



## PUBLIC COMMENT TRACKER

The public comment period for the draft Skagit 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (Skagit 2045 or Plan) occurred from January 22 through February 5, 2021. After the public comment period closed, comments received were placed into the Public Comment Tracker: a disposition of comments used to respond to each comment and provide suggested Skagit 2045 revisions based on timely public comments received. The Public Comment Tracker identifies commenters by name, affiliation if any, and provides verbatim comments as received.

Skagit Council of Governments (SCOG) staff responses correspond to each of the comments, and suggested Plan revisions with associated page numbers are included in the Public Comment Tracker. Page numbers referenced from Skagit 2045 are from the draft Plan and may not correspond with page numbers in the final document.

Public comments were submitted by ten commenters during the public comment period. Comments received were from the following people, in the order received by SCOG:

1. Name: Brian Dempsey, on behalf of City of Burlington<sup>1</sup>  
Comment #: 1  
Page #: 3
2. Name: Forrest Jones, on behalf of Skagit County  
Comment #: 2  
Page #: 3
3. Name: George Edmunson  
Comment #: 3  
Page #: 3
4. Name: Emmett Richards  
Comment #: 4-8  
Page #: 3-5
5. Name: Elizabeth Sjostrom, on behalf of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)  
Comment #: 9-10  
Page #: 5
6. Name: Terri Wilde  
Comment #: 11-14  
Page #: 6
7. Name: John Shambaugh, on behalf of WSDOT  
Comment #: 15-36  
Page #: 6-17

---

<sup>1</sup> Comment submitted prior to public comment period beginning. Receipt confirmed by SCOG staff during comment period.

8. Name: Cliff Hall, on behalf of WSDOT  
Comment #: 37-43  
Page #: 17-19
9. Name: Heather Rogerson, on behalf of the Port of Skagit  
Comment #: 44-49  
Page #: 19-22
10. Name: Amanda Warner Thorpe, on behalf of the U.S. Forest Service  
Comment #: 50  
Page #: 23

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
1	Brian Dempsey	Could you bump up the cost for our bridge project to \$20 million?	<p>Skagit 2045 identifies the cost of the Railroad Overpass Project as \$15 million, which is consistent with the draft Burlington Comprehensive Plan and adopted Transportation Improvement Program.</p> <p>If Burlington revises the cost in the final Comprehensive Plan or Transportation Improvement Program, Skagit 2045 can be amended to reflect this revised project cost.</p>	
2	Forrest Jones	<p>I thought the Regional Transportation Plan looked good.</p> <p>I did see you have the Guemes Ferry Terminal Modifications (Electric Ferry) but not the Guemes Ferry Electric Shore-Side Facilities project where we were recently awarded a ETS Grant for \$989,521.24 that will require a 1 to 1 match.</p>	The Guemes Ferry Electric Shore-Side Facilities project was mistakenly omitted from Exhibit 5-7 Funded Projects (Fiscally Constrained) due to an error in the database used to create project tables in Skagit 2045. This error has been fixed, and the project cost has been updated to include the award Mr. Jones cites.	Revise Exhibit 5-7 to include Guemes Ferry Electric Shore-Side Facilities project and update project cost as suggested by Mr. Jones.
3	George Edmunson	I agree with Gary Haglands comment this is a terrible plan, it purpose is to control free people	Comment noted.	
4	Emmett Richards	I saw in the Skagit Valley Herald that public comments for Skagit 2045 can be sent to your e-mail address. We moved to the La Conner area about 9 years ago from Kennewick Washington where we lived most of our adult lives.	Comment noted.	
5	Emmett Richards	I'm impressed with the road networks in Skagit County and I continue to be pleasantly surprised how well, even some of the most remote roads, are maintained. Even more impressive is that the County seems to be able to do this without raising taxes as most of our other counties and the State does. We seem to combine a	Comment noted.	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		sane level of non-vehicle traffic (bikes and walkers in some cases) with that of vehicle transportation.		
6	Emmett Richards	We also have not bought into, at least yet, use of rail for mass transit. Busses seem to be effectively used in our County and serve the needs of our citizens. So continuing with a solid and sound transportation network is something that I encourage. Especially with the expectation that driverless vehicles seem to be coming faster than I like, but in reality will make much of our transportation challenges much easier. More people will get rid of at least some of their vehicles; accidents and insurance costs will decline, the need for additional roads will decline, and the cost of maintenance will decline.	Autonomous vehicles (“driverless vehicles”) are not a focus of Skagit 2045, but may be in future plan updates.	
7	Emmett Richards	Use of electric vehicles may present a challenge since we are cutting back on fossil fuel, not just vehicles but powerplants, so I’m not convinced we will have enough electricity, certainly cost effective electricity, to accommodate the projections for electric vehicles, but that is for someone else to figure out.	<p>Electrification of passenger vehicles is not a focus of Skagit 2045.</p> <p>Electrification of ferry vessels and shore-side facilities is included within Skagit 2045, through projects of Skagit County and the Washington State Department of Transportation.</p> <p>Future plan updates may focus on electrification of passenger vehicles.</p>	
8	Emmett Richards	To end my e-mail, keep up the good work in maintaining County road networks, don’t spend a lot of money on bike lanes or any on light rail systems, and try to cope with a growing regional populations.	Maintenance and preservation of the existing transportation system is a focus of Skagit 2045.	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		Good luck and thank you for your time.		
9	Elizabeth Sjostrom	<p>Ms. Sjostrom proposed a proposed revision to Fish Passages appendix from Chris Damitio with the Washington State Department of Transportation:</p> <p>“In the Skagit region, three of these injunction barriers have been corrected, and 50 remain to be corrected by 2030. The remaining barriers can be corrected at the end of their useful life.”</p>	Additional information is presented in Comment #10 regarding this proposed revision.	
10	Elizabeth Sjostrom	<p>Ms. Sjostrom provided additional information from Chris Damitio:</p> <p>“There are indeed 88 injunction sites in Skagit County. The injunction though doesn’t note we need to fix ‘xx’ number of culverts by 2030 but says we need to open 90% of the habitat by 2030.</p> <p>Habitat is measured in the number of meters we can create access too. Statewide we have determined that if we address all culverts that open up at least 900m of habitat then that will allow us to attain the 90% goal.</p> <p>So while there are 88 sites in Skagit County, only about 50 open +900m of habitat and thus need to be addressed by 2030. The remaining ~40 can be addressed at the end of their useful life.”</p>	Revisions are proposed to Appendix I: Fish Passages based on input received.	<p>Include the following revisions in Appendix I: Fish Passages:</p> <p>“Fish-passage barriers subject to the federal injunction are included on the following map. In the Skagit region, three of these injunction barriers have been corrected, and <del>88</del> <u>WSDOT estimates that 50</u> remain to be corrected by 2030. <u>Correction of these 50 barriers should open 90% of habitat blocked by fish-passage barriers, consistent with the federal injunction. Additional barriers to fish passage can be corrected at the end of their useful life.</u> The map displays expected habitat gain for some barriers, and also <del>indicated-indicates</del> which barriers are in the planning or design phases as of December 2020. Prioritization of these barriers may change between 2021 and 2030, as WSDOT continues to correct these barriers to passage of salmon and steelhead in the Skagit region.”</p>

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
11	Terri Wilde	A bike route up Highway 9 would be awesome!!	<p>Centennial Trail (Big Rock to Clear Lake) is a project partially funded in Skagit 2045, and would construct a portion of this trail in the Skagit region.</p> <p>A corridor study, referred to as the “Bicycle Route 13 (Centennial Trail Corridor Study)” is included in Skagit 2045 as a planned project, with a 10-foot wide trail envisioned, mostly along State Route 9, from Snohomish County to Whatcom County borders.</p>	
12	Terri Wilde	I like the bike trail up 20 too!	Another corridor study, referred to as the “US Bicycle Route 10 (Coast to Cascades Trail) Corridor Study”, includes an east-west multimodal corridor utilizing State Route 20 and other roadways. This corridor study is a planned project in Skagit 2045.	
13	Terri Wilde	I live with a person who would commute weekly from Concrete to Bellingham by bike if there was a way to do so safely.	Comment noted.	
14	Terri Wilde	Enhanced bus service upvalley is appreciated too.	Though no project is included in Skagit 2045 specifically increasing Skagit Transit service in the east Skagit region, there are two fleet expansion projects included as planned projects.	
15	John Shambaugh	Great job on the Skagit 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. The information on the transportation system characteristics and demographics for the County are very interesting. I am including my comments in a excel spreadsheet but you may have to look at the marked up copy of the PDF document to better understand some of the issues. Some of the issues are simple fixes, while others may have to wait for the next plan update.	The PDF document Mr. Shambaugh submitted has been reviewed along with comments included in the Public Comment Tracker.	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
16	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Word spacing</p> <p>Page: 10</p> <p>There are many locations throughout the document where word spacing is non-existent making it difficult to read. This is problematic for visually impaired or other handicapped people.</p> <p>Examples as follows:</p> <p>actions relating to land use and the transportation system affect each other.</p> <p>The safety and security of all individuals who use the regional transportation</p> <p>actions relating to land use and the transportation system affect each other.</p>	Some pages of Skagit 2045 are difficult to read due to how the text is formatted.	Revise text formatting to align left, providing equal spacing between words.
17	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Exhibit 3-4 , 3-5, 3-6</p> <p>Page: 25, 26</p> <p>The font for the graphics is too small, especially in Exhibit 3-6</p>	The exhibits referenced by Mr. Shambaugh include small font sizes.	Revise exhibits 3-4, 3-5 and 3-6 by increasing font sizes.
18	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Text and table are inconsistent</p> <p>Page: 29</p> <p>The written text and table numbers are different. These are small numbers and rounding up can skew the results. Better to use the same number as represented in the table or remove one or the other.</p>	The bullets on Page 29 and Exhibit 3-9 Travel Mode are consistent with each other. Non-motorized trips are indicated as “over 6%” and include walking trips (5.8% in exhibit) and bicycling trips (.6% in exhibit). Additional bullets indicate that transit trips are “under 1%” (0.3% in exhibit) and ferry trips are “under 1%” (0.4% in exhibit). The bullets are intended to summarize the trip percentages in the exhibit, which includes rounding and combining some trip types.	
19	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Transportation Concurrency Requirements</p> <p>Page: 31</p> <p>The concurrency section is confusing. The first and second paragraph say almost the same thing making it hard to follow and confusing. Consider</p>	<p>The concurrency and level-of-service section should be revised to address Mr. Shambaugh’s comment.</p> <p>Per RCW 47.06.140, WSDOT must consult with local governments when setting level-of-service standards on</p>	<p>Revise, under Transportation Concurrency Requirements and Level-of-service Standards heading of Section 3: Relationship to Other Plans, as follows:</p> <p><u>“Under Washington state law, required concurrency outcomes ensure</u></p>

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		<p>combining the paragraphs. In addition, it is my understanding that while WSDOT sets LOS for HSS and ferry this process is completed in consultation with the MPO. I believe this is important to note in the plan because the alignment/partnership between agencies can provide a more effective outcome.</p>	<p>Highways of Statewide Significance.</p>	<p><u>transportation facilities and strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years (RCW 36.70A.070).</u> The purpose of concurrency is to assure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development are adequate to serve the development at the time it is available for occupancy and use, without decreasing service levels below locally established minimums. Concurrency ensures consistency in development approval and that development of adequate public facilities are completed in a timely manner – it also prevents development that is inconsistent with the public facilities necessary to support the development (WAC 365-196-840).</p> <p><del>Under Washington state law, required outcomes are to ensure transportation facilities and strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years (RCW 36.70A.070).</del> Local governments may adjust their transportation level-of-service standards for their local transportation system, which can have a direct impact on concurrency determinations. Consistent with Washington state law, level-of-service standards for the state highway and ferry systems are set by WSDOT for all Highways of Statewide Significance (<u>RCW 47.06.140</u>), and by Skagit 2045 for all other state routes (<u>RCW 47.80.030</u>).</p>



#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
				<p><u>WSDOT establishes level-of-service standards for Highways of Statewide Significance in consultation with local governments, consistent with RCW 47.06.140.</u> Concurrency requirements do not apply to the state highway and ferry system in the Skagit region.”</p>
20	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Regional Policies</p> <p>Page: 38</p> <p>This section describes the Regional Policies and sets forth goals and strategies under each policy, however there is no distinction between what the goal is versus the strategy. Consider removing the reference to "goal". Goals generally set forth the desired outcome where as a strategy or strategies are generally the path taken to implement goal or policy.</p>	<p>As Mr. Shambaugh notes, goals and strategies are not differentiated under each regional policy in Section 4: Transportation Priorities &amp; Policies. Skagit 2045 includes the following description of goals and policies:</p> <p>“Goals are desired future conditions related to the regional transportation system, and strategies are actions that can be taken to help realize these goals.”</p> <p>Restructuring goals and policies is outside of the scope of this update, but could be considered in a future amendment/update to the Plan. Differentiating goals from strategies would make the relationship between policies, goals and strategies clearer.</p>	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
21	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Strategy format for Policy 6</p> <p>Page: 41</p> <p>Of all the six policies identified, Policy 6 strategies use "shall" to reference an action. Generally policy plan use words like encourage, ensure, consider etc.... To identify an action. "Shall" is generally used to frame-up a regulatory action.</p>	<p>The policies referenced by Mr. Shambaugh are the adopted Skagit County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) for transportation. Skagit 2045 includes these policies verbatim in the Plan. Shall verbs are included in the CPPs, which are adopted by the Skagit County Board of Commissioners through a process separate from preparation and approval of Skagit 2045.</p> <p>The CPPs were revised on January 26, 2021, and Skagit 2045 should include revisions to the transportation CPPs adopted in January.</p>	<p>Revise Policy 6 in Section 4: Transportation Priorities &amp; Policies as follows:</p> <p>“6.4 <del>The</del> Transportation <del>Element</del> <u>elements</u> of the Comprehensive Plan<u>s</u> shall be designed to; facilitate the flow of people, goods and services so as to strengthen the local and regional economy; conform with the Land Use Element <del>of the Comprehensive Plan</del>; be based upon an inventory of the existing Skagit County transportation network and needs; and encourage the conservation of energy;</p> <p>6.5 <u>Provisions in</u> Comprehensive Plan<u>s</u> <del>provisions</del> for the location and improvement of existing and future transportation networks and public transportation shall be made in a manner consistent with the goals, policies and land use map of the <u>Comprehensive Plan locally adopted comprehensive plan</u>;</p> <p>6.6 The development of a recreational transportation network shall be encouraged and coordinated between state and local governments and private enterprises;</p> <p>6.7 <del>The Senior Citizen and Handicapped +T</del> <u>transportation system services for seniors and individuals with disabilities</u> shall be provided <del>with an adequate budget by public transportation operators</del> to provide for those who, through age and/or disability, are unable to transport themselves;”</p>
22	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Section 5 Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs</p>	<p>Numerous maps of regional transportation facilities are included in Appendix G and</p>	<p>Include callout box in Regional Transportation Facilities subsection of Section 5:</p>

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		<p>Page: 44</p> <p>This section describe transportation facilities for a variety of modes. Recommend putting in a callout box or something similar that indicates that the transportation facility maps are located in Appendix G. Better yet insert the maps into Section 5. As I was reading the text I found myself wanting to jump to a map so I could better orient myself to the story.</p>	could be highlighted in the Regional Transportation Facilities subsection.	<p>Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs:</p> <p><b><u>“Maps of Existing Transportation Facilities</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Regional transportation facilities are included in a series of maps in Appendix G.”</u></b></p>
23	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Section 5 Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs</p> <p>Page: 44</p> <p>This chapter would benefit from some tables and graphics to depict the transportation network, i.e. traffic volumes, LOS, freight, growth rate, passenger load. Placement of tables and graphic could also benefit the reader by having less to read. Maps, Tables and Graphics can work towards summing up the transportation network in Region much better than text alone.</p>	<p>Section 5: Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs includes many charts, maps and tables.</p> <p>Examples of charts include: Skagit Transit ridership; Amtrak ridership; and comparisons of outputs from modeling scenarios in Skagit 2045.</p> <p>Examples of maps include: maps of modeling scenarios; a map of regional transportation facilities; and maps of funded, planned and illustrative projects.</p> <p>Examples of tables include: project tables for funded, planned and illustrative projects.</p> <p>This section includes a substantial volume of information. SCOG staff have prepared other ways to make this information more readily available – such as providing webmaps on SCOG’s website and project data sheets in Appendix A.</p>	
24	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Strategy identified 1st paragraph, last sentence</p> <p>Page: 46</p> <p>This strategy should be expanded to include making more with what we have. While</p>	Include additional text in Section 5: Transportation Improvements & Programs to address Mr. Shambaugh’s comment.	<p>Revise, under Traffic Volumes heading on Interstate 5 of Section 5: Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs, as follows:</p> <p><b><u>“Improvements on local street networks may</u></b></p>

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		we anticipate that ITS operational improvements will be deployed on the interstate, operational improvements would not be limited to I-5 along. Improvement could occur anywhere on the regional transplantation network as well as local streets and roads. which includes improving the operations of the local network as well as capitalizing on other modes of transportation i.e. transit.		<a href="#"><u>compliment operational improvements on Interstate 5 by better integrating local and state transportation systems. And capitalizing on modes of travel. other than single-occupancy vehicles, may reduce vehicle travel demand on Interstate 5.</u></a>
25	John Shambaugh	Issue: Other Modes Page: 46  I-5 is a barrier to all transportation modes. Generally the interchanges and some of the arterial streets and roads were constructed in the 50's and were not designed to pass all of todays traffic needs (freight, transit and non-motorized) in an efficient manner.	Include additional text in Section 5: Transportation Improvements & Programs to address Mr. Shambaugh's comment.	Revise, under Other Modes heading on Interstate 5 of Section 5: Transportation Improvements & Programs, as follows:  <a href="#"><u>"Interstate 5 presents a barrier to many modes of travel."</u></a>
26	John Shambaugh	Issue: Level of Service Page: 46  Show existing and forecasted LOS and or traffic volumes in a table for all regional transportation facilities in County	Including a table of traffic volumes/level of service for all regional transportation facilities is not recommended due to the shear number of links (roadways) and nodes (intersections) that is modeled in the 2018 baseline scenarios and three 2045 future scenarios.  SCOG staff is considering options, such as webmaps, to make this information more readily available to the public.  A future amendment/update to Skagit 2045 could consider better disseminating level-of-service information by facility in the scope of the project.	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
27	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: ID 53 Cook Road</p> <p>Page: 69</p> <p>Amend project description as follows: "This project will add intersection control to the ramps at the Interstate 5/Cook Road interchange and some limited road widening. A variety of Automated Traffic Management systems will be installed to prevent queuing traffic from spilling back onto the Interstate 5 mainline. This project will go through a practical solutions process with Skagit County."</p>	<p>Revise project description for WSDOT project as Mr. Shambaugh suggests.</p>	<p>Revise project description for I-5 / Cook Road Interchange Improvements project in Section 5: Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs as follows:</p> <p><u>"This project will add intersection control to the ramps at the Interstate 5/Cook Road interchange and some limited road widening. A variety of Automated Traffic Management systems will be installed to prevent queuing traffic from spilling back onto the Interstate 5 mainline. This project will go through a Practical Solutions process with Skagit County."</u></p>
28	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Appendix A ID 53 Cook Road</p> <p>Amend project description in Appendix A for Cook Road project.</p>	<p>Revise project description for WSDOT project as Mr. Shambaugh suggests in applicable Appendix A project sheet.</p>	<p>Include new project description for I-5 / Cook Road Interchange Improvements project in Appendix A as follows:</p> <p><u>"This project will add intersection control to the ramps at the Interstate 5/Cook Road interchange and some limited road widening. A variety of Automated Traffic Management systems will be installed to prevent queuing traffic from spilling back onto the Interstate 5 mainline. This project will go through a Practical Solutions process with Skagit County."</u></p>
29	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: ID 67 project</p> <p>Page: 71</p> <p>Amend the Project #67 description to include "This project requires the coordinated development of Practical Solutions with WSDOT."</p>	<p>Revise project description for Mount Vernon project as Mr. Shambaugh suggests. This project is on State Route 536, a WSDOT facility.</p> <p>Revise applicable Appendix A project sheet as well.</p>	<p>Revise project description for Replacement of Division Street Bridge project in Section 5: Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs and Appendix A as follows:</p> <p><u>"...This project requires <del>coordination</del> the coordinated development of Practical Solutions with WSDOT."</u></p>

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
	John Shambaugh	Issue: ID 59  Page: 71  Amend ID 59 by adding "Mount Vernon" to the last sentence	Revise project description for WSDOT project as Mr. Shambaugh suggests. Remove "Sedro-Woolley" from project description as project is far from Sedro-Woolley jurisdictional boundaries.  Revise applicable Appendix A project sheet as well.	Revise project description for I-5 Active Traffic Management project in Section 5: Transportation Improvements & Programs and Appendix A as follows:  "This project requires coordination with Skagit County, <a href="#">Sedro-Woolley Mount Vernon</a> , and Burlington."
30	John Shambaugh	Issue: Six priority results  Page: 72  Are the six priorities a reference to the Policy's on page 38, or to the State of transportation Policy Goals i.e. economic vitality, stewardship, safety, environment, etc.... A reference is needed in order to know what the purpose is here.	Yes, the six regional priorities are the same six regional priorities from Section 4: Transportation Priorities & Policies.	Revise, under the Evaluating Projects heading of Section 5: Transportation Improvements & Programs, as follows:  "The least-cost planning methodology utilized in Skagit 2045 included the consideration of projects costs, timing, dedicated project funding, and a project-level evaluation using the six regional priorities <a href="#">from Section 4: Transportation Priorities &amp; Policies of the Plan</a> ."
31	John Shambaugh	Issue: LOS peak period  Page: 72  At some point SCOG should consider a policy discussion on capacity and a reasonable LOS threshold to use. Does the model allow calculation on a 2 or 3-hour peak period. A one hour peak is not a reasonable if the goal is to get the most out of the current regional transportation network.	The regional travel demand model documentation is not yet complete, but will be later in 2021. Documentation will include a description of modeling steps and how the p.m. peak period is modeled.  The level-of-service analysis used in Skagit 2045 is based on the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual published by the Transportation Research Board – specifically how level of service is stratified based on volume to capacity ratios. Exhibit 5-14 in the Plan includes the six classes of level of service, color coded from green, yellow, orange to red.  The policy discussion about capacity of the roadway network and the reasonableness of any	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
			level of service is outside of the scope of the Plan update. These policy questions could be considered for a future plan update or amendment to Skagit 2045. The point is well taken that the vast majority of roadway capacity is underutilized at most times, and a p.m. peak hour model shows the regional roadway network during higher levels of congestion than are typically experienced at other times of the day, or other days of the week (e.g. weekday midday, overnight or weekend travel).	
32	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: The plan uses references to streets, roads, highways indiscriminately</p> <p>Page: 72</p> <p>Consider using transportation network rather than streets. Cities generally refer to streets where as counties refer to roads and the state system is referenced as highway.</p>	<p>Skagit 2045 treats roads, roadways and streets as synonyms. Not having a distinction between these terms is intended to convey each as interchangeable. This may not be consistent with how others use these terms, as Mr. Shambaugh describes.</p> <p>As displayed on Exhibit 5-1, the regional transportation system consists of roadways, waterways, ferries, railroads, non-motorized, intermodal facilities and transit facilities.</p>	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
33	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: 2045 Illustrative Scenario</p> <p>Page: 73</p> <p>It would have been interesting to include assumptions about mode shift as well as antonymous vehicles. I suspect two opposing outcomes by 2045. non the less an expanded bridge may not be needed given the technology direction. With the four lane bridge concept was the addition of other bridges across the river considered.</p>	<p>The 2045 scenarios did not consider mode shift nor autonomous vehicles. These factors could be considered for the next Plan update or to an amendment to Skagit 2045.</p> <p>A four-lane bridge over the Skagit River near downtown Mount Vernon was considered in the 2045 Illustrative Scenario. In this scenario, the existing two-lane bridge in the vicinity of the project was assumed to continue to operate. These two bridges were modeled together, along with other nearby bridges over the Skagit River (i.e. Interstate 5 bridge, Riverside-Burlington Boulevard bridge) in the 2045 Illustrative Scenario.</p>	
34	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: SR 536 Bridge</p> <p>Page: 73</p> <p>Was the proposed new bridge for SR 536 considered in this scenario? Does the model reroute traffic when LOS E or F are reached? it does not seem reasonable the local network would remain unchallenged with LOS E or F especially if it last over one hour. Does the model predict how long the peak period would be?</p>	<p>As noted in the previous SCOG staff response, a new four-lane bridge over the Skagit River was considered in the 2045 Illustrative Scenario.</p>	
35	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Skagit 2045 Framework</p> <p>Page: 80</p> <p>Was TDM used in modeling the scenarios?</p>	<p>Transportation demand management measures are not modeled in any of the 2045 scenarios. SCOG's current three-step, p.m. peak period model does not have the capability to conduct this type of modeling.</p>	
36	John Shambaugh	<p>Issue: Environmental constraint map</p> <p>Page: 86</p>	<p>The blending of map colors and transparencies makes Exhibit 6-3 hard to read.</p>	<p>Revise Exhibit 6-3 to improve visual contrast and legibility.</p> <p>Revise all maps in Skagit 2045 to improve visual contrast and legibility.</p>



#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		Colors on the map and legend are confusing with background colors, i.e. green....		
37	Cliff Hall	<p>I reviewed your draft MTP update and find that it meets the regulatory requirements and is well written.</p> <p>I have a few general suggestions and are intended as just that, suggestions. No show stoppers here.</p>	Comment noted.	
38	Cliff Hall	<p>The Section 3 title, "Relationship to Other Plans", is confusing because It begins on page 22 talking about land use, population growth, employment, travel modes etc., and it isn't until pages 30-34 that it discusses "other plans".</p> <p>I suggest creating another Section with a title something like, "Land Use and Demographics".</p>	This comment should be considered with an amendment to Skagit 2045 or with the next Plan update. Section 3: Relationship to Other Plans could be split into two sections better reflecting the content of the section. Much of the content in Section 3 involves land use and regional travel patterns, not well represented by the section title "Relationship to Other Plans".	
39	Cliff Hall	<p>The maps are sometimes confusing. For instance Exhibit 3-3 I can't find in the text. It seems to appear out of nowhere. I know it is about showing the GMAs and SCOG MPA, but others won't know that. Additionally the Section 3 title, Relationship to Other Plans, right above it and the map title, Exhibit 3-3 Urban Growth and Land Use Analysis adds to the confusion.</p> <p>I suggest clarifying why the map is there, either in the text or title. I prefer titles. Then if you are scrolling you can see why the map is there and dig deeper if want more information.</p>	A reference to Exhibit 3-3 should be included in the Section 3: Relationship to Other Plans.	<p>Add the following to the Regional Land Use Growth subsection of Section 3: Relationship to Other Plans:</p> <p><u><a href="#">"Skagit County UGAs are shown in Exhibit 3-3. The exhibit shows the municipal urban growth areas of the four cities (Anacortes, Burlington, Mount Vernon, Sedro-Woolley) and the four towns (Concrete, Hamilton, La Conner, Lyman), as well as the two non-municipal urban growth areas (Bayview Ridge, Swinomish)."</a></u></p>

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
40	Cliff Hall	<p>My comment on Section 5 is similar to Section 3 above. The title to Section 5 is “Transportation Improvements and Programs” but pages 44 through page 59 describe the current state of the system and the Improvements don’t start until pages 59-80.</p> <p>Maybe it could be split into two sections, the first could be titled something like, “Existing Transportation Facilities and Demand”?</p>	<p>This comment should be considered with an amendment to Skagit 2045 or with the next Plan update. Section 5: Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs could be split into two sections better reflecting the content of the section.</p> <p>Section 5 includes descriptions of transportation facilities that compose the regional transportation network. The section title “Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs” best captures the latter part of the section, which lists transportation projects and focuses on travel demand model analyses.</p>	
41	Cliff Hall	<p>What about including a conclusion or recommendations section? It is very difficult to determine what the plan recommends to achieve your stated goals in the long term.</p>	<p>The Executive Summary does include challenges and opportunities facing the Skagit region over the next 25 years.</p> <p>A section with conclusions/recommendations may be considered in an amendment to Skagit 2045 or with the next plan update. Currently, Skagit 2045 includes priorities, projects, strategies and other elements that could be considered “recommendations”. Additional consideration could be provided to what conclusions or recommendations would be highlighted and how they may be grouped or compiled, in addition to what is already presented in the Executive Summary section.</p>	
42	Cliff Hall	<p>There are grammatical and formatting issues throughout. They are fairly minor and I am not including them individually because this is a draft and I’m sure you are working on this already.</p>	<p>Skagit 2045 was reviewed in January and again in February by SCOG staff, including a review of grammatical errors and formatting issues.</p>	<p>Correct formatting issues and any grammatical errors identified in the draft Plan.</p>

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
43	Cliff Hall	Thanks for including the System Performance Report.	Comment noted.	
44	Heather Rogerson	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Skagit 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (the Plan) prepared by the Skagit Council of Governments (SCOG). The Port of Skagit (the Port) recognizes the work that has gone into development of the Plan and appreciate the Plan's acknowledgement of the vital role of local airports, including Skagit Regional Airport, in the region's transportation system and economy.	Comment noted.	
45	Heather Rogerson	<p>The facility information for Skagit Regional Airport provided on page 59 should be updated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of takeoffs and landings at Skagit Regional should be stated as: "It is estimated that Skagit Regional Airport experienced 33,500 takeoffs and landings in 2019."</li> </ul> <p>By way of explanation, the above 33,500 operations estimate for 2019 is from the Forecast Chapter of the Skagit Regional Airport Master Plan update, approved by the FAA. The FAA Model for Operations at Non-Towered Airports was used to generate the operations estimate, which is consistent with results of an aircraft operations study conducted by the Port in 2013-2016.</p> <p>Currently, the draft Plan states, "The latest available data, from 2016, indicates that Skagit Regional experienced 61,900 takeoffs and landings." This estimate</p>	Make revisions to Skagit Regional Airport facility information per Ms. Rogerson's comment.	<p>Revise Skagit Regional Airport description in Section 5: Transportation Improvements &amp; Programs as follows:</p> <p>"Skagit Regional Airport is located three miles west of Burlington. The airport has 132 based aircraft, including 113 single-engine, 8 multi-engine, 3 jets, 1 ultralight and 7 rotor based. <del>The latest available data, from 2016, indicate that Skagit Regional experienced An estimated 61,900</del> <u>33,500</u> takeoffs and landings <u>occurred at Skagit Regional Airport in 2019.</u> Aeronautical Services, FedEx, Methow Aviation, <u>San Juan Airlines</u> and Ameriflite provide cargo service to the Airport. The airport has two runways. Runway <del>10-28</del> <u>11-29</u> is 5,477 feet long, 100 feet wide, has an asphalt surface, and is equipped with pilot controlled medium-intensity runway lights. Runway <del>10</del><u>11</u> is equipped with runway end indicator lights (REIL) and <u>visual approach slope</u></p>

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		<p>appears to be from the FAA Terminal Aircraft Forecast (TAF). The FAA does not do a detailed forecast for most general aviation airports and will frequently include a placeholder for operations. As a result, the TAF has shown 61,900 annual operations for Skagit Regional since at least 2016 through 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Juan Airlines should be added to the list of businesses providing cargo service to the Airport.</li> <li>• In the text of the report and on the aerial photograph of the Airport, references to Runway 10-28 should be changed to Runway 11-29, respectively.</li> <li>• Runway 11 and Runway 29 are served by Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs) not Visual Approach Slope Indicators (VASI).</li> <li>• Runway 04-22 is also served by Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs).</li> </ul>		<p><u>precision approach path indicators (PAPI).</u></p> <p>This runway has non-precision, non-directional beacon and global positioning systems approaches. Runway <del>28</del>29 is equipped with REIL and <del>VASI</del>PAPI, and has a non-precision, global positioning systems approach. Runway 4-22 is 3,000 feet long, 60 feet wide, <del>and</del> has an asphalt surface, and has <del>visual approaches to both ends</del> PAPI.”</p>
46	Heather Rogerson	The Port will provide high-resolution photograph options for the photo box on Page 29 of the Plan that capture the diversity of aircraft operating at Skagit Regional Airport.	Skagit 2045 should include a photograph provided by Port of Skagit showing airplanes at Skagit Regional Airport.	Include photograph from Ms. Rogerson of airplanes at Port of Skagit, replacing previous picture in Plan of single aircraft.
47	Heather Rogerson	For future updates of the Plan, the Port recommends SCOG identify and consider updated data related to the number of vehicle trips for Skagit County residents commuting outside the county for work. On Page 29 the Plan states, “the vast majority of workers do not cross county lines to get to their places of work,” citing the 2008 NuStats study which reported	SCOG expects to complete a household travel survey of Skagit County residents in 2021. This survey will provide current information on travel behavior, including travel between counties for work. The COVID-19 pandemic caused a delay to this project, which otherwise would have been completed prior to the adoption of Skagit 2045.	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		<p>83.9 % of Skagit County residents work within Skagit County. Compared with other sources, this number may be high.</p> <p>The 2018 Skagit County Economic Profile prepared by the WWU Center for Economic Business Research evaluated two different data sources from 2015 and 2019 which estimated that anywhere between 51% to 80% of Skagit County residents work in Skagit County. The Skagit County Economic Profile report can be found at the WWU website: (<a href="https://cbe.wvu.edu/cebr/topics-and-reports">https://cbe.wvu.edu/cebr/topics-and-reports</a>). The Skagit County Economic Profile acknowledges that, “finding accurate and reliable data on commuting patterns is incredibly difficult.” While challenging, identifying current and reliable information related to outcommuting would inform future transportation planning and assist in understanding the economics of Skagit County.</p>	<p>SCOG staff conducted an analysis on commuting patterns in 2014 using three different data sources. Results of the analysis indicated that one data source showed substantially higher levels of travel from Skagit County to other counties for work than the other two sources.</p>	
48	Heather Rogerson	<p>The Port will coordinate with Skagit County to provide input on the proposed Peterson Road improvement projects identified as project numbers 46 and 47. Construction of a new separate shared use path along Peterson Road from the Bayview Ridge residential development to the Port’s existing trail system would be a great benefit to the public and a welcome addition. The Port is supportive of a project to improve Peterson Road from the Bayview Ridge residential development west to Higgins Airport Way. Improvements are needed especially considering the projected 70% employment growth on Bayview Ridge over the planning horizon for Skagit</p>	<p>As Ms. Rogerson notes, coordination between the Port of Skagit and Skagit County will occur on these projects. If project elements are revised, Skagit 2045 can be amended to reflect these changes.</p>	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
		2045. However, the Port would like to provide input on the design standards for improvements and recommends a traffic calming element be included in the project to deter / prevent heavy truck traffic from utilizing Peterson Road through the residential development.		
49	Heather Rogerson	Airport users have voiced concern regarding the lengthy backups and wait times that occur during peak travel times at the Hwy 20 / Higgins Airport Way intersection and the Garrett Road / Hwy 20 intersection heading south towards the I-5 ramp. Evaluation of these issues is recommended.	<p>SCOG does not have traffic counts as these intersections to evaluate congestion at Garrett Road and Higgins Airport Way. While the regional travel demand model does not show high volumes at these approaches to State Route 20, it is not the appropriate tool for analyzing congestion at intersections. Additionally, most traffic counts used for validating the regional travel demand model are at midblock locations – measuring roadway volumes, but not intersection volumes, turning movements nor queue lengths.</p> <p>The Port of Skagit could reach out to WSDOT about signal timing at these intersections to determine if signal timing may be adjusted to account for queuing along roadways intersecting State Route 20. Queue lengths would likely be surveyed at Garrett Road and Higgins Airport Way to assist with determining whether or not signal timing adjustments are warranted.</p>	

#	Commenters	Public Comments	SCOG Staff	
			Responses	Suggested Plan Revisions
50	Amanda Warner Thorpe	Other surrounding National Forests that could be mentioned are the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest (about 125 miles southeast of the project area) & the Olympic National Forest (about 100 miles southwest of the project area, requires ferry). U.S. Route 2 & U.S. Route 101 provide primary access to these National Forests, respectively. In terms of improving access to these Federal Lands, it could prove beneficial to add work which is economically feasible to surrounding roads & trails. Only economically viable work should be added because the plan is already estimated to be \$925 M.	<p>Skagit 2045 only includes national forests that are within the exterior boundaries of Skagit County, referred to as the “Skagit region” in the Plan. The regional transportation system does provide connections to other state routes and U.S. highways that connect to the other national forests mentioned by Ms. Warner Thorpe.</p> <p>Projects in Skagit 2045 could include elements relating to national forest roads and trails. The Plan would not preclude projects from adding these beneficial elements. Project descriptions in the Plan are planning-level descriptions and are not required to include every project element.</p>	

Notes: formatting may be modified in bringing comments from public comment submissions into the Public Comment Tracker (e.g. bold text, italicized text, underlined text, spacing, font type and size); introductory and closing salutations are mostly excluded from the Public Comment Tracker, but can be found in public comment submissions; comments are generally paragraphs taken, in order, from public comment submissions; charts and supplemental materials referenced by public comments are not included in the Public Comment Tracker, but can be found in public comment submissions.