

Washington’s Scenic and Recreational Highways Plan
Public Comments Received on Background Paper #2

State Parks Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>On pages 5 and 14, there are five primary policy goals for the state's transportation system. Page 17 refers to six.</p>	<p>Corrected. There are 5 State Transportation Policy Goals.</p>
<p>Overall, the objectives on pages 18 and 19 are headed the right direction. We see a number of areas that mesh well with State Parks agency goals.</p>	
<p>Performance measures for Safety and Mobility include several specific types of facilities, such as signs, visitor centers, overlooks, etc. We recommend inclusion of an "other" category, so that innovation in traveler services can be encouraged. Sample language could be: Number of other types of traveler information or interpretive opportunities, such as use of short range radio broadcast equipment.</p>	<p>Done</p>
<p>We don't fully understand the measure "Number of park or public recreation area access points improved." Does this refer to the roads turning off a state highway, or to the park itself? One is very limiting, the other much less so. Highway related park improvement could, for instance, include construction of a new camping loop to provide more overnight opportunities along the corridor.</p>	<p>The intension is not to be limiting with this measurement, but look for opportunities to improve access to recreational opportunities within the vicinity of the Scenic and Recreational Highway. May need more discussion on this.</p>
<p>The Highway Heritage Marker program is well established and a perfect complement to Scenic and Recreational Highways. Are they included under "traveler information signs," or do they deserve their own listing? Since not all viewpoints have interpretation, perhaps a useful measure would be: Number of interpretive displays, including Highway Heritage Markers.</p>	<p>Suggested measure added.</p>

State Parks Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Both sets of objectives make references to the highway viewshed (viewpoints, conservation and recreation purposes, acres of land protected, and so on) without actually using the term. Nothing directly says the viewshed should remain scenic. It seems this most basic tenet should be included as appropriate.</p>	<p>Could be added to the Environment goal. Will discuss with Steering Committee in more detail.</p>
<p>We are pleased with the specific proposals to gather data needed to understand our current status. We recommend that the Highway Heritage Markers be specifically added to that list. We're sure they would be included, but that will make sure they can be pulled out as a unit if needed.</p>	<p>Done.</p>

Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>On page 19 regarding proposed performance measures under the State Transportation Health and Environment Objective, I recommend a change to (II) in the WSDOT Implementation Steps to read: "WSDOT will pursue cultural, natural, recreational, and scenic protection partnerships for areas associated with scenic and recreational highways.</p>	<p>Done – to be discussed further with Steering Committee.</p>
<p>In the same table and regarding performance measures, I recommend revising a few of the performance measures to include cultural and historic properties. My recommended language should read something like the following: "Number of acres of land along scenic and recreational highways transferred protected as cultural and historic properties, working farms and forest, conservation lands, park lands, and open space through purchases, sales, transfers, and exchanges."</p>	<p>Done</p>
<p>Thank you for including DAHP's planning goals and performance measures in Background Paper #2. Below, you will find six new goals from our most recent state historic preservation plan (Sustaining Communities through Historic Preservation: The Washington State Historic Preservation Plan 2009-2013). The six new goals are as follows:</p> <p>Goal I Enhance the Effectiveness of Historic Preservation Efforts Goal II Strengthen the Connections between Historic Preservation and Sustainability Goal III Strengthen the Role of Historic Preservation in Local Planning and Community Revitalization Goal IV Increase Efforts to Promote Heritage Tourism Goal V Improve Identification and Protection of Archeological Sites and Cultural Resources Goal VI Increase the Diversity of Participation in Historic Preservation</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>

Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>DAHP also revised performance measures for this biennium as follows:</p> <p>Number of of properties newly entered into the National and Washington Heritage Registers</p> <p>The number of properties newly entered into the archaeological and historic sites databases</p> <p>Percentage of federal project reviews completed within the statutory 30-day deadline.</p> <p>Percentage of non-forensic human remains notifications and Indian/Non-Indian notifications completed within the statutory two-day deadline.</p> <p>Percentage of state archaeology permit reviews completed within the statutory 60-day deadline</p> <p>Percentage of transportation project reviews completed within the statutory 30-day deadline.</p> <p>Private Investment in Historic Building Rehabilitation (in millions of dollars)</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>

US Forest Service Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>I think it is really important that the benchmarks and performance measures selected are meaningful and easily measured. Just having more of something isn't always meaningful, especially in these tight budget times when we are seeking sustainable operations.</p>	
<p>I also think there needs to be more emphasis on the "recreational" component of the Scenic and Recreational Highway System. I think it would be important to have measures that help sustain and enhance the recreational values, facilities, and services. Right now most of the wording and text really tips the balance towards the scenic component.</p>	
<p>As stated on our conference call earlier today, I believe the FHWA/USDOT National Scenic Byways Program is a really important tool for WSDOT in achieving the 5 overall transportation goals and to do so in ways that help integrate planning across those 5 goals. Along the same lines I believe that the whole SSRHS Program helps the State achieve all 5 transportation goals.</p>	
<p>Page 7: Additional bullets to add under "When establishing performance measures, we also need to recognize..." would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the degree possible, establish measures and collect data in a way that can serve more than one program. • Allow for the contribution of data by partner organizations. 	<p>Done.</p>
<p>Page 8: Since the US Forest Service is a main partner in the SS&RHS, I think there needs to be a paragraph here, just like there is for the National Park Service, that talks about some of our natural resources stewardship....we identify and maintain scenic viewsheds, provide important recreational assets, facilities and services, and just need to be represented. I can work with you on some specific wording.</p>	<p>Will work with US Forest Service on specific wording.</p>

US Forest Service Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Page 14: I wanted to make you aware that the America’s Byways Resource Center has commissioned the development of economic Impact Tool for byways that we say in its BETA form at the National Conference in Denver in August. It was meant to fill that gap that many states and proponents have identified over the years that this information is lacking. I think it would be good to see if this tool could be tested or put as one of the measures that would allow us to establish some of that kind of baseline data for our routes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Page 6: Under the 4 goals listed on this page, I think we should be more specific and say “Stewardship-protecting, preserving and enhancing both scenic and recreational resources”. That way we might measures things like the change in %/# of sites?#of participants of/at recreational sites along the route, improved/increased recreational access through easements, etc.</p>	<p>Will have more discussion with Steering Committee on this.</p>
<p>Page 18: Under the Objective add the word “recreation””and public access to support recreation and tourism on...” Under Implementation Steps, I would add V1: WSDOT will work on adding separate bike lanes and/or widen shoulders along the SS&RHS. Under Performance Measures, you might also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of sign plans implemented • I would change the ratio of or distance between visitor centers, rather than solely #. They are expensive to build, maintain, and operation so we need to not just count. • Same with viewpoints, it isn’t just about numbers. In some cases, not putting more is the best thing to do. • Same with trails, more isn’t better if they aren’t maintained. In the FS we use “miles maintained to standard.” 	<p>Done.</p>

US Forest Service Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Page 19: Under the Objective add the word “recreational””enhance natural, cultural, recreational, and historic resources...”</p> <p>Under Performance Measures, you might also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miles treated for invasive species. 	<p>Done.</p>

Curt Warber Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>In the Corridor Management Plan Appendix, the Goals listed for the Strait of Juan de Fuca National Scenic Byway, SR 112, are actually for the Cape Flattery Scenic Byway. The Strait of Juan de Fuca National Scenic Byway and the Cape Flattery Tribal Scenic Byway are adjacent, meeting at MP 0 for SR 112 in the Makah Indian Reservation.</p>	<p>Corrected.</p>
<p>Similar to the local roads that are part of the Palouse Scenic Byway, the Cape Flattery Tribal Scenic Byway was recognized as a Washington State Scenic Byway by the Transportation Commission, but not adopted as part of the Scenic and Recreational Highway System. This is in contrast with the San Juan County roads that were adopted as part of the Scenic and Recreational Highway System to make up the San Juan Islands Scenic Byway in combination with the Anacortes ferry routes.</p>	
<p>Page 18-19: The objectives, implementation steps, and performance measures are a good starting point.</p>	
<p>Page 18-19: An explicit discussion of WSDOT's commitment to a context sensitive design process for capital and major maintenance projects on the Scenic and Rec. system would be welcome.</p>	<p>Will have more discussion with Steering Committee on this.</p>
<p>Page 18-19: Some mention of support for current and future Corridor Management Plans for highways in the Scenic and Rec system would be welcome</p>	<p>No specific language proposed. Not sure what the commenter would find adequate.</p>

Curt Warber Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Page 18-19: There are additional traveler services/travel experience elements that are not currently listed as performance measures. Some to consider might include public restrooms, enhanced traffic conditions/construction information (eg 411, low power radio, variable message signs, effective web notification, etc), safety and emergency services coverage (eg cell phone coverage, availability of first responders, medical facilities), a full range of travel planning information in addition to visitor centers (eg trip planning websites, enhanced 411, wayfinding maps/brochures), safety improvements focused on recreational corridors (eg slow vehicle pullouts).</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>
<p>Page 18-19: Mobility objectives might recognize level-of-service issues specifically related to recreational use of the route. Congestion often occurs differently in time and space on roadways that have high volumes of recreational traffic.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Page 18-19: There is a wider range of recreational access facilities than are noted in the current draft. Among others, the performance measures might be expanded to recognize trailheads, sno-parks, equestrian staging areas, boat ramps, human-powered boat put-ins, watchable wildlife sites, etc.</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>
<p>Page 18-19: Museums and interpretive facilities may be worthwhile to identify and measure.</p>	<p>Will have more discussion with Steering Committee on this.</p>
<p>Page 18-19: The current draft does not include a robust set of objectives and performance measures related to tourism economic development. One or more specific objectives related to tourism may be appropriate, as well as performance measures such as visitor nights in the corridor, trip duration in the corridor, visitor spending, recreational traffic as a percentage of total traffic, available hotel rooms/campsites, etc.</p>	<p>Other state agencies collect some of this information (see Pages 8-13 of Background Paper #2). All WSDOT measures must show relationship to the 5 State Transportation Policy Goals. Will have more discussion with Steering Committee.</p>

Curt Warber Comments	WSDOT Responses
<p>Page 18-19: It would be useful to clarify whether the character of WSDOT’s review of county development decisions will include different criteria for Scenic and Rec. highways than for other highways.</p>	<p>Not clear on what would address the concerns here. No language was provided or changes recommended.</p>
<p>Page 18-19: It would be useful to clarify the relationship between the system-wide objectives, implementation steps, and performance measures and the goals developed for individual byways.</p>	<p>Not clear on what would address the concerns here. No language was provided or changes recommended.</p>
<p>Page 18-19: It would be useful to clarify whether there will be any relationship between the system-wide objectives, implementation steps, and performance measures and the ranking criteria for National Scenic Byways grants.</p>	<p>Not clear on what would address the concerns here. No language was provided or changes recommended.</p> <p>Page 6 of Background Paper 2 says, The overall objective of setting goals and collecting and evaluating data is to gauge continued progress toward increasing stewardship, increasing tourism and traveler services, planning, and integration for Washington’s Scenic and Recreational Highways.</p> <p>The recommended performance measures are an expansion of an existing process, to better enable Washington State to evaluate progress toward goals and objectives. As new performance measures are initiated, they should be regularly evaluated to determine if the measures are effective, or if modifications are needed.</p>