the state's legislature's Joint Transportation Committee.
278181	20	Mark Proulx	None - private citizen	Chapter 3: P63: Until PSRC demonstrates some semblance of leadership by advocating a progressive Washington State income tax, the other financing schemes discussed here will invariably punish those who can least afford to pay.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
279828	1	Scott Bonjukian, Patrick Burns, McCaela Daffern, Evan Fischer, David Hancock	5 different people submitted this same comment.	<p>I am commenting on several Interstate 5 freeway projects: project 4198 (Lake City Way interchange lane extensions), project 4200 (reconstructing the Mercer Street and SR-520 interchanges), project 4250 (SR-520 corridor reconstruction), project 5508 (adding a northbound lane between Seneca Street and Mercer Street), and project 5679 (an infill light rail station at Seattle's NE 130th Street),</p> <p>As a Seattle resident, I challenge PSRC, WSDOT, Sound Transit, SDOT, and other partner agencies to make these projects contingent upon designs which accommodate future freeway lids which reduce air pollution and noise, improve mobility, and provide new land for air rights development. The City of Seattle has agreed to conduct a lid feasibility study valued at \$1.5M starting in 2018, so lids are in the region's future. It is imperative that these projects appropriately configure Interstate 5 for future generations.</p> <p>To go a step further, I strongly request all of these projects include lid implementation. In the 21st century no recessed urban freeway should be built or improved without the community benefits and environmental mitigation that lids provide. Building lids concurrently with roadway work can also save costs for all agencies involved. And while we need to improve our regional transportation network, we also need to ensure that network promotes healthy people and thriving communities.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
279834	1	Mel Roberts	Kent Bike Adv Board	<p>Appendix L page 16 "1028 year error"</p> <p>route of the Puget Sound Electric Railway. The trolley ran between Tacoma and Seattle from 1902 to 1028. The 18.1-mile facility runs nearly straight and level along the length of the Green River Valley from Tukwila to south King County. The route connects the cities of Tukwila, Kent,</p>	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for the correction. We will address this in the final plan.
279846	1	Mary jo burns	Lid I-5	Please add my name to those supporting the Lid I5 group. I strongly urge - and will be working for - future freeway projects that have designs which incorporate freeway lids.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
279928	1	Sam Phillips		There is a lot of demand for the Kingston-Edmonds ferry to access the Olympic Peninsula, especially in the summer. The maps do not include the corridor between Kingston and the Hood Canal Bridge. The plan should consider this corridor.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
279928	2	Sam Phillips		Many rights of way dead end. The plan should consider a strategy to connect rights of ways to provide alternative local road transportation to avoid congestion in corridors.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
279943	1	Snoqualmie Valley Transportation, Amy Biggs	Snoqualmie Valley Transportation	<p>Not sure who is collecting info on the proposed transit plan but I have been reading it and spotted this on page 32. Thought you might like to know:</p> <p>"SPATIAL GAPS IN THE CENTRAL PUGET SOUND REGION</p> <p>*Redevelopment of fixed-route transit service since the recent recession has focused on more urban areas making it increasingly difficult to connect rural clients and riders to areas well served by fixed-route transit. This problem is particularly evident in areas outside of transit district boundaries (see Figure 3-1). As a result, travel is cumbersome for transit-dependent populations who live outside of urbanized areas and may require multiple transfers."</p> <p>The document then goes on the show, in figure 3-1, the transit district boundaries. The challenge here is that, when we are talking about rural clients who cannot get transportation, we are talking about people who live within the transit district boundaries. So either this needs to be reworded or it's not in keeping with the realities of what folks in our area are facing. Make sense?</p>	Transit	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. This language, found in Appendix H: Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan, will be updated in the final plan to clarify that spatial gaps exist in all rural areas of the region.
279947	1	Kitsap Transit, Edward Coviello	Kitsap Transit	Transit service between Bremerton and Silverdale is planned in our Long Range Transit Plan as a BRT/high-capacity route linking the two Regional Centers by 2040. This service concept is missing from Figure 9: Kitsap County Key Investments, on page 47. The project is listed in the Regional Capacity Projects List as Project ID 5318.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
279947	2	Kitsap Transit, Edward Coviello	Kitsap Transit	The Poulsbo to Bainbridge Island BRT/high-capacity transit Project ID 5319 is missing from both Figure 9 and Figure 7:	Project Specific	Technical Correction	Figure 9 is intended to illustrate example projects, rather than be a full listing of all projects. We will review Figure 7 and update it to incorporate this project.
279947	3	Kitsap Transit, Edward Coviello	Kitsap Transit	Regional Integrated Transit Network, on page 36. Further, the Southworth to Seattle Fast Ferry, Project ID 5367 is missing from Figure 9.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
279947	4	Kitsap Transit, Edward Coviello	Kitsap Transit	<p>Figure 4: Selected Existing and Potential Transit Station Areas, on page 11 is missing the Wheaton Way and Silverdale Transit Center station areas. Both Transit Centers are planned to be served with a BRT/high-capacity transit route by 2040.</p> <p>The Wheaton Way Transit Centers is already generating nearby housing development interest prior to its construction.</p>	Project Specific	Technical Correction	We will update Figure 4 to address this in the final plan.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
279947	5	Kitsap Transit, Edward Coviello	Kitsap Transit	Figure 20: Map of Centers Connected by High-Capacity Transit, is missing the Silverdale to Bremerton BRT /high-capacity transit link. Kitsap Transit plans to have BRT/high-capacity transit linking the Silverdale and Bremerton Regional Growth Centers by 2040. The Poulsbo to Bainbridge Island BRT/high-capacity transit project is also missing.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	We will update Figure 4 to address this in the final plan.
281068	1	Reiner Decher		Looking at the larger picture, it seems that Sound Transit seems unwilling to consider existing rights of way to outlying communities, even as these are growing and only need a traffic capacity provided by a single track line. I am thinking of Woodinville to Redmond or Kirkland and Bellevue to Renton. Some communities have taken steps to make trails of these ROWs and that, in my opinion, will prevent them from ever being usable as rail corridors again. I fault PSRC for not stepping in and clarifying the need for these corridors and prevent their loss.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281071	1	Gregory Quetin		In general the future of transportation in the Puget Sound must become carbon free to do our part in avoiding climate change. For this reason, in addition to the costs of freeway expansion and maintenance I believe we should commit to not expanding any freeways or highways going forward. Instead, the increased demand for transportation in the region should be approached with congestion tolls, expansion of bus and rail services in such a way as to increase the freedom of people to move around the region and support the vibrant economy here. In parallel with this we need to address the scars in our communities caused by urban freeways.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281071	2	Gregory Quetin	This comment also matches communication 279828 aside from one word.	<p>Specifically, I am commenting on several Interstate 5 freeway projects: project 4198 (Lake City Way interchange lane extensions), project 4200 (reconstructing the Mercer Street and SR-520 interchanges), project 4250 (SR-520 corridor reconstruction), project 5508 (adding a northbound lane between Seneca Street and Mercer Street), and project 5679 (an infill light rail station at Seattle's NE 130th Street),</p> <p>As a Seattle resident, I challenge PSRC, WSDOT, Sound Transit, SDOT, and other partner agencies to make these projects contingent upon designs which accommodate future freeway lids which reduce air pollution and noise, improve mobility, and provide new land for air rights development. The City of Seattle has agreed to conduct a lid feasibility study valued at \$1.5M starting in 2018, so lids are in the region's future. It is imperative that these projects appropriately configure Interstate 5 for future generations.</p> <p>To go a step further, I strongly request all of these projects include lid implementation. In the 21st century no recessed urban freeway should be built or improved without the community benefits and environmental mitigation that lids provide. Building lids concurrently with roadway work can also save costs for all agencies involved. And while we need to improve our regional transportation network, we also need to ensure that network promotes healthy people and thriving communities. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281249	1	[anonymous]		It is great that the region is committed to improving transit. However, this plan, like many others, is completely insufficient in regards to planning public transit investment. We need a fully built out subway system connecting all major urban neighborhoods and a commuter rail system to connect the suburbs to the central cities. The existing light rail infrastructure is great as it serves a vital need, but it is not enough. And furthermore, to build the same light rail infrastructure into the suburbs (as with ST3), is irresponsible. LRT is an insufficient transit mode to serve suburban destinations like it is planned to. The regional vision for transit needs to address more concerns. BRT and RapidRide upgrades are perhaps the least possible solution transportation agency could come up with and yet this is what we have... A plan that basically proposes upgrading many of the busiest bus lines to BRT or RapidRide and repairing aging highways. But this would barely be enough to accommodate today's population, let alone 1million more people and 800k more people commuting to work. A true rail transit network must be built in the region in the next 20 years, and the existing long range plans of Sound Transit, Metro and other transit agencies are not sufficient.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281290	1	Michaela Barrett		<p>There are already voices screaming that because this plan does not focus on building new lanes and roads, it is the product of "anti-car" ideologues. Ignore them! We cannot road build our way out of congestion.</p> <p>This plan is a good balance of maintaining and improving the existing road structure while pushing ahead on ambitious mass transit, which is what will really keep people moving as our region grows. Keep up the good job!</p>	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281303	1	[anonymous]		The plan needs to understand that people need to be able to drive to where they want to go when they want to get there. I use public transportation frequently and more than most but I still need to use my car regularly to run errands, go to events, make appointments or take care of other personal/professional obligations. The plan needs to put more emphasis on improving roads and increasing capacity for cars.	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281303	2	[anonymous]		Environmental arguments against such improvements, while valid to some extent, fail to account for the fact that by 2040 it is likely that the bulk of cars being operated will be fully electric or otherwise not running on fossil fuels. Thus, that increased capacity will cause excessive pollution are overstated.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281303	3	[anonymous]		Claims that you can't "build out of congestion" are also misplaced. Even if road improvements will not completely eliminate congestion they are still absolutely necessary to address the current state of complete gridlock that is present on our roads at an ever increasing number of hours on both weekdays and weekends. As it stands this traffic nightmare that we live with has substantially lessened the quality of life that longtime residents of the Puget Sound region used to enjoy. The PSRC owes it to the residents of this region to do all it can to improve the quality of life with regard to transportation and not maintain strict adherence to an ideology that simply does not reflect reality.	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The draft plan contains a wide variety of investments, including roadway improvements at both the local and regional scale.
281304	1	Stevan Gorcester	WSDOT (consultant)	Great job on a very extensive plan!	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281304	2	Stevan Gorcester	WSDOT (consultant)	Project 1722 incorporates by necessity the relocation the I-5/70th Avenue E bridge. Please add it to the project description (Included are new interchanges at I-5, SR 509 and 54th Avenue and the relocation and widening of 70th Avenue E bridge). Also, please add it to the RTP project map.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	This element was not included as part of the original project submittal; we have worked with the project sponsor on the correct description and confirmed there will no impact to our air quality conformity finding with this correction.
281309	1	[anonymous]		The obsession with bicycle lanes and the absurd opinion that more than an insignificant number of people will ever ride bicycles in these lanes is ridiculous. The topography of the Puget Sound area is not flat enough for extensive bike riding. Riding bicycles requires physical effort and frequent sweating. Plus it takes time away from using electronic devices so biking will never justify the provisions and expense to support it.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281309	2	[anonymous]		Trolley and light rail ridership will never justify the resources it requires.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281309	3	[anonymous]		Toll roads exist primarily to generate revenue, redistribute wealth and provide a commuting advantage for the wealthy.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.
281309	4	[anonymous]		Reducing street and highway regular lanes only increases congestion, travel time and increases wasteful and unhealthy gas and diesel engine idling.	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281309	5	[anonymous]		Use Seattle as an example of what not to do when developing transportation policy. Recognize the fact that the glaciers severely restrict east-west travel and stop trying to introduce modes of travel and policy that ignore this geological fact. Vehicle parking must be provided for public transportation to be usable. People in this area will walk no more than five blocks to reach public transportation. Age, physical health weather, time required, things being carried, errands and topography make this a fact. Ignoring this means a sizable portion of the public needs to drive to overcome these realities.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281309	6	[anonymous]		Then there is the fact that safety issues exist on public transportation. I use public transportation less now because it's becoming more difficult for me to protect myself and fellow travelers on public transportation as I age. When younger I tolerated a lot more because nobody dared hassle me or people with me. Now fewer recognize they shouldn't hassle me. Now more unsavory people are also present in the community and more frequently ride public transportation during the day. As a result I no longer take my granddaughters or visitors to downtown Seattle. I don't want them to see me resort to protecting them.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281309	7	[anonymous]		The silly direction Seattle is going relative to transportation is disturbing because they are ignoring the reality of local geography and desired life styles. This ain't the flat topography of the old cities of Europe with people used to living on top of each other. I've visited my European relatives so I understand our differences.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281310	1	Cris Horbelt	Taxpayer	[EXPLETIVE]. You've sat around with your thumb up your [EXPLETIVE] watching traffic get increasingly worse, you've let the GMA constrain building and focus housing into limited areas making prices skyrocket and now you want the rest of us to pay even more? On top of that worthless [EXPLETIVE] of a governors "energy tax"? [EXPLETIVE]. Come and try and take more money. I will evade every tax you [EXPLETIVE] try. ETOLLING? Try it - I'll just stop paying for tabs too. [EXPLETIVE].	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281311	1	Michael Stewart	private citizen	The so-called regional transportation "plan" appears to assume that automobiles can be forced to disappear through political pressure. That is a foolish assumption in Seattle and the Puget Sound region, especially in the absence of effective public transportation. Over-crowded busses and removal of parking does not equal a "plan" - get real and deal with the reality that many people actually need a car, and will continue to have & use one.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281312	1	Jeanine SanClemente	Mothers Out Front Puget Sound	Please consider the poorest of us when you look at long-term transportation planning and ways to fund these plans. High urban housing costs force the poorest to live far away from their jobs and to work in the gig economy, which requires traveling from job to job. The current transportation plan does little to help these workers as it focuses largely on heavily populated areas, not outlying areas with the lowest housing costs. Charging the working poor per mile driven is unconscionable and elitist, and only deepens the financial divide between wealthy and poor.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72.
281317	1	[anonymous]		I am opposed to the proposal of additional toll roads, increasing tolls on existing tolled roads and especially, opposed to the idea of pay-per-mile driven fee. We already pay a high gas tax, increased property taxes to pay for Sound Transit Light Rail and high tolls for use of the HOV lanes. People cannot afford to be continually taxed and charged for everything they do. People cannot afford to live near their jobs which requires them to travel on our roads whether on Sound Transit, bus or automobile.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281317	2	[anonymous]		Improve the bus system and existing Park & Rides. The lot at 70th St. & I-405 sits half empty most days. Add more buses.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281317	3	[anonymous]		This plan will cause drivers to be priced out of even using the roads. As it stand, using the HOV from Bothell to downtown Seattle can cost over \$15 during peak hours. Toll roads to the airport would lead to over a \$30 or more trip. And that would be just tolls not even including a pay-per-mile charge.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281326	1	[anonymous]		I-5 is neglected in this plan. I-5 is one of the major regional backbones in this area supporting not only individual travel but also business. It is unrealistic and irresponsible to not begin planning for an expansion of I-5 given the projected growth in the area.	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	There are a variety of improvements proposed by the Washington State Department of Transportation on I-5. Refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information. See Appendix I, which includes an I-5 Action Plan.
281327	1	[anonymous]		I am a rural citizen that has to commute for work as there are NO options for public or shared transportation where I live. Please consider the tax paying residents carefully when making your decisions, I pay my taxes for use and maintenance of public roadways already, the tolls are ridiculous and costing tax paying citizens additional congestion and time already. Incorporating additional tolls and/or pay by mile will only compound the problems.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72.
281327	2	[anonymous]		Instead [of adding tolls & pay by mile] use the outrageous amounts of money you are already making on said existing tolls and taxes and use the funds towards increasing the rail/train system to cover larger areas	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281327	3	[anonymous]		keep in mind Park-n-rides need to be increased both location and sizes as well (currently all the park-n-rides near my are full by 7:45AM-thus causing more traffic).	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Please note the Regional Transit and Parking Strategy incorporates park & rides and there are several park & ride projects included in Appendix G: Regional Capacity Project list.
281327	4	[anonymous]		Many people (especially with children) cannot afford to live in the metro areas anymore, thus rural commuters are on the rise. Please fix the problem productively and without additional cost to us.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281328	1	Sylvia Schweinberger	Ms.	I notice the executive council and the executive board are made up of mayors and politicians and a few specialized groups (Cascade Bicycle Club and Muckleshoot Indian Tribe) but I don't see any specialists on Transportation - and there should be a lot - I would like to see Transportation Specialists on this board.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281328	2	Sylvia Schweinberger	Ms.	<p>Page 2 Paragraph 1 does not include one of the largest increasers of greenhouse gasses and that is poor traffic flow.</p> <p>We need to improve traffic flow all over the city of Seattle. This can be done using light timing systems, increasing the width of major arterials like I-5 and I-99. Also increasing the width of 4 lane arterials (15th Avenue NW, Roosevelt Avenue, Montlake Blvd, 23rd Avenue East, etc.) by looking for ways to move bike lanes to side streets instead of sharing the main arterials. And installing pedestrian bridges to reduce crosswalk lights along arterials. Traffic Flow can also be improved by increasing street parking and this must be done by requiring new buildings to provide parking for their tenants/customers in underground or above ground garages. Providing more off street parking will free up the on street parking so cars don't have to drive so long to find a parking spot. All these things can reduce the amount of green house gases by getting drivers where they need to go as fast as possible, thus reducing the amount of carbon exhausted. Please include improving traffic flow as a high priority for funding.</p> <p>In Seattle, we need to look at the speed limit reduction and whether it decreased the amount of accidents in the City. If it did not - put the speed limits back to where they were so that people can get where they are going faster and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	Parking	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The plan identifies multiple benefits of efficiency improvements, including air quality benefits. See Chapter 1, pp. 19-21, Air Quality and Climate Change, Chapter 2, pp. 31-34, Implement Efficiency Improvements, Appendix D, Air Quality Conformity Analysis, and Appendix N, Technology.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281328	3	Sylvia Schweinberger	Ms.	We also need to improve safety at bottlenecks along freeways and arterials. These happen at high use freeway exits which don't have enough traffic lanes or good control of traffic flow. These can cause long lines of cars stopped along a freeway or arterial usually during rush hour times and can cause collisions due to fast moving traffic having to slow down suddenly. Safety at these congested areas should have a high priority for funding.	Safety	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281329	1	Steve Stroiney		The draft plan moves us in the right direction - I'm broadly in support of the priorities and courses of action.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281329	2	Steve Stroiney		I'd encourage emphasis on a few key features: (1) Encouraging land use patterns that enable more people to live closer to their travel destinations, thereby reducing the number and length of vehicle trips.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan was designed to support the region's adopted long-range growth strategy, VISION 2040. See Chapter 1, pp. 12, Supporting VISION 2040. PSRC has begun a project to update the growth strategy through the year 2050.
281329	3	Steve Stroiney		I'd encourage emphasis on a few key features: ... (2) Accelerating the delivery of currently-planned and new transit projects.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281329	4	Steve Stroiney		I'd encourage emphasis on a few key features: ... (3) Tolling on roadways where necessary to relieve congestion.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281330	1	Trevor Reed		Please continue the focus on user fees for automobiles and increase their scope/applicability. At present, the proposal does not go far enough in regards to demand management and to improve the operational efficiencies of existing assets. Greater focus needs to be given to congestion tolling	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281330	2	Trevor Reed		Additionally, greater density and development around transit needs to be adopted.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan was designed to support the region's adopted long-range growth strategy, VISION 2040. See Chapter 1, pp. 12, Supporting VISION 2040. PSRC has begun a project to update the growth strategy through the year 2050.
281330	3	Trevor Reed		Thank you for the focus on trip reduction, the construction of transit-centric development and focus on non-motorized modes. I have my masters in transportation policy, and from reviewing the document, my only concerning is it doesn't go far enough in curtailing car usage.	Multi-modal	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281333	1	[anonymous]		I detect a mode of thinking that wants to wish cars away. This is unrealistic. Too many people need to drive, because of children, or need to carry heavy materials, or because they work in a location far from transit. You need to make room for cars.	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281335	1	[anonymous]		Every picture in the document has the sun shining bright. Do you actually live here? What about the days (like today) with over 1" of rain expected? Temps in the 40s? How does your biking plan work then? Bikes are not real transportation (and I ride one). They should not get fixed infrastructure.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281335	2	[anonymous]		Put ALL money to fixing road conditions, signage, lane usages, and bus routes/lanes. Your policies are squeezing drivers with NO alternatives, our bus network is a complete joke. It's too slow, too infrequent, and because the road network is so poor (ever tried to go east-west in Seattle, north of ship canal?) it takes forever. put in real arterials (not road diets) that buses can use. Have buses actually run when scheduled (my "express" bus is cancelled at least 2x per 5 day workweek). And get them downtown fast. When it takes over 1 hour to get from an inner Seattle neighborhood to downtown via bus/rail then people will choose their cars. ALL.THE.TIME.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281335	3	[anonymous]		Add a ton more park n rides, that gets people onto transit and removes cars from downtown core. But when it's too hard to actually get to transit, people won't use it. If I have to take a 30 min bus, then wait 10 min for a train, it doesn't matter than the train ride to downtown is just a quick 8 min, I've already burned so much time getting to train I'm much better off having driven myself.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Please note the Regional Transit and Parking Strategy incorporates park & rides and there are several park & ride projects included in Appendix G: Regional Capacity Project list.
281336	1	Casimir Krzyminski		Some real consideration should be given to a major go-around highway. The 405 was built as a go-around for I-5 but over the years built a metropolitan life of it's own. If a go-around highway could be built to remove the traffic that is only passing through the Seattle metro area I think it would help greatly. Starting south of Tacoma and ending north of Everett. Perhaps the current Hwy 18 could be used as a base for this go-around. Removing the passing through vehicles would greatly help the congestion.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281338	1	City of Burien, Brian Roberts	City of Burien	1. Burien's primary commuter route to the Duwamish Industrial Center and to Downtown Seattle is the corridor composed of SR 509, East Marginal Way/SR 99, and /or 1st Ave S. This corridor is critical for both transit and passenger vehicles, and has operated over capacity for many years. Transit reliability is particularly impacted because there is only a short 1 mile segment of HOV lanes across the 1st Avenue S bridge(s). No HOV or BAT lanes exist at all on 1st Ave E or on East Marginal Way between SR 509 and Spokane St. There are no HOV lanes of SR 509 south of the Cloverdale St interchange. When the SR 509 extension to I-5 (project ID 1613) opens in 2030, corridor capacity will be further degraded	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281338	2	City of Burien, Brian Roberts	City of Burien	Burien notes with dismay that there are no capacity improvement projects listed in Appendix G except project ID 5635, SODO Area ITS. This City of Seattle project is described as a freight mobility project, unlikely to benefit commuter throughput. If this is a Regional Transportation Plan, then it needs to include cross-jurisdictional projects to address the mass movement of Burien and vicinity community into and out of Seattle.	Project Specific	General Comment	PSRC worked with City of Burien staff to incorporate regional capacity projects sponsored by Burien and/or the Washington State Department of Transportation.
281338	3	City of Burien, Brian Roberts	City of Burien	2. Burien is resubmitting for PSRC's consideration, City Council Resolution No. 396. Burien believes the Final Regional Transportation Plan should address the regions long-term aviation capacity needs. This effort will server the purposes of both future economic development and reduction of health-related impacts for communities proximate to airport facilities. Given the economic activity generated by the region's airports, and the surface transportation needed to access and service these facilities, their absence from the final Plan is a serious omission. Please see the attached document for the full text of Resolution 396.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The region's aviation system is discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 53-54. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The study will include an evaluation of multimodal access to the region's airports.
281342	1	Ian Sullivan		I am pleased to see the focus given to clean transportation and mass transit. With ever-increasing congestion in the Puget Sound region as more people move here, our freeways and roads simply do not (and cannot) have the capacity to move everyone from the suburbs to the city centers. Accelerating the new rail lines in development must be a high priority, with good bus connections and ample park-and-rides provided at the major stations.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281361	1	Kelly Wardle		I encourage you to consider rethinking I-5 downtown entrances/exits. Some of the craziness on the highway downtown are from requiring vehicles to cross up to three lanes at a time. It not only would improve traffic flow, it would increase safety.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix I includes an I-5 Action Strategy led by the Washington State Department of Transportation.
281373	1	Richard Sandaas		Billions have been spent on highway projects in the region over the past few years: Waterfront tunnel, Mercer Mess, SR 520 and I 405 express lanes. In aggregate this has resulted in a net loss of general purpose lanes (the tunnel and Mercer) and status quo (SR 520 and I 405). With this expenditure of public funds on transportation projects the question is what are transportation planners thinking? PSRB had better face reality and deal with the need for more general purpose capacity.	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281374	1	Peter Kwon		On page 34 of the draft Regional Transportation Plan document which can be found here: https://transportationplan.participate.online/plan-document It states: "Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (Sea-Tac) is the region’s primary commercial service airport, serving almost 46 million passengers and more than 412,000 operations (take-offs and landings) in 2016. Sea-Tac also served 366,000 tons of air cargo in 2016." It also states: "Regional planning for future system needs embraces the strategies and recommendations contained in the state’s Long-Term Air Transportation Study in the Puget Sound completed in 2009." It goes on to state under "Planning for the future airport system is guided by the following regional policies:" "• The region should maximize aviation capacity within the existing regional airport system before constructing new airports. • The state will play a lead role in addressing aviation capacity needs and place a priority on funding and planning the state’s air transportation system. • When additional capacity is forecast to be needed, and no feasible airport capacity is available within the region, the state will take the lead role in addressing capacity needs, including by funding a site selection study for the placement of new airport(s) if no sponsor is available." The state’s Long-Term Air Transportation Study in the Puget Sound, which the PSRC's Regional Transportation Plan is referring to, found that Sea-Tac Airport is expected to exceed 106% capacity before 2025 in all three measured metrics: Aircraft Operations, Passenger Facilities, and Aircraft Parking and Storage. This is found in the Executive Summary, page 20 and 23: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/95B76DEF-C4FC-4700-991E-	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The final plan will include this new initiative.
281375	1	Jan Howard		I notice that there is discussion about "bike lanes" in this plan. Bicyclers need to start paying. Please ensure that bikers start paying their fare share of all of these improvements. If I, driving a car, must pay a license tab fee every year - then bikers need to start paying a fee every year for all of the upgrades and changes to roads to ensure they can bike safely.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281422	1	[anonymous]		Population/business growth in the region continues to put pressure on highway plans that have roots from 1950-60s planning. Small scale modifications will help some of the congestion drivers encounter. Sound Transit will not have a significant impact for the expense we support with our taxes; the congestion impact keeps growing and will not go away at this pace.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281422	2	[anonymous]		At some point our leaders will have to think more grandly; I-5 is over 50 years old and will need rebuilding over the next few years and ALL of our chips are bet on one major stretch of highway. 99 and the "wonderful" tunnel will have reduced capacity by 30% or so when we need to increase highway capacity for private vehicles, trucks and transit not to mention cutting off Ballard access to the south. 405 is over capacity much of the day already and another lane or two would be welcome as the Eastside expands	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281422	3	[anonymous]		Electric cars, buses and trucks will come along; self driving vehicles are in the future but they all have the same need as the gas era. These machines all need space on roads/highways! Yes, you can crowd self driving vehicles closer together at various speeds moving together on I-5, 405, 90 or 99 in the distant future, but Greenwood and Meridian will still be crowded.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281422	4	[anonymous]		It really is time with all this distant future planning to look at another north/south freeway. One goal could be to skirt Seattle so through traffic from BC to Portland doesn't have to do the downtown Seattle jog under the Convention Center. 405 doesn't do the job anymore. New highways could incorporate the advances/wiring/sensors needed for the future and allow the needed rebuilding/upgrades to existing highways. I am concerned that the anti-car groups have control over way to much of our regional planning, at least in Seattle they are in total control, and we have lost sight of the function of Transportation; to move people and products efficiently.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. In 2003 the State of Washington studied a potential route east of Interstate 405. The estimated cost was \$13-19 billion and the project was determined to be infeasible. The state currently has no plans to build a new route.
281441	1	Bryan Weinstein		population growth is going to happen in the next 20 years more on the eastside (as it has recently) than anywhere else. why are all transportation and rail investments being made in the dense city cores? instead investments should START at the outer spokes of the transportation hubs and work inwards. that places like Sammamish, Issaquah and Snohomish and other parts are getting investments only in 2040 is a poor use of money and poor engineering - by the time these investments come out east - the last prices are going to be limited due to build-up that will have already taken place in the region. this plan has flaws!	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281476	1	Tom Gaffney		It would be helpful to have a fleet of Neighborhood Local Buses whose mission would be to serve the much shorter neighborhood commutes - those journeys of less than two miles. Every neighborhood has certain activity centers, for example, in NE Seattle: U-Village, UW, Roosevelt-65th, 65th-23rd, Library, 35th-75th, 35th-84th, 35th-95th, Nathan Hale HS, Fred Meyer, 145th-QFC; 125th-15th, Northgate, 75th-Safeway, and Roosevelt HS (I'm sure I left some out). This could be considered the NE Cluster. Think of jitneys - not for the long haul into Seattle, but for the neighborhood hops. At the right price and with a 30 minute wait between buses, it could get all those neighborhood errand cars off the road.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281477	1	Michelle McVadon		I have lived at the south end of Beacon Ave S for 8 years. The noise and jet fuel smells have increased to really problematic levels in the last 2 years. I would plead with you to not expand any air traffic over this area. But to instead locate a new regional airport in a different location. Thank you for your consideration of this matter which is really important to our health and well being.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The new initiative will be included in the final plan.
281478	1	Margaret V		Happy to see more rapid transit being provided, but it is really too little too late for anyone but children at this point.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281478	2	Margaret V		Also, a majority of working people cannot walk or bike to work due to location, mobility issues and need for their auto for the workday. SOMETHING needs to be done about the highways or lack of them.	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281478	3	Margaret V		Adding more bike lanes downtown is a joke. People cannot move in downtown. It is a crime. Please rethink all your plans and come up with something more reasonable!	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281480	1	Deirdre Curle		As many residents in the South King County airport communities are painfully aware, Sea-Tac airport is already at maximum capacity. The time to site and build a second regional airport is now. We must start this process immediately and we must not delay this important project which will likely take another decade or two to complete. Please represent your constituents and put this in motion for the greater good. Thank you.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The new initiative will be included in the final plan.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281481	1	Charles Davis		Please develop a regional airport as an alternative to further expansion of Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Our location as a hub in the northwest corner of the country will only attract more air traffic and will only further congest the existing airport. It is important to plan now and implement soon before the current facility expansion (e.g., for international arrivals) becomes overcrowded. Air traffic will only increase, bringing more noise and air pollution to residents of the area. These are bad now and will get worse before a new regional airport can start to bring relief. Please assign a high priority to this request. Thank you.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The new initiative will be included in the final plan.
281483	1	Cameron Sparr		Please put tolls on both I-5 at Downtown Seattle and on I-90 on the floating bridge. I support doing this for many reasons: - I believe it would relieve congestion for the times that I do need to drive through Seattle (I would happily pay the tolls on those instances). - It would reduce vehicular greenhouse gas emissions by incentivizing public transit. - It would provide much-needed funding for expanding, improving, and maintaining the Seattle light-rail network.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281484	1	Sarah Plautz		We live under the current SeaTac traffic pattern & due environmental reasons (air & noise pollution) support working toward the addition of a second regional airport. Seattle is a community that is well aware of environmental concerns & we should plan for healthy future communities as well as mitigating current problems.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The new initiative will be included in the final plan.
281485	1	Nona		LISTEN: Why nothing for I-90 East? Traffic doesn't end at Bellevue Way where light rail exits 90. (which will benefit only downtown Bellevue and Microsoft) This entire catchment area along I-90 from Bellevue Way to North Bend is desperately in need of mass transit. We use the bus, but not enough of us do - this needs to change with increased services (like Issaquah Highlands directly to I-90 without that tedious time consuming stop at Issaquah Transit Center), ditto for direct service from P & R along I-90 at Preston, Snoqualmie, North Bend. Like it or not, people are moving east along 90 to these far out communities (Preston to North Bend), and presently they are entrenched car drivers. Give them a reasonable option with transit.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The plan includes additional transit for East King County, including light rail to Issaquah.
281485	2	Nona		Protect natural resources. Protect Mountain to Sound Greenway. ... Focus development in already developed areas, increase density. Protect rural areas from unplanned sprawl.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan was designed to support the region's adopted long-range growth strategy, VISION 2040. See Chapter 1, pp. 12, Supporting VISION 2040. PSRC has begun a project to update the growth strategy through the year 2050.
281485	3	Nona		Not a single mention of I-90 East corridor; focus has been on N-S from airport to UW. (Lakewood to ?) Has anyone LOOKED at I-90 congestion on road from Exit 25 to 405? This area is dangerous! Page 4: Please prioritize NEW INTERCHANGE AT EXIT 25, I-90 to Highway 18. This is an extremely dangerous area. AND it would cut down on the ~25 THOUSAND cars that commute through Issaquah every day. Issaquah can handle it's own traffic, but it can't handle the traffic of cars using our downtown as a short cut home. Yes it's nearly 25 thousand cars a day passing through Issaquah downtown from Exit 15 (using Newport Way to Issaquah Hobart Road) and Exit 17 (using Front Street to I-H road).	Project Specific	General Comment	Please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for information on improvements in this area; in particular, the Washington State Department of Transportation is proposing improvements at the I-90/SR 18 interchange.
281485	4	Nona		Disingenuous to self-congratulate "one of the largest commitments to new mass transit in the nation". Given that we are several decades behind other urban areas to fund and build mass transit. Odd way to spin it into patting ourselves on the back. Again in "More mass transit on the way" there's not a single mention of the I-90 east corridor. Do you think traffic ends or eases up at Bellevue Way or 405? Has anyone looked at growth projections for this area? Traffic load on I-90 for this KEY corridor?	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment on public transportation. Please note that the 2040 Regional Integrated Transit Network does account for Sound Transit's plans for high capacity transit on the I-90 corridor to Issaquah.
281485	5	Nona		Page 6: Prioritize Highway project # 2. Must we really wait 5 more years?	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281488	1	Mary Sorman		We have far too much congestion on the ground and in the skies. Neighborhoods over the flight paths ton Sea-Tac have become choked with horrific exhaust smell, increased noise and a big blow to the quality of life. Daily life under the increasing air traffic has plenty of studies to prove it's legitimacy. Seattle is growing too fast. We need an additional airport to help take the load off of Sea-Tac.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. This new initiative will be included in the final plan.
281490	1	Andrew Sang		I would like to voice my support for the general direction of this plan.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281490	2	Andrew Sang		I'm glad you're taking a more transit-focused approach than most other regions and also that you're using metrics such as "people moved per hour" and "goods moved per hour" instead of a rough analogue being "vehicles moved per hour." The fact that our region has moved beyond the simple level of service metric is already a good sign.	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281490	3	Andrew Sang		I believe that the PSRC needs to take a more active stance on land use policy in our region. Good land use is what will make or break our transportation system and it will be the number one determinant on whether we'll be able to achieve our goals. PSRC needs to move to ensure that transit brings folks where they need to be, and that housing is constructed over transit rich regions to the maximum that the market will supply and ensure that transit stations' utility isn't kneecapped by poor land use decision based on the vacillation of local politicians to the detriment of the entire region. We need communities that are built with the car as the auxiliary instead of primary mode of transportation, or even regions where it's unnecessary, and that may entail transit oriented development around high capacity high frequency transit, which certainly would be ideal, but it could also simply be development that has pass-through for bikes and pedestrians (see attached image), mix use bicycle/pedestrian oriented commercial activity inside neighborhoods, or transit privileges.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan was designed to support the region's adopted long-range growth strategy, VISION 2040. See Chapter 1, pp. 12, Supporting VISION 2040. PSRC has begun a project to update the growth strategy through the year 2050.
281490	4	Andrew Sang		<p>On the subject of our highways and cars in our cities, our usage of cars needs to be curtailed by lessening their subsidy. We subsidize cars to an unacceptable extent if we're going to be serious about reducing their usage, in the form of free parking and untolled freeways. We need to be charging an appropriate price for access to freeways that's reflective of the actual costs, and to charge for parking in neighborhood streets. In downtowns, we need to remove parking entirely and dedicate that space for transit, bikes, and pedestrians if we want to achieve the PSRC's slated objectives. We need to remove the subsidies cities give to drivers as well in the form of parking minimums. We all pay for parking when there are minimums in every capacity of our lives except as a driver, since those costs are passed onto consumers. Finally, we need WSDOT to stop subsidizing driving by pouring billions of tax dollars into untolled freeways, and instead we need them to channel that money into properly funding sound transit.</p> <p>These are objectives the PSRC will need to take a look at if you're serious about tackling sustainable transportation in the coming decades</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281495	1	Bill Hirt	N/A	<p>The Jan 11th Seattle Times Editorial “New Transportation Plan Must be Pragmatic” criticism of the Puget Sound Regional Council’s transportation plan is well founded. The premise for the plan is summarized in the following excerpt:</p> <p>There should be an increased reliance on express lane tolls and user fees, such as a road usage charge, that are phased in as toll system technology and user acceptance evolves over time. Toll and fee rates should be set in a manner that strives to improve travel benefits for users of the express toll lane system and manages system demand during peak periods of the day. The use of toll revenues should also evolve over time towards increasingly broader uses.</p> <p>The PRSC plan envisions \$27.6B of the \$39.9B in new revenue needed by 2040 will come from “Road usage charges”. They assume user acceptance will “evolve over time” allowing them to divert toll revenues towards “increasing broader uses”. They “strive to improve travel benefits for users of the express toll lane” but do nothing for those unwilling or unable to pay.</p> <p>Those assumptions, along with the assumption \$5.1B from a “Carbon Tax on Fuel,” seem somewhat “optimistic”. They project Sound Transit won’t need any new revenue, having \$61.6B to spend by 2040 with \$42.4B spent extending light rail.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281495	2	Bill Hirt	N/A	They propose to use the money to make “Key Investments”, in King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties on highways, transit, and local roadway and trail projects. What’s interesting is none of the PSRC King County Investments include projects for cross-lake commuters. They include light rail from Kirkland to Issaquah, but ignore East Link. They could have proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) for I-90 commuters that would have been infinitely better than light rail. Instead they proposed BRT for I-405 but nothing for SR 520: apparently ignoring the needs of cross-lake commuters from both sides of the lake.	Project Specific	General Comment	Please note that the Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
281495	3	Bill Hirt	N/A	They applaud, “Transit’s use in the central Puget Sound region grew at a faster rate than any of the 52 metropolitan areas with a population of more than one million people.” Yet the PSRC “Stuck in Traffic: 2015 Report” included a “pie chart” showing the percentage of transit riders had increased from 8.6% in 2010 to 9.8% in 2013, yet traffic delays between 2010 and 2014 increased by 52%. The Dec. 26th Seattle Times headline, “Everett to Seattle: 94 minutes in the morning” suggests 2016 transit ridership increase did little to reduce congestion.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281495	4	Bill Hirt	N/A	<p>The entire PSRC plan is predicated on people choosing to live within easy access to transit or to work;</p> <p>The strategy contains numeric guidance adopted for counties, cities, and towns to use as they develop new population and employment growth targets and update local comprehensive plans. These land use assumptions serve as the basis for local and regional transportation planning.</p> <p>Their “regional growth strategy” assumes an additional “510,000 people will walk or bike daily as a form of transportation” and “more than 620,000 additional people will live within half a mile of frequent transit”. That by 2040, transit ridership will increase to 510 million annually. Yet their “managed lanes network” does little to expand commuter access to transit near where large numbers of commuters currently live or may want to live.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281495	5	Bill Hirt	N/A	<p>They admit current “park and rides fill very early in the morning” and assume 18,000 new parking stalls will be built; apparently unaware Sound Transit ST3 P&R funding is limited to adding 8560 spaces between 2024 and 2041. Thus it’s not clear where the think the will pay for the additional nearly 10,000 stalls: a significant improvement but far more are needed.</p> <p>Clearly, the PSRC would be well advised to be “more pragmatic”.</p>	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. A variety of proposed investments in park and ride capacity can be found in Appendix G.
281510	1	Jessica McFarlane		As a lifelong Seattle citizen, a current Seattle resident and a Seattle business owner, I beg you to prioritize travel time reduction (in cars) and congestion reduction as your #1 and #2 considerations during the "period of maximum constraint." Bike lanes and street cars, in particular, should not be prioritized over the ability for city residents and workers to get around the city in vehicles during this disruptive time of massive infrastructure projects. In the last several years, the region has become so inhospitable to vehicles and people suffer. This "period of maximum constraint" needs to give the people some relief by delaying streetcars and bike lanes and prioritizing cars.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281510	2	Jessica McFarlane		Please also consider the idea of (re) opening the Battery Street Tunnel as a roadway to help ease congestion.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281518	1	[anonymous]		This plan is horrific. Every single part of it is as bad as it can be for ordinary citizens who do not live within the city limits of Seattle. This plan gives untold billions of my hard-earned money to fund Transit that only carries 4% of the population. This is evil, just evil.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281518	2	[anonymous]		<p>The majority of residents of the state of Washington drive automobiles, especially those who live in more-rural areas of the state (yes, there are still rural areas in Western Washington). This plan by design neglects the roads which carry most of the load, and pay for Choo-choo trains that are the biggest waste of money that was ever conceived of. I want to see every member of the Puget Sound Regional Council (and their staffs), and every employee and director of Sound Transit give away their cars, and their chauffeured limousines, and be forced to ride Sound Transit wherever they go. 100% of the time.</p> <p>I will leave the state of Washington before my family and I are forced to fund this piece of garbage.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281520	1	John Heinley		<p>- Financing / Paying for Transportation Improvements</p> <p>I agree with the concept that transportation should be paid for by those who benefit from the investment. What I'm not seeing in the plan is the relative balance in how that will be attributed toward car users and transit users. For instance, Figure 4 is a great graphic, but what are the components that make up the Local and Sound transit revenues? Likewise, the State Highway, City, and County revenues? Figures 6 and 7 provide hints, but the change in format (graphic to numbers) makes it difficult to understand any relationship between the two types of information.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281520	2	John Heinley		Congestion's relation to the need for capacity, versus congestion-pricing. I challenge your statement that '...Congestion provides a misleading indicator...' on page 15. Really? I could entertain, '...may provide...', or, '...in certain corridors...', but if you present a blanket statement you should provide a rationale. Do you make this statement to bolster congestion-pricing as a primary solution? If transportation were a hotel, and it could be thought of that way, congestion-pricing (or, as for a hotel, seasonal pricing) would be part of the solution. But, there may be a need for upgrades to capacity - such as an additional hotel wing - or, hourly rates? ;-)	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281520	3	John Heinley		Of course, will you apply congestion-pricing to transit users? Indeed, can you show that transit-users are likewise sharing the cost of improved service? I think if car-users saw that transit-users shared in the cost, and that they also had a benefit, you might have more success in implementing the plan.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281520	4	John Heinley		Page 29 on Financing: A car entering a congested highway incurs no consequence? Really? Is not congestion itself a consequence? In fact, you use congestion as a tool to influence driver behavior. Instead, show me whether congestion is not a sufficient consequence. Show me that load posting and tighter geometry in local roads don't impose a consequence on larger trucks. Please show me (and more importantly, others who are not engineers) likely axle loads from larger trucks (road-hauling) vs. local trucks.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281520	5	John Heinley		Plus, capacity improvements don't have a positive Benefit to Cost Ratio? I'm not convinced.	Roadway Capacity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281520	6	John Heinley		By the way, there's another business model that ties use of the resource to payment - cell service. By the minute in some cases, or by data used, etc. I've often thought a similar method could replace a gas tax for road users. It wouldn't need a GPS Big Brother tracking system. Instead, it would have a natural cost enhancement to use the system when congested - more time, more cost. And, the State Patrol is always willing to enforce the other limit regarding space and time. What I don't know is how a 'transmitter' could be fitted to every vehicle, especially in a way that would prevent tampering. Maybe such a device could also serve as for toll-collection or feedback to an Intelligent Transportation System.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281520	7	John Heinley		- Transportation Demand Management Business will invest \$18 for every \$1 invested by 'taxpayers'. Please explain. Aren't businesses taxpayers? CTR Thought: Can employers get an incentive when more of their employees sign-up / use transit? Maybe this already happens. GTEC's and In Motion: Good job! I use transit. It's easier to use transit when the user can see how their trip can work, can benefit, etc. Else, why change a habit? TDM Products: How about more feedback from CTR employers and affected businesses. As in, for retail, how customers responded to TDM measures, etc. Measure how well CTR strategies worked, or didn't, and their context - so it can be improved, copied where appropriate, etc. You'll identify TDM advocates, how about others? What will it take to win over those who aren't sold - you may have to ask.	TDM and CTR	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281520	8	John Heinley		Last: Where's Appendix A and Q? And, do a search in, I think, the Finance appendix, for "...such a..." You meant to say, such as, but I didn't note where the mistake took place.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281521	1	Ben Beck		Start holding big businesses like Boeing, Microsoft, and Amazon accountable. It seems unfair that Boeing gets a huge tax break to entice them to stay in the region meanwhile their workers and trucks are running up and down the highways wearing them out and now you want to have toll roads and pay to use? So instead of having the Corporation pay for the roads you are going to pass it on to the little guys that work there? For instance, a toll on US 2 trestle could result in about a \$1-1.50/hr decrease in money take home for the Boeing worker that lives out in Lake Stevens. Let me ask you, what is the gas tax for? It seems to me that the those in charge in Olympia are always looking for more ways for the working man's money. The big businesses here have Inslee and the rest in their back pocket. What they are trying to do here is not sustainable.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281557	1	Terry Hurd	Frederickson Community Council,Pierce Communities Coalition,Land Use Advisory Commission	I am with the Land Use advisory Commission. Your interference in local control cannot be overstated. Much like the citizens having no say in land use regulation development in Pierce County the PSRC is not following the local citizens desire for their community nor plan. We are being forced to develop to slum level densification on a single source aquifer and your making it happen. There is no road grid nor thru road system north south. Those from beyond the UGA drive thru our neighborhoods plugging the country roads. We need one + schools built each year and that is not happening, 25% of students are in portables. Stop stealing our money for your social programs. We know what we need. Freedom is being taken from the citizens by your kind of actions.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281569	1	Gregory Scruggs		I support every measure that enhances access to non-single-occupancy vehicle transportation and every measure that prioritizes public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian mobility over auto mobility. I reject the Seattle Times editorial board criticism and do not endorse their viewpoint. Reducing VMT is the most important priority for our region.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281613	1	[anonymous]		You all should be horsewhipped for your proposed screwing of Washington residents. Wonder why so many homelessness? Fraudulent foreclosures and continual tax increases, that's why. Keep your hands off of my hard earned money. Grrrrrr.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281620	1	Laura Millikan		Still need the ability for people to purchase passes and fares at the transit centers and park-n-rides. Ridiculous to require people to go to a grocery store to buy their pass or add fare money. Grocery stores are so far away from transit centers and P&Rs that it's easier and often faster to just drive to my destination rather than go out of my way and take the time for an extra stop, just to buy a pass or add money to it.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
281620	2	Laura Millikan		P.37 - If Central Puget Sound Region transit use is the fastest growing metropolitan area in the country... WHY IS METRO CONTINUING TO CUT SERVICE HOURS AND ROUTES?	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281620	3	Laura Millikan		P.38 - Thank you for the definitions of Rapid, Frequent, and Local. Please drastically increase the percentage of Frequent routes. This is what I need the most and is the type of service that MIGHT allow me to commute on mass transit for the first time ever in my 20+ years in King County.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
281620	4	Laura Millikan		P.45 - ELIMINATE TOLLS ON INTERSTATES - these are completely useless and are clogging traffic more and more.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281620	5	Laura Millikan		P.46 - NONE of the 20 items on the Key Investments will be beneficial to me in any way. Where is any benefit to SR900?	Project Specific	General Comment	Please note that the Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
281755	1	Kathryn Rathke		Hello, I have comments regarding "Planning for Future Airport System Needs". The plan calls for maximizing aviation capacity within the existing airport system before constructing new airports. I live on Beacon Hill, at the nexus of three air paths: SeaTac, Being Field, and Renton airplanes all affect my neighborhood with their noise and air pollution. People lie to say "well you knew what you were getting into" when residents register their concerns. I'm afraid we couldn't foresee the explosive growth in population and freight that would increase flight traffic exponentially. We assumed that regulations would maintain our health. But the sky is now constantly alive with planes. It affects our sleep and air quality.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. This new initiative will be included in the final plan.
281755	2	Kathryn Rathke		I strongly urge the planners to develop a new alternative to the existing southern Seattle airports. We in the south end are already enduring the burden of the area's explosive growth, and pushing that capacity even further is extremely unfair to a largely minority population that is historically reticent to be civically active.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning.
281871	1	Angela		First off, I would like to say that I am excited for the new plans underway for the Puget sound, and that it has always been a good experience riding in Seattle for me.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281871	2	Angela		I live in Issaquah and travel to Sammamish/Redmond for work, and can never get a bus for when I come home or on the weekends. I kindly request that you look into extending route 269 for a few later times, or even throughout the weekend. Many of us in the area don't work average 9-5 jobs, since most of the office jobs are in downtown Issaquah or in Bellevue. Thank you for your consideration.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
281963	1	City of Shoreline, Nora Daley-Peng	City of Shoreline	Please add the following to the Regional Capacity Project: Extend N/NE 175th St to 15th Avenue NE Add Meridian Ave from 145th to 205th Add NE 185th from Aurora to 10th NE Please add the following to the Regional Bike Network (see below and attached map: pink lines are recommended additions): Trail Along the Rail from 145th to 195th North Connector Route on 195th from Interurban Trail to 10th Ave NE Meridian Ave from 145th to 205th 175th from Interurban Trail to 25th Ave NE 25th Ave NE from 175th to 155th NE 160th from 15th Ave NE to 25th Ave NE	Project Specific	General Comment	We cannot add new projects to the Regional Capacity Projects list at this time. PSRC did extensive outreach with our member jurisdictions throughout 2017 to collect new and revised project submittals for the draft plan. There is a formal process for project submittals, which feed directly into our regional travel demand models and subsequent air quality analyses and formal conformity findings as required by federal legislation. We worked with City of Shoreline staff to finalize the projects that are ultimately represented on the project list.
281963	2	City of Shoreline, Nora Daley-Peng	City of Shoreline	Please add the following to the Regional Bike Network (see below and attached map: pink lines are recommended additions [Shoreline-RegionalBikeNetwork.png]): Trail Along the Rail from 145th to 195th North Connector Route on 195th from Interurban Trail to 10th Ave NE Meridian Ave from 145th to 205th 175th from Interurban Trail to 25th Ave NE 25th Ave NE from 175th to 155th NE 160th from 15th Ave NE to 25th Ave NE	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will address this in the final plan.
282028	1	Hopelink, Staci Haber	Hopelink	For the Coordinated Transportation Plan Page 12 onwards: Need to include totals, not just percentages, of demographic populations. Balances out the need in the region if you provide total numbers as well	Special Needs Transportation	Technical Correction	PSRC will amend the regional population table to incorporate overall county populations. It should be noted that not all population groups use the same total in US Census data.
282028	2	Hopelink, Staci Haber	Hopelink	For the Coordinated Transportation Plan...Pg 18: ORCA LIFT should be capitalized (low income fare transit) card PG 23: Also mention human services bus ticket program as a form of fare payment	Special Needs Transportation	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will review and make the appropriate corrections in the final document.
282028	3	Hopelink, Staci Haber	Hopelink	For the Coordinated Transportation Plan...Pg 23: Include data on success of 2017 ORCA Youth Promotion	Special Needs Transportation	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will review and make the appropriate corrections in the final document.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282028	4	Hopelink, Staci Haber	Hopelink	For the Coordinated Transportation Plan...Pg 28: Deeper special needs transportation funding?	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Please see Appendix H, PSRC Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for a more detailed discussion of funding estimates for special needs transportation.
282028	5	Hopelink, Staci Haber	Hopelink	For the Coordinated Transportation Plan...Pg 34: Expanding on temporal gaps? Which population is affected by which time?	Special Needs Transportation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282028	6	Hopelink, Staci Haber	Hopelink	For the Coordinated Transportation Plan...Pg 34: No mention of rider denial rates among existing providers. Maybe add to institutional gaps? Because the service is available, they just don't have the funding and therefore capacity to provide the needed trip?	Special Needs Transportation	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. This barrier to service among special needs transportation providers could be incorporated into existing funding-related institutional gap language in the final plan.
282028	7	Hopelink, Staci Haber	Hopelink	For the Coordinated Transportation Plan...Pg 43 : Under promote increased coordination strategy – the near term goal could be people providers and agencies plugging into the local mobility coalition to learn from each other. I think that's more than reasonable to expect by 2024.	Special Needs Transportation	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. PSRC will work with the Special Needs Transportation Committee to address the near-term goal suggestion.
282028	8	Hopelink, Staci Haber	Hopelink	For the Coordinated Transportation Plan...Pg 44: Prioritized Strategy – improve accessibility to transportation options? Do you mean the actual transportation is more accessible (like for people with disabilities)? Or physical access to the transportation hubs/routes is available? Or communication accessibility is improved? Which gap is this one addressing?	Special Needs Transportation	General Comment	This is a broad strategy addressing multiple needs and gaps within the Plan.
282029	1	Hal Cooper	Self	The proposed Regional Transportation Plan for the Puget Sound area is very comprehensive and inclusive.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282029	2	Hal Cooper	Self	The first concern is that major economic driving force for the plan is the major economic growth occurring in the region which is creating a shortage of the available housing and the need for more long distance transport.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282029	3	Hal Cooper	Self	The second concern is that the primary focus of the plan is on the north-south geographic focus of the region at the present time which needs to consider east-west traffic movements as well as the north-south orientation.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	There are a variety of investments proposed in the draft plan for east-west mobility; please refer to the projects web map at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
282029	4	Hal Cooper	Self	The third concern is that the subject of the electrification of transportation in the Puget Sound region is not a main consideration of the plan and needs to be augmented in response to Governor Inslee's Clean Energy Initiative.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Electrification of the transportation system is a key component of the plan's Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy, as well as the ongoing work related to emerging technologies. The plan includes recommendations for further work on these issues.
282029	5	Hal Cooper	Self	There is going to be a greater emphasis on long distance commuting in the plan which is going to be increasingly by rail and particularly by higher speed or even high speed rail both in western Washington and in the future to eastern Washington plus across Puget Sound by boat.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282029	6	Hal Cooper	Self	<p>The present western Washington commuter rail services are going to need to be able to go beyond the present three counties of King and Pierce and Snohomish to the north to Skagit and even Whatcom Counties as well as to Thurston and Lewis Counties to the south which would need to include a direct frequent rail passenger service between downtown Seattle and the Capitol in Olympia.</p> <p>There is also going to be a need to build new railroad tunnels under the existing inadequate facilities at the Stevens Pass between Everett and Wenatchee as well as under Stampede Pass between Auburn and Ellensburg which would be both longer and multiple track facilities.</p> <p>The present Sounder rail commuter service needs to be extended to the Eastside from both Tukwila on the south and Everett on the north so as to create a new rail loop around Lake Washington. This service would enhance regional mobility with a major terminal in Bellevue plus stops at Renton and Redmond and Kirkland and Woodinville and Maltby and Snohomish and could also be used for future intercity passenger service as well.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282029	7	Hal Cooper	Self	The presently proposed Sound Transit Link light rail system in the Puget Sound area is going to need to be expanded in the future with more and longer routes as the region will continue to expand and gain population at the same time that the need for mass transit becomes greater and that more people do not have cars or drive less than at the present time.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
282029	8	Hal Cooper	Self	<p>There is going to need to be increased consideration of electric transportation in the future in the Puget Sound area in order to meet Governor Inslee's Clean Energy Program objectives for energy and environmental reasons in the foreseeable future which will require the generation and use of additional amounts of electricity which will require expansion of the electric utility grid.</p> <p>There will be increased use of electric cars and buses and trucks on roadways as well as for the light rail and commuter rail systems which will need to include the electrification of railroads for both freight and passenger transport as has been proposed by the Solutionary Rail Group based on Vashon Island in the recent time.</p>	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282033	1	City of Kenmore, Rob Karlinsey	City of Kenmore	We note that although the “King County Metro Transit Bothell to 11W via Kenmore” project is shown on Figure 6 (King County Key Investments), the “Sound Transit NE 145th Street and SR 522 Bus Rapid Transit” project, starting in 2017, is not. These two projects are coordinated and the BRT project should be identified under Key Investment Transit Projects.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
282033	2	City of Kenmore, Rob Karlinsey	City of Kenmore	The Light Rail Study for the SR-522 corridor, approved under ST-3, is not mentioned in the Plan. This is a significant analysis for future transit planning and should be recognized.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The draft plan includes all funded Sound Transit projects. The plan focuses on specific proposed projects and future transit alignments. As projects are developed from studies such as the one you reference, they will be included in the future.
282033	3	City of Kenmore, Rob Karlinsey	City of Kenmore	The Plan, overall, focuses on regional corridors, but also should consider and discuss plans for significant connectors to the regional corridors.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282033	4	City of Kenmore, Rob Karlinsey	City of Kenmore	A passenger ferry from Kenmore is not mentioned under the discussion on pages 52 and 53, even though other planned ferry expansions are included. In a recent feasibility study conducted by King County, Kenmore was identified as a first choice for passenger ferry service on Lake Washington.	Ferries	Board Review	Ferries have been integrated into the 2040 regional transit network. PSRC recognizes ferries as providing an important role in moving people in the region. The request for further study and planning around passenger-only/fast ferries will be forwarded to the Board.
282033	5	City of Kenmore, Rob Karlinsey	City of Kenmore	The distribution of user fees to a corridor or geography has not, historically, and will not, in the future, address the corollary impacts of tolling. For example, Kenmore traffic suffered when 520 tolling was instituted as drivers used SR-522 as an untolled alternate route. User fees should be available to help mitigate the adverse impacts of new projects outside the corridor or geography.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282150	1	John Neller		This is my review of the PSRC Draft Regional Transportation Plan. I am a cyclist, a train rider (Amtrak, Sounder, and light rail) and a user of other forms of transit (buses, ferries, water taxis) and a driver. I am also a member of All Aboard Washington (AAWA), a rail transit advocacy group (formerly known as Washington Association of Rail Passengers). In that role I serve on our Inter-modal Connectivity task force; we hope to see more cooperation and coordination among various agencies and modes of transportation. Within the PSRC region, this would include Sound Transit, Metro Transit, Community Transit, Everett Transit, Pierce Transit, Kitsap Transit, Amtrak, SeaTac Airport, and the Washington State Ferries – all agencies receiving taxpayer support, which ought to be mutually supportive. Sadly, this is too often not the case today.	Multi-modal	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282150	2	John Neller		Bicycle Issues: Most of the transit agencies offer fairly good services to cyclists, but there are still some concerns. One area not mentioned in the plan, perhaps because it is regarded as a very small and local issue, has to do with the ability of cyclists to trip traffic signals. This situation varies greatly among different cities and counties, but it is of very considerable importance to anyone cycling on the roads of the area. A few places (e.g. Seattle and Bellevue) have definite policies to ensure that the signals respond to bicycles, but in many areas it is a ‘hit or miss’ situation for cyclists. Even when the systems work well, there are inconsistencies among municipalities.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. Supporting innovation and technology for both and bike and pedestrians is mentioned in the Executive Summary and elsewhere. We will bring this to the board for consideration to add some additional language to the Active Transportation Plan, Appendix L.
282150	3	John Neller		Sound Transit has been pretty good about accommodating cyclists, but there are a few issues here. I recently rode in one of the new Sounder cars that are positioned at the north end of the trains. I discovered that the bicycle position found on all the other cars was missing; instead another position had been designated which required lifting up three seats in order to place the bicycles. This position was adjacent to the stairwell leading to the second level, and it was narrower than the length of a bike, so that about six inches of the wheel protruded into the stairwell, meaning that passengers using the stairs would be striking the bicycle wheels with their legs and luggage. I later learned the reason for this problem: the contract for the new cars had been ‘piggy-backed’ onto a contract for a transit agency in Utah which does not carry bicycles. Several years ago there was a bicycle advisory committee at Sound Transit, but the agency disbanded it, apparently in the belief that it needed no input from cyclists and could anticipate such issues on its own, but Sound Transit failed to even consider any impact to passenger with bicycles. There are also some issues with the light rail cars and some Sound Transit buses.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282150	4	John Neller		One concern that was mentioned in the document, both for cyclists and pedestrians, is enforcement of traffic laws. Unfortunately, I doubt that most police forces are driven by PSRC guidelines, and what actually happens is often quite different. There were several instances in recent years where cyclists were hit and killed by motorists who failed to yield the right of way. In one case, a cyclist riding in the bicycle lane on Dexter Avenue was killed; in another, cyclist Sher Kung was killed on Second Avenue in Seattle. In both instances, the motorist was making a left turn and failed to yield. Another time, cyclist Suzanne Sciarini was riding on a shoulder when a motorist exited a parking lot; she was also killed. In the first case, the motorist left the scene and was prosecuted because he left the scene. In the other two cases the motorist was not punished, even though the cyclists had the right of way.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Active Transportation Plan does include a goal to improve safety which outlines some regional actions. This section, p. 48 of Appendix L, also notes Washington State's Vulnerable Users Bill which does get at your concern.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282150	5	John Neller		<p>inter-city train issues:</p> <p>Of the several Amtrak train stations in the PSRC region, one – Tukwila – is quite poorly served by bus connections. Even though it is one of only two Amtrak stations in King County, bus service consists primarily of a single Metro route, the Rapid Ride F line, which is an east-west line connecting to Renton, Southcenter Mall, and Burien (there is also a bus line that runs between the Tukwila station and the Federal Center South, but it only runs during weekday rush hours). The station is also served by Sounder trains, but these run only on weekdays and only during certain hours. There are no buses running north and south in the Kent Valley that connect with the station. The combined population of the cities of Kent and Auburn is a quarter of a million people, but if a resident of these cities or the surrounding areas wants to catch an Amtrak train in Tukwila at a time when the Sounder trains are not running, there is no available bus service. It should be remembered that Amtrak passengers typically carry more luggage than commuters, so that having to make bus transfers is more burdensome to such travelers. Recently, I attended an AAWA meeting on a Saturday in a hotel a few hundred yards from the station, and it requires three buses from my home in Auburn. It should also be noted that there is likewise no single bus connection between Auburn and Tacoma, the nearest Amtrak station in the opposite direction. Finally, one would expect that there should be a direct bus connection between Tukwila Station and SeaTac airport, which is only four miles distant. Today, it takes a bus ride, a light-rail ride, and a quarter-mile walk to get from the station to the airport. The Metro Connex plan includes a future bus route between Kent and Tukwila Station, but it has no stop in Auburn.</p> <p>Another very frustrating issue is the lack of mutually-supportive information available to the public in the transit locations in Seattle. At King Street Station (Amtrak), there are racks holding schedules for Metro and Sound Transit buses, but at the Metro office on Jackson Street and the Sound Transit offices in Union Station, there are no Amtrak schedules and no information regarding Amtrak, or even an acknowledgment of Amtrak’s existence just a few blocks away. When we asked the personnel at these offices about Amtrak, they either told us it was not their job to provide information or expressed ignorance of Amtrak, and one person told me that there was no information about Amtrak because it is not a public entity. Surely a few schedules could be provided without breaking the budget – after all, Amtrak manages to provide Metro and Sound Transit information in its station. As I recall, all three locations do provide state ferry schedules, so it is hardly without precedent.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282150	6	John Neller		<p>Transportation Integration Issues:</p> <p>It would seem to me to be obvious that that the various public, and publicly subsidized, transportation systems should work together. In many areas, different modes of transportation are quite well integrated, but there are exceptions. One of these involves the schedules of the ferries and Sounder trains in Edmonds. In some instances, morning ferries arrive from Kingston six minutes before the Sounder train is scheduled to depart for Seattle. Even if the ferry is not late, this is not enough time for passengers, especially elderly or disabled ones, to walk the length of the dock and then south to the train station. As a result, passengers are motivated to drive their cars onto the ferries, and then on to Seattle, rather than board the boat as a foot passenger and then catch a train. Since the ferry system is treated as an extension of the highways, and even receives gas tax revenues, that increases the cost to the passengers and the revenue to the ferry system.</p>	Ferries	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
282150	7	John Neller		SeaTac airport is served by light rail and buses, but the light rail station was built at a considerable distance from the terminal, resulting in a lengthy walk from the station, often with multiple pieces of luggage. The buses now mostly stop at the same location, though several years ago many stopped at the main terminal building. This again motivates passengers to drive to the airport, where they pay to park in the ramps at the airport. In other cases, people use taxis or ride-hailing services, which must pay a fee to enter the airport. Public transportation would be cheaper for travelers.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282150	8	John Neller		<p>Coordination is lacking in Tacoma between agencies as well. A few years ago, Sound Transit created two new Sounder train stops south of the Tacoma Dome Station – the South Tacoma station and the station in Lakewood. No Pierce Transit buses serve either of these Sounder stations.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282161	1	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	<p>350 Seattle is a grassroots organization that works toward climate justice by organizing people to make deep system change: resisting fossil fuels; building momentum for healthy alternatives; and fostering resilient, just, and welcoming communities.</p> <p>350 Seattle’s Transportation Team has a mission to advocate for a fossil-fuel-free transportation system. Global warming caused by fossil carbon pollution is bringing catastrophic events locally and worldwide more quickly than we expected. Last summer the smoke from wildfires stretched from California to northern Canada and choked our skies with smoke. Hurricanes devastated Houston and Puerto Rico. The 2017 cost of these natural disasters broke the record. We need to rapidly de-carbonize our economy to avoid even worse climate scenarios. In our region, where transportation is the source of nearly half of the region’s carbon emissions, we must do all we can to transition to a fossil-fuel-free transportation system as quickly as possible.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282161	2	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	In reviewing the Plan, we are pleased to see PSRC promoting changes to land use patterns which are necessary for a sustainable transportation system. Specifically, we agree that transit-served centers should be mixed use, compact, walkable, safe for biking, and should include ample affordable housing. We applaud the Plan’s vision for transit-oriented communities and PSRC’s ongoing Growing Transit Communities Partnership strategy.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282161	3	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	We also appreciate that the Plan anticipates replacing the current gas tax with a new funding source and identifies road usage charges as a promising alternative.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282161	4	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	<p>That said, the Plan does not go far enough. In fact, the Plan minimizes concerns around climate change. The first chapter, “Toward a Sustainable Transportation System,” states, “(t)he Regional Transportation Plan sets the region on course to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions consistent with state limits through a flexible and balanced approach of land use, pricing, choices, and technology.” Yet, to be sustainable and to avert the worst catastrophes that climate change will bring, “significant reduction” is not enough. Climate science is clear — we need to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible.</p> <p>The Executive Summary clarifies that “significantly reduction” means that the Plan “shows the potential to reduce greenhouse gases by as much as 75 percent by 2040 with key local and regional actions.” We cannot settle for strategies that “show potential.” PSRC must articulate firm targets, based on the best available climate science, for a transportation system that has no greenhouse gas emissions. The Plan should be clear: responding to climate change is a matter of urgency requiring immediate mobilization.</p> <p>The plan is also unclear in stating that this reduction will be “consistent with state limits through a flexible and balanced approach...” Please provide a citation for the state limits to which you refer, and clarify what you mean by a “flexible and balanced approach.” We note that the physics of climate change is not flexible, and our response needs to set hard targets in line with climate scientists’ best estimates of what is need to stabilize our climate. Despite the key importance of setting such science-based targets, the Plan fails to include a summary of, or reference to, the climate science that alerts us to the need for rapid and dramatic reduction in greenhouse emissions.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282161	5	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	We are encouraged that the plan emphasizes walkability and bike-ability. Active transportation provides a sustainable, resilient, healthy, economical, and community building solution to the first and last mile problem of transit oriented communities. Yet, the Plan fails to adequately address how we can promote the development of walkable communities. Slowing traffic is a key factor in creating a walkable neighborhood. Not only is speeding one of the biggest safety factors (see this NTSB study - https://www.nts.gov/safety/safety-studies/Documents/SS1701.pdf), but also, to be really walkable, a neighborhood needs to be enjoyable for walking, and free from speeding traffic. The Plan does discuss “minimizing conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles” in these areas, however a conflict minimizing approach does not slow cars. The plan should include guidance on a range of traffic calming [https://www.pps.org/article/livememtraffic] methods that can be used to make transit served neighborhoods walkable.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The plan does include an Active Transportation Plan, Appendix L, which addresses these issues. We do agree that traffic calming is an important element and will review the language in Appendix L to assess if this can be further clarified
282161	6	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	Promoting active transportation is not just an engineering problem, it is fundamentally about people’s perceptions and behaviors — it is a cultural problem. The plan fails to acknowledge this or discuss how planners might engage with communities to promote this cultural shift. The plan should encourage planners to stage public information campaigns on how active transportation can improve public health, reduce pollution, promote community, and increase the cultural and economic vitality of neighborhoods.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The Active Transportation Plan, Appendix L, includes a goal of increasing the percentage of people walking and bicycling and includes action steps related to engagement. See Appendix L, page 53. We will review the language in Appendix L to assess if this can be further clarified
282161	7	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	The plan includes no discussion of reducing or eliminating off street parking requirements in transit-served communities (such as Seattle is considering). Reducing or eliminating subsidized parking is critical to furthering housing density and affordability, as well as encouraging walking, biking, and transit use. Reducing on-street parking is also needed to make room for walkers and bicyclists. Finally in all transit served areas off- and on-street parking needs to be priced, in transit served areas the days of free parking should be over. Finally, parking revenue can be a source of funding for neighborhood improvements, yet it is not mentioned in your Sustainable Financial Framework section.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Potential new revenue sources do assume a regional surcharge to paid parking, see Figure 18, p. 73. This source is discussed further in Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background.
282161	8	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	The Plan does not discuss of airplane transportation and the associated greenhouse gases and other pollution. The aviation industry has a disproportionately large impact on the climate system and warrants consideration.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	PSRC is responsible for estimating emissions from on-road vehicles. We do partner with and assist other regional and state agencies on broader air quality issues and other sources of emissions. There are regional and state emissions inventories that include aviation sources developed by these partner agencies.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282161	9	350 Seattle, Andrew Kidde	350 Seattle	The plan should include more on the need for the electrification of vehicles, which is a vital part of any plan to reduce carbon emissions in our transportation system. Charging stations need to be installed, but there remain legal questions about where they can be located and how they will be regulated. The Plan should support legislative efforts to clarify these issues.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Electrification of the transportation system is a key component of the plan's Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy, as well as the ongoing work related to emerging technologies. The plan includes recommendations for further work on these issues.
282198	1	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept, Amy Pow	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept	Chapter 1: Towards a Sustainable Transportation System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve and Promote Health (P.22): Recommend extending the scope beyond air quality, physical activity and personal safety. More than 50% of our health outcomes are affected by social determinants of health, including the built environment (places) we live, work and play. Besides supporting the current draft paragraphs, focus also on providing affordable and reliable public transit to help low-income populations access work opportunities that could provide living wage incomes to support healthy lifestyles. 	Health	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan contains significant investment in new transit service, see Chapter 2, pp. 37-41, Regional Integrated Transit Network and Plan. Health measures used to evaluate the Regional Transportation Plan were developed and prioritized by the PSRC Transportation Policy Board. Changes to this framework may be considered either in the development of the VISION 2050 plan, or when the Transportation Policy Board conducts the next update to the Regional Transportation Plan.
282198	2	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept, Amy Pow	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept	Chapter 4: Performance Measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support using an equity lens in measuring all aspects of transportation outcomes. Continue to ask these equity-related questions and embed them into performance management practices: Who (and whose health) is being affected? Were underserved groups fully identified in the process? What population groups were overlooked? What further actions are required to address these groups? Where were investments made? Were capital investments focused in areas showing higher health disparities? 	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. An equity lens was used to develop and evaluate the performance outcomes framework. See a more complete discussion in Appendix K, System Performance Report, and Appendix B, Equity Analysis Report.
282198	3	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept, Amy Pow	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept	Chapter 5—Plan Implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to manage transportation performance to achieve Region’s Growth Strategy, identify triggers to inform changes in investment strategies to bring the RGS on track. Should growth targets be phased in to correspond to transportation concurrency? 	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The land use assumptions incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan are drawn from the VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy and adopted local comprehensive plans. These plans were based on goals to improve jobs-housing balance, minimize commute distances, and ensure economic opportunities throughout the region. The upcoming update to the region's growth plan - VISION 2050 - will offer an opportunity to explore approaches to implementing land use plans, and potentially phasing.
282198	4	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept, Amy Pow	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept	Chapter 5--Plan Implementation:...P.89—PSRC’s Approval Process: Consider adding a Health Lens Analysis Tool to address health equity from a triple-bottom line approach. Here’s the tool -- https://www.tpchd.org/home/showdocument?id=2461 .	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC will continue to explore new methods for evaluating the region's plans, and will consider a health analysis tool in future plan updates.
282198	5	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept, Amy Pow	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept	Appendix B—Equity Analysis Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend tracking those metrics in P. 35 over time by places/neighborhoods to guide future investment decisions. Track also the combined “transportation and housing burden index” by income levels. 	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC's Growth Management Policy Board has discussed the importance of understanding the relationship of transportation and housing costs. The VISION 2050 work plan will explore tools to analyze potential burdens.
282276	1	City of Tacoma, Victoria R Woodards	City of Tacoma	Thank you for this opportunity to comment. We wholeheartedly endorse the draft as currently written. PSRC staff have clearly been working diligently with the PSRC Boards to capture the appropriate direction for this major plan update.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282276	2	City of Tacoma, Victoria R Woodards	City of Tacoma	We particularly appreciate: The consistent tie-in with the VISION 2040 land-use strategy, e.g. "The Regional Transportation Plan priorities investments for those parts of the region expected to accommodate the most growth, especially in centers and compact urban communities. It implements the VISION 2040 regional growth strategy by targeting transportation investments that provide capacity for a population of 5 million in 2040, ensuring that people can get to work and recreation, that freight and goods movement can supply businesses and factories, and that ports can continue to function as regional and global gateways." RTP page 1.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282276	3	City of Tacoma, Victoria R Woodards	City of Tacoma	We particularly appreciate:...The recognition of the role that the Growing Transit Communities strategy and partnership have and are playing in ongoing land-use and transportation policy development.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282276	4	City of Tacoma, Victoria R Woodards	City of Tacoma	We particularly appreciate:...The increased focus on social equity and environmental justice.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282276	5	City of Tacoma, Victoria R Woodards	City of Tacoma	We particularly appreciate:...The identification of priority transpiration routes and facilities critical to the regional system in the event of a major earthquake, i.e. regional resiliency. However, we do recommend some discussion of the role of fast ferries in responding to a natural disaster. Appendix O (Resilience) could have some discussion about the resiliency role that fast ferries are playing in San Francisco and New York.	Ferries	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282276	6	City of Tacoma, Victoria R Woodards	City of Tacoma	We particularly appreciate:...The integrated network and plan provisions that focus on how important efficient public transit is to equitable access to opportunity.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282276	7	City of Tacoma, Victoria R Woodards	City of Tacoma	We particularly appreciate:...The recognition that the region's ferry system is both a marine highway and a high-capacity transit system and the RTP's emphasis on promoting the integration of ferry services and facilities with other modes of transportation and with TOD focused around ferry terminals. We would like to see a brief discussion about the emerging role of fast ferries in the region and some call for further planning in this regard.	Ferries	Board Review	Ferries have been integrated into the 2040 regional transit network. PSRC recognizes ferries as providing an important role in moving people in the region. The request for further study and planning around passenger-only/fast ferries will be forwarded to the Board.
282280	1	Stephen Dolinko		I firmly do NOT support the recommendations of having a taxation payment system that uses mileage as it taxes those who have the least. While I would love to drive a Tesla and save on my gas mileage I sadly do not make enough and my student debts are astronomical so I can work I cannot afford such expensive luxuries that would allow me to save. Thus I need a less expensive vehicle aka a combustion engine and I need to commute because housing costs are so astronomical that is how I can afford to live and work in this area. This is from someone who has lived in the region for 30+ years. A mileage taxation is regressive and hurts those who have the least because those who are commuting further cannot afford to live in the areas they work. But they would be penalized the most to drive, so they can work and earn just enough to get by.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.
282280	2	Stephen Dolinko		In addition toll lanes I feel are very wrong and if public funds are used to expand roads then I do NOT support them being made into HOT or toll lanes to generate money as that has already hurt my business just along the 405 and I fear my business will be hurt more by such damaging systems. Everything that was stated from the Cambridge report about the 405 toll lanes has come to pass and the 405 freeway has been a royal ungodly mess since it went into effect with HOT lanes.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282280	3	Stephen Dolinko		<p>Since PSRC is looking to raise funding because of the massive influx of new people in the region, I suggest that this burden would be placed on the purchasers of new houses and not on mileage for those of us who are not as well financially blessed and work very hard to make it in this region. In addition there should be additional road taxes charged to any electric vehicle at the time of purchase and bicyclists should pay some as well to fund the roads and improvements as they benefit from our tax dollars providing a safe road for them to commute on. In addition if such revenues need to be made, perhaps making more luxury taxes such as yachts and new boat fees could be applied. Lastly the construction and aggregate transportation companies cause excessive road wear and tear and lead up to excessive congestion, as such it would only be prudent for these companies to shoulder some of the burden of cost as well to maintain and fund our transportation systems as well.</p> <p>My reasons for the above statement are many. In general I do not know even where to begin with what has been stated but let me attempt to address the many issues that have been glossed over or have been blatantly ignored. If nothing else instead of outright calling many statements lies they should be emblazoned as alternative facts by Mrs. Conway by PSRC.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy assumes a variety of new revenue sources for different transportation user types.
282280	4	Stephen Dolinko		First On Page 4 of the executive statement could not be further from the mark stating that more people are driving less. If one looks at the gross numbers yes this statement would be true i.e. if one adds in 1 million people to a population and 2000 of them ride bikes then yes 2000 more bike riders are there but the study and statement ignores the other 998000 people were also added and does not look at a population based on percentage and necessities they will need. As such while our population grows most of the people who commute are doing it by vehicle.	Analysis results	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. While overall vehicle miles traveled increases, the number of miles driven per person has been decreasing over the last several years. Refer to Appendix K, System Performance Report, for more information.
282280	5	Stephen Dolinko		The reasons for this vary but it boils down to a few simple factors. 1. Living in downtown Seattle is financially impossible for the majority of people who live in the area because the demand of housing exceeds supply. Thus people have had to move outside of the city and are forced to commute into the city.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282280	6	Stephen Dolinko		2. The areas serviced by mass transit are only the corridors of one city to the next, and vastly ignores much of those living on the east side. For example ST3 demands payment from many who will never receive any utility from it. Before one raises an objection of this, I simply state that I would love to use mass transit but there is no where I can park and zero mass transit that arrives in my area at a reasonable rate, time frame, numbers of buses, buses so filled one is not picked up, or hours that I would need it. I have a fellow peer who lives 7 miles away and it takes him 2.75 hours to go each way. This is an unreasonable expectation on most people to expect them to spend upwards of 5.5 hours to use mass transit per 24 hour day. When I have driven him home from work it takes 22-24 minutes. Thus, a commuting vehicle is what is necessary where I live.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
282280	7	Stephen Dolinko		3. Previous promises have turned out to be lies or plain illegal, e.g. ST3's costs or 405's gas tax money paid for the expansion but it was used to become a toll lane and prevents citizens who paid for the expansion to use it unless they have the financial means to utilize it.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282496	1	Naomi Benton	Home Owner	<p>We who live in May Valley, live in a fragile environment. Last year our dear little road was caving in and was reduced to 1 lane for all of our traffic including school buses and bicyclist. If you walk the road there are huge pipes placed under the road by the county to have the run off from the hill to flood our little valley. With the amount of speeding trucks and water running from the sides of the road and under the road, is going to create problems for this fragile environment. The worry of the Salmon in the stream is being neglected, the oil, gas, car window wash and in general trucks, buses and added traffic will devastate this beautiful area. We moved into the country to get away from this traffic and now the county has dumped it on us.</p> <p>Years ago I attended a meeting about the dump and saw plans for the future with families walking about like in a park. It is not a park and it has continued to be a dump.</p> <p>Take the traffic somewhere else.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan acknowledges the potential impacts of transportation on the natural environment, (see Chapter 1, pp. 18-22, Supporting a Sustainable Environment), as well as the acute need for continued maintenance and preservation of existing transportation infrastructure, see Chapter 2, pp. 26-27, Maintenance, Preservation, and Operations.</p>
282537	1	John Bagaason		<p>Highway 524 in South Snohomish County needs to be widened. I understand that it's not being done due to lack of funds. This project needs to be given priority. Thanks.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	<p>A variety of investments are proposed in this area; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.</p>
282581	1	Marina Subbaiah, Mary Jo Tornberg, Charisse Bennett		<p>T2040 ID: 4556</p> <p>Given that the Issaquah-Hobart Road was the first place winner in the worse traffic congestion/commute time increase in King County it is disappointing that there are no funds committed to improve this road or transportation options on this road. All the development approved and planned for Black Diamond/Ravensdale is only going to worsen conditions. This is a regional commuter route that deserves regional funding.</p> <p>Where is the plan for transit on this corridor? Why is there not plan for a park 'n ride at Hwy 18 and Issaquah-Hobart?</p>	Congestion	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment. There are additional investments proposed in the surrounding area that may be of interest, including the future transit network; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.</p>
282581	2	Marina Subbaiah, Mary Jo Tornberg, Charisse Bennett		<p>T2040 ID: 4216</p> <p>Widening of Hwy 18 to 4 lanes cannot happen soon enough! Again, this is a regional commuter route and a MAJOR truck route with HUGE safety implications. When Issaquah follows through with Mayor's suggestion to toll Front Street commuters from the South will only add to the current traffic safety nightmare on 18 over Tiger Mtn and on May Valley Road/SR900. Issaquah should not be allowed to toll their main street and shut down traffic from the south end when they are a transportation center.</p> <p>We need a park 'n ride at Highway 18/Issaquah -Hobart Road and we need transit service from that location. The Issaquah-Hobart/Ravensdale Black Diamond roads need to be 4 lanes, they are already so far beyond capacity and I see no plans to improve any of this, only thousands of new houses that will increase traffic on these overburdened roads.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
282590	1	Jennifer Valente		<p>Issaquah Hobart Road needs funding desperately! With Black Diamond proposing over 2,000 homes, and the fact that Issaquah Hobart Road is already a parking lot, we need to widen the road (even if it is not a popular idea).</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
282590	2	Jennifer Valente		<p>The time has come and if the city of Issaquah really does toll Front Street, how is that going to affect May Valley Road? It is simply rerouting the problem. Please help us!</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282594	1	Steven Bolin		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation services similar to Metro’s Access paratransit service should be open to a people with a broader range of abilities. Just because a person can travel to a fixed-route bus stop, they may be too frail or have other special needs that make travel by fixed-route bus difficult. Paratransit services provided by Metro and other transit operators should be available to others who have special transportation needs, and not just those strictly eligible under the minimum Americans with Disabilities Act standards. For people who have difficulty traveling, another option that should be considered and even encouraged is to provide delivery of goods and services to their homes. This would lessen the need for them to travel, and may be a cost-effective way to provide goods and services without requiring transportation of the person with special transportation needs. <p>-----</p> <p>Additional comment via email:</p> <p>One of many examples of Metro Access that I believe should be provided is for people who could take the regular bus however it is unreasonable for them to take the regular bus one example of many examples if for people with arthritis and who need tom travel in the cold weather the cold weather will make arthritis worse so waiting at bus stops in the cold weather is bad for people with arthritis so even if it is possible for some one to wait at a bus stop in the cold and take the regular bus it is unreasonable so they should be allowed to take Metro Access buses or have merchandise delivered to them and and paid for with PayPal.</p>	Special Needs Transportation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282606	1	Jana hadley	N/A citizen	Suggest that Issaquah/king county immediately work to rectify the congestion on Issaquah Hobart. The lights need to be timed at May Valley and Iss/Hob as wait time can be in excess of 5 min. There are times, as a resident of May Valley when we are UNABLE to even get home due to accidents/ traffic congestion backing up to 1-90 and we don't shop in Downtown Issaquah due to lack of parking, horrible congestion. I am very disappointed to see our city elected officials turning a blind eye to this huge issue.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. There are additional investments proposed in the surrounding area that may be of interest, including the future transit network; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
282607	1	Vernon Huffman	Bike4Peace.com	New people and jobs are expected to boost demand for travel within and through the region by 30 percent, assuming we develop communities as we have. If we instead require planned communities where residents can walk to work and shop, we can significantly reduce the amount of travel with all its attendant hazards. Tiny half measures aren't enough. We must demand that employers plan to pay salaries sufficient to house employees within walking distance.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282607	2	Vernon Huffman	Bike4Peace.com	We also must recognize that the greatest obstacle to safe, efficient transportation is the family car. We must use effective Transportation Demand Management to get people out of their cars and into safe, efficient modes. Traffic congestion is not a problem to eliminate, but an opportunity. When it becomes easier to use shared transit than it is to drive, our entire system will be more efficient.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282607	3	Vernon Huffman	Bike4Peace.com	Toward that end all shared transit should be fare free. Buses filled with passengers should zip around gridlock. It should be easier to bike across town than to drive.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282607	4	Vernon Huffman	Bike4Peace.com	Electric vehicles have a place when used efficiently, but merely transferring inefficient use of energy for transportation to an electrical grid already over-dependent upon coal and nukes is no solution.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282618	1	Ron Peltier	City of Bainbridge Island	<p>Through Vision 2040 PSRC has crafted an upbeat narrative of growth, economic prosperity and environmental sustainability. It tells us that by the year 2040 the Puget Sound Region’s population will grow by 1.1 million to a total of 5 million people, and take place in tandem with restoring and sustaining the environment. There’s plenty of reasons to believe, however, that even current levels of population and development in the Puget Sound Region are not environmentally sustainable, much less pondering the addition of another 1.1 million by 2040.</p> <p>A simple Google search for “Puget Sound declining” results in dozens of stories about Orca, salmon, steelhead trout, sea birds, Pacific herring, tufted puffins, marine microbes, depleted oxygen levels, polluted storm water and more. It’s pretty clear that current efforts to save the Sound, admirable as they may be, are just not enough to turn things around. Polluted stormwater washing off roads and parking lots into our rivers and marine waters is a major reason why.</p> <p>If we didn’t already know this, we got a major event last Winter to drive home the point. The catastrophic failure of the West Point treatment plant resulted in a huge and sustained discharge of untreated sewage and stormwater into Puget Sound. That event occurred, in large part, because of existing infrastructure that combines stormwater and sewage for treatment at one facility. It was a monumental failure by King County to prioritize adequate stormwater and sewage infrastructure to service existing development (doesn’t the GMA say something about that?). Dramatic as it was, it was just one piece of the overall problem.</p> <p>The 2017 State of the Sound Report from the Puget Sound Partnership says we aren’t doing enough when it comes to saving the Sound. Here’s the executive summary:</p> <p>With the benefit of experience and ongoing learning, we now better understand how to protect and recover Puget Sound. In fact, hundreds of partners are at work every day on actions that improve our ecosystem. Despite these advances, the pressures on Puget Sound threaten to overwhelm all efforts. It is now apparent that recovery will require effort and investment of a magnitude significantly beyond what we have invested to date. If the</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan acknowledges the potential impacts of transportation on the natural environment, (see Chapter 1, pp. 18-22, Supporting a Sustainable Environment), as well as the acute need for continued maintenance and preservation of existing transportation infrastructure, see Chapter 2, pp. 26-27, Maintenance, Preservation, and Operations. Please note that Maintenance, Preservation, and Operations estimates assume significant improvements to stormwater facilities and treatment. Appendix M, Maintenance, Preservation, and Operations, includes details on assumptions for stormwater facilities.
282619	1	Mark Rigos	Personal	1. Projects need to come online sooner.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282619	2	Mark Rigos	Personal	2. Funding sources need to be a priority from the Feds. Seek large grants from the Feds. 3. Consider lowering prevailing wage to 3rd highest city in County, so the project costs drop, and the projects can get built quicker.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282619	3	Mark Rigos	Personal	4. I-90 / SR-18 is a death trap and should be top transportation project in the entire State of WA. 2 major freeways merge with traffic signal lights. This is unbelievable. SR-18 needs to be widened to 4 lanes over Tiger Mountain. There are too many fatalities on this stretch of highway. Ports of Tacoma and Seattle should contribute funding here... so many trucks drive that route.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Washington State Department of Transportation is proposing improvements to the interchange at I-90 and SR 18, including a widening of SR 18 to four lanes. Please refer to project #4414 on the Regional Capacity Projects list (Appendix G).
282626	1	Tom Carpenter		<p>The PSRC has some authority to manage regional growth in the form of “certification” of a jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has no such authority to manage regional transportation. 	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	As the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the central Puget Sound region, PSRC is required under federal and state legislation to prepare a long-range regional transportation plan.
282626	2	Tom Carpenter		<p>The plan appears to be focused on funding, with little attention to the performance of the regional transportation system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears the PSRC has not accepted any accountability for the “regional transportation system performance” The region continues to rank in the top 2 or 3 metropolitan areas for congestion (an indicator of system performance) Those of us who have lived here for 40 years or more witness first hand how poorly wheeled vehicle (auto, truck, bus) performance is. The movement of people and freight has value. Delays in that movement have a cost. There’s little, if any, content in the plan addressing this. Performance data included in the appendices uses vague statistical terms (e.g. average amount of time spent commuting). First, averages are meaningless without other data (e.g. standard deviation, median) 	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The plan's performance was considered in light of population and employment forecasts for the year 2040, and assumptions about implementation of local jurisdiction's plans to accommodate growth. The Regional Transportation Plan was developed and evaluated with a performance outcomes framework that considered several factors, including mobility improvements. The plan makes significant progress in supporting VISION 2040 and the Regional Growth Strategy, enhancing accessibility and mobility choices, improving reliability, safety and security, improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gases, and providing equitable benefits and access to opportunity for all the region's residents. Details of plan performance can be found in Chapter 4, Performance Based Planning, and Appendix K, System Performance Report.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282626	3	Tom Carpenter		<p>Transportation concurrency, which could have provided important information for regional transportation planning, has been implemented so poorly by many jurisdictions that it’s become all but useless.</p> <p>SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There’s no regional SLA. Without it, it’s assured planning will be dominated by supplier-out thinking. • How do you measure customer expectations? • Transportation Concurrency comes closest to SLA, but it’s highly locally interpreted, often to the point of being meaningless. - For Renton, the whole city must fail for it to fail TC. - KC uses travel sheds, although recently it’s abandoned much of the benefit. • System performance, in the form of service level commitments, is the domain of Transportation Concurrency. It’s the only transportation mechanism that linked two of the PSRC focus areas: transportation and growth. • TC is horribly implemented due to significant variations in how much jurisdictions want to be “governed” by TC. They treat it as something that reduces their flexibility, when, in fact, it could have provided valuable system performance data. Those that truly understood the potential of TC saw it as a management tool. 	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Under the concurrency provisions of the Growth Management Act, local jurisdictions are responsible for establishing and monitoring level of service standards and meeting local objectives before permitting additional development.
282626	4	Tom Carpenter		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There’s nothing in the plan that focuses on the actual users of the transportation system, particularly those that use wheeled vehicles. The closest is a focus on freight transport which, albeit valuable, ignores all the “freight” moved every day that doesn’t involve the ports or other major freight sources and destinations. 	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
282626	5	Tom Carpenter		<p>REGIONAL ARTERIAL NETWORK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There doesn’t seem to be much focus on what has been called in the past the “regional arterial networks”. Proposals to adopt RAN have been ignored in the past, but that doesn’t change the fact that they exist. • RAN’s cross jurisdictions which means they have to be managed regionally. There’s nothing in the plan that addresses the nature of traffic movement, and the role RANs can play. • Look at Issaquah-Hobart Road. This traffic nightmare, along with SR-169, are as significant to moving traffic north-south as I-5. 	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282626	6	Tom Carpenter		<p>USE FUNDING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why isn’t Regional Arterial Network being discussed as a means to deal with use funding for county and city roads that function uniquely as connecting corridors and rural local access? • Why isn’t there more on use funding in the plan, other than the unpopular topic of tolling? The models that exist can easily provide sufficient guidance for parsing funding to jurisdictions. 	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Please See Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, for additional discussion of different types of user fees, and the potential to use them to fund a wider variety of projects than is possible with current sources.
282626	7	Tom Carpenter		<p>JURISDICTIONAL IMPACTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jurisdictional autonomy means a jurisdiction may make local decisions without substantive regard for impacts outside the jurisdiction. - Local decisions include those that affect loads (e.g. development, employment), or the road network (e.g. add/remove, use restrictions). 	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282626	8	Tom Carpenter		<p>ISSAQUAH VS. ITS DESIGNATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2015, Issaquah was designated as a Regional Growth Center by the PSRC. • Why would you do so for a jurisdiction that entirely borders the rural area? - It’s clear that these urban uses in proximity to rural areas require special treatment to minimize their urbanization effect on rural areas. • How does that designation relate to Issaquah’s decisions 1) against a city bypass for the Issaquah-Hobart Rd route, 2) impacting regional truck routes by restricting certain truck traffic from city local roads, and 3) the stated intent of the new mayor to tolling Front St.? • Where’s the management of accountability for local decisions that affect the regional transportation system? 	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The City of Issaquah went through a multi-step process to complete the designation of a portion of downtown as a Regional Growth Center. That process included the completion of a subarea plan for downtown, and compliance with designation criteria adopted by the King County Council in Countywide Planning Policies, as well as regional criteria adopted by PSRC’s Executive Board.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282626	9	Tom Carpenter		REGIONAL MANAGEMENT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a capability maturity model for the regional transportation management? • Counties and cities are autonomous corporations with the unique attribute of being representative governments. • To act regionally, governments rely solely on consensus to manage across jurisdictional boundaries. • Thus far, the PSRC has identified transportation, growth, and economics as the regional characteristics that require consensus to manage regionally. • Capability maturity models relevant to system management have a dimension focused on deployment. - The first focus is on business units (e.g. all units participating). The next is on integration between business units. The third focuses on business scenarios that cut across multiple business units. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profound improvements in capabilities only occur with integration and cross-functional consensus. 	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282626	10	Tom Carpenter		MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY MATURITY MODEL <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are we in terms of our ability to manage a regional transportation system? • What happened to Transportation Performance Management Capability Maturity Model? • Are there CMMs that focus on our ability to manage regionally? Success is totally dependent on the ability of a very large number of jurisdictions choosing to manage regionally. 	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282626	11	Tom Carpenter		OUTCOME AND MEASURES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It’s hard to see what the actual performance measures are. The list covers quite a few outcomes that are secondary (e.g. climate), while others are primary (e.g. freight, travel). • For wheeled use, what are the performance measures? Is “freight” only focused on major facilities, like a port? What about the goods and services delivered locally? 	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Plan performance for freight is forecast for both medium and heavy trucks in the plan. PSRC does not currently have the ability to produce separate forecasts for local deliveries.
282626	12	Tom Carpenter		TARGET ZERO IS GWAP (GOAL WITHOUT A PLAN)	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282644	1	David Clark, EPR	EPR	Regarding the Regional Transportation plan, airport issues are barely addressed, and the approach seems to say there is additional capacity at SeaTac. There is no additional capacity, which was exceeded years ago, of the surrounding communities to absorb the noise, vibration, air quality and community-killing impacts already. With the use of the 3rd runway as more than the originally promised “overflow only during inclement weather “, and. The 10% annual increase in traffic, SeaTac is already a public health and welfare disaster for the neighbor communities. And FAA NexGen and Port hopes for expansion at SeaTac promise to make it far worse. A hard cap rolling back landings to 2010 levels and night closing are already essential while new sites to handle traffic above that are selected and implemented.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC’s Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. This new initiative will be included in the final plan.
282666	1	Jack Whisner		ES: no mention of sidewalks.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Executive Summary does discuss the importance of mobility choices but the ES is a high level summary. More information and discussion on pedestrian networks can be found on page 42 of the main document and in the Active Transportation Plan, Appendix L.
282666	2	Jack Whisner		ES...no mention of variable tolling; that is mechanism to achieve free flow on limited access highways; please add network-wide variable tolling.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy does assume variable pricing on certain facilities by time of day. Please see Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, for additional discussion of peak period pricing and other approaches to user fees.
282666	3	Jack Whisner		Doc: P&R is not cost-effective; the funds would be better used on service hours; the land would be better used on housing close to frequent transit.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
282666	4	Jack Whisner		Variable tolling should be applied to all lanes of all limited access highways, not just HOT lanes. The two HOT lane projects today (SR-167, I-405) have blockages at their north ends. SR-520 tolling results in diversion. Network wide tolling would limit both issues. Would help freight, transit, and general purpose flow.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	5	Jack Whisner		Appendix L: should explicitly state the objective of adding sidewalks to the frequent transit arterials that lack them (e.g., SR-7 south of Tacoma, north part of Greenwood Avenue North, north Seattle part of Aurora Avenue North, 30th Avenue NE in Lake City	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The Active Transportation Plan does discuss access to transit but we agree that additional clarification will be helpful on this topic and will address this in the final plan.
282666	6	Jack Whisner		Appendix G 5637: SDOT has already changed its mind; transit needs 11-foot lanes for safe operation.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	7	Jack Whisner		5633: nonsense; streetcar is very costly; would split headway between Uptown and SLU; that is poor service design.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	8	Jack Whisner		5153: Broadway Extension is nonsense; it is costly and duplicative or Route 49	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	9	Jack Whisner		5073: Broadway is slow for transit due to streetcar restriping.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	10	Jack Whisner		5075: in U District, service should be focused University Way NE as it has been for 120 years; that will have shorter walks to Link station.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	11	Jack Whisner		5173: Madison project needs redesign; should provide better transfer with Link	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282666	12	Jack Whisner		5156: explicitly add sidewalks	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Project information was submitted by the project sponsor.
282666	13	Jack Whisner		5177: extension east to Children's would be over the top and too costly; arterial is congested and it has too little benefit to network.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	14	Jack Whisner		5152: project should be redesigned to follow Route 70 pathway and provide closer connection with Link station.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	15	Jack Whisner		4092: explicitly add sidewalks	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Project information was submitted by the project sponsor.
282666	16	Jack Whisner		3311 and 3073: not without a lot more service; north Sounder only has four one-way trips today.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282666	17	Jack Whisner		5681: Boeing Access Road Link station: drop parking as not cost-effective.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282686	1	Pierce Transit, Sue Dreier, Darin Stavish	Pierce Transit	Chapter 2: * On page 33 where you mention "options to pay fares and fees via mobile apps," we'd suggest you use Pierce Pay as an example. * On page 38 where you mention the corridor we are studying for Bus Rapid Transit, please flesh the name out to Pacific Avenue/SR 7.	Other / miscellaneous	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will work with Pierce Transit staff to make the appropriate corrections in the final plan document.
282686	2	Pierce Transit, Sue Dreier, Darin Stavish	Pierce Transit	* On page 60 where improvements are mentioned to the Canyon Road Corridor in Pierce County, we were puzzled by the fact there was no mention of transit improvements planned for the corridor too, as shown in our Destination 2040 Long Range Plan.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The selected projects on p. 60 provide examples of investments to improve freight mobility.
282686	3	Pierce Transit, Sue Dreier, Darin Stavish	Pierce Transit	Chapter 3: * Pierce Transit agrees that traditional tax-based funding is not sufficient to solve the region's transportation problems. We also agree that new sources of reliable funding need to be identified and implemented. This is in line with my agency's legislative priorities adopted by our Board of Commissioners. Pierce Transit is working to garner support for an exploratory study, to identify and evaluate funding mechanisms deployed across multiple states. The study will inform the agency of best practices and possible avenues to generate additional reliable revenue, rather than relying solely on sales tax revue. This concerns, particularly amount your transit agency partners, is reiterated in Chapter 5 on page 95. * As to tolling, Pierce Transit supports comprehensive tolling reform as it relates to transit operations, including fixed route, paratransit, vanpool, and fleet support vehicles, to ensure parity amount agencies statewide. However, we do not agree with constraining toll revenues to be used exclusively for road investments.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, includes more detailed documentation of potential new revenue sources for transit, which include a share of road usage charges.
282686	4	Pierce Transit, Sue Dreier, Darin Stavish	Pierce Transit	Chapter 4 * On page 81, we'd suggest defining "frequent transit" quantitatively, such as "frequencies of every 10-15 minutes." And do the maps on page 82 depict overall accessibility to the same frequent transit networks? * On page 82, Figure 23, it isn't clear what travel mode is indicated by the data (e.g., SOV, HOV, transit?). * On page 82, it appears Figure 24 is in the wrong place. We'd suggest moving it directly below the paragraph with the title "The Plan Improves Air Quality and Reduces Greenhouse Gases" for a more logical flow. * On page 83, Figure 25, we'd suggest adding the horizon period or timeframe to the title for clarification purposes, such as 2020-2040.	Other / miscellaneous	Technical Correction	We will review these sections for further clarity in the final document.
282686	5	Pierce Transit, Sue Dreier, Darin Stavish	Pierce Transit	Chapter 5 * On page 90, we were pleased to see mention of programmatic investments in the Plan and their compelling need if transit agencies are to expand service in both the short- and long-term. In our case, our recently completed update to the Base Master Plan identifies \$137.7 million is required to expand our fleet to include the incrementally higher levels of local fixed route bus service outlined in our Destination 2040 Long Range Plan, along with introducing Bus Rapid Transit routes, plus more frequent Sound Transit Express routes directly connecting the South Sound to Sea-Tac Airport, downtown Seattle, and the University of Washington campus. * Regarding the Consistency Review of Transit Agency Plans" on page 92, has anything changed in these criteria since Transportation 2040 was last updated?	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC and local transit agency staff collaborated extensively on both the development of local agency long range plans, and in the development of the Integrated Regional Transit Network, included in the Regional Transportation Plan. This network was based largely on transit agency long range plans, which were approved by their respective governing boards. This network, and the planned transit improvements it represents, has been transmitted to PSRC boards for review and comment through the Regional Transportation Plan. No additional review for consistency is required at this time.
282686	6	Pierce Transit, Sue Dreier, Darin Stavish	Pierce Transit	In closing, my thanks for your consideration of Pierce Transit's comments, along with incorporating our suggested changes in the final Regional Transportation Plan document. We continue to see the importance of comprehensive planning work that documents regional conditions, accelerated projections for future growth, and sustainable strategies to protect public health and improve our collective quality of life. While economic growth and infill development are still very important to Pierce County, the saying "we cannot simply build our way out of traffic congestion" is as germane to the South Sound as anywhere in the central Puget Sound region. As such, we agree with the need to strategically invest in both local and regional transit systems, along with the identified growth center or compact communities that most effectively support them.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282687	1	Joe Kunzler, AvgeekJoe Productions	AvgeekJoe Productions	I think the plan is a rather good idea overall, but I'd rather see Community Transit start discussing openly what they're going to do with all the service hours & dollars saved when bus routes to Seattle end at Lynnwood Link in 2024, not Downtown Seattle. I, for one, want better connections between Skagit & Snohomish Counties and between Mukilteo & Everett.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282687	2	Joe Kunzler, AvgeekJoe Productions	AvgeekJoe Productions	I also want ST3 to go quickly and a PSRC Hall of Fame. I have quite a few nominees in mind...	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282688	1	Terie-Lee Taylor-Smith		I live just off May Valley Road in unincorporated King County. I work (for King County DAJD) in Seattle, and as you can imagine, my commute is on two lane roads all the way to I-90. Traveling on May Valley Road (MVR) to either Issaquah-Hobart Road, or to SR 900, I drive 5-7 miles to I-90 on a two lane road with no turning lanes, small or non-existent shoulders, and bike traffic, pedestrians, equestrians, joggers, etc. This makes for a scenic and enjoyable commute, except for the speeding cars and the large trucks with pups carrying building soil and rocks and cement. The commute is sometimes harrowing. I have requested that the county lower the speed limit and put up additional traffic calming and slowing devices, such as stop signs, speed bumps, circle rounds at intersections, etc., but I don't believe I have been heard. I belong to the Friends of May Valley Road group and we are trying to get relief on May Valley Road for our increasing truck traffic. We are not having a lot of luck but we are determined. However, reading this report, combined with the knowledge of the mega-developments going up in Ravensdale and Black Diamond, I am getting worried about the increasing traffic on all these surrounding roads, which were not designed for these heavy traffic loads. I have lived in my home for almost 16 years and have seen the traffic get exponentially worse.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282688	2	Terie-Lee Taylor-Smith		Please put into your plans more transit and more park and rides in our areas of unincorporated King County. Please put more traffic calming and slowing devices in place and lower all the speed limits! Our lives depend on it!	Safety	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282696	1	Janelle Boyd		As a Sounder Train commuter, I feel that it is very important that the parking capacity issue be high on the priority list, for resolution. It doesn't make sense to have all these awesome commute options, but no where to park. It was mentioned that you have to arrive extra early, in order to secure a spot, however, for those who have to wait for daycare/schools to open, this does not provide an equitable scenario. It is very frustrating and adds to the morning stress to RUSH to the park and ride to fight over parking spaces, and sometimes end up not even getting a spot, and by then the bus park and rides are also to the max. Which then leads to driving into work and paying ridiculous cost for parking garage/lot fees.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.
282736	1	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbo, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	While our Comments herein address State, Regional, County, and Local issues, we look at things from our Rural Area lens. From that perspective, we believe two major items must be addressed to ensure a sustainable transportation system, while meeting the Growth Management Act (GMA) vision to continue to preserve rural lands and rural character (“Keep the Rural Area Rural”): (1) Develop methodology to promote “regional transportation concurrency”—we have provided some detailed background as part of our comments on Land-Use Forecasting in Appendix R — Analysis Tool Documentation, and (2) Find “equitable funding mechanisms” to maintain rural transportation infrastructure increasingly being used by urban commuters traveling between cities, from homes in one location and work opportunities in others. We address “equitable funding mechanisms” throughout our comments herein	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, includes more detailed documentation of potential new revenue sources for rural transportation needs.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282736	2	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>We note the lack of an Appendix on Rural Transportation, as was the case in the 2014 Transportation 2040 Update’s Appendix R—Rural Transportation Study. At that time it was stated:</p> <p>“The issues and opportunities outlined in the rural transportation study are intended to serve as the starting point for potential future efforts to address rural transportation issues in the central Puget Sound region. The next major update for the region’s long-range transportation plan will be in 2018. As the scope of that process is developed, the issues and opportunities outlined in the rural transportation study, as well as the geographic study area, may be considered for possible further examination.”</p> <p>The issues (our emphases are underlined below) identified in Appendix R of that 2014 Transportation 2040 Update have only grown worse:</p> <p>Demographics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18% of regional population lives outside contiguous UGA--4% in cities outside contiguous UGA and 14% in Rural Area. • Almost 80% of workers outside the contiguous UGA have jobs in the contiguous UGA. • Commuters travel twice as far as those in the contiguous UGA - average commute of 22 miles vs 11 miles. • Higher reliance on driving alone, less use of transit or other alternatives. <p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Transportation Study Area - 1,500 lane miles (12% of region). • Contiguous UGA - 11,306 lane miles. • 6% of the region’s park and ride capacity. • 16% of the region’s registered vanpools. • All counties have fixed service routes – Less than 1% of all transit boardings are in the rural area. 	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. As work progresses to plan for growth to 2050, PSRC will be evaluating future transportation needs throughout the region, including the rural area, as part of the next regional transportation plan. In addition, the board recently increased the amount of funding for the Rural Town Centers and Corridors program in recognition of needs in this area.
282736	3	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[ES pg. 9] King County has one of the largest deficits between available funds and funds necessary for filling infrastructure needs of its extensive road network and large number of bridges. New funding formulae and/or new funding sources are required, as much of the heavy use of the King County road network is by urban commuters whose gas taxes pay only a small fraction of maintenance costs, while Rural Area residents’ property taxes cover an inordinate proportion.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	4	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[ES pg. 9] If there continue to be bus routes, such as along SR-169, which provide no advantage to the commuter due to either no HOV lanes or no special access/lanes, then we believe transit use will suffer and congestion will continue to build.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Plan recognizes the need for transit speed and reliability projects (see page 40 of the Draft Regional Transportation Plan), some of which are accounted for in a programmatic manner within the plan.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282736	5	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>(See pg 11) New sources must be fair and equitable and reflect true costs to society.</p> <p>In general, a combination of revenue sources, primarily from unincorporated area residents, is used to fund/maintain King County road infrastructure. King County primarily relies on property taxes (over one-third of the revenues dedicated to County roads) and, to a lesser extent, on gas taxes (state motor vehicle fuel tax is shared among cities, counties, and WSDOT.</p> <p>To compound the problem, Rural Area taxpayers tend to subsidize (through their property taxes) urban drivers who use King County roads. Such urban users comprise the majority of vehicle miles driven on major King County roads connecting urban areas (e.g., Issaquah-Hobart Rd between the cities of Maple Valley and Issaquah). By not focusing on the actual “users,” a funding/usage imbalance is created and perpetuated. The DRAFT Plan addresses this, in part, by exploring “user fees.” However, such fees also must be used on the infrastructure where they are generated for the problems to be truly addressed.</p> <p>Such user fees will need to be shown to be both more equitable and reduce the need for higher gas and property taxes. This will entail strong public outreach to gain support. Continued guidance is required from the state and regional levels to help solve our transportation problems.</p> <p>It is desired the imbalance between funding (payers) and usage (users) of King County road services be reduced or eliminated through market-based solutions. More sustainable funding models (perhaps even including changes to state laws regarding taxing authority) must be developed and implemented for King County road services, especially for maintenance of existing roads that are serving as regional traffic corridors. More equitable funding of Rural Area roads should be established so those roads, which regularly serve King County's urban residents and/or businesses, support the efficient and timely movement of people and goods. We see several potential solution paths for discussion:</p> <p>(1) In the short term, State laws (listed below) could be reviewed for opportunities to enable a more transportation-sustainable allocation of gas tax monies and provide more flexibility in revenues used'</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.
282736	6	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>(See pg 15) A good deal of these investments are in smaller cities, not the Rural Area. It is important to understand the differences among the Rural Area, Rural Cities, and Rural Towns—per the King County Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>“Rural Towns are unincorporated towns governed directly by the County. The purposes of the Rural Town designation are to recognize existing concentrations of higher density and economic activity in the Rural Area....” Currently, there are three “Rural Towns”: Fall City, Snoqualmie Pass, and the Town of Vashon.</p> <p>Rural Cities are incorporated and, thus, not governed by King County. They are: Black Diamond, Carnation, Duvall, Enumclaw, North Bend, Skykomish, and Snoqualmie. These smaller cities can be viewed as those that are surrounded by or embedded in the Rural Area:</p> <p>“King County’s Rural Area, including communities such as the Hobart Plateau, Vashon-Maury Island, the Snoqualmie Valley, and the Enumclaw Plateau, are characterized by low-density residential development, farms, ranches, forests, watersheds crucial for both fisheries and flood hazard management, mining areas, small cities and towns, historic sites and buildings, archaeological sites, and regionally important recreation areas....” (Ref.: King County Comprehensive Plan: Chap. 3—Rural Areas and Natural Resources Lands, Sec. 3. Rural Area and Communities, p. 3-3; updated December 4, 2017)</p> <p>Consequently, the pace in the Rural Area is quite different from that in both “Rural Cities” and “Rural Towns.” As such, there are unique safety impacts on Rural Area roads caused primarily by urban commuters and recreationalists. Urban commuters traverse many King County roads during AM and PM peak hour travel time periods. This is a major issue we discuss many times in our Comments herein.</p> <p>Urban recreationalists routinely impact a variety of Rural Area locations, such as, Tiger Mountain, Flaming Geyser, Spring Lake/Lake Desire Park Equestrian Trails, 140th Pl NE/148th Ave NE (wine country), etc. These areas experience heavy and/or speeding traffic, poor signage, lack of parking and what can only be called “silo disfunction”—the inability to get things done when having to deal with multiple agencies, such as KCDOT,</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282736	7	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch 1, pg. 21-22] Funding will need to be planned for and secured to ensure such [water quality] projects [such as culverts] reach the smaller parts of the region’s transportation infrastructure, specifically King County rural roads, where the first line of defense exists. Not all projects need to be “hard” solutions. In fact, “soft” solutions, such as vegetation, rain gardens, wetland areas, etc., often are longer lasting, less expensive, and more aesthetically appealing.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The plan's maintenance, preservation, and operations sections contain a discussion of investment needs related to stormwater retention and treatment. See p. 27, and Appendix M.
282736	8	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 2 pg. 26] We believe PSRC is in a unique position to provide strong leadership with the State Legislature to help alleviate County infrastructure funding shortfalls. Given King County DOT’s severe funding shortfalls, it is not in a position to meet its infrastructure maintenance needs in unincorporated areas. Although the DRAFT Plan describes potential new revenues sources, it does not propose changes in current policy, funding allocations, or gas tax allocation formulae.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	9	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 3 pg. 64-65] Again, the budget for King County’s unincorporated area roads and bridges is totally unsustainable (due to an inequitable allocation of fuel tax monies and further annexations of urban unincorporated areas along with its accompanying property tax revenues) and has forced KCDOT to develop a “tiered” system for its infrastructure, where the lowest tiers are expected to “turn to gravel” over time as insufficient maintenance and preservation monies are devoted to the higher tiers. This directly causes safety concerns due to lack of maintenance even before the roads “turn to gravel,” e.g., snow removal/deicing, repairing flooding damage.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, includes more detailed documentation of potential new revenue sources for rural and unincorporated area transportation needs.
282736	10	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 3 pg. 64-65] While it is clear the current fuel tax is unsustainable, a simple user fee is unfair unless combined with parameters that account for a vehicle’s weight (wear and tear on the infrastructure), mileage (impacts on the environment), etc. Further, as Federal monies are becoming an increasingly unreliable source, the problems are compounded.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72.
282736	11	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 3 pg. 70-73] "The revenue instruments should relate in some manner to the benefits the users receive and/or the costs that these users impose on the system and other users." We support tying “revenue instruments” to both “benefits” received and “costs” imposed (i.e., impacts that result in the need for monies to resolve the new impacts). In fact, this has been a major concern of Rural Area residents, who routinely pay more for King County road maintenance thorough their property taxes than do the majority of the users of this roads. Unfortunately, gas tax allocation formulae have exacerbated this problem.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282736	12	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Ch. 3 pg 70-73] "Local jurisdictions should utilize all currently available revenue authority, including vehicle license fees, road and property tax levy adjustments, impact and development fees, increasing taxes on parking, and more coordinated parking pricing."</p> <p>King County has limited options to do this within the Rural Area where the tax base is completely insufficient without imposing fees on the vast majority of users—urban residents commuting between cities. However, State law does not allow such reallocation of revenues. We believe PSRC can help lobby the State for such needed changes.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	13	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Ch. 3 pg 70-73] "The Phasing in of Tolls and Other User Fees"</p> <p>The question is how can this be accomplished on the smaller King County roads such as the Issaquah-Hobart Rd which is subject to both AM and PM 3+-hr peak-hour congestion. Other examples include Green Valley Rd, Auburn-Black Diamond Rd, May Valley Rd, Avondale Rd, Novelty Rd, etc. Many of these directly feed State Routes and, as such, suffer from large traffic volumes.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	14	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Ch. 3 pg 70-73] "Implementation of additional user fees must come with a strong commitment to dedicate revenues to the purpose of improving mobility, in the form of direct investments in transportation systems, or off-setting other existing transportation taxes and fees."</p> <p>We strongly support this commitment.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	15	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Ch. 3 pg. 70-73] "Limit the use of revenues to the corridor, or geography, from which the revenues are generated."</p> <p>This is critical to making King County unincorporated area road revenues sustainable. Should “user fees” be implemented, they must include a mechanism to allocate collected revenues—based on road miles driven—to those roads themselves. This will require collection methods and software to do such an allocation. This is not something the current fuel tax can do and thus, is one of its many flaws, although not one articulated by government officials except for KCDOT.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	16	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Ch. 3 pg. 70-73] "Remit some, or all, revenues to users of the transportation system through a reduction in, or elimination of, other transportation related taxes and fees."</p> <p>While we support remitting “some” revenues, one cannot remit “all” revenues back to users to “eliminate...other transportation related taxes and fees.” If done, there would be no money generated whatsoever for maintaining our transportation infrastructure. In actuality, such “user fees” would replace some of the existing revenue sources.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282736	17	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 3 pg. 70-73] In Figure 18 new “user fees” less the “fuel tax rollback” amount to less than 45% of all “new” revenues. This appears to be a missed opportunity.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Financial Working Group felt strongly that Road Usage Charges should be designed as a replacement for fuel taxes.
282736	18	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 4 pg. 80] The King County Rural Area grossly lacks transportation choices. No trains and little bus service. And, what little bus service exists, must use congested routes with no HOV (or transit-dedicated) lanes and multiple bus changes in order to arrive at destination, thus providing little to no benefit to users. This also is the case for the nearby cities in spite of what Figure 22 (p. 81) shows for “2040.”	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	19	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 4 pg 83] Figure 25 — Regional Transportation Plan Investments and Revenues by Program Both the Counties and the Cities show shortfalls in “current law revenues” to cover their “maintenance and preservation” needs. Yet, at least for the cities, almost all “new revenue” is planned to cover “system improvements.” Another concern is the four-county numbers appear too low to cover the identified needs.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. New revenues are assumed to be required for both maintenance and preservation as well as system improvements.
282736	20	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 5 pg. 86-87] We see maintenance and preservation as the paramount duty of departments of transportation. The concept of a Regional Asset Management Planning Program appears to be worthwhile exploring. Appendix M states such a program would establish more complete inventories of roadways, bridges, bicycle/ pedestrian facilities by using regional guidelines. Should this clearly show current and future maintenance/ preservation needs, as well as more informed investments at all levels, then this indeed should be explored; however, using such a top-down and regional approach should not lose sight of dire local needs.	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	21	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 5 pg. 86-87] The Rural Area has a dearth of transit opportunities and possesses corridors which lack HOV lanes to facilitate such transit.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282736	22	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Ch. 5 86-87) Again, should “user fees” be implemented, they must include a mechanism to allocate, where revenues—based on road miles driven—are generated, to those roads themselves.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	23	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Appendix M] The Plan’s high-priority commitment to maintenance and preservation of our existing infrastructure is well warranted and something we support. The \$100+B estimate for such work, though staggering, is critical to fund and implement over the life of the Plan. The KCDOT road and bridge maintenance and repair backlog is immense and very underfunded. This must be fixed.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. As noted, approximately one half of the transportation needs identified in the plan accrue to maintenance, preservation, and operation of existing assets.
282736	24	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Appendix p] The DRAFT Plan seeks a long-term vision where “revenues (are) generated from those who benefit from the investments.” This concept is critical to aiding Counties whose roads are increasingly used by urban commuters traversing from city to city, yet, due to funding constraints such as exacerbated by vagaries in the gas tax allocation, do not pay their fair share for use of those roads.</p> <p>The data in Figure 3—Transportation Revenues in the Central Puget Sound Region 1995-2014 show revenues generated by counties have barely resulted in a net change over the 20-yr period. This has caused a tremendous backlog in meeting maintenance and preservation needs.</p> <p>We question the validity of most of the assumptions in the Current Law Revenue Forecast, especially those for the counties (e.g., property tax levy renewals and high general fund transfers).</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	25	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	[Appendix P pg 14] This captures the growing dilemma facing King County and shows that something has to change by initiating new systems of funding, as we have enumerated several times herein. In fact, Figure 5: County Current Law Revenue Forecast, shows a nearly 50% reliance on property taxes to fund transportation needs. This has forced KCDOT to institute a Tiered Road System which projects lower tier roads (e.g., Tiers 4 and 5) to “turn to gravel” over time as insufficient maintenance and preservation monies are devoted to the higher tiers. Again, the budget for King County’s unincorporated area roads and bridges is totally unsustainable (due to an inequitable allocation of fuel tax monies and further annexations of urban unincorporated areas along with loss of their accompanying property tax revenues).	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	26	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Appendix P pg 19] "The primary issue currently facing cities and counties is the availability of revenue tools that are adequate to address pressing maintenance, preservation, and local system improvement needs. Currently available tools do not generate sufficient revenues to have a meaningful impact on this large and growing problem. The Regional Transportation Plan includes recommendations that local jurisdictions maximize existing authority and implement an array of new tools in the near-term to generate additional revenues that will help local jurisdictions meet these challenges"</p> <p>This explains the dilemma that has faced King County for several years and has only gotten progressively worse with time. Clearly, some form of “User Fees” are necessary on King County roads to capture their use by urban commuters traversing from city to city. However, there is no explanation on the details of implementation (e.g., How? Where? Who?).</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. See pp. 86-87 for a general implementation timeline for various actions identified in the plan.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282736	27	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Appendix P pg. 20] Table 6: Summary of New Revenues Sources for Cities & Counties</p> <p>Table 6 appears to show there are no near-term (i.e., over the next 7 years) fixes. Further, approximately 2/3 of the potential revenue through 2025 is assumed to come from an equally new Carbon Tax and an increased MVET. Clearly, without either there will be major problems both for cities and counties, which already possess the largest revenue shortfalls just to meet their basic maintenance and preservation needs. In the subsequent years through 2040 approximately 1/2 the potential revenue is assumed to come from User Fees (presumably Tolls, VMTs, etc.), which certainly could prove to be big political lifts in the State Legislature.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. It was assumed by the Finance Working Group, which developed recommendations for the financial strategy, that it would take several years to authorize and institute road usage charges. A first step is a demonstration pilot project being conducted the Washington State Transportation Commission in 2018-2019.
282736	28	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Appendix P pg. 25 - Early Action to Support Local and State Investments] This appears to state that cities and counties are on their own in lobbying the State Legislature to obtain “new sources” of revenue as identified in the earlier tables. This does not appear to be a plan for success. In fact, we believe the PSRC should present the entire Plan to the State Legislature, so that early revenue sources can be identified and secured as soon as practical. In addition, nothing requires a city to take into consideration the impact of its transportation needs on its neighbors—both city and rural surroundings. Neighboring cities call this “pass-through traffic,” so do we in the neighboring Rural Area, the difference being that we pay more than urban users, through our property taxes, to maintain King County’s unincorporated Area roads. This clearly needs to change.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Implementation Actions identified in the plan (see pp. 86-87) encourage local jurisdictions to implement currently authorized revenue authority in the short term.
282736	29	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Appendix P pg. 26] While this addresses existing tolls on major thoroughfares, it is no direct help to cities and counties moving forward. The phasing in of any VMT charges looks many years away and, thus, will provide no immediate help. While we understand this is a long-term plan (i.e., 22 years from 2018 to 2040), more or less casting off the first 8 years (i.e., to 2026) of the DRAFT Plan provides a weak base from which to satisfactorily meet overall DRAFT Plan goals. Efforts to expedite this timetable should be addressed.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282736	30	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Appendix P pg. 27] RE Guidance on the Use of User Fees</p> <p>Again, we support “(l)imit(ing) the use of revenues to the corridor ... from which the revenues are generated.” However, the term “geography” must be clearly defined. Does it mean “sub-region,” e.g., southeast King County?</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. As any new user fees are developed and implemented, policy makers will have to define eligible uses, users, and geographies.
282736	31	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Appendix P pg. 28] Table 15: Summary of the Financial Strategy Implementation Plan</p> <p>King County has tried vainly for years to “(w)ork with the state Legislature ... on financial issues facing local jurisdictions, and the need for additional dedicated resources to support maintenance and preservation programs” This has proved to be a dead-end. A coordinated regional effort is needed to move forward. It also has been unsuccessful in arguing for an “increase local share of statewide revenues.”</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282736	32	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>[Appendix R — Analysis Tool Documentation]</p> <p>There needs to be much more information included, such as peer-reviewed citations, on the Key Assumptions and Models in all four areas explored in this Appendix: Regional Macroeconomic Forecast, Land Use Forecast, Travel Demand Analysis, and Air Quality / Climate Change Analysis. Links to datasets, models, results, etc. should be provided.</p>	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. More detailed information on the models and tools used for analysis are provided on PSRC's website; we will provide a link to this information in the final document.
282736	33	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs), Peter Eberle, Susan Harvey, Steve Hiester, Peter Rimbos, Nancy Stafford, Gwyn Vukich	King County Rural Area Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs)	<p>instances reflected in the Land-Use Vision datasets? Jurisdictional development should not greatly exceed growth targets. The highest priority of a jurisdiction should be to minimize its impacts on other jurisdictions’ (Cities and Rural Areas) infrastructure by creating internal job opportunities at least equal to the growth being permitted. Funding for infrastructure improvements must be highly prioritized in jurisdictional 6-yr Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs) with guaranteed revenue sources clearly identified. A regional perspective must be ensured whereby intercity needs and uses are addressed and accommodated by accurately describing impacts to all elements of the transportation network regardless of jurisdiction.</p> <p>Clearly, there is a need to develop methodology to promote “regional transportation concurrency.” As part of the GMA, State law requires transportation concurrency, to insure Level of Service (LOS) commitments are met within a reasonable time (6 yr) to respond to transportation service impacts from development. There are concerns this amount of time is too long to have improvements in place to meet needs. Further, all too often, “financial commitments” are based on not-as-yet-secured Grant monies, which are really taxpayer monies. This helps perpetuate growth not paying for growth. Also, possibly most importantly, there appears to be no Concurrency enforcement mechanism!</p> <p>There are several specific issues with applying Concurrency and setting LOS standards:</p> <p>(1) Holistic concepts like Travel Sheds have limitations in that they stop at jurisdictional boundaries (probably not the “natural” nor actual Travel Shed boundary).</p> <p>(2) Difficult to meet meaningful coordination with neighboring jurisdictions requirements.</p> <p>(3) Integrated regional transportation concurrency is extremely difficult.</p> <p>(4) Some jurisdictions define LOS based on an “average” degree of travel comfort, e.g., intersection delay, road speed, capacity, “screenline,” distance traveled, which easily disconnects from user experience, impacting infrastructure investment.</p> <p>(5) Some jurisdictions greatly exceed growth targets and appear to have no obligation to create internal job opportunities equivalent to the population growth permitted within their jurisdiction. The text book example is the City of Black Diamond where two new Master-Planned Developments, totaling 6,050-homes, are approved</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The land use assumptions incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan are drawn from VISION 2040 and adopted local comprehensive plans. Regional assumptions for population and employment growth through the year 2040 extend beyond local targets, which are currently a 2030-2035 planning horizon, depending on the county. Under the concurrency provisions of the Growth Management Act, local jurisdictions are responsible for establishing and monitoring level of service standards and meeting local objectives before permitting additional development. Analysis in the regional plan highlights performance on regional facilities that cross jurisdictional boundaries, and reflects implementation of priority local capacity investments identified in local comprehensive plans.
282739	1	City of Kent, April Delchamps, Dana Ralph	City of Kent	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Draft PSRC Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Overall, the plan complements the City of Kent Comprehensive Plan, Transportation Master Plan, and Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).</p> <p>Despite enduring a great recession, considerable local and regional transportation investments have continued to be made. In recent years, significant investments, particularly Connecting Washington, Sound Transit, and Metro expansion have brought Kent mush closer to achieving the goals outlined in the RTP. Looking forward, Kent will be updating the Kent Transportation Master Plan in 2018. Kent anticipates sharing the results of this significant planning effort with PSRC as the region continues to implement the RTP, VISION 2050, and the Regional Growth Strategy.</p>	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282739	2	City of Kent, April Delchamps, Dana Ralph	City of Kent	<p>Support for Centers</p> <p>Kent, one of the few jurisdictions with both a Regional Growth Center and a Manufacturing and Industrial Center (MIC), is keenly aware of the importance of both of these designations. The RTP appears to be more focused on regional growth centers. For example, the introductory description for centers (page 8) details regional centers but not MICs. Please include language describing some of the unique transportation challenges presented in a MIC, particularly the role of freight mobility, warehousing, and storage. Also, please provide further clarity regarding priority access to regional centers: the plan specifies and emphasis on centers, however, only 41% of projects directly connect to a regional center.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	<p>The introductory text refers to centers broadly, and was meant to encompass both growth and manufacturing / industrial centers. We will review the document and add clarity where appropriate to note the importance of both types of centers.</p> <p>The plan recognizes the importance and role of all of the regional geographies, including designated centers, consistent with the overall regional growth strategy.</p> <p>The limited amount of PSRC funding is focused on both regionally and locally identified centers, with the regional FHWA funding competition focused on supporting regional growth and manufacturing / industrial centers.</p>

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282739	3	City of Kent, April Delchamps, Dana Ralph	City of Kent	<p>Sustainable Funding</p> <p>The plan calls for local jurisdictions to utilize all currently available revenue authority, including vehicle license fees, road and property tax levy adjustments, impact and development fees, increasing taxes on parking, and more coordinated parking pricing. The City is currently collecting a B&O tax, a garbage utility tax for transportation, and traffic impact fees; nevertheless, the City is also faced with a significant revenue shortfall with the change in the way the State allocated sales tax revenue to cities, knows as the Streamlined Sales Tax (SST). The State has provided Kent with about \$5 million per year in mitigation funding over the last decade, funding that is scheduled to end in October 2019. A recent study shows the change to SST may have already cost Kent more than \$12 million a year over the last 10 years. While all funding options should be given serious consideration, the Kent Valley will need additional resources beyond local funding options in order to preserve those freight routes that industry and the ports rely upon to move goods and services.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. In addition to locally-generated revenues, the plan assumes implementation of a road usage charge, a portion of which would be allocated to local jurisdictions.
282742	1	City of Monroe, Ben Swanson, Geoffrey Thomas	City of Monroe	<p>On behalf of the City of Monroe, I am requesting PSRC add two projects to the Snohomish County Key Investment figure in the Executive Summary.</p> <p>The first is SR 522 (T2010 ID: 4257 and 1698); a key transportation corridor for the City of Monroe and east Snohomish County. The completion of the SR 522 widening and interchange improvements will eliminate bottle necks for passenger vehicles, eliminate delays for freight, and increase reliability of first responders and transit. By adding these projects to the key investment map, in the Executive Summary, they will not be lost in the larger plan and will be more visible to the State Legislature.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	The Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website. However, we will review the Key Investments maps for potential revision for the final plan document.
282742	2	City of Monroe, Ben Swanson, Geoffrey Thomas	City of Monroe	Second, the Centennial Trail - Snohomish to Monroe (T2040 ID: 2842) should also be included, as the right-of-way in already acquired and \$250,000 in design funding is committed by Snohomish County. This addition will keep the project in the public eye and build momentum for future design and construction funding.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
282758	1	Rowley Properties, Kari Magill	Rowley Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connecting Washington is an important and vital program. We applaud its creation and approval by the Legislature. It's integrity must be maintained and cost savings/efficiencies reinvested into the program in order to expedite projects on the list. We seek to see Issaquah project(s), as studied under the Front Street IJR constructed prior to light rail's arrival. We are appreciative of the Hwy 18/190 interchange funded as it will make substantial improvements to transportation safety and movement. 	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282758	2	Rowley Properties, Kari Magill	Rowley Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With more mass transit on the way, Issaquah and its surrounding neighbors are significantly in need of more bus and high capacity transit service. We support the Kirkland to Issaquah light rail line and look forward to its construction, hopefully sooner than the projected 2040 date. 	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282758	3	Rowley Properties, Kari Magill	Rowley Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We appreciate the placement of importance on incorporating technology changes into the plan as a region we must continue to strive for efficiencies and effective utilization of our limited financial and built environment resources available. 	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282758	4	Rowley Properties, Kari Magill	Rowley Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In assessing short-term actions and what's next for the Regional Transportation Plan it is important to limit increases on taxes to fund such initiatives. These could include tolled express lanes, facility and bridge tolls, and road usage charges to replace the gas tax and further fund and manage the transportation system. Pg. 11. 	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282761	1	Valerie Moore		<p>I think the proposals in this report for the Issaquah-Hobart Road will not alleviate the current and future congestion on this road. I live off the Issaquah-Hobart Road and see first hand on daily basis the constant and increasing congestion, especially during the commuting hours.</p> <p>This road is used as a commuting route by residents from communities such as Maple Valley, Covington, Black Diamond, and Ravensdale, to access 1-90 to Seattle or I-90 to I-405. As these communities have grown, so has the congestion on Issaquah-Hobart Road. These commuters will never use Hwy-18 to access I-90 as the drive over Tiger Mountain on Hwy-18 can be hazardous during inclement weather and is basically not a direct or convenient route.</p>	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. There are additional investments proposed in the surrounding area that may be of interest, including the future transit network; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282761	2	Valerie Moore		<p>As the cost of living in our area increases, residents must move farther and farther away from the expensive housing in the cities to be able to afford a home. Unfortunately, this only leads to longer commute times and more congestion on rural roads that were not designed for that high volume of traffic. The way to reduce congestion is not widening roads or building new roads, but to reduce the number of cars on the road by providing public transportation. There is currently no public transportation to link the above-mentioned communities [Maple Valley, Covington, Black Diamond, and Ravensdale] to current transit centers that provide public transportation to Seattle or Bellevue and other cities. These communities desperately need public transportation routes and park and rides to allow them to reach major employment centers. .</p> <p>To solve the congestion on Issaquah-Hobart Road, there could be park and rides in each community that are served by public buses with express service along Issaquah-Hobart Road to the Issaquah Transit Center.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282794	1	Kimberly Workman		<p>Please plan to offer a Park and Ride somewhere near HWY 18 and/or the Issaquah-Hobart Road. Perhaps the road could be widened?</p> <p>We are residents living off of Tiger Mountain Road and it takes us literally 20 minutes to travel 1/4 mile to May Valley Road every morning.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282795	1	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	<p>ACES Northwest Network is a coalition formed in 2017 for the purpose of promoting the planning and use of new transportation technologies in the Puget Sound region. This includes connected vehicles (V2V, V2I, IoT), electric vehicles, shared vehicles, autonomous vehicles and a wide variety of other technologies. A list of Network participants is included in Attachment A.</p> <p>One of our primary goals is to unite the public and private sectors to commonly plan for the implementation of new technologies and work to eliminate regulatory barriers.</p> <p>The world of transportation technology is advancing quickly, and promises to address the following goals of our region’s residents and businesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce single-occupancy vehicles • Reduce vehicle miles traveled • Reduce traffic congestion and travel time • Improve freight and logistics • Increase transit ridership • Improve mobility for the elderly • Connect low density areas to transit • Improve mobility for the disabled • Create jobs and economic development • Achieve Target Zero • Reduce surface water runoff • Improve vehicle safety • Reduce carbon emissions • Improve air quality 	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282795	2	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	<p>We approve of the information contained on pages 16-18 of the 2018 Update (Supporting Innovation), pages 31-34 (TDM and Transportation Technology) and Appendix N – Technology; and support the Implementation Actions for Technology found on page 87, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establishing a technology advisory committee. ACES NW Network would appreciate the opportunity for some of our members to join the PSRC committee.• Update the region’s ITS Implementation Plan (RITSIP) to better reflect existing conditions, current needs and projected changes due to new technologies.• Continue to enhance regional models to analyze the effect of new technology on the transportation system and travel behavior. We assume that “regional models” refers to the PSRC’s land use and transportation models. We encourage development of these models to attempt to project the impacts (positive and negative) on land use and transportation, as well as attempt to identify and forecast the benefits and detriments of new technologies.• Facilitate regional discussions to identify opportunities to support private sector projects and partnerships and the deployment of pilot programs. This effort is central to the ACES mission and we look forward to collaborating with the PSRC on this Implementation Action. We call your attention to our existing efforts with the City of Bellevue to enable pilot transportation technology programs to be delivered in the City.	Emerging Technologies	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. We look forward to working with partner agencies on these issues.
282795	3	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	Regional Transportation Technology Plan. Create a regional transportation technology plan that identifies new technology projects for the region to implement and provides a schedule and budget for implementing them. The transportation technology plan should communicate the regional strategy and serve as a tool for obtaining public and private funding for technology projects. Creation of the transportation technology plan should be added to the list of implementation actions on Page 87 of the 2018 Update.	Emerging Technologies	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. We will share this concept with our boards for their consideration.
282795	4	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	Funding. Identify public and private funding sources for the technology projects. For example, PPP’s such as the Smart Columbus public/private partnership, local sources including Bellevue’s transportation technology fund, state sources like the R&D sales tax credit, and federal grants like the USDOT INFRA and ACTMTD grant programs.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282795	5	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	Regional Transportation Project List. Identify and add the technology projects to the list of existing projects within Appendix G of the 2018 Update and to the PSRC’s Transportation Improvement Plan.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	The draft plan contains a wide variety of investments, most of which are considered programmatic in nature, including operational and localized investments. The Regional Capacity Projects list is a subset of all investments, and serves a particular purpose which is to meet our federal air quality conformity requirements by the inclusion and modeling of regionally significant (aka modelable) projects. We are unable to list and monitor all projects throughout the region through 2040 as part of the plan, but that in no way diminishes the importance of these critical investments.
282795	6	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	Target Zero. Leverage the efforts to achieve Target Zero to identify, fund and implement new technologies that have the potential to improve vehicle safety, reduce fatalities and serious injuries, and at the same time improve mobility and achieve other transportation technology goals. In other words, “Supporting Innovation” should be an integral part of achieving a “Safe Transportation Network”, and vice-versa.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282795	7	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	<p>Improve Transit Ridership and Reduce Single Occupancy Vehicles. Maximize the investments in light rail and bus transit, and reduce single occupancy vehicles, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o enabling commuters from lower density areas to connect to transit via new technologies -- for example, using ride sharing, car sharing or flexible electric vanpools to connect from lower density neighborhoods to park & rides/mobility hubs; o enabling shared employer shuttles and transportation network companies to utilize park & rides, mobility hubs and rail stations for pick up and drop off; o planning for the siting and funding of new park & rides, or “mobility hubs” throughout the region (it is critical that the PSRC take the lead on this effort); and o making use of new “mini transit” models such as autonomous shuttles <p>The Regional Transit Access and Parking Strategy on pages 40-41 of the 2018 Update is a start, but additional effort from the PSRC is needed to enable the entire region, including lower density areas, better access to the transit system.</p>	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. These are important issues to recognize and include in the planning efforts and implementation of emerging technologies.
282795	8	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	<p>Improve Freight Mobility. Include a discussion of new technologies in the Freight Mobility section on pages 57-58 of the 2018 Update. It is likely that freight and logistics companies will be early adopters of new technologies, including those being developed by local companies (and ACES members) PACCAR and NVIDIA which include autonomous and electric trucks. Platooned truck exercises currently done in California and proposed in Oregon should also be explored with WSDOT. The 2018 Update should call for the region to identify ways to support the implementation of these technologies with an eye toward improving freight carrier route selection and delivery times, improving throughput, reducing overall traffic congestion, improving air quality through reduction of diesel emissions and achieving Target Zero.</p>	Emerging Technologies	Board Review	We agree the intersection of freight and technology is an important consideration, which is reflected in the information contained in Appendix N. We will bring these issues to the attention of the board for their consideration.
282795	9	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center, Bruce Agnew, Tom Alberg, Bryan Mistele	ACES Northwest Network/Cascadia Center	<p>Remove regulatory barriers. We ask that the PSRC and its technology committee focus on avenues to remove legislative and municipal barriers to new technologies. ACES NW Network has identified several legislative areas that need to be improved, and have included them in Attachment B to this letter. ... Attachment B Legislative Agenda 2018 The ACES Legislative Caucus was held at the INRIX headquarters in Kirkland on Friday, October 20, 2017. Tentative agenda items (in partnership with Bellevue/Eastside Chambers):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible, app-dispatched, electric van pools for the I-405, SR 167/9/522 corridors deployed through employer partnerships, state support and super fast charging centers • Coordination with the Governor’s Office and NW congressional delegation on federal and state jurisdiction regarding autonomous vehicles regulations • Restrictions lifted on shared employer shuttles imposed by RCW 35.58.245 • Multi-modal public and private transportation electrification incentives • Potential transit agency and private mobility service partnerships to address first mile/last mile challenges and conversion of park and ride lots to mobility hubs • Low income mobility access from low density neighborhoods to high density employment • Statewide TNC business regulatory harmonization • Enhancing Commute Trip Reduction Act for van pools and car pools • Providing cost-effective electric vehicle incentives for people and goods • Creating tax incentives for used electric vehicle purchases for low income workers • Adjusting the cap on EV sales tax credit • Modifying regulations for curbside or off-street electric vehicle charging stations • Update statewide building and electrical codes to incentivize the expansion of electric vehicle charging station capability in multi-family, commercial, and single family housing developments <p>Attendees: Rep. JT Wilcox Sen. Steve Hobbs Rep. Larry Springer</p>	Emerging Technologies	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. These issues will be referenced in PSRC's ongoing technology work with regional and state partners.
282796	1	Allen Johnson	none	1) Overall – very heavy on pretty pictures and urbanist ideology.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282796	2	Allen Johnson	none	2) Solutions (focus) – you are too focused on forcing people of cars (which most people like) and into mass transit (which most people don’t like). You need to figure out how to move cars effectively in addition to mass transit. Simply declaring war on cars plays great with the anti-car urbanists, but not with people who live here.	Multi-modal	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282796	3	Allen Johnson	none	3) Solutions (practical) – your most cost effective way to move more people faster (see below #6 / metrics) is to make traffic signals smarter. I’m not generally a downtown rush hour commuter, so my experiences may differ somewhat from your focus, but I lose way more time sitting at red traffic lights where there is an empty road in the green direction than I lose stuck in freeway traffic. Lots of traffic lights around the city appear to have no sensors and rely on timers only, so a left turn light may require 3 or 4 cycles to make it through. We’re spending \$54 billion for ST3 to move a tiny fraction of people on mandated routes – we could improve the mobility experience of every car user (which is the vast majority of trips for the vast majority of people) by improving signals.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282796	4	Allen Johnson	none	4) Solutions (practical) – and stop with the road diets!!! If you did an honest traffic study across all dayparts and seasons (don’t just cherry pick Amazon bike commuters in South Lake Union), I bet you would find that cars outnumber bikes by at least 100x. Dedicated bike lanes sound really nice for environmental metrics, but they reduce the number of people that can move through a given route. You need to focus on solving problems, not making the anti-car zealots happy.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282796	5	Allen Johnson	none	5) Revenue sources – tolls on roads I’ve already bought and paid for suck. Real people will fight you tooth and nail.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Current revenue sources have proven inadequate to maintain, preserve, and operate existing transportation assets, let alone make capacity improvements to accommodate growth.
282796	6	Allen Johnson	none	6) Metrics – I see lots of metrics about safety, the environment, reducing greenhouse gases and getting people out of cars. I don’t see anything about how quickly people get from point A to point B. If this is a transportation plan, where are the real metrics? You are measuring puff and fluff, and disregarding the fact the a transportation plan needs to be about transportation	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix K, System Performance Report, includes metrics on travel delay and other performance measures.
282801	1	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	<p>Corridor Congestion Challenges: Like other parts of the region, Pierce County’s major freeway corridors are significantly more congested since 2007. Pierce County residents suffer from growing congestion on many state arterials.</p> <p>We believe this problem deserves to be more prominently shown in the main body of the plan than Figure 23 (page 82 of the draft Regional Transportation Plan):</p> <p>[image of figure 23]</p> <p>While this is important information, it should be accompanied by additional context and visuals to more accurately reflect the mobility challenges faced by the region. A couple of specific suggestions are to (1) supplement this chart with a “heat” map of important corridors that illustrate average travel speeds or cumulative delay during peak travel periods; and (2) put congestion increases in historical context as is done in the WSDOT Corridor Capacity Reports.</p>	Analysis Tools and Documentation	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. Where feasible, we will work to improve our graphics and visuals to provide more clarity to the reader.
282801	2	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	Corridor Congestion Challenges: It should also be noted where travel time improvements in the 2040 plan are the result of financial disincentives such as additional tolling and/or fees based on vehicle miles traveled. There is a major difference between reduced congestion because of increased transportation system capacity and reduced congestion because fewer people are driving.	Congestion	General Comment	The analysis of the plan is based on the comprehensive implementation of policies and investments, and their combined impacts and benefits. Separate analyses are not conducted on individual policies or investments to gauge their independent impact.
282801	3	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	<p>Assumptions Regarding Road Usage Charges</p> <p>The lynchpin of the plan’s financing strategy is a new road usage charge, but whether, how, and when the region will implement a fee based on vehicle miles traveled is very speculative at this point. It is also unclear if such an approach has public support or would be affordable to our constituency. The Washington State Transportation Commission is just now beginning a road usage charge pilot program, and there are many technical and policy questions still outstanding.</p> <p>...Without satisfactory answers to these questions, Pierce County is concerned—both about the negative impact road usage charges could have on our residents and whether these charges should be included as a key component in the regional transportation plan</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Transportation Policy Board's Finance Working Group was challenged by data indicating that within the life of the Regional Transportation Plan there is likely to be a major disruption in how highway maintenance and improvements are financed due to higher fuel mileage vehicles, more electric vehicles and potentially more electric, autonomous and shared vehicles. State leaders have also explored alternatives and challenges with implementing alternatives like road usage charges, which are currently being tested through a statewide pilot project just getting underway. The working group also recognized that there are major hurdles to implementing any future road usage charges, which, if ultimately actually proposed, would require a substantial policy debate well beyond discussions to date along with broad public acceptance, which is currently lacking. The state legislature and the Governor will ultimately decide whether and when to change the means to maintain and improve the state's transportation system, which would require broad public support. For now, the Regional Transportation Plan includes an assumption for road user charges, understanding that timing and implementation of any new major financing mechanism is far from certain.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282801	4	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	Assumptions Regarding Road Usage Charges : 1. Compared to a gas tax, how much more would a program like this cost to administer and from where would the money come?	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC estimates that the cost to collect road usage charges will be approximately 10% of road usage charge revenues. This represents a conservative estimate based on only 1 million users of the system. As additional users of the road usage charge enroll, fixed costs are scaled across a larger population, which reduces cost of collection as a percent of gross revenue. The Financial Strategy accounts for these costs. Resources to pay for the cost of collection will be generated from the fee itself. Supporting documentation can be found here. http://wstc.wa.gov/StudiesSurveys/RoadUsage/RUC2013/documents/2016_0112_RUCReport.pdf
282801	5	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	Assumptions Regarding Road Usage Charges : 2. Are the revenues collected dedicated solely for “highway purposes”?	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. It was assumed by the Finance Working Group that revenues generated through road usage charges would not be restricted by the 18th amendment, making portions of those revenues available to a wider array of transportation investments.
282801	6	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	Assumptions Regarding Road Usage Charges : 3. Would road usage charge replace the gas tax or supplement it?	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. It was assumed that road usage charges would replace fuel taxes.
282801	7	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	Assumptions Regarding Road Usage Charges: 4. How would the state prevent fraud without violating citizen privacy?	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Enforcement and privacy concerns will have to be carefully considered as a road usage charge system is designed. The Washington State Transportation Commission's Road Usage Charge Pilot Program is testing various approaches to enforcement and data security.
282801	8	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	Assumptions Regarding Road Usage Charges: 5. What accommodations, if any, will be made to account for the disproportionate impact on those who cannot afford to live near employment centers (particularly in light of policies that concentrate employment growth in high-cost of living metropolitan areas)?	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.
282801	9	Pierce County, Bruce F. Dammeier, Connie Perry, Douglas G. Richardson	Pierce County	Transportation Benefits of Regionally Equitable Growth: The Regional Transportation Plan acknowledges the current VISION 2040 regional geographies, but it fails to highlight the transportation benefits of regionally equitable growth. We think it should. Nearly half of Pierce County workers commute out of the county for work. If they didn’t have to, the entire region would be better off. It is a similar story in Snohomish and Kitsap, where a large portion of the workforce has to travel to Seattle and back each work day. This puts a tremendous amount of stress on the regional transportation system. Transit options that take commuters to and from major urban centers is one approach, but it would be better to have more job opportunities where people already live. We believe that more jobs locally within each county is ultimately better for families and communities and that the region should implement policies that encourage such job growth to occur.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The land use assumptions incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan are drawn from VISION 2040 and adopted local comprehensive plans. These plans were based on goals to improve jobs-housing balance, minimize commute distances, and ensure economic opportunities throughout the region. The Supporting the Regional Economic Strategy section of Chapter 1 highlights the importance of continuing to encourage economic growth across all parts of the region, in alignment with the regional growth strategy, to help minimize impacts on the region's transportation system, among other benefits. See p. 13.
282804	1	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 1. Thorough and overall glad to see environmental protection and overall sustainability tone with the issues included (i.e. reducing pollution, managing stormwater, promoting health, climate impacts, air and water quality, environmental justice and equity, etc.)	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282804	2	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 2. Very important to continue to emphasize and focus on the need to develop regional connections for regional trips—it is not acceptable to expect that local streets carry the burden of regional traffic demands.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The plan recognizes the importance of investments on local roads and the arterial network, and their importance in implementing growth plan by creating and maintaining a highly connected network of multimodal facilities. See Chapter 2, pp. 43-44, Regional Roadway System. Also see Chapter 3, A Sustainable Financial Framework, and Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, which emphasize the importance of securing additional new revenues to meet the investment needs of cities and counties.
282804	3	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 3. Continue to look at opportunities to apply advancements in technology to our regional transportation system to improve mobility in ways beyond traditional infrastructure improvements.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282804	4	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 4. Provide clearer language about implementation for both rural and suburban, it seems at implementation some of the suburban seems lost. (Gaps/Prioritized Strategies)	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282804	5	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 5. Issaquah would like a stronger call for making trainings and materials available in other languages (Title VI) to better “Promote customer-friendly travel training and information...” (Prioritized Strategies)	Equity	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. PSRC will enhance the discussion of the importance of information available in different formats to the Transportation Demand Management section.
282804	6	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 6. It should be noted in the Plan that King County has the largest fleet of electric buses in the country under the Current Status section. Such a note would help indicate good work in the region that should continue.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
282804	7	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 7. The Plan acknowledges equity issues when implementing user fees, such as a Road Usage Charge (RUC), by indicating that the design should be careful to consider the financial implication on different populations, particularly those with low incomes, or who live in remote areas with few transportation options. However, it doesn’t have the solution(s) for people who do not have public transportation as an option. (Financial Strategy Implications). The only funding mechanism seems to be to tax the existing tax base for the future capacity needs. There should be mention of a regional transportation impact fee, levied on all new construction to pay for the capacity improvements required to connect cities.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy assumes a regional transportation impact fee to fund improvements. See p. 73.
282804	8	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 8. Additionally, for Build High Quality (pg. 57), Separated Facilities: needs to be a little clearer - did ridership really increase from 21% to 171% within one year of building the protected lanes. In numbers or other clarity.	Analysis Tools and Documentation	Technical Correction	We agree that additional clarification will be helpful on this topic and will address this in the final plan.
282804	9	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 9. Local roads often support regional traffic that connect to the regional system. This regional traffic is more often than not, a burden on those local corridors. Individual jurisdictions cannot make improvements over these entire corridors; therefore, corridor planning that involves every jurisdiction that may use that corridor needs to be included in the Plan. This corridor planning should correspond with local and regional plans and include input from the Regional Transportation System Initiative.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The plan recognizes the importance of investments on local roads and the arterial network, and their importance in implementing growth plan by creating and maintaining a highly connected network of multimodal facilities. See Chapter 2, pp. 43-44, Regional Roadway System. Also see Chapter 3, A Sustainable Financial Framework, and Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, which emphasize the importance of securing additional new revenues to meet the investment needs of cities and counties.
282804	10	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PLAN and APPENDICES 10. Front St N is called out as a principal arterial. It should be noted, however, that Issaquah has no plans to widen the roadway or otherwise expand capacity on this corridor.	Project Specific	General Comment	It is unclear where in the document this comment is referencing; no particular facility is called out as a principal arterial, and there is no regional capacity project proposing to widen Front Street in Issaquah.
282804	11	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	11. Appendix F: While it is included in the main Plan (pg. 15), we have heard from some Issaquah businesses solicited that advocacy groups (outside of transportation field) as well as employers need to be called out as “implementers” more strongly. This is a good thing as the businesses see the important role they play in implementing trip reduction strategies. Also, “better marketing to the general public” about trip reduction is needed.	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282804	12	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	Appendix F: Glad to see social determinants content, but would like more inclusive language in reference to “affordable housing” to include “housing support services” such as access to shelters, day centers, emergency financial assistance, and fuel assistance.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. This suggestion will be brought to the Transportation Demand Management working group for consideration in future updates to the TDM strategy.
282804	13	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	12. Appendix L: Active Transportation Plan, In the executive summary, under The Need section paragraph two, the last sentence needs to state. “Non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities increased from 21% to 27% “of the total” between 2010 and 2016 in the central Puget Sound region.” This will provide context as it does when the study is cited later in the document.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	We agree that additional clarification will be helpful on this topic and will address this in the final plan.
282804	14	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PROJECTS 1. Plan, Figure 8: King County Key Investments: Issaquah Mountains to Sound Greenway trail on Newport Way from Lakemont to SR 900 is missing from this map and should be included.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
282804	15	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PROJECTS: Appendix G and Map: • SR 900 to SE 54th St should be included on the list of Regional Capacity Projects	Project Specific	General Comment	We cannot add new projects to the Regional Capacity Projects list at this time. PSRC did extensive outreach with our member jurisdictions throughout 2017 to collect new and revised project submittals for the draft plan. There is a formal process for project submittals, which feed directly into our regional travel demand models and subsequent air quality analyses and formal conformity findings as required by federal legislation. We worked with City of Issaquah staff to finalize the projects that are ultimately represented on the project list.
282804	16	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PROJECTS Appendix G and map: The 11th/12th I-90 crossing appears to be included in project 2529, Link LRT extension from South Kirkland to Issaquah. It should be included separately. Additionally, in the description, it is described as “a pedestrian bridge across I-90 at Central Issaquah.” This is intended to be multi-modal. It is included in our TIP and WSDOT’s project list as a multi-modal bridge.	Multi-modal	General Comment	We worked extensively with City of Issaquah staff on the appropriate projects to include in the regional capacity projects list. The bridge you mention is considered a programmatic investment, below the threshold of needing to be explicitly included on the regional capacity projects list.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282804	17	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PROJECTS Appendix G and map: As we understand it, the Cedar-Sammamish Trail should be located on the east side of SR900, along Tibbetts Creek – not the west, as shown.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	We will confirm the correction location with the project sponsor and revise the final plan as appropriate.
282804	18	City of Issaquah, Christen Leeson	City of Issaquah	PROJECTS Appendix G and map: Link LRT should terminate on I-90 at Front (or east of Front), but not extend down Front Street.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	We will confirm the correction location with the project sponsor and revise the final plan as appropriate.
282816	1	Erin Harris		Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the long-range plan for our region. I am a regional local, and a recent transplant to Kitsap County. One of our reasons for choosing Kitsap is a desire to avoid commuting on the freeways, and instead commute by ferry. I work for the Seattle Department of Transportation, and am submitting comment as a private individual. Our region has complex transportation needs and narrow corridors, and the congestion is truly remarkable. It has been a pleasure to live in Kitsap where traffic is less of an issue. That said, we see there the safety and health impacts of the lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, limited transit, and a full reliance on vehicle travel. People just don't walk as much, and even fewer ride bicycles. I live two miles from the ferry terminal in Bremerton and do not walk because of lack of pedestrian facilities to my home. The narrow sidewalks leave pedestrians too close to passing vehicles, and it does not feel safe. Since moving to Kitsap my family walks and bicycles less than living in Seattle, and we are avid outdoor enthusiasts.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC does encourage local jurisdictions to plan for all modes and offers additional resources and information in Appendix L, the regional Active Transportation Plan.
282816	2	Erin Harris		I am very disappointed by the visioning for Kitsap County. The few improvements included in the plan are welcome, and the county needs more safety, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements. This county will grow with the rest of the region, and not including the needed multi-modal improvements will only resign Kitsap County to increased traffic. We are a rare opportunity that we have the space for the improvements, and the foresight of watching the region expand and struggle with traffic. Offering pedestrian and bicycle improvements in the next 20 years will only help this county to minimize future traffic impacts, improve public health and safety, and support the local economy by allowing the community to choose how much monthly income to spend on transportation.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC does encourage local jurisdictions to plan for all modes.
282816	3	Erin Harris		1. Please include safety improvements for the highway traveling through Gorst. The allowed crossings at the curve increase the hazard of the roadway. The lowered speed zone there is insufficient to provide reasonable safety. Please consider median barriers, additional warning signs on the pillars, additional shoulder lanes for merging, extend the speed zone to start earlier for each approach, lower the speed even further (perhaps to 30 MPH, RCW 46.61.415), and provide enforcement here for the speed zone. I have not seen the collision statistics, but I am aware of two collision fatalities in recent years at this location.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282816	4	Erin Harris		2. Please include a multi-use trail from Port Orchard to Bremerton to Silverdale to Poulsbo. These communities are disconnected unless by car. The trail could connect to the east bound trail in Port Orchard, and to the existing trail in Silverdale, and on to Poulsbo. There have been a number of bicycle & pedestrian plans for Kitsap County, although none appear to be fully implemented, including specific request for funding from PSRC (Kitsap Way project 2017). Please provide funding for these plans.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Kitsap County and jurisdictions did submit some routes to be included in PSRC's Regional Bicycle Network which can be found in the Active Transportation Plan, Appendix L. A link to a web-map can be found on page 31. This network does provide flexibility in terms of the implementation and facility types.
282816	5	Erin Harris		3. Please include more pedestrian facilities in Kitsap County. This low-income county is disproportionately impacted by lack of pedestrian facilities and forced reliance on owning a vehicle. RCW requires pedestrian access and many roadways in Kitsap only provide a dark shoulder for pedestrians. A dark shoulder is no longer adequate and no longer the State standard for pedestrian facilities.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282816	6	Erin Harris		4. Please include bicycle protected facilities to each ferry terminal, even if it is only from a nearby park-and-ride. Paid parking and busses are not always available, and being able to ride a bicycle to / from the ferry will provide more travel options for commuters, and reduce traffic volumes.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The regional Active Transportation Plan, Appendix L, does include a regional bike network that connects to local ferries. This is an aspirational network but facilities for all-ages and abilities are encouraged. TRANSIT ACCESS
282816	7	Erin Harris		5. Please include maintenance support for Kitsap County to maintain the pavement markings. In many (most?) areas the markings are so faint they are barely visible, especially in the rain and dark.	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282828	1	City of Des Moines, Matt Pina, Bonnie Wilkins	City of Des Moines	<p>The City of Des Moines appreciates the important work of the Puget Sound Regional Council and the opportunity to comment on the Draft of the Regional Transportation Plan - 2018.</p> <p>The draft plan acknowledges the importance of a sustainable regional transportation network moving people and goods in ways that support a healthy environment and a strong economy. The plan also recognizes the opportunity to address past harms to the environment and improve air and water quality. The City of Des Moines is committed to multi-modal options.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282828	2	City of Des Moines, Matt Pina, Bonnie Wilkins	City of Des Moines	<p>The City of Des Moines comments relate primarily to the section of the plan devoted to the regional aviation system and planning for future airport system needs (pg.53-54).</p> <p>Washington is the most trade dependent state in the nation and Washington airports undeniably have a significant impact on the State’s economy. (The 2012 Aviation Economic Impact Study estimated that, ‘the total impact of airport-related activity included approximately 250,000 jobs, \$15.3 billion in wages and \$51 billion in total economic activity. The study also stated that more than \$790 million in tax revenue came from airport’s economic impact, with \$550 million going to the State and \$250 million distributed to local jurisdictions; cities, counties and special purpose districts.’) The plan is deficient in the discussion of this critical element of the state’s transportation system, devoting a brief half page to this topic.</p> <p>The primary concern of the City of Des Moines has to do with the asymmetrical relationship between the public benefit of economic activity coming from airport operations (specifically SeaTac International Airport) and the disproportionate negative impacts experienced by our city in proximity to this major airport. We understand the plan addresses the statewide transportation system, nonetheless SeaTac is the largest component in the statewide aviation system.</p>	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The study's scope includes an evaluation of economic impacts of aviation activity in the central Puget Sound region. This new initiative will be included in the final plan.
282828	3	City of Des Moines, Matt Pina, Bonnie Wilkins	City of Des Moines	<p>It is state policy to work with appropriate local and regional authorities to begin the process of siting a second large commercial airport in western Washington.</p> <p>We are supportive of the plan’s discussion related to the State taking the lead in addressing capacity needs, including by funding a site selection study for the placement of new airports(s), and placing a priority on funding and planning the state’s air transportation system (pg. 54).</p>	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282828	4	City of Des Moines, Matt Pina, Bonnie Wilkins	City of Des Moines	The plan section related to maximizing aviation capacity within the existing regional airport system before constructing new airports, should be modified to require that the disproportionate impacts experienced by Des Moines residents and surrounding communities are primary considerations in the decision to move toward siting a new international airport within the region (pg. 54).	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning.
282828	5	City of Des Moines, Matt Pina, Bonnie Wilkins	City of Des Moines	<p>Additionally, the impacts of SeaTac in terms of mobility, connectivity and multi-modal accessibility to and from the airport is problematic and remains largely unaddressed. The complexity of the regional transportation systems and often ineffective regional planning for transportation is part of the difficulty in addressing transport concerns.</p> <p>SeaTac is growing rapidly and the plan needs to provide guidance to assure that multi-modal options are the standard for addressing airport growth. Constraints on the capacity of the regional transportation grid to absorb millions of more passengers and tons of cargo must be seen as signaling consideration of new airport facilities that will relieve congestion, not simply add to it. The integration of the state aviation system into regional transportation planning is essential to the accommodation of future demand at SeaTac and elsewhere.</p> <p>Without adequate access, the economic potential from aviation is constrained and the impacts to local residents become increasingly unfair.</p>	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The study will include an evaluation of multimodal access to the region's airports.
282828	6	City of Des Moines, Matt Pina, Bonnie Wilkins	City of Des Moines	<p>Sustainability must be central to any discussion of the effectiveness and functionality of the state transportation system, including the aviation system. As you know, the classic definition of sustainability comes from the 1987 Brundtland Report, defining sustainable development as, ‘development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.’</p> <p>We strongly object to the absence of any discussion related to sustainability and air and water quality related to airport system needs, particularly related to maximizing existing airport capacity before constructing new airports. Sustainability, air, and water quality must be critical considerations in the decision to site new airports. The following policies from Vision 2040 support the inclusion of these considerations related to air system planning:</p> <p>* MPP-T-7: Develop a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to human health.</p> <p>* MPP-T-5: Foster a less polluting system that reduces the negative effects of transportation infrastructure and operation on the climate and natural environment.</p> <p>* MPP-T-20: Design transportation facilities to fit within the context of the built or natural environments in which they are located.</p>	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan has been developed with multiple objectives in mind, including supporting the region's growth strategy and economy, as well as a sustainable environment. See Chapter 1, pp. 2-14, and pp. 18-23, Supporting a Sustainable Environment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282828	7	City of Des Moines, Matt Pina, Bonnie Wilkins	City of Des Moines	The ability to implement sustainable measures to protect the natural environment, human health, mitigate noise and understand any adverse health impacts of jet fuel emissions, etc. is an essential constraint on future airport capacity and expansion. Without the ability to implement sustainable measures, future SeaTac airport growth in both operations and capacity, should be constrained.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282828	8	City of Des Moines, Matt Pina, Bonnie Wilkins	City of Des Moines	Additionally, the City requests that discussion of the City of Des Moines’ potential for a passenger ferry terminal be added to the section related to the ferry system (pg. 50). The City is actively working on potential passenger ferry service to Seattle and Tacoma. The City’s proximity to light rail and a fast-growing employment base serve to make passenger ferry service in Des Moines a viable alternative mode of transportation.	Ferries	Board Review	Ferries have been integrated into the 2040 regional transit network. PSRC recognizes ferries as providing an important role in moving people in the region. The request for further study and planning around passenger-only/fast ferries will be forwarded to the Board.
282829	1	Bob Creamer, MJ Creamer		As Snohomish County residents, we feel that your organization is not focusing on transportation concerns in our area.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Transportation needs and projects were drawn from local plans and projects developed in all four counties. See the interactive project webmap for more details about mapped projects in your area: https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html
282829	2	Bob Creamer, MJ Creamer		1) Highway 2 Trestle and Highway 9 connections are causing issues with peoples' daily commutes in our county. And yet, we see no interest by PSRC to make these problems a priority.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Washington State Department of Transportation has proposed improvements in this area, including improvements to the US 2 / SR 9 interchange; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
282829	3	Bob Creamer, MJ Creamer		2) We see many projects occurring south of Sno. Co., especially in King County. We feel this is due to the makeup of PSRC's policy board and executive board. These boards have too many elected officials and not enough of residents who have to contend with traffic congestion every day.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Please refer to the projects web map at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information on investments proposed in Snohomish County.
282829	4	Bob Creamer, MJ Creamer		3) We feel that PSRC shows too much concern about Seattle and King County and only gives token service to other counties. We wonder why PSRC never holds meetings outside of their "kingdom" in Seattle. Your weekly, monthly meetings in Seattle are difficult to attend because of congestion that impedes timely, efficient access to your office.	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282829	5	Bob Creamer, MJ Creamer		4) Which cities and counties are included in PSRC's Central Puget Sound Area? Snohomish County has the largest manufacturing plant in the world, yet, we are not designated as a Metro Center. Why? We have a large number of people from the south who commute to Everett to work at this plant, yet, Light Rail is not scheduled for Everett until 2036, 2040, which concerns us with your prioritization of transportation projects.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	The central Puget Sound region has four counties - King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish - and 82 cities and towns. The City of Everett is designated as a metropolitan city in our region, and Paine Field/Boeing Everett is a designated regional manufacturing/industrial center.
282835	1	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the T2040 draft plan. Although this is the formal comment period, Transportation Choices and Puget Sound Sage have been very pleased at PSRC staff’s willingness to work with and engage our and other organizations over the course of the plan update. Taking the time to explain the plan and solicit feedback starting early on in the process allowed us to familiarize ourselves with the plan elements and provide meaningful comments.</p> <p>We understand that this update was relatively limited, and that the time frame was short to make many substantive changes. This is especially true for feedback provided during the comment period. Therefore, in our comments below, we propose several small changes or additions to language to strengthen policies pertaining to health, social equity, and the environment, and then ask for some additions that can serve as a roadmap for larger changes that PSRC staff have committed to and the board has voiced support for, either in subsequent long-range transportation plans or the Vision 2050 update.</p>	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	2	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix A: Multicounty Planning Policies:</p> <p>The MPPs laid out in T2040 are comprehensive, progressive, and visionary. However, we feel that sometimes there is not a clear explanation of how they are implemented, and how individual jurisdictions and the region as a whole are held accountable to achieving them. We believe that being able to measure and communicate how we are enacting these policies and reaching these goals is paramount.</p> <p>We highly recommend including some introductory text in this section that lays out how these policies will be folded into work on Vision 2050 to establish more comprehensive performance measures, set minimum thresholds, ensure robust implementation, and hold jurisdictions accountable for meeting these goals.</p> <p>Below are some examples of policies that are particularly important but may not be fully daylighted in performance measurement.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The region's GMA Multicounty Planning Policies were adopted by the General Assembly in the VISION 2040 document. PSRC has initiated a work program to update VISION 2040 and extend the plan's horizon to the year 2050. The update of VISION will offer an opportunity for the region's elected decision makers to update Multicounty Planning Policies. The final Appendix A will include an introduction describing the relationship of MPPs to the Regional Transportation Plan, and that they are amended or adopted through the VISION document.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282835	3	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-En-4 Ensure that all residents of the region, regardless of social or economic status, live in a healthy environment, with minimal exposure to pollution. COMMENT: For discussion in Vision: how are we measuring this?	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	The VISION 2050 process offers the opportunity to review MPPs and ways to measure their implementation.
282835	4	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-DP-14 Preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods and create vibrant, sustainable compact urban communities that provide diverse choices in housing types, a high degree of connectivity in the street network to accommodate walking, bicycling and transit use, and sufficient public spaces. COMMENT: For discussion in Vision: how are we measuring this?	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	The VISION 2050 process offers the opportunity to review MPPs and ways to measure their implementation.
282835	5	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-DP-44 Incorporate provisions addressing health and well-being into appropriate regional, countywide, and local planning and decision-making processes. COMMENT: What is meant by “appropriate” here? For discussion in Vision: how are we measuring this?	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	The VISION 2050 process offers the opportunity to review MPPs and ways to measure their implementation.
282835	6	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-DP-45 Promote cooperation and coordination among transportation providers, local government, and developers to ensure that joint- and mixed-use developments are designed to promote and improve physical, mental, and social health and reduce the impacts of climate change on the natural and built environments. COMMENT: How are we doing this?	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	The draft plan recognizes the multiple benefits of transit oriented communities, which can lead to a range of substantial social, economic and environmental benefits. Please refer to Chapter 1, Transit Oriented Communities, for more detail.
282835	7	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-DP-54 Develop concurrency programs and methods that fully consider growth targets, service needs, and level-of-service standards. Focus level-of-service standards for transportation on the movement of people and goods instead of only on the movement of vehicles. MPP-DP-55 Address nonmotorized, pedestrian, and other multimodal types of transportation options in concurrent programs – both in assessment and mitigation. MPP-DP-56 Tailor concurrency programs for centers and other sub- areas to encourage development that can be supported by transit COMMENT: How are we doing this? And how can we fold into Vision?	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The region's GMA Multicounty Planning Policies were adopted by the General Assembly in the VISION 2040 document. PSRC has initiated a work program to update VISION 2040 and extend the plan's horizon to the year 2050. The update of VISION will offer an opportunity for the region's elected decision makers to update Multicounty Planning Policies. The final Appendix A will include an introduction describing the relationship of MPPs to the Regional Transportation Plan, and that they are amended or adopted through the VISION document.
282835	8	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-Ec-9 Ensure that the region has a high quality education system that is accessible to all of the region's residents. COMMENT: Is this something T2040 can measure in the transit chapter?	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	9	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-T-3 Reduce the need for new capital improvements through investments in operations, pricing programs, demand management strategies, and system management activities that improve the efficiency of the current system. COMMENT: How do we measure our investment in TDM? What threshold or target is good enough?	TDM and CTR	General Comment	Refer to Appendix F, Regional TDM Action Plan, for goals and strategies developed by the Regional TDM Steering Committee.
282835	10	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-T-24 Increase the proportion of trips made by transportation modes that are alternatives to driving alone. COMMENT: Can we identify a target mode split and make investments to achieve it?	Multi-modal	Board Review	PSRC boards have not adopted mode split targets at this time. This could be a topic for future board discussion.
282835	11	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-T-25 Ensure mobility choices for people with special transportation needs, including persons with disabilities, the elderly, the young, and low-income populations. COMMENT: Can we identify a target threshold to work towards, and work with these populations to identify what is sufficient to “ensure mobility choices”?	Special Needs Transportation	General Comment	Please refer to Appendix H, the Coordinated Transit-Human Services plan which includes goals and prioritized strategies developed by the Special Needs Transportation Committee.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282835	12	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	MPP-T-22 Implement transportation programs and projects in ways that prevent or minimize negative impacts to low-income, minority, and special needs populations. COMMENT: We recommend expanding this policy to go beyond “minimize harm.” We should strive to identify existing disparities and proactively invest to bring greater benefits to these populations.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) are adopted in the PSRC's VISION 2040 plan. Changes to MPPs may be considered as the region updates the VISION plan and extends the planning horizon out to the year 2050.
282835	13	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix B: Equity Analysis Report Center for Social Inclusion (CSI) recommendations COMMENT: One very important part of the equity work that was done for T2040 included the partnership with Center for Social Inclusion. In order to capture and institutionalize that work, please summarize the work items and the findings included in the memo of recommendations.	Equity	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. PSRC will consider summarizing the Center for Social Inclusion's review of PSRC equity evaluation methods in the final version of Appendix B.
282835	14	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix B: Equity Analysis Report “Some examples of potential burdens include disruption of community cohesion (e.g., access to schools, parks, medical facilities, and religious institutions), adverse employment effects, decline in tax base or property values, displacement, increased noise and/or emissions, diminished aesthetics, and disruption to businesses. At the regional scale, many of these potential burdens can be difficult to assess, and are more appropriately evaluated at the project level.” COMMENT: Because it is challenging to evaluate burdens at the regional level, can we identify a work item to figure out how to capture collective impacts at the project level? What are opportunities in all project selection and reporting processes to do ongoing analysis and mitigation of these impacts?	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC will continue to explore new methods for evaluating the region's plans, and will consider additional equity analysis tools and methods in future plan updates.
282835	15	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix B: Equity Analysis Report: Special needs and transit COMMENT: If we acknowledge that transit is the backbone of serving “special needs” populations, we believe it would be helpful to measure transit speed and reliability compared to cars, and figure out how to align our investments to best serve these populations.	Special Needs Transportation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	16	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix B: Equity Analysis Report: Chapter 4 - Summary what input from EJ populations COMMENT: We strongly recommend laying out a work plan or a commitment to develop a work plan to address the issues raised here, either through Vision 2050 or through a separate process. What are the mechanisms and authority that PSRC has to help remedy issues around, say, lack of access to transit and safe walking projects? Low-income rates for user fees? Transportation cost burden?	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC will continue to explore new methods for evaluating the region's plans, and will consider additional equity analysis tools and methods in future plan updates.
282835	17	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix B: Equity Analysis Report: “[transit access] increases for both groups to nearly 60 percent by 2040, which is a larger improvement compared to regional changes. These results suggest that transit investments, which make up a core of the plan, are already serving marginalized populations relatively well, and will improve service to these residents in the coming decades” COMMENT:This is a great achievement, yet still leaves a large portion, 40%, of these populations unserved. Can we commit to not only continuing to monitor performance in this area, but settling an acceptable threshold and working towards it in the next update? This is especially relevant as it was identified as a need by outreach to these populations.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	18	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix B: Equity Analysis Report: % biking and walking COMMENT: This is a good metric to measure. How can we expand on this measure to show sufficiency and safety of these networks, not just choices people are making (that may or may not be safe or comfortable if they don’t have other options)?	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	We agree that safety and comfort of pedestrian and bicycle networks is a direction for future analysis. PSRC is committed to conducting additional analysis of the regional bike network and will seek additional data sources to better address safety and comfort for people walking and bicycling.
282835	19	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix B: Equity Analysis Report: VMT reductions COMMENT: Can we expound a bit more on what VMT reductions *mean* for people of color and low-incomes? Why are these going down - is it better housing options? More transit access? Or are people not traveling because they have no options? Would be helpful to explain.	Analysis Tools and Documentation	Technical Correction	We agree that additional clarification will be helpful on this topic and will address this in the final plan.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282835	20	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix B: Equity Analysis Report: “While many benefits accrue to the entire region, greater than average positive changes are generally seen for areas with higher concentrations of people of color and people with low incomes. Forecast improvements in accessibility, access to frequent transit, transit usage, active transportation, and relative costs, show these groups experience greater than average benefits through implementation of the plan.”</p> <p>COMMENT: This is great news, but it may be helpful to acknowledge existing deficits for these populations. Do these greater positive changes actually lead to overall equitable outcomes that help make up for past disparities?</p> <p>It may also be helpful to acknowledge the limitations of the analysis that assumes people of low-income and communities of color remain in the same location. It would be helpful to have a disclaimer that noted that if these populations are pushed out due to displacement, these benefits may be lower.</p> <p>Additionally, PSRC should work with equity consultants going forward to better define “benefits” and explore further how they are measured - do benefits as measured by PSRC align with what these populations identify as a benefit? Does measuring outcomes in the aggregate “minority” census tracts do a sufficient job of understanding baselines and benefits accrued?</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	21	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix C: Public Involvement and Outreach</p> <p>General</p> <p>COMMENT: PSRC did great work trying new and innovative outreach methods during this plan. Can we add a lessons learned here that captures what worked and what didn’t? For example, it would be great to record the importance of resourcing groups and communities to participate, but also note that engaging these folks very early on is critical in order to identify the best way to deal with capacity and other constraints. Other lessons learned discussed in our Community Partners meeting include: engaging earlier to provide more time for outreach, clarity on how the information will be used, and reliable translation and interpretation (e.g. Google Translate has not performed well).</p> <p>This can help provide a good roadmap for continuing to improve for the Vision update.</p>	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	22	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix C: Public Involvement and Outreach: Demographics</p> <p>COMMENT: How many people in each organization were interviewed? And what was the demographic distribution?</p>	Public Engagement	General Comment	The final version of Appendix C will include complete documentation on the full outreach for the plan.
282835	23	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix C: Public Involvement and Outreach: Meeting goals/objectives</p> <p>COMMENT: It would be very helpful to see the goals/objectives and the “meeting goals/objectives” sections aligned more explicitly, so we can better understand how the specific goals laid out were achieved and to what extent. Perhaps through a chart? For instance, how did PSRC “Include a feedback loop for those commenting to know how their comments will be addressed”? It was not clear from the meeting goals/objectives section.</p>	Public Engagement	General Comment	The final version of Appendix C will include complete documentation on the full outreach for the plan. As comments were received, respondents were notified that their comments would be provided to the board, and all information will be posted to PSRC's website.
282835	24	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix E: Climate Change Analysis:</p> <p>Page 1 “Choices: continue to provide travelers options to the single-occupant vehicle;”</p> <p>COMMENT: Suggest using the term “alternatives” instead of “options” (which makes it sound like providing options for driving).</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	Technical Correction	We concur and will make this change in the final plan document.
282835	25	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix E: Climate Change Analysis: Regional targets</p> <p>COMMENT: My understanding was that the board directed staff to adopt the newer, stronger science-based regional targets in this plan, but I don’t see a lot of language to that effect. We support the regional accountability of adopting our share of emissions reductions goals.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	PSRC's Boards directed staff to continue working closely with PSCAA staff with the goal of supporting the regional targets their board has adopted.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282835	26	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix E: Climate Change Analysis: Equity COMMENT: Because “equity” is a measure that we are supposed to evaluate plan alternatives using, we should make sure to include a discussion of equity in the climate change section, both in the possible (and heretofore) impacts of climate change, and the equity impacts of the possible strategies to address climate change. This was raised several times during the board discussion and community partners meetings.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	27	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix E: Climate Change Analysis: “Based on the work of PSRC’s Growing Transit Communities program, the baseline assumption for growth around transit stations in the region by 2040 is approximately 30%. If that new growth were focused even further – such that 50-75% of growth by 2040 is concentrated around transit stations – it is anticipated that emissions could be reduced an additional 2-4%. ” COMMENT: Given our need to lower emissions, this seems like a good strategy. What are the next steps to commit to this additional reduction? Is it feedback during this T2040 process? A commitment to doing so in Vision? Further board discussion and votes?	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	PSRC's Boards will continue to have discussions on the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy, and what additional steps to take in the future. Specific to the Land Use strategy, these conversations will continue as part of the VISION 2050 process.
282835	28	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix E: Climate Change Analysis: “Modest changes in the current plan assumptions, for example increasing the price per mile by \$.05, have the potential to generate an additional 5% in greenhouse gas emissions reductions.” and this? “Examples of additional steps that could be taken to further reduce emissions include the expansion of the pedestrian network, particularly to transit stops, and greater usage of alternative work schedules, lowering the burden on the system during peak commute hours. Based on national and regional data, these types of activities could provide an additional 1-2% reduction in emissions.” COMMENT: Given our need to lower emissions, this seems like a good strategy. What are the next steps to commit to this additional reduction? Is it feedback during this T2040 process? A commitment to doing so in Vision? Further board discussion and votes?	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	PSRC's Boards will continue to have discussions on the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy, and what additional steps to take in the future, either as part of the next regional transportation plan update or via other work programs.
282835	29	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix I: State Facilities Action Plans: HOV plan > “Recognizing that more work is needed to develop agreement on HOV and managed lanes operation, WSDOT recommends that the Regional Transportation Plan be modeled to assume HOV lanes will be managed appropriately to achieve desired performance, coupled with a commitment to work together with regional partners on the best implementation approach to achieve that outcome.” COMMENT: This is a big assumption, given that we know that HOV lane performance is currently unacceptable, yet the political challenges of managing these lanes remains. If this is the basis for projected travel times in the plan, this could be very misleading. We should at least model options of doing nothing vs. managed appropriately, and make very clear what we would need to do to see that level of performance.	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	PSRC's modeling assumes the existing regional policy in place at the time, unless a specific proposal or policy change is noted. For example, where there are high occupancy toll lanes in place or proposed, or managed lanes included in project proposals, those are incorporated in the model; all other assumptions are based on existing policy unless otherwise formally addressed in the plan as a policy revision, such as the use of pricing mechanisms in the financial strategy.
282835	30	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix I: State Facilities Action Plans: HOV plan > “HOV solutions and congestion management strategies” COMMENT: HOV Strategies considered should also be looking for gaps or other places where the HOV system could be expanded, both at the state level and also locally where it could help support the state system by offering alternatives. Because of board direction to further incorporate social equity into the plan, strategies should include discussion of equity/income benefits or impacts of expanding and managing the HOV system (or at least a commitment from WSDOT to research them).	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Further discussions regarding the HOV system will be ongoing throughout 2018.
282835	31	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix I: State Facilities Action Plans: Prioritization and state goals > “Exemption from concurrency: Because highways of statewide significance are exempt from concurrency requirements development is allowed to go forward even without improving congested highways in the immediate area.” COMMENT: Is this something we can explore further to understand and highlight the impacts?	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We will continue to analyze the relationship of growth, travel demand, and congestion in future planning efforts.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282835	32	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix I: State Facilities Action Plans: Prioritization and State goals > What policies guide planning for local priority state highways? COMMENT: We should also list the WSDOT/WSTC Washington Transportation Plan here.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The final version of Appendix I will be edited to reflect this comment.
282835	33	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix I: State Facilities Action Plans: Prioritization and State goals > “Improvements that increase capacity by adding lanes will be considered if policy change, local network improvements, operational improvements, or demand management strategies don’t address identified mobility needs.” COMMENT: It seems that there is general consensus at the regional level that demand management and other TDM strategies are the best first line defense. WSDOT’s practical solutions is a great statewide approach to this. How can we make a case for this when developing packages at the legislature? How can we also ensure we are doing the same at the regional level?"	TDM and CTR	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. WSDOT's State Facilities Action Plan identifies strategic next steps to evaluate near-term operational efficiencies on state highways. PSRC will continue to work with WSDOT and other regional partners to advance this work into the future.
282835	34	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix K: System Performance Report: Inclusion of health and equity COMMENT: We are very supportive of the Board direction to include health and equity in the system performance measures.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	35	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix K: System Performance Report: “This approach provides context for understanding how overall trends affect vulnerable or historically marginalized communities over time, and how these impacts compare to effects to the region as a whole. Incorporating this analysis throughout the planning process is important to understanding how equity objectives are being met across many different metrics.” COMMENT: We agree that this is a great step. We would love to see some language that commits PSRC to developing a plan that identifies performance targets in these areas and improves overall outcomes for these groups, in addition to continuing to measure them.	Equity	Board Review	Thank you for your comment.
282835	36	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix K: System Performance Report: “How the plan performs” COMMENT: These metrics measure “how the plan performs”, but this appendix could be clearer on what they are measuring. In other words, how is “the plan” defined? The set of investments? The financial strategy? It would be helpful to better understand the assumptions that go into the model.	Performance Measures	General Comment	The performance measures are on the comprehensive transportation system as described in the draft regional transportation plan, including the existing system and services, proposed investments, system policies and the financial strategy.
282835	37	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix K: System Performance Report: Transit trips and VMT COMMENT: The aggregate numbers are a helpful overview, can we also show VMT or transit trips per person in order to better understand the change to individual behavior change over time?	Performance Measures	General Comment	There are a variety of measures contained in Appendix K reflecting per capita performance of the system.
282835	38	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix K: System Performance Report: “access to frequent transit” and “access to jobs by transit” COMMENT: These are great metrics for understanding communities’ access to reliable transportation and work opportunities. Given the Board direction to better incorporate health into the plan, can we lay out a work plan to better understand access to other services, in particular social services, healthcare, and education?	Performance Measures	General Comment	We agree that access to other services other than jobs is important to understand, especially as our region’s population ages and staff will look for ways to better incorporate this information into future planning.
282835	39	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	Appendix K: System Performance Report: People who walk or bike for transportation COMMENT: Please explain how this is defined. People that walk or bike for a certain distance? A certain number of times per week? As a commute method? Number of minutes? (Also, there is a small typo - “of” should be “or”)	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	People who walk and bike for transport refers to trips taken for transportation purposes such as going to work, school or even to the grocery store or coffee shop. It does not included reported trips for exercise such as going on a run or hike or for such trips as walking a dog (unless there is some other combined transportation purpose). The data comes from PSRC's household travel survey and is forecasted out to the year 2040.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282835	40	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix K: System Performance Report: Stormwater</p> <p>COMMENT: Stormwater is listed here, but we believe the metrics are not a great proxy (% built within the UGA may not capture the stormwater impacts of infrastructure built within the UGA that has, say, large swaths of impervious surface), and that project selection still does not capture impacts/benefits to stormwater runoff. Would be good to commit to better addressing this in Vision 2050.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	41	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix K: System Performance Report: Safety</p> <p>COMMENT: Because the Board directed staff to better incorporate social equity in the performance measures, it would be very helpful to disaggregate safety data by race and income as well (like we are doing for costs, VMT, and more). Can we commit to looking into this going forward? At the very least, it would be helpful to call out the fact that there are known disparities by these demographics if we can't measure them in this update. Here are two example studies with these kinds of findings:</p> <p>https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379708000883 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0091743514002291</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	As part of the Board adoption of regional safety targets in January 2018, staff is directed to bring back additional information in the future with more detail and sub-categories, to the extent feasible.
282835	42	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix K: System Performance Report: Safety</p> <p>COMMENT: Please also include non-motorized data per capita as well.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	43	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix K: System Performance Report: Safety</p> <p>COMMENT: The charts that show crash data with Vision Zero targets are misleading. Those are TARGETS, not projections. We should instead include two lines on that graph - targets AND projections, based on past trends. This will help us take accurate steps to address ongoing safety issues. At the very least, the graph should be amended to call these targets rather than projections.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	The comment is unclear; the charts clearly indicate the data that is based on observed data, vs. the projections and targets based on Target Zero.
282835	44	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix K: System Performance Report: Travel time/reliability</p> <p>COMMENT: Because many people don't have access to a car, it would be helpful to disaggregate this by mode in order to show relative performance across different modes.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	45	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix K: System Performance Report: Jobs</p> <p>COMMENT: This metric defines a 10-minute walk as a distance of ¼ mile. However, most models I'm familiar with say that a mile takes 20 minutes to walk, which would make a 10-minute walk ½ mile. Are we using a different kind of standard?</p>	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	We agree that as written is confusing and we will further clarify this in the final plan.
282835	46	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background:</p> <p>Investment type</p> <p>COMMENT: It would be helpful to understand not only what kind of investments were made, but where they were made. In particular, what has investment been like in vulnerable neighborhoods, especially around safety, air quality, access, and physical activity? What are the opportunities to quantify or at least daylight this information - either in this section or the equity analysis?</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Projects can be examined in more detail through PSRC's interactive webmap, which not only has descriptive project information, but other data layers such as demographics, jurisdictional boundaries, concentrations of poverty, etc. See: https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html
282835	47	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background: Emerging and ongoing issues</p> <p>COMMENT: We support a continued focus on the issues highlighted in this section, especially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * the diversification of transit revenues * focus on maintenance and preservation over road expansion. * consideration of cost burden on users by ability to pay 	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282835	48	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background: Principles for new revenue</p> <p>COMMENT: We highly support continuing to use principles of social equity and performance (congestion, health, environmental impacts, etc.) when considering and developing new revenues.</p> <p>In particular, going forward, we would like to see a commitment to further tying need/costs by jurisdiction based on the investment needed *to attain regional performance outcomes*</p> <p>This work has already been started by PSRC staff and member jurisdictions, with a particular focus on maintenance and preservation. In order to maximize the impacts of our investment, we should be doing similar calculations across all regional outcomes. For example, in order to reach Vision Zero safety targets, what investments does each jurisdiction need to make and what are the total costs?</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282835	49	Transportation Choices Coalition, Puget Sound Sage, Hester Serebrin, Nicole Vallesterro Keenan-Lai	Transportation Choices Coalition	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background: RUC / congestion pricing</p> <p>COMMENT: We support the exploration of this new revenue source based on its ability to better achieve equity (progressive rates), environmental (charging to help drive down GHG emissions), and funding flexibility goals (funds as a more stable transit and transit access funding source). However, done poorly it could be just as regressive and restricted as the gas tax. If it becomes compulsory, how can we make sure that its equitably calculated and implemented? This section should call attention to the great efforts and recommendations of the Transportation Futures Task Force, which did a lot research and thinking on these issues.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.
282838	1	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	<p>1. Appendix K, page 4:</p> <p>a. Are “trips” in this case referencing “boardings” or do they indicate something other than an “unlinked trip?”</p>	Analysis results	General Comment	The transit trips shown in Table 2 are for the total linked transit trips – not transit boardings.
282838	2	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	<p>1. Appendix K, page 4: b. What base year does “today” represent?</p>	Analysis results	General Comment	The modeled base year for this plan is 2014.
282838	3	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	<p>1. Appendix K, page 4: c. Daily vehicle hours traveled are currently 2.4 million for the region, with 457,000 hours of vehicle delay. Yet in the 2014 update to T2040, in 2010 (base year), daily vehicle hours traveled were 2.99 million and daily vehicle hours of delay were 954,289. What factor/s contributed to a decrease in daily vehicle hours traveled/delay between 2010 and today?</p>	Analysis results	General Comment	The difference in numbers between the previous and current Regional Transportation Plans are based on updated count and travel time data for numerous arterial and freeway locations that were not available in 2010. This updated information resulted in updates to the regional travel demand model and how it predicts travel times. The updated travel model shows increases in both hours of travel and delay between 2010 and 2014.
282838	4	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	<p>1. Appendix K, page 4: d. What are the person-trip numbers for biking and walking individually, by county and region-wide?</p>	Analysis results	Technical Correction	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. This table shows person-trips (not vehicle trips) and should be labelled that way.
282838	5	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	<p>1. Appendix K, page 4: e. Walking and biking are approximately 17% of daily trips today, growing to 20% in 2040. Yet the T2040 update projected a 12.0% mode share in year 2040 under the constrained plan, 5% lower than “today’s” reported numbers in the draft RTP. In addition, the T2040 update constrained plan projects 2.26 million non-motorized trips in 2040, while the draft Regional Transportation Plan shows 2.44 million walk/bike trips occurring “today.” What factor/s contributed to the dramatic increase in walk/bike trips between 2010 and today? What can explain how T2040 year 2040 projected numbers are higher than “today’s” reported walk/bike trips?</p>	Analysis results	General Comment	The different numbers result from an increase in observed walk and bike trips but also due to better estimation of the observed amount of walking and biking that people provided in PSRC the 2014/2015 household travel survey. This survey which was designed to better capture those short walking and biking trips than from surveys. Previous models under-predicted the amount of walking and biking that was occurring and would occur in the future.
282838	6	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	<p>1. Appendix K, page 4: f. Daily vehicle miles traveled regionwide are 80.3 million today, yet on page 15, Figure 10, shows that DVMT are 86.9 million today, 8% higher than page 4. What explains this difference/inconsistency?</p>	Analysis results	Technical Correction	Thank you for bringing this to our attention, this is an error that will be corrected in the final plan.
282838	7	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	<p>1. Appendix K, page 4: g. In the T2040 2014 update, transit mode share was projected to have risen from 3.1% in the 2010 base year to 4.3% in the constrained plan year 2040, an approximate 1.2% rate increase. Yet similarly, in the RTP Draft Plan, transit mode share increases from 5% “today” to 6.3% in plan year 2040, an approximate 1.3% rate increase. This suggests that transit was poised to grow its mode share by 1.2% or 1.3% with or without ST3 rail projects. Does PSRC have a 2040 baseline scenario with and without ST3? Can you provide “today’s” and year 2040 transit trips by type (e.g. bus, light rail, commuter rail, BRT/REX, ferry, etc.)?</p>	Analysis results	General Comment	No 2040 scenarios were modeled without the currently funded Sound Transit 3 transit investments because the projects have secured funding. We provide transit boardings by mode however transit trips by mode cannot be separated out in our current model system.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282838	8	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	1. Appendix K, page 4: h. Why do the four county Daily Truck Trips not sum to the region total?	Analysis results	Technical Correction	Thank you for bringing this to our attention, this is an error that will be corrected in the final plan.
282838	9	Kemper Development Company, Bob Pishue	Kemper Development Company	2. Appendix B, p. 29: a. Chart 9 shows for “all trips purposes” transit mode share is 3% of region-wide trips “today” and is projected to be 5% in 2040. Yet the numbers in Appendix K, pg. 4, show that transit is currently 5% of trips today and projected to grow to 6.3% in 2040. What is contributing to this significant difference between these two appendices?	Analysis results	Technical Correction	Thank you for bringing this to our attention, this is an error that will be corrected in the final plan.
282840	1	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Regional Transportation Plan – 2018 (RTP). While The RTP supports VISION 2040 and the Regional Growth Strategy, provides for substantial investments in transportation, a fiscal strategy to pay for it, and plans for implementation it is somewhat frustrating to note that travel times on key corridors (Figure 23) will just keep up with anticipated growth.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282840	2	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	As the region prepares to update VISION 2040 we need to ask ourselves if VISION 2040 and the Regional Growth Strategy is working as intended. The region’s market appears to be driving where growth in employment and housing is occurring more than the Regional Growth Strategy. Higher wage jobs are locating in the regional largest metropolitan center, while lower wage jobs and housing for all but the highest wage earners are locating in less affluent areas in the periphery. As long as this trend continues we will be unable to purchase our way out of the region’s transportation woes.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The process to update VISION 2040 will offer an opportunity to evaluate the region’s success in implementing the Regional Growth Strategy and options for refining it.
282840	3	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The City of University Place supports several programs and projects outlined in the plan, specifically: 1. The maintenance and preservation of existing transportation network is key to providing a safe and cost effective system. Allowing roads and bridges fall into disrepair endangers the public safety and leads to higher replacement costs in the long term.	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282840	4	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The City of University Place supports several programs and projects outlined in the plan, specifically: 2. Connecting SR 167 to I-5 and the Port of Tacoma will complete a long overdue connection in the freeway system contributing to economic development throughout the region and providing an alternative route to relieve congestion on I-5. Consideration should be given to completing this project sooner. In 2023 rather than in 2031 (See typo on Page 7 of the Executive Summary). Although not programed, a multi-modal trail along the SR 167 corridor should be considered whenever new construction and improvements are made along this corridor.	Multi-modal	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282840	5	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The City of University Place supports several programs and projects outlined in the plan, specifically: 3. The proposed Link light Rail (LLR) extension to Tacoma Community College should occur sooner to provide more transit opportunities to those who continue to commute longer distances alleviating traffic congestion on the already overburdened road system. At the time this extension is built, consider placing the station in the Northwest Business District of the University Place Regional Growth Center south of 19th Street West. The Northwest Business District is a mixed of use zone which allows high density multifamily taller buildings.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282840	6	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The City of University Place supports several programs and projects outlined in the plan, specifically: 4. The LLR connection from Tacoma to Federal Way will add significantly increase the systems usefulness in the South Sound. While a number of LLR projects are included in the RTP ST3 includes connecting LLR from Tacoma to SeaTac this connection not shown on The Plan maps on pages 46 and 48.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
282840	7	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The City of University Place supports several programs and projects outlined in the plan, specifically: 5. The funding of projects included in the Regional Active Transportation Plan.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282840	8	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The Regional Council should consider addressing the following: 1. Address how the Regional Economic Strategy (Amazing Place) discussed on page 13 can be successful given congestion, jobs-housing imbalance, and rising cost of living in the largest metropolitan centers which impacts business development and quality of life.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282840	9	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The Regional Council should consider addressing the following: 2. Discuss how changes in retail effects transportation. For example, on-line retailers, deliver goods to individual addresses using a variety of smaller frequent delivery services, as opposed to less frequent delivery using larger trucks to retail outlets.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix J. Regional Freight and Goods Movement p. 7 examines the role of local deliveries and e-commerce in the context of the broader trucking distribution system.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282840	10	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The Regional Council should consider addressing the following: 3. Older cars and trucks will linger among the technologically advanced vehicles for the foreseeable future minimizing gains.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC has conducted research into the regional vehicle fleet and the rate of vehicle turnover, which is incorporated into our future assumptions regarding the benefits of vehicle technologies.
282840	11	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The Regional Council should consider addressing the following: 4. On page 37, the RTP states this is the fastest growing region for transit ridership. What influence does building a new system and increasing capacity have on this assertion as compared to areas with existing systems with limited new capacity?	Transit	General Comment	The central Puget Sound region is expanding its public transportation system and developing an interconnected network of frequent, express and local public transit (see Figure 7). This has an influence on ridership growth and is expected to continue to influence ridership growth into the future.
282840	12	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The Regional Council should consider addressing the following: 5. Operational improvements on I-5 listed on page 45 includes ramp meters. While ramp metering may improve traffic flow on I-5 they have significant impacts on the level of service at adjacent intersections and local streets.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282840	13	City of University Place, David Swindale	City of University Place	The Regional Council should consider addressing the following: 6. A table that showed what travel times would be with a more equalized jobs- housing balance would be helpful. This might suggest a different strategy would be less expensive and more effective.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The land use assumptions incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan are drawn from VISION 2040 and adopted local comprehensive plans. The upcoming update of the VISION plan to the year 2050 planning horizon will offer an opportunity to look at different land use development scenarios.
282851	1	Alex White		Fantastic. Moving toward are transportation system less reliant on car trips is the best thing we can do as a region to fight climate change, maximize efficiency, and increase the safety of all road users.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282852	1	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation, Erik Ashlie-Vinke, Reid Shockey	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft 2018 Regional Transportation Plan. The Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation (SCCIT) is a non-profit organization comprised of business, citizen and governmental leaders who share a common interest in seeking solutions to our transportation problems and assuring that we improve the quality of life for the residents of Snohomish County, as well as providing a more competitive business environment.</p> <p>Rapid growth has caused a strain to the transportation system that provides a challenge to both businesses and local governments. At the same time 2024 completion of Lynnwood Link, the 2036 opening of the light rail extension to Everett, and the expansion of Community Transit’s Swift bus rapid transit (BRT) provide Snohomish County and the region with new opportunities to improve mobility. To take advantage of these opportunities, the Regional Transportation Plan must effectively coordinate the state, regional and local transportation projects.</p>	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282852	2	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation, Erik Ashlie-Vinke, Reid Shockey	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation	<p>We suggest that PSRC take some additional steps to integrate planning of transit, sidewalk, bikeway, and roadway projects that access light rail. For instance:</p> <p>* Many state, local, and transit agencies have sponsored projects in Appendix G that will be necessary for access light rail, but it reads as a list of unprioritized needs. This regional plan should go beyond this list to designate the agencies who are responsible and accountable for assuring that an integrated, multijurisdictional plan of access improvements is completed including specific measurable goals on how we get there.</p> <p>* The main body of the plan should include a map that shows how the projects listed in Appendix G work to provide necessary access to light rail station areas, integrating all the various state, county, local, and transit agency priorities.</p>	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282852	3	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation, Erik Ashlie-Vinke, Reid Shockey	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation	State highways are the backbone of the regional transportation system. Both the draft regional plan and the State Facilities Action Plan, contained in Appendix J, should be taken a step further to clearly show how the state highway system integrates with local systems and high capacity transit (HCT) transit services to provide for a complete network to implement the regional vision. There are many important state projects included in the plan that SCCIT feels will be improve the business climate and quality of life in Snohomish County. These corridors such as US 2, SR 9, SR 96/I-5 interchange, SR 522, SR 524 and SR 531 should have a delivery strategy commensurate with the completion of HCT. Some of these corridors have been included on the Snohomish County Key Investment Map, but many others have been left off. We would suggest that this map be revised.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Key Investments map you reference was meant to illustrate examples of projects only, rather than being a complete list. The full list of regional capacity projects are included in the projects web map on the PSRC website.
282852	4	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation, Erik Ashlie-Vinke, Reid Shockey	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation	The Plan should also address Public/Private Partnerships (P3). This finance strategy may present some opportunities for delivering larger infrastructure projects. Addressing these opportunities may position the region to take advantage of federal opportunities.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282852	5	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation, Erik Ashlie-Vinke, Reid Shockey	Snohomish County Committee for Improved Transportation	Lastly SCCIT feels that The Regional Transportation Plan must be effective in providing for or facilitating the inter-jurisdictional coordination needed to integrate the work of numerous agencies into one cohesive strategic plan.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282867	1	Andrew Sang		I think it's foolish to continue to increase funding and subsidy for automobile oriented travel. Here in the Puget Sound Region, we're constrained on one side by water and on the other by mountains. We're bisected by a massive lake too. What we need are transportation solutions that will scale, and be sustainable in supporting our growth. Pouring more funding into free-to-access highways that will fill up with more cars as soon as they're built is a total waste of tax dollars. We need more public transit, and if we're building highways, they need to be heavily tolled to accurately reflect the demand and true market price, or they won't move at any reasonable speed while at the same time fueling an unsustainable car-oriented lifestyle.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282867	2	Andrew Sang		I'd like to urge the PSRC to fund Sound Transit and other agencies with federal dollars, and to reduce highway construction for non-toll roads. I'd like to urge PSRC to produce better cities with better, more connected streets (at least for pedestrians and bikes).	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282867	3	Andrew Sang		And I'd like to urge PSRC to focus on building densely everywhere, but particularly around high capacity transit and commercial sectors, while reducing the amount of parking in our communities.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. See Chapter 1, pp.9-12, Transit-Oriented Communities, for a discussion of the importance of TOD to implementation of the region's growth strategy.
282869	1	[anonymous]		1--I believe, contrary to the report, that gas tax and e-car equivalent charges, should continue to be the primary funding source for roads. The use of tolls and especially the introduction of "Road Usage Charges"--administered by a non-elected administrative "committee" --should be reduced (or never introduced (road usage charges). The only exception might be flat charge tolls for MAJOR construction projects like Hwy 520 AND flat charges for inner city congestion. No charges should be based on tracking auto use .	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282869	2	[anonymous]		2--The practice of eliminating General Purpose road capacity by cities for bikes, pedestrians, should only be allowed if mitigating actions are required and taken. For example, Seattle continues to reduce effective general purpose lanes (for example First Ave. street car project). Seattle should be "required" to install Adaptive Signals broadly to try to optimize the remaining road capacity. There are also alternatives to "find" capacity for bicycles by slightly reducing sidewalk capacity and lane width, while retaining lanes for autos.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282869	3	[anonymous]		3 As noted in 2 above, cities should be required to move to broad based implementation of Adaptive Signal systems. Follow Bellevue's example. Keep traffic moving doing the best you can with existing capacity.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282869	4	[anonymous]		4 Sound Transit and should be required to plan, build and maintain increased Park and Ride capacity across the system.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. A variety of proposed investments in park and ride capacity can be found in Appendix G.
282869	5	[anonymous]		The transportation planning in Western WA is strongly influenced by Public Transportation advocates, bicycle advocates and construction unions. These are important constituents. Nonetheless, auto travel will continue to carry the majority of citizens for decades into the future. The PSRC MUST FOCUS MORE on simple quality of life factors (commute times, cost, etc.) for the people in this area. The minority (public trans, bikes, etc.) seems to have too big an influence on the direction of the plan. These comments are not to deny the future (disproportionate investments in mass transportation, autonomous vehicles, etc.) or the complexity of transportation planning. However, I believe the pendulum has swung too far and more focus must be on how to move cars. As noted above, maybe starting with Adaptive Signals and requiring mitigation for reduction of general purpose lanes.	Multi-modal	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282873	1	Douglas Rauh		As I reviewed the plan I decided to restrict my remarks to what I want to see as the end result of a project the PSRC has helped fund thru a grant(s). As an ordinary citizen I would like to see more projects that actually solve a problem today. When project visions are for 20, 30, 40 years from now I have little faith in their basis assumptions and feel it is just another political boondoggle. Watching 90 year old trees cut down for a bike trail that plants a replacement with a trunk the size of a water bottle does not make me feel like my tax dollars are being spent on things I want. It also makes me doubt the PSRC is fully exercising their fiduciary responsibility. In the last couple of years PSRC has approved federal money that facilitated projects that did not reflect the local community values on Bainbridge Island.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282873	2	Douglas Rauh		Here on Bainbridge Island residents like our trees. Yet PSRC approved money to clear cut every single tree in the SR-305 Scenic Byway between Vineyard Lane and High School Road for a Regional Trail called Sound to Olympic Trail. PSRC should improve how you listen to the local community residents that are affected by your approval of grant money.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282873	3	Douglas Rauh		PSRC approved a grant for a pedestrian bike bridge over SR-305. This bridge was originally to connect two segments of the Sound to Olympic Trail but the design was modified to build the trail as one segment all on the east side of SR-305. At that point the pedestrian bike bridge served no trail related purpose and PSRC should have canceled the grant.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282873	3	Douglas Rauh		PSRC should improve how money is used to improve the transportation system without just responding to the latest government agencies request to pour more cement. If the cause of a transportation bottleneck is policy let's try getting the policy changed first before spending tax payer money on more construction that results in cutting more trees.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282873	4	Douglas Rauh		PSRC approved money to cut down trees in the park next to the Washington State Ferries toll booths on Bainbridge Island in order for Olympic Drive to be widen for additional bike lanes. A quick look at the root cause of the bike car interface would have revealed that Washington State Ferries policy offloads the bikes first then the cars. The bikes have an 80' climb which is hard. By the time the bikes climb the hill the walk off passengers are trying to cross Olympic Drive at the toll booths. The result is an inefficient and dangerous ferry offloads. If PSRC had approved a grant for Washington State Ferries to build a second pedestrian ramp for ferry passenger to offload to the south side of Olympic Drive then no passenger would need to cross during the vehicle offload. PSRC could have at that point asked Washington State Ferries to offload the vehicles first then the bikes. This would speed up the ferry offload and be safer for the bikes without requiring cutting trees to widen Olympic Drive. Once the two northbound lanes of Olympic Drive are empty of vehicles the bikes could have both empty lanes.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282873	6	Douglas Rauh		PSRC appears to be slow comparing a roundabout to an "Adaptive Control Traffic Signal". With autonomous vehicles in our near future PSRC should put more emphasis on technology as a solution to increasing highway capacity.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix N contains information on existing and emerging technologies, and includes recommendations for future work on these issues.
282873	7	Douglas Rauh		SR-305 Study Group is asking for a roundabout at Johnson Road on SR-305 in order for a road extension to be built to Noll Road. This is billed as an improvement to Noll Road. The effect is to build a road for developers using tax payer money so they can construct more houses. The goal of the SR-305 Study Group is to increase the average speed. Yet a roundabout will cause trucks to slow down to 5-10 mph and cars to 10-20 mph on a highway with a 50 mph speed. Worse the roundabout does not work well with ferry traffic as demonstrated by the High School Road and Madison Avenue roundabout on Bainbridge Island. Ferry traffic is the effect of holding traffic in Seattle for one hour then releasing it in 8-10 minutes on Bainbridge Island. The short term effect is a lot of vehicles in a short distance resulting in inefficient use of the current land side transportation infrastructure. By treating the ferry traffic like a train and using Adaptive Control Traffic Signals instead of roundabouts a highway like SR-305 could adjust intersection timings to demand resulting in the long line of ferry traffic getting a green tunnel from Bainbridge Island to Poulsbo. The Adaptive Control Traffic Signals could be enhanced to connect to future autonomous vehicles in order to adjust the vehicles speed to further improve the efficiency of highways like SR-305. Or PSRC could approve federal money to build a static obstruction in the middle of a highway like SR-305. This obstruction would force trucks to slow to 5-10mph at 2 am in the morning even when the road is empty. The driver would have to shift down and up again creating more air pollution while increasing the trip time for the truck.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282873	8	Douglas Rauh		PSRC should improve grant requests by always requiring a technology solution comparison when non technology solution is being proposed. PSRC needs to force applicants to justify why the non-technology solution is better. PSRC should require computer modeling and the model must use the latest Highway Capacity Manual plus the latest updates. Roundabout database information has been adjusted to reflect U.S. Highway driving conditions.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282874	1	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition, David Fisher	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition	1. Regional planning must recognize the critical role that air connections play in the economic health of the region and the state. As the nation’s most trade-reliant state and a growing hub of global technology and innovation, it is imperative that people, parts, and products all can move efficiently into and out of our airport facilities.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The study's scope includes an evaluation of economic impacts of aviation activity in the central Puget Sound region.
282874	2	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition, David Fisher	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition	2. Regional planning must enable all airport facilities and services in the region to be scaled to meet projected passenger volume and demand over the entire planning / forecast period. While costs must be closely scrutinized, we believe that planning should be managed so that it will meet or exceed generally accepted airport service level standards at the end of the planning horizon. Recognizing the constrained foot-print of Sea-Tac and the long planning horizons required for the development of major public facilities like additional air service capacity, we encourage the planning process to begin as soon as possible. In the meantime, Sea-Tac must maintain an aggressive capital improvement plan to continue meeting the needs of a growing region and state. We encourage frequent and careful assessments of passenger counts and forecasts and adjustments made to reflect the updated information. Finally, we believe that planning efforts can only go so far, and market supply and demand realities will play a major role in determining how air service in the region evolves over the next 20+ years. Regional plans must be flexible enough to recognize and respond to these changing market dynamics.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The study's scope includes an evaluation of economic impacts of aviation activity in the central Puget Sound region. This new initiative will be included in the final plan.
282874	3	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition, David Fisher	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition	3. Regional planning must balance competing airport needs. One of the most important questions that must be resolved in planning regional air capacity is to strike an appropriate balance among competing needs for the limited real estate at Sea-Tac and at other regional airport facilities. This balance not only entails meeting the future needs of competing carriers – both existing and new – but also striking a balance between various types of air traffic such as passenger service and cargo service. The costs and benefits of cargo operations must be fully analyzed and understood along with projected passenger growth forecasts.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning. The study's scope includes an evaluation of different types of aviation activity, including air cargo, as well as the roles of airports throughout the region.
282874	4	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition, David Fisher	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition	4. Regional planning must integrate airport operations and ground transportation options. Passenger perceptions of their airport experience begin long before they step foot into the terminal. Accordingly, we encourage regional planning to bring together the appropriate transportation departments and transit services to plan for effective multimodal transportation services to and from the region’s airport facilities and to recognize that support of the region’s airports is a part of their core mission. It is also worth noting that an important element of sustainability is to find ways to get people out of their cars. This will require making public transit systems the most cost- and time-efficient means of getting to and from the airport. We support strategies to ensure ground transportation options are appropriately sized to provide convenient access for projected increases in passenger volumes and we encourage designs that can be flexible enough to adapt to future changes in transportation systems, technology and modes.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The anticipated regional aviation baseline study will include an assessment of multimodal ground access to airports.
282874	5	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition, David Fisher	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition	5. Regional planning should recognize the unique assets and attributes of the Pacific Northwest. While much of this objective will be carried out in the context of airport-specific plans, we believe that regional planning should emphasize sustainability, highlight the region’s cutting-edge technological innovations, and showcase the rich history, culture and diversity of the region.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan has been developed with multiple objectives in mind, including supporting the region’s growth strategy and economy, supporting innovation, as well as a sustainable environment. See Chapter 1, pp. 2-23.
282874	6	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition, David Fisher	Tomorrow@Sea-Tac Coalition	6. Finally, regional planning must include a robust public information and engagement strategy. The breadth of our coalition membership demonstrates the importance of safe, efficient and effective air service to the economy and the people of our region and our state. Given this broad impact, diverse stakeholders should have an opportunity and be encouraged to provide input into the planning process.	Public Engagement	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC strives to conduct an open, transparent and thorough public outreach process. Appendix C contains additional background, and will be updated for the final plan document with the results of the public comment period and other outreach undertaken. The proposed Regional Aviation Baseline Study places high priority on thorough and continuous stakeholder engagement throughout the region.
282876	1	H W Haynes		I am writing herein to thank the Puget Sound Regional Council for their fine work in striving to harmonize the regional transportation planning experience across and within the counties of Kitsap, Pierce, King, and Snohomish Counties (ordering of aforementioned counties is unimportant for the purposed described herein). This is especially important because of the expanding nature of inter county commuter traffic.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282876	2	H W Haynes		My comments are directed at the subject Regional Transportation Plan (Transportation 2040 Update), and more specifically, the funding modes and means directed and proposed for maintaining structural components therein. Likely many other parties will commented in excellent detail on the funding process directed at maintaining current road standards. These current road standards were designed for load carrying capacity and traffic volumes best represented by the economically careful human behavior patterns found in the 1950's and 1960's, and the rising out of depression (and WW II) social/cultural climate that existed then. I respectfully submit that this traffic experience has changed since then (more cars and people; and faster and more maneuverable vehicles), and the future of the human experience (or "aesthetic") needs to be reexamined (see below). This re-examination should be in such a way that the roads of the future may stepwise begin to be economically produced as revisions and repairs of roads and services we currently have, and accelerate in embracing needed upgrades and repairs.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	3	H W Haynes		<p>This revised needs analysis is not new thinking, but merely bringing forward the successful creative work done by many successful road engineers, and recasting these successes as staged upgrade standards to be opportunistically applied in the design, installation, maintenance, and extension (or continuance) of present and future structures.</p> <p>Hopefully the below may encourage the practical idea of advancing and incorporating urban planning ideas and models by designing improvement modules based on capitalizing on upcoming repair opportunities, as often the highest percentage of costs in any project are involved in the planning, staging, getting into, setting up, and breaking down of equipment and manpower on any given job aspect. The lowest cost portion of a job or project is in actual continuance of successive footages of roadways, barriers, etc.</p> <p>Thus, much economy can be created in keeping in place crews and equipment for some improved segment of time. The working projects segments that (when blended together) can cause substantial increases in public comfort, property values, and transportation flows becomes stepwise complete. It is a matter of trying to minimize the start-up and break-down costs as a percentage of the finalized project effort (e.g., make the planning, training, set-up, and break-down costs, say, under 10% of the total finished project cost). Examples of such thinking may be found in China's "Great Wall" (the length of which is about the distance of Los Angeles to New York City, and back again), and the efforts by the King County and Seattle's Counsels to have linking trail systems.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	4	H W Haynes		<p>task, it would have been nice to find other things for it and its crew to do. The cost of designing, building, "debugging", and repairing "Bertha" was an enormous percentage of the project cost. By job end, the cost to bore a single foot forward (and line the tunnel way with concrete reinforcement and roadway) had substantially fallen. The great "front end" costs were at each "set up" and "break-down", and the custom engineering and crew training costs were also high. The job stopping of and upgrading of "Bertha" herself with each of new encounters was also high, but once things were becoming more routine and cyclical, things then went increasingly well. This progressively plummeted cost per tunnel boring foot as labor also increased in efficiency.</p> <p>The decommissioning and breaking up (scrapping) of "Bertha" equipment was very high and stalling in time, and formed a major burdened cost of its own. The investment in installing "Bertha" and its crew was not only lost, but high costs and lost time were generated in cutting up and hauling away equipment, and human capital investment diluted and dispersed when by then well trained and efficient crew were rededicated from the tunneling task ("let go" to find their way in doing something else).</p> <p>A significant "Bertha" opportunity was presented here if only somehow the crew and equipment could have been continued in service and made part of an ongoing cost effective "future vision" of an extended tunnel service embracing urban plan. But this was not the case. "Bertha" served only a near term Seattle Waterfront development vision.</p> <p>Multiple "Bertha's" tunnels may seemingly have supported others published ideas of a substantial revision of Seattle's surface transportation plan (including a recent Seattle Times article on the repurposing of old tunnels instead of abandoning them and filling them with rubble), and an up scaling of a broader surface area development vision supported by a substantially reduced tunnel boring and lining cost. This may have continued the "design and installed" evolution of the tunnel boring and servicing equipment, and the lowering of delivered materials costs (reflective of growing job size(s), better logistics supporting equipment and methods, and improved trade discounts on increasing materials lot sizes purchased). But in order to do this, Seattle needed to find (have ideas on), see (make designs, models, and find political inspiration for), and fund itself into a plan</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282876	5	H W Haynes		Some unfolding mission statements are presented in "Vision 2040", and also in the very important foundation document (recently adopted) "Regional Economic Strategy". Does the mission statements of "Vision 2040" and recently adopted "Regional Economic Strategy" shared in a combined mission statement that also includes "Growth" Management" and "Environment", and does this have fundable tying elements in the transportation plan update?	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Projects and programs in the Regional Transportation Plan were designed to address the core policy objectives contained in both VISION 2040 and the Regional Economic Strategy (Amazing Place). See Chapter 1, Supporting VISION 2040, pp. 2-5, and Supporting the Regional Economic Strategy, pp. 12-14.
282876	6	H W Haynes		<p>Why is a set of mission linking statements needed to tie the work of many committees? The work of many committees (in the final result) are linked together to form a common product experience base delivered to a consumer, whether it be local or native, or a visitor. Each are willing to pay some emotional price as an investment inside of what they are experiencing. The engineering (both in terms of criteria and in the service delivered) is found in road standards as part of this experience base. The road user(s), and proximate roadway resident(s), find the truth of this experience changes physically as one moves from one geographical area to another. Each of these point geographical experiences also changes over time depending on upward shifts in the crushing demands placed upon it by the varied type of traffic flows and traffic attitudes (vehicle operation methods, such as "polite" and "road rage") created by others (both off and on the roads, and proximity thereto).</p> <p>Recognizing these changing road design and road use demands, designers and engineers address these shifting issues and bring about new thinking, materials, and structures to mitigate design concerns (such as new types of roads (such as vehicle presence sensing and advising), and new types of vehicles (such as autonomous vehicles)). The acceptance level of inventions and innovations by above becomes the subject of various cultures and social classes, and defines the grand "design" (or conditions it lacks) in how they may adapt to and/or improve on these changing "roads" design conditions. This can be seen on the internet using such features as GOOGLE EARTH, where one can view transportation models and the design conditions of roads, its maintenance, and survey the actual resultant shifts in demographics and levels of commercial productivity over time as a result of this treatment. Digression into this topic is beyond the scope of the quickly completed short draft note objective here.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	7	H W Haynes		Please keep in mind that if a private party buys a home, they are making a long term investment (and gamble) in terms of the community they may serve. The viability of their family experience and its further history is at stake. How may their odds of success be improved and even nurtured? What should their assumptions be if they are based on what they first see in buying a subject property (and in using the sales efforts given by real estate agent(s))? Should this be depending on sustaining an ancient ideal of the "Golden Rule", and believing in a desire for the community leaders (and their planners) to hold to a oath and commitment for perpetuating a vision and a mission satisfying levels of productive public promise and service. If so, by what degrees is this truth measured?	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	8	H W Haynes		The current consideration does not completely take into account the depth of traditional rural uses and their means of transportation (including for equestrians, bicycles, pedestrians, farm animals, wildlife, and serving commerce vehicles such as forklifts, tractors, track hoes, halers, spreaders, etc.). Each need to be accommodated in order to continue rural cultural and commercial workloads. These important economic and traditional uses may be inconvenienced or disturbed (or even destroyed) by mismanaged and dissuasive road applications and uses (including creation of road noise intrusive to people, wildlife, livestock and livestock modes of production, and other rural uses (such as leisure and tourist (hospitality) activities)). Also, a plan needs to be created which recognizes the need for traffic noise barriers (which may be speedily installed if the right equipment and modules are available), along with a prioritized implementation strategy which embraces the needs of people and businesses residing along the corridor(s). This is especially wanted in answering the needs of rural residences and rural businesses where solitude, quietness and restfulness, and rural culture and character, are important qualities. Such preservation is important to the productivity of these rural areas and corridors (including transitional areas such as suburban, etc.), and may find special treatment in such cause areas such as Universities, National Parks, Scenic Areas, and within the administrative and command areas of Military Posts.	Multi-modal	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282876	9	H W Haynes		<p>The current consideration does not completely take into account the depth of traditional rural uses and their means of transportation (including for equestrians, bicycles, pedestrians, farm animals, wildlife, and serving commerce vehicles such as forklifts, tractors, track hoes, hailers, spreaders, etc.). Each need to be accommodated in order to continue rural cultural and commercial workloads. These important economic and traditional uses may be inconvenienced or disturbed (or even destroyed) by mismanaged and dissuasive road applications and uses (including creation of road noise intrusive to people, wildlife, livestock and livestock modes of production, and other rural uses (such as leisure and tourist (hospitality) activities)). Also, a plan needs to be created which recognizes the need for traffic noise barriers (which may be speedily installed if the right equipment and modules are available), along with a prioritized implementation strategy which embraces the needs of people and businesses residing along the corridor(s). This is especially wanted in answering the needs of rural residences and rural businesses where solitude, quietness and restfulness, and rural culture and character, are important qualities. Such preservation is important to the productivity of these rural areas and corridors (including transitional areas such as suburban, etc.), and may find special treatment in such cause areas such as Universities, National Parks, Scenic Areas, and within the administrative and command areas of Military Posts.</p> <p>As an example, it should take little explanation here that local residences may differ in experience hearing the noise of a single heavy truck laboring up a steep grade (such as 12%). Most may accommodate it if it is infrequent (say, once a day). Most may want to live someplace else if this occurrence grows to many times an hour, and those who may buy the subject residence, and are insensitive to subject intrusions, may have very different backgrounds and capabilities than the parties so displaced. These new residents then become the emerging heart and soul of their good community. This is "driven" by the engineering of the transportation department models (be it land, sea, and/or air).</p>	Multi-modal	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	10	H W Haynes		<p>This scenic preservation should also include control policies related to occasional or random road users,</p> <p>including potentially nuisance and traffic distracting factors such as family pets. This should include dogs that are "barkers" and/or "biters", and/or destructive wanderers (joining into packs attacking other animals, and other behaviors such as wandering across, out into, and biting traffic). Pets which dissuade and harm domesticated rural livestock (and also wildlife) are also an issue, and even a political one.</p> <p>Since this seemingly local "pet" intrusion issue also affects traffic flows from other counties to, within, and across neighboring county jurisdictions, and safety matters relating thereto (including the drafting and settling of insurance policies and claims), this seems not only a PSRC issue, but also a State issue as well.</p> <p>There seems to be a declaration by some that their family animal, because it is "theirs", has a "natural" right to kill and maim the pets of others, and harm free roaming and aesthetically pleasing wildlife (many seem to take pleasure when their animal makes a "kill"). This family pet has a seemingly right to injure and damage any person's privacy, and/or their person, and/or their property, and/or the productivity of others. Their private animal has the right and privilege to damage and kill wildlife even though they are important to the ecosystem and the aesthetic character of the region. The extent of this goes seemingly outside of public interest and reason. The argument I have commonly hear is that this is the natural condition of this animal, and this condition should be protected by the animals owner (the animal is theirs, and embraced with privileges going above and beyond anything human ... including the rights of their own children). Such ideas seem so pervasive and contrary to court decisions that the makeup and acceptance of such ideas seem not a part of law, but a part of a political movement that can become so enlarged that it is embraced by whole substantial groups within communities (if so organized, may even be popularized inside of a political party).</p> <p>Pets can be trained (including dogs). Pets can be controlled as to where they live and how they follow (many jurisdictions have "leash" laws and "poop" laws). Adjacent property owners should not have to make careers out of addressing neighbor nuisance animal issues (such as filling out long complaint forms and sitting for days and weeks logging the barkings of dogs and their intrusions, and then taking this matter through an expensive court process). This is brought to forefront here as these pet animals may become traffic nuisances that can cause</p>	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282876	11	H W Haynes		<p>By "preservation" we mean not only to the road itself, but also in making improvements to surroundings needed in order to meet and install aesthetically pleasing high quality mitigations acceptable to all stake holders. This includes keeping within (and even enhancing) the surrounding sensory climate (the "aesthetic" experience), and in testing and satisfying the surrounding traditional culture needs (and its traditional uses) of the subject roadway. Human perception and properties related thereto are important to the "customer" (and tax payer) experience.</p> <p>Priorities in terms of road repairs and convenience upgrades should be allocated based on changing community impacts (including to rural community cultures, commerce, and traditional uses), including quality of human and wildlife habitat. A mechanism for evaluating and laying in place a rapid set of near term range of responses (also see above) needs to be designed and created in order to offset difficulties manifested in and by the wake of vehicular traffic implementing electronic, cell phone, and "e-mail" recommended shifts in ostensibly time saving traffic movements.</p>	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	12	H W Haynes		<p>this revised set of traffic loadings has generated new human and road frame roads onto rural and urban serving low traffic volume streets which were not designed for these (now revised) workloads and public safety considerations. This newly utilized software and/or "APPS" thus broadly redirects traffic around traffic "bottlenecks" (traffic congested areas), and shifts traditional road uses away into an experience level that may be suggested as "something else" other than what it is designed for. This re-servicing creates swift erosion and displacement of traditional road uses and local culture(s)). As an example, rural farms and stables who rely on rural roads to run their animals and equipment, including horses from equestrian facilities to county parks and trails, now become displaced by "outsiders" speeding traffic and endangerment to their persons and their animals. This drives away stable customers, drives away tourists and eco-tourism, drives away professional in the community requiring peace and harmony to do their work, and it also drives down property values and increase crime along the revised services roadway. Increased crime and decreased productivity along the roadway (and loss of jobs) increases the policing and criminal justice system burdens allocated along the subject roadway, and also therefore increases the tax burden needed to protect this space. A paradox exists in that taxes needed increases for law enforcement and road improvements at a time when the actual ability for local residents to carry such burdens is being depressed by traffic coming from other jurisdictions.</p> <p>Mitigation funding strategies may include additional taxation on long range commuters who uses such rural corridors, and also may include applying "outside user" road usage fee multipliers that may directly go toward those local road improvement needs (see below).</p> <p>Hopefully a taxation plan may place an additional cost burden on long distance and "shortcutting" commuters that, in examining the increased transportation cost burdens assessed to them, they may find it economically advantageous to locate closer to work and thus spend less traffic miles/hours "plugging up" the fixed amount of base highway time and miles available (as measured in road miles and road hours). These available road hours consider a vehicle path operating at a given speed, and vehicle pitch distance (spacing) along a corridor, and various product input and output points. This level of analysis is much like charting the capacity of products placed upon a moving conveyor belt. Hopefully the accumulated additional user taxes would help to curb otherwise unneeded and unnecessary property tax avoiding trip miles (and hours) on the road. Tax burdens</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	13	H W Haynes		<p>As noted above, failure to address shifting road uses and expanding range of nuisances has usually resulted in displacing the aggrieved populations and culture, and then a gutting of the traditional economic base. This seemingly causes a disruption and skewing (and redefining) of the then new paradigm that results in adopting the new population(s) culture or composite culture, and may produce a shift of the potential commercial economic base and its resultant productivity. Examples of this may be seen in the history of cities such as Detroit and Chicago, where there may be found districts with abandoned buildings and houses, and streets left to be "turned to gravel" (and abandoned for lack of regional productivity and appropriate supporting tax base). These areas seemingly are collapsing regions of decaying urban and commercial uses, and the highest and best purposes of these properties (by nature) may be to return to agriculture and forested lands. Tum-around stories may be seen in cities such as portions of Cincinnati, New York City, and Seattle (and by the convenience found within this local model, one can drive and see the revitalization of some areas, and the decline in others).</p>	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282876	14	H W Haynes		<p>Similarly, current tax structure does not reflect the tax shortfall created by long distance commuters traveling to far away located specific "magnet" employers. Both parties seek the economic impacts of lower real estate costs and lower tax consequences (and lower paid in road taxes). It is the commuter who pays for the uncompensated loss in personal and family time by executing longer commutes to and from work. While the long distance commuter increases the distance and amount of time they spend on the sovereigns expensive to build and maintain road structure(s) (in order to save on the cost of their home and taxes, and to enjoy a "rural" lifestyle), this public (both employer and employee who see benefits) similarly decrease the amount they pay in wages and taxes that is applied for road use per mile. They also disproportionately increase the amount of distance and time they use the fixed asset public roads (as an employer and employee user group). This disharmony seems to create a geometrically scaled multiplier factor as they buy and use newer vehicles with greater miles per gallon fuel efficiency, and also buy electric vehicles for use (which currently pays no fuel tax at all). The drivers are also coming from areas with lower real estate "mil" rate on the much lower cost property, and this carries with it lower combined real estate taxes and proportion applied to road taxes.</p> <p>The tax disharmony shortfall of driving farther and farther for commuting purposes, and this population segment spending less and less for the driving privilege, seems to drive a frenzied roads department looking for revenue. With the most politically favored attitude of applying a tax broadly across all users, the road uses and repairs are primarily funded by "closer in" higher taxed users. It is largely being funded by the more densely populated and disproportionately closer higher valued properties whose private owners often drive far fewer miles for their purposes (and may even own no car at all). This seems unbalanced and unfair, especially for the elderly who often drive on less than one full tank of gas worth of fuel range per month (roads are substantially funded by property taxes, and also amount of fuel used taxes).</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	15	H W Haynes		As noted above, we have a road system of relatively constant geometry and finite length, and its load carrying capacity is being turned into a "parking on" without the privilege of charging for the time and space users occupy. A normally run and profitable "downtown" parking lot would "go broke" in months if operated this way (e.g., a parking lot can be scaled so that it rents per square foot and unit time occupied. Parking lot rents may be calculated just as building rents may).	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	16	H W Haynes		User fees should also consider "efficiency" of road use. A utilization "efficiency" multiplier may contain a changing tax calculation variable feature applied to a specific road user group where significant emergency mitigations are needed on roadways to accommodate the traditional rural user customer, and the displaced value that they would otherwise have had for their uses, purposes, and comforts so disturbed and displaced (there are many court cases reaching across a broad range of law that seemingly touches on aspects of this issue). An example of this would be the need for installing road upgrades and modifications (including trails, shoulders, acoustically sensitive barriers and road surfaces, speed bumps and speed strips, revised traffic signage and traffic controls (lights, automated speed signs, etc.), under road wildlife serving corridors and passages, etc.) in order to keep the local community and user group(s) safe, functional, and aesthetically comfortable. Isn't it unfair to be bullied by outsider traffic and "APPS"?	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	17	H W Haynes		<p>In regions or areas that the jurisdiction wishes to not serve or service a specific roadway, or "let the roads turn to gravel", a process and plan for returning these roads to the surrounding private users should be made (to interested local road service groups (including neighborhood volunteers)). This process should include a "Petition For Road Closure" (which exists in some jurisdictions including King County), and such policies, processes, and methods by which the re-privatization of such roads would be allowed. Such "Petition For Road Closure" and road abandonment standards should also allow for reevaluation of road traffic circulation patterns and security, and for the repurposing of traffic circulation patterns, modification of road system entry points, and allow for the formation of more private gated communities. Gated communities traditionally seem to need less policing, and have better internal "neighborhood watch" security (often at their own expense). These private gated communities become, in essence, a "village" wherein a locally serving community identity and socially protective environment is created.</p> <p>Thus, per above, road usage charges should reflect traffic impacts on specific local and rural communities, and the need for funding mitigations to correct for those local deficits. Similarly, some roads should be allowed to be closed and also "go private", wherein the security and comfort within of these "village" like areas may be repurposed and restored to and including "gated" communities.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282876	18	H W Haynes		<p>The importance of the PSRC's watchdog work favoring the rural areas sensitive lifestyle and sensitive economic base, and resultant sustainability, should not be underestimated and seems embraced by the PSRC's Regional Economic Strategy (or "RES"). This should include consideration and protection of rural area regions and communities, although by population size and density rural areas seem less important than towns and cities. Sustainable long term productivity measures are often ignored in favor of cities and towns whose productivity often is dependent on quickly growing services and/or manufacturing base that often has to accommodate a high tum-over of product revisions and upgrades, and product types with comparatively short obsolescence cycles. By comparison, examples of this is to compare the rural communities making of staples such as timber, milk, cattle, com, etc. with the city zonesLarge scale manufacturing of, say, airplanes, boats, cars, engines, houses and software. By contrast, rural areas must be much more independent and self sustaining as the complexity of many institutionalized services found in cities and towns is often difficult to obtain, or even absent. Because of the high sense of independence and capability, and community cooperation, found within the culture of rural dwellers, these people are often found to be highly prized employees amongst city employers. How these rural attitudes may be created and sustained within growing city populations has been an institutional challenge.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	19	H W Haynes		<p>Sadly, lagging traffic measurements and report writing often causes publication of repair and mitigation supporting strategies, costs, and time tables many years lagging behind what are the actual needs. This, of course, also relies on what properties and scales are being used at the time (certain data field will not even occur because the question(s) where never asked by the costly to place interviewer). Often these requirements are "low balled" in order to draw tax payer favor. If the price tag becomes too high at the onset, the politicians may simply shrug and walk away. This keeps pushing and piling up a "bow wave" of project(s) and funding shortfalls which are increasingly restrictive of society and commerce at all levels. Simply put, as one trucking company retired executive put it, in 1960 he could average 3 (three) loads and trips a day per vehicle, and now (in the FY 20 I 7) this company averages 1 (one) with the same class and capability vehicle, and on the same route run. While this may favor hiring more truck drivers, buying and using more trucks, and buying and using more fuel, this is causing more time for products to be "warehoused" in vehicles in transit within the "supply pipeline". This increases the amount of time and cost associated with products being stored and move to consumers, and also increases the cost of money in keeping this extended supply line filled (it is more time that funds have to be used at various storage and movement points in which each has its own various costs). This would seem progressively more crippling to an economy where once upon a time (many decades ago) management of resources and logistics through "just in time delivery" was a hallmark of efficiency. What this means now is getting progressively more complex and difficult to adapt to and sustain.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282876	20	H W Haynes		<p>Traditionally, roads were created thousands of years ago by workforces dedicated to speeding military units (and their supply logistical support) to their needed areas. Now, in the 21 st century, modem roads are often rendered useless for military purposes by commuters in traffic slowdowns within choke points, and in the case of a national emergency, may become blocked with "standstill" traffic (short changing any hope of surface level emergency transportation movement or resupply, and increasing dependence on (hopefully politely engineered) air, sea, and subterranean movements).</p> <p>By "user experience" we mean parties who operate on the road, adjacent to the road, and/or may live proximate to the road (impacted by its road users who produce noise, vibration, pollution, etc.). We also need to consider priority purposes in the design and application of our roads, such as the speeding of military units and supplies, and also needs that should be served by first responders (paramilitary (or police), and fire), as well as national security needs including offering aid, assistance, and supplies in times of disaster.</p>	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282876	21	H W Haynes		<p>By "aesthetic", we should consider what we need and what we sell within this region, to both ourselves and visitors. "Aesthetic" is the ever to be perfected, and striving, model for "customer" or human experience. This "Aesthetic" experience is part of the emerging levels of design criteria that at each stage becomes quantized inside of a specific revisions engineering specification. There are mathematical and instrumented test points to be met, as well as particular environmental and artistic ties that must be captured by the senses. By these changing methods this experience is lifted; that is, the method and means by which this quality of life may rise and raise customer expectations, and demand(s). This changes levels of customer satisfaction, much like the common "open" design Ford "Model T" was replaced by the comfort of the streamlined and enclosed iconic 1940 Ford and its powerful, quiet, and economically produced V-8.</p> <p>Transportation methods of all types are important to this consideration, but we must not only consider the raw utilitarian qualities of these various means, but also the internal and external human experience impacts created by removing intrusiveness, and callas impacts upon the senses. Thus, substantial engineering momentum should be imparted into finding and adapting technologies which may reduce air, water, and noise pollution (especially with aircraft and trucks), and the negative impacts forced upon all animal and plant life. We must also improve upon the design and artistry found within these product forms. This will increase the quality of "place" we are trying to market (rather than reduce it), and help in raising (rather than lowering) our prospects for continued prosperity. This would seem consistent with the recently adopted Puget Sound Regional Councils Regional Economic Strategy (or "PSRC's RES").</p>	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282878	1	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	The Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) reflects a significant effort to incorporate the most recent revenue projections, project lists, costs, plans and modeled and actual performance data into the previously-adopted Transportation 2040 plan. As a partner, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) appreciates the extensive work that went into preparation of the RTP.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282878	2	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	With a few important exceptions, the draft RTP financial strategy provides an incremental update to strategies adopted in 2010 and again in 2014. One significant change that merits further explanation is the fundamental change in emphasis in the Draft RTP which moves away from the previous plan assumption of systemwide tolling and towards road user charges. To help show the impacts of that change the updated RTP should include a table that provides a detailed comparison of the existing plan and the updated plan. This should include the transportation performance measures used in prior RTPs, including separate measures of congestion on freeways and arterials, mode shares, etc.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. As you're aware, modeling frameworks continually evolve, making direct performance comparisons to earlier plans challenging. While the Finance Working Group discussed the differences in performance from various pricing mechanisms. In addition, each regional transportation plan is evaluated based on the performance outcomes framework as directed by the board and the proposed policies included at the time of drafting.
282878	3	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	As the region is in a period of rapid growth and profound change, and while it is helpful to have an update to the planning baseline, there are many urgent and emergent issues facing us as a region. It is not too soon to begin tackling the tough issues facing the next regional transportation plan update that will extend the planning horizon to 2050. Tremendous growth has brought with it severe congestion and housing affordability challenges. WSDOT would like to continue the conversation of how to achieve a safe, equitable and sustainable transportation system in anticipation of the new 2050 planning horizon. To this end, WSDOT looks forward to being substantially involved in the development of a VISION 2050 Plan.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC looks forward to continued partnership with WSDOT PSRC and the State of Washington continue the work to refine and update the region's transportation plans.
282878	4	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	WSDOT is embracing a Practical Solutions approach that calls for identifying the right investment, in the right location, at the right time. Fundamental to this approach is the collaboration with local partners and the recognition that it's not about fixing a problem on the state highway system, but instead, advancing to the next generation of transportation investment. WSDOT appreciates the partnership with PSRC on the new Appendix I, the State Facilities Action Plan. This crucial work will focus on ways to preserve and protect existing facilities and to create innovation mobility solutions now, and in the future.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282878	5	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	<p>Following are issues the draft RTP covers which are likely to dominate transportation planning in the Puget Sound region in the coming years:</p> <p>* Technology: Technology is hard to predict and we applaud the efforts to anticipate future opportunities and impacts. We look forward to collaborating with the region to assess and anticipate the changes that advances in technology will bring in the coming decades.</p>	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282878	6	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Transportation-efficient land use in suburbs: The region has long embraced urban growth boundaries and a centers approach. More recently Sound Transit 3 was passed by voters serving centers with high capacity transit throughout much of the region. These policies aim for transportation efficiency by concentrating employment in places served by transit, and replacing driving with walk and bike trips in walkable neighborhood business districts. The final step to leverage our mass transit investment and reduce the growth in car travel must include actionable strategies to make car-centric suburban neighborhoods more walkable and bikeable. To this end, suggested actions from the Active Transportation Plan (ATP), Appendix L, should be carefully considered and applied in order to effect appropriate and nonmotorized investments in our growing suburbs.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We agree this is an important element to highlight and will review the language in Appendix L to assess if this can be further clarified.
282878	7	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Transportation-efficient land use in suburbs: The draft RTP would be improved by a discussion of mode share trends in suburban areas and the potential for on-demand services to meet anticipated mobility needs.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. To the extent feasible, we will look for opportunities to broaden our display of data in subareas of the region. In addition, PSRC is continuing to work with partners to advance our understanding and ability to plan for shared mobility and other transportation options.
282878	8	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Congestion pricing and road use charges: The 2010 Transportation 2040 Plan’s major policy achievement was to propose a path to regional congestion pricing. That strategy was shown to raise significant revenues for transportation while reducing congestion in major corridors and greenhouse gas emissions. The 2018 update removes congestion pricing except of existing and planned managed lanes, but suggests road use charges can be implemented to have a similar effect. Some form of demand management through pricing is pivotal to the region’s transportation strategy, and it is critical to understand operational opportunities and constraints in order to tee up decisions about whether, when and how to move forward. The draft RTP can illuminate the impacts and trade-offs by providing a detailed performance comparison of the new RTP with the existing plan.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282878	9	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Revenues for system preservation and local transportation: Both the existing plan and 2018 update assume a very high level of revenues from road pricing in the outer years, filling substantial funding gaps for system preservation, local roads and transit. The 2018 update assumes road use charges will raise the equivalent of almost a \$2.00/gallon increase in fuel taxes after 2025, and that is in addition to a carbon tax on fuels, an increase in county road levies, and new MVET. In the next plan, these amounts need to be again examined to ensure the levels projected are feasible and publicly acceptable. This RTP update should explain how those plan assumptions influence travel demand and system performance.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. To clarify, after 2025, fuel taxes are assumed to be replaced by mileage charges in the draft plan. In addition, the impact to system performance from the combination of policies and investments, including pricing, are fully documented in the draft plan. Further, Appendix E, Climate Change Analysis, discusses the impact of pricing on travel demand and emission reductions.
282878	10	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	Following are needed technical edits: * Executive Summary – The Executive Summary states “and a new interchange at I-90 and Highway 18 will be built. This is not accurate. WSDOT will improve the existing interchange.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	We will make this revision to the final plan document.
282878	11	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Executive Summary - The top three projects (1, 2, and 3). This gives the impression that all these projects listed are funded. Please clarify that these projects are planned in the draft RTP, but all currently do not have funding.	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. A caption will be added to the maps to indicate that not all projects are fully funded.
282878	12	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Regional Capacity Projects List – WSDOT SR 167 project # 1722 needs to be updated to reflect the most current information, summarized below: - Old Description: Construction of new four lane alignment on SR 167 between I-5 and SR 509. (early 2017) - New Description: Construction of new four-lane alignment on SR 167 between I-5 and SR 509 includes new interchanges at I-5, SR 509 and 54th Avenue. Work also includes replacing the 70th Avenue overpass at I-5. (January 2018)	Project Specific	Technical Correction	This element was not included as part of the original project submittal; we have worked with the project sponsor on the correct description and confirmed there will no impact to our air quality conformity finding with this correction.
282878	13	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* HOV and Express Toll Lane System Map - WSDOT will provide an updated map to provide additional detail to replace the one on page 34 of the draft RTP. We will do so by mid-February, 2018. This will be a refined version (to include planned and under construction facilities) of the map below.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	We await receipt of the updated information to be provided by WSDOT, and will make any necessary corrections in the final plan document.
282878	14	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Level of service versus Vehicle Miles of Travel – The WAC in 468-86-110 specifies that regional transportation plans must identify regional transportation needs including “...comparing current usage, and operational characteristics to level of service standards”. WSDOT would like to partner with PSRC on ways to replace this metric with VMT to determine transportation system performance. The problem with the LOS metric is that it intensifies regional congestion, is hard to calculate, and focuses on expensive capacity investments. The benefits of a VMT metric is that it supports transit and active transportation investments, is easier to model, less costly to implement, has health benefits (including GHG reduction) and addresses growing regional congestion more effectively.	Performance Measures	General Comment	PSRC is focused on using transportation performance metrics in our planning that are useful for both policy makers and the general public and are supportive of finding new ways to measure success.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282878	15	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Regional Integrated Transit Network – The Draft RTP would be improved by including a summary of standard performance metrics used to assess transit performance such as mode share, cost per rider, cost per service hour, transfer rate, revenue miles per service hour, etc. More emphasis on the new transit network, including a map of the integrated system, differentiating transit operator systems would be helpful as well as an explanation on how this new network will assist in future planning.	Performance Measures	General Comment	Transit boardings by operator are provided in Appendix K, Table 1. Transit Mode Share and trips are also provided in Appendix K. The transit performance measures included in the revised plan focus on accessibility to people and jobs, and were developed with our Transportation Policy board.
282878	16	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Technology – For the next plan update, a sensitivity analysis would be helpful in terms of the potential impacts of technology, showing how the system would perform if: o Communication and transportation technology result in a decrease in peak period travel demand. o System management technology enables an increase in throughput on highways. o On-demand services replace low-productivity fixed route transit services (and complement transit service in high-demand corridors). o Technology results in greater dispersion of the population. o Predictive and real-time pricing and delay information shifted travel behavior.	Emerging Technologies	Board Review	The draft plan contains recommendations for advancing our work on technology, and PSRC will continue to work to advance our understanding and ability to plan for new technologies coming to the region.
282878	17	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Rail - Positive Train Control: adding language to describe ongoing PTC work on the rail system is recommended. Additional comments on the rail section: o RTP Pg. 55, Reference to the region having two types of intercity passenger rail service is incorrect: Intercity service only pertains to Amtrak Cascades. Long distance service pertains to Coast Starlight and Empire Builder. o RTP Pg. 55, Stated growth in rail service by 2023 is incorrect: the growth in service by 2023 between Vancouver, BC and Seattle is a growth scenario identified in the State Rail Plan. o RTP Pg. 56, Reference to the 2018 State Rail Plan update suggests a defined scope – this is yet to be determined: tempering language is strongly encouraged.	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will work with WSDOT on any necessary corrections to the final document.
282878	18	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Freight - Pg. 58-59, Growth in freight is discussed, but doesn’t address some of the issues/concerns such as truck parking: sensibly carry the “Key Issues from Freight and Goods Movement” from Appendix J into the main body of the plan to inform readers not able to read all appendices.	Freight / Rail	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. We will bring this issue to the board for their review and discussion.
282878	19	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Freight - Appendix J Pg. 40, reference to freight funding appropriation is somewhat vague: recommend replacing “Funding from the first two fiscal years of the program was allocated to three projects in WSDOT’s preservation program, two of which are in the region” with “Funding from the first two fiscal years was appropriated by the legislature to three projects in WSDOT’s preservation program, two of which are in the region.”	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The requested clarification will be made to Appendix J.
282878	20	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* State Facilities Action Plan – Two edits: o Correct typo in the Title of Section 4. This should refer to Connecting Washington, not Connected Washington.	Other / miscellaneous	Technical Correction	We will make this correction to the final plan document.
282878	21	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	State Facilities Action Plan: o Add reference to Guidance for Considering Impacts of Climate Change in WSDOT Plans. WSDOT conducted a vulnerability assessment of all state facilities, and considers ways to improve the resilience and durability of these facilities in asset plans and projects.	Climate Change / Air Quality	Technical Correction	We will incorporate these edits in the final document.
282878	22	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Active Transportation Plan – PSRC has conducted thoughtful update to the Active Transportation Plan (ATP). This has been a complex and collaborative process and PSRC is to be commended. The Introduction section reads well on the first page of the ATP. This short summary succinctly lays out the context for the ATP, the four key goals, and the purpose of ATP. Very crisp and clear introduction for the reader. Thanks!	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282878	23	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page 14 - First sentence: “In the central Puget Sound region, the number of fatalities and serious injuries for bicyclists and pedestrians has not seen a decrease in the trend as is the case with motor vehicles.” This is an extremely important issue and finding with respect to bicycle and pedestrian safety needs and should be well noted in the Executive Summary upfront in the ATP.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We agree this is an important distinction and will review the language in the Executive Summary of Appendix L to assess if this can be further clarified.
282878	24	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Any reference to “Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons” (RRFBs) should be replaced with “Pedestrian Activated Flashing Beacons” pursuant to the termination of FHWA’s policy of 1A-11 for RRFBs.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for the correction. We will address this in the final plan.
282878	25	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* We suggest it would be helpful to acknowledge that the U.S. Bicycle Route System will utilize the regional network identified in the PSRC’s ATP. This will help accommodate inter-regional and statewide bicycle travel and bicycle tourism.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282878	26	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page Six – Goal One: “Support social equity in active transportation projects and programs” – It would be helpful to the reader to clarify what the focus of social equity is, in terms of “how” the plan will achieve “social equity”. Understand that “Social Equity” is a major focus throughout the RTP update, but it would be helpful to better understand the desired or needed target for achieving Social Equity in the ATP. The two supporting objectives under Goal One suggest actions to be undertaken in helping to achieve Social Equity. Perhaps another Objective / Action could include something like “Define/confirm Social Equity targets for bicycle and pedestrian modes in geographic areas within the PSRC that are underserved / underdeveloped for bicycle and pedestrian modes” (or something to that effect).	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC boards have not adopted mode split targets at this time. This could be a topic for future board discussion.
282878	27	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page Six – Goal Two: “Improve safety and comfort for people walking and bicycling.” What metric is being applied in order to determine how well (and how much) we are “improving safety” in the ATP? The three supporting Objectives below Goal Two suggest actions in how the ATP, the PSRC and its partners will help to achieve improved safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. Suggest addition of another supporting objective that confirms safety targets/metrics we are trying to achieve in this plan.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. These goals are further defined in Chapter 6 of Appendix L. This section provides more detail on specific actions and how the goal will be evaluated (pages 48-52). This goal will be evaluated by monitoring crash rates over time, assessing the number and percentage of bike facilities that serve 'all ages and abilities' and will monitor how many jurisdictions in the central Puget Sound region are adopting complete streets policies.
282878	28	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page Six – Goal Three: “Increase the Percentage of People walking and biking.” Again, suggest adding in one more supporting objective to confirm the percentage target or metric we are trying to achieve in this goal (e.g. what percentage increase target are we trying to achieve here?). Is there are certain percentage target we are trying to achieve here? Relative to other modes in the RTP? Relative to the previous (2014) ATP?	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Over the last year, PSRC has been responding to federally required performance measures and targets. We agree that addressing targets for increased bike and pedestrian modes is worthwhile and are committed to addressing this in future plan updates and work program items.
282878	29	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page Seven – Last sentence in the first paragraph: Add in the word “in” between the words “increase” and “active” in order to clarify sentence and for readability	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We will review the language to see if this can be further clarified.
282878	30	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	*Page 13 – “The RTP results in an increase in the percent of people walking and bicycling for transportation purposes.” In the discussion below this introductory sentence and the supporting table, is there any data / information available from the previous PSRC regional plan update/ATP (2014) that could show readers what percentage biking and walking trips have increased since the adoption of the previous RTP (Relative increases/changes in the bike and pedestrian modes since the last plan update)?	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We will continue to monitor bicycle and pedestrian mode trends..
282878	31	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page 14 – in the discussion about bicycle and pedestrian safety issues (injuries and fatalities), there is a bit of mixing of terminology here with the use of the terms ‘collisions’ and ‘crashes’ both mentioned in this section. Suggest either using one of the two terms or clearly describing the differences, if any, between the two terms. Also, if any WSDOT data sources are included in the ATP plan or elsewhere in the PSRC plan, the standard legal WSDOT disclaimer needs to be included: (Under 23 U.S. Code § 409, safety data, reports, surveys, schedules, lists compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential crash sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings are not subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.)	Safety	Technical Correction	We will review the documentation and work with WSDOT to ensure the appropriate language is included in the final plan.
282878	32	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page 26 – “According to the 2014 PSRC Household Travel Survey, 1,626,000 daily trips were taken by people walking.” Has the 2014 PSRC HH Travel Survey been updated and completed? If so, is there more current data to provide here from the PSRC HH Travel Survey? It is possible this figure could be even higher for a more recent year (2016/2017).	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	The 2017 PSRC HH Travel Survey is not scheduled for release until later in the Spring of 2018. Any changes in regional mode share can be shared in subsequent updates to the Regional Transportation Plan.
282878	33	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page 27 – The sentence describing limitations to survey results related to transit access mode share: “However, there are some differences in the survey methods that likely exaggerate the changes in walking shares between 2014 and previous surveys, so changes might not be quite as dramatic as suggested by the results in this table, though the general trend in increased walking shares is still evident.” Therefore, the reader should take caution in interpreting and understanding this data and what it is saying. A couple of extra sentences explaining the context of this and the survey limitations such that readers and ATP users do not misuse or misunderstand this point and its context would be most helpful.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will clarify this in the final plan.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282878	34	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page 31 – “Aspirational Routes” – Good summary of the focus and intent of “Aspirational Routes” in the ATP. It is important to emphasize as suggested in the second bullet item that “Aspirational Routes” do not necessarily tie or commit and agency or entity to a specific action or commitment to a proposed nonmotorized trail development along its facility. This is an important issue for WSDOT since many nonmotorized trails and facilities, and especially ‘aspirational’ trail proposals along or on state routes frequently cannot not be accommodated within constrained WSDOT project scopes and budgets. Ongoing maintenance and liability of these facilities is also an issue for WSDOT and sometime can inhibit viable nonmotorized facility proposals from moving forward. Simply put, WSDOT must be cautious about expectations that can arise from an aspirational facility need/proposal and what they commit to the agency.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282878	35	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page 34 – The first sentence in the second paragraph on page 34 indicates the average bicycle trip being about three miles. Is this data point from the PSRC 2014 Household Travel Survey? Is this average trip length expected to change or increase with the updated (2017/18?) PSRC Household Survey?	Analysis results	Technical Correction	PSRC will clarify the source of this in the final plan.
282878	36	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* Page 48 – Under Goal Two, Objective Three, good suggestion to confirm coordination with WSDOT in promoting our “Target Zero” program in improving access to bicyclist and pedestrian data as well as their reporting. As a follow-up action item to this objective, it will be important to identify the gaps in this effort, many of which are related specifically to data and reporting. Suggest that it will be important to prioritize these actions with consistent data collection and analysis methods perhaps being most important. Crash reporting gaps and issues will need to be coordinated with WSDOT Traffic as well as Washington State Patrol (WSP) as well as by local PSRC partners with their law-enforcement agencies.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We look forward to working with WSDOT on this topic in the future.
282878	37	WSDOT, Robin Mayhew, Roger Millar	WSDOT	* State and Federal Active Transportation Funding Sources Available (summary table at the end of the ATP, page five of the table): In the summary of State Funding programs in the State and Federal Funding sources summary appendix, the TIB Funding Programs summary should include reference to its (TIB) ‘Complete Streets’ (funding) program. In the description of the Safe Routes to School program, change Eligible Project Sponsors to read: All public agencies in Washington (including tribal governments), and nonprofit entities responsible for the administration of local transportation safety programs. In the description of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program, add the Eligible Project Sponsors to read: Public agencies, including tribal governments.	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The requested clarifications and edits will be made.
282882	1	Bellevue Downtown Association, Patrick Bannon, Matt Jack	Bellevue Downtown Association	Through careful planning and a strong market response from new development, Downtown Bellevue continues to embrace and exceed expectations for employment and housing growth. Our city’s core is one of the fastest growing regional centers and will remain the primary multi-modal hub of the Eastside’s network. Recognizing future trip growth, the Draft Plan confirms how important key investments and new strategies will be for improving regional mobility and access to centers like Downtown Bellevue. The BDA continues to support current commitments vital to Downtown Bellevue’s growth as a sustainable regional center.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282882	2	Bellevue Downtown Association, Patrick Bannon, Matt Jack	Bellevue Downtown Association	The Regional Transportation Plan should advance the following projects and initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I-405 Master Plan Congestion Relief and Bus Rapid Transit projects • SR-520 capacity and interchange improvements • Regional funding and project commitments in Sound Transit 2 and Sound Transit 3 • City of Bellevue’s Transportation Facilities Program, Capital Investment Improvement Plan, Downtown Transportation Plan Update, Bellevue’s Transit Master Plan, Pedestrian and Bike Implementation Initiative • Emerging smart technology for mobility projects and programs • Transportation Demand Management investments and programs for regional centers and corridors • Improved collaboration and integration at all levels for transportation planning and project delivery • New, innovative partnerships among agencies and jurisdictions, including the private sector 	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282884	1	Seattle Times (editorial board)		If you like how Seattle plans for traffic congestion, you’ll love the new regional transportation plan that the Puget Sound Regional Council is developing. A draft version of the plan includes controversial measures such as tolling roads across the region and adding per-mile driving fees. These measures are intended to both raise revenue and give government more tools to manipulate when and where people drive.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282884	2	Seattle Times (editorial board)		<p>The PSRC is a wonky organization that’s off the radar for most people. But its regional growth and transportation plans strongly influence policy in King, Pierce, Kitsap and Snohomish counties.</p> <p>Inside players, including Seattle anti-car activists, recognize its importance. They lobby the PSRC to shape policy and the criteria it uses to divvy up federal transportation grants.</p> <p>For instance, the state is just starting to study per-mile driving fees. Legislative action and public discussion is needed before this proceeds further. But by making these fees a cornerstone of the regional transportation plan, the PSRC pushes them toward certainty.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The plan recognizes that broad public discussion and better understanding of road user charges will be required before they are actually proposed for consideration by the state legislature and the Governor in the future.
282884	3	Seattle Times (editorial board)		<p>Residents concerned about the direction and priorities of regional transportation policies have an opportunity to have their voices heard. They can review the PSRC’s draft transportation plan update and submit comments through Jan. 31.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the public won’t have access to a batch of recent data on how the PSRC’s approach is working.</p> <p>Results of the PSRC’s spring 2017 travel survey, which informs planners about how Puget Sounders get around and how long it takes, were due in the winter of 2017. But they’re delayed and won’t be available until March.</p>	Analysis results	General Comment	PSRC conducts regional travel surveys on a regular basis. The data provided from regional surveys conducted in 2014-2015 helped to inform the draft transportation plan and PSRC’s models. The most recent survey was conducted in the spring of 2017, and the results are expected to become available in March of 2018. This data will inform future versions of the plan, which is updated every four years.
282884	4	Seattle Times (editorial board)		<p>The majority of residents, who make most of their trips in personal vehicles, already know how things are working out.</p> <p>Freeway congestion in the central Puget Sound region is growing at a rate much greater than population growth, according to the state Department of Transportation. From 2014 to 2016, congestion on I-5, I-405 and I-90 increased 76 percent, 33 percent and 117 percent, respectively.</p> <p>Seattle drivers wasted 55 hours stuck in peak-hour traffic during 2015, according to Kirkland traffic-data company Inrix. Last year it ranked Seattle traffic 10th worst in North America and 20th worst in the world.</p> <p>Inrix estimated these delays cost Seattle drivers \$1,590 on average that year. Citywide, the cost was \$1.9 billion.</p>	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282884	5	Seattle Times (editorial board)		<p>Regional transportation plans and project rankings should factor the cost of congestion and time spent on slower modes of travel.</p> <p>Instead, the PSRC gives more weight to transportation projects that “eliminate vehicle trips” than to projects that “improve traffic flow.”</p> <p>PSRC’s prioritization system gives relatively low points to projects with a “demonstrable travel improvement for an identified problem that occurs during the peak hours of travel” or “a demonstrable travel improvement on a facility anticipated to have a future congestion issue.”</p> <p>This year’s update to the regional transportation plan is an opportunity to make it more pragmatic and less ideological. For starters, the cost of travel time deserves as much consideration in the plan as adding more charges.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	There are nine distinct sections within the Prioritization Framework for projects submitted to the regional transportation plan, including travel, freight, safety and other metrics. Project benefits across a wide spectrum of these metrics are combined; projects that are providing a travel flow improvement are therefore not valued less in the total system.
282884	6	Seattle Times (editorial board)		<p>The PSRC should also wait for results of the state’s user-fee pilot project, and public dialogue on the merits of this approach, before making a long-range plan that assumes it will happen.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. As discussed in the plan, any new revenue sources will require legislative action across a broad range of governments, including cities, counties, the state, and the federal government. Many would also require broad public support and voter approval. The regional plan does not assume that a road user charge will happen, and does not propose action by the state legislature at this time. The user charges are part of a finance plan designed to support future investments that is based on data indicating that traditional methods of financing road maintenance and improvements are likely to be unsustainable due to higher fuel economy, more electric vehicles and the introduction of autonomous, electric and shared vehicles.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282887	1	City of Marysville, Dave Koenig, Kevin Nielsen	City of Marysville	The Puget Sound Region is very diverse in its transportation needs. Each county has different transportation needs and solutions to those needs. Communities like Marysville need to build up its roadway infrastructure to provide access to properties for future and current urban growth development. Other communities whose roadways are built out need to concentrate their efforts on transit solutions. The Regional Transportation Plan needs to reflect the diversity of the regional and recognize the different needs of the region and its communities. In some communities like Marysville financing a road infrastructure is very important to provide access to properties within the Urban Growth Area for housing and employment growth.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Regional Transportation Plan contains a balanced, multimodal package of investments to meet transportation needs throughout the region. he plan recognizes the importance of investments on local roads and the arterial network, and their importance in implementing growth plan by creating and maintaining a highly connected network of multimodal facilities. See Chapter 2, pp. 43-44, Regional Roadway System. Also see Chapter 3, A Sustainable Financial Framework, and Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, which emphasize the importance of securing additional new revenues to meet the investment needs of cities and counties.
282887	2	City of Marysville, Dave Koenig, Kevin Nielsen	City of Marysville	Consideration in the plan should be given to the Arlington-Marysville Manufacturing Industrial Center an over 4,000 acre area for regional employment growth. This area is a valuable resource for the region. There is no discussion of this valuable asset.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	It is noted in Appendix J, Freight and Goods Movement, the work by the City of Arlington to add to the inventory of industrial zoned land. There is not yet an official regional designation for this proposed manufacturing / industrial center; once the updated Regional Centers Framework is adopted by PSRC's Executive Board, we expect this request to be forwarded to PSRC for action.
282887	3	City of Marysville, Dave Koenig, Kevin Nielsen	City of Marysville	The "key investment maps" on page 49 do not necessarily depict all of the key improvements. The projects provided by Marysville and listed in this document only represent key improvements on federally classified principal arterials, state routes and highways. This federally classified designation differs from the City's roadway classification system, so many "key investments" are not necessarily shown on this map or represented in this regional plan. Based on the document located in this link (https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/t2040capacityprojectlistthreshold2017.pdf), the City elected not to include any roadways with a classification less than principal arterial so we could apply for funding for those projects as exempt. Generally, the map that presents "key investments" is limited and not representative of all projects and should therefore be updated.	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The investments maps are intended to be illustrative of the types of investments contained in the plan. The plan webmap has full detail for all of the mapped projects. As noted, a significant amount of the plan's investments are not mapped, and are included as programmatic estimates. The maps will be clarified to emphasize these points.
282887	4	City of Marysville, Dave Koenig, Kevin Nielsen	City of Marysville	Regional aviation on page 54 excludes Arlington Municipal Airport. Harvey Field is listed which has less capacity than the Arlington Airport.	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The region has a total of 26 public use airports and two military airfields within the four county region, with varying capacity. Harvey Field is specifically identified in the plan text because it is designated as a general reliever airport.
282887	5	City of Marysville, Dave Koenig, Kevin Nielsen	City of Marysville	Financial Strategy, Page 87 should have some discussion on P3 legislation at both the state and federal level.	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of the potential for public private partnerships to fund transportation improvements will be added to the plan.
282887	6	City of Marysville, Dave Koenig, Kevin Nielsen	City of Marysville	Suggest more information on ST3 and the discussion of projects focused with connections to these future link light rail stations.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282887	7	City of Marysville, Dave Koenig, Kevin Nielsen	City of Marysville	Marysville Projects List: 88th St NE (4123) was moved to "financially constrained". Before, this project was "approved". The City is entering into design and right-of-way phase for this project with the intent to seek federal and/or state funds for construction. We don't want to be precluded from applying for construction funding.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	The project is still noted as being Approved in the plan projects database; Appendix G will be updated to reflect the correct approval status. Please note that your approval status does not preclude you from pursuing funding opportunities for construction.
282887	8	City of Marysville, Dave Koenig, Kevin Nielsen	City of Marysville	Marysville Projects List: State Ave 100th to 116th (4126) was moved to "financially constrained". This project was previously listed as Unprogrammed. The project is currently in design and right-of-way phase. We don't want to be precluded from applying for construction funding.	Project Specific	General Comment	This is the correct status for this project; projects must be in the financially constrained portion of the plan in order to proceed and to receive funding.
282889	1	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Regional Transportation Plan and appendices (T2040) . Cascade has over 15,000 members around the Puget Sound and statewide. Many of our members look forward to the opportunity to have more transportation opportunities as the region is planning to catch up and keep up on transportation over the next two decades. A key component for our membership is the need to provide safety and connectivity for people who already bike, but also for the 60% of people who would like to, if biking didn't feel unsafe. Many member jurisdictions are increasingly looking for how to build safe and connected places to bike, especially by creating safe and connected bicycle networks. Policy and planning efforts need to increasingly prioritize active transportation because (1) serious injuries and deaths are on the upswing; (2) the growth of “transportation innovation” could help or hurt vulnerable users; (3) as businesses are increasingly looking to safe bicycling as a tool for employee retention and recruitment, active transportation is an economic development strategy; and (4) multimodal systems are efficient in moving people as the region grows.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282889	2	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	P. 18 We support PSRC’s proactive look at “supporting innovation,” but it is also important to highlight the potential impacts of emerging technologies on biking and walking. For example, improper pick-ups/ drop-offs by TNCs can reduce safety and mobility for those walking and biking by obstructing crosswalks, bike lanes, and other places for people. Similarly, as bikeshare expands, users will increasingly need safe bike networks to use so that their use is predictable and avoids conflict with people driving or walking. The plan needs to address those considerations.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will review the language in Appendix L to assess if this can be further clarified.
282889	3	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	P. 23 Safe Routes to School needs to be more explicit in T2040. We appreciate reference to Safe Routes to School programs and projects, but as physical activity is a public health priority, Safe Routes to School provides significant benefits to decreasing our nation’s obesity crisis. Also, as school drop-offs and pick-ups contribute significantly to congestion, increasing walking and biking to school also addresses peak hour congestion issues across the region.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282889	4	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	P. 28 T2040 needs to adopt a robust safety framework beyond Target Zero. Adopting the Vision Zero policy framework will enable PSRC and it’s member jurisdictions to better address the emerging safety concerns for the transportation system, particularly for those biking and walking. Vision Zero prioritizes engineering and speed elements over education and enforcement.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. Safety is an important element to the RTP and we will bring this to the attention of the boards for discussion.
282889	5	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	P. 42 Roadway design and adjacent land uses affect the safety and growth of biking and walking in the Central Puget Sound Region. We encourage T2040 to recognize not only the importance of building an all ages and ability network to encourage biking and walking, but also to note that there are significant deleterious impacts to walking and biking due to unsafe and inhospitable roadway designs and adjacent land uses.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will review the language in Appendix L to assess if this can be further clarified.
282889	6	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	P. 46 Factual errors/omissions in map. As of now, the Burke Gilman Trail Missing Link is planned for completion in 2019, not 2022. Additionally, the map should add the Eastside Rail Corridor as a major trail project/key investment.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The City of Seattle is the sponsor of the Burke Gilman Trail extension project and submitted this information. The map on this page shows a selection of multimodal projects and notes that the full list can be found in the Regional Transportation web-map where the Eastside Rail corridor is included.
282889	7	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	P. 52 Change “nonmotorized” to “active transportation.”	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will correct this in the final plan.
282889	8	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	MPPT16 Language suggestion: For this policy add the language inserted in the brackets, which is consistent with Active Transportation Plan (Appendix L): “Promote and incorporate bicycle and pedestrian travel as important modes of transportation by providing [networks of all ages and abilities] facilities and reliable connections.”	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The multicounty planning policies are part of the VISION plan which is just beginning an update process.
282889	9	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	MPPPS21 Language suggestion: For this policy add the language inserted in the brackets: “Site schools, institutions, and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plans[, and encourage children walking and biking to school].”	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The multicounty planning policies are part of the VISION plan which is just beginning an update process.
282889	10	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for System Performance Report Appendix K Inclusion of health and equity: We support the direction to include health and equity in the system performance measures.	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282889	11	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for System Performance Report Appendix K ... People who walk or bike for transportation: How is this defined?	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	People who walk and bike for transport refers to trips taken for transportation purposes such as going to work, school or even to the grocery store or coffee shop. It does not included reported trips for exercise such as going on a run or hike or for such trips as walking a dog (unless there is some other combined transportation purpose). The data comes from PSRC's household travel survey and is forecasted out to the year 2040.
282889	12	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for System Performance Report Appendix K ... Safety: Please include nonmotorized data per capita.	Safety	General Comment	As part of the Board adoption of regional safety targets in January 2018, staff is directed to bring back additional information in the future with more detail and sub-categories, to the extent feasible.
282889	13	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L Throughout: Appreciate the focus on all ages and abilities biking and walking improvements. Thank you.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282889	14	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L ... Throughout: Recommendation for the PSRC to adopt people-first language in its plan documents. E.g., “people who bike” instead of “bicyclists.” Residents and visitors use many modes interchangeably and should not be limited in definition to the mode they are using at one given time. Increasingly as the lines between modes blur, this change in language will help the region and jurisdictions plan more effectively.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We made an effort to use people oriented terms throughout Appendix L but we will revisit the language to see how this can be improved.
282889	15	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L P. 24 It is important to note that PSRC lacks its own Complete Streets policy. Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) adopted a policy in 2012: https://www.srtc.org/completestreets/ . We encourage the plan to recognize the merits of adopting a Complete Streets policy for the MPO.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We agree that Complete Streets is an important element for active transportation will be considered for a future work program.
282889	16	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L P. 29 Due to the continued crash and safety problems for walking and biking T2040 should note the import of PSRC adopting a Vision Zero policy framework to improve safety and to better assess the co-benefits of safety investments made in the region.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Safety is an important element to the RTP and PSRC will continue to work to improve how safety can be assessed.
282889	17	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L - P. 31 The Regional Bicycle Network needs to incorporate a more robust connectivity analysis, Level of Traffic Stress (http://transweb.sjsu.edu/project/1005.html) tools, and expanded data/count tools to better model demand, use, and future projections for bicycling in the PSRC region to improve all ages and abilities designs and connectivity.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Additional analysis of the regional bike network is an action outlined in Appendix L. We will review the language in Appendix L to assess if this can be further clarified.
282889	18	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L - P. 34 We applaud and support the proposal for electric bicycle charging stations as complementary to the current push for electric car charging stations. We support including language in T2040 to support PSRC taking leadership in building out this concept.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282889	19	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L -P. 45 We are encouraged to see the reference to Level of Traffic Stress, but do not see how it is used or supports actions, goals, investment decisions or other analysis in T2040.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282889	20	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L - Goal 1; Objective 3: T2040 needs to expand beyond Target Zero to incorporate a Vision Zero framework. The lack of safety improvements over the past decade shows that Target Zero alone as a safety framework is not working for vulnerable users. Additionally, bicycle data gathering still needs significant improvements don’t forget that element, while still emphasizing more pedestrian data improvements. How can PSRC provide regional leadership and synthesis for both efforts?	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix L does include implementation actions for data collection which the BPAC will be working on.
282889	21	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L - Goal 2 PSRC should also adopt a Complete Streets policy like SRTC.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. We agree that Complete Streets is an important element for active transportation and will bring this to the attention of the board for their consideration.
282889	22	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L - Goal 3 Encourage PSRC to evaluate how it rewards going beyond the minimum in design and project selection to support the buildout of all ages and abilities infrastructure.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282889	23	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	Comments for Draft Active Transportation Plan Appendix L - Goal 4 PSRC can provide leadership by increasing adoption of Level of Traffic Stress in all PSRC analysis and recommend it as a Local Action to take.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282889	24	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	P 65 “Funding Opportunities” Section asserts there is a “wealth of funding opportunities for active transportation.” We disagree, as jurisdictions and the region continue to underinvest in biking and walking. We recommend PSRC stay consistent around funding opportunities for active transportation and note that active transportation needs additional funding tools, similar to what the rest of T2040 asserts (more funding is needed).	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282889	25	Cascade Bicycle Club, Blake Trask	Cascade Bicycle Club	<p>Comments for Financial Strategy Background Appendix P</p> <p>Road Usage Charge / Congestion Pricing: We support the exploration of this new revenue source based on its ability to better achieve equity (progressive rates), environmental (charging to help drive down GHG emissions), and funding flexibility goals (funds as a more stable transit and transit access funding source). However, done poorly it could be just as regressive and restricted as the gas tax. If it becomes compulsory, how can we make sure that its equitably calculated and implemented?</p> <p>This section should call attention to the great efforts and recommendations of the Transportation Futures Task Force, which did a lot research and thinking on these issues.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282894	1	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Puget Sound Regional Council's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP calls for developing an integrated strategy for addressing congestion and mobility, the environment, and transportation funding. These are critical elements that need to be integrated for the region to be successful as it faces unprecedented growth in both population and employment as well as environmental challenges.</p> <p>The King County Department of Transportation supports the policies and priorities identified in the RTP. We are pleased that the plan includes sections on social equity, environmental justice and public engagement. We encourage the Puget Sound Regional Council to continue to incorporate and enhance its work in these areas.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282894	2	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>We support the financial framework included in the R TP that identifies guidance on how the region can meet its financial needs, including the move to a more user fee based system as a means to maintain and improve the region's transportation system.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282894	3	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>Overall</p> <p>1) We support using an equity lens in measuring all aspects of transportation outcomes. Given the additional emphasis on high-capacity transit in centers, it is particularly important to analyze and mitigate displacement risk of residents and small businesses as property values increase and connections to opportunity improve.</p> <p>2) We encourage PSRC to expand community representation on boards and committees and provide the financial and technical support needed to do so.</p> <p>3) We encourage the PSRC to monitor the combined transportation and housing burden index by income levels.</p> <p>4) We support PSRC for their efforts to include health, equity and a renewed focus on climate change.</p> <p>5) We recommend expanding the scope of improving and promoting health beyond air quality, physical activity and safety. Affordable and reliable public transit is critical for low-income populations to access work and school opportunities - living wage incomes support healthy lifestyles.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Equity was an important consideration throughout the development of the plan.
282894	4	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>Chapter 2</p> <p>Highlight backlog of deferred maintenance earlier in the report. The Maintenance, Preservation, and Operations chapter (Chapter 2) highlights recent investments and reviews the importance of maintenance, and project maintenance costs, but there is no specific mention of the backlog of deferred maintenance or breakout those related costs from general maintenance projections. These issues are mentioned much later in the plan. We would like to see a discussion of the importance and projected cost to address deferred maintenance in Chapter 2, including a mention of the financial constraints.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. A more complete discussion of deferred maintenance and preservation needs will be added to the main plan document. Appendix M contains a more complete discussion of maintenance and preservation needs.
282894	5	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>Chapter 3</p> <p>Acknowledge bridge maintenance needs explicitly in infrastructure maintenance section. The discussion of aging infrastructure doesn't call out bridge replacement and maintenance, which is a significant need for the region. Bridge infrastructure might have an equally important impact on safety and mobility as the HOV network discussed in the text. We would like to see the condition, importance, and needs of the region's bridges highlighted in the discussion of aging infrastructure in Chapter 3.</p>	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	The maintenance needs of bridges are discussed both in Chapter 2 and in Appendix M.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282894	6	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	Appendix J Additional topics related to freight and local needs. We would like to see the plan acknowledge some additional issues: 1) The importance of truck safety on arterial, local, and rural roads; 2) Potential impact of trucks using local roads to bypass highway weigh stations; and 3) The growing trend in use of personal vehicles for on-demand goods delivery and the potential VMT, congestion, or greenhouse gas emissions impacts that may be associated with this.	Freight / Rail	Board Review	We will bring these issues to the attention of the board for their review and discussion.
282894	7	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	Appendix L Additional discussion of urban vs. rural context regarding active transportation. The active transportation discussion should include more discussion/explanation of urban vs. rural context, especially as related to implementation of complete streets concepts. The plan should more fully acknowledge that implementation of these concepts will look different in urban versus rural portions of the region. For example, a complete rural street may include a multi-purpose wide shoulder instead of a sidewalk or bike lane, small block sizes are not appropriate or necessarily feasible in the rural area, and many PSRC regional bike network segments on rural roads won't be all ages and ability rural facility types (trails and side paths) identified in the plans' typology.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will review the language in Appendix L to assess if this can be further clarified.
282894	8	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	p. 52 The report should include a mention of the growing ridership trend that the Water Taxi service has been experiencing. Appendix O Resilience - there is no mention of ferries or passenger only ferries as being a of a robust regional response and resiliency system.	Ferries	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The final plan will incorporate information on passenger only ferry ridership trends.
282894	9	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	Appendix L - Chapter 3 We are pleased to see that the Active Transportation Plan now includes background on All Ages and Abilities bicycle facilities. It is important to introduce that concept in the plan and use it to evaluate facilities later in the plan.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282894	10	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	Appendix L - Chapter 4 We appreciate the listing of the Regional Bicycle Network (RBN) Criteria (e.g., regional centers, regional transit destinations, etc.). It helps provide background rationale for our current mobility connection strategies and projects; We appreciate the acknowledgement of the necessity for RBN Built-in Flexibility. In many instances exact network alignments have yet to be finalized and this flexibility provides greater opportunities to meet the intent of the RBN; We also appreciate the recognition of the preferred All Ages and Abilities approach to RBN development; King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks ongoing efforts to create a safe an pleasant all ages and abilities active transportation network through the development of shared use paths and in-road mobility connections includes the redevelopment of legacy path facilities (e.g., Burke Gilman Trail) to meet the County's most up-to-date design guidelines or upgrading to improve network usability. In some instances the RBN shows these existing legacy routes, but it may not indicate that planned redevelopment is anticipated, thereby overlooking the importance of these improvements to the RBN. Chapter 4 should briefly acknowledge redevelopment activities with a note like the following: Ongoing Bicycle Network Improvements Segments of the Regional Bicycle Network are continuously under improvement to provide greater all ages and abilities bicycling opportunities. While the RBN illustrates a network of existing Completed Segments, these links may also be slated for important planned improvements or redevelopment along with the Planned Segments identified on the RBN map.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will clarify this in the final plan.
282894	11	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	pp. 16-17 Additional text could be added making a stronger linkage between emerging technologies and public transit systems. Text should be added stating that the new mobility options should complement fixed route bus service, not compete. As the PSRC works to analysis the effects of the new emerging technologies it should highlight the need for standard data and trip planning and marketplace for trips (MaaS).	Emerging Technologies	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will reflect these clarifications in the final document.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282894	12	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	pp. 28-29 With the number of fatalities and serious injures for bicyclists and pedestrians not seeing the same decrease as vehicles incidents a stronger link to investment in non-motorized infrastructure as a strategy to increase bicyclist and pedestrian safety should be included.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comments.
282894	13	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	pp. 31-32 Missing a discussion of roadway and parking pricing as a TDM strategy.	TDM and CTR	General Comment	The draft plan references parking management broadly as a tool to enhance the existing system.
282894	14	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	p. 41 #3, 'add strategic parking capacity'- consider adding note about changing travel patterns and vehicle technology and need to consider flexible approaches to adding parking supply Add need for state RCW to enable management of state owned lots	Parking	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The final plan will be clarified to note potential changes to parking demand and supply in reaction to changing technology.
282894	15	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	p. 73 Add paid parking revenue as funding source for transit agencies	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, has more detail on revenue sources assumed for transit agencies. See pp. 20-21. The Finance Working Group recommended paid parking revenues as a source for local jurisdictions.
282894	16	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	p. 1-2 Appendix E • The four-part Greenhouse Gas Strategy does not acknowledge the integration of actions and the fact that many actions to reduce GHG emissions are inextricably linked. Equity and social justice should be referenced more strongly as an underlying reasons to take action against transportation pollution and be interwoven into the rationale behind the four parts. • "Washington's emissions have been relatively flat the last several years, and the state appears to be on track to meet the 2020 limits" (pg. 1) o Is this a true statement? This is not the case in King County, where emissions have increased by 4% compared to 2007.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	While not explicitly stated, the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas strategy is reflective of the overall foundation of PSRC's planning, which recognizes and plans for the integration of land use, transportation and the economy. In addition, equity considerations and analyses are embraced throughout the plan, and where future implementation needs are required, equity will continue to be an important consideration. Regarding the statement that the State appears to be on track to meet the 2020 statewide greenhouse gas limits, this statement is based on information provided by the Washington State Department of Ecology on levels of emissions through 2013 and the consideration of rules and programs currently in effect, including at the time of this report the expected emissions reductions from the state's Clean Air Rule. The ability to meet the 2035 and 2050 statewide greenhouse gas limits without further actions is less optimistic.
282894	17	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	Appendix E Transportation Choices (pg. 3): • No mention of King County's Water Taxi. Consider referring to Kitsap and King County's ferry service in a regional passenger-only ferry context.	Ferries	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will review the documentation and assess where clarity can be provided on this topic.
282894	18	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	pg. 3 Appendix E Recommend that information be included on the number of new service hours expected to be implemented by 2040 by all of the regions transit agencies	Transit	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will review the documentation and assess where clarity can be provided on this topic.
282894	19	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	Appendix E • Technology (pg. 3): o Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards are currently under review by the US EPA and the Trump administration expressed interested in rolling back these standards. Consider revising language or including CAFE as a keystone element in emission reduction.	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	The adopted CAFÉ standards are still in place, and for the last several years automakers have exceeded the federal requirements for greenhouse gas emissions and fuel economy. PSRC is required to utilize the current and adopted standards when conducting our analyses, and given the remarkable advancement in vehicle technologies in recent years we remain confident that these are the appropriate assumptions for the region's vehicle fleet.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282894	20	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>Appendix E Technology (pg. 3): o No initial mention of the robust actions at the state and federal level to electrify transit fleets. King County has committed to transition transit fleets to zero-emission technology by as early as 2034 and other regional agencies are following suit by investing in battery bus technology.</p> <p>o No mention of future changes in utility load due to transit electrification and implications for regional emissions if PSE continues to relay on coal and natural gas.</p> <p>o Is there an opportunity to also mention Green Direct and other innovative renewable energy purchase opportunities that have helped reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions?</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	Technical Correction	<p>We would be happy to make reference to the electrification of the region's transit fleet in the final document. Regarding the impacts to the utility load, the appendix at this time does not include the full lifecycle analysis and implications of energy supply as it relates to future technology work. At such time as PSRC's Boards direct pursuit of these additional areas of the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy, further information may be provided on the more comprehensive scope of these issues. However, it is important to note that much work has been done in the utility sector to prepare for an electrified transportation system, and ongoing coordination among a variety of organizations is actively underway. Regarding the comment related to renewable energy purchases, that is outside the scope of the regional transportation plan.</p>
282894	21	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>Appendix H</p> <p>The Plan has identified the growing need and high demand for more service for people with special transportation needs such as seniors/people with disabilities (who are too frail to use Access or the bus OR not frail enough to be eligible for Access but would have great difficulty getting to a bus or riding a bus independently). The lack of funding provided both nationally and locally for this growing population who have limited mobility and are often on a limited income.</p> <p>King County Metro has provided some funding for populations with special transportation needs via the Community Access Transportation program, but more funding is necessary to address the growing gaps in service identified in the report. The funding would be target to help fill the gaps in service and not just divert service off the more expensive ADA Paratransit service. The CAT program could be expanded - taking advantage of existing and new community partnerships and the infrastructure that already exists to increase service or develop new ideas. Community shuttles are expensive - so looking into other models that may include partnership with the taxi/TNC industry or technology to expand volunteer ridesharing programs (using apps to match rides for the volunteers) may be more cost effective. A high priority County wide for seniors and people with disabilities who cannot ride a bus or afford a taxi are rides to medical appointments and affordable same-day service.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
282894	22	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>Appendix H pp,. 31 & 34: Pg 31: "There is a need for better coordination between transportation providers and human service agencies ... " and Pg: 34 "Cross-county trips within and outside the region are difficult"</p> <p>• What's not mentioned in the discussion of these items is the lack of common digital standards (e.g. classification of customer disabilities, mobility aids, mobility devices, etc.) that limit the seamless exchange of information between programs and transportations providers and are a major blocking element to increased coordination. Our lack of common standards and exchange protocols limits our ability to reduce duplication of services. (e.g. DART & Access operate in overlapping service areas; We're unable to assign trips onto lower cost options (Taxi & TNC) seamlessly.)</p>	Special Needs Transportation	Board Review	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. The topic of common digital standards and exchange protocols among public transportation providers' ADA-paratransit operations will be brought to the Board's attention as a future work program item.</p>

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282894	23	King County Department of Transportation, Peter Heffernan, Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation	<p>Appendix H p. 31</p> <p>"Transportation providers and brokers use different scheduling, dispatching and reporting software, making information sharing difficult."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The issue is not that agencies utilize different software, but that no protocols or data standards have been established. These issues would not be resolved if we all used the same software. <p>Appendix H p. 35</p> <p>"Traveler information technologies"</p> <p>o The statement that transportation technologies are too difficult isn't accurate for capturing the future needs of customers with disabilities. While this is the case for many, the next generation of users will be more adapt during the time period that this plan is to cover.</p> <p>o Traveler information technologies are really good a providing information for able bodied individuals, but do not provide information that's needed by individuals with disabilities. This includes barriers on the path of travel that would prevent a person from traveling, location of curb ramps, information about the bus stop itself, information about construction along the path, any reroutes, etc. Without this information, customer with disabilities cannot plan a trip with confidence, which limits their ability to use transit for their mobility needs.</p> <p>Appendix H p. 43</p> <p>"Promote increased coordination between transportation providers and human service agencies to provide more seamless service and increase</p> <p>o Near Term (by 2024): Common regional data schema describes attributes necessary to transport individuals with specialized transportation needs.</p> <p>o Longer Term (by 2040): Common regional data exchange protocol is used to facilitate and efficiently coordinate transportation for individuals with specialized transportation needs.</p>	Special Needs Transportation	Board Review	Thank you for your suggestion. The topics of common digital standards and exchange protocols among public transportation providers' ADA paratransit operations and improvements to travel information technologies for people with special transportation needs will be brought to the Board's attention as a future work program item.
282895	1	Will Knedlik		<p>PSRC's transportation plan update was constructed over at least a full half year, in third-and-fourth quarters of 2017, according to a PSRC website graphic presenting its basic timeline, before PRSC drastically changed both the central purpose for and also core parameters of its update when it nearly doubled its quintessential projection of population growth, as the key driver for traffic gridlock today, and for worsening congestion of various transport modes in the future, which numbers were released to its Executive Committee on January 25, 2018.</p> <p>Simply put, when a dog is shot while the veterinarian is deworming him, efforts to smile and to finish that procedure on a thus-deceased canine is not simply illogical, but absurd.</p> <p>Any attempt by PSRC to continue the update process in this instance would be still more ridiculous – and far more costly for regional taxpayers – since litigation would be certain, given that the sine qua non element for its own updating function was thus killed by PSRC itself.</p> <p>Even without this gigantic change, PSRC's update was so gravely deficient that litigation already was invited by huge gaps, lacunae and worse – in facts nominally analyzed and in logic purportedly employed – so that its own lethal blow to that grossly flawed update should be welcomed as an opportunity to refashion such worthlessness into a workmanlike draft.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. As required by federal law, the Regional Transportation Plan incorporated the region's current adopted land use assumptions and forecasts, which presently extend to the year 2040. These assumptions were drawn from VISION 2040 and adopted local comprehensive plans. As a preliminary step to update these assumptions and extend them to the year 2050, PSRC has developed draft population and employment forecasts for the year 2050. When finalized later this year, these will provide the framing growth assumptions for the update to the region's growth management plan - VISION 2050. When adopted in 2020, the land use and growth assumptions in VISION 2050 will inform the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan, anticipated in 2022.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282895	2	Will Knedlik		<p>The principal defect with the update even before PSRC pulled the rug out from under the exercise by changing the dimensions of its estimates of population growth so immensely that it not only changed the size, but the nature, of such undertaking – and, thereby, both clearly extended, and also cumulatively exacerbated, the same underlying errors evident in earlier iterations of PSRC’s transportation planning for some decades – is that PSRC’s commitment to multimodal transportation planning is not merely far more rhetorical than real, but is, therefore, not simply chimerical, but in fact now repeatedly counterproductive in multiple respects.</p> <p>While our state is nearing the 120th anniversary of the start of a multimodal transportation initiative based upon explicit recognition of the paramount importance of good roads for such interconnected transport (which began with Sam Hill’s founding of the Washington State Good Roads Association, in 1899, based squarely on his clear understanding that neither people, nor products, could be moved to and from railheads of the Northern Pacific line, reliably, because of then wholly inadequate roads and because of even worse maintenance of that infrastructure necessary and sufficient for such movement), and while it has been expanded to incorporate air transport as a since-invented mode (together with rail-and-water modes extant six score years ago), PSRC’s modus operandi has been to allocate immense-but-finite transportation resources so as to degrade and thus to destroy bridge, freeway, road and street elements of sine qua non roads (as essential for multimodal transport).</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282895	3	Will Knedlik		<p>While grotesque misallocations of ever more limited financial resources to modes that do not and cannot transport people and products with any proportional relationship to greatly escalating amounts of public funds being allocated to them in recent decades have been, and are, the primary reason for quintessential roadways literally collapsing from resulting neglect fostered by PSRC’s direct aiding and abetting thereof through its gross misuses of tax dollars – such that the chief state transportation engineer has recently stated that “we have infrastructure that is crumbling under our feet now” in keeping with like concerns as expressed at least a full decade before by Honorable Doug MacDonald while Secretary of the Washington State Department of Transportation until he was cashiered for courage, and for candor, about such misfeasance if not malfeasance – PSRC’s faux planning in its furtherance of knowing-and-willful congestion does not end simply with misuses of taxes.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282895	4	Will Knedlik		<p>Indeed, the current draft update released for comment continues its earlier promotions of bicycles as a mode of multimodal transport without providing reliable documentation of whether additional growth of bikes on public streets will increase or decrease congestion, increase or decrease deaths and serious injuries, and increase or decrease other adversities for crucial throughput of people as passengers and for throughput of products as freight?</p> <p>For example, when one bicyclist repeatedly delays a standing-room-only Metro 255 bus, which is my primary mode of transportation between Kirkland and Seattle, as it travels on its route from Kirkland to Bellevue on 108th Avenue Northeast, as occurs on myriad occasions, then that single bicycle rider is not only holding up as much as a half-mile of cars, but it is also holding up numerous transit vehicles, which also can and do include Sound Transit 540 passengers, school students on school district buses and other people.</p> <p>Further, and far worse on some respects, bicycling is an inherently dangerous activity, which results both in deaths and in severe injuries to bicycle riders impossible to mitigate without construction of separate facilities for bicyclists, who have indicated, repeatedly, that they are not interested in financing those facilities for their use and that they prefer to poach transportation infrastructure dedicated “exclusively for highway purposes” (which does NOT include bicycle use to the extent permitted in an inherently dangerous fashion).</p> <p>Furthermore, limited increases in bicycle use is resulting in additional deaths and serious injuries, and is so preventing legally mandated reductions in roadway deaths toward zero.</p>	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282895	5	Will Knedlik		<p>In addition, PSRC disguises the tiny person-and-product throughput actually possible by lumping bicycles together with pedestrians (as completely different transport categories distorted by the willfully misleading conflation of humans with one type of vehicle).</p> <p>The illogic is as great as positing a single category for people and for motorcycles, which likewise travel on two feet and on two wheels respectively, or for societies and for coffee pots, since dregs both find their way to the bottom (as does this distorting faux category).</p> <p>Human beings are not similar enough to any kind of vehicle, motorized or nonmotorized, to be meaningfully lumped into one category, particularly when nearly 100 percent of all trips do start and finish on two feet, for all having two legs, and when bike trips are a tiny percentage of all pedestrian-and-bicycle trips, so that said falsified category is necessarily intended to mislead.</p> <p>To add injury to insult, real human beings are substantially endangered, as pedestrians, by those vehicles, if bicycle use rises without separation from pedestrians, who can be and are run down by bicyclists repeatedly in recurring misuses of sidewalks (as designed by definition and otherwise for pedestrians but as NOT often in fact designed for bikes).</p>	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Data sources that PSRC uses, such as the US Census data, often lumps these categories together. PSRC seeks additional methods of data collection for both bike and pedestrian travel to better improve our analysis for these modes.
282895	6	Will Knedlik		<p>Additionally, the update does not adequately deal with conversion of already-insufficient roadways, which are further harming person-and-product throughput in motor vehicles, as well as emergency services reliant on already-overcrowded roads, nor does it deal at all with the reality that roadways financed “exclusively for highway purposes” (pursuant to mandatory terms of the Washington State Constitution in Article II, section 40) obligate a provision for full reimbursements of the state’s Motor Vehicle Fund for monies supplied to finance those so-degraded roads (plus the time value of monies thereby expropriated).</p>	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282895	7	Will Knedlik		<p>In short, PSRC’s nominal planning process respecting bicycling is nothing short of patent dereliction of its duties, including but not limited to its explicitly assigned obligations for “least cost planning methodology” (together with WSDOT and other specified agencies).</p>	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282896	1	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, Betty Capestany, Chris Johnson	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Regional Transportation Plan. As the voice of business on the Eastside, the Bellevue Chamber of Commerce represent employers of all sizes and sectors, each of which rely upon our regional transportation system to move people and goods daily. We find that our entire network, from highways of statewide significance to local arterials, is increasingly congested and the distinction between peak and off-peak periods is rapidly diminishing.</p> <p>Not surprisingly, in our annual survey of CEO’s last November, business leaders once again identified the daily congestion penalty, as the single greatest barrier they face in attracting and retaining talent in a tight labor market. Consequently, finding and implementing innovative transportation solutions, especially those which utilize emerging technologies, is our top public policy priority. However, the marketplace often leads the way and the public sector can be slow to respond, especially when it comes to reducing regulatory barriers.</p>	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282896	2	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, Betty Capestany, Chris Johnson	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce	<p>1) We strongly support the narrative contained in “Emerging Transportation Technology,” on pages 16 - 18 of the 2018 Update. Specifically, we endorse the findings related to autonomous and connected vehicles, as well as shared mobility. Recommendation: Now is the time to move beyond broad philosophical language and imbed these components directly into critierial for project selection, funding and implementation.</p>	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282896	3	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, Betty Capestany, Chris Johnson	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce	<p>2) We concur with the findings under Transportation Demand Management, pages 31 – 34, particularly “Transportation Technology and Operations,” regarding the use of technology investments, as innovative approaches to operational challenges such as managing traffic flow. Recommendation: Such tools should be utilized to maximize throughput for all modes, increase person trips and reduce travel time, rather than to reduce VMT or increase the level of service for one mode, at the expense of another.</p>	TDM and CTR	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282896	4	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, Betty Capestany, Chris Johnson	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce	<p>3) Similarly, we endorse “Implementation Actions” relating to Technology, as summarized on page 87 and more fully described in Appendix N, as follows:</p> <p>a. Establish a technology advisory committee. Recommendation: Convene as soon as possible and include robust private sector participation;</p> <p>b. Update the region’s ITS Implementation Plan (RITSIP) to better reflect... projected changes due to emerging technologies. Recommendation: Recruit subject matter experts from the technology industry to contribute to this effort;</p> <p>c. Continue to enhance regional models to analyze the effect of autonomous and electric vehicles, shared mobility, and new technology on the transportation system and travel behavior. Recommendation: Include these emerging modes in BKR traffic model screens for new projects.</p> <p>d. Facilitate regional discussions to identify opportunities to support private sector projects and partnerships and the deployment of pilot programs. Recommendation: We need innovative project development, funding and delivery models, which include private sector partners at every stage.</p>	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We look forward to working with partner agencies on these issues.
282896	5	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, Betty Capestany, Chris Johnson	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce	While our comments have focused sections of the 2018 update relating to transportation technology, we know there are larger issues which will necessarily drive future updates to the Region’s Transportation Plan. Of particular importance, we observe that while the Connecting Washington Package will invest billions in our region, there is no sustainable financial plan in place, to complete implementation of the adopted I-405 Master Plan.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. As noted, additional revenues will be needed to fully implement all of the projects contained in the Regional Transportation Plan, including improvements on I-405.
282896	6	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, Betty Capestany, Chris Johnson	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce	There is a strong need for the identification of new resources at all levels, to construct additional lanes from Bothell to Lynnwood. The 2018 Update does a commendable job of assessing the limits of current project funding in “Emerging and Ongoing Issues in Transportation Finance,” and correctly points out that our reliance on the motor vehicle fuel tax, will no longer be adequate. In addition to consideration of new, technology-based revenue tools, we strongly urge PSRC to review local option financing tolls already available under state law, including but not limited to the transportation benefit districts (TBD) and the regional transportation investment district (RTID). Local and state elected officials alike, will look to PSRC for guidance as to which local option taxes would make the most sense for the Central Puget Sound Area.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282904	1	Virginia Winbow		I live in the Mill Creek/Lynnwood area. Having read the executive summary and the main report, it appears that there is a lack of real information about what constitutes the "operational improvements" on I-5 that would address the massively long driving times during morning rush hour southbound within the next few years. Just on Monday it took me nearly 2 1/2 hours to go from 164th street at I-5, to the Century Link Event Field. In what decade will these "operational improvements" be named and constructed and ready? The report doesn't say.	Congestion	General Comment	There are a variety of investments proposed on I-5 in this vicinity, including managed lanes and interchange improvements expected to be completed between 2025-2030. Please refer to the projects web map at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
282904	2	Virginia Winbow		I have read one of the reasons for the backed up traffic on I-5 is the "C-class weave", (https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/new-520-bridge-wont-solve-i-5-merge-mess/) i.e., is the large volume of cars merging onto I-5 southbound from 65th, then changing lanes to the 520 bridge eastbound ramp, causing the backups. Did the plan address this? I didn't see it. Yet, massive investments are appear to be made in the Seattle area, but none are mentioned to deal with this major cause a long-standing I-5 bottleneck.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Washington State Department of Transportation is proposing a variety of improvements along I-5, including a future project to remove the left-side off-ramps to Mercer Street and SR 520 which is currently unfunded. Please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
282904	3	Virginia Winbow		The plan hints we should just wait for mass transit solutions. Yet our area is looking at 2035 earliest for these to appear. Also, while job commuters can do mass transit, I am not a job commuter. I have looked at mass transit times in lieu of driving, but it would take me two hours to go point to downtown point. What is the "point" of that? I also may carry with me heavy packages that are not practical to drag around with me on mass transit.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
282904	4	Virginia Winbow		Lastly, the traffic from 405 to I-5 northbound is dumped off onto I-5 just before 164th street, the busiest street by volume in the county, I have read. No provision was made for I-5 to receive this traffic from I-405, and this bottleneck is getting worse. Did the plan mention a solution for that? I didn't see it.	Congestion	General Comment	The Washington State Department of Transportation has proposed improvements in this area; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
282904	5	Virginia Winbow		In short, taxpayers here in the Snohomish county region where I live are being expected to foot the bill for regional problems elsewhere, but no solutions for our traffic problems here to downtown Seattle seem to appear in this plan--other than better mass transit in 2035. This is absurd. Please go back to the drawing board and specifically state what operational improvements will be made--and when- on I-5 to alleviate the congestion from Snohomish County to downtown Seattle, and the congestion from I-405 northbound that has been simply dumped onto I-5 north without considering its impact.	Congestion	General Comment	There are a variety of investments proposed in this area, including improvements to both I-5 and I-405; please refer to the projects web map at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
282905	1	[anonymous]		<p>While reading the draft of the Puget Sound Regional Council's transportation plan there was a constant theme of fees. Tolls, HOV lane fees, parking fees, carbon tax, street fees, increase in property tax adjustments, pay by mile fees, etc. This plan needs to improve traffic flow!!! Stop making traffic flow worse! This regional transportation plan should factor the cost of congestion and time spent on slower modes of travel. Emphasis should be on projects that improve traffic flow!</p> <p>If we opened up the toll/HOV lanes to all traffic it would help decrease congestion. At the very least open them up to all in non peak times as we have already paid for these roads, and are being taxed twice in user fees.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please refer to Appendix K, System Performance Report, for more information on the benefits of the plan to travel delay between now and the plan horizon year, 2040.</p>
284075	1	City of Bonney Lake, Jason Sullivan	City of Bonney Lake	1. There is a need for a dedicated revenue stream for the preservation and maintenance of existing roadway improvements. Local jurisdictions’ cannot continue to rely on taxes, grants, and other general fund revenues. The City of Bonney Lake would support legislation that would allow local jurisdictions to establish a street utility to pay for the maintenance and preservation of existing roadway improvements. The City encourages PSRC to begin working with the legislature and agencies that represent city and county governments to enact legislation that allows for the establishment of a street utility.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. A street utility tax is assumed as a new revenue source for local jurisdictions.
284075	2	City of Bonney Lake, Jason Sullivan	City of Bonney Lake	2. If PSRC establishes criteria for Countywide Centers as part of the Regional Centers Framework, funding for improvements within these subregional centers should also be given priority and jurisdictions that have these subregional centers should be allowed to complete in the regional funding competition in addition to the countywide competition.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284075	3	City of Bonney Lake, Jason Sullivan	City of Bonney Lake	3. Given that transit is critical to the implementation of the transportation plan, PSRC should seek a change in state law regarding how areas within the UGA are added to a transit district. Not all areas of the UGA are within a local transit district and the current process to join a transit district is hurdle and significantly impacts the ability to provide transit services within the UGA.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284080	1	Cathy Brandt		Traffic on Issaquah-Hobart Road, especially during commute times, is some of the worst in the County. There are also great concerns regarding May Valley Road between Issaquah-Hobart Rd. and northwest to Highway 900 (and beyond). These roads course between Tiger and Squak Mts., and around Squak to Cougar Mt., areas that part of our beloved 'Issaquah Alps'. There is too much traffic traveling on those roads.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. There are additional investments proposed in the surrounding area that may be of interest, including the future transit network; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.
284080	2	Cathy Brandt		Many of the vehicles traveling on those two roads [May Valley Rd & Issaquah-Hobart Rd] could otherwise take Transit or even carpool, if there were options for this. We need a Park and Ride somewhere near Highway 18 at Hobart, and perhaps one at Highway 900 near May Valley Road.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284080	3	Cathy Brandt		Further, we should widen Highway 18 to four lanes at the bottleneck there and elsewhere. We should also somehow extend Highway 18 further north of I-90, instead of it ending at I-90. There are enough travelers on Hwy 18 needing to going north (instead of E or W on I-90) to justify some options for that. Perhaps something to sort of parallel I-405 northward.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284080	4	Cathy Brandt		<p>On the subject of truck traffic, we need to acknowledge that truck fatalities in Central P.S. increased by 50% over the last 5 years. I live near May Valley Road (MVR) at 127th, which leads to Renton. Truck traffic has increased dramatically in the last few years on this road, and the road is NOT conducive to truck travel. It is UNSAFE, not economical, and unnecessary. If Highway 18 were widened, and truck traffic was required to travel on Highways as much as possible, we would see less traffic on MVR, which would bring the roads back to the previous safety levels. Although there have not been a lot of serious accidents (yet) on MVR, there are bound to be...there have been so many close calls.</p> <p>By the way, your study indicates that truck traffic (or tonnage) is expected to increase more than the population, so there is a need to look at how to deal with this. Some of the above ideas will help with this</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284080	5	Cathy Brandt		Further, the travel time between now and 2040 is expected to increase more dramatically between Auburn and Renton. Some of this traffic might be diverted to Highway 18 if there were more options for that route. This could result in less traffic jams on Highway 167, and I-90, as well as Issaquah-Hobart and MV Roads.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. There are additional investments proposed in the surrounding area that may be of interest, including the future transit network; please refer to the projects webmap at https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html for more information.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284147	1	Seattle Freight Advisory Board, Hal B.H. Cooper Jr., Christopher Eaves, Johan Hellman	Seattle Freight Advisory Board	Economic Benefits – Freight needs to be recognized as central in support of local family wage jobs and integral to the overall economic health of the region. The Report provides a relevant discussion on the economic benefits of moving freight (see page 11, Exec Summary). Appendix “J” - The Regional Freight and Goods Movement, Figure 1, shows truck tonnage estimated to increase 56% between now to 2040. This would be good information to include in the body of the main document. However, if this information remains in the appendix, it would be helpful to include an acknowledgement and address the importance of accommodating growth in freight and also that most of this freight is currently moving on trucks. Notably 80 percent is local and regional distribution truck volumes and we need to preserve freight mobility on regional arterials. This demand for movement of goods will be further exacerbated by a shortage of trucks expected later this year.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The figure already appears on p. 58 of the main document as Figure 12. Population, Employment, and Truck Tonnage 1970 - 2040.
284147	2	Seattle Freight Advisory Board, Hal B.H. Cooper Jr., Christopher Eaves, Johan Hellman	Seattle Freight Advisory Board	Protection of Critical Trade Infrastructure – We support the plan’s recognition that “the Puget Sound region is a major North American gateway for trade with Pacific Rim countries and is a major economic engine for Washington state” and that a “transportation system that provides for the efficient movement of freight and goods is critical for the region’s economic prosperity.” To this end, we respectfully submit that the discussion of land use practices and planning tools should more fully support compatibility with existing trade infrastructure, such as freight rail corridors, rail-served industrial areas, and rail yards. Additionally, rail-served sites should be preserved, protected, and encouraged to upgrade infrastructure in land use plans to accommodate growing freight demands for the region. Additionally, rail-served sites should be preserved, protected, and encouraged in land use plans to accommodate growing freight demands for the region. This is especially important within designated and proposed MICs.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284147	3	Seattle Freight Advisory Board, Hal B.H. Cooper Jr., Christopher Eaves, Johan Hellman	Seattle Freight Advisory Board	Freight Networks and Heavy Haul – As you know, the unique physical features that distinguish the Puget Sound Region also present serious impediments to the movement of people and goods. Freight is especially sensitive to this constricted system. Putting movement of freight at the forefront of planning along key corridors is crucial for continued growth in the region. Appendix “J” does a good job of cataloging freight important networks but does not show the integration and overlap or gaps of the STRAHNET/STRACNET, National Freight Strategic Plan and provides little mention of developing and supporting a Heavy Haul network. It would be useful to see these designation gaps and future planning for preserving this critical system across these system designations.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284147	4	Seattle Freight Advisory Board, Hal B.H. Cooper Jr., Christopher Eaves, Johan Hellman	Seattle Freight Advisory Board	Performance of Freight Networks – The documents describe the importance of delays to freight and within the performance monitoring note the important performance measure of reducing truck delay. Other performance measures that are important to freight include maintenance of the freight network and establishment and progress towards a Heavy Haul system. Additionally, congestion in the regions primary network (freeways) impacts freight dramatically as Vehicle Miles Traveled and Vehicle Hours Traveled increase. As networks used by trucks are impacted by congestion for longer periods of time each day, the window of opportunity for trucks to operate is reduced. This can dramatically impact freight mobility and delivery operations. With this growing population there needs to be an emphasis on meeting the public’s need for getting everyday commodities to local distribution facilities. This distribution system continues to rely on large trucks that operate in congestion and gridlock. These delays and congestion eventually increase costs to the consumer.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284147	5	Seattle Freight Advisory Board, Hal B.H. Cooper Jr., Christopher Eaves, Johan Hellman	Seattle Freight Advisory Board	Emerging technology – The Report describes and attempts to anticipate emerging technologies. You may wish to consider discussing and describing the dramatic shifts that on-line shopping has had and will continue to have on supply chain and delivery of goods. This shift has changed the needs for the last mile (loading zones) and even the last 50 feet of delivery of goods. Also new technologies like autonomous delivery, electrification of vehicles, and Intelligent Transportation Systems will reshape how freight operates on the overall transportation system. These trends are emerging but may change how we prioritize and measure transportation performance.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We agree and look forward to the next stages of this work on technology.
284147	6	Seattle Freight Advisory Board, Hal B.H. Cooper Jr., Christopher Eaves, Johan Hellman	Seattle Freight Advisory Board	Safety – It is encouraging to see the growing and anticipated growth in bicycling. This growth in bicycling also means increasing demands for bicycle access to limited transportation systems. Where trucks are a priority, such as on the freight network in the City of Seattle, there should be conscientious attention to safety where the mixing of modes occurs. The number of bike fatalities suggests that this is an issue to consider in the future as we develop multi-modal systems. We appreciate the description and discussion of rail crossing and rail safety. We believe positive train control will help improve rail safety and it would be important to monitor and measure crossings and safety.	Safety	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284147	7	Seattle Freight Advisory Board, Hal B.H. Cooper Jr., Christopher Eaves, Johan Hellman	Seattle Freight Advisory Board	Funding – Movement of freight has dividends not only in the economic growth of the region but in providing family wage jobs. These benefits should be a consideration as funding is allocated throughout the region to expand, enhance, and support Manufacturing Industrial Centers.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284160	1	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	Transportation in Snohomish County and the region is at a turning point. We have seen tremendous challenges with growth that has strained our transportation network. With Sound Transit's Link light rail and Community Transit's Swift bus rapid transit (BRT) we have an opportunity to address some of the county and region's most pressing problems. Sound Transit, WSDOT, local transit, local roads, sidewalk and bicycle infrastructure are all necessary and mutually dependent. The Regional Transportation Plan must be effective in providing for the inter-jurisdictional coordination needed to provide the needed infrastructure.	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284160	2	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	<p>Connecting and Integrating With Light Rail:</p> <p>Within the time frame of this plan, Snohomish County will see the completion of the ST2/ST3 Link light rail the largest regional infrastructure project since the building of 1-5. The success of will depend on effective access to the expanded system. Snohomish County completed a study to identify corridor improvements providing east/west mobility and access to the future light rail stations. Some of these study recommendations are the in the plan and we support the inclusion of others.</p>	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. PSRC will continue to work with you and other agency partners on implementing the Regional Transit and Parking strategy.
284160	3	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	We appreciate the inclusion of projects to construct transit priority lanes on 128th St SW west of 1-5 (project #5650) and to make interchange improvements at 1-5/SR 96 (project #1706). These projects are necessary to provide access to the planned Link station at Mariner and improve the Swift Blue Line service to the station. Because of its importance we would like to see the interchange project added to the "constrained" list.	Project Specific	General Comment	The Washington State Department of Transportation did not request this project be included in the financially constrained portion of the plan. At a future date, the state may request a plan amendment to move the project from Unprogrammed and into the constrained plan.
284160	4	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	We also appreciate the inclusion of transit priority lanes on 164th SW (project #5649) to access the planned Link station at Ash Way and improve CT's planned Swift Orange Line service to the station.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284160	5	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	Missing from the list is the completion of transit priority lanes on 128th St SW /SR 96 east of 1-5 to Mill Creek. This project is an extension of the 128th and SR 96 projects above and is also necessary to provide access to the planned Link station at Mariner and improve the Swift Blue Line service to the station .	Project Specific	General Comment	The Community Transit BRT project #5334 includes speed and reliability improvements on 128th and other facilities.
284160	6	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	Listed in Appendix G are many projects sponsored by various agencies that are or will be necessary to access light rail, but this reads like a list of uncoordinated needs. We suggest that PSRC take some additional steps to discuss how these transit, sidewalk, bikeway, and roadway projects integrate to provide a more effective whole. It is through this level of planning that project gaps and phasing mismatches can be shown. The regional plan could go even further by designating the agencies responsible for assuring that an integrated, multijurisdictional plan of access improvements is completed- together with specific measurable goals on how we get there.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284160	7	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	<p>Integrating State Highways:</p> <p>Both the draft regional plan and The State Facilities Action Plan, contained in Appendix J, discuss the need for "filling the missing links in the highway system". The state system is the backbone of the regional transportation system and completing and improving it is critical. Snohomish County suggests that PSRC and the WSDOT take the "action plan" a step further to clearly show how the state highway system integrates with local systems and HCT transit services to provide for a complete network connecting cities, HCT stations, and regional centers to implement the regional vision and to identify obvious gaps.</p> <p>Over the years, WSDOT, has made significant progress in improving many highway corridors upon which our residents' daily lives are so dependent. But there is still far to go for corridors such as US 2, SR 9, SR 522 and SR 531. The rapid rate of growth in Snohomish County population should indicate that the completion of these corridors be given priority.</p>	Roadway Capacity	Board Review	The draft plan includes a recommendation to work with WSDOT and other regional partners to advance the State Facilities Action Plan, including integration with the region's transit agencies. The integration of the system and identification of needs will be an important element considerations as part of VISION 2050 and the subsequent transportation plan.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284160	8	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	SR 524 is another state highway that should be prioritized earlier on the constrained plan. This heavily traveled substandard highway connects the fast growing communities in southwest Snohomish County to 1-5 and the future Lynnwood City Center light rail station. Community Transit has determined that the current roadway is not adequate to provide safe transit service. The three projects listed in the plan are shown to be completed in 2030 or 2040. This is between six and 16 years after the opening of the Lynwood City Center Link station that it will provide access to. PSRC and WSDOT should reconsider the timing of these projects so that they are more in line with the opening of the Lynnwood City Center Station in 2024.	Project Specific	General Comment	We will forward this comment to WSDOT as the project sponsor for their consideration.
284160	9	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	Regional Trails: For many years Snohomish County has been committed to building an extensive regional trail system. Appendix G lists some of these important trail projects such as the Whitehorse Trail (project #2853) and two Centennial Trial projects (project #2822 and #2842). Snohomish County would like to revise and add to this list of regional trial projects. Snohomish County Parks will assist with the details.	Project Specific	General Comment	We cannot add new projects to the Regional Capacity Projects list at this time. PSRC did extensive outreach with our member jurisdictions throughout 2017 to collect new and revised project submittals for the draft plan. There is a formal process for project submittals, which feed directly into our regional travel demand models and subsequent air quality analyses and formal conformity findings as required by federal legislation. We worked with Snohomish County staff to finalize the projects that are ultimately represented on the project list. Also, please note that there are thresholds for what projects need to be explicitly identified on the Regional Capacity Projects list; much of the plan's proposed investments are below this threshold and are deemed to be in the plan programmatically. For bicycle/pedestrian projects, the threshold is separated pathways over \$20 million on dedicated rights of way; all other investments would be considered programmatic.
284160	10	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	The plan should include a new trail project for completing the Centennial Trail South from the City of Snohomish to the Snohomish County line along the old BNSF Eastside Rail corridor. Snohomish County Parks can assist with details of the project.	Project Specific	General Comment	We cannot add new projects to the Regional Capacity Projects list at this time. PSRC did extensive outreach with our member jurisdictions throughout 2017 to collect new and revised project submittals for the draft plan. There is a formal process for project submittals, which feed directly into our regional travel demand models and subsequent air quality analyses and formal conformity findings as required by federal legislation. We worked with Snohomish County staff to finalize the projects that are ultimately represented on the project list. Also, please note that there are thresholds for what projects need to be explicitly identified on the Regional Capacity Projects list; much of the plan's proposed investments are below this threshold and are deemed to be in the plan programmatically. For bicycle/pedestrian projects, the threshold is separated pathways over \$20 million on dedicated rights of way; all other investments would be considered programmatic.
284160	11	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	The name of the Centennial Trail Monroe- Duvall (project #2822) should be changed to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. PSRC staff will follow-up with the project sponsor to ensure the correct title is applied.
284160	12	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	The name of the Centennial Trail Snohomish C/L- Monroe C/L (project #2842) should be changed to the Snohomish Valley Trail. The new extents should be Everett city line to the Snohomish city line. Snohomish County Parks can assist with further details of the project.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. PSRC staff will follow-up with the project sponsor to ensure the correct title is applied.
284160	13	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	Financing the Plan: As to be expected, paying for the plan will be a major challenge. Snohomish County suggests that the plan discuss the following finance issues. • Local transportation mitigation fees vary widely between cities, counties, and the state. Few fee systems have provisions for high capacity transit. The regional plan could examine opportunities for revising the fees to support HCT.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. A number of new revenue sources are assumed for both local and regional transit. See pp. 72-73 and Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background.
284160	14	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	The Plan should also address Public/Private Partnerships (P3). This finance strategy may present some opportunities for financing many of the larger infrastructure projects in the plan. Addressing these opportunities may also position the region to take advantage of federal opportunities currently being discussed at the federal level.	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of the potential for public private partnerships to fund transportation improvements will be added to the plan.
284160	15	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	The "Key Investments" map on Page 8 of the Executive Summary and Page 49 of the plan does not adequately depict the number of "key" projects than in Snohomish County. PSRC should consider revising this map	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The project investments maps were intended to be illustrative of the types of projects contained in the Regional Transportation Plan. The maps will be edited to clarify their intent.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284160	16	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	The Vision 2040 Map on Page 2 of the Plan, while technically accurate, does not indicate the possibility of a MIC in Arlington or additional regional growth centers near future light rail stations, which are under active consideration by the PSRC. These centers will be part of upcoming Vision 2050 discussions and have a direct relationship to several projects in Appendix G.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. When new centers are designated, relevant maps will be updated.
284160	17	Snohomish County, Jay Larson, David Somers	Snohomish County	The Eastside Rail corridor from Woodinville to Snohomish is no longer being served by BNSF as is shown on Page 14 of Appendix J. Snohomish County has purchased this right of way and the rail service is provided by a short line service provider similar to the Ballard Terminal Railroad.	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The map will be updated to no longer show this as BNSF or UP in the final document.
284164	1	City of Snoqualmie, Mark Hofman	City of Snoqualmie	Elements and policies in the draft Plan that support improvements for multi-modal transportation, especially opportunities for walking and biking, are key to the Plan's success and the health and vibrancy of the region. However, local and commuter transit service continues to be a primary transportation concern for Snoqualmie and other surrounding cities. In order to make the Plan's goals for multi-modal transportation and greenhouse gas reduction a reality, the Plan should acknowledge (and fund) increased local and commuter transit services to cities across the region, not just in the urban "core."	Multi-modal	General Comment	The plan incorporates the transit service growth envisioned in King County Metro's long range plan, METRO CONNECTS which integrate with Sound Transit and other transit agency investments in the region through 2040. In addition to the local and express transit service envisioned in those plans, the plan envisions improvements to rural mobility through flexible transit service, including that found as a prioritized strategy in the region's Coordinated Plan (Appendix H).
284164	2	City of Snoqualmie, Mark Hofman	City of Snoqualmie	In addition, the City of Snoqualmie also supports the Plan's proposals to support Interstate 90 as a major electric highway with regionally planned and constructed charging stations and infrastructure.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284164	3	City of Snoqualmie, Mark Hofman	City of Snoqualmie	And, the City also appreciates the Plan's continued support and funding for a vital regional and community safety and traffic issue at the Interstate 90 and State Route 18 Interchange (Highway Project #2 on page 46 of the draft Plan). While this scheduled project will directly benefit safety and traffic conditions at and near this key regional interchange, the Plan should also identify and fund additional transportation projects along State Route 18 from the I-90 intersection south past Tiger Summit down to Issaquah/Hobart Road. As noted in the draft Plan, this vital link is a regional freight corridor increasingly serving major national and international markets. The Plan's population, truck tonnage, and jobs growth projections demonstrate that this currently inadequate highway section will greatly serve regional and statewide freight and tourism needs vital to eastern and western Washington. While Project #2's improvements to I-90 and SR 18 will address an imminent need for improved safety at the intersection, the Plan should not overlook the need for continuing planning and funding along the remainder of the SR 18 corridor.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284164	4	City of Snoqualmie, Mark Hofman	City of Snoqualmie	In addition to the demographic and forecasting data already contained in this draft Plan with appendices, the Plan should also include a detailed comparison between the housing and jobs growth projections used for the current Transportation Plan and Vision 2040, and those used as basis for this draft 2018 Plan, and thus for upcoming Vision 2050.	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	The regional transportation plan is based on VISION 2040 and the adopted growth targets in local comprehensive plans. PSRC has conducted an analysis of past and current forecasts, which was presented to the Executive Board and is available on our website.
284164	5	City of Snoqualmie, Mark Hofman	City of Snoqualmie	Finally, we note that Page 78 of the draft Plan includes a sentence indicating that "The Plan Supports the Region's Growth Strategy." The City remains in full support of the region's growth strategy, certainly as broadly stated on Page 78, but continues to be concerned with PSRC's past attempts to use the local transportation plan certification process to improperly dictate "ceilings" upon land use and development in the urban growth areas of small cities. We noted that Page 91 of the draft Plan directs local jurisdictions to incorporate a brief report in future updates to their comprehensive plans that addresses conformity with GMA, consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan, and consistency with the multicounty planning policies. This language should be revised, because it exceeds GMA requirements concerning what must be included in a local jurisdiction's comprehensive plan. And, the PSRC already has a 2003 Adopted Policy and Plan Review Process document. Any reference in the RTP should be to the PSRC's Adopted Policy and Plan Review guidance, and not seek to slide in additional requirements into the RTP itself. Finally, although it should go without saying, the City of Snoqualmie opposes any attempt by PSRC to use projected growth targets as "ceilings," given the multiple Growth Board decisions and VISION 2040's current language indicating growth targets are "floors," and not "ceilings."	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The language regarding certification of local plans was drawn from VISION 2040 (see "Review of Local Comprehensive Plans, Certification of Transportation-Related Provisions," p. 98) and from the 2003 "Model VISION 2040 Statement" in the adopted Plan Review Manual (see p. 2-1).
284179	1	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	1. Pg. 6, Figure 2, Pg. 11, Figure 4. Silverdale is a Core City and should be identified on the map as such. (Vision 2040, pg. 18, 21)	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The map depicts both incorporated jurisdictions and unincorporated areas. Incorporated jurisdictions are colored according to their regional geography classification. While Silverdale is a designated regional growth center, and the Regional Growth Strategy provides guidance for a percentage of Kitsap County's growth for Core Cities (incorporated jurisdictions with designated regional centers), the Silverdale area will be shown on PSRC maps as unincorporated until an agreed-upon area is incorporated and specific boundaries are designated.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284179	2	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	2. Pg. 45. The RTP implies that I-5 is the only regionally significant state facility, categorizing all other state highways as “Local priority state highways”. The RTP is supposed to plan for all areas of the region. The RTP should specifically call out the need for near-term action on SR16 and SR3 with specific notation of congestion, safety, freight movement, national security, and resilience issues associated with the Gorst area.	Project Specific	General Comment	The comment appears to reference the State Facilities Action Plan. This plan does not suggest that I-5 is the only regionally significant state facility, but rather identifies it as a critical facility with significant congestion and preservation needs. Throughout the plan, other important regional state highways are noted, including on the Regional Capacity Projects list and in the section of the State Facilities Action Plan that calls for local priority state routes to be addressed.
284179	3	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	3. Pg. 49 map * General: dates do not match well with projects	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Project completion dates were provided by the project sponsors.
284179	4	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	3. Pg. 49 map * Kitsap Fast Ferry Southworth to Seattle is not identified.	Ferries	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The projects listed in Figures 8-11 are intended to be illustrative and not comprehensive. The project in question is included in the Plan (see Appendix G: Regional Capacity Projects List and the projects webmap).
284179	5	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	3. Pg. 49 map * 4. What is this project and why does it have a 2040 date?	Project Specific	General Comment	All project information is based on data provided by the project sponsors.
284179	6	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	3. Pg. 49 map * 6. What does 2014 date represent?	Project Specific	Technical Correction	This is an error, the date should be 2024.
284179	7	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	3. Pg. 49 map * 7. Bainbridge Island project graphic does not correspond with the funded projects.	Project Specific	Technical Correction	We will review this information and work with the sponsor to make sure the map is accurate.
284179	8	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	4. Pg. 57. Freight Mobility. The RTP implies that the only regionally significant freight roadway facilities are associated with “international trade”. This section should identify the freight routes important to all the areas of the region. SR 16 and SR 3 are vital freight routes serving the Kitsap and Olympic Peninsulas and military installations. Other routes within the region are similarly vital to the region, with or without direct linkage to the Ports. Pg. 59 “Regional and Local Distribution” identifies the majority of freight issues are not related to the ports but does not provide any guidance on how to accommodate 80% of all truck traffic in the region.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284179	9	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	5. Pg. 58. Military goods movement. This section should include reference to the importance of Naval Base Kitsap logistical needs.	Other / miscellaneous	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The final document will include reference to the importance of Naval Base Kitsap and Naval Station Everett.
284179	10	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	6. Pg. 60. Projects and investments should include a “needs” section. SR16/3 Gorst area is prime example where investment is needed to support the regional freight network. Identification of specific projects by the region is needed to push solutions at the state and federal levels.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284179	11	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	7. Pg. 71. No mention is made of tolls on the Tacoma Narrows Bridge or WSF.	Financial Strategy / Funding	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of tolls on the Tacoma Narrows Bridge and Washington State Ferry fares will be added the user fee discussion on p. 71.
284179	12	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 1. Active Transportation Plan (ATP), Pg. 3. The ATP “actions” to “promotes the implementation of the Regional Bicycle Network” is not consistent with the “Four Primary Goals”. The four goals emphasize integration of non-motorized facilities within communities as well as those linking communities. The Goals do not prioritize connections within and between centers nor does it dictate the type of facilities to “2. Improve safety and comfort for people walking and bicycling” or “4. Improve access...”. The GMA emphasis is on “...facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access...” (Pg. 8, RCW 36.70a.070). For bicycles and pedestrians that access is not limited to Centers and connecting Centers, but predominately includes linkages within communities, connecting neighborhoods, community centers, schools, and parks. The emphasis on “regional bicycle routes” does not match the Four Primary Goals nor reflect the comprehensive planning efforts of jurisdictions. The planning process to create the “Regional Bicycle Network” utilized arbitrary criteria and “charrettes” which undermined local planning processes and approved plans.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284179	13	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 2. Pg. 31. The “Segments of....” * The “Regional Bicycle Route” map does have a legend so it is not possible to determine what the different graphics/colors represent.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The map you are referring to is a screenshot of a web-map. That same page includes a link to an on-line web-map which does include a legend as well as information about each route. This map is more easily navigable as people can zoom in and out to see the detail of this network. The webmap can be found here: http://psregcncl.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=adb196eea3d445f9ba1f80bdd7af19cb
284179	14	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan * Completed Segments. “...in some cases, paved and striped shoulders on rural roadways”: The caveat “in some cases” is indicative of the lack of incorporating context sensitive design, practical solutions, and an over reliance on the Rails to Trails model in the ATP. In rural areas 4 foot or greater paved shoulder are an appropriate facility. If all applicable rural shoulders are not included, then there should be no delineation between Completed and Planned Segments. For Kitsap County, shoulder condition information was provided.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. It is a goal to better evaluate the completeness of shoulders in more rural areas. However, without adequate data to assess the width or connectivity of these shoulders, we opted not to label them as 'completed'. If data is provided that can demonstrate width and connectivity information (completed shoulders with no gaps), this data can easily be updated.
284179	15	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan * Aspirational Routes. This classification should be deleted o If a project “...would compete gaps in the regional network...” then it should be shown as a route. o If it is “...a popular scenic route” and identified in a local plan then it should be shown as a route. o If it is “not identified in agency plans” it should not be shown on the map. That the RBM would show projects that are not consistent with local plans violates GMA.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comments.
284179	16	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan o The web based mapping system used for the map does not have the scaling limitations of paper maps. The ATP should show all the jurisdiction’s networks, not limit it to showing arbitrary regional routes. Neighborhood connections to local parks and services are just as important to active transportation and probably more important to safety than a forced route hierarchy.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for our comment. PSRC included all the routes that Kitsap County submitted for this effort.
284179	17	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 3. Map: The Southworth Dr. and Kingston graphic should be consistent with all routes within Kitsap County. [see map images]	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will work with the sponsor to clarify the most current information on these routes.
284179	18	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 4. Map: The Clear Creek Shared Use Trail was not included in Kitsap County’s submission. Inclusion of the trail “violated” the route density criteria. If included, the complete route should be included. Add Trigger Ave from NBK-Bangor to CCT and the Marwick Trail extension. The line is not interactive on the map. [see map images]	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. We will work with the sponsor to clarify the most current information on these routes.
284179	19	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 5. Map: Update parks layer to show Port Gamble Park. Kitsap County will provide updated GIS layer. [see map images]	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We are using an ESRI map service for this web-map. It does appear that the Port Gamble forest is included in light green.
284179	20	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 6. Addressing All Ages and Abilities: * “The BPAC has recommended that shared use paths, protected bike lanes and neighborhood greenways are the preferred types for implementing the RBN...” this statement is indicative of the lack of incorporating context sensitive design, practical solutions, and an over reliance on the Rails to Trails model in the ATP.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comments.
284179	21	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 7. Pg. 45-6. Objective 2 speaks about internal engagement within PSRC. PSRC is a member organization, coordination with member planning process should be the primary method of “public engagement”.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284179	22	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 8. Pg. 48. Objective 2, “Promote the implementation of the regional bicycle network to support all ability levels.” The focus on the RBN detracts from the purpose of the ATP. By it nature pedestrians (“...connecting destinations to and from where people live, shop, play, exercise and work...pg. 32) and bicyclists (...average bike trip is about 3 miles...pg. 34) are local, not regional transportation modes. The actions should reflect the local active transportation utilizing a context sensitive design and practical solutions bases.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284179	23	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 9. Pg. 49. Objective 1 & 2. If the Chapter 5 Design Guidelines are to be used for “informing the criteria for reginal funds” then the full range of designs implementation within a context sensitive design and practical solutions approach should be given equal weight. The criteria should reflect the right solution for the project, not fixate on urban level design standards.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284179	24	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	Active Transportation Plan 10. Pg. 58 Objective 2. While the objective references the RBN (see previous comments) and local networks the actions pursue RBN “awareness” and “fostering support” while the local network’s action plan is “crowdsourcing data collection”. Not exactly balanced regional actions.	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284179	25	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	<p>State Facilities Action Plan</p> <p>1. WSDOT Approach (Pg. 3). Is this section only specific to King County project delivery or WSDOT’s approach for the Central Puget Sound Region? The section outlines WSDOT’s approach to planning/project delivery for selected WSDOT projects within King County, but does not discuss how this new organizational structure will integrate with WSDOT’s planning structure relative to Olympic and Northwest Regions, local jurisdictions, and PSRC’s planning effort throughout the region.</p>	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	<p>The Office of Urban Mobility and Access (UMA) is focused primarily on central Puget Sound’s most densely populated and congested areas in King, Pierce and Snohomish Counties. The Urban Mobility and Access Office works in close coordination with the WSDOT Olympic Region Office which is responsible for Kitsap County and Northwest Region Office. Within UMA, the Management of Mobility (MoM) Division focuses on planning and programming of integrated transportation system that provides efficient and safe travel options for all modes, utilizing state of the art practices and technology. The MoM Division works closely with partners including cities, counties, businesses, tribes, transit agencies, ports and others through a variety of established meetings including PSRC committee and board meetings, county subarea meetings, and other topic meetings as appropriate. Internally, the MoM Division coordinates closely with the other Divisions within the Urban Mobility and Access Office, HQ, the Olympic Region, and the Northwest Region. The MoM Division serves as lead on short- and long-term regional system planning for External Planning Coordination - Central Puget Sound Boards / Committees / Groups, • Central Puget Sound Planning (role designed to complement regional office needs), • HOV/managed lanes, • State routes and interstates, • Traffic operations, and • Incident management / Emergency Management.</p>
284179	26	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	<p>State Facilities Action Plan 2. Seismic Lifeline Routes (pg. 15) What additional study... (pg. 18). How is Kitsap County addressed relative to seismic vulnerability? The Potential Lifeline additions should include: SR 16/3 entire corridor with specific attention to Gorst (liquefaction, land slide, access to Bremerton Airport, military logistics route), SR 305 Agate Pass Bridge, SR 3 Hood Canal Bridge.</p>	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	<p>WSDOT is currently reviewing the expansion to the seismic lifeline in conjunction with the Governor’s Resilient Washington sub-cabinet. This is called out on page 215 in the draft report (August 2017). The recommendation provided concerning Kitsap County has been forwarded to the proper contacts at WSDOT, and will be included for consideration as part of the research and planning activities related to the seismic lifeline expansion. In regards to the two specific bridges mentioned, the SR 305 Agate Pass Bridge is identified to still need retrofit, while the SR 101 Hood Canal Bridge was rebuilt in 2008, meets current seismic standards and is not identified in need of retrofit.</p>
284179	27	Kitsap County Public Works, David Forte	Kitsap County Public Works	<p>State Facilities Action Plan 3. Local-Interest State Routes (pg. 27-28). The structure of this appendix seems to classify WSDOT facilities as either part of the King Count Project Delivery (with an assumed “regional interest”) and Local-Interest Routes. At a minimum Highways of Statewide Significant (HSS) routes should be addressed specifically.</p>	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	<p>The portion of the State Facilities Action Plan related to local priority state routes is not intended to represent only King County, but all local priority state routes in the four-county central Puget Sound region. PSRC and WSDOT are actively engaged in advancing this work throughout 2018.</p>
284182	1	BNSF Railway, Colleen K Weatherford	BNSF Railway	<p>BNSF Railway - BNSF’s official name is BNSF Railway, not Burlington Northern Santa Fe. BNSF is referenced as Burlington Northern Santa Fe several times in the document. Please correct. This was found on pages 56, 57, and 60.</p>	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	<p>Thank you for your comment. References to "Burlington Northern Santa Fe" will either be changed to "BNSF Railway" or "BNSF" in the final document.</p>
284182	2	BNSF Railway, Colleen K Weatherford	BNSF Railway	<p>Passenger Rail - In addition to the movement of freight, our rail network also hosts the region’s passenger train service. As a reminder, BNSF is willing to cooperate on commuter rail studies and provide state and local officials, such as PRSC, with information. BNSF has Passenger Principles that guides BNSF’s policies and guidelines. For example, where commuter service is proposed on a line BNSF intends to continue owning and to be jointly used for commuter and freight use, commuter operations cannot degrade BNSF’s freight service, negatively affect BNSF’s freight customers or BNSF’s ability to provide them with service. BNSF is willing to discuss these Principles in more detail with PSRC.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
284182	3	BNSF Railway, Colleen K Weatherford	BNSF Railway	<p>Protect and Encourage Critical Trade Infrastructure – We support the plan’s recognition that “the Puget Sound region is a major North American gateway for trade with Pacific Rim countries and is a major economic engine for Washington state” and that a “transportation system that provides for the efficient movement of freight and goods is critical for the region’s economic prosperity.” To this end, we respectfully submit that the discussion of land use practices and planning tools should more fully support compatibility with existing trade infrastructure, such as freight rail corridors, rail-served industrial areas, and rail yards. Additionally, rail-served sites should be preserved, protected, and encouraged in land use plans to accommodate growing freight demands for the region.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
284182	4	BNSF Railway, Colleen K Weatherford	BNSF Railway	<p>Freight Distribution Network – Additionally, the plan should also consider examining distribution facilities and their impact on highway congestion. Further, a proactive and thoughtful approach to locate these type of facilities near high capacity-capable transportation networks (e.g., a railroad) would benefit the region by taking freight off constrained highways and reduce the impact of goods movement on the region.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284182	5	BNSF Railway, Colleen K Weatherford	BNSF Railway	Vision 2040 and subsequently Vision 2050 – It was noted in the Plan that the future land use plan for “Vision 2040” and subsequently “Vision 2050” is “focusing a greater share of that growth into transit-oriented development”. We would strongly suggest that Vision 2050 include land use strategies to protect and encourage critical trade infrastructure and rail-served industrial sites.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284182	6	BNSF Railway, Colleen K Weatherford	BNSF Railway	Appendix G – Please consider adding South Seattle Alternative Access located in the City of Tukwila to the project list. The city of Tukwila is the lead agency.	Project Specific	General Comment	This comment may be referring to a project that was considered exempt from needing to be explicitly listed on the Regional Capacity Projects list, and therefore contained in the plan programmatically. If not, however, we cannot add new projects to the Regional Capacity Projects list at this time. PSRC did extensive outreach with our member jurisdictions throughout 2017 to collect new and revised project submittals for the draft plan. There is a formal process for project submittals, which feed directly into our regional travel demand models and subsequent air quality analyses and formal conformity findings as required by federal legislation. We worked with Tukwila staff to finalize the projects that are ultimately represented on the project list.
284194	1	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	<p>The mission of the Port of Seattle is to create good jobs for our region and across the state by moving freight and passengers through our world-class airport and seaport facilities, advancing trade and commerce, promoting manufacturing and maritime growth, and stimulating economic development. We are committed to opportunity, equity and livable communities. Just as the region has grown over the past 10 years, so have passenger volumes at the airport and cruise terminals, and cargo moving by plane and ship. Our region’s ability to compete in the international marketplace relies on an efficient transportation system, especially accessing the gateways of the airport and seaport terminals. And, it’s also clear to us that that regional infrastructure must be well-developed throughout the region, and balanced among modes.</p> <p>The Regional Transportation Plan 2018 speaks to the importance of a sustainable system with continued investment through sound financing; the Implementation Actions lay out the path. We recommend six enhancements to the plan, and have provided other technical comments on Attachment A.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284194	2	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	a. Enhance “Implementation Actions” with freight priorities: The Implementation Actions (page 86) provide a strong focus, but lack actions related to the Regional Freight and Goods Movement. Please pull forward key freight actions to include alongside others listed there.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284194	3	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	<p>b. Recognize all of the economic benefits of the international gateway: It’s important to call out the economic benefits to the region of the international gateway, as noted in the Freight Mobility section (Plan page 57). The discussion of discretionary trade through the Puget Sound gateway (3rd bullet) is correct, but stops short of explaining the full scope of the benefits. Not only does transpacific shipping bring discretionary imports through our gateway, but also imports for our region arrive at our ports without additional transportation costs. Secondly, the handling of all shipments, either regional or those headed inland, provide jobs and business revenue for our region. And after bringing imports in, the ships return to Asia with our exports, and reduced export transportation rates on the transpacific backhaul.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284194	4	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	c. Preserve, protect and enhance regional centers, especially MICs, by ensuring mobility: This plan speaks to the importance of freight mobility, throughout the region, and especially in the Manufacturing & Industrial Centers, where industrial, family-wage jobs are concentrated. We need to anchor our industrially-zoned properties in the close-in centers which currently enjoy over 90% rate of occupancy. Gentrification of the MICs, with nonindustrial and non-maritime jobs, would increase congestion in areas that depend on proximity to the deep water ports, rail and or airports. The industrial base of this region provides a diverse economy that makes us the envy of the nation.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284194	5	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	d. Underscore need for freight deliveries and pick-ups in both urban and suburban settings: As represented in the Freight and Goods Movement Plan (Appendix J), there is significant discussion of cargo movement, by truck, by sea and by air. However, everyone can also relate to the proliferation of truck deliveries to homes and businesses as e-commerce takes off, and the pick-up of waste, recycling and outbound packages from the same locations. Additional discussion of the first and last miles in the supply chain would enhance the plan.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284194	6	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	e. Emphasize freight systems continuity, preservation, maintenance, resiliency and safety:Emphasize systems continuity, preservation and maintenance, resiliency and safety: Other components of the freight system that require regional support include continuity of freight corridors across jurisdictional lines, funding for preservation & maintenance, resiliency by providing redundant routes in case of natural or unplanned disasters, and safety for all users in any mode.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284194	7	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	f. Incorporate the PSRC’s unique expertise in our region’s growth and economy to maximize the understanding of airport system needs: While the state’s airport system best operates as an integrated ecosystem, the Puget Sound region’s air travel needs and demands are unique, particularly as it relates to commercial service. The examination of future systems-needs should include both a significant regional role as well as a fresh perspective based on region’s rapid growth and economic transformation to help us understand current and future regional air capacity needs. This analysis could begin with an exploration of air transportation demand and air capacity needs, before a discussion of future investments in airport infrastructure	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning.
284194	8	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	We appreciate the improvements that PSRC has made to the Freight Model, as described in Appendix J, pp 19-20, and note that “other improvements are planned over the next year.” The region must be able to quantify the performance of the goods movement system. These upgrades to the model, as well as better data and analysis tools will make visible the needs and gaps in the region’s freight system.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284194	9	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	TECHNICAL EDITS: Throughout the document, when referencing the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport by its nickname, please include the hyphen: Sea-Tac Airport. The City of SeaTac has no hyphen (noted first in Exec Summary, and later on King County Investment graphics).	Aviation	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The appropriate corrections to Sea-Tac and SeaTac will be made throughout the document.
284194	10	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	TECHNICAL EDITS: Page 8: The second sentence in the opening paragraph about centers (both Regional Growth Centers AND Manufacturing Industrial Centers says “Centers are locations with compact, pedestrian-oriented development and a mix of different commercial, civic, entertainment, and residential uses.” Please update this in the final to reflect that centers can be either RGCs or MICs, and MIC are not compact, pedestrian-oriented, nor any of the uses listed! This sentence sits better in the RGC paragraph.	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The final document will provide more clear distinction between the Regional Growth Centers and the Manufacturing Industrial Centers.
284194	11	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Figure 2: Suggest adding Paine Field Airport. Also, the Eastside Rail Corridor still shows on map despite being federally rail banked and some trackage removed; it should only show from Woodinville north to Hwy 2. Fauntleroy ferry terminal is currently not shown.	Aviation	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. These corrections will be made in Appendix J.
284194	12	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Page 7: Drayage trucking paragraph is missing reference to Port of Tacoma along with Port of Seattle. Note containers are moved “to and” from the ARGO railyard.	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. Corrections will be made to Appendix J: Page 7 in the final document.
284194	13	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Page 8: Marine Cargo & Regional Seaports: description of NWSA says POS retains responsibility for STIA and Fishermen’s Terminal and the region’s cruise homeports. Port of Everett handles 10% of the oversized “fuselages” for the 747...	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. Corrections will be made to Appendix J: Page 8 in the final document.
284194	14	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Page 9: “As of Spring of 2017,” total “annual” or “2016” containerized cargo through the NWSA was ...	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. Corrections will be made to Appendix J: Page 9 in the final document.
284194	15	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Page 13: The region’s freight rail lines “own the tracks and have” a shared operating agreement with Amtrak and Sound Transit. Also, it seems appropriate to include a narrative description of the sale of the Eastside Rail Corridor here, and note the federal rail-banking of that asset.	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284194	16	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Page 14, Figure 8: Please update to show Eastside Rail Corridor no longer in operations by any rail line between North Renton and Woodinville. From Woodinville north to Hwy 2, it should be colored “all other rail lines”	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The map will be corrected to no longer show this as BNSF or UP in the final document.
284194	18	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Pages 12-15: The discussions of rail seem to focus on international, intermodal rail when non-intermodal activity is a significant amount of traffic as well: grain trains, oil tankers and Trailers on Flatcars (TOFL).	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284194	19	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Page 21: How does the RTP perform for freight? This paragraph discusses how the truck delays increase, but doesn’t explain what part is due to growth in volume of trucks or truck trips, and what part is increased congestion on regional roads.	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	We agree that further clarity on the reasons behind the increase delay is useful and will include this in the final plan.
284194	20	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Page 21, Figure 11: please add labels to the axes, “minutes of delay” and “medium and heavy trucks.”	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The title for Figure 11 will be modified to clarify "minutes of delay" in the final document.
284194	21	Port of Seattle, Geraldine H. Poor	Port of Seattle	Appendix J: Page 26, Figure 12: please make chart more readable or provide listing of crossings in our region, as these are not able to be distinguished.	Freight / Rail	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The complete list of crossings, as well as an interactive webmap from the Joint Transportation Committee Road-Rail Conflicts Study is available at the JTC website.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284198	1	Community Transit, Kate Tourtellot	Community Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refine the Community Transit’s project descriptions in Appendix G as follows: * Project 5466: update project name to Swift BRT Green Line – Canyon Park Regional Center to Paine Field/Boeing * Project 5336: update project name to Swift BRT Yellow Line – Airport Road to Cathcart Way (Everett) * Project 5332: update project name to Swift BRT Red Line – Smokey Point Corridor. Please adjust the Start Year to 2024 and the Completion Year to 2028 * Project 5705: update project name to Swift BRT Blue Line Extension to N. 185th Street (Shoreline). Please adjust the Start Year to 2019 and the Completion Year to 2024 * Project 5312: update project name to Swift BRT Green Line Extension to UW Bothell Campus. Please adjust the Start Year to 2024 and the Completion Year to 2030 * Project 5335: update project name to Swift BRT Orange Line – 164th Street & 19th Street Corridors. Please adjust the Completion Year to 2024 Please update all maps to reflect complete list of Swift BRT routes, as revised above. Pages: Executive Summary-8, and The Plan-49. The maps should reflect the BRT lines as provided in our 2025 and 2040 Remix networks last year. 	Project Specific	Technical Correction	To the extent feasible, we will make these corrections; please note, however, that any revisions that may impact the regional modeling cannot occur at this time, as that would require new analysis and a new air quality conformity finding. We will work with Community Transit staff to finalize these edits.
284198	2	Community Transit, Kate Tourtellot	Community Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The graph source notations in Appendix B, page 17 need to be fixed and a few typos on page 18 	Other / miscellaneous	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment, we will review the document for corrections.
284198	3	Community Transit, Kate Tourtellot	Community Transit	<p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan, pg. 72, 2nd and 3rd bullets seemed to conflict. The 2nd bullet states “Constrain revenues to only road investments,” and the 3rd bullet states, “Allow revenues to be used to support multimodal investments, including transit, other high capacity vehicle services, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and transportation demand management strategies in the corridor or geography for which revenues are generated.” 	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The bullets illustrate policy choices that decision makers will have to resolve as user fee systems are designed and implemented.
284198	4	Community Transit, Kate Tourtellot	Community Transit	<p>Concerns:...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix N, Technology – there is no mention of the regional electronic fare card program, ORCA or Next Generation ORCA. The regional transit providers are spending a significant amount of money, approximately \$95 million, to replace and enhance the existing system in 2022. This program improves access to Transit. The electronic fare card allows passengers to travel seamlessly between the six transit provides and the Washington State Ferries. The Next Generation ORCA card includes mobile tickets. 	Transit	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comment. The final plan document will be updated
284199	1	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>The Sierra Club Washington Chapter is pleased to present the following comments on the PSRC’s DRAFT Regional Transportation Plan (Plan). The Plan is comprehensive and a good step forward; however, we have several recommendations to enhance the Plan we request you consider as it is finalized.</p> <p>The Plan, when implemented, must lay a path towards a truly sustainable transportation system that improves mobility to support our growing region. In so doing it cannot be overemphasized that part and parcel to that sustainability is an environmental strategy that aims to reduce impacts on our region’s air and water quality and reduce greenhouse-gas (GHG) emissions.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	2	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Given the importance of transit we see two overriding concepts the Plan needs to address: (1) Mobility rather than just connections among centers and (2) the “last mile” access needs to make transit work better for more users.</p> <p>The success of the Plan is the existence of sustainable funding, not on a year-by year basis, but over the long term. New transportation funding approaches are welcome, but they must be fair and equitable. The Sierra Club stands ready to work with the PSRC and other agencies to ensure the success of the Plan.</p>	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	3	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>We support the following:</p> <p>1. New funding approaches that not only encompass the concept of user fees, but also account for the user’s impact on the infrastructure and society (e.g., environment).</p> <p>2. Ensuring HOV lanes function as designed by requiring those on major highways meet minimum speed thresholds to ensure reliability of transit and carpool trips and have 3 or more occupants and/or implementing sufficient lane pricing for HOV 2+ lanes below that threshold.</p> <p>3. A transit system that is both far-reaching and convenient.</p> <p>4. Transit-Oriented development to reduce sprawl, take advantage of transit investments, and save money and impacts of ever-burgeoning infrastructure.</p> <p>5. Emphases on maintaining and preserving aging infrastructure.</p> <p>6. A regionwide policy plan that matches the State’s “Target Zero” (also adopted by many jurisdictions)—a goal to reduce traffic fatalities to zero by 2030 by rethinking speed, e.g., lower speeds for major highways = safer system.</p> <p>7. A long-term strategy to greatly reduce GHG emissions that recognizes the direct links between land-use and transportation policies.</p>	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	4	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>1 Chapter 1. Toward a Sustainable Transportation System</p> <p>Supporting People p. 15—“Special care was taken to address equity in the development and evaluation of the Regional Transportation Plan through creative board engagement, improvements to the performance evaluation framework, completion of a specific equity analysis background report, and improved public involvement strategies. See Appendix B for the full equity analysis.”</p> <p>COMMENT: The Sierra Club supports social equity and access as part of its core philosophy and appreciates the fact the Plan makes it a priority.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	5	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Supporting a Sustainable Environment</p> <p>Air Quality and Climate Change</p> <p>AIR QUALITY</p> <p>pp. 19-20—“The region is in attainment for all pollutants regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. These pollutants include carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter. At various points in the past, the region had exceeded the federal standards for several pollutants, but PSRC has worked closely with the region’s air quality consultation partner agencies — the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the Washington State Departments of Ecology and Transportation, and the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency — to successfully achieve and maintain attainment of the standards.</p> <p>Federal and state transportation conformity requirements ensure that the Regional Transportation Plan will not impede the region from meeting and maintaining air quality standards. Regional conformity analyses are required for a certain length of time, even during these “maintenance” periods. The projects and programs in the plan are well within the established limits for the pollutants for which conformity still applies in the region. Full documentation on the formal conformity analysis and finding is included in Appendix D.”</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix D Regional Air Quality Conformance Analysis concludes that both particulate and NOx emissions will continue to be below their respective budgets, yet we have several concerns that we express in our comments under Appendix D herein.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	6	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>CLIMATE CHANGE</p> <p>p. 21—“Pursuing further actions within the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy could potentially reduce emissions by an additional 30-50 percent below 2006 levels by 2040, or greater, depending on the aggressiveness of the measures pursued and the timing by which they could be accomplished. For example, more robust penetration of electric vehicles into the regional fleet could be pursued, along with supporting fast charging infrastructure, resulting in significant emission reductions by 2040.</p> <p>PSRC will continue to monitor activities and initiatives related to air quality and climate change affecting the region, and will continue to monitor and support state and regional initiatives. Appendix E contains more information on the plan’s Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy.”</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix E Climate Change Analysis addresses the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy; however, it must be understood the best science tells us existing State GHG emissions limits are insufficient to maintaining a livable climate. Therefore, we call for the Plan to be more demanding than the State’s limits. Also, we are concerned with several optimistic assumptions that were used, especially when it comes to land-use and emissions that we detail in our comments under Appendix E herein.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	7	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Chapter 2. Plan Investments</p> <p>Implement Efficiency Improvements</p> <p>Transportation Demand Management</p> <p>p. 33—“The Regional Transportation Demand Management Action Plan (see Appendix F) provides much greater detail, including objectives, strategies, and actions in support of the regional plan.”</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix F Regional Transportation Demand Management Action Plan is missing the number one tool—pricing—that must be addressed.</p>	TDM and CTR	General Comment	Pricing of the transportation system is discussed in the draft plan related to the overall financial strategy, as well as an important element of the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy.
284199	8	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Improve Mobility Through Strategic Capacity</p> <p>p. 35—“The Regional Transportation Plan contains a variety of investments in strategic capacity, both at the local and regional scale. Many are local priority investments that are captured in the plan’s financial strategy but are not called out as individual projects. Examples of these types of investments could be safety improvements on local roadways, local transit operational improvements, signalization, etc. The plan also includes large-scale regional investments as identified on the Regional Capacity Project list. These projects span all modes of travel and rise above a certain threshold. Individual projects are listed in Appendix G, and may also be viewed geographically within an interactive web based map, found at: https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtpwebmap.html.”</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix G Regional Capacity Projects List covers a broad swath of the overall needs, but contains many capacity-building projects which are far off in time, high in cost, and rated low priority. These projects, if implemented, in many cases, will simply enable further unsustainable development in far-away locations distant from regional activity and job centers. That is the wrong direction to go to achieve a sustainable transportation system. Priority should be focused on improved connections between major urban centers that benefit reliability of transit service. The selected projects should support the land-use policies that increase residential density in vibrant, walkable neighborhoods served by frequent transit that have ample access to employment and service centers. Please see more specific comments under Appendix G.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	9	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>FLEXIBLE TRANSIT SERVICES</p> <p>p.39—“Flexible transit service is any public transportation that is not a fixed-route transit service. This type of service accounts for the wide variety of public transportation services and supports that provide mobility to people throughout the region. This service can take many forms, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A demand response service that provides mobility to people with special transportation needs who are unable to take fixed-route transit. • Demand response and/or community- or human-service agency-provided transportation serving markets and communities where fixed-route transit is not feasible. • Vanpool and similar services that provide access to jobs, typically over long distances and at specific times. • A variety of first- and last-mile connections that help riders get to or from a transit station. <p>Several services and programs providing this type of transit can be found in Appendix H: 2019-2022 Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.”</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix H PSRC Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan contains many admirable elements; however, we recommend the following also be considered: homelessness, special-needs populations, last-mile access, etc. Please see our more detailed comments under Appendix H.</p>	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	10	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>p. 40—“Transit service must be supported by capital investments to ensure that it is fast, reliable, and efficient. Many of the capital costs associated with investments in high-capacity transit and other frequent and express transit services are larger in scale and allow for additional capacity to the system; these investments are referenced in Appendix G, the Regional Capacity Projects List. Other capital investments are smaller in scale or more operational in nature; these estimated costs are included in the plan’s financial strategy. Examples include speed and reliability improvements such as business access and transit lanes, curb bulb-outs, stop-level improvements that speed boardings and limit vehicle dwell time at stops, and/or improvements such as transit signal priority. Transit agencies also need to plan for supporting transit service through planning for and developing adequate transit maintenance and operations base facilities, transit revenue vehicles to provide the service anticipated, maintenance and construction equipment, and other necessary investments.”</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix G Regional Capacity Projects List provides a series of good transit investments, but there is no attempt to look at regional arterials to form a coherent network that would efficiently support maximizing mobility within existing capacity.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	11	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>pp. 40-41 — REGIONAL TRANSIT ACCESS AND PARKING STRATEGY (table)</p> <p>Making sure that it is as easy as possible to get to and use the region’s integrated transit network will be fundamental to the success of the system. The regional transit access and parking strategy establishes guiding principles for delivering better access and articulates key strategies for improved transit access.</p> <p>Guiding Principles</p> <p>The following principles should serve as a foundation for transit agencies, local jurisdictions, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and other regional transportation stakeholders when they make transit access investments.</p> <p>1. Equity. Ensure that efforts to improve access consider the needs of those who most need transit services.</p> <p>2. Local Context. Access needs will be different given the diverse geographies in the region. Stakeholders should leverage tools such as the Puget Sound Regional Council’s Transit Access Checklist to support an understanding of context.</p> <p>COMMENT: Local context should take a long-term view to consider the geography of access two or more decades into the future to plan infrastructure accordingly. This should emphasize placing parking on the periphery of small city downtowns and not in the core of those downtowns adjacent to the valuable commercial properties and transit facilities.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	12	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>pp. 40-41 — REGIONAL TRANSIT ACCESS AND PARKING STRATEGY (table): Guiding Principles:</p> <p>3. Collaboration. Effective and engaged collaboration with a variety of stakeholders will ensure the delivery of the most beneficial access investments.</p> <p>4. Innovation. The region must be innovative in leveraging emerging technologies, mobility services, and other low-cost opportunities that make it easier for people to get to and use transit.</p> <p>5. Prioritization. Project sponsors should rely on transparent and rigorous processes for prioritizing the highest-value improvements.</p> <p>COMMENT: Prioritization should emphasize high-value improvements that are cost effective with costs defined broadly, including environmental costs, and that deliver more transit riders per parking space.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	13	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Elements</p> <p>The following strategic elements articulate actions to make it as easy as possible for all the region’s residents to get to and use transit.</p> <p>1. Maximize non-SOV access to transit. Consider the following access modes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use and transit-oriented development. Successful transit-oriented development means more people close to transit, which results in good access for residents and employees. <p>COMMENT: We fully support emphasis on transit-oriented development. It should be a high priority for alignment decisions and design details of mass transit system expansions.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	14	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Elements: Pedestrian and bicycle investments, and accessibility improvements for people with limited mobility. Safe, accessible, and comfortable facilities that support everyone’s ability to easily get to transit stops and stations will increase transit access.</p> <p>COMMENT: The importance of safe and effective pedestrian and bicycle investments cannot be emphasized enough, not only for improved access and mobility, but for the associated public health benefits.</p>	Bicycle / Pedestrian	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	15	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Elements: Connections with local transit and bus/rail integration. Investments that get local transit users close to high-capacity transit stops and stations will provide riders another mode of access and extend regional mobility.</p> <p>COMMENT: These connections are extremely important to the overall transit system and will save on avoided costs of construction of expensive parking structures. Operating costs of local transit should be viewed by regional transit (e.g., Sound Transit) plans and projects as a direct substitute for costly capital projects that tie up land in automobile-centered uses, thus making further human-scale development more difficult.</p>	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	16	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>2. Manage parking demand at the region’s most-used park and rides.</p> <p>Recent trends indicate that there are several dozen park and rides throughout the region regularly at or above capacity. As a result, these park and rides ll very early in the morning and create many challenges. For riders, it means arriving early simply to get a parking space, creating equity concerns. For transit agencies, it can lead to buses and trains crush-loaded by the artificial peak of early arrivals, and for local jurisdictions it can mean congested local streets surrounding these facilities.</p> <p>Managing demand, including through price, can improve the customer experience by providing riders certainty that they will be able to find a space, and greater flexibility for when they use transit. It can offer more equitable access by freeing up spaces for use outside the peak period, and potentially ensure affordability if it leverages programs such as ORCA LIFT. Managing demand can also improve regional mobility by getting more transit riders per parking space, shifting demand to underutilized park and rides, and increasing non-auto access to transit.</p> <p>COMMENT: Managing demand should principally use price, along with registration systems for carpools, to ensure use of spaces by higher ridership parking vehicles. Emphasis should be on maximizing the need to obtain more transit rides per parking space. Gauge pricing for any parking facility with 85% or greater utilization during peak usage. Vanpool and carpool access should be provided at all park-and-ride facilities. ORCA or an equivalent regional fare card should be leveraged to contribute to maximizing priced parking and transit ridership, including reduced fare programs for low income households similar to ORCA Lift.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The financial strategy recognizes that as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See Chapter 3, p. 72, Guidance on the Distribution of User Fees.
284199	17	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>3. Add strategic parking capacity.</p> <p>The Regional Transportation Plan assumes approximately 18,000 new parking stalls will be built in addition to the almost 45,000 that currently exist. These new stalls will be delivered exclusively by transit agencies. In addition, there are other strategic and lower cost ways to create additional parking, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leased lots. Continuing to add leased parking capacity will both increase supply and come at a much lower per-stall cost than building new permanent stalls. • Creative partnerships. Leveraging existing private parking supply is a cost-effective strategy for transit agencies and local jurisdictions. Fee-based parking near high frequency transit service can add parking capacity and provide predictability to riders with a guaranteed parking space near transit. • Restriping existing park and rides. Restriping and reconfiguring the layout of parking stalls can add significant new capacity for little more than the cost of paint. <p>COMMENT: Success of the three transit strategic elements above should be continuously measured based on whether or not the assumed additional spaces will be cost effective in terms of numbers of riders delivered to the transit system and the return on investment from priced parking revenue.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	18	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Regional Roadway System</p> <p>INVESTMENTS</p> <p>p.44—“Many of the roadway investments in the plan are local priority investments that are captured in the plan’s financial strategy but are not called out as individual projects. Examples of these types of investments include safety improvements on local roadways, intersection improvements, signalization, etc. The plan also includes larger scale regional roadway investments as identified on the Regional Capacity Project list (Appendix G). Examples of these investments include adding strategic capacity along state routes and principal arterials, including the addition of high-occupancy vehicle lanes and other multimodal improvements, operational improvements on interstates, updated interchanges, etc.”</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix G Regional Capacity Projects List includes major roadway investments, but provides too much emphasis on building more capacity far from regional activity and job centers and, thus, does not contribute to a sustainable transportation system.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	19	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>p. 45—“As part of the efforts in the plan to identify near-term actions to improve system performance and close additional funding gaps, PSRC engaged with WSDOT to develop a State Facilities Action Plan to address several strategic issues facing state facilities in the central Puget Sound region. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I-5 operational improvements. Near-term actions to improve operational challenges on I-5, and a longer-term study of demand management strategies. Operational improvements can include investments such as ramp meters, incident response, traveler information, shoulder running, etc.• I-5 preservation. Identification of current needs, strategies to address them, and the challenges in implementation. Throughout the central Puget Sound region, the majority of pavement and bridge structures on I-5 originally constructed in the 1960s are still in service today. The estimated preservation need through 2040 for the full set of assets on I-5 in the region (pavement, bridges, drainage, electrical, and barriers) is approximately \$2.5 billion, which is 18 percent of all statewide preservation needs.• HOV policy and managed lanes. Proposed work plan, in partnership with PSRC, to evaluate alternative approaches to address speed and reliability of the HOV lane system. While HOV lanes systemwide continue to provide an advantage to transit and carpools compared to the general purpose lanes, certain corridors such as I-5 and I-405 are not performing to state standards. Tools such as express toll lanes are one way WSDOT is managing the system, and additional tools and strategies will be reviewed.• Seismic preparedness. Identification of accomplishments to date, current activities and potential areas for future focus. As an example, over the past two decades WSDOT has spent over \$195 million to retro t all or part of more than 400 bridges throughout the state, and the Legislature provided \$170 million as part of Connecting Washington for continued work. However, more work is still needed and critical corridors have been identified as part of the “Seismic Lifeline” routes.	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	20	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Freight mobility</p> <p>NATIONAL AND STATE PLANNING CONTEXT</p> <p>pp. 60-61—As part of the FAST Act, two new funded programs were created for which freight projects were explicitly eligible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects program provided a total of \$4.5 billion over five years to a competitive grant program for freight.• The National Highway Freight Program (NHFP), is a freight-specific formula program total- ing \$6.3 billion over five years that is apportioned to states based on the percentage of miles a state has in the Primary Highway Freight System. The FAST Act provided for states and metropolitan planning organizations to add a limited number of miles to this system through the identification of Critical Urban Freight Corridors and Critical Rural Freight Corridors. PSRC and WSDOT coordinated closely on this process and were able to extend key eligibility for these funds by designating freight corridor segments that will help the region make more complete connections for freight and goods movement. <p>To take full advantage of new freight provisions in the FAST Act, states need to develop state freight plans to be eligible to receive formula funding under the NHFP. Washington State Department of Transportation develops a freight systems plan and a freight investment plan to identify projects that are eligible for the NHFP funding as provided for in the FAST Act. The 2017 Washington State Freight System Plan was developed with input from PSRC and other stakeholders, and reflects an alignment on many factors related to freight and goods movement in the central Puget Sound region. WSDOT and PSRC coordinate regularly on freight systems planning, examples of which include recognizing the role of the designated Manufacturing Industrial Centers and working closely to respond to new federal funding opportunities. The Washington State Freight System Plan provides examples of how components of the region’s multimodal freight system support the state’s economy as a whole, such as highlight- ing the role of the region’s marine cargo ports and the important connections they provide for</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	21	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Chapter 4. Performance-Based Planning — Measuring What Matters</p> <p>Congestion Management Process</p> <p>pp. 76-77—“The Federal Highway Administration defines the Congestion Management Process (CMP) as ‘a systematic and regionally accepted approach for managing congestion that provides accurate, up-to-date information on transportation system performance and assesses alternative strategies for congestion management that meets state and local needs.’ This approach provides multiple benefits, including a structured process for analyzing congestion, an objectives-driven, performance-based approach, a forum for increased collaboration, and more effective and efficient use of resources. Each metropolitan planning organization the size of PSRC is federally mandated to develop and implement a CMP consistent with the requirements established in 23 CFR 450.320.</p> <p>In the central Puget Sound region, the CMP is integrated throughout all planning stages rather than conducted as a stand-alone process. PSRC is using a new interactive, online approach to inform the CMP, by providing users with the ability to view regional performance data according to parameters that are adaptable to other regional corridor and sketch planning efforts. This approach integrates well within the Regional Outcomes Framework and is allowing regional performance data not only to be considered throughout the PSRC planning process, but also to be integrated into other efforts throughout the region, such as the Washington State Department of Transportation Corridor Sketch Planning Initiative. For more information about the Congestion Management Process, see Appendix K, System Performance Report. To review the interactive data that informs the CMP, see the Regional Performance Data page at psrc.org.”</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix K System Performance Report describes the Congestion Management process, but fails to define “mobility” in terms that are measurable. People need to get from place to place easily, while having choices for doing so. It should be described how this is best measured, so that mobility can be improved over time.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	22	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix C: Public Involvement and Outreach (PDF, 3.4 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Public outreach must be effective. An overriding metric could be: If outcomes do not make a difference to people in the way they get around, then the outreach hasn’t been successful. Plus, there is need to be more innovative in hard to reach populations.</p>	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	23	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix D: Regional Air Quality Conformity Analysis (PDF, 3.5 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix D states emission analyses demonstrate “on-road transportation emissions are expected to be below the motor vehicle emissions budgets specified in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).” Yet we have several concerns with the assumptions used to model future scenarios and the subsequent emissions analyses.</p> <p>The Transportation Conformity Analyses uses PSRC’s land use and travel demand modeling and EPA’s emissions factor model to estimate regional emissions. However, the Macroeconomic Forecasts that provide numbers for population and jobs relies in part on jurisdictions not exceeding their Growth Targets. Unfortunately, recently at least six cities in King County alone failed this test and PSRC did not approve their Comprehensive Plans, which resulted in a series of conditions that each city would have to agree to. In some cases, the “goal posts” were moved” and a city was re-categorized to the next larger type of city, thus increasing its Growth Target. Clearly, such occurrences will multiply in the years ahead with over 1M more people expected in the region by 2040. Another concern is if the land-use assumptions that feed the analyses include the massive Master-Planned Developments slated for both Black Diamond and Covington (both of which have cavalierly planned to far exceed their growth targets) far from regional activity centers. Any consideration of increasing Growth Targets of cities should be infrequent and only should focus on those major activity centers that are connected by mass-transit corridors and avoid all locations on the fringes of the urban area.</p> <p>The Motor Vehicle Emissions analyses indicate decreasing emissions in relation to both the particulate and NOx emissions budgets. Why is it assumed that emissions will go down so much year to year in the future? In fact, with the Federal government relaxing (or, in some cases, outright, eliminating) certain standards the auto industry was required to meet, it is hard to ascertain how emissions will not increase from year to year going forward. What assumptions about electric vehicles (EV) or other zero-emission vehicle (ZEV) adoption rates are used in this analysis, and how is this transition ensured in light of relaxed federal emissions standards beginning in 2017? This must be addressed.</p> <p>It is not clear how the emissions methodology in Attachment A takes into account idling (which has increased</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	<p>Per federal legislation and in agreement through the interagency consultation process, PSRC is required to use the adopted land use vision as the planning assumptions for forecasted land use growth distributions, which are currently based on local jurisdiction adopted targets as projected through 2040 in coordination with the Regional Growth Strategy. Regarding the fuel economy standards, the approved standards are still in place and have not been revoked. If there are changes to the standards in the future, PSRC's modeling will be adjusted accordingly. Finally, EPA's MOVES software includes detailed assumptions for all of the items listed, and the inputs used by PSRC are based on the current regional vehicle fleet and the trends in regional vehicle turnover rates. The inputs regarding transit and carpool usage are based on the results of the household travel survey, regional travel data and the proposed regional transit network.</p>
284199	24	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix E: Climate Change Analysis (PDF, 3.2 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix E greatly relies on the adoption of Federal fuel economy and GHG emissions standards for vehicles and trucks, which now are being eviscerated or outright eliminated by the current Administration.</p> <p>Comments detailed under Appendix D above on Growth Targets also are pertinent here in Land-Use assumptions—a key leg of the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy.</p> <p>However, we see several assumptions listed that feed the overall analyses:</p> <p>Land-Use: How do the analyses account for several King County cities on the urban fringe that plan to exceed their growth targets, thus causing much more long-distance driving and more GHG emissions?</p> <p>User fees: More widespread use of user fees, though necessary, is subject to political and public pressure and is by no means assured.</p> <p>Transportation Choices: While we strongly support offering transportation choices, they are few and far between in outlying parts of the metropolitan region, so we cannot assume a smooth-running regional network.</p> <p>Technology: Although the Federal government has made great strides in CAFE standards, etc., the current Administration is eviscerating many of those gains.</p> <p>Such changes in underlying assumptions can potentially impact results, especially in those cases where results may be sensitive to small changes.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	<p>The analytical assumptions used in the greenhouse gas analysis are based on the best available information. The CAFÉ standards are still in place and have not been revoked, and land use assumptions are based on the regional growth strategy and adopted local targets. The plan is required to be updated every four years, so any changes to these assumptions will be updated in the future, and implementation of user fee and other policies will be monitored over time.</p>

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	25	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix F: Regional Transportation Demand Management Action Plan (PDF, 4.8 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: We agree that the value of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) actions is immense and encourage PSRC to follow through on its TDM strategies outlined in Appendix F.</p> <p>Strategy 2, Provide Information People Need, should include promoting a realistic regional public discussion of the costs of transportation impacts on health and wellbeing and the financial costs associated with system road and parking capacity increases to meet peak demand. Pricing of peak demand for highway space and parking at transit facilities will help to inform the public user of the real costs associated with peak capacity. Public outreach regarding costs and impacts will better help the public appreciate the tradeoffs involved with large infrastructure investments and Transportation-Demand Management (TDM) methods that can allow for smarter utilization which compliments strategy 3, Enhance the existing transportation system. We urge the use of transparent cost information sharing via TDM outreach as a precursor to implementing highway congestion pricing on a larger, network scale.</p> <p>TDM actions to maximize new investments (strategy 4) should equally consider how existing users of an upgraded or expanded system (e.g., mass transit line openings) will make use of the new investment along with new users attracted to the transportation investment. Redeployment of existing assets, whether transit service hours or roadway lane miles or curb parking spaces, should be considered in ambitious ways to seek synergies with the new investments.</p> <p>The Regional TDM Action Plan should include among its outcomes for assessing performance the average and distribution of distance of trip by mode regionally and by county for peak commute time and off-peak travel periods.}</p>	TDM and CTR	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	26	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix G: Regional Capacity Projects List (PDF, 4.7 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Appendix G contains a long list of capacity projects many of which are far off, high in cost, and rated low priority—in other words, will not proceed.</p> <p>We highly object to the inclusion of Project ID 112, the Cross-Base Highway, in this list of capacity projects. This project would create highly adverse impacts to the unique habitats through which it would pass and enable more sprawl development on the fringes of the urban area in east Pierce County. Modest improvements to the arterial street Perimeter Rd should be substituted for Cross-Base Highway and we urge that SR 704 be deleted from the WSDOT inventory of state roads.</p>	Project Specific	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	27	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix G: Regional Capacity Projects List (PDF, 4.7 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Freight corridor highway improvements should be reevaluated where existing rail corridors can be used as a reasonable alternative to the highway route. Priority for use of multi-modal cargo hauling and rail lines as a primary means for moving freight among industrial centers and ports will both ensure dedicated freight hauling and safer highways by reducing the number of large trucks on those roadways.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	28	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix G: Regional Capacity Projects List (PDF, 4.7 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Investments in RapidRide transit corridors should be contingent on ridership improvement, reliability upgrades, and proximity to higher-density residential transit oriented development and/or major activity center employment clusters.</p>	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment
284199	29	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix H: PSRC Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (PDF, 11.4 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: The Plan should call out homelessness as target population and include it as part of local, regional, and national plans to help address the problem. Mental illness may require specific programs to help provide mobility to such special-needs populations. Use of shared mobility services to special needs population should be expanded. Both first and last mile access is a key need for special-needs populations.</p>	Special Needs Transportation	General Comment	Thank you for your suggestion. The Coordinated Plan does address low-income populations, but the homeless are not specifically called out as a separate sub-group.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	30	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix I: State Facilities Action Plans (4.0 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: A Regional Plan for local actions is needed to ensure better use of key parts of the system, such as HOV lanes, as the highest priority: (1) Performance of to benefit transit and (2) Management to ensure transit throughput, speed, and reliability. Revenue generation should be a secondary priority in tolling schemes that involve HOV lanes.</p> <p>Section 2. HOV Solutions and Congestion Management Strategies clearly shows how HOV lanes performance has reduced drastically in just four years between 2011 and 2015 (Table on p. 6). This alone should push WSDOT to increase the HOV standard to 3+ occupancy carpools, at a minimum during peak commute periods. A “challenge” expressed is that “(O)nce HOV lanes are congested, the impact of changing to 3+ has been considered unacceptable. Changing to 3+ would move 3/4 of HOV traffic into congested general- purpose lanes, and leave the HOV lane seeming underutilized.” (p.6). However, that is exactly the incentive HOV 3+ occupancy is supposed to signal to commuters. While data appears to show that pricing lanes works (p. 8), there still remains a concern that these are “Lexus” lanes. In the long run. HOV 3+ occupancy lanes are fairer and more efficient. Consequently, we support Option 3.: “Adopting a 3+ carpool definition system-wide, either all-day or during peak periods” (p. 9).</p>	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	31	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix I: State Facilities Action Plans (4.0 mb) COMMENT: Section 3. I-5 Action Plan describes the needs, projected timelines, and uncertainties associated with rehabilitating I-5 pavement and bridges. We urge officials in PSRC jurisdictions to advocate for increased priority of I-5 rehabilitation, instead of so many new projects in the Connecting Washington suite of state investments. Action by subsequent Legislatures can change the project list adopted in 2015. We recognize the need to fund over \$100 million in correction of fish barriers along the I-5 corridor, and applaud WSDOT for developing life-cycle management plans for the culvert and storm water systems in its asset management program.</p>	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	32	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix I: State Facilities Action Plans (4.0 mb) COMMENT: Section 4. Planning Beyond Connected Washington shows an ever-increasing number of vehicle miles traveled as the region’s population and employment levels continue to increase. This has created an unsustainable transportation system. We believe that highways of statewide significance (HSSs) being exempt from concurrency requirements, thus allowing unsustainable development to proceed, must be changed. Whatever original reasons for such exemptions have been overwhelmed by the region’s traffic congestion and no longer make sense. Also, as stated earlier, suburban cities that exceed their Growth Targets help exacerbate congestion on connecting State routes.</p>	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	33	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix J: Regional Freight and Goods Movement (PDF, 4.9 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: We urge PSRC to seek ways to shift longer distance freight transport from truck to rail through its plan investments and policies. At Port facilities, emphasis should be placed on greater reliance on direct ship-to-rail transfers, while roadway pricing policies should reflect the weight-based damage caused by heavy-duty trucks and their large weight cargoes. Among specific freight corridors identified in the plan, we urge consideration of revised priorities:</p> <p>Gateway project near Port of Tacoma and Sea-Tac Airport: PSRC should advocate for design changes that will serve the needs of truck freight and its principal destinations while not inducing more sprawl development and encouraging more light-duty vehicle trips for commuting and other purposes. Interchange connections and highway widths that serve freight needs while not attracting large volumes of general traffic will better serve the freight transport without congestion conflict into the future.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	34	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix J: Regional Freight and Goods Movement (PDF, 4.9 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Canyon Road connections to Frederickson: Seek alternatives that rely on freight rail serviced by a combination of short haul railroad operations.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	35	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix J: Regional Freight and Goods Movement (PDF, 4.9 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Freight rail electrification: PSRC must be an advocate for electrified freight rail in major rail corridors throughout the central Puget Sound region. A shift to electrified rail will have major benefits for GHG emission reductions, improved air quality, and can help leverage renewable energy investments</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	36	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix M: Maintenance, Preservation and Operations (PDF, 3.9 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: We strongly support the commitment to prioritizing funding for the “maintenance, preservation and operation of the existing transportation infrastructure in a safe and usable state.” (p. 2). From all there data we have seen from KCDOT, King County’s maintenance and preservation needs are massive and its funding totally unsustainable (ref.: Road Services Division 2017-2018 Line of Business Plan: http://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/transportation/roads/strategic-planning.aspx#lob). In addition to aging and worn roadways, the following items must be addressed: proper stormwater management, replacement of inadequate culverts; and repair of aging bridges. Estimating the cost of these items ids extremely difficult and, based on historic experience, such estimates usually are too low.</p> <p>Costs to maintain transit networks are massive with Appendix M showing ~\$25.8 billion (p. 9), for maintenance, preservation, operations, and capital replacement. Transit, a critical tentpole, must have adequate funding if our transportation system truly is to be sustainable in the long-run.</p>	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	37	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix N: Technology (PDF, 4.4 mb)</p> <p>COMMENT: Participation of private entities in the transportation demand management arena should be encouraged. Data from private operators should be integrated into overall system. ITS needs to be region-wide and not descend into balkanized development by each of the jurisdictions throughout the region. New technological developments that reduce VMT instead of provide other conveniences should be emphasized and prioritized. The system must strive to compliment and improve transit rather than compete with transit. Technology should be used to improve ease of access to transit system, overcoming first mile / last mile challenges.</p>	TDM and CTR	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	38	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb)</p> <p>Introduction (p. 1)</p> <p>Financing Transportation Investments in a Growing Region (p. 1)</p> <p>COMMENT: In the first paragraph, second sentence, we suggest more direct language: “Economically unstable and inequitable funding, such as the sales tax; a growing backlog of maintenance and replacement such as for roads and bridges; and the woeful shortfall of the current mix of funding sources, especially for likely economic, geographic, technological, and environmental changes over the coming decades-all are causing the need to look at new approaches to paying for projects and programs.” We do support the conclusion that: “traditional tax-based financing measures will not, by themselves, be sufficient to meet the region’s transportation investment needs or do so in a way that aligns with desired regional outcomes.”</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	39	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb)</p> <p>Introduction (p. 1)</p> <p>Financing Transportation Investments in a Growing Region (p. 1) COMMENT: The second paragraph focuses the solution on user fees, phrased in there first sentence as “funding transportation through fees and tolls that apply to users of the transportation systems and services.” We suggest that user fees potentially can create a heavy burden on low-income households with negative impacts on equity. So, we suggest adding in the following: “Most transportation infrastructure has broad societal impact, far beyond the immediate users, for good or bad, with over-usage leading to negative consequences and under-usage to poor allocation of resources. Therefore user fees have important roles to play in assuring both appropriate usage and good decision-making, yet in a society characterized by escalating inequality, it is critical to include ways of mitigating the impacts of user fees on lower income users, while assuring that tax revenue is paid predominantly by the relatively more affluent part of the population.”</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. As noted in the discussion on the use and distribution of user fees, as revenue policies are developed, consideration must also be given to the equity implications of the application of user fees and the use of revenues. See p. 72.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	40	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) Emerging and Ongoing Issues in Transportation Finance (p. 2)</p> <p>COMMENT: Under I. The Future of Fuel Taxes. given the gas tax is a form of carbon tax, what does the following statement mean: “As the transportation sector strives to disentangle personal and freight mobility from carbon emissions, taxes on motor fuels will become an even less viable means of funding future investments.” (last sentence)? We are concerned because fuel taxes are portrayed as unsustainable, with “user fee replacement alternatives” now available. However the phrase “electric vehicle” is never used, nor is “carbon tax.”</p> <p>Consequently, we suggest adding more discerning wording, such as: “The current fuel tax is oversubscribed, not indexed to inflation, and will not return adequate revenue as electric vehicles become more prevalent. Therefore, replacements must be phased in, bearing in mind that it currently serves as both a user fee and a carbon tax. In terms of road impact, a replacement should be based on both mileage and vehicle weight. In terms of social/equity impact, it should be based on both mileage and vehicle value. In terms of environmental impact, all three factors are related to the carbon used to produce the electricity and in the manufacturing of a high weight / high value vehicle. In addition, parking fees should be considered to be a user fee, with a major indirect effect on mileage, as well as the allocation of public right of way and parking structures. If a new carbon tax is enacted, a request could be made for some of its revenue going to multi-modal projects.”</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	41	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) Emerging and Ongoing Issues in Transportation Finance (p. 2)</p> <p>COMMENT: Under III. Diversification of Transit Operating Revenue Sources. it has been apparent for some time that relying on the sales tax to support transit is unsustainable. However, although volatility is cited, equity is not. We suggest adding the following: “General sales tax revenue is inequitable as well as volatile, but it is easy to collect. Therefore sales taxes should be used only as a secondary source of revenue, with emphasis on high-value services and products for the affluent, such as financial services and transactions, expensive cars, boats, and airplanes, and other luxuries. High-value property taxes would be suitable as a more stable, primary source of revenue, especially if implemented as a general property tax with rebate for lower to moderate income households which minimize their carbon footprint. A carbon tax also would be a good source of revenue and since transit use reduces the carbon footprint.”</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	42	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) Emerging and Ongoing Issues in Transportation Finance (p. 2)</p> <p>COMMENT: Under IV. Bond Financing. when comparing bond financing, versus pay-as you- go, we recommend the following: “Bond financing is very attractive in an environment of rapid growth and low interest rates. To make this more viable as a long-term strategy, lawmakers could be asked to form a state or national public infrastructure bank, or it equivalent, to assist with low cost and stable bond financing.”</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	43	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) Emerging and Ongoing Issues in Transportation Finance (p. 2)</p> <p>COMMENT: Under VI. Tax Limitations. we support an increased Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET), especially for the region, as over reliance on the sales tax and property taxes has proven wholly inadequate.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. Increases in MVET are assumed to fund various plan investments.
284199	44	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb)</p> <p>Developing the Financial Strategy (p. 3)</p> <p>COMMENT: We support the Transportation 2040 Finance Working Group Policy recommendation that “revenue instruments should relate in some manner to the benefits the users receive and/or the costs that these users impose on the system and other users” (p. 4).</p> <p>The Working Group omitted use of parking pricing as a new revenue source. Priced parking can reasonably be expected to become available over the life of the plan, so the inclusion of priced parking clearly meets the criteria for inclusion.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	45	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb)</p> <p>A General Funding Scenario (p. 9)</p> <p>COMMENT: The draft Plan states: “the Finance Working Group anticipates the transition to begin in the mid-2020s with revenues from the user fees supporting a wide range of transportation investments in the second phase of the plan (2026-2040)” (p. 10). We believe the transition to newer revenue sources must be accelerated to meet the needs of the transportation system. It should not take 7 or 8 years to effect such a transition, nor could the system afford such a wait.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	46	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) Estimating Current Law Revenues (p. 10)</p> <p>COMMENT: Some of the assumptions that underly the current law revenue forecasts on p. 13 are overly optimistic. Why is it assumed local property tax levies will continue to be renewed? Why is it assumed WSDOT will so greatly increase (~triple) the PSRC regional allocation? Also, King County cannot sustainably continue 50% general fund transfers to the transportation budget. Finally, assumptions of what the current Federal Administration will do or not do, essentially, are impossible to even formulate.</p> <p>The Table 4: T2040 Current Law Revenue Estimate by Source shows one of the biggest issues facing financial stability of the system—sales taxes represent ~1/3 of all current revenues throughout each sub-period and for the full 22-yr period, with that percentage actually increasing with time.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. The Finance Working Group looked at long term trends in levy renewals, general fund transfers, and the region's receipt of federal support, among other data, to develop current law revenue assumptions. PSRC will track these assumptions and adjust them in future plan updates if necessary.
284199	47	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) New Revenue Assumptions and Estimates (p. 17)</p> <p>COMMENT: Figure 11: Transportation 2040 New Revenue Requirements shows nearly \$20B in new revenue required by cities alone. This is a massive amount that certainly cannot be financed by such jurisdictions.</p> <p>This appendix identifies extensive efforts to collect financial data from state and regional agencies and use it project estimates of future costs and revenues for transportation. However, there appears to be no measures or indications provided as to the uncertainties in such estimates. At a minimum, we suggest that it is both possible and reasonable to identify how past projections of revenues and costs have differed from actual revenues and costs. These discrepancies from over the last half century could then be projected into the future as part of an overall analysis to obtain a better sense of reality.</p> <p>Of particular concern is that we have good reason to expect major, but unpredictable, events or trends in the future that could upset these projections. From the oil shocks of the 1970s to the financial crash of 2008, we know that farreaching economic disruptions are almost certain. Furthermore, massive computerization, artificial intelligence, genetic engineering, escalating inequality, and more, will continue to change society in often unexpected ways.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. New revenues needed to meet needs identified in local comprehensive plans are indeed substantial.
284199	48	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) New Revenue Assumptions by Program (p. 19)</p> <p>COMMENT: Tables 7 thru 9 detail potential new revenue sources and amounts. Clearly, a move towards User Fees such as: Road Usage Charges, Facility Tolls, MVET, Carbon Taxes, Impact Fees, and Parking Surcharges are most fair and equitable, as well as generators of a good portion of the monies needed to maintain and preserve our transportation infrastructure and fund common-sense, surgical improvements in capacity.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	49	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) Financial Strategy Action Plan (p. 25) Early Action to Support Local and State Investments (p. 25)</p> <p>COMMENT: The draft Plan states that early actions will be needed, especially to help cities and counties fund their backlog of maintenance and preservation projects, there is no strategy articulated to support same. This also is the case for local transit providers.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	50	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) The Phasing in of Tolls and Other User Fees (p. 26)</p> <p>COMMENT: We fully support the use, and expansion of, tolls and user fees, that both charge based on use and impact to the system to support maintenance and operation of the transportation system, and also manage demand on premium limited-access highways through congestion-based pricing. System needs, as well as limitations on viability of the fuel tax, necessitate an ambitious timeline for implementation of user fees be followed regionally and state-wide.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284199	51	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	<p>Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) Guidance on the Use of User Fees (p. 27)</p> <p>COMMENT: We support “a strong commitment to dedicate revenues generated from these programs to the purpose of improving mobility.” This must be the Plan’s goal to which we all strive.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS

Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
284199	52	Sierra Club Washington, Tim Gould	Sierra Club Washington	Appendix P: Financial Strategy Background (PDF, 4.4 mb) Table 15: Summary of the Financial Strategy Implementation Plan (p. 28) COMMENT: This provides a good summary of the above strategies and good talking tool to help inform both the Public and elected officials to potential solutions.	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284317	1	Dick Burkhart		Comments on Appendix K (System Performance): (1) I would add “Mobility” as a performance parameter. One example would be average non-auto trip times between selected peripheral locations, or urban centers to peripheral locations, plus the available travel options. (2) I would also add “Resilience”. How well does the system handle traffic jams, major accidents, bridge failures, snow storms, hurricanes, earthquakes, etc.? Obvious measures would include average delays and their variance, but also percentage of travelers getting through by alternate routes. How well will the system handle divergence from the expected trends? For example, how quickly can operations, plans, and financing be adjusted as travel demand changes along different corridors or within different regions or centers.	Performance Measures	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. There are several programs noted on page 23, none of which provide data on the success or number of users of those programs.
284373	1	Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions (CATES), John Niles	Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions (CATES)	1. Vehicle automation -- computerization of motor vehicle control instead of human driving -- is an important technological trend and I commend PSRC taking this trend into account in the T-2040 materials which after all is a plan for the future. I commend PSRC for addressing vehicle automation in Appendix N on Technology. The steps listed are sound.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284373	2	Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions (CATES), John Niles	Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions (CATES)	2. On the action item stated in Appendix N as "Facilitate regional discussions to identify opportunities to support private sector projects and partnerships and the deployment of pilot programs," be aware that City of SeaTac's engagement of Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions (CATES) to explore action opportunities that would make the City a "Center of Excellence" in automated vehicle deployment has come to the attention of the Bloomberg Philanthropics "Autonomous Vehicles in Cities" initiative as described at https://avsincities.bloomberg.org/global-atlas/americas/us/seatac-us . It was entered in the worldwide inventory of notable AV projects as one of two in Washington State. In the months before the T-2040 update is finalized, this effort and whatever follow-on is decided by the City may be worthy of note in the T-2040 Plan. SeaTac Municipal Public Works Director Will Appleton would have the latest information on where this project stands at any time in the future.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
284373	3	Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions (CATES), John Niles	Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions (CATES)	3. On the action item stated in Appendix N as "Continue to enhance regional models to analyze the effect of autonomous and electric vehicles, shared mobility, and new technology on the transportation system and travel behavior," I recommend PSRC staff give serious consideration to conducting a major simulation of central Puget Sound region mobility in a future year under the assumption that autonomous, electric, shared-ride robotic taxicabs (like UberPool without drivers) would be available for surface mobility as a supplement to rail and BRT mass transit as planned. There is a very worthwhile example of such a study, a model of what's possible to educate the public and elected officials, conducted a few years ago by the International Transportation Forum of OECD, documented fully as follows: Report: https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/15cpb_self-drivingcars.pdf "Urban Mobility System Upgrade: How shared self-driving cars could change city traffic" Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j9kKORHI-LI Powerpoint: http://www.citymobil2.eu/en/upload/Presentations/Urban%20mobility%20system%20upgrade-ITF.pdf Academic study: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2046043016300442	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286533	1	City of Bellevue, David Berg	City of Bellevue	<p>The City of Bellevue is pleased to provide comments on the Puget Sound Regional Council's draft Transportation 2040 Plan. As a region, we have both the opportunity and the challenge to harness our tremendous population and economic growth to help maintain the quality of life for which we are renowned. The T2040 plan is a critical component to this regional opportunity.</p> <p>We understand that the 2018 plan update is relatively minor in terms of substantive change, with a significant plan overhaul anticipated in 2022. Nevertheless, we are encouraged by some of the new draft plan components- such as the regional access and parking strategy and technology appendix-that call for maximizing existing resources through innovation as well as public-public and public-private partnerships.</p>	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286533	2	City of Bellevue, David Berg	City of Bellevue	<p>As indicated in the draft plan, regional transportation needs continue to grow while resources to address them diminish. That dynamic makes it essential that government agencies be strategic and make effective use of regional transportation investments. The City has long supported greater collaboration and efficiencies between state and regional agencies to get maximum benefit from public investment in the regional transportation system and we are pleased to see this reflected in the draft plan.</p>	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286533	3	City of Bellevue, David Berg	City of Bellevue	<p>Bellevue supports efforts to ensure that the regional transportation system uses new and smart technologies that increase overall system efficiency, including the exploration of new technology-related funding mechanisms. We look forward to a deeper study of the complexities of the potential expansion of transportation user fees. Further study of this area is critical to inform the 2022 plan update as our region moves closer to embracing new technologies in our transportation system.</p> <p>We appreciate the inclusion of Technology as a stand-alone plan item (Appendix N). As the draft plan notes, the way our regional transportation system is planned, designed, built and operated is poised to be fundamentally altered by the rapid evolution of new technologies. Bellevue has prioritized readying our transportation system for these changes. But as indicated in the draft plan, embracing new technologies must not only be a local undertaking, but a regional one. We stand ready and willing to assist the PSRC in convening a technology advisory committee or in facilitating regional discussions to identify opportunities to support private sector projects and partnerships and the deployment of pilot programs. Lastly, as these technologies continue to advance, in future plan updates it will be prudent for the Transportation Policy Board to take a close look at its prioritization measures and determine if changes are appropriate, given the rapidly changing transportation landscape.</p> <p>The next four years promise to be exciting and challenging for our region as new transportation investments are made and infrastructure projects realized. But, perhaps the biggest game changers ahead of us are the elements we don't yet have planned. We look forward to continued participation in the regional transportation planning and implementation processes through this plan's horizon and beyond.</p>	Emerging Technologies	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. We look forward to working with partner agencies on these issues.
286536	1	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on PSRC's draft Transportation 2040 plan update. This is an exciting and challenging time for how we think about our community's travel needs and the ways we can meet them. The update process is a strong catalyst to refresh our common understanding, and to focus transportation system investments toward the region's greatest priorities.</p>	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286536	2	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<p>We are pleased that this draft update expands the regional conversation on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions mandates,</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286536	3	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<p>We are pleased that this draft update ... recognizes the important role of freight in our transportation systems and economy,</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286536	4	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<p>We are pleased that this draft update ... emphasizes the needs for maintenance, preservation, and resiliency.</p>	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286536	5	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<p>We also appreciate the expanded consideration of social equity and environmental justice, and strongly endorse PSRC's frank discussion of future transportation funding needs and challenges.</p>	Equity	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286536	6	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<p>Below are comments we ask you to consider as you prepare the final plan and begin the upcoming VISION 2050 update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation: We recommend that PSRC expand its list of implementation actions in the draft update to match the plan's bold vision. This update is an opportunity for PSRC to work with its members to scope, prioritize and implement needed actions as part of developing PSRC's regular work program and budget. 	Other / miscellaneous	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286536	7	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate Change: PSRC should work to align plan reduction targets with those of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency and periodically report to PSRC boards on progress being made to integrate climate change strategies. The draft plan acknowledges the role of transportation-related greenhouse gas and other pollutant emissions in climate change but needs next steps. We suggest that PSRC add an implementation action to convene a regular regional forum where state, regional, and local programs can coordinate and exchange information to effectively reduce emissions. 	Climate Change / Air Quality	Board Review	Thank you for your comment. We will bring this to the attention of PSRC's Boards for their consideration.
286536	8	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data development: The plan should describe how the agency will develop a robust work program to expand data development, as well as establish standardized metrics across the region for comparable performance measurement. PSRC should take a lead role in data development to support area transportation planning. Travel patterns for both people and goods are changing rapidly in our region. However, the plan relies on dated information and generalized trending, even as it recognizes the importance of robust analytic data and performance measures to guide and evaluate transportation system use and performance during a time of disruption. 	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	PSRC continually works with our members to develop our budget and work program and will continue to focus on new ways to collect and understand how the transportation system is changing. This will include refinement of regional models, development of new data sets, and a continuous household travel survey to provide information about how travel behavior changes over time.
286536	9	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Strategy: We recommend that PSRC include specific implementation actions to advance transportation financing options and monitor actual outcomes. The draft plan shows a notable shift in long-term finance strategy from regional tolling to a spectrum of user charges, and we commend PSRC for making a real effort to better quantify transportation needs and update the regional strategy. However, there are no details that describe next steps to secure proposed funding and track the long-term actual versus planned revenues. 	Financial Strategy / Funding	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. General implementation steps to advance the plan's financial strategy are contained on p.87, and in more detail in Appendix P, Financial Strategy Background, p. 28
286536	10	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology: The plan should promote a culture of innovation across existing regional modal/technical disciplines through educational outreach and information-exchange forums. The plan elevates the role of technology to a stand-alone category of future PSRC work as it describes the potential for, and issues around, the use of technology to address transportation needs. However, technology is a means toward better transportation system performance, rather than an end in itself. A separate standing committee exclusively for technology risks creating a silo that fails to connect technology investments with practical system outcomes. 	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286536	11	City of Seattle, Goran Sparrman	City of Seattle	As our region’s metropolitan planning organization, PSRC is uniquely poised to support a robust discussion of Central Puget Sound’s urgent transportation needs, and to promote coordinated and innovative strategies to meet them. We look forward to being an engaged partner with you and our fellow members to fulfill the vision of Transportation 2040.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286540	1	Sound Transit, Peter M Rogoff	Sound Transit	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). I'd like to congratulate you on developing a well-crafted plan that guides future transportation investments in support of the region's growth strategy, Vision 2040. This important update to Transportation 2040 keeps the region's transportation strategy current by reflecting big strides the region has made addressing challenges in recent years while preparing for those yet to come. On behalf of Sound Transit, I'd like to make a few observations about the main strategies and priorities of the Draft RTP for your consideration as you work toward a final plan this spring.	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286540	2	Sound Transit, Peter M Rogoff	Sound Transit	Local roadway and transit improvements: Along with the major investments the State of Washington is making in the Puget Sound highway system, Sound Transit's continued expansion of the regional high capacity transit system is a linchpin to realizing the region's growth vision. But these are by no means the region's only transportation priorities. I am heartened to see the RTP's emphasis on bolstering our local transit and road systems that are so crucial to providing transportation capacity and choice for all travelers.	Congestion	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286540	3	Sound Transit, Peter M Rogoff	Sound Transit	HOV lane performance: Improving and maintaining speed and reliability in the region's high-occupancy vehicle lanes is critical to keeping bus services fast and predictable for riders. Indeed, Sound Transit's forthcoming investment in bus rapid transit in the I-405 corridor is predicated on having HOV lanes that continue to provide a travel time advantage for transit. Bus rapid transit will only be successful if we can keep the HOV lanes flowing freely.	Multi-modal	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286540	4	Sound Transit, Peter M Rogoff	Sound Transit	Transit system integration: Continued work by all of the region's transit agencies to coordinate and integrate each other's services and facilities is crucial to providing seamless travel options for our residents, workers and visitors. Sound Transit is committed to working with our transit partners and the PSRC to do even better as the transit system and ridership continues to grow.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286540	5	Sound Transit, Peter M Rogoff	Sound Transit	Building transit communities: With major pieces of the high capacity transit system now in place and a range of expansions underway, now is the time to direct more energy toward realizing the land use goals those investments are intended to support. The fast and reliable transportation available at high capacity transit stations provides unique opportunities to efficiently serve more people with less land. Sound Transit is committed to helping our station host communities leverage those opportunities wherever possible. Building the regional high capacity system sometimes results in land that can be repurposed after construction is complete, or opportunities for integrated development with our stations. Through our transit-oriented development program, we have put new emphasis on using those assets for good land use and housing affordability outcomes and will continue to work with our host communities to develop investments that fit with local and regional goals.	Growth Management / Vision 2040	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. See Chapter 1, pp.9-12, Transit-Oriented Communities, for a discussion of the importance of TOD to implementation of the region's growth strategy.
286540	6	Sound Transit, Peter M Rogoff	Sound Transit	Improving I-5 operation: We know the demands on I-5 far outstrip its ability to serve all users efficiently and reliably. Sound Transit's current and planned investments in express bus and light rail service along I-5 provide important transportation capacity and travel choices that augment and support investments in the interstate. We fully support efforts to optimize the ability of this key transportation lifeline to move people and goods.	Transit	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286540	7	Sound Transit, Peter M Rogoff	Sound Transit	Technological change and innovation: The RTP does a nice job of balancing technological investment priorities. We agree that additional investment in technologies we already know are helpful to optimizing transit effectiveness -- like high occupancy vehicle and business access & transit lanes, transit signal priority, and hard-shoulder running -- should be pursued. We also agree that investing in new and emerging travel options, such as automated and connected vehicles, accommodations for share mobility services, and electrifying vehicle fleets needs to be prioritized so we can be ready for the future. Sound Transit is keenly interested in how these investments evolve and looks forward to working with PSRC and others to make them real.	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286541	1	NW Seaport Alliance	NW Seaport Alliance	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on PSRC’s Transportation 2040 Update. The Northwest Seaport Alliance (alliance) is a port development authority governed by the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma. The alliance unifies management of the Ports’ marine cargo facilities and businesses to strengthen the Puget Sound gateway and attract more marine cargo and jobs to the region. In 2013, facilities now managed by the alliance generated 48,000 jobs and \$4.3 billion in economic impact by moving \$73 billion in international trade through its facilities. This activity generates \$379 million in state and local revenue every year.</p> <p>We appreciate your staff’s efforts in developing the draft update. We hope the final product will be a plan that will provide a solid basis for future efforts to maintain and improve our region’s transportation network so that it can meet the needs of a growing economy and dynamic global trade, and support a high quality of life, healthy environment and social justice. A well-functioning and well-maintained multimodal transportation system that supports the efficient, reliable and cost-effective movement of freight is also critical to the success of our region.</p> <p>We offer the following comments both in response to the draft update, and to provide initial input into the scoping effort for Transportation 2050. The following includes recommendations for implementation actions related to freight mobility, which, combined with those from other reviewers, may warrant a freight-specific implementation section:</p>	General support for plan	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286541	2	NW Seaport Alliance	NW Seaport Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic growth: NWSA greatly appreciates the inclusion of our region’s economic strategy goal to “compete globally,” and the reference to strategies that are designed to support industrial lands, maritime sites, trade and logistics infrastructure, and freight mobility. Ensuring that freight can reach our facilities is critical to our success. For that reason, we would encourage PSRC to use, and further develop existing land use and transportation planning tools to ensure that both PSRC’s land use planning and transportation program development protect, preserve and improve existing maritime, rail and truck infrastructure, especially in the region’s MICs, and along the corridors that provide access to these areas. <p>Freight mobility is essential to the overall economy and quality of life of the region. Appendix J (Regional Freight and Goods Movement) quotes WSDOT’s Freight System Plan, indicating that “up to 80% of all truck trips in metropolitan areas are generated by deliveries of goods and services in the regional and local distribution system.1”. Figure 12 shows that between 2016 and 2040, truck tonnage is expected to increase by 56%, far outpacing both employment (40%) and population (26%) growth. Annual tons per capita are forecast to increase 27 percent from 55 in 2010 to 70 in 2040.3</p> <p>This issue is entirely missing from the list of key issues identified at the end of Appendix J, yet the region’s success in addressing it will affect every resident and business in the region, every day. The update should highlight the need to address this reality, and set the stage for a more robust and visible approach to addressing freight needs in Transportation 2050.</p>	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286541	3	NW Seaport Alliance	NW Seaport Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance and preservation: We agree that maintaining and preserving the existing transportation system should be a high priority for the region. We encourage you to include consideration of maintenance and preservation of the functionality of the system in making decisions. This should include preserving the capacity of existing (and future) freight transportation system, as well as those corridors that are critical in ensuring the system provides sufficient resiliency in case of a large incident like an earthquake. Seattle’s approach in defining its truck street system, described in the Freight Master Plan, could serve as an example. 	Maintenance and Preservation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286541	4	NW Seaport Alliance	NW Seaport Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety: Safety is our highest priority. We appreciate that the draft update is focused on the most vulnerable transportation system users, pedestrians and bicyclists. As large trucks and other freight vehicles potentially pose particular dangers to non-motorized, and other system users, we encourage you to incorporate road/rail/terminal safety and freight operation conflict resolution needs in PSRC’s safety programs. New approaches to ensuring the safety of all users while maintaining their functionality for freight and transit, like Seattle’s Complete Corridor (rather than Streets) Program, can help achieve these goals. 	Safety	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286541	5	NW Seaport Alliance	NW Seaport Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Innovation: Technological innovation in connected and autonomous vehicles, shared mobility solutions, and ITS enhancements will greatly enhance our region’s ability to manage ever increasing demand for scarce transportation infrastructure. This is true for both the movement of people and goods. Unfortunately, the innovation section in the plan update is exclusively focused on the movement of people. Yet, connected vehicle technology, efforts such as FHWA’s Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems (FRATIS) program, implementation of block-chaining technology in logistics, and extending signal priority to trucks along major freight corridors are viable solutions to improving freight mobility. Implementation of freight supportive technologies like these should be supported by both the 2040 update and Transportation 2050. 	Emerging Technologies	General Comment	Appendix N contains more detailed information on technology, including those related to freight.
286541	6	NW Seaport Alliance	NW Seaport Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional integrated freight network: Appendix J, and in particular Figure 24, provide a good overview of the major freight facilities in the region. This includes marine- and airports, all rail facilities (including yards and related lead tracks,) and pipelines in addition to T-1 and T-2 truck corridors. However, not all jurisdictions consistently and thoroughly report data on truck volumes on major truck corridors to WSDOT, and there is comparatively little coordinated effort to ensure that jurisdictions along truck freight corridors maintain continuity. The system map also does not yet include designated over-legal routes, or heavy haul routes important to the ports, and the regional economy. A more robust regional freight network must be supported by project selection criteria that maintain and improve the functionality of the existing system while providing investment in strategic system expansion. 	Freight / Rail	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286541	7	NW Seaport Alliance	NW Seaport Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data and analytics: Appendix J, while providing a wealth of data from federal and state sources, clearly shows that PSRC is currently lacking detailed data, modeling, and analysis tools to determine local and regional freight activity, performance, and needs. We strongly encourage PSRC to prepare for a more robust freight data collection and analysis approach that provides quantitative information on the corridors critical to freight. This effort should support the development of a more robust freight plan, similar to the approach taken by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG,) in Transportation 2050. <p>In summary, we hope the Transportation 2040 update will set the stage for Transportation 2050, to develop, and implement, a regional freight strategy, covering all modes, to:</p> <p>Improve data collection and analysis, design, operations, safety to increase the resiliency and strategic capacity of the region’s freight system.</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the draft update. We look forward to working with your staff as PSRC begins to embark in a more robust Transportation 2050 plan update. Please do not hesitate to contact Christine Wolf on our staff, at 253-888-4414 or by e-mail at cwolf@nwseaportalliance.com, with any questions or concerns.</p>	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.
286542	1	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>Dear Kelly McGourty:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Puget Sound Regional Council draft Transportation Plan. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the Transportation Plan and has the following comments:</p> <p>WATER QUALITY PROGRAM:</p> <p>The plan doesn’t articulate actions to operationalize any of these Water Quality (WQ) policies. Overall, though, the plan offers an ambitious vision for reducing vehicle miles traveled and reducing other pressures on and from the transportation system that contribute to water quality problems. It promotes environmentally sensitive land use and development approaches and aims to minimize sprawl and preserve/enhance open spaces; the population growth centers envisioned by the plan are all within current UGA boundaries.</p> <p>From our program’s perspective, this type of planning is needed to address many aspects (transportation related and beyond) of the stormwater problem appropriately and meaningfully at a regional level.</p> <p>A couple other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan also highlights the backlog in maintenance activities, but does not mention the water quality benefit of these activities (or costs of not doing them). • The plan aims to reduce reliance on the general fund which could stabilize funding for many other state government agencies and functions. 	Water Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286542	2	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>AIR QUALITY PROGRAM – CLIMATE POLICY:</p> <p>Climate Mitigation</p> <p>On page 20 of the Plan Document, it states that the ‘Plan results in 24% reduction in GHG emissions from 2006 levels.” A suggestion is to add more clarity for the layperson reading this document; in other words,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide the 2006 baseline value• Explain the source (s) of GHG emissions i.e. all vehicles? Light-duty only? <p>On page 21 it states that to achieve even greater emissions reductions, the Four Part Strategy could be pursued that could potentially reduce emissions an additional 30 to 50% below 2006 values by 2040.</p> <p>Without actual data, this is quite confusing. Does this mean in addition to the 24% originally stated on page 20?</p> <p>For more information, one is directed to Appendix E which again provides a forecasted GHG reduction of 24% below 2006 levels by 2040 based on current RTP (regional transportation plan) policies, but then on page 5, suggests more aggressive actions could have the potential to reduce emissions 52-75% below 2006 levels. This statement does suggest additive emissions reductions. One is then directed to Appendix R, for a review of modeling tools but little information can be gleaned from this Appendix. Again clarity in the Plan Document would be useful and may be accomplished with a simple data table.</p> <p>Appendix E might also consider including the goals in HB 2294 of the Paris Climate Agreement, that is, if the Bill moves forward and timing of the PSRC document allows.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	Technical Correction	We concur that additional clarification would be useful in this section, and will work to provide that for the final document.
286542	3	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>On page 2 of Appendix E is an interesting Text Box with limited information on Vehicle Miles Traveled Reductions. Is the performance measure, VMT / capita, a proxy for driving alone?</p> <p>There is no discussion of this Text Box within body of Appendix E and one is directed to Appendix K, the Systems Performance Report where there is an array of data offered on page 15 - Figure 10 / 11 and Text Box. Again there is very little mention of VMT per capita in the Plan Document itself and only the Text Box presented in Appendix E on climate Analysis.</p> <p>Also are there any thoughts on aligning the PSRC transportation metrics with Results Washington or vice versa?</p>	Analysis Tools and Documentation	General Comment	The documentation provides information on how the regional transportation plan is consistent with the trends indicated from the statewide VMT per capita benchmarks. Elsewhere in the document per capita and total metrics are provided for a variety of measures.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286542	4	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>The Executive Summary has a brief statement on climate adaptation “...addressing transportation’s role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to climate change”</p> <p>This is the only time the concept of adaptation is mentioned....subsequent comments in the Plan Document and Appendices discuss resilience, which assumes the layperson understands the relationship between adaption and resilience. On page 30 of the Plan Document, there is a discussion on resilience where it is stated that there is a working partnership with Central Puget Sound Climate Preparedness Collaborative, “to foster collaboration and leverage opportunities to ensure the region is prepared and economically resilient in the face of climate-related impacts.”</p> <p>The Plan Document refers one to Appendix O for more information on resiliency efforts. The discussion on page 5 on the impacts of climate change, including a discussion of potential effects on transportation infrastructure, would be informative in the ES or Plan Document.</p> <p>Despite all the various climate adaptation initiatives listed in Appendix O, the Plan Document only references Central Puget Sound Climate Preparedness Collaborative which curiously has only a brief mention in this Appendix (page 11) where no link is provided in order to access more information yet it is suggested that this initiative will be, “valuable as a forum for information, knowledge exchange, partnerships and regional coordination to facilitate resilience across a wide range of sectors”</p> <p>For public understanding and participation in climate adaptation the Transportation plan could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explain the relationship between climate adaptation and resilience• More thoroughly develop information on climate adaptation within the ES or Plan Document• Offer public participatory information on the Central Puget Sound Climate Preparedness Collaborative	Climate Change / Air Quality	Technical Correction	Thank you for your comments. Where feasible, we will provide additional clarifying language in the final document.
286542	5	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>AIR QUALITY PROGRAM:</p> <p>Transportation planning has significant implications for air quality including regional impacts as well as local and personal exposure. We recognize and appreciate the PSRC’s commitment to incorporate healthy air goals into the long-range transportation planning and collaborate with state, local, and federal partners to ensure best air quality outcomes. We hope our comments and observations provided below facilitate achieving healthier air for all commuters and residents in the four-county region as well as down-wind.</p> <p>Appendix D, “Regional Air Quality Conformity Analysis”.</p> <p>The RTP approach to measuring air quality impacts and compliance has been historically through reliance on the federal requirement known as “transportation conformity”. In</p> <p>Appendix D, PSRC has done an outstanding job outlining the purpose of the transportation conformity requirement. Appendix D provides an excellent review of the work PSRC accomplished in calculating total transportation-related emissions and comparing them to the emission budgets Ecology allocated for areas that at one time or another violated one of the federal ambient air quality standards.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We appreciate the Washington State Department of Ecology's partnership and collaboration on our air quality work.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286542	6	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>Appendix D, p. 2:</p> <p>There are a few outdated references to Tacoma PM2.5 nonattainment area that has been redesignated to attainment in Appendix D. Suggested revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the language in bold: “In 2009, EPA designated parts of Tacoma-Pierce County as nonattainment for PM2.5. • The name of the maintenance area was changed from Wapato Hill-Puyallup River Valley to Tacoma-Pierce County. • Revise reference to Tacoma nonattainment area and change to maintenance area “Within the Puget Sound region, there is currently a PM2.5 maintenance area...” • Revise references to “Clean Air Washington Act” to the “state Clean Air Act” • You may want to consider a reference to Ecology’s interactive map showing maintenance area boundaries online at https://arcg.is/1G84Sj and update the map in Figure 1 using Ecology layers. • Consider including links to maintenance plans: Seattle Kent Tacoma 2nd 10 year PM10 maintenance plan Tacoma-Pierce County PM2.5 Maintenance Plan. 	Climate Change / Air Quality	Technical Correction	Thank you for these notations. We will work to provide additional clarity and revise any outdated references in the final document.
286542	7	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>Appendix A, p. 9-10 and in the main document, p7-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest clarifying that the MVEBs are for the Tacoma-Pierce County PM2.5 maintenance area, in pounds per winter day, using MOVES 2010b instead of 2014. <p>At the bottom of p. 19 of the main document, there is a reference to exceedances of the federal ambient air quality standards: “At various points in the past, the region had exceeded the federal standards for several pollutants, but PSRC has worked closely with the region’s air quality consultation partner agencies...” An exceedance of the standard means any time the monitored values are above the established limit, for any reason including natural exceptional events. A violation of the standard means the rate of exceedances over a three-year period is such that that area is not complying with the standard. In other words, an exceedance does not always lead to violations of the standard and regulatory actions. The statement in the document is unclear as to whether it refers to “violations” or “exceedances”. As the region continues to experience exceedances, the statement needs to be corrected for accuracy.</p> <p>The transportation conformity determination is important for fulfilling federal obligations under the Clean Air Act. However, it may have a limited capacity in addressing emerging air quality concerns related to the long-term transportation planning. Our comments below focus on current air quality challenges facing the region as well as proposing to consider developing a new health/ air quality metric(s) that focuses on reductions in commuters’ exposure to transportation-related air pollutants.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	Technical Correction	Thank you for these notations. We will work to provide additional clarity and revise any outdated references in the final document.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286542	8	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>Ozone and Regional Haze</p> <p>The plan notes air quality considerations and criteria pollutants on p. 19 of the main document and on p. 5 in Appendix K “System Performance Report”, where it provides a graphic showing dramatic decline in ambient air pollutants anticipated by 2025 and continuing decline between 2025 and 2040. While the improvements in transportation-related emissions show positive trends, the trends in monitored levels of ozone and visibility impairment in protected wilderness areas due to regional haze have yet to catch up.</p> <p>We suggest the plan include discussions about challenges related to how transportation emissions contribute to formation of ozone and regional haze in the region. All partners and the public need to share the understanding that we need to do more to address ozone and regional haze.</p> <p>Ozone (O3): Interstate highway 5 (I-5) corridor and urban transportation-related emissions are a significant contributing factor in formation of ground-level ozone in central Puget Sound region. While the region maintains attainment, the levels of ozone have been balancing fairly close to the federal standard levels (see Figure 1. Puget Sound Region Ozone Design Values, 2000 - 2017.) State and local air quality agencies expressed concerns over the ozone trends and the risk of nonattainment as well as the role the transportation-related emissions play in the ozone formation. One of the challenges is possible increase in background concentrations of precursors coming from outside the area, contributing to increased ozone formation, and canceling out reductions due to technology and fuels.</p> <p>We suggest that PSRC include a discussion in the plan of proactive approach to monitoring and mitigating transportation-related activities contributing to ozone formation. For example, PSRC may want to consider planning for commuters’ awareness campaign during high ozone days. Other strategies can be found through EPA’s Ozone Advance program.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment. We agree that ozone and regional haze are important considerations in the region. PSRC has a limited role in the monitoring, analysis and enforcement of these issues, but will continue to work with our regional air quality partner agencies on ways to improve our planning documents and how we can continue to provide assistance.</p>
286542	9	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>Appendix D, p. 2:</p> <p>Suggest adding language in bold: “The region is currently designated as Unclassifiable/Attainment for the 8-hour ground-level ozone standard EPA issued in 2015.” You may want to clarify that current ozone levels from 2015 – 2017 exceed the standard, partly due to wildfire smoke in 2017.</p> <p>Figure 1. Puget Sound Region Ozone Design Values, 2000 - 2017.</p> <p>Regional haze: The Pacific Northwest is the home to several Class I wilderness areas that have visibility protections. The Interagency Monitoring of PROtected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) program has been developed to study the components of visibility degradation in Class I wilderness areas. The federal Clean Air Act also established the Regional Haze program aiming at preserving natural visibility conditions in our beloved wilderness areas. Transportation-related pollution from central Puget Sound region plays a noticeable role in visibility degradation in several Class I areas.</p> <p>We suggest the plan include some discussion of regional haze as part of air quality metrics used to measure improvements from transportation planning decisions. Ecology is required to develop a 10-year plan, due to EPA in 2021, demonstrating improvements in visibility. PSRC’s involvement in identifying transportation planning strategies to facilitate visibility improvement in the next planning period is welcomed and encouraged.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment. We agree that ozone and regional haze are important considerations in the region. PSRC has a limited role in the monitoring, analysis and enforcement of these issues, but will continue to work with our regional air quality partner agencies on ways to improve our planning documents and how we can continue to provide assistance.</p>

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286542	10	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>Additional Health and Air Quality Considerations.</p> <p>On p. 23 of the main document, the plan highlights the health implications related to physical inactivity from people spending a lot of time in the car. The plan makes it a priority to promote “programs and investments that provide alternatives to driving, especially to improve the walkability and bikability of the region’s communities.”</p> <p>While many studies have found that physical activity benefits outweigh possible adverse health effects from exposure to unhealthy air¹, those studies often measured exposure to ambient concentrations recorded away from heavy traffic. Newer studies focusing on commuter exposure to traffic-related air pollution find significant health impacts including heightened risk for developing cardiovascular disease, obesity, and type 2 diabetes^{2,3,4} and that active commuters receive a greater PM_{2.5} dose and have higher rates of exposure than commuters using cars or public transportation.</p> <p>In the light of these findings, we suggest PSRC consider expanding the RTP’s air quality section to incorporate strategies to minimize commuters’ personal exposure to traffic-related pollutants. The concept of transportation conformity, while extremely important, may not be the best tool to monitor and improve health outcomes for commuters. The PSRC is in an excellent position to consider alternatives that minimize the risk of air pollution and noise exposure for active- and public-transport commuters⁵.</p> <p>Information on healthier routes, including levels of traffic-related pollution, may help the public to make informed choices especially if they have predisposing health conditions and are at increased risk from air pollution impacts.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. We will continue to work with our regional air quality partner agencies to address issues of concern and improve our analytical and planning efforts into the future.
286542	11	Washington State Department of Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology	<p>Ecology’s Air Quality Program staff are available to answer questions regarding our comments and provide additional review of the updated language related to criteria pollutants and transportation conformity in the plan. We are also available to brainstorm ways to incorporate air quality and transportation improvement strategies that may not be addressed by the federal Clean Air Act requirements as they were last updated in 1990.</p> <p>1 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4893018/ Preventative Medicine. 2016 Jun; 87: 233–236. Can air pollution negate the health benefits of cycling and walking? Marko Tainio,a, Audrey J. de Nazelle, Thomas Götschi, Sonja Kahlmeier, David Rojas-Rueda, Mark J. Nieuwenhuijsen, Thiago Hérick de Sá, Paul Kelly, and James Woodcocka.</p> <p>2 https://doi.org/10.2337/db16-1416 Diabetes 2017 Jan. Longitudinal Associations Between Ambient Air-Cell Function, and Adiposity in Los Angeles Latino Children. Tanya L. Alderete, Rima Habre, Claudia M. Toledo-Corral, Kiros Berhane, Zhanghua Chen, Frederick W. Lurmann, Marc J. Weigensberg, Michael I. Goran and Frank D. Gilliland.</p> <p>3 http://www.fasebj.org/doi/pdf/10.1096/fj.201500142 Journal of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB), March 2016. Chronic Exposure to Air Pollution Particles Increases the Risk of Obesity and Metabolic Syndrome: Findings from a Natural Experiment in Beijing. Yongjie Wei, Junfeng (Jim) Zhang, Zhigang Li, Andrew Gow, Kian Fan Chung, Min Hu, Zhongsheng Sun, Limin Zeng, Tong Zhu, Guang Jia, Xiaoqian Li, Marlyn Duarte, Xiaoyan Tang.</p> <p>4 http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa040203 Peters A, von Klot S, Heier M, Trentinaglia I, Hrmann A, et al. 2004. Exposure to traffic and the onset of myocardial infarction. New Engl J Med 351(17): 1721-1730</p> <p>5 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28088011 Environmental Research. 2017 Apr;154:181-189. Particulates and noise exposure during bicycle, bus and car commuting: A study in three European cities. Okokon EO1, Yli-Tuomi T2, Turunen AW3, Taimisto P4, Pennanen A5, Vouitsis I6, Samaras Z7, Voogt M8, Keuken M9, Lanki T10.</p>	Climate Change / Air Quality	General Comment	Thank you for your comment and your willingness to provide assistance on this work moving forward.

RESPONSES TO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENTS							
Communication Id	Comment Number	Contacts	Related Organization(s)	CommentText	Comment Categories	Comment Tag	Response
286543	1	City of SeaTac, Joseph Scorcio	City of SeaTac	<p>The City of SeaTac appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Puget Sound Regional Council 2040 Draft Regional Transportation Plan. SeaTac recognizes that planning for and providing a reliable and sustainable transportation system for our rapidly growing region is vital for our continued economic prosperity and quality of life.</p> <p>SeaTac's primary concern with respect to regional transportation planning is focused on the regional aviation system and planning for future airport system needs. Continued record growth year after year at Sea-Tac International Airport is a clear indicator that planning for a second regional airport should not only be a priority, but should already be aggressively underway. By the mid 2020's, both the State Route 509 completion project and Sound Transit Light Rail project will further accelerate the already rapid growth seen at the Airport. Additionally, the Airport will be releasing its Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) later this year, and preliminary indications are that the plan will seek to maximize aviation capacity at Sea-Tac International Airport.</p>	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning.
286543	2	City of SeaTac, Joseph Scorcio	City of SeaTac	<p>While SeaTac and other communities surrounding the Airport benefit economically from its growth, the corresponding environmental and health impacts, many of which we are still working to clearly understand, are also growing. SeaTac is concerned that these airport related impacts will begin to outweigh the benefits sooner rather than later and that given the regional policies and triggers outlined in the Draft Plan, will not provide relief (in the form of a new regional airport) soon enough.</p>	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning.
286543	3	City of SeaTac, Joseph Scorcio	City of SeaTac	<p>If it is the intent of the 2040 Draft Regional Transportation Plan to be proactive towards our region 's future transportation needs, then we should not wait any longer to begin the process for selecting and developing a second regional airport. We must act now to identify and plan for the "relief valve" well before it is needed. PSRC together with the State should begin the planning process in earnest.</p>	Aviation	General Comment	Thank you for your comment. At the direction of PSRC's Executive Board, PSRC will lead a new regional aviation baseline study in 2018-2019 that will build on master planning processes underway at many of the region's airports, and set a regional stage for future planning.