

**North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study
Public Outreach Survey & Key Person Interviews**

Submitted to:

Washington State Department of Transportation

January 1999

McCLURE CONSULTING

**23406 South Kingston Road NE
Kingston, WA 98346**



360 • 297 • 4300

Table of Contents

Overview	5
Public Outreach Survey	8
Key Person Interviews	17
Appendices	31
A - Outreach Survey Database	33
B - Selected responses to the question: <i>“Are there other possible solutions that you feel should be considered?”</i>	45
C - Verbatim Comments From the Questionnaire	55
D - Brochure & Questionnaire	120
E - Survey Distribution Partners & Placements	125

Overview

The goal of the North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study is **not** to select a site for a new bridge or auto ferry. In fact, it would be more accurate to say that the goal is to determine if any possible sites or solutions for vehicle access can be disqualified from future consideration. The Access Feasibility Study seeks to determine if any of the possible bridge or auto ferry solutions pass a first test of feasibility. Possible solutions are evaluated by considering a range of factors, including travel patterns, social and political forces, etc., to determine which solutions, if any, are feasible enough to undergo more in-depth consideration. Because the next level of analysis involves costly engineering studies and environmental impact statements, the prudent course is to use this initial feasibility process to reduce the number of possible solutions for which those expenses might be incurred.

Public opinion is an important factor when considering initial feasibility of each possible solution. Do islanders and those commuting on and off the island think there is a problem? Do they favor any one solution over another? Is there any consensus?

Two-way communication is characteristic of the outreach process (which is more fully described in the introduction of each report section). Citizens are now better informed of the issues, and agencies now have a better understanding of public opinion.

The purpose of this overview is to document the highlights of public opinion and to capture some of the characteristics of the range of opinion that exists around this issue.

The first, and most obvious, finding is that there is no consensus in support of any one solution among those who responded to the outreach effort. There is, however, agreement to reject a couple of proposed solutions. There is virtually no support for either widening the existing Deception Pass Bridge or building a new bridge parallel to the existing bridge. For a variety of reasons, that will be discussed later, these two solutions will not survive the test of public opinion. Opposition is strongest from North Whidbey residents who frequently cross the bridge.

Lack of consensus is also illustrated by an ideological, and to some extent geographical, split on Whidbey Island. This situation exists independent of this issue; it was just illuminated by the outreach effort.

- The conventional wisdom is that North Island residents are more pro-growth and pro-development. They are more likely to want a new bridge but less likely to get involved in the debate. South islanders are more “environmental”, more “no-growth”, better organized and more vocal. Of course, not all North Islanders are pro-growth and not all South Islanders are no-growth activists, but the survey and interviews do support this ideological and geographic split. While the “no-growth – pro-growth” debate may precede the issue of increased vehicle access, the access feasibility study will inevitably find itself viewed in that context.

The challenge of responding to the range of opinion that exists is illustrated by the preference for bridge versus ferry as a solution:

- Some people prefer a bridge because it is *more* efficient; there's no wait; no schedules, none of the hassles associated with ferry travel. They see benefits in being more closely connected to the Mainland and I-5. They are more likely to see the benefits of new growth and developments that may occur if access is improved.
- Some people prefer a ferry because it is *less* efficient; requires a greater degree of sacrifice, planning, and patience. They believe a ferry is more in keeping with the character of living on an island. They believe that a new bridge would provide too close a connection to the Mainland, too much development, and too much growth. A common sentiment: *"We moved to the island to live on an island. If people want a quick commute they should live in the suburbs"*.

An interesting aspect of the bridge versus ferry debate is that people seem to have a stronger opinion when it comes to a bridge; they are either more likely to want one or oppose one. With auto ferries either fewer people find auto ferries objectionable, or fewer have made up their mind concerning ferries as a solution.

This data suggests, but does not prove, that an auto ferry might be the more acceptable mode of increasing vehicle access to the island. While many of those who want to see access improved would prefer a bridge, they might accept a ferry as a compromise. And, many of those who oppose a bridge might accept an auto ferry because, unlike a bridge, the ferry is not perceived as an unrestricted conduit to growth and development.

Public opinion, of course, can be both positive and negative. Among those who responded to the survey, and among the key persons interviewed, there is a great deal of negative opinion concerning the possible solutions. The survey does not tell us how widespread this opposition is in the community, but we do know that it is present. In general terms, opposition can be described in three forms:

- **Philosophical:** Within the community are individuals who question the premise of the feasibility study. They may agree that traffic is a problem, but disagree that the solution is increased access. In fact, poor access is seen as a way to preserve the island from urban encroachment. Some within this category believe that Whidbey Island has not yet reached a consensus on what it wants to become ... something that should be done before increasing access to the island. Some within this group would accept more limited improvements in access; improved transit, passenger only ferries, modest widening of the existing bridge (but not 4 lanes), possibly an auto ferry. Others, though, are almost militant in their opposition to any improvement at all.
- **Specific Opposition:** As might be expected, no one wants a new transportation facility in their own back yard. People who live on Camano Island may think a new bridge is a good idea, but don't want it to connect to Camano – they would prefer it be parallel to the existing bridge. That idea is rejected by North Island residents who would prefer to see it connect to Camano Island. More importantly though, is that the character of opposition changes relative to the site:

- **Whidbey Island** residents who object to a bridge or ferry talk about infrastructure limitations and quality of life. They worry that better access will turn the island into a commuters suburb. Increased development is a key concern.
- **Camano Island** resident's primary objection to either a bridge or ferry is that it will just shift the traffic from Whidbey's bridge to Camano's, and that traffic on Camano Island is already too heavy. There is also a feeling that routing traffic through Camano Island will change the Island's character. Non-Camano residents warn that Camano Island residents will resist a bridge.
- **La Conner** residents like the isolation they have by being off the main road. There is fear that a bridge connection too close to La Conner would ruin that. While some merchants might enjoy the additional tourist traffic, the feeling is that residents would resist. This might depend on how close the connection actually was to La Conner.
- Since there were no **Fir Island** or **Conway** residents in the sample, the objections to a bridge connection to that area come from residents of surrounding areas. This is the only bridge connection where there is concern about the loss of agricultural land. Also mentioned are loss of wildlife habitat, and the potential for flooding.

Based on the opinions of those who returned a survey and of those we interviewed, the two solutions with at least as much *support* and *interest* as *opposition* are:

- **Auto ferry service from North Whidbey Island to Stanwood or other mainland location.** 44% of those who completed a survey either prefer this option or say it is worth considering, while 31% say it should be rejected. The specific benefit of this option is that it bypasses the Camano Island traffic jam. Also, the wording "Stanwood or other Mainland location" makes this location less specific than others, and perhaps less objectionable. NOTE: There are an insufficient number of Stanwood residents in the sample for us to draw any conclusions about what Stanwood residents think about this option.
- **A Bridge from Strawberry Point on North Whidbey Island to Fir Island near Conway.** 40% of the survey respondents prefer this option or say it is worth considering, while 38% reject it. The primary benefit is that it provides the most direct connection to I-5 and the commute either north or south from Conway. NOTE: The "rejection" percentage for this option may be lower than that for other bridge options because there are no Fir Island or Conway residents in the sample.

Public Outreach Survey

Introduction & Methodology

The North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study asks “Are there feasible solutions for increasing vehicle capacity from North Whidbey Island to the Mainland?” Finding the answer involves public input. Three open houses were held (one each in Oak Harbor, Langley, and on Camano Island) where citizens could review displays that outlined possible solutions for improving vehicle access to North Whidbey Island. A questionnaire was designed that followed the content and progress of the displays so that people could evaluate and comment on each possible solution.

To reach a greater number of citizens, the information from the open house displays and accompanying questionnaire were repackaged as an *informational brochure with a questionnaire insert*. The questionnaire insert included a postage-paid business reply mail permit.

A total of 3,000 brochures/questionnaires were distributed through clubs and community organizations and at public buildings and other pick-up locations. The list of distribution sources and pick-up points is in appendix “E”.

This survey is not based on a random sample and the results should not be interpreted as *statistically* representative of the populations where surveys were distributed. However, nearly 1,000 residents and 15 community leaders shared their opinions – enough representation to indicate how different elements within the community think about this issue. Perhaps the best way to think about this data is to imagine an open house where 1,000 citizens showed up. As with an open house, citizens who responded to this survey are those interested and concerned enough to read the material and respond.

The analysis is based on 842 questionnaires returned in time to be used, plus 39 from the three open-houses. In addition, comments from 68 letters and 19 e-mail messages were coded onto questionnaires and entered into the database, making the total database size 968. The following tables show who responded. Over three-fourths of the questionnaires come from Whidbey Island residents, with over a third from Central Whidbey Island, which on the questionnaire was defined as Oak Harbor to Coupeville.

The questionnaire included places for respondents to write comments about the possible solutions listed and to suggest solutions of their own.

- Suggestions and comments about other possible solutions have been coded and data-entered for analysis. Specific suggestions for other bridge locations, ferry routes, and road improvements, as well as other questions, suggestions, or comments that couldn't be coded have also been typed. This information is in Appendix "B".
- Comments related to the possible solutions are voluminous. They are included in Appendix "C" and have been sorted by type of solution and sub-sorted by whether the writer *prefers* the solution, thinks it is *worth considering*, or thinks it should be *rejected*.

Results Summary

Further insight into who completed surveys is gained by looking at their travel/commute patterns as relevant to this study:

- 27% cross the Deception Pass Bridge at least once a week
- 28% cross it 2-3 times a month
- 31% cross it less often or not at all
- 63% of the North Whidbey Island residents cross once a week or more, compared to 33% among Central Island residents, and only 5% of the South Island residents.

South Island residents, not surprisingly, are much more likely to take the Mukilteo/Clinton Ferry:

- 23% take it at least once a week and 45% take it 2-3 times a month
- Only 3% of North Island residents take it at least once a week; 12% take it 2-3 times a month.
- Most North Whidbey residents (84%) take the ferry once a month or less, if at all.

Public Reaction to Possible Solutions

This chart provides an overview of how respondents evaluated the nine possible solutions presented in the survey. What stands out immediately is that for each solution there is a larger percentage who "reject" than "prefer".

- The largest "prefer" percentage is for building a new bridge, but few agree on location. A bridge from Strawberry Point to Fir Island is preferred slightly over the other options.
- The largest "reject" percentages are for building a bridge parallel to the existing Deception Pass Bridge and Widening the Deception Pass and Canoe Pass Bridges.
- When combining the "prefer" and "worth considering" percentages, both the bridge and ferry options are about equal. However, fewer people reject the auto ferry option (32%) than the new bridge option (44%). It's fair to say that while there is a little more support for the general idea of building a new bridge over adding a new ferry, there is also more opposition to building a bridge. In fact, the "reject" percentage is larger for all bridge options than for any ferry option.
- An auto ferry from North Whidbey to Stanwood or other mainland location is more acceptable than to Camano Island.

Widen the Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges

Only 8% prefer this option. Mainland residents prefer this option more than do Island residents:

- 20% for La Conner residents
- 19% for Stanwood/Camano Island residents

Those who prefer to widen the existing bridge often say this would be the most cost-effective solution. Widening doesn't necessarily mean 4 lanes – some mention moving the walkways (beside or underneath) in order to widen the two lanes.

Residents who say this solution is worth considering often provide some caveat:

- "Would only be effective if highway was widened to Sharp's Corner."
- "Consider only after improved transit and passenger ferry service."
- "As long as it won't distract from our grand view & nature."
- "Not to 4 lane; some widening OK if maintain original bridge character."

Most people reject the idea of widening the Deception Pass and Canoe Pass Bridges. Those who reject it the most are those who cross the bridge most often and/or live in North Whidbey (66% who cross the bridge once a week or more, and 63% who live in North Whidbey reject this option).

The appendix includes nearly four pages of comments from residents who reject this option. A common theme is objection to changes that would alter the historic, landmark character, or beauty of the bridge:

- “Do not destroy the beauty and history.”
- “Ruins picturesque beauty.”
- “This bridge has historical and well as visual significance. Do not disturb.”
- “Absurd. You can’t alter the bridge and its approaches without destroying our largest tourist draw! Stupid. Period.”

Another theme is that widening the bridge will not in itself solve the problem:

- “4 lanes would have to be built all the way from N. Whidbey to I-5 to make this effective, just widening the bridge won’t do it.”
- “Why widen the bridge when you have a 2 lane road on each side?”.

In fact, some believe that widening the bridge will just make the problem worse:

- “Would concentrate more traffic in the currently congested SR 20 corridor.”
- “Traffic should be reduced in this area (to conserve the state park and make it safer for visitors) not increased!”

Building a New Bridge Parallel to the Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges

The least favorite new bridge option, in fact the least preferred of all possible solutions, is to build a new bridge parallel to the existing bridge. This option is rejected by over 60% of all Whidbey Island residents. Reasons are similar to those given for widening the existing bridge. Only 6% overall, and only 4% of North Whidbey residents prefer this option.

The only segment to show any preference for the parallel bridge option are residents of Stanwood and Camano Island (16% prefer it and 20% say it’s worth considering).

Building a New Bridge – versus - Adding New Auto Ferry Service

The general idea of building a new bridge is preferred by 27% of all respondents -- the highest “prefer” percentage of any solution presented. This option is preferred more by residents of North Whidbey Island (38%) than by anyone else.

Generally, those who prefer building a new bridge say this is the most permanent, most efficient, most dependable option. The sentiment of many of these people is that better access is required and if you want to move cars, a bridge is the best way to do it.

When combining the “prefer” and “worth considering” percentages, the general idea of adding an auto ferry is as acceptable as the general idea of building a new bridge. However, there may be less opposition to adding an auto ferry since the percent that reject the ferry option is

considerably less than the percent that reject the bridge option (32% vs. 44%). The possibility of an additional bridge has been discussed for some time. People have had time to think about a bridge and reach an opinion. Because the ferry option has not been as publicly discussed, many people have not yet reached an opinion.

Among those who prefer a ferry, many believe it is more in keeping with the "Island Character" than a bridge; that a ferry will improve access without the expansive growth and development that a bridge would encourage. One person's comment summarizes this opinion:

- "Prefer ferry to bridge to discourage excessive growth. Bridge much too easy for people to move here."

Those who prefer a ferry like the fact that ferries are not as efficient as a bridge. This is precisely what those who reject the ferry option complain of:

- "Ferries cannot effectively handle the projected traffic increase."
- "Never on time/or always have to wait in line."
- "Overall, ferries are too slow and schedules are restrictive."

Three Bridge Options

While 15% of all respondents prefer the option of a bridge connecting to Camano Island, there is widespread opposition, and almost no support among residents of Camano Island & Stanwood:

- Only 6% prefer it, while 77% reject it

Respondents who most want a new bridge to Camano Island are those who cross the Deception Pass Bridge at least once a week (preferred by 25%) and/or those who live on North Whidbey (24%). Many who prefer the Camano bridge option do so because they would like to see the two parts of the county connected or say this is the most direct way to commute to I-5:

- "You are accessing other part of Island County and also I-5 corridor further South."
- "I feel disconnected to Whidbey and Coupeville, our county seat."
- "Shortest bridge span – keeps construction costs down. Once on Camano motorists have direct route to I-5 via Stanwood – connectivity between Oak Harbor & Stanwood would benefit both towns."

Those who reject the Camano bridge solution say Camano Island and its roads can't handle this traffic:

- "Our Camano road is already crowded – bumper to bumper much of the time."
- "Camano already has its own traffic problems, including single access to mainland."
- "Additional Whidbey traffic would further jeopardize Camano lifestyle, environment and community."

Of the two remaining options for new bridges, the connection from Strawberry Point to Fir Island is more popular than the connection to La Conner. To some extent, this preference may be

attributed to the fact that the sample includes residents from La Conner (65% of them oppose a bridge connecting there) but no residents from Fir Island or Conway.

Judging by the comments, people think these two options make more sense than widening the existing bridge or building a new bridge parallel to the existing one. Respondents frequently mention the easy connection to I-5, particularly regarding the Fir Island connection:

- “Straight shot to I-5 from there (La Conner) – it is easy to go North or South.”
- (Fir Island has) “Good access to I-5 and Mount Vernon, also (easy for) tourists to reach Whidbey Island”
- (Fir Island) “Looks as if it would be the shortest route to I-5 with minimum environmental impact on existing communities.”

For some, both of these options are preferred or worth considering. They would be satisfied with either and believe the one with the lowest cost and least environmental impact should be selected. The following comment is typical:

- “Pick the cheapest and least environmentally damaging option between this (La Conner) and Strawberry Point bridge.”

If respondents’ comments are any indication, opposition to these two bridge options would be strong and vocal. While several people feel either of these bridges would be too costly to build, and some mention flood potential on Fir Island, the main theme from those who reject these options is the environmental impact, loss of agricultural land and inevitable change to the rural lifestyle:

- “This is a big negative for the wildlife habitat.”
- “Would require loss of valuable agricultural land across Skagit County and disrupt neighborhoods in North Whidbey.”
- “Would destroy much of the Skagit Flats wetlands, wildlife habitat.”
- “Why destroy more precious farmland?”

Some respondents are determined to oppose these bridge options:

- “Be aware: any attempt to build a bridge will meet massive opposition. We will have our bodies chained to your construction equipment — if the lawsuits fail.”
- “These should not even be an option! These are rural communities. Why should any of these people have to deal with the pollution, noise and unsightly view of a road and bridge for the convenience of people that come and go to the city when the Island would be changed forever because of it?”
- “We have a large and active community here that will physically protest any bridge construction effort here and (use) considerable media power.”
- “Not needed, not wanted, not welcome, not now, not for a long time, no thank you.”

The comments relative to these general locations show what kind of objections will be encountered if proceeding with a particular site. The bridge locations, as described in the

survey questionnaire, are geographically vague. More specific locations might not elicit the same objections.

Two Auto Ferry Options

The Stanwood/Mainland option is more acceptable than the Camano Island option. This is particularly true for Stanwood & Camano residents (most of whom are from Camano Island):

- 37% prefer the Stanwood/Mainland connection, while only 5% prefer the Camano connection.

Objections to a Whidbey-Camano ferry route are much the same as those to the Whidbey-Camano bridge option. People don't want to see Camano Island disturbed and repeatedly state that Camano Island already has traffic problems.

Those who prefer the N. Whidbey to Stanwood connection cite the easy connection to I-5 and the fact that it bypasses the Camano traffic problem. A few people say it would provide economic benefit to Stanwood.

The objections to the Stanwood ferry connection are varied: Too much traffic now, the impact on sea life, cheaper to drive around than pay for ferry, ferries cost more in the long run.

The description of the Stanwood option is particularly vague. Some people may imagine "Stanwood or other Mainland location" to mean traffic going through Stanwood, others may imagine traffic bypassing Stanwood, while others may imagine another Mainland location altogether. Benefits and/or objections would be more specific if a more specific site were named.

Complete text of respondents comments regarding each possible solution are found in the appendix to this report.

Other Possible Solutions

The questionnaire asked respondents to write in any other solutions that should be considered. These were coded into categories for computer processing and are shown in this table.

The comment made more than any other was to "Do nothing/Limit growth or access". Similarly respondents pointed out the infrastructure on Whidbey Island has limits. Altogether, a "net" of nearly 18% of the respondents made one or both of these two comments.

The farther south people live on Whidbey Island, the more likely they are to want to limit growth:

- North Whidbey 11%
- Central Whidbey 18%
- South Whidbey 28%

This sentiment is also strong among La Conner residents (25%).

The next most common type of solution concerns transit. Overall, nearly 18% of the respondents made one of four transit suggestions. Most common was the general recommendation for improved transit (13.1%). Another 1.5% also want improved transit but outlined a much broader vision of a transportation network where all systems are linked. There were also suggestions for improved carpools, vanpools, and park and ride lots.

Suggestions for improving transit to ease the traffic problem were made more often by residents of South Whidbey Island:

- North Whidbey 8%
- Central Whidbey 18%
- South Whidbey 21%

Also likely to suggest transit solutions are those who use transit or vanpools (23%), use a carpool (28%), and/or frequently take the Clinton-Mukilteo ferry (22%).

The next tier of suggestions concerns using ferries. The primary suggestion here is to offer passenger-only ferries. Central Whidbey residents make this suggestion more than those who live elsewhere. Routes suggested most often are shown in this table (right) with number of mentions in parenthesis. The complete list is in the appendix.

Some thirty respondents (3.1%) had suggestions for other auto ferry routes. These are listed in the appendix. The only routes mentioned more than once are Coupeville to Camano (5 mentions), North Whidbey to Camano (2 mentions), and Oak Harbor to Seattle (2 mentions).

2% of the respondents suggest resurrecting the Mosquito Fleet. Most consider this to be a ferry that runs a route with multiple stops. 3 respondents mentioned Oak Harbor to Coupeville to Camano. All other routes were mentioned only once, although Oak Harbor is frequently part of the route.

Appendix "B" includes suggestions for road improvements, other bridge locations, tunnel locations, some suggestions for Washington State Ferries, and questions for WSDOT.

<

Key Person Interviews

Fifteen interviews were conducted with people in the area who are in a position to have a good "read" on their community. The purpose of these interviews was to gain additional perspective on transportation preferences and feasibility of suggested solutions. Those interviewed were among many suggested by members of the Project Technical Steering Committee. All are familiar with transportation issues, many have served on boards, attended community meetings, or seen the outreach survey. This is a summary of interview responses, with actual comments by category.

Persons Interviewed

Rich Medved	Real Estate Developer- Former Skagit Co. Public Works Dir.
Jim Lynch	Retired – Former Seattle Metro engineer, lives in La Conner
Stan Stanley	Former President-Dir. of EDC, lives in Oak Harbor
Karl Krieg	Owner of Krieg Construction & Bank Trustee
Dr. William Applegate	Retired – Former Planning Commissioner, lives North of Oak Harbor
John Graham	Heads Citizens Coalition + Giraffe Project, lives in Clinton
Lynae Slinden	Clinton Business Owner & community organizer, lives in Langley area
Wayne Crider	Exec. Officer Skagit/Island Co. Builders Assoc. , lives in Oak Harbor
Barbara Bailey	Former Director Navy Spouses Association, lives North of Oak Harbor
Jay Lien	Realtor - Camano Island
Sharleen Eller	Assistant Dir. EDC for Island County, lives in Coupeville
Elizabeth Turpin	League of Women Voters, lives North of Oak Harbor
Rob Harbour	Director Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve, lives in Coupeville
Dean Maxwell *	Mayor, Anacortes
Ian Munce *	Planning Director, Anacortes
Don Piercy	Vice President Interwest Bank, Oak Harbor, lives in Coupeville

* Conducted as one interview.

Summary

Those we interviewed represent varying points of view:

- Most of the interviewees believe that vehicle access to the north part of Whidbey Island is a problem; some say the problem is serious while others are not so sure. Some believe the problem can be alleviated with a combination of moderate improvements, while others think that a bridge is needed (or will be needed eventually). Some who want a bridge or other major improvement say improved access and growth will be good for the Island's economy; others are more concerned with access for those who live on the Island now.
- Many of those we talked with are concerned about population growth and development that may occur if access is substantially improved. Some believe the Island's rural character

and/or infrastructure limitations are paramount considerations. They are concerned that increased access will lead to increased development resulting in the loss of Whidbey Island's special character. While these folks may agree that access to the North part of the Island is a problem, they are willing to pay the price of living with some inconvenience in order to have the rural lifestyle they want. Some of these people do not want to see any new bridges or ferries, while others think some moderate improvements are needed. Most would like to see substantial improvements in public transit.

The extent of the problem:

All but three of the people we spoke with agree there is a problem getting on and off the north end of the Island. (None of these three travel the route regularly.) Those who travel it most often were most likely to say the problem was serious. Other than the fact that there are just too many cars for the size of the road, most agree the problem is made worse by one or more of four factors:

- Narrowness of the bridge
- Narrowness of SR 20 north of the bridge
- Lack of turn-outs or passing lanes
- Slow vehicles (sightseers, or trucks that have to slow down to negotiate the narrow curves).

No Single Solution Emerges:

Approximately a third of the people we interviewed preferred building a new bridge, a couple preferred modest widening of the existing bridge, and one preferred an auto ferry (others said the auto ferry was worth considering). Those who prefer a bridge like that option because it moves the most cars most efficiently. Those who prefer the auto ferry do so because the ferry is not as efficient as a bridge (people have to think about taking a ferry, consider delays, work with a schedule, etc.). Ferries are perceived as not providing the unrestricted pipeline to growth represented by a new bridge.

None of the people we talked with wanted to see the existing bridge widened to the extent that it changed the "look" or "character" of the bridge. Those who suggested widening the bridge (even when it wasn't their preferred solution) felt the bridge could be made safer by moving the pedestrian walkways to the outside or underneath, and using that space for wider lanes. Widening and removing curves north of the bridge were also suggested.

Among those who wanted a new bridge, or who felt a new bridge was worth considering, most preferred Strawberry Point to the Conway/Fir Island area over any other options. This route is seen as more convenient to I-5 and less objectionable than a bridge to Camano.

Others we interviewed do not like any of the possible solutions presented in the questionnaire, although they felt some might be worth consideration. Instead they offered alternate solutions which we will discuss later.

Problems with Possible Solutions:

Problems with two of the possible solutions were discussed repeatedly:

People are very sensitive to the situation on Camano Island. At least three-fourths of those we interviewed said a bridge, or ferry, from Whidbey Island to Camano Island would not work. Such a connection would just transfer Whidbey Island's traffic problem to Camano Island, an area that

already has traffic problems of its own. In addition, we were told that Camano Islanders would resist a bridge or ferry. (There was some suggestion of a passenger only ferry to Camano.)

The other message that came through loud and clear was that it didn't make sense to substantially widen the Deception Pass Bridge (or build a new bridge parallel to the existing one) without similarly widening SR 20 from the bridge to Sharp's Corner, an improvement that some say would be cost prohibitive considering the property acquisition involved. Also, just about everyone interviewed is reluctant to see any construction that would substantially alter the beauty or historical significance of the existing bridge. One person pointed out that any major construction at the Pass, with the resulting traffic delays, would have a serious negative impact on the economy of Oak Harbor.

A few other problems were mentioned:

- A bridge to the Fir Island area would face environmental difficulties.
- Ferries are more expensive, less convenient, and/or less efficient than a bridge.
- Adding a bridge invites growth: more traffic and more people put a strain on the Island's infrastructure. An auto ferry doesn't invite growth to the extent a bridge does.
- La Conner residents enjoy their isolation and will probably resist a bridge near town.

Other Ideas & Solutions:

Most of the people interviewed offered other solutions to the North Whidbey access problem. For those who do not want a new bridge or auto ferry these suggestions were offered as a substitute. Others believe some of these ideas should be implemented in addition to new major access improvements.

- Several mentioned the need for more emphasis on public transit. Those who do not want a new bridge probably have a larger expansion of public transit in mind, as they were more likely to specify improved vanpools and busses. Getting the transit interconnect situation worked out so people can use public transit to easily and conveniently commute between Island and Skagit Counties was mentioned by more than one person. A couple of people said the Navy should be using vanpools and/or busses instead of having personnel commute individually by car.
- A small passenger only ferry between Coupeville and Camano Island for Camano Islanders who need to conduct County business was mentioned by several of those we interviewed. (This suggestion is not seen as a way to significantly relieve traffic congestion.)
- A number of the people we talked with would like to see passenger only ferry service as an alternative to a new bridge or auto ferry service. Passenger only routes mentioned:
 - Oak Harbor to Everett – suggested by two people (one wants a stop in Coupeville)
 - From South end of Island
 - From Whidbey Island to Seattle
 - Improvements to public transit required for passenger only ferry service

- At least three of the people we interviewed said the lack of affordable housing on the island for Navy families and/or lack of jobs on the Island for Navy spouses accounts for much of the traffic crossing Deception Pass Bridge.
- A couple of people suggested increasing the size of ferries on the Clinton-Mukilteo run so they could carry both more cars and walk-on passengers. Bainbridge Island was recommended as a model.

Other suggestions for reducing traffic or improving access are:

- Encourage more vanpool use at major employers
- Enlarge parking lot at south end of bridge.
- Build new bridge from Similk Bay to Coronet Bay.
- Install light rail from Mukilteo to major rail line running from Portland Oregon to Vancouver British Columbia. (Would also like light rail running on Island.)
- Operate transit on Sunday for tourists and have tour busses so tourists park their cars and take the bus to see island.

Other Traffic Problems:

According to those we talked with, there are other areas where highway improvements are needed at least as much as on Whidbey Island:

- SR 20 & I-5 Intersection. (mentioned twice)
- SR 20 from I-5 to Mount Vernon cutoff.
- SR 20 from Sharp's Corner to Burlington.
- SR 20 from Bridge to Sharp's Corner -- straighten out curves.
- SR 532 from Camano Island to I-5 – widen, it's always congested).
- Keystone Ferry is not very reliable, hard on tourism.
- Spend money in more urban areas in Snohomish County, like Mukilteo Speedway.

A Polarizing Issue:

We were advised by several with whom we spoke that the issue of improved access is part of the bigger “pro-growth versus no-growth” issue. We were told that it is primarily residents from the South end of the island who oppose improved access or new development, that they are more organized and more vocal than North end residents. Both residents from the North and South parts of the Island told us about how the Island is split on this issue.

We found that generally those we interviewed from the South or Central parts of the Island spoke more about infrastructure limitations and the need for Whidbey Islanders to decide if they wanted a more suburban or rural lifestyle, mentioning phrases like “rural character” or “island character” more. None of these residents thought a new bridge was a good idea. Instead, they proposed improved transit, passenger only ferries, or a modest widening of the existing bridge by moving pedestrian walkways.

All of those who want a new bridge live in Oak Harbor or the Mainland. That's not to say that all Oak Harbor residents want a bridge; some prefer the other options. Also, we can't say that North Island residents are for unrestrained growth. Although some would like to see new growth and development, others would prefer to see access improved for those who live on the Island in a way that doesn't invite too much new growth.

Comments from Key Person Interviews

Statements of Philosophy/Point of View

How will the increased population created by a new bridge fit with population projections/goals of GMA? Will population exceed projections? Any facility you build (bridge or ferry) will affect population, living patterns, and commuting patterns. Whidbey Island needs to decide how much it wants to grow. Maybe the Island needs to live with a lower population rather than accept State money for improvements that will make the population grow faster than it should.

•

Would like to see more partnership between State and community. What's being proposed is 100% State money to get more people to move to Whidbey. If growth is what Whidbey Island wants the Island should pay its share.

•

Is it a foregone conclusion that vehicle access has to be improved? My misgivings are that if you build it, they will come. We will end up with the same problem again. We don't need more motor vehicles on the Island. We have to realize that other people want to live on the Island, but the Island is reaching its infrastructure limits – we have to be cautious about continued growth.

•

This is a rural area and people around here like it rural. The rural character of the area is also a big attraction for tourists. There's a very fine line between keeping it rural and making improvements that are needed.

•

I feel we should take a hard look at options other than bridges and auto ferries. Many public transportation improvements to reduce single occupant vehicles. In the long term, though, we need to decide if we can live with poor access if we want to live on an Island.

•

What role does Whidbey Island want to play and what kind of road infrastructure does that require? I don't think it's Whidbey's role to be the location for growth. I see it more as a place to recreate and recharge. The rural character is essential. We may have to learn to live with some congestion – although, that still leaves the safety issue to deal with. This has been a gap in the way WSDOT does planning. They need to tailor their thinking to the role of the area instead of trying to offer the same construction for everyone.

•

I'm not against growth. I'm pro-growth, but it needs to be controlled. I would like to see a new bridge.

•

I'm in favor of better public transportation and passenger only ferries rather than auto ferries and new bridges. It seems to me that what people really want is a better way to get to Everett and

Seattle. Transportation needs on the northend can be handled by better public transit ... including the interconnect between Island and Skagit Transit.

You don't see a lot of organization in favor of more growth. The opposition to growth is well organized and very serious. They use fear to block any significant development. The thinking is that improving access is like laying a new trunk line for more phone capacity – improve access and you get more growth, more cars, and more pollution. They are saying "I'm here – stay out".

Statements of Philosophy/Point of View *(Continued)*

Transportation capacity is a main issue in all development. There have been developments proposed in Stanwood and Burlington areas that can't proceed because of transportation capacity. Better transportation is needed for increased development in Oak Harbor area, but job creation also has to be there. Island and Skagit counties have been lagging behind other I-5 counties in development. Better transportation capacity will help – it has been holding up development.

I want to make sure DOT gets the message. They do things from an engineering point of view. There's no creative thinking. Instead of asking which bridge/ferry is most feasible, they should be asking if there is any need for a new bridge at all. We moved here for the "island character" and live with all the inconveniences "happily" in order to have the quality of life we have. All of the debate about growth and planning has to do with "quality of life", regardless of how you see it. Most people are willing to admit there is a price to pay to preserve the rural life. I'm not "no-growth". I'm for sensible growth – growth that infrastructure supports and doesn't ruin the rural character. We have serious infrastructure limitations here (drinking water/storm water run-off). Improved access means more people. I question the benefit of that.

Is North Whidbey Island access a problem?

Yes, there's definitely a problem: heavy trucks have to slow down more than cars; older people drive too slowly; traffic seems to be getting worse all the time. Have had it take as long as 45 minutes to get from Deception Pass Bridge to Sharp's Corner.

Yes there's a problem now, but a new bridge will just exacerbate the problem.

The problem now is that there's a high volume of traffic with no opportunity to pass slow drivers. I rate the problem now as "low" to "moderate", depending on the time of day and day of year. I view it more as a potential problem that can become profound if we don't plan something for the future.

There is a problem. What I find most annoying is that it's a 2 lane road and not enough places to pass. Often there's construction work that causes delays. The bridge is narrow – it's a problem when trucks cross. When tourists are on the bridge it's dangerous.

There's a problem – just too many cars for the available road. But, that doesn't mean that I want more roads or bridges.

From our perspective, there's not that much of a problem. But, we don't commute that way.

There is a problem – from Sharp's Corner to Oak Harbor. SR 20 has too many curves and you get behind slow drivers and trucks.

•
The problem is caused by bridge and road north of bridge being too narrow. It's especially bad in the summer months or when there is any kind of event (construction or other event) around the bridge.

•
Is North Whidbey Island access a problem? *(Continued)*

I don't feel there is a serious traffic problem, but I'm retired and usually cross the bridge during non-commute hours, probably 3-4 times a month.

•
I'm not sure how serious the problem is. Traffic has been slow the few times I've been on the Island lately.

•
Yes, there's a problem. SR 20 doesn't have the capacity to handle the traffic all the way to I-5. There are delays and accidents.

•
SR 20 and access to the North end of the Island is dangerous. You hear about accidents all the time. It's a little twisting two-lane road with, I think, only one passing lane the length of the Island.

•
Preferred Solution

The ideal place for a bridge would be to connect North Whidbey to Fir Island. It's close to I-5 for easy fast connect time in either direction up or down I-5. There's nothing wrong with having a toll to pay for a new bridge. I also would like to see the entire SR 20 corridor widened.

•
I would look seriously at any alternative that takes traffic away from SR 20/Deception Pass Bridge area. Widening the bridge might solve the problem if it could be done, but there are people who don't like that idea because it destroys the natural beauty. You might have to give up part of the park. So, moving traffic away from the bridge is the better solution.

•
I don't think widening the bridge will help unless you also widen SR 20. I guess if it were up to me, I'd widen the narrow parts of SR 20 and add some passing lanes; both on and off the Island from Anacortes down to Coupeville. Putting walkways under the bridge would also help.

•
The best solution is to build a bridge from North Whidbey Island to the Fir Island/Conway area. This is better than a bridge to La Conner or Stanwood because it provides the most direct access to I-5. This will provide safety and access to the people who live on the Island now. I'm not concerned about the growth issue because that will be handled by the GMA and comprehensive plan. A new bridge is the answer. Everything else is a band-aid, not a long-term solution.

•
First, the bridge can be widened by putting the walkways on the outside of the bridge and using that space for roadway. A solid guard should be built in the center to keep people from walking across the bridge. The State should blast away some rock on the north end of the bridge and straighten out the narrow curves in the road and build parking lots for tourists so they don't park along the side of the road. There's been no accommodation for tourists. I'd love to see a bridge

on the east side of the Island and in the long term we will have to have a new bridge. Strawberry Point to somewhere in the Flats/Fir Island area is the best idea.

•
A new bridge via Goat Island to the La Conner area is the best idea. A bridge is better than a ferry because it's so much more efficient at moving cars.

•
The only solution is an auto ferry from downtown Oak Harbor at the old seaplane base to the Mainland somewhere in the Stanwood-Conway area.

Positive Comments about Alternatives *(When they are not the preferred solution)*

A Bridge to Camano Island would help commuters to Boeing, but not sure how feasible it is.

•
Connection to La Conner would relieve a lot of traffic congestion on Deception Pass Bridge.

•
I don't favor any one solution, but feel any that get traffic away from the Bridge are worth considering. A bridge to La Conner would be good, but probably the most impossible from an environmental and cost standpoint. Strawberry Point to Fir Island also sounds good.

•
Auto ferries are more of a quick fix and might be put in service to relieve pressure while a major bridge project comes on line. Ferries would also help with disaster preparedness. The best ferry connection would be whatever is the most direct route to I-5.

•
You can't have an auto ferry to Camano, but having it land on the Stanwood side would probably be OK.

•
Widening the existing bridge is worth considering. I don't see it as 4 lanes. I'm thinking of 2 lanes with a safe bike lane and pedestrian walkway (possibly below). And, you have to respect the façade of the bridge as much as possible. It's hard to find a balance.

•
I don't see adding an auto ferry being as big a problem as a new bridge, in terms of negative impact on island & infrastructure. It's worth taking a look at, but better to connect to mainland than to Camano Island.

•
Widening the existing bridge is OK, but a bridge to Fir Island is better.

•
Building a new bridge would solve the problem, but it would be expensive. It would be better to build a parallel bridge than to try and enlarge the old one. Having the bridge come out near Conway will be less objectionable to people than having it come out in La Conner. Also, Conway is close to the freeway.

Problems with Alternatives

I see huge environmental issues with any connection (bridge or ferry) to the Fir Island area. Remember too, this is the area that flooded a few years ago.

•
Putting in a Ferry is expensive and I'm not impressed with ferry service. There's always a back up. I don't see it as a solution. Bridges are more convenient.

•
Widening the existing bridge or building a parallel bridge are not good ideas. You would also have to widen SR 20 from Oak Harbor to Sharps Corner. It would be very expensive and take away the historic value of the bridge.

•
I don't like any of the bridge or ferry alternatives – widening the existing bridge, making it double tiered or putting a walkway underneath would be a last resort. If you widen SR 20, you will have to take out a lot of trees.

•
People will object to either widening the existing bridge or building a new one beside it because that would ruin the beauty of the area.

•
I'm not in favor of a bridge to Camano, because you end up with the same problem. How do you get traffic off Camano?

•
Camano Island people wouldn't like any auto ferry coming to the Island. They have the same concerns as people on Whidbey Island.

•
While an occasional passenger only ferry from Camano would be nice, a big ferry (either passenger only or auto) would be a big problem. Camano only has the one bridge and people there are worried about impact of a ferry. A big passenger only ferry just wouldn't work because we don't have the public transportation system to support it.

•
Making a 4-lane bridge is not feasible because the road would have to be widened as well.

•
Additional bridges will just encourage more traffic and more people.

•
Put all the new bridge suggestions in the reject column. A new bridge will just create a second generation of problems and costs and a demand for more services. Once you build it, you get more people and more water and sewer infrastructure. The linear nature of the Island doesn't lend itself to utility infrastructure.

•
A bridge to Camano is a no go. There are terrible traffic problems on 532 now and there's a complete "no-growth" attitude on Camano Island.

•
Auto Ferry isn't the solution. It is slower (than a bridge) and can't handle the number of cars.

•
The problem with widening bridge, or building a parallel bridge, is that it would be too expensive to widen SR 20 all the way to Sharp's Corner, which you would have to do. Also, there's the economic impact that any new construction would have if it restricts traffic. It would kill Oak Harbor. So, any new construction has to be away from SR 20.

•
Problems with Alternatives *(Continued)*

I have mixed feelings about a passenger only ferry on the north end of the Island. Not sure it would work. Trying to put a bridge to Camano is not a good idea because people there will rebel.

•
If you widen the bridge or build a new bridge parallel to the existing one, you will have to widen SR 20 as well. That would involve buying homes and businesses on Fidalgo for right-of-way. I think that would be too costly.

•
Building a bridge to Camano is absolutely unacceptable politically to people who live there. It would require condemnation.

•
A ferry to Camano Island is not cost effective.

•
Building a bridge to Camano Island is technically questionable. It would have to be a floating bridge, and the water depth and windblasts would be a problem. I don't know about currents.

•
I don't think you could build anything that came out too close to La Conner. They like their isolation (NIMBY). There's a continuing battle there between those trying to maintain historical significance and merchants who want more tourists.

•
Widening the bridge seems a pricey alternative and would destroy the historic value of the bridge. Similarly a parallel bridge would ruin the beauty of the pass. Personally, I think a bridge to Camano would be OK, but Camano/Stanwood area has traffic problems too. You would just be shifting the problem from one area to another.

•
Building a bridge means you have to widen the road as well. It would be a massive and expensive job to put a four-lane road through the Island. This would destroy the island character.

•
Enlarging the Deception Pass Bridge, or a new bridge in the same place, would be sacrilege.

•
A new bridge (as opposed to auto ferry from Oak Harbor to the Mainland) would be too easy, too inviting to growth. Plus, it would route traffic through a residential area (Strawberry Point). Having to catch a ferry makes people pause -- does not invite so much traffic.

Other Solutions & Ideas

There should be more emphasis on improving Public Transit.

Would like the Clinton/Mukilteo run to follow the Bainbridge Island model of very large ferries that can handle large numbers of walk-on passengers.

A small passenger only ferry between Camano Island and Coupeville would be good, but wouldn't pay for itself and wouldn't relieve congestion.

I would like to see Sunday transit service that would handle some Sunday tourists. One way to promote tourism is to have less traffic with a very accessible transit system. If tourists could get around without cars, it would be a very attractive thing to promote. In places like Yosemite, you park your car and take a tourist buss to see the sights. We could have busses that tour the Island.

A passenger only ferry to/from Seattle would be a good idea. And, we should have passenger only service from Coupeville to Camano Island – but no auto ferries on Camano.

Passenger only ferry service is an idea – but I don't think it will work without improvement to the transit system.

Navy personnel/families can't afford to live on the Island. If we had affordable housing for them on the Island, there would be fewer commuters on the bridge.

Passenger ferries with transit at both ends: Coupeville to Camano would be my preference, but don't know how Camano would feel about that. If public transit were available, maybe there wouldn't be too much impact. We should beef up public transit. We should find out how many cars are going to the NAS and provide them vans or busses. Same thing with other employers.

I've never seen a Navy bus. There should be Navy transportation vanpools. When you go to the Clinton ferry you see dozens of vanpools going to Boeing. The Navy should be doing everything to ease traffic at the north end of the Island that Boeing is doing at the south end.

That transit interconnect problem (between Skagit and Island Transit) needs to get resolved.

I also think there might be a fair amount of support for a passenger only ferry to Camano.

Passenger only ferries at south end of Island would help.

Parking lot at south end of bridge should be enlarged. It slows down traffic when people are trying to turn into a congested parking lot.

Oak Harbor has shown a strong desire to rebuild their pier. They see it as part of revitalizing downtown. There should be a passenger only ferry from the Oak Harbor pier to Everett that would tie in with public transportation down there. Possibly passenger only ferry from Clinton to Seattle as well.

There should be better public transportation including the interconnect between Oak Harbor and Mount Vernon.

Other Solutions & Ideas *(Continued)*

Bigger boats on the Clinton-Mukilteo run would relieve congestion some. Now people are either racing down the Island to try to catch a ferry, or driving all the way around the north end because the wait for the ferry is too long. There should be some public transportation from the north part of the Island to Boeing.

The better location for a bridge is to build a floating bridge from Similk Bay to Coronet Bay on the north end of Whidbey Island. Better than a bridge however, would be to take that money and invest it in the Whidbey Island community so people who live on the Island don't have to go off Island to get jobs. Another source of traffic is because housing on the Island is too expensive so Navy families have to live off the Island.

Would like to see a high-speed passenger only ferry from Oak Harbor to Coupeville to Everett.

I would avoid any projects that involve dealing with the Indians.

I would be in favor of a passenger only ferry between Coupeville and Camano, with bus/van service at each end. It would serve Islanders and not necessarily invite too much growth. Better yet would be to have links to light rail. If it were up to me, I'd have better access to rail from Portland to Vancouver BC; light rail from Mukilteo to Seattle; I'd expand vanpools, bus service, and bike lanes. I'd work to get more jobs on the Island so people don't have to go off island to work. Island County can support increased economic development and employment with small 10-15 person firms.

Other Traffic Problems

A serious problem is between Sharp's Corner and Burlington. Very heavy traffic will soon exceed capacity. This is largely traffic to/from Whidbey Island.

The Keystone ferry is unreliable. That's a problem that affects tourism, which is a major part of the economy around here.

•
There are other areas that are actually a higher priority than Whidbey Island. Primarily the more urban areas: Snohomish County and the Mukilteo Speedway.

•
SR 20 from I-5 to the Mount Vernon cut-off is a much more critical problem to locals than North Whidbey Island.

•
Another traffic problem (but not as critical as SR 20 in North Whidbey) is SR 20 intersection with I-5 in Burlington. Also, Stanwood is growing very fast and Camano traffic is non-stop. Need 4 lanes on SR 532 all the way out to I-5.

•
Need to straighten out the curves on SR 20 north of the bridge.

•
The #1 priority in my opinion is the SR 20/I-5 interchange. It's badly over capacity and needs to be fixed before anything else.

•
State needs to put in passing lanes on SR 20.

Differences between North & South Whidbey Island

•
People in South Whidbey are better at making their views known. The north part of the Island is more populated, more mobile, and less cohesive.

•
A lot of people who live in North Whidbey work up North, so expanding the Clinton ferry won't help the situation on the north part of the Island.

•
People who live from Coupeville south, generally go south to get off the Island rather than north. People from the south part of the Island see the "North SR 20 Access Issue" as a north Whidbey Island issue that doesn't affect them.

•
There's a north/south split on the Island. People in the south see the new bridge as a grab on the part of North Whidbey Island developers to ruin the Island ... then again, South Island people don't commute that way.

•
There's polarization galore on this issue. It's largely those on the South part of the Island who oppose growth. They are vocal and influence politics on the Island.

Appendices

North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study – Public Outreach Survey & Key Person Interviews

Where do you live?

	Residence				Mukilteo/Clinton Ferry				Deception Pass Bridge				Frequency Take				Frequency Cross			
	North Whidbey		South Whidbey		Anacortes/Vernon/		Mount Vernon/		Starwood/		Once a Month		2-3 Times		Once a Week		Don't Use Transit or		Use	
	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Fidalgo	Burlington	LaConner	Camano	Starwood/	Once a Month	or Less a Month	or More a Month	2-3 Times	Once a Week	Once a Week	Vanpool	Vanpool	Carpool	Use	Use
TOTAL	194	340	212	219	15	9	20	145		538	216	78	303	267	265	629	82	102		
100.0	20.0	35.1	21.9	1.5	0.9	2.1	15.0		55.6	22.3	8.1	31.3	27.6	27.4	65.0	8.5	10.5			
N. Whidbey Island (N of Oak Harbor)	191	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161	21	6	15	56	119	155	13	19			
19.7	98.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.9	9.7	7.7	5.0	21.0	44.9	24.6	15.9	18.6			
Central Whidbey (OH to Coupeville)	0	340	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	86	22	50	132	111	217	29	39			
35.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.4	39.8	28.2	16.5	49.4	41.9	34.5	35.4	38.2			
South Whidbey (S. of Coupeville)	0	0	212	0	0	0	0	0	27	95	48	123	34	11	117	26	20			
21.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	44.0	61.5	40.6	12.7	4.2	18.6	31.7	19.6			
Whidbey Island NAS	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	2	0	1			
0.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.3	0.0	1.0			
Anacortes/Fidalgo	15	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	1	5	9	11	2	2			
1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.9	3.4	1.7	2.4	2.0			
Mount Vernon	7	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	4	2	4	2	0			
0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.5	0.8	0.6	2.4	0.0			
Burlington	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0			
0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0			
La Conner	20	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	19	0	0	9	7	2	18	0	1			
2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.6	0.8	2.9	0.0	1.0			
Conway	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Stanwood	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	12	3	0	12	4	0	13	0	2			
1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.7	0.0	2.2	1.4	0.0	4.0	1.5	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.0			
Camano Island	128	0	0	0	0	0	128	0	104	7	0	85	21	6	86	10	13			
13.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.3	0.0	19.3	3.2	0.0	28.1	7.9	2.3	13.7	12.2	12.7			
Other	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	6	4	1	4	0	5			
1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.9	2.6	2.0	1.5	0.4	0.6	0.0	4.9			
No Answer	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

How often do you do each of the following? (Continued)

	Residence										Frequency Take		Frequency Cross				
	North Whidbey		Central Whidbey		South Whidbey		Anacortes/Vernon/ Mount Vernon/ Stanwood/		Mukilteo/Ciinton Ferry		Deception Pass Bridge		Once a Week or More				
	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Fidalgo	Burlington	LaConner	Camano	Once a Month	2-3 Times a Month	Once a Month	2-3 Times a Month	Vanpool	Carpool	
TOTAL	194	340	212	219	15	9	15	9	20	145	538	216	78	303	629	82	102
100.0	20.0	35.1	21.9	1.5	0.9	2.1	15.0	2.1	15.0	55.6	22.3	8.1	31.3	27.4	65.0	8.5	10.5c.
Cross Deception Pass Bridge	15	50	123	1	2	9	97	9	97	174	82	44	303	0	230	33	31
Once a month	7.7	14.7	58.0	6.7	22.2	45.0	66.9	45.0	66.9	32.3	38.0	56.4	100.0	0.0	36.6	40.2	30.4
or less/Never	267	56	132	34	4	7	25	7	25	180	70	16	0	267	198	29	32
2-3 times a month	27.6	28.9	38.8	16.0	33.3	44.4	35.0	35.0	17.2	33.5	32.4	20.5	0.0	100.0	31.5	35.4	31.4
Once a week or more	265	122	111	11	9	3	6	2	6	182	63	17	0	0	200	19	38
27.4	62.9	32.6	5.2	60.0	33.3	10.0	4.1	10.0	4.1	33.8	29.2	21.8	0.0	0.0	31.8	23.2	37.3
No Answer	133	1	47	44	0	0	17	2	17	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
13.7	0.5	13.8	20.8	0.0	0.0	10.0	11.7	10.0	11.7	0.4	0.5	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.2	1.0
d. Use Transit Bus	175	246	130	13	7	18	107	18	107	481	172	51	247	223	629	6	69
Once a month	72.7	72.4	61.3	86.7	77.8	90.0	73.8	90.0	73.8	89.4	79.6	65.4	81.5	83.5	100.0	7.3	67.6
or less/Never	56	6	22	15	2	0	10	1	10	24	24	8	20	22	0	39	17
2-3 times a month	5.8	3.1	6.5	7.1	13.3	0.0	6.9	5.0	6.9	4.5	11.1	10.3	6.6	8.2	0.0	47.6	16.7
Once a week or more	50	8	17	17	0	1	6	0	6	23	10	17	26	13	0	37	13
5.2	4.1	5.0	8.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	4.1	0.0	4.1	4.3	4.6	21.8	8.6	4.9	0.0	45.1	12.7
No Answer	158	5	55	50	0	1	22	1	22	10	10	2	10	9	0	0	3
16.3	2.6	16.2	23.6	0.0	11.1	5.0	15.2	5.0	15.2	1.9	4.6	2.6	3.3	3.4	0.0	0.0	2.9

How often do you do each of the following? (Continued)

	Residence				Frequency Take ---- Mukilteo/Clincon Ferry				Frequency Cross --- Deception Pass Bridge								
	North Whidbey		Central Whidbey		South Whidbey		Mount Vernon/ Stanwood/		Once a Month		Once a Month		Once a Week				
	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Fidalgo	Burlington	LaConner	Camano	or Less	or More	or Less	or More			
TOTAL	194	340	212	219	15	1.5	0.9	2.1	15.0	538	216	78	303	267	265	82	102
	20.0	35.1	21.9	21.9	1.5	0.9	0.9	2.1	15.0	55.6	22.3	8.1	31.3	27.6	27.4	65.0	10.5
e. Use Vanpool																	
Once a month or less/Never	177	276	149	149	15	7	19	118	510	199	61	276	248	244	615	69	86
	91.2	81.2	70.3	70.3	100.0	77.8	95.0	81.4	94.8	92.1	78.2	91.1	92.9	92.1	97.8	84.1	84.3
2-3 times a month	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	4
	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	1.4	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.2	3.9
Once a week or more	6	4	4	4	0	0	0	1	4	1	10	4	2	9	0	8	7
	3.1	1.2	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.5	12.8	1.3	0.7	3.4	0.0	9.8	6.9
No Answer	11	58	59	27.8	0	1	1	24	19	16	7	21	14	12	14	4	5
	5.7	17.1	27.8	27.8	0.0	11.1	5.0	16.6	3.5	7.4	9.0	6.9	5.2	4.5	2.2	4.9	4.9
f. Use Carpool																	
Once a month or less/Never	164	245	137	137	13	8	18	107	467	170	59	254	225	216	617	78	0
	84.5	72.1	64.6	64.6	86.7	88.9	90.0	73.8	86.8	78.7	75.6	83.8	84.3	81.5	98.1	95.1	0.0
2-3 times a month	10	17	9	9	1	0	1	9	30	17	2	15	14	20	0	0	50
	5.2	5.0	4.2	4.2	6.7	0.0	5.0	6.2	5.6	7.9	2.6	5.0	5.2	7.5	0.0	0.0	49.0
Once a week or more	10	22	11	11	1	0	0	6	25	16	11	16	18	18	0	0	52
	5.2	6.5	5.2	5.2	6.7	0.0	0.0	4.1	4.6	7.4	14.1	5.3	6.7	6.8	0.0	0.0	51.0
No Answer	10	56	55	25.9	0	1	1	23	16	13	6	18	10	11	12	4	0
	5.2	16.5	25.9	25.9	0.0	11.1	5.0	15.9	3.0	6.0	7.7	5.9	3.7	4.2	1.9	4.9	0.0

Here are some possible solutions ... we'd like to know what you think about each one.

	Residence						Frequency Take			Frequency Cross									
	North Whidbey		Central Whidbey		South Whidbey		Mukilteo/Clinton Ferry			Deception Pass Bridge									
	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Once a Month	2-3 Times	Once a Week	Once a Month	2-3 Times	Once a Week	Once a Month	2-3 Times	Once a Week	Don't Use Transit or	Use Vanpool	Use Carpool	
Total	194	340	212	15	9	20	145	538	216	78	303	267	265	629	82	102	10.5	8.5	10.5
	20.0	35.1	21.9	1.5	0.9	2.1	15.0	55.6	22.3	8.1	31.3	27.6	27.4	65.0	8.5	10.5	8.5	10.5	10.5
Widen the Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges																			
Prefer this	11	20	14	0	2	4	27	58	15	1	36	27	11	57	8	6	6	8	6
	5.7	5.9	6.6	0.0	22.2	20.0	18.6	10.8	6.9	1.3	11.9	10.1	4.2	9.1	9.8	5.9	5.9	9.8	5.9
Worth considering	41	78	53	4	2	3	36	118	66	20	88	64	53	149	23	24	24	23	24
	21.1	22.9	25.0	26.7	22.2	15.0	24.8	21.9	30.6	25.6	29.0	24.0	20.0	23.7	28.0	23.5	23.5	28.0	23.5
Reject this	123	200	95	9	2	10	50	298	121	49	139	154	176	356	42	65	65	42	65
	63.4	58.8	44.8	60.0	22.2	50.0	34.5	55.4	56.0	62.8	45.9	57.7	66.4	56.6	51.2	63.7	63.7	51.2	63.7
No Opinion	6	3	3	0	0	1	8	15	2	1	8	4	5	13	3	2	2	3	2
	3.1	0.9	1.4	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.5	2.8	0.9	1.3	2.6	1.5	1.9	2.1	3.7	2.0	2.0	3.7	2.0
No Answer	13	39	47	2	3	2	24	49	12	7	32	18	20	54	6	5	5	6	5
	6.7	11.5	22.2	13.3	33.3	10.0	16.6	9.1	5.6	9.0	10.6	6.7	7.5	8.6	7.3	4.9	4.9	7.3	4.9
Build a new bridge																			
Prefer this	74	94	36	5	3	5	39	182	48	16	67	80	101	201	21	19	19	21	19
	38.1	27.6	17.0	33.3	33.3	25.0	26.9	33.8	22.2	20.5	22.1	30.0	38.1	32.0	25.6	18.6	18.6	25.6	18.6
Worth considering	38	64	31	4	3	7	50	133	42	14	68	60	62	139	21	25	25	21	25
	19.6	18.8	14.6	26.7	33.3	35.0	34.5	24.7	19.4	17.9	22.4	22.5	23.4	22.1	25.6	24.5	24.5	25.6	24.5
Reject this	69	161	129	6	2	6	36	182	116	39	137	110	90	240	35	54	54	35	54
	35.6	47.4	60.8	40.0	22.2	30.0	24.8	33.8	53.7	50.0	45.2	41.2	34.0	38.2	42.7	52.9	52.9	42.7	52.9
No Opinion	3	1	3	0	0	0	4	6	2	2	8	2	0	9	1	0	0	1	0
	1.5	0.3	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	1.1	0.9	2.6	2.6	0.7	0.0	1.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
No Answer	10	20	13	0	1	2	16	35	8	7	23	15	12	40	4	4	4	4	4
	5.2	5.9	6.1	0.0	11.1	10.0	11.0	6.5	3.7	9.0	7.6	5.6	4.5	6.4	4.9	3.9	3.9	4.9	3.9

North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study -- Public Outreach Survey & Key Person Interviews

No Answer	158	33	56	44	0	0	5	16	77	45	15	60	37	40	104	13	16
	16.3	17.0	16.5	20.8	0.0	0.0	25.0	11.0	14.3	20.8	19.2	19.8	13.9	15.1	16.5	15.9	15.7

Here are some possible solutions ... we'd like to know what you think about each one. (Continued)

	Residence										Frequency Take			Frequency Cross											
	North Whidbey		Central Whidbey		South Whidbey		Anacortes/Vernon/		Mount Vernon/		Stanwood/		Mukilteo/Clinton Ferry		Deception Pass Bridge		Once a Week or More		Once a Month or Less		Don't Use Transit or				
	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Fidalgo	Burlington	LaConner	Caimano	or Less	a Month	2-3 Times	Once a Week	or More	a Month	2-3 Times	Once a Week	or More	a Month	2-3 Times	Once a Week	or More	Vanpool	Carpool
TOTAL	194	340	212	219	15	9	20	145	15.0	2.1	15.0	55.6	22.3	8.1	31.3	27.6	27.4	265	27.4	265	27.6	27.4	65.0	82	102
100.0	20.0	35.1	21.9	1.5	0.9	0.9	2.1	15.0	55.6	22.3	8.1	31.3	27.6	27.4	265	27.6	27.4	65.0	82	102	8.5	10.5	8.5	8.5	10.5

Build new bridge from North Whidbey Island to mainland near La Conner, via Goat Island

Prefer this	76	23	30	5	3	0	3	10	57	11	3	16	22	32	57	6	4
	7.9	11.9	8.8	2.4	20.0	0.0	15.0	6.9	10.6	5.1	3.8	5.3	8.2	12.1	9.1	7.3	3.9
Worth considering	242	55	74	30	5	4	2	66	170	54	7	89	65	78	185	21	24
	25.0	28.4	21.8	14.2	33.3	44.4	10.0	45.5	31.6	25.0	9.0	29.4	24.3	29.4	29.4	25.6	23.5
Reject this	435	66	168	123	7	2	13	38	204	94	47	125	124	97	247	37	52
	44.9	34.0	49.4	58.0	46.7	22.2	65.0	26.2	37.9	43.5	60.3	41.3	46.4	36.6	39.3	45.1	51.0
No Opinion	37	13	10	6	0	1	0	7	21	8	4	9	10	14	23	4	4
	3.8	6.7	2.9	2.8	0.0	11.1	0.0	4.8	3.9	3.7	5.1	3.0	3.7	5.3	3.7	4.9	3.9
No Answer	178	37	58	48	0	2	2	24	86	49	17	64	46	44	117	14	18
	18.4	19.1	17.1	22.6	0.0	22.2	10.0	16.6	16.0	22.7	21.8	21.1	17.2	16.6	18.6	17.1	17.6

Build new bridge from Whidbey Island's Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area

Prefer this	146	37	49	19	5	2	2	29	100	25	13	45	32	62	108	14	13
	15.1	19.1	14.4	9.0	33.3	22.2	10.0	20.0	18.6	11.6	16.7	14.9	12.0	23.4	17.2	17.1	12.7
Worth considering	239	51	85	32	5	2	6	53	166	51	9	77	70	81	182	18	24
	24.7	26.3	25.0	15.1	33.3	22.2	30.0	36.6	30.9	23.6	11.5	25.4	26.2	30.6	28.9	22.0	23.5
Reject this	367	58	140	108	4	2	9	28	162	82	38	102	108	72	198	31	45
	37.9	29.9	41.2	50.9	26.7	22.2	45.0	19.3	30.1	38.0	48.7	33.7	40.4	27.2	31.5	37.8	44.1
No Opinion	38	8	9	8	1	1	0	9	18	10	3	14	8	9	24	5	0

North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study – Public Outreach Survey & Key Person Interviews

	3.9	4.1	2.6	3.8	6.7	11.1	0.0	6.2	3.3	4.6	3.8	4.6	3.0	3.4	3.8	6.1	0.0
No Answer	178	40	57	45	0	2	3	26	92	48	15	65	49	41	117	14	20
	18.4	20.6	16.8	21.2	0.0	22.2	15.0	17.9	17.1	22.2	19.2	21.5	18.4	15.5	18.6	17.1	19.6

Here are some possible solutions ... we'd like to know what you think about each one. (Continued)

----- Frequency Take ----- Frequency Pass Bridge

Mukilteo/Clinton Ferry Deception Pass Bridge

Once 2-3 Once 2-3 Once 2-3

a Month Times a Month Times a Month Times

or Less a Month or More or More

538 216 78 303 267 265

55.6 22.3 8.1 31.3 27.6 27.4

8.1 31.3 27.6 27.4 65.0 8.5

102 10.5

Use

Vanpool

Transit or

North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study – Public Outreach Survey & Key Person Interviews

No Opinion	29 3.0	5 2.6	13 3.8	5 2.4	1 6.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 2.8	16 3.0	6 2.8	4 5.1	9 3.0	11 4.1	6 2.3	22 3.5	3 3.7	0 0.0
No Answer	236 24.4	35 18.0	78 22.9	75 35.4	3 20.0	1 11.1	7 35.0	22 15.2	94 17.5	42 19.4	15 19.2	68 22.4	47 17.6	36 13.6	112 17.8	19 23.2	15 14.7

Here are some possible solutions ... we'd like to know what you think about each one. (Continued)

	Residence										Frequency Take				Frequency Cross																	
	North Whidbey		Central Whidbey		South Whidbey		Anacortes/ Vernon/ Mount		Stanwood/ Camano		Mukiteo/Clinton Ferry		Deception Pass Bridge		Once a Week		2-3 Times		Once a Month		2-3 Times		Once a Week		Don't Use Transit or Use							
	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Fidalgo	Burlington	LaConner	Camano	or Less	or More	or Less	or More	or Less	or More	or Less	or More	or Less	or More	or Less	or More	or Less	or More	or Less	or More	or Less	or More				
TOTAL	194	340	212	28	4	2	15	9	20	145	538	216	78	303	267	265	82	102	629	85	10.5	27.4	27.6	30.2	30.2	26.7	24.4	20.2	23.2	20.2	23.2	25.5
100.0	20.0	36.1	21.9	13.2	26.7	33.3	1.5	0.9	2.1	15.0	55.6	22.3	8.1	31.3	27.6	27.4	27.4	27.4	65.0	8.5	10.5	27.4	27.6	30.2	30.2	26.7	24.4	20.2	23.2	25.5		

Add auto ferry from North Whidbey to Stanwood or other mainland locations

Prefer this	186 19.2	34 17.5	56 16.5	28 13.2	4 26.7	2 22.2	6 30.0	54 37.2	120 22.3	41 19.0	12 15.4	70 23.1	59 22.1	45 17.0	127 20.2	19 23.2	26 25.5
Worth considering	237 24.5	52 26.8	89 26.2	50 23.6	5 33.3	4 44.4	5 25.0	26 17.9	140 26.0	71 32.9	14 17.9	75 24.8	70 26.2	80 30.2	168 26.7	20 24.4	31 30.4
Reject this	298 30.8	68 35.1	106 31.2	53 25.0	5 33.3	2 22.2	5 25.0	49 33.8	186 34.6	57 26.4	29 37.2	86 28.4	89 33.3	99 37.4	208 33.1	27 32.9	29 28.4
No Opinion	28 2.9	7 3.6	13 3.8	5 2.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 1.4	15 2.8	7 3.2	4 5.1	11 3.6	6 2.2	9 3.4	23 3.7	3 3.7	0 0.0
No Answer	219 22.6	33 17.0	76 22.4	76 35.8	1 6.7	1 11.1	4 20.0	14 9.7	77 14.3	40 18.5	19 24.4	61 20.1	43 16.1	32 12.1	103 16.4	13 15.9	16 15.7

Other possible solutions (Write-in)

Frequency Cross	Residence										Mukilteo/Clinton Ferry			Deception Pass Bridge			Frequency Take																	
	North Whidbey		Central Whidbey		South Whidbey		Anacortes/Vernon/ Mount		Fidalgo Burlington		LaConner Camano		Stanwood/		Once a Month	2-3 Times a Month	Once a Week or More	Once a Month	2-3 Times a Month	Once a Week	Don't Use Transit or Vanpool	Use Vanpool or Carpool												
	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Island	Whidbey	Anacortes/	Vernon/	Fidalgo	Burlington	LaConner	Camano	Stanwood/	Once a Month	2-3 Times a Month	Once a Week or More	Once a Month	2-3 Times a Month	Once a Week	Don't Use Transit or Vanpool	Use Vanpool or Carpool													
TOTAL	194	340	212	15	9	20	145	538	216	78	303	267	265	629	82	102	100.0	35.1	21.9	1.5	0.9	2.1	15.0	55.6	22.3	8.1	31.3	27.6	27.4	65.0	8.5	39	5	6.1
10.5 Passenger Only	77	8	39	18	0	0	0	6	26	21	11	22	24	11	39	5	13 Ferries	8.0	4.1	11.5	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	4.8	9.7	14.1	7.3	9.0	4.2	6.2	6.1	
	37	2	14	12	0	0	8	12	6	6	15	5	4	17	1	4	3.8	1.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.0	5.5	2.2	2.8	7.7	5.0	1.9	1.5	2.7	1.2	3.9		
Increase capacity of Mukilteo/Clinton run	8	9	9	0	0	0	4	12	10	5	12	10	5	20	5	2	3.0	4.1	2.6	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.8	2.2	4.6	6.4	4.0	3.7	1.9	3.2	6.1	2.0		
Other auto ferry connection	4	11	2	0	0	0	1	10	5	2	6	8	3	10	2	5	2.0	2.1	3.2	0.9	0.0	0.7	1.9	1.9	2.3	2.6	2.0	3.0	1.1	1.6	2.4	4.9		
Mosquito Fleet - direct ferry connections	11	9	4	1	0	1	7	22	8	2	14	9	9	28	1	3	3.5	5.7	2.6	1.9	6.7	5.0	4.8	4.1	3.7	2.6	4.6	3.4	4.5	1.2	2.9			
Other bridge connection	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	1	5	2	2	7	1	1	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.9	1.3	1.7	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.0			
^ Park & Ride suggestions	1	10	13	0	0	1	3	11	7	3	12	7	2	14	1	6	29	0.5	2.9	6.1	0.0	2.1	3	2.0	3.2	3.8	4.0	2.6	2.2	1.1	1.2	5.9		
^ Carpool/Vanpool suggestions	15	55	38	1	1	1	11	51	35	14	50	33	18	56	18	25	127	7.7	16.2	17.9	6.7	7.6	16.5	12.4	6.8	8.9	22.0	24.5						
^ * Increase/Improve Transit	2	6	5	0	0	0	2	7	5	2	10	1	3	8	2	4	1.5	1.0	1.8	2.4	0.0	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.3	2.4	3.9			
^ * Vastly Improved Transit Network	16	61	42	1	1	1	13	57	39	16	59	34	20	63	19	29	140	8.2	17.9	19.8	6.7	9.0	12.7	7.5	10.0	23.2	28.4							
* IMPROVE TRANSIT (NET)	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5		

North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study -- Public Outreach Survey & Key Person Interviews

1.3	1.0	0.9	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.3	1.4	3.8	2.0	1.5	1.1	1.3	0.0	4.9
Island Employment/ Work Hours	6 0.6	3 0.9	2 0.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.7	2 0.4	3 1.4	1 1.3	2 0.7	2 0.7	1 0.4	4 0.6	1 1.2	0 0.0
Navy pays for impact/ Close NAS	4 0.4	3 0.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 0.4	2 0.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 1.1	1 0.4	3 0.5	0 0.0	1 1.0
Other	64 6.6	24 7.1	9 4.2	4 26.7	0 5.0	1 5.0	8 5.5	38 7.1	12 5.6	1 1.3	17 5.6	16 6.0	18 6.8	37 5.9	4 4.9	7 6.9

Appendix B - Lists of Selected Responses to the Question:

“Are there other possible solutions that you feel should be considered?”

(Note: Each response listed was mentioned once, unless multiple number of mentions noted in parenthesis.)

SUGGESTIONS FOR OTHER BRIDGE LOCATIONS

Fidalgo Island to Whidbey east of Deception Pass where the old ferry used to run: (2)
From juncture of Tooxell (sp?) and Jones Road across County Park Ala Spit across channel to Hope Island and then across to Fidalgo Island near Lone Tree Point
Fox Spit (East Point) to Camano State Park
North Whidbey to North Camano, then another bridge North Camano to 300th Street, then widen 300th Street out to I-5
Cornet Bay Road end on Whidbey to Dewey Beach area, one way north bound; Lone Lake & Deception Pass and park one way south bound
East of Cornet Bay to Dewey or Gibraltar
Hoypus Point east of Cornet Bay to Dewey Beach
Blowers Bluff area or Snokelum Point area to Camano, thru Stanwood to I-5
Oak Harbor to Camano
Oak Harbor to Mt. Vernon
Strawberry Point to Utsalady Point
Strawberry Point to Brown Point or Utsalady Bay
Points South of Oak Harbor to mainland
Silver Lake Road (Whidbey) to Fir Island Road out of Conway
Coupeville to Camano
Central Whidbey, south of Coupeville (Morris or Wanamaker Rd.) to Camano
Race Road (Central Whidbey) to Camano area of Camano Island
Race Road to south of Onamac Point on Camano
Langley to South Camano to mainland
Greenbank to Camano
South Whidbey to Camano
South Whidbey to mainland: (3)
South Whidbey to Mukilteo
South Whidbey to mainland near Everett, via Gedney Island
South Whidbey to Everett-Mukilteo area
Glendale (S. Whidbey) to Everett or Nelson Corner (Mukilteo)
Clinton to Mukilteo: (2)
Whidbey to Hope Island
Camano to closest point on Whidbey
Port Townsend to Whidbey to Camano
South end of Camano to mainland
Fir Island to mainland

OTHER SUGGESTED ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Add bike lanes: (6)

Add more pull-over/passing areas for slow moving vehicles: (3)

Put in a few more slow lanes; add signage that slow drivers must pull over to avoid back-ups.

Four lane straight areas for passing.

Add permanent passing lanes across Dugualla Flats (2 lanes each direction).

Add passing lanes at North & South exits of Deception Pass park at park boundaries.

Add adequate turn lanes.

Add middle turning lanes.

Add left & right turn lanes.

Install numerous left turn lanes.

Add left turn lanes at intersections

More left turn lanes at major intersections along Hwy. 525.

At big traveled intersections, make center lane a left turn.

Add shoulders: (3)

Widen shoulders.

Widen the highway: (5)

Widen some areas: (2)

Widen the whole length of SR 20 and 525.: (2)

Widen, add lights, turn lanes, bike lanes, etc.

Widen, straighten, add center lanes and lighting

Fix/widen SR 20 before considering bridges or auto ferries.

Create 3 lanes wherever possible & alternate 2 lanes northbound and (in a different stretch) 2 lanes southbound for passing zones

Extend 4-laning of SR 20 East into Burlington

4-lane SR 20 to I-5

4-lane north end of SR 20

4 lane SR 20 everywhere except the bridge.

SR 20 ought to be 4 lanes from Sharps Corner to SR 525 intersection east of Keystone ferry.

Build a four lane highway SR 20/525.

Improve intersections (Parker Rd/Morris Rd/SR 20)

Triangle intersections to midpoint of inside curves.

Add guard rails and traffic signals at major intersections.

Add traffic signals.

Add more stop lights in the future

OTHER SUGGESTED ROAD IMPROVEMENTS (cont.)

Add lights 5:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. during November, December, January & February (Hwy. 525 too)

Add high sodium vapor lighting to all roads.

Lane markings at night need to be brighter.

Channel through traffic away from the state park and tourist attractions

Construct a by-pass highway around the City of Oak Harbor

Add another road, parallel to SR 20 - make each one way.

Create alternative routes parallel, though not adjacent to SR 20, allowing some traffic to bypass the congested business areas.

Build bypass around Oak Harbor area.

From SR 20 out Fackena Road (sp?) build a short road to connect to road to High lane at Greens.

Build an alternate route off-island that completely bypasses Deception Pass/ Anacortes/Mt. Vernon.

Build an escape route off the Island in addition to SR 20 for emergencies/disasters - a road to Clinton and/or Deception Pass.

Camano needs another way off the island - especially for emergencies.

New north-south freeway along west Cascades to bypass Olympia, Tacoma, Seattle, Everett, Mt. Vernon, Bellingham to Canada.

Make the main highway safer

Improve road from Texaco refinery to Dugualla Bay Flats

Improve SR 20 between Oak Harbor and Sharps Corner.

Return SR 20 to 2-3 lanes only through Oak Harbor

Go back to gravel roads!!

SUGGESTED TUNNEL LOCATIONS

Through the cliff face on North side of Deception Pass to where power line intersects SR 20
Through Deception Pass on north side - parallel current power lines with highway winding up north of Pass Lake
Mukilteo or other location to Whidbey
North Whidbey to near La Conner, "Dugualla Bay Tunnel"
Strawberry Point to Conway
Strawberry Point to the Mainland
South of Penn Cove, or somewhere between Strawberry Point and Poinell Point to Camano
Port Townsend to Whidbey to Camano
Port Townsend to Everett

QUESTIONS FOR WSDOT

What are the useful lives of each of the proposed solutions?

What is the increased unit cost for each solution if/when Whidbey Island NAS is closed?

Long range, how much does it cost to build a bridge vs. the cost of running a ferry system?

What is the potential benefit of each proposed solution beyond simply moving vehicles, i.e.; regional impacts such as the Cascadia Corridor and the Vancouver, B.C./Seattle link?

What is the "time cost of money" for proposed solution?

In the trade-off analysis what other, unrelated but potential projects would be put at risk by choosing any of the proposed solutions?

Have you conducted a survey to determine what percentage of current No. Whidbey residents actually "work" on the mainland? What percentage of current No. Whidbey residents who commute will retire within next 10 years? What percentage of population increase will move to No. Whidbey? What percent of population increase in next 10 years living in No. Whidbey will work on mainland? What percentage will be retired?

How can DOT's OFM justify it's population projections with concurrency requirements of GMA?

What is the relative flexibility of each of the proposed solutions to future demographic changes?

Bridges spanning greater distances than possible ferry routes?

Could you put a toll on the existing bridge and charge more for fewer people per car? With no toll lanes for buses and vanpools - TDM measures.

Would a tunnel be less affected than a bridge by weather?

What would the financial impact be of a tunnel versus a bridge?

Is Puget Sound too deep for a tunnel?

Why not eliminate parking at Deception Pass?

Why don't you lay all the bridge and ferry solutions over each other on a map so we can compare them? (Good Open House note)

What constituencies do your citizen participants represent?

How were the Technical and Policy Steering Committees selected?

Why so few questionnaires distributed?

What is the point of providing better access to our island if the roads aren't adequate to handle the increased traffic?

Is there any way to facilitate commuters from Camano to Redmond area?

What are the relative sensitivities to, and recovery times from a major seismic event?

Is new access needed for the summer crowds, or does the Island have enough full-time residents to warrant such an expense?

Why did you repave Hwy. 525, Smugglers Cove Road, Main Street and East Harbor Road in Freeland? It was totally unnecessary and the management of traffic during the Hwy. 525 repaving was the worst I've ever seen.

SUGGESTED LOCATIONS FOR NEW AUTO FERRY SERVICE

North Whidbey to Camano: (2)
North Whidbey to Camano and/or Stanwood
North Whidbey to Conway/LaConner, not Stanwood
North Whidbey to mainland
Hoypus Point or Ala Spit to Swinomish Reservation
Oak Harbor or Crescent Harbor to mainland
Oak Harbor to Stanwood
Oak Harbor to Camano
Oak Harbor or Coupeville to Camano
Oak Harbor to Seattle: (2)
Strawberry Point to Fir Island or Conway area
Somewhere between Oak Harbor & Coupeville to Camano
Somewhere between Oak Harbor & Coupeville to Mukilteo
Central Whidbey to Seattle
Coupeville to Stanwood
Coupeville to Camano: (5)
Coupeville to Everett or Edmonds
Somewhere south of Coupeville to Camano
South Whidbey to Seattle
Possession Point to Edmonds
Clinton to Edmonds
Whidbey to Camano
Whidbey to Seattle
Whidbey to Bellingham

Anacortes to Port Townsend
Mukilteo to Port Townsend
Stanwood to Edmonds
South end of Camano to mainland

**SUGGESTED LOCATIONS FOR
NEW PASSENGER ONLY FERRY SERVICE**

North Whidbey to Camano: (4)
Oak Harbor to Stanwood
Oak Harbor to Camano: (2)
Oak Harbor to Everett: (2)
Oak Harbor to Seattle: (5)
Strawberry Point to Camano
Eastern side of Whidbey to Camano
Central Whidbey to Seattle
Central Whidbey to Camano
Central Whidbey to Camano Island State Park
Coupeville to Camano: (13)
Coupeville to Everett
Langley to Everett
Keystone to Seattle
Clinton to Mukilteo: (5)
Clinton to Seattle: (4)
S. Whidbey to S. Camano
S. Whidbey to Seattle
Columbia Beach to Everett
Whidbey to Camano: (7)
Whidbey to mainland
Whidbey to Stanwood: (4)
Whidbey to South Snohomish
Whidbey to Mukilteo: (2)
Whidbey to Everett: (2)
Whidbey to Seattle: (5)

**SUGGESTED ROUTES FOR
"MOSQUITO FLEET" FERRY SERVICE**

(Note: “Mosquito Fleet” service = multiple locations served by one ferry route.)

North Whidbey to Central Whidbey to Freeland or Langley
North Whidbey (or Keystone to reduce costs) to Everett to Seattle
Oak Harbor to Coupeville to Camano: (3)
Oak Harbor to Coupeville to Stanwood
Oak Harbor to Island cities to Everett
Oak Harbor to Clinton to Everett to Seattle, high speed
Oak Harbor to Camano to Everett (& maybe Seattle & Sea-Tac)
Oak Harbor to Everett to Mukilteo to Seattle
Oak Harbor to downtown Seattle, with stops along the way
Central Whidbey locations to Camano
Langley to South Camano to mainland
Keystone to Everett to Seattle
South Whidbey to Coupeville to North Whidbey to Camano
Clinton to downtown Seattle , with stops along the way
Whidbey to Camano to Stanwood to Mukilteo to Everett
Whidbey to Seattle to Bellingham to Tacoma to Port Angeles

Bellingham to Seattle to Port Angeles to Tacoma

SUGGESTIONS FOR WASHINGTON STATE FERRIES

Add auto parking facilities (short-term and long-term) in Mukilteo: (4)

Provide more parking at Mukilteo ferry.

Expand parking facilities at all Island-side ferry terminals for walk-ons, with free motorcycle & bicycle parking.

Add park and ride lots at ferry terminal.

Add overhead loading for foot passengers at Clinton & Mukilteo.

Put the Mukilteo/Clinton weekend ferry runs back on the half hour, instead of 20-25 minutes apart during evening hours, (post-commute).

Improve passenger facilities - parking garages, clean & heated waiting areas.

Remove fare from walk-on use of Clinton -Mukilteo run.

Let pedestrians & bikes travel free, both directions; or give a discount to cars carrying 3+ people

No charge on ferries for vanpools or their passengers.

NO charge for cars with 4+ people.

Increasing charges for vehicles with fewer passengers, e.g. on person car pays lots more than 2 person car.

Create a "Whidbey Island Residents Only" lane on both sides of the ferries that would get priority in loading

OTHER COMMENTS

Close existing bridge to all but park traffic.

What is needed is parking area away from the highway and a pedestrian bridge and footpath. Attach pedestrian bridge to present bridge with connecting path to parking area and overpass across highway so people can hike trail to Goose Rock or walk around area on east side of bridge. Keep cars moving across bridge without stopping and ticket too slow drivers. Add a pedestrian walk under the Deception Pass Bridge.

Relieve the gridlock on the mainland first.: (2)
Use transportation dollars to solve traffic problems on the mainland.
Expanding existing cities on mainland should be considered.
Use bridge money to solve traffic congestion in the I-5 corridor.

The Island would show that it is making land use and traffic improvement decisions that will help its situation before the rest of the state has to pay for a bridge.
Get rid of our real estate and business-oriented governing bodies.
DOT proposals violate GMA concepts - leave those decisions to local governments who are addressing them in proper State-mandated way.

Restrict Island to residents only.
Limit number of non-resident cars/trucks coming on to/off of Island at certain peak times.
Limit the number of no-resident vehicles that can come onto our island, just as the federal government has done at Yosemite.

After improving public transportation, discourage non-carpool drivers from using Deception Pass with a toll, and reward carpoolers with either a lower toll than single passenger cars or no charge at all.: (2)
Bicycles should be encouraged and promoted as a means of pollution free transportation.
Create trucking cooperatives for transporting supplies to the Island.
Increase gasoline taxes to force us to find other ways of getting around: //
State should stop deciding what is best for Island residents.
New development should finance any road changes.
Have a single 50 mph limit the entire length of Whidbey Island and enforce it.
Prior to making a decision, a public vote should be taken to determine whether or not the citizens want to subject themselves to the increased population and traffic density.
Give Camano to Snohomish County.
Increase speed limits Classic to Freeland.
Water could be brought to Island via bridges.
Telecommunications and telecommuting improvements - DOT should offer direct T1 or fiber optic data transmission lines to companies and individuals who defer peak hour usage of transportation system.
Be more dependent on local facilities and service.

Appendix C – Verbatim Comments from Questionnaires

*Sorted by Solution
Sub-sorted by Preference or Rejection*

Widen the Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges

“Prefer This” Comments:

Improve the existing route. The people who live on Whidbey moved there knowing the degree of remoteness. That degree should be maintained. A quantum leap of access should not be made. Whidbey residents had full knowledge of mainland access when they located there. Why should they expect the state to remove all access deficits at state expense? People can accept the conditions or move. We all have choices.

Traffic on the highway and side roads area already so thick that it would also require widening some of them. It may need to be done anyway. We don't need another slow way on and off. Remove pedestrian walkways, put under the road deck.

Whichever (among widen, new bridge & new bridge parallel options) is affordable, giving the most room for future transportation!

Take advantage of existing infrastructure and traffic/social patterns.

See Auckland, New Zealand example - they hired Japanese engineers who designed an additional lane on each side and attached it, calling it the “Nippon-Clip on” technique!

Other access needs widening.

Whidbey has 3 access points; that's enough; limit growth.

If foot traffic is moved to suspended under-bridge walkways.

If you make SR 20 5 lanes Sharpes Corner to Oak Harbor.

Would improve traffic flow considerably if the bridge were wider and the foot traffic not as close to road traffic.

Probably the most affordable option for the budget of the State.

Has the least amount of negative impact on existing dwellers and dwellings.

This solution would cost less

Best chance of getting beyond EPA. Least impact on environs.

Make 2 wide lanes with no sidewalks.

Seems to be most economical.

Sure to cause less inconvenience.

Least expensive?

Eliminate walkways - would allow increased vehicle speeds using a minimum speed limit!

“Worth Considering” Comments:

Meaningless unless SR20 is widened to 4 lanes.

If the purpose of this survey is to solve the Deception Pass congestion then the solution should be there with widening the bridge or a new bridge.

When the time comes.

Meaningless unless SR20 is widened to 4 lanes.

Must be done NOW! DOT is already 10 years behind the times for current traffic!

Will improve safety.

Remove pedestrian walkways on Deception Pass Bridge, provide viewing facilities and a walkway under the bridge deck.

Widen Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: “Worth Considering” (cont.):

Modify and control random parking on the north side of the bridge and an Canoe Island space.

Probably will need to be done at some point in time.

Consider only after improved transit and passenger ferry service.

Depends on cost.

This option might greatly affect the beauty of the Deception Pass area as well as the park area.

Would require the rebuilding and/or widening of SR 20 to Sharp's Corner.

But very disruptive to existing traffic flow.

Bottlenecks occur when people slow down to enjoy the scenery in the Deception Pass area.

Entering and departing from the scenic pull-outs are another major problem area. Separate lanes that do not have access to pull-outs or pedestrians would afford major relief.

Aesthetically undesirable. Bridge is the gateway to Whidbey, and says that this is a special place.

However, it would mar the beautiful historic bridge structure...

Would only be effective if the highway was widened to 4 lanes from Anacortes to the south end.

If you create uninterrupted traffic flow to/from I-5.

Which would be more cost effective, this or building a new bridge?

Bridge can be widened by removing pedestrian sidewalks (hazardous anyway). Pedestrian viewpoints could be added under, over, or beside (least acceptable).

Worth considering only if you also widen SR20.

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost at this stage.

Would require widening from Sharp's Corner on Fidalgo to Oak Harbor city limits to 4 lanes - seems prohibitive.

Not to 4 lanes; some widening OK if maintain original bridge character.

Widen approach both sides and extra parking.

Recognize the need for maintaining and possibly upgrading.

Would this handle future traffic? If so, would it be the most cost effective?

Widen approach road south.

Best we accept this, cause nothing else is going to happen under WSDOT!!

Maybe.

This is such a beautiful old bridge that fits well with Deception Pass. Architectural design would be important. Widening the road North of Deception would be necessary.

This in itself will do little good. The need is to increase the capacity of SR 20 south from Sharps Corner.

Widen only the existing lanes for safety, and pedestrian traffic.

Would improve safety.

Would destroy beauty of area.

This should be considered if the aesthetics of the bridge can be maintained.

On and off lanes for view area required to reduce traffic impact.

There will be a need for a 4 lane highway and bridge from the refinery to Oak Harbor. Local traffic must be able to get on and off. Local traffic has to use Highway 20.

Possible (3 lanes) expansion from Sharpes Corner to Oak Harbor to accommodate extra lane for commuting traffic. Middle lane would be changeable each way.

Only if it is 4 lane and no pedestrians or bicycles.

Widen Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: "Worth Considering" (cont.):

Would like to see main traffic stream removed from Park area.

We will need 4 lanes from Anacortes to Oak Harbor.

We are getting now gridlock at I-5 at Burlington. How many people go to Anacortes, Mt. Vernon and North? How much traffic goes to Seattle?

Will this actually reduce traffic flow on SR 20? Probably not - just congestion over bridge area.

Worth considering if less costly and more feasible than a completely new bridge.

Put pedestrian traffic below roadway, also bicycle lane.

Ranks fourth after new bridge options: Strawberry Pt., LaConner, Camano.

Would promote safety but wouldn't speed ingress or egress unless highway becomes 4 lane to mainland and to Oak Harbor.

This option will only work if the road through the park is also significantly improved, an option that probably will not fly.

Any solution that provides separation of peds and cars is a must.

Water resources on Whidbey are not likely to support your estimate of growth.

Could make overpass for pedestrians only.

How will this affect the roads to and from the area?

As long as it will not distract from our grand view & nature!

“Reject This” Comments:

Leave scenic - no freeway needed.

Only if it is a TRANSIT ONLY (Bus Tram) route.

Leave our Deception Pass Bridge alone!

Widen existing Deception Pass lanes by removing sidewalks and relocating them under current span.

Bridge is a landmark, wouldn't want to change it.

Deception Pass is a landmark and should remain the same.

There is historic meaning and visual aesthetic that is far more important than moving people.

Roads leading to and from bridge are also too narrow.

This would not only destroy the architectural integrity of the bridges but cause more traffic congestion at each end.

The bridge is too old. Money would be thrown away.

It would be a bad idea to destroy or reduce scenic atmosphere of Deception Pass region.

Too much money.

Construction process would literally stop traffic for long long time, hours and months.

Wrong location. Speed limit too slow through area to accommodate much more traffic on 20.

This is the ONE tourist attraction for this area!

Would impact a scenic area adversely: is not the most direct route to the mainland and would be slowed by gawkers, tourists, pedestrians. **WOULD NOT IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW.**

ABSOLUTELY NOT!! The entire Deception Pass area has too much traffic now. The only reason most people travel through this pristine area is because the existing bridges are there. Leave this area alone; it has been damaged too much as it is!

Widen Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: “Reject This” (cont.):

DO NOT WIDEN!

This is a historical site and a part of Two State Parks. Let's keep it That WAY!

Improve only.

It is proven that increased roadways or bridges do not lessen vehicular congestion over an extended period of time.

A pedestrian walkway is suggested - located beneath the current bridge.

Would change a landmark.

Leave Deception Pass Bridge alone.

The right of way/crossing is too narrow, too high an environmental impact. Better to build a new bridge at a different location.

People come to see the bridge. It would ruin the looks!!!

Deception Pass State Park is most popular in state. Why do major damage within the park when other options are available.?

This would be an environmental and land use disaster, and would encourage even more congestion eventually.

This is a scenic landmark. It should be preserved.

4 lanes would have to be built all the way from N. Whidbey to I-5 to make this effective; just widening the bridge won't do it.

Do not destroy the beauty and history.

Waste of money and effort. Would only produce a bottleneck exiting to our 2 lane highway at either end. Not necessary for safety and traffic runs smoothly across the present bridge.

To do so will spoil the natural beauty.

Would concentrate more traffic in the currently congested SR 20 corridor.

Would probably damage scenic beauty of original bridge and area.

Wide bridge on narrow road would solve nothing.

Absolutely not! It would deface this beautiful and historic bridge and park.

Don't destroy the beauty of Deception Pass.

Not unless you widen roads to and from bridge.

Not useful unless SR 20 is widened to 4 lanes.

With the tourist season and geography of the area, would make this too expensive and still would not alleviate the congestion on this road.

Bridge options very expensive, may negatively impact neighborhoods, roads & environment.

Retain the old bridge for foot and non-motorized traffic and sightseeing.

Historical value!

Congestion during construction

Ruins picturesque beauty

Widening bridge alone will not relieve congestion without entire SR 20 from Oak Harbor to Sharps Corner upgrade.

If an accident happens or air show traffic, there are 1-2 hour delays.

Absolutely not!

The parklike setting around the bridge is too aesthetically valuable to be impacted by additional traffic- if you build it, they will come.

Historical Register could be big problem.

Widen Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: "Reject This" (cont.):

Preserve pristine setting of Deception Pass & Park.

Won't work, the bridge is not the only "bottle neck".

Disaster!

I can't believe it would be cost effective to add lanes to existing bridges. Without four lanes of traffic between bridges and I-5 the impact of congestion is not reduced.

Don't alter aesthetics and beauty of this area.

Still limits traffic to one lane each way and traffic will slow anyway to enjoy view.

Do not destroy the rest of the beauty of the island - or at least what little is left!

Maintain the current area, park and bridge, for future generations.

Scenic corridor should be left as is.

The narrow, winding road will never safely accommodate increased traffic due to the bottleneck at the bridge.

With the State Park and scenic viewpoints there is high tourism in that area with pedestrians wandering about.

Please do not change the approach to Deception Pass at all.

The road into and out of the pass has too many curves and restrictions.

Stupid idea!

I feel that any solution to this problem should not include any change to the Deception Pass area.

Cost and destruction of landmark.

Absolutely not. That bridge is a work of art we could never afford to match, only destroy.

The greatest need is for central Island up to Oak Harbor to have alternative onto and off Island.

No way.

Will be inadequate moments after completion.

Absolutely NOT!

Leave the bridges alone!

Will only be a short term solution - we will just have more cars and trucks until everything has to be enlarged again. Invent new solution that will last for years - using our waterways seems ideal.

We're lucky we have waterways to use.

The landmark should not be changed.

The road from Deception Pass to Anacortes is extremely dangerous, too many curves, not lighted well and impossible to drive on icy, snowy weather.

During peak visitor season and when a large number of people are at the Pass, traffic is dangerous.

This is absolutely unacceptable!!

Widening of Deception Pass & Canoe Pass bridges should not be considered until every effort to design and plan alternative forms of transportation such as energy efficient public transit, including ferries, have failed and are found impossible.

Strongly opposed.

Canoe Pass maybe.

Preserving the scenic area.

Don't disturb/obscure the natural beauty.

Don't add to traffic problem while work is in progress.

Unless the entire SR 20 route is widened this will do no good.

Widen Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: "Reject This" (cont.):

Only addresses one bottleneck.

Expansion would ruin the beauty of the existing bridge.

We should first plan a transit system (busses and light rail) for the long-term future before considering widening of Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges, or any new bridges. This must be a serious planning effort which recognizes that we cannot go on forever just building more bridge lanes for cars and trucks.

The bridge and adjacent highways are beautiful and should be left alone.

Deception Pass Park and the bridge are scenic/historic places that should be preserved as is, except for one pedestrian underpass for foot crossings of traffic at one end.

Area should be left as a scenic and park-like area.

With no other choice to get off the Island traffic beyond will be a hardship on the roads and still not get to I-5.

Why widen the bridge when you have a 2 lane road on each side?

Bad for the environment, more logging, wider roads on North and South side of bridge. Overall, too much money and a bad idea. Would widening the bridge relieve the problem? Oak Harbor seems to be a final destination, not the bridge.

Leave it alone!

Traffic should be reduced in this area (to conserve the state park and make it safer for visitors) not increased!

This option would forever change the historical importance of the bridge and the pristine beauty of Deception Pass.

Please No.

This bridge has historical as well as visual significance. Do not disturb.

This bridge is a big part of the history and natural beauty of this area. Please leave it as it is!

This is no option at all. Cost too much - still will take 30 minutes to Mt. Vernon.

A wider bridge does nothing with a 2 lane highway!

Easier transportation would encourage more people to move here.

No. Still too much traffic from the Island to Deans Corner.

Bridge built in 1937 - too old to widen without expensive upgrades.

Problem - it ends and begins with 2-lane highways.

This is too historical and aesthetically important to the region to make any changes!

Existing bridge on National Register.

Fits visually/aesthetically with the landscape.

Widening/building new on this site does not alleviate other SR 20 "bottlenecks" north and south of the bridge.

Deception Pass is a recreational area and in summer there are too many people walking around.

Let's not alter our only tourist attraction on Whidbey Island.

Roads would still restrict traffic flow.

Would create faster traffic - more problems for the walkers and gawkers.

Historical item should not be changed.

Widening of current bridge would destroy aesthetics of Deception Pass area.

Too expensive.

Blasting rock formations, old trees & CCC fences is not only unnecessary, but a CRIME!

Widen Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: "Reject This" (cont.):

Would require widening all the way to and from the bridge.

Would destroy whole wild magnificence of this historic and nature-blessed area.

If the essence of Whidbey is to be saved, LEAVE IT BE! If you build it, they will come. You will not ease current conditions by increasing access because more people will be flocking here if it becomes easier to get on and off Whidbey Island.

Huge environmental impacts.

Don't change it - most beautiful bridge in Washington state.

SR 20 & 525 have too low capacity to handle.

The Deception Pass park area is a choke point for traffic.

The historical value of the bridge and natural beauty of the area should not be devalued to further congestion, pollution & autos.

Adding to Deception Pass would be taking away its history and beautiful being.

Won't help - SR 20 is restricted to two lanes at the bridge approaches. Does this proposal imply a major project to widen SR20? If so, why isn't that stated as part of this option?

Not every island should end up like Manhattan.

Not an option.

Keep - maintain, not widen.

Widening Deception does not widen SR 20 to the pass and to 20 at the Anacortes signal!!!

I heard it's only paint holding this old bridge up now... add more traffic? Ridiculous! Also how can you widen the bridge without widening the "feeder" roads?! WHAT HAPPENS TO THE PARK?!!

Absurd. You can't alter the bridge and its approaches without destroying our largest tourist draw! Stupid. Period.

Do not build in this area of natural beauty.

SR 20 from Oak Harbor to Sharpe's Corner is all bad - not just bridge.

Would be too costly and affect the landscape and not reduce the traffic. We need an alternative route.

This would destroy the beauty of the bridges.

Absolutely Not!

How would road be widened?

Why alter one of the state's premier tourist sites?

Leave the Pass bridge alone! Scenic!

Would destroy the aesthetic appeal of Deception Pass & connected roadway.

Adversely impacts park.

This will lead to also widening the roads (North and South) - the result: a change which will not only encourage more congestion, but will also ruin one of the unique aesthetic attractions of the U.S.

The spectacular beauty of the bridge and surrounding area is unique in the Northwest. Widening the bridge would negatively affect the whole area, including the State Park and the lovely road on the North of the bridge. We'd be destroying a very special place.

This bridge is beautiful like it is -- leave it alone.

Leave that beautiful area alone!

Widen Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: "Reject This" (cont.):

Separate commuters and tourists by other options.

Would have to widen SR 20 Sharps Corner to Coupeville.

We need to think more creatively!

Worst possible choice.

This is only an option if you can preserve the present scenic beauty of Deception Pass which I can't imagine.

Leave this scenic area alone.

Preserve the beauty of this area as is and provide alternate route around it for thru traffic.

Widening the bridge will wind up with a 4 lane bridge and must be serviced with 4 lane highways across Fidalgo and a long portion of North Whidbey. The bottle neck will occur where (anywhere) the 4 lanes are reduced to 2 lanes.

Leave the unique beauty the way it is!

Would destroy park's integrity.

The traffic impacts of this option during construction work would be unacceptable.

SR 20 both on N. Whidbey and Fidalgo preclude these alternatives - still a two lane road for miles.

No way.

Won't help as the SR 20 between I-5. (Sic) The bridge is the real problem (one lane).

Keep this state landmark/historic site - don't spoil it.

You would ruin Deception Pass as a beautiful bridge if you try to turn it into a freeway. Any time you build, enlarge or detour traffic the void is always filled with additional cars.

SR 20 cannot stand any more traffic.

This would ruin a beautiful area.

This would destroy the aesthetics of the bridge and area.

Too much damage to existing parks, habitat and scenery. Area is highly attractive to sightseers.

Deception Pass is a great historical site with breathtaking beauty. It should not be disturbed.

“No Opinion” Comments:

The bridge is fine. It has history, beauty. Bigger and better doesn't help preserve Whidbey and why we all live here!

“No Answer” Comments:

Make the speed limit 15 mph on bridge (it'll lengthen its life!). Only take a few more seconds!!

Put sidewalk under bridge; establish observation look-outs, both north and south ends.

Leave this one for tourists.

Recommend closing the pedestrian passageways on both sections of the bridge and replacing them by observation areas on either end.

Improve existing bridge, but do not have more than two lanes. Improve pedestrian access over or under bridge.

Passage hampered more by speed limits, road curves and stop lights than by bridge width.

No changes to Deception Pass area - this is one of the scenic wonders of America.

Build A New Bridge

“Prefer This” Comments:

A second way to drive off the island would enhance tourism and be a convenience.

Least amount of land owners affected for right of way.

I am even willing to consider a toll bridge.

A second way to drive off the island would enhance tourism and be a convenience.

Prefer the bridge because I feel we already pay too much to get off the island via the Mukilteo and Port Townsend ferries.

A new bridge will EVENTUALLY have to be built; if not now, then eventually. Whatever the price is now, it will only be more expensive later.

Widen Deception Pass & Canoe bridges and then build a new bridge. Make each one way.

Make it a toll bridge, with water and waste disposal lines running under it.

Bridge is dependable. A ferry is not always dependable.

Most efficient means of getting autos on and off the island.

Least disruptive during construction.

Could be toll bridge one way but that would slow traffic and require tenders - discount this. First choice before bridges to Camano & Fir Island, new auto ferry, auto ferries to Camano & Stanwood options.

Best solution.

Best solution - ferry traffic would be unreliable and inconvenient for those wanting direct access to I-5 corridor.

This solution will improve the distribution of traffic from Whidbey to SR 20 and I-5 more effectively.

It will relieve the traffic on SR 20 and reduce accidents from Oak Harbor to Burlington.

To pay for the building operation and maintenance a nominal toll can be paid. This would put the burden of the bridge in the location and people who use bridge and someday it may be free.

This seems to be the most practical and most permanent and reliable solution.

This is needed to solve the traffic problem for the long term.

The amount of traffic using a new bridge would be greater than when Hood Canal was built.

So not to interrupt traffic, build new bridges parallel to Deception Pass and Canoe Pass bridges.

Then when the new bridges can be opened for traffic, close the old bridges, and widen them to be more efficient and safer.

A new bridge would be good for everyone since the traffic on and off the island is now getting so congested.

By making a bridge other than at the Pass, it would divide the traffic - Seattle traffic would use one bridge and north traffic would use the Pass.

We are long overdue!! Traffic is not going to get any better until we do have another access.

At least 4 lanes for traffic volume.

A new bridge is required. The question is where do we build it. I would prefer Greenbank/Camano/Snohomish or Clinton/Everett.

Believe more people will use a bridge than ferry.

Yes, need free alternate access to mainland.

Build a New Bridge: “Prefer This” (cont.):

Ultimate solution to increased traffic is to connect most densely populated area (Oak Harbor) with I-5 corridor by bridge.

This is long overdue.

Costs could be recovered - tolls. Less operating costs & maintenance costs than ferry.

Avoid the long term operating & maintenance costs associated with a ferry. Recover cost through small - one way - tolls.

Your survey does not look at the south end of Camano and Mid Whidbey as a solution - close proximity to I-5, closer to Seattle, would serve South Camano.

They built a floating bridge across Lake Washington and the Hood Canal. Why can't they do same between Whidbey and Camano.

This option sounds most efficient but expensive.

Best overall solution.

The cost of ferries and approaches would go a long ways on building the bridge.

How will this solve the SR20 problems?

I believe another bridge from the south half of Whidbey to the mainland would be wisest. That would meet our additional needs, but also pull a great deal of traffic away from Deception Pass.

Most people are heading towards the Seattle area anyway, and this would shorten the drive somewhat. Those who are not heading south would continue to use Deception Pass: but this smaller volume would bring the bridge's traffic load back to what it was designed for.

A new bridge and widening of SR 20 is an expensive solution, but the best possible and it could be a toll bridge, to absorb costs.

The best solution. Permanent, doesn't require being tied to a schedule or a working ferry - or weather. Could also support water and natural gas lines to the island.

This should be very cheap to build.

Is permanent and compared to ferry service, probably less expenditure.

Just north or south of Coupeville to Camano Island.

Will require extensive road improvements / additions on-Island and to I-5 (mainland).

This is only a stop gap.

The best idea to make smooth travel to the I-5 corridor.

Bridge at North Whidbey would reduce the SR 20 traffic from Sharpe Corner to mid Whidbey, reduce problems at Deception Pass and would make a stop there more pleasurable I'm sure.

Make the new bridge 4 lanes.

This is the only way to go.

“Worth Considering” Comments:

Only at Deception Pass.

Please consider where the traffic comes from and where it is going. A great portion of the trucks must come from or are going to Seattle. Many of the passenger cars must be doing the same.

Cost/Environmental Impact.

But may be necessary for safety (MV Traffic/Disaster).

Build a New Bridge: “Worth Considering” (cont.):

As long as not next to the Deception Pass Bridge.

This sounds like the best idea. Need traffic study.

Which would be more cost effective, this or widening?

Hope Island looks like the easiest route, or Hoypus Point.

If environmental impacts can be mitigated.

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost at this stage.

Only if we get ferry service to Camano or Stanwood too.

Somewhere with less impact on environment and people.

If we can afford it. Present bridge is too narrow for current truck sizes. Not earthquake designed.

Put new 2-lane bridge from N. end of Coronet Bay Rd at Hoypus Pt across to Yokeko Dr. Widen

Coronet Bay Rd (3 lanes - 1 SW, 2 NE) and Yokeko Dr./Washington St. (Also 3 laned - 2

Northbound NE, 1 S/SW) and make Deception Pass bridge 2 lanes ONE-WAY southbound. New Hoypas/Yokeko Bridge - 2 lane one way northbound).

On the south end of island.

Whichever (among widen, new bridge & new bridge parallel options) is affordable, giving the most room for future transportation!

SR 20 both on N. Whidbey and Fidalgo preclude these alternatives - still a two lane road for miles.

Depends on cost.

I believe this solution although more costly would be preferred over ferry route. However, if tax payers need to foot this bill I would say No - I do not need this and wonder what it would do to rural areas.

Wouldn't a new bridge be less cost effective? And hinder progress more?

A bridge would be a high-flow gain which would yield rapid change. Not so good.

If you create uninterrupted traffic flow to/from I-5.

Only if it were the only solution.

Between eastern tip Coronet Bay to Dewey Beach.

Reduce the number of cars.

I believe this is best solution, but will never happen due to DOT resistance to funding.

Expensive.

Sounds simple and efficient.

Would divert traffic from NAS, away from Deception Pass.

Will this actually reduce traffic flow on SR 20? Probably not - just congestion over bridge area.

Would beat having to meet ferry schedule, etc. Would it be cost prohibitive. (sic)

Very expensive.

This option will only work if the road through the park is also significantly improved, an option that probably will not fly.

Any bridge will have to accommodate marine traffic.

Hard to believe the population on one island would rate an expensive new bridge.

One additional bridge only.

Build a New Bridge: "Reject This" (cont.):

A new bridge will make it too easy to get to Whidbey and speed up any population expansion.

A new bridge would bring more traffic and worse - more development which would ruin the rural character and natural environment of the island.

Too much money.

Focus on what the permanent residents of the Island want, not on the short term “desires” of the Navy population. They obviously would favor convenience, etc. since they don’t have to pay for such improvements or live with their consequences.

Never a bridge, please!

We see no need to “optimize” every square foot of the Puget Sound area for transportation.

Islands of rural character, just as gated communities in the city should be allowed to exist for people who would prefer some of the other aspects of life rather than getting somewhere fast. There’s no room for wider roads before and after the bridges!!

It is wrong-minded to make an island an artificial extension of the mainland. We choose to live on an island because it is isolated!

You state that you are studying solutions to create “additional vehicle capacity between North Whidbey and the mainland.” What do you do with the cars once on the island? SR20 is 2 lanes on both sides of the bridge -- Add cars to Whidbey you will overwhelm SR20. Forget bridges -- Waste of a lot of money. Add ferry service. If it works, fine, if not, the ferries can be used elsewhere.

Bridges are forever!

Sounds very expensive!!

Any widening of transportation facilities will encourage population growth. DO NOT BUILD!

New bridge would mean total rebuild of SR20 to Sharps Corner - Better to focus on NEW solutions.

NO BRIDGE!

The problem is the main highway on the island, not getting here from off-island. Adding easier access via a bridge or bridges will only worsen the congestion on SR20. In many places, particularly central Whidbey, SR20 lacks shoulders and has power poles immediately adjacent to the road surface.

Would be a very shortsighted remedy which would have disastrous and irreversible consequences.

Will ruin all that is lovely.

With the growth of retailers here on the island the amount of traffic from the island to the mainland for purposes of shopping should decrease. I’m sure that over the next few years we will see additional stores locating here as population increases, further negating the need for a new bridge.

The enormous cost both for our pocketbooks and for the environment are reason enough NOT to spend any more time using tax-payers’ money to even explore the possibility.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in such great numbers, and it would go on and on for months and eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees.

We will fight you every step of the way to prevent the building of any kind of bridge.

Chills my blood.

Build a New Bridge: “Reject This” (cont.):

It is proven that increased roadways or bridges do not lessen vehicular congestion over an extended period of time.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in great numbers; the litigation will go on and on for years and it will eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees that could be better used in other ways.

Even with a second bridge, there will be traffic gridlock in a few years. It's a foolish, expensive "band-aid."

Beauty of Deception Pass area would be damaged by additional bridges.

But if you are forced to, this.

Leave this scenic area alone.

No, this would alter mother nature too much.

Any new bridge will increase through traffic from I-5 to Port Townsend ferry.

More access will encourage more traffic!!

Building a new bridge would bring too much development to the island.

It would ruin the ecosystem.

We don't want to become part of the mainland.

Cost and increased traffic and population on Whidbey Island.

Why do we want to improve access to Deception Pass State Park area? The park is full during the summer months. On fact the park is bursting its seams now.

Not needed, not wanted, not welcome, not now, not for a long long time, no thank you.

Please drop this plan.

Would drive development here, making us just like the places our visitors are trying to get away from.

We have a large and active community that will physically protest any bridge construction effort here and considerable media fire power.

Too large an investment that won't get paid back for a long time. Too long before relief can be provided.

Huge environmental impacts on very small geographic entities (Fidalgo, Whidbey, and Camano Islands).

I think the premise that we have to create new infrastructure to accommodate more traffic is faulty. Better to work on traffic reduction, a more sustainable approach to our island future!

Be aware: any attempt to build a bridge will meet massive opposition. We will have our bodies chained to your construction equipment - if the lawsuits fail.

Strongly opposed.

This ought to be rejected out of hand. Not even considered!

Insufficient arteries on Whidbey to handle increased traffic.

If the existing bridge is widened or added to, the traffic will still bottleneck, unless roads are redone all the way to SR 20 spur (Sharps Corner).

This would result in a long-term total disaster for the people of Island County from a social and environmental standpoint. The "Land Industry" (developers, realtors, etc.) would rejoice, not caring about the environmental destruction.

The people here have repeatedly rejected this. Why does it keep getting shoved back on us?!

Build a New Bridge: "Reject This" (cont.):

Just a bridge won't do it; will have to include land for roads on both sides of bridge.

Please No.

Definitely not! Where would the additional traffic go? Would require new roads/highway. How can you build the bridge without widening the “feeder” roads?! Destroys the Park/scenic area! (Or: build it where?)

This is an island. Don’t make it a peninsula.

NO. We don’t want another bridge to the mainland! This is an island! If you don’t like it, don’t live here!

NO NEW BRIDGE

NEVER

Wide bridge on narrow road would solve nothing.

It is not necessary for Whidbey Island to have instant vehicle access by the world. It is a rural place of relative peace and quiet. Those who choose such a life are entitled to do so without the state imposing urban transportation standards.

Not useful unless SR 20 is widened to 4 lanes.

Extra bridges will turn this into a suburb, that is a clone of every other suburb in the state and nullify its natural beauty.

Then what, build a 4-lane freeway down the Island to accommodate the increased growth?

Bridge options very expensive, may negatively impact neighborhoods, roads & environment.

If people do not like the crowded conditions perhaps they’ll leave - developers will very unhappy if they do.

This will only allow more people to live on the islands & commute for work. Surgeons see surgery as the only solution to every problem. DOT only knows how to build roads & bridges.

We don’t need an easy route to I-5 or more cars. Whidbey Island roads are overcrowded now.

Just keep the old one safe.

I don’t want the population growth that a bridge would bring.

More emphasis should be placed on encouraging transit use and links between Island and Skagit counties. New bridges would encourage excess development and destroy the rural nature of Whidbey Island.

Deception Pass is said to be by many travelers one of the most beautiful places in the world, Why deface that!

If the essence of Whidbey is to be saved, LEAVE IT BE! If you build it, they will come. You will not ease current conditions by increasing access because more people will be flocking here if it becomes easier to get on and off Whidbey Island.

We moved here to enjoy our rural environment. We do not want to see this beautiful island turned into yet another suburb of the I-5 corridor.

No new bridge should be considered. This would be the worst of all possible alternatives.

Transportation affects the environment in many ways - air pollution, sprawl, global warming and water quality, a critical problem for the Puget Sound ecosystem.

Highway 20 and the town of Oak Harbor cannot take more traffic.

Blasting rock formations, old trees & CCC fences is not only unnecessary, but a CRIME!

Would require widening all the way to and from the bridge.

Build a New Bridge: “Reject This” (cont.):

Would destroy whole wild magnificence of this historic and nature-blessed area.

Don’t change it - most beautiful bridge in Washington state.

We really don't need more traffic on Whidbey Island roads - especially in Oak Harbor.
This would destroy our quality of life by turning Whidbey into a suburb of Everett and Seattle.
We're already in trouble.
No new bridges.
All roads are 2 lane - adding bridge capacity does not solve - adds another traffic bottleneck at another place.
Not worth the environmental impact.
Huge environmental impacts.
SR 20 & 525 have too low capacity to handle.
Would exacerbate current traffic congestion by encouraging more traffic to board the island.
I would hate to see Whidbey Island become over populated. Another bridge would move that along. If people want to live here, they need to accept the inconvenience of moving on and off the island with the one bridge.
Definitely not!!
No, we need mass transit to solve our problem.
Absolutely not.
NO!
Am against any new bridge, but if there must be one make it to Camano.
Not another inch of open space for cars/roads/bridges. NO!!!
There is no way to go, after you cross the bridge - If another bridge was built it would only make more congestion on Fidalgo and cause a "bottle neck" of traffic.
Horrible idea.
Will only be a short term solution - we will just have more cars and trucks until everything has to be enlarged again. Invent new solution that will last for years - using our waterways seems ideal.
We're lucky we have waterways to use.
Stop widening roads and bridges!
NO! Terrible Idea!
Bad idea. It just invites more problems.
Would be extremely expensive / would impact environment, private property and forest land.
If you build it you are inviting growth and more traffic.
The problem is exaggerated by the "development" community. The present overall flow is really not a major problem.
Old bridge is fine. Traffic is just heavy.
Keep Whidbey as an island.
Why? More people and the beauty of Whidbey is lost. One reason it has remained slow growth is not easily accessible!
Easier way to get to Mt. Vernon. A better connection to I-5, Bellingham, Everett, Seattle without using a ferry system.
Would like to see the use of ferries first. From Whidbey to Stanwood.

Build a New Bridge: "Reject This" . (cont.):

Building a new bridge without making major improvements to SR 20 and SR 525 will not improve traffic flow on the Island. In fact, a new bridge without companion SR20/525 improvements would result in massive gridlock on the Island.

MONEY??

We should avoid creating another “Mercer Island” type bedroom community.

Stupid - no way!

No more roads!

Too great of impact environmentally - and financial costs too risky!

“No Answer” Comments:

NO New Bridges!

“New” - does that mean an additional one? If so, depends on where it is located.

Would be incredibly costly! Not opposed to the idea.

If we must have a new bridge or ferry, keep the mainland access well south of the Mt. Vernon-Burlington area. SR 20 is already over-used and dangerous.

NO! NO!

***Build A New Bridge:
Parallel to the Deception Pass and Canoe Pass Bridges***

“Prefer This” Comments:

It would be nice to have more room (too much traffic).

This is the way - design second bridge to look like original (steel) widen existing bridge for two lanes one way, remove walk ways.

Should have more than two lanes, one being an HOV lane.

Whichever (among widen, new bridge & new bridge parallel options) is affordable, giving the most room for future transportation!

At the same time strengthen and widen the road from the pass North to SR 20.

New road around State park entrance and existing businesses.

Take advantage of existing infrastructure and traffic/social patterns.

Bridge is one time cost as compared with new ferry and ongoing cost.

Infrastructure in place supports this plan.

Bottlenecks occur when people slow down to enjoy the scenery in the Deception Pass area.

Entering and departing from the scenic pull-outs are another major problem area. Separate lanes that do not have access to pull-outs or pedestrians would afford major relief.

It seems this is where the traffic would be.

So not to interrupt traffic, build new bridges parallel to Deception Pass and Canoe Pass bridges.

Then when the new bridges can be opened for traffic, close the old bridges, and widen them to be more efficient and safer.

Just for pedestrians and bicycles.

Keep design similar.

“Worth Considering” Comments:

Might be the cheapest.

If any bridge is worth considering, this should be the one.

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost at this stage.

Then relocate the highway, maintaining the park area for visitors.

Depends on cost.

Restrict each bridge to one-way traffic with distinct pedestrian walkways on the scenic sides connected by underpasses bridge to bridge.

Better access point?

Reduce the number of cars!

This option would require widening SR 20 from Country Corner to Oak Harbor to handle increased traffic.

Beauty of current bridge is important factor to consider trying to duplicate if new one is built.

Aesthetics of this area is most important.

This in itself will do little good. The need is to increase the capacity of SR 20 south from Sharps Corner.

New Bridge Parallel to Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: “Worth Considering” (Cont.)

This would be the next best option to widening existing bridge. Cost would be higher, but cheaper than bridges built elsewhere.

This option will only work if the road through the park is also significantly improved, an option that probably will not fly.

“Reject This” Comments:

The value of this option is dependent in large measure on what other measures are taken.

Would destroy scenic and historic aspects of existing bridge.

Impacts the scenery.

Still must contend with narrow road to Sharps Corner.

Would ruin the look of the pass.

Too much money.

Focus on what the permanent residents of the Island want, not on the short term “desires” of the Navy population. They obviously would favor convenience, etc. since they don’t have to pay for such improvements or live with their consequences.

Never a bridge, please!

There’s already a bridge there. This is not creative thinking.

This would destroy our quality of life by turning Whidbey into a suburb of Everett and Seattle.

We’re already in trouble.

No gain.

Wrong location. Speed limit too slow through area to accommodate much more traffic on 20.

Would impact a scenic area adversely: is not the most direct route to the mainland and would be slowed by gawkers, tourists, pedestrians. **WOULD NOT IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW.**

If another bridge were located further south, the existing bridges would be adequate to handle Whidbey Island traffic that is heading North, towards Mt. Vernon and points North..

The problem is the main highway on the island, not getting here from off-island. Adding easier access via a bridge or bridges will only worsen the congestion on SR20. In many places, particularly central Whidbey, SR20 lacks shoulders and has power poles immediately adjacent to the road surface.

Would be a very shortsighted remedy which would have disastrous and irreversible consequences.

Will ruin all that is lovely.

With the growth of retailers here on the island the amount of traffic from the island to the mainland for purposes of shopping should decrease. I’m sure that over the next few years we will see additional stores locating here as population increases, further negating the need for a new bridge.

The enormous cost both for our pocketbooks and for the environment are reason enough NOT to spend any more time using tax-payers’ money to even explore the possibility.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in such great numbers, and it would go on and on for months and eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees.

New Bridge Parallel to Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: “Reject This” (Cont.)

We will fight you every step of the way to prevent the building of any kind of bridge.
Water too deep in Saratoga Passage thus raising cost of bridge too high.
Won't solve problem - unsightly.
Blasting rock formations, old trees & CCC fences is not only unnecessary, but a CRIME!
Would require widening all the way to and from the bridge.
Would destroy whole wild magnificence of this historic and nature-blessed area.
Don't change it - most beautiful bridge in Washington state.
Not needed, not wanted, not welcome, not now, not for a long long time, no thank you.
Please drop this plan.
Would drive development here, making us just like the places our visitors are trying to get away from.
We have a large and active community that will physically protest any bridge construction effort here and considerable media fire power.
Too large an investment that won't get paid back for a long time. Too long before relief can be provided.
No changes to Deception Pass area - this is one of the scenic wonders of America.
Please leave this area alone!
This does nothing to relieve the highway congestion.
Not a good solution.
The bridge is only part of the problem - traffic from Sharp's Corner to Oak Harbor is the problem.
Be aware: any attempt to build a bridge will meet massive opposition. We will have our bodies chained to your construction equipment - if the lawsuits fail.
Too high of an impact on Deception Pass State Park.
This would be an environmental and land use disaster, and would encourage even more congestion eventually.
No point - traffic must slow to 2 lanes - widening SR 20 thru the park area would ruin the northern entrance to Whidbey.
A good way to ruin a beautiful area.
Would destroy beauty of Deception Pass and the park.
No. Deception Pass Park and the bridge are scenic/historic places that should be preserved as is, except for one pedestrian underpass.
Too many people now in that area. Choose an alternate site to spread traffic.
Two bridges still limited by slow adjoining road.
Would require new roads through Deception Pass Park and across Fidalgo Island - very expensive, park land lost; many private properties condemned.
Do not destroy the beauty and history.
Please no.
Will do nothing.
Increase the infrastructure and the growth will follow.
Even with a parallel bridge there will be a bottleneck at Deception Pass due to pedestrians, tourism, and scenic viewpoints.

New Bridge Parallel to Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: "Reject This" (Cont.)

The problem with this plan is SR 20 would need to be improved for miles on either side of Deception Pass through old growth forest and scenic park land filled with trails.

Think of the thousands of dollars being spent to only make the problem “bigger”. Minimize the number of cars instead.

Keep this state landmark/historic site - don't spoil it.

Leave the current bridge and the pass alone and allow it to continue as a leading tourist attraction.

The Deception Pass area should be protected, and traffic guided away from it.

Too much road construction in scenic areas.

The beauty of Deception Pass area would be damaged by additional bridges.

Would lose scenic beauty of existing bridge.

Would not want, nor could we afford, a 4 lane highway between Sharps Corner & Oak Harbor.

SR 20 both on N. Whidbey and Fidalgo preclude these alternatives - still a two lane road for miles.

Adding another bridge would ruin the scenic beauty and historic value of Deception Pass.

Talk to the folks in Gig Harbor.

NO. This bridge obviously carries heavy load but numerous residents commute this way because there is no alternate further south with access further south on mainland.

At all locations a new bridge is a concept for the past, not for the future. This ecosystem cannot stand more air pollution, water pollution, sprawl, global warming and the continued paving over of all islands which are part of the Puget Sound.

Disturbs/obscures natural beauty. Disturbs traffic flow on approaches to existing bridges.

Let's keep this scenic beauty as it is.

This will not solve the problem. Decreases Deception Park pristine value.

Would ruin the appearance of the area.

We see no need to “optimize” every square foot of the Puget Sound area for transportation.

Islands of rural character, just as gated communities in the city should be allowed to exist for

people who would prefer some of the other aspects of life rather than getting somewhere fast.

This bridge has historical as well as visual significance. Do not disturb. Preserve Deception Pass as is.

Do not build in this area of natural beauty.

Would destroy the beauty of existing bridge.

Would ruin the views & park.

This bridge is a big part of the history and natural beauty of this area. Please leave it as it is!

Huge environmental impacts.

Unfeasible, environmentally and financially for the return received.

Huge environmental impacts on very small geographic entities (Fidalgo, Whidbey, and Camano Islands).

This is too historical and aesthetically important to the region to make any changes! Plus would require too many changes on SR 20 leading up to parallel bridge. DO NOT DO THIS!!

Will only be a short term solution - we will just have more cars and trucks until everything has to be enlarged again. Invent new solution that will last for years - using our waterways seems ideal.

We're lucky we have waterways to use.

Replace is better.

New Bridge Parallel to Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: “Reject This” (Cont.)

No roads to connect.

Not too practical - will destroy beauty of pass.

Definitely not! Not only would it ruin the aesthetic value of the pass, but it would require new roads which would tear through our already dwindling park area.

This will spoil its beauty especially for the tourists.

Traffic on SR 20 between Oak Harbor and Deception Pass, and also across Fidalgo Island would be the bottleneck.

Wouldn't it affect the tourist traffic and lower the "view" impact of Deception Pass?

Would concentrate more traffic in the currently congested SR 20 corridor.

Will cause congestion because limited slow access roads.

If the existing bridge is widened or added to, the traffic will still bottleneck, unless roads are redone all the way to SR 20 spur (Sharps Corner).

Would destroy much of the park to construct the bridge.

Would increase air pollution in and around our oldest trees.

Chills my blood.

Even with a second bridge, there will be traffic gridlock in a few years. It's a foolish, expensive "band-aid".

Would probably damage scenic beauty of original bridge and area.

No. Let's leave it alone and enjoy the view for all.

Preserve the beauty of this area as is and provide alternate route around it for thru traffic.

How can you build the bridge without widening the "feeder" roads?! Destroys the Park/scenic area! (Or: build it where?)

Just keep the old one safe.

Already too congested.

Another bridge here, only if the plan is to have a 4 lane highway all the way to I-5 from the Coupeville area.

Even dumber (than widen Deception Pass or build a new bridge options). Absurd. You can't alter the bridge and its approaches without destroying our largest tourist draw! Stupid. Period.

I don't want the population growth that a bridge would bring.

NO NEW BRIDGE

Deception Pass is not only the most beautiful scene in this state - but potentially in this nation. It would be a travesty to attempt this.

We moved here to enjoy our rural environment. We do not want to see their beautiful island turned into yet another suburb of the I-5 corridor.

Loss of park land & unique beauty too great!

Wide bridge on narrow road would solve nothing.

Absolutely unacceptable!

This would ruin a beautiful state park.

Would have to widen SR 20 Sharps Corner to Coupeville.

It is not necessary for Whidbey Island to have instant vehicle access by the world. It is a rural place of relative peace and quiet. Those who choose such a life are entitled to do so without the state imposing urban transportation standards.

New Bridge Parallel to Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: "Reject This" (Cont.)

Will detract from beauty of Deception Pass.

Ruin the look of the Pass.

Not useful unless SR 20 is widened to 4 lanes.

Heavy impact on traffic during construction.

Bridge options very expensive, may negatively impact neighborhoods, roads & environment.

SR 20 & 525 have too low capacity to handle.

Worst possible choice.

What a stupid idea - you obviously don't live here.

Very poor idea - very disruptive to people living along SR 20 on Fidalgo & Whidbey.

Let's keep traffic away from the Pass.

Does not solve traffic congestion at SR 20 & I-5.

NO! Terrible Idea!

A new bridge must be serviced with 4 lane highways across Fidalgo and a long portion of North Whidbey. The bottle neck will occur where (anywhere) the 4 lanes are reduced to 2 lanes.

Completely destroy the scenic beauty of Deception Pass.

How would traffic exiting the bridges be handled? A freeway thru the Island? I hope not!

Save the existing environment.

Will damage Deception Pass State Park.

More emphasis should be placed on encouraging transit use and links between Island and Skagit counties. New bridges would encourage excess development and destroy the rural nature of Whidbey Island.

A new bridge will make it too easy to get to Whidbey and speed up any population expansion.

Also, with 4 lanes of bridge you're going to need 4 lanes of road leading up to it to do any good.

Not a good idea!

Better than adding lanes to existing bridge, but still has the same problem of inadequate number of lanes between bridge and I-5.

Would probably detract from beauty of a single bridge.

SR532 is already crowded.

The bridge isn't the only problem, the whole of SR 20 from Sharps Corner to Coupeville is part of the problem as well as the park.

More access will encourage more traffic!!

If the essence of Whidbey is to be saved, LEAVE IT BE! If you build it, they will come. You will not ease current conditions by increasing access because more people will be flocking here if it becomes easier to get on and off Whidbey Island.

Insufficient arteries on Whidbey to handle increased traffic.

Too little room.

This is no option at all. Cost too much - still will take 30 minutes to Mt. Vernon.

Another bridge will not alleviate the traffic congestion between Oak harbor and Sharp's Corner, which is caused by a 2 lane road.

Never!

Would just add volume without addressing impact on SR 20 to north and south.

Leave this scenic area alone.

New Bridge Parallel to Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges: "Reject This" (Cont.)

No, this would alter mother nature too much.

NO! Widening bridge alone will not relieve congestion without entire SR 20 from Oak Harbor to Sharps Corner upgrade.

Preserve pristine setting of Deception Pass & Park.

SR 20 cannot stand any more traffic. The bridge isn't the only problem - 2 lane road.

Would destroy the beauty of the bridge and area.

Too much damage to existing parks, habitat and scenery. This area is highly attractive to sightseers.

Would destroy a large part of the state park.

It is proven that increased roadways or bridges do not lessen vehicular congestion over an extended period of time.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in great numbers; the litigation will go on and on for years and it will eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees that could be better used in other ways.

This potentially conflicts with existing bridge aesthetics.

Doesn't deal with bottlenecks on SR 20 north and south of bridge site at Deception Pass.

"No Answer" Comments:

Back to the survey. Where does the traffic come from. If we can remove the Seattle traffic maybe the bridge will accommodate traffic for many years.

Deception Pass is said to be by many travelers one of the most beautiful places in the world, Why deface that!!!

Historical Register could be big problem.

By widening the bridge or putting a new ferry in operation does this not mean extensive renovation of the road system to the island from the mainland?

Use old ferry route A. Dewey short bridge - less road to build.

NO!

Would be incredibly costly! Not opposed to the idea.

Have to go thru rock or ?

Would promote safety but wouldn't speed ingress or egress unless highway becomes 4 lane to mainland and to Oak Harbor -- more or less costly than widening bridge -- still requires 4 lane on Whidbey side and mainland.

Would destroy beauty of area.

DOT Engineers love to design and build bridges, and will do so if they possibly can get approval. They are not educated to understand the long-term consequences for these Islands and for the health of the Puget Sound Ecosystem.

Would alleviate the traffic bottleneck along northern portion of bridge corridor, but would not alleviate traffic on the island.

Too great an impact on the environment.

Need 4 lanes of traffic.

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island

“Prefer This” Comments:

Merely moves problem rather than alleviating or creating a true alternative that spans the full scope of both the Whidbey problem and the available options.

Southbound travelers from I-5 can reach WI by Deception Pass and drive south on the island.

Northbound from I-5 can get to WI from Camano and drive north or south.

Most logical solution for unimpeded auto traffic.

Should have bridge close to cities.

Connection to Camano Island, as part of Island County seems more important than to the mainland.

Passenger cars.

By far the best option. All of Island Co. deserves to be linked. This option will relieve stress at both ends of the island.

Whichever one of these more southern locations that is most economically feasible in terms of the design, costs of construction, displacement of existing homes, etc. We don't have enough information to evaluate these 3 alternative proposals.

In addition to providing a more direct route for the population center to connect with the I-5 corridor, a bridge here would connect Camano Island more directly with its county seat (Coupeville).

North of Mariners Cove the channel runs next to Whidbey Island - high bank could let boat traffic thru - the rest is very shallow.

You are accessing other part of Island County and also I-5 corridor further South.

Considerable traffic is enter island - and this would solve two problems at once - and create a highway and bridge building problem on Camano.

The State Highway System is already in place and the further South a connection is made, the less long term highway maintenance will be required.

I feel disconnected to Whidbey and Coupeville, our county seat.

I'm sick of relying on Stanwood for my needs.

Getting to Whidbey faster would be a boon for my family's business.

Would cut out long drive around the islands to Mt. Vernon & down to Seattle... Very good to cut drive time.

Second choice after new bridge option, and before bridge Fir Island, new auto ferry, auto ferries to Camano & Stanwood options.

This solution is highly preferred for the following reasons: (1) facilitates easier access to the county seat between Islands, (2) relieves traffic on SR 20 - better access to north and south Whidbey, (3) better distribution of food and materials to south and north Whidbey - truck and trailers, (4) accommodates traffic increase requirement for future island increase in population.

From between Polnell Point and Strawberry Point to Camano

Close to I-5 once across the bay.

People will still drive; myself included.

Makes more sense than parallel new bridge or widening.

A different bridge access would be best all around. It would give better access to and from Island.

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island: “Prefer This” (cont.):

Best solution is a toll bridge with road connecting to Hwy. 532 at Stanwood.

Seems like the best option. Would be accessible by all of Whidbey island 24 hours a day in all weather. A high flow road across Camano, Stanwood to I-5 would be convenient for north and south flow traffic.

This solution is closer to I-5 and Camano Island populations.

Would greatly reduce my travel time (bus commuter: Stanwood to Seattle) and I would enjoy immensely.

Would divert traffic from NAS, away from Deception Pass.

Yes - bridge would give rapid access to I-5 - free.

Avoids SR 20, which is already too congested.

From Oak Harbor.

Permits better access for county service to both places, i.e. Sheriff/county court/etc.

Shortest bridge span - keeps construction costs down. Once on Camano, motorists have direct route to I-5, via Stanwood - connectivity between Oak Harbor & Stanwood. Would benefit both towns.

If Island County stays with its present geographic makeup, its residents need more cohesiveness. South of Coupeville Morris Road - cross to Camano at Sunset Beach or Woodland Beach - to cross Island Road and to 532.

Would cause traffic to flow away from Deception Pass.

This would give more choice to the folks on the south end of the island. Also, would give quicker access to the mainland with the alternative of heading north or south at I-5. Increases Camano access to county seat.

Third choice for bridge, after LaConner and Strawberry Pt. options.

Shortest, most direct to I-5.

Strawberry Point to Camano.

This option if directed from Hansaker (sp?) Drive to the vicinity of the Utsalady Point boat ramp on Camano seems to be the shortest span and probably would be the most viable from a finance standpoint.

To tie Island County together.

Limited access highway (2 lane) already in place from Stanwood to I-5 (SR532).

Tie into an interchange at Ault Field/SR20 Junction.

Pay for with tolls.

“Worth Considering” Comments:

This might alleviate congestion on the Deception Pass Bridge.

As long as Camano is part of Island County, would benefit the people who would need and use it the most.

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost at this stage.

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island: “Worth Considering” (cont.):

This would incorporate a greater expense to these projects and also to the tax payers of the island who will be footing the bill. Yes, something should be done and the only really useful idea would be a ferry that could pay for itself. Or would it?

If it's OK with Camano.

Third best option after Strawberry Point and LaConner bridge options.

Roads are available and close to Hwy. 532.

Reasonable span distance.

Not as direct as Strawberry Point to Conway.

Camano needs a better link to its county seat.

Would provide a more direct route to Seattle.

Something like they have in Seattle connecting East & West. After all Camano is part of Island County and I believe there are quite a few people who commute from either place.

Too much congestion already.

To enable Island County residents transportation to County seat.

North Whidbey doesn't seem to be a population center.

Would connect Whidbey and Camano.

Whichever (of bridges to Camano, LaConner, Strawberry Pt.) is most feasible considering engineering and environmental problems, and which would best meet the needs of the people. Only if new connection made between Camano Island and the mainland.

Allows quicker access to county seat for residents and sheriff deputies.

Would be shortest route back to Snohomish County/King County. However, rural nature of area is probably in conflict with build-up that would be forced.

Would have to consider the impact on roads, farms, homes, etc. On either side - perhaps to a less populated area would be best.

Would depend on actual placement. Optimum solution would contain shortest distance to I-5 with minimum impact on residential areas.

Greatest benefit to both North & South Island residents.

Camano Island residents should be able to get to Coupeville, their county seat, without going north and around.

People coming from the north already have a viable option in the Deception Pass Bridge. If transportation options are going to be expanded then the solution, be it ferry or bridge, should be farther south. That way people coming from the south have a quicker option.

If individuals cannot/will not utilize public transportation to reach areas of employment, a connection that does not require driving across the bridge seems logical.

Some road improvements required

Only if access from I-5 doubled

More direct route to Seattle than Deception Pass bridge options.

Is this possible?

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Worth Considering" (cont.):

As the people on Camano if they like the idea. If they don't, then don't bother them. Go to Fir Island/Conway area.

Mark Clark Bridge and Highway #532 is over loaded now.

There should be better access to county courthouse for Camano residents - our county shouldn't be so divided.

The only way to go.

Ranks third after LaConner & Strawberry Pt. bridge options, but before widening Deception Pass option.

Fast access needed to make Camano available to Whidbey residents bypassing Mt.

Vernon/Burlington.

Water crossing is short - but deep and Stanwood is still in the way.

Shortest distance to mainland.

I believe this is the best options, however it will put a tremendous burden on Camano Island.

If you must.

Will require 4 lanes to I-5.

Will require 2 miles deep water bridge (environmental impact?)

This would probably destroy Camano Island's rural living as has happened to Whidbey Island.

“Reject This” Comments:

You would have a bottle neck at the Mark Clark Bridge, not to mention Terrys Corner. You would need to build an additional bridge from Camano to Mainland.

NO!

More emphasis should be placed on encouraging transit use and links between Island and Skagit counties. New bridges would encourage excess development and destroy the rural nature of Whidbey Island.

Is this a 2 lane or 4 lane bridge? Either way, what are we going to do with the added cars when they get here? Build more and bigger roads? Again, not a good idea.

Island traffic egress presents existing problem.

Too much impact on the island community = traffic - road use - speed through residential areas.

Congestion - small community.

Camano doesn't want extra traffic.

Too much money.

We see no need to “optimize” every square foot of the Puget Sound area for transportation.

Islands of rural character, just as gated communities in the city should be allowed to exist for people who would prefer some of the other aspects of life rather than getting somewhere fast.

Creates too much traffic problems on Camano & Stanwood.

Never a bridge, please!

I moved here from the Kirkland, Redmond area; in an attempt to get away from the crowding and traffic congestion. I am adamantly opposed to bringing more congestion through Camano.

Camano not feasible.

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island: “Reject This” (cont.):

This would destroy our quality of life by turning Whidbey into a suburb of Everett and Seattle. We're already in trouble.

With one main road on Camano, traffic is bad, especially in summer.

Too long and expensive.

And then how will we get across the Mark Clark Bridge in a timely manner? Sources say it would be too expensive to widen given environmental concerns.

The problem is the main highway on the island, not getting here from off-island. Adding easier access via a bridge or bridges will only worsen the congestion on SR20. In many places, particularly central Whidbey, SR20 lacks shoulders and has power poles immediately adjacent to the road surface.

Would be a very shortsighted remedy which would have disastrous and irreversible consequences.

Bridge to Camano Island a tragically flawed idea.

Will ruin all that is lovely.

With the growth of retailers here on the island the amount of traffic from the island to the mainland for purposes of shopping should decrease. I'm sure that over the next few years we will see additional stores locating here as population increases, further negating the need for a new bridge.

The enormous cost both for our pocketbooks and for the environment are reason enough NOT to spend any more time using tax-payers' money to even explore the possibility.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in such great numbers, and it would go on and on for months and eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees.

We will fight you every step of the way to prevent the building of any kind of bridge.

Chills my blood.

Water too deep in Saratoga Passage thus raising cost of bridge too high.

Terribly unfair to Camano residents. We have only one access point. What would effect on Camano traffic be? Exchanging one problem for another - improving quality of life for Whidbey at expense of Camano's.

It is proven that increased roadways or bridges do not lessen vehicular congestion over an extended period of time.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in great numbers; the litigation will go on and on for years and it will eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees that could be better used in other ways.

Camano Island to Stanwood to I-5 already has traffic saturation. Take No. Whidbey some place else please, but not Camano or Stanwood.

Our Camano road is already crowded - bumper to bumper much of the time.

Route is over poor wintertime road and past school with 20 mph speed limit.

Would only encourage commuters and cause decline in our standard of living. Development and growth of Whidbey island should NOT be encouraged.

Camano Island/Stanwood can't handle this load.

If the essence of Whidbey is to be saved, LEAVE IT BE! If you build it, they will come. You will not ease current conditions by increasing access because more people will be flocking here if it becomes easier to get on and off Whidbey Island.

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Reject This" (cont.):

Camano Island traffic cannot sustain the impact of being a quick-easy passage to Whidbey Island. We have already said we don't want to be the thoroughfare-connector. Why aren't we being listened to?

No way should I-5 to Whidbey traffic cross Camano Island.

Focus on what the permanent residents of the Island want, not on the short term "desires" of the Navy population. They obviously would favor convenience, etc. since they don't have to pay for such improvements or live with their consequences.

We moved here to enjoy our rural environment. We do not want to see their beautiful island turned into yet another suburb of the I-5 corridor.

Camano already has its own traffic problems, including single access to mainland.

Additional "Whidbey traffic" would further jeopardize Camano lifestyle, environment and community.

Doubling or tripling traffic on SR 532 wouldn't solve anything.

Roads on Camano are already impacted by growth on Camano.

Camano/Stanwood traffic problems are too bad already without adding Whidbey traffic.

These should not even be an option! They are rural communities. Why should any of these people have to deal with the pollution, noise and unsightly view of a road and bridge for the convenience of people that come and go to the city when the Island would be changed forever because of it?

Why!! What major population area are you trying to access??!

Pretty insane cost.

Why not just build a 4 lane bridge from Mukilteo to Clinton!? Then run a 4 lane highway all the way to Oak Harbor, put in lots of fast food restaurants, car washes and mini marts, this would complete the devastation.

Don't disturb Camano Island.

Blasting rock formations, old trees & CCC fences is not only unnecessary, but a CRIME!

Would require widening all the way to and from the bridge.

Would destroy whole wild magnificence of this historic and nature-blessed area.

Don't change it - most beautiful bridge in Washington state.

Camano road systems inadequate - adding traffic from Whidbey irresponsible.

Not needed, not wanted, not welcome, not now, not for a long long time, no thank you.

Please drop this plan.

Huge environmental impacts.

SR 20 & 525 have too low capacity to handle.

Unfeasible, environmentally and financially for the return received.

Huge environmental impacts on very small geographic entities (Fidalgo, Whidbey, and Camano Islands).

This is deep water - would require a much more expensive bridge - would not help the traffic going to I-5.

Will only be a short term solution - we will just have more cars and trucks until everything has to be enlarged again. Invent new solution that will last for years - using our waterways seems ideal.

We're lucky we have waterways to use.

No roads to connect.

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Reject This" (cont.):

Be aware: any attempt to build a bridge will meet massive opposition. We will have our bodies chained to your construction equipment - if the lawsuits fail.

I don't believe this would solve any traffic problems.

Will not help those of us who work in Burlington.

Camano needs passenger ferry to county seat. That would reduce vehicle traffic on bridge and SR 20.

No additional vehicle access routes to Whidbey Island!

Would require 4 lane highway across Camano Island; new Mark Clark Bridge and widening of main street through Stanwood to make it work. Many homes and commercial properties disrupted.

Please no.

Maybe Strawberry Pt. To Camano to Stanwood to I-5, but will change island.

Make carpools mandatory - 3 people each car, for example.

Doubt Camano Island people will ever approve.

The Hwy. 532 corridor has rush hour problems now.

Why go to another island?

Creates additional bottleneck and impact on Stanwood/Camano Island.

Really stupid. Couldn't we come up with something that would impact 3 or 4 islands? Sheeeeeesh!

You're joking. Camano doesn't want their neighborhood destroyed!

NO NEW BRIDGE

Even with a second bridge, there will be traffic gridlock in a few years. It's a foolish, expensive "band-aid".

Camano can't accommodate any additional traffic from Whidbey Island.

Camano Island roads are overburdened now...

NO.

This would just put congestion on SR 532 and the Mark Clark Bridge which are congested already.

Very costly because I imagine SR 532 would have to be widened (4 lanes?).

Camano's roads can't take the traffic.

Worst idea of all due to Camano/Stanwood problems & Mark Clark bridge.

Would be a horrendous cost to taxpayers. In addition, if this happens, be prepared for quadrupling Island traffic requiring 4-lane (or more) highways.

It is not necessary for Whidbey Island to have instant vehicle access by the world. It is a rural place of relative peace and quiet. Those who choose such a life are entitled to do so without the state imposing urban transportation standards.

No practical long term solution until transportation issues linked to land use planning. Any improvement listed would only result in more problems in the I-5 corridor. Any increase in traffic capacity would only result in increased growth.

Bridge options very expensive, may negatively impact neighborhoods, roads & environment.

We have too much traffic in Stanwood and Camano Island as it is!

I should not have to pay to solve their problems - especially when they choose to live there.

(Stanwood resident)

Impact to two lane roadways and Mark W. Clark bridge, neighborhood congestion, curving country roads, very dangerous! Asking for big traffic congestion and accident potential.

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Reject This" (cont.):

We moved to Camano to get away from traffic and to not have to be bothered with ferry lines. To make Camano a “pass thru” to another island is totally contrary to the Camano Island way of life. The goal of our transportation plan cannot be to make long commutes more practical, or we simply extend the problem while destroying our resource lands.

Too much impact on Camano.

Anything that aggravates Camano’s own traffic problem should be avoided.

This idea would ruin Camano Island & Stanwood by turning the area into a thruway. Far too many home owners would be displaced to build a bridge on Camano Island. Major traffic congestion, high cost.

Adds congestion to Camano.

And then where does the traffic go?

The main roads on Camano could not withstand much in the way of increased traffic.

This would benefit only a small percentage of people. It would not help the bulk of the people who commute between Oak Harbor and the Mt. Vernon/Burlington area.

Traffic bottleneck occurs at Stanwood already. This plan would work if highway could be improved from Camano to I-5, and Stanwood could be bypassed.

Would drive development here, making us just like the places our visitors are trying to get away from.

We have a large and active community that will physically protest any bridge construction effort here and considerable media fire power.

Increased vehicle emissions would contribute to global warming, as well as degrade local air quality.

Financial burden of construction project of these dimensions is unnecessary and unfair.

Puget Sound ecosystem would suffer.

Stress to our fragile shorelines and runoff from oily roads would surely occur.

Use a passenger only ferry service instead. If people had low-income housing off-island they would be living where they work.

We don’t need more cars or an easy route to I-5. We have too much traffic for Whidbey island roads now.

Where are most people headed when leaving the island north? On a daily basis? - Anacortes, Mt. Vernon, etc. And where are most people coming from when going onto the island north?

Camano Island is far too congested to handle additional traffic.

The people on Camano would fight project causing delays and/or cancellation.

At all locations a new bridge is a concept for the past, not for the future. This ecosystem cannot stand more air pollution, water pollution, sprawl, global warming and the continued paving over of all islands which are a part of the Puget Sound.

Insufficient arteries on Whidbey to handle increased traffic.

Camano Island has traffic problems due to population growth. Adding Whidbey traffic would cause more problems.

Too long to get off Camano to I-5.

Too expensive due to long span and channel depth. Visual eyesore - decrease real estate value on both Camano and Whidbey.

Camano has its road problems also.

Build A New Bridge North Whidbey to Camano Island: “Reject This” (cont.):

Traffic impact would strangle Camano Island traffic. Single road couldn't handle traffic.
Improved roadways on Camano still must travel SR 532 to I-5 via tiny Stanwood.
Camano Island has a major traffic constriction now (one 2 lane road on/off the island). Putting more traffic onto the island via bridge or ferry would mean major road expansion and destruction of present rural environment. Use existing SR 20 corridor to get traffic off/on Whidbey Island. South Whidbey to Camano Island is better.
Bad visual effect.
Absolutely not - never.
NO way!!!
Already difficult to access Camano via 532 - no additional capacity there.
It makes no sense to funnel traffic across a fragile area served by a 2 lane bridge and 2 lane roads.
An Island is an Island (Camano) and cannot survive full-scale invasion of mass transit.
Additional bridges and roads can only destroy an Island (Camano) this size.
Costly!

“No Opinion” Comments:

Would definitely make Camano and Whidbey more of “one county.”
I'm guessing. It wouldn't do Camano Island any good and maybe some harm.
The roads on Camano would take too much work.
Would definitely make Camano and Whidbey more of “one county.”
Don't know much about Camano except it is mostly residential. Let's not channel more traffic into that type of environment.
Camano Island seems no closer to Seattle or Mt. Vernon. This seems it would be a waste.

“No Answer” Comments:

Living in an earthquake zone may cause severe problem with bridges - also, severe winds and currents are a factor.
NO!
Would be incredibly costly! Not opposed to the idea.
The long-term consequences of such a bridge would be total destruction of the Puget Sound Ecosystem, of which the Islands are an intimate part.

***Build A New Bridge
North Whidbey to Mainland near La Conner, via Goat Island***

“Prefer This” Comments:

Least amount of land owners affected for right of way.

If not LaConner, second choice Fir Island.

Whichever one of these more southern locations that is most economically feasible in terms of the design, costs of construction, displacement of existing homes, etc. We don't have enough information to evaluate these 3 alternative proposals.

Dugualla Bay Highway #20 best: 1)reduces highway construction, 2) shallow water in the main. Most easily constructed bridge to mainland.

Good access to I-5 and Mount Vernon, also tourists to reach Whidbey Island.

Offers best long term business and global potential for trade access.

NAS proximity and relief of North area SR 20 traffic jams.

LaConner already business/tourist area and would benefit from additional traffic.

Would connect near Oak Harbor and be more popular route than further north.

Waterway here is somewhat calmer than down Saratoga Passage further.

Straight shot to I-5 from there - it is easy to go North or South. Twisting roads (single lane) on Whidbey and Fidalgo slow you down considerably, especially when you have someone driving 20 miles below the speed limit in front of you!

Makes more sense than parallel new bridge or widening.

Best possible solution.

From the surface this seems most intriguing.

Need additional service on both north and south Whidbey, but not thru Deception Pass.

Second choice behind auto ferry to Conway/LaConner.

Whichever is cheaper - this or Strawberry Point bridge option.

Pick the cheapest and least environmental damaging option between this and Strawberry Point bridge.

May be too expensive and create undesirable commercial development on Whidbey.

This would need to be a 4-lane with adjoining 4-lane highway.

Would improve traffic flow, time and decrease distance to anywhere east. Our time has come to consider a bridge equal to the one from San Diego to Coronado.

Consider floating bridge with tolls and put tolls on existing Deception Pass, etc. bridge. (sic)

Would cause traffic to flow away from Deception Pass.

Will require 4 lanes to I-5.

2 mile bridge, shallow water (environmental impact?)

Yes.

First bridge choice, before Camano and Strawberry Pt. options.

“Worth Considering” Comments:

Road would need to be widened to 4 lanes from Fir Island to I-5.

My 2nd choice - need to do the survey. What would attract the most Seattle traffic.

New Bridge North Whidbey to Mainland near La Conner: “Worth Considering” (Cont.)

Third choice after new bridge and bridge-Camano alternatives.

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost at this stage.

Although a bridge in either of these locations would relieve the traffic across Deception Pass area, it would not seem to help the south bound traffic from the island. The current drive from Oak Harbor (the population center) to Seattle (the most common destination) is

Consider - only too far North, but will change island forever.

Whichever (of bridges to Camano, LaConner, Strawberry Pt.) is most feasible considering engineering and environmental problems, and which would best meet the needs of the people.

Not sure access roads capable of supporting much more traffic, however at least this is not an area of expected growth due to flood plain zone.

Would also create a problem in the LaConner area and which route it would take to I-5, probably to Conway or to Mt. Vernon.

Second best option after Strawberry point and before Camano bridge options.

Except for high rise off Whidbey over Ala Spit onto Hope Island then mainland.

Would prefer the 2 halves of Island County be linked.

Not as direct as Strawberry Point to Conway.

More direct route to Seattle than Deception Pass bridge options.

Possibly the easiest and cheapest way to go.

Scenic area - will draw more tourists from I-5.

Would provide a more direct route to Seattle.

Second choice, after toll bridge North Whidbey to Stanwood.

Would have to consider the impact on roads, farms, homes, etc. On either side - perhaps to a less populated area would be best.

Would depend on actual placement. Optimum solution would contain shortest distance to I-5 with minimum impact on residential areas.

Third choice after Camano Bridge (#1) and Strawberry Point bridge (#2).

Yes - bridge would give rapid access to I-5 - free.

Not a bad idea at all.

This location is a possible one. The bridge from Whidbey to Goat to LaConner is spanable. Ease of access from I-5 isn't as good as it would be from Conway. More people (homeowners) would be negatively affected by this location.

But then where does the traffic go - still funnels to the same places.

If individuals cannot/will not utilize public transportation to reach areas of employment, a connection that does not require driving across the bridge seems logical.

Since users are likely the ones who commute between Oak Harbor and the Mt. Vernon/Burlington area, these two ideas seem to be best. (Bridges to LaConner or Strawberry Point) The big drawback is the bridge would have to be built in wetlands.

Perhaps viable, but need to consider park land influence on specific route.

#2 after Strawberry Pt. bridge option, but before Camano bridge option and widening Deception Pass bridge.

New Bridge North Whidbey to Mainland near La Conner: "Reject This" Comments

Merely moves problem rather than alleviating or creating a true alternative that spans the full scope of both the Whidbey problem and the available options.

Is this a 2 lane or 4 lane bridge? Either way, what are we going to do with the added cars when they get here? Build more and bigger roads? Again, not a good idea.

Too expensive due to long span and channel depth. Visual eyesore - decrease real estate value on both Camano and Whidbey.

Limited community facilities. Poor docking choice.

We moved here to enjoy our rural environment. We do not want to see their beautiful island turned into yet another suburb of the I-5 corridor.

Never a bridge, please!

We see no need to "optimize" every square foot of the Puget Sound area for transportation.

Islands of rural character, just as gated communities in the city should be allowed to exist for people who would prefer some of the other aspects of life rather than getting somewhere fast.

Too long and expensive.

Here or Strawberry Point will be prohibitively expensive, will require additional bridge across Skagit River at Conway, will eat up valuable land and will be subject to flooding of Fir Island.

Too far north and too difficult to get to I5 easily.

The problem is the main highway on the island, not getting here from off-island. Adding easier access via a bridge or bridges will only worsen the congestion on SR20. In many places, particularly central Whidbey, SR20 lacks shoulders and has power poles immediately adjacent to the road surface.

Would be a very shortsighted remedy which would have disastrous and irreversible consequences.

Will ruin all that is lovely.

With the growth of retailers here on the island the amount of traffic from the island to the mainland for purposes of shopping should decrease. I'm sure that over the next few years we will see additional stores locating here as population increases, further negating the need for a new bridge.

The enormous cost both for our pocketbooks and for the environment are reason enough NOT to spend any more time using tax-payers' money to even explore the possibility.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in such great numbers, and it would go on and on for months and eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees.

We will fight you every step of the way to prevent the building of any kind of bridge.

Chills my blood.

Even with a second bridge, there will be traffic gridlock in a few years. It's a foolish, expensive "band-aid".

It is proven that increased roadways or bridges do not lessen vehicular congestion over an extended period of time.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in great numbers; the litigation will go on and on for years and it will eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees that could be better used in other ways.

Too close to existing bridges to be truly beneficial for Oak Harbor/Coupeville access to mainland.

New Bridge North Whidbey to Mainland near La Conner: "Reject This" (Cont.)

Would add traffic to the already congested intersection of SR 20 and I-5 in Burlington.

Route is over poor wintertime road and past school with 20 mph speed limit.

Would only encourage commuters and cause decline in our standard of living. Development and growth of Whidbey island should NOT be encouraged.

This is a big negative for the wildlife habitat.

Devastating impact on LaConner/Skagit Valley area.

These should not even be an option! They are rural communities. Why should any of these people have to deal with the pollution, noise and unsightly view of a road and bridge for the convenience of people that come and go to the city when the Island would be changed forever because of it?

Why!! What major population area are you trying to access?!?

Not much of a gain from existing bridge.

4.5 miles of bridge.

North Whidbey to Fidalgo Island via Hope Island would be better.

Too much money.

NO - Spend the money on Deception Pass.

If the essence of Whidbey is to be saved, LEAVE IT BE! If you build it, they will come. You will not ease current conditions by increasing access because more people will be flocking here if it becomes easier to get on and off Whidbey Island.

Not needed, not wanted, not welcome, not now, not for a long long time, no thank you.

Please drop this plan.

Huge environmental impacts.

Focus on what the permanent residents of the Island want, not on the short term “desires” of the Navy population. They obviously would favor convenience, etc. since they don’t have to pay for such improvements or live with their consequences.

If too many cars can get here easy all island roads will suffer - as well as the people.

Be aware: any attempt to build a bridge will meet massive opposition. We will have our bodies chained to your construction equipment - if the lawsuits fail.

Not saving miles.

People coming from the north already have a viable option in the Deception Pass Bridge. If transportation options are going to be expanded then the solution, be it ferry or bridge, should be farther south. That way people coming from the south have a quicker option.

Far too long and costly.

Any bridge should join the two halves of Island County.

I don’t believe this would solve any traffic problems.

No additional vehicle access routes to Whidbey Island!

Would require loss of valuable agricultural land across Skagit County and disrupt neighborhoods in N. Whidbey.

Please no.

Reduce the number of cars!

It’s hard enough now to drive through LaConner.

Impact on LaConner/rural areas roads would be too great (too much!).

Leave LaConner area alone.

New Bridge North Whidbey to Mainland near La Conner: “Reject This” (Cont.)

Absolutely not! It would destroy the entire essence of that private corner of our region. It would spur commercial growth (pavement) in Skagit Valley No!

NO NEW BRIDGE

Would destroy much of Skagit Flats wetlands, wildlife habitat

We don't need more cars or an easy route to I-5. We have too much traffic for Whidbey island roads now.

Serves same area as present bridge and highway.

At all locations a new bridge is a concept for the past, not for the future. This ecosystem cannot stand more air pollution, water pollution, sprawl, global warming and the continued paving over of all islands which are a part of the Puget Sound.

No direct route to I-5 on LaConner side.

Would be a horrendous cost to taxpayers. In addition, if this happens, be prepared for quadrupling Island traffic requiring 4-lane (or more) highways.

Way too expensive and would be an eyesore.

Would be closer to SR 20 but again would disturb rural farmland and wetlands.

More emphasis should be placed on encouraging transit use and links between Island and Skagit counties. New bridges would encourage excess development and destroy the rural nature of Whidbey Island.

Benefits North Whidbey residents only.

Costly!

North Whidbey traffic flow would be okay if South Whidbey traffic goes to mainland without using North Whidbey.

No practical long term solution until transportation issues linked to land use planning. Any improvement listed would only result in more problems in the I-5 corridor. Any increase in traffic capacity would only result in increased growth.

Bridge options very expensive.

Pretty insane cost.

Why not just build a 4 lane bridge from Mukilteo to Clinton!? Then run a 4 lane highway all the way to Oak Harbor, put in lots of fast food restaurants, car washes and mini marts, this would complete the devastation.

May negatively impact neighborhoods, roads & environment.

Won't save time going to Seattle/Everett.

This would destroy our quality of life by turning Whidbey into a suburb of Everett and Seattle.

We're already in trouble.

The goal of our transportation plan cannot be to make long commutes more practical, or we simply extend the problem while destroying our resource lands.

More traffic to isolated area.

Blasting rock formations, old trees & CCC fences is not only unnecessary, but a CRIME!

Would require widening all the way to and from the bridge.

Would destroy whole wild magnificence of this historic and nature-blessed area.

Don't change it - most beautiful bridge in Washington state.

This sounds like an eyesore - similar to ones I've seen in Florida.

New Bridge North Whidbey to Mainland near La Conner: "Reject This" (Cont.)

What about a bridge from North Whidbey to the Dewey or Gibraltar area! Goat Island is a ridiculous idea!

Would drive development here, making us just like the places our visitors are trying to get away from.

We have a large and active community that will physically protest any bridge construction effort here and considerable media fire power.

NO way!!!

Increased vehicle emissions would contribute to global warming, as well as degrade local air quality.

Financial burden of construction project of these dimensions is unnecessary and unfair.

Puget Sound ecosystem would suffer.

Stress to our fragile shorelines and runoff from oily roads would surely occur.

SR 20 & 525 have too low capacity to handle.

NO!

Unfeasible, environmentally and financially for the return received.

Huge environmental impacts on very small geographic entities (Fidalgo, Whidbey, and Camano Islands).

Will only be a short term solution - we will just have more cars and trucks until everything has to be enlarged again. Invent new solution that will last for years - using our waterways seems ideal.

We're lucky we have waterways to use.

Insufficient arteries on Whidbey to handle traffic.

Flooding across Fir Island and potential for flooding across Skagit Flats makes this proposal unreasonable.

Must cross Indian reservation. Wrong way to go.

Cost prohibitive.

Absolutely not - never.

The Growth Management Act was passed based upon a finding of the State Legislature of a "threat to the environment". That threat is fundamentally caused by too much development and too much pollution resulting from this development.

Not gaining much distance wise.

Walk-on ferry and proper bus service. Bus service doesn't work unless you can drive to get to it. Too far north.

Would require major road improvements between bridge and I-5 access

Not a practical approach - geographically. Why not consider crossing Hope Island?

"No Answer" Comments:

Consider a tunnel from Strawberry Pt to Conway Area.

NO!

Would be incredibly costly! Not opposed to the idea.

***Build A New Bridge
Whidbey's Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area***

"Prefer This" Comments:

The cost of ferries and approaches would go a long ways on building the bridge.

Head due west from Conway to Ault Field junction with SR20; saves about 30 miles to points south (Camano, Seattle) and better way to Mt. Vernon and Bellingham.

A bridge would cut close to an hour from my commute time.

Would reduce commercial traffic as well as provide quicker access on and off the Island for commuters.

Strawberry Point to Utsalady Point - Build additional bridge lanes to Camano.

Straight shot to I-5.

Make it as far south on Whidbey as possible so it will be a good choice for people going to Seattle; connect as quickly with I-5 as you can; pick up traffic that would go to Deception Pass bridge and traffic that might be driving down the island to the ferry. In other words, find a solution that works two ways. This would take into consideration the Growth Management plan's expectation that Freeland and other areas will be taking most of the anticipated growth.

Only logical choice. Is it possible to keep Conway residents happy? Going through their fields and homelands?

Whichever one of these more southern locations that is most economically feasible in terms of the design, costs of construction, displacement of existing homes, etc. We don't have enough information to evaluate these 3 alternative proposals.

The only way.

Road expansion would appear to be feasible with closest access to I-5.

Least commercial impact.

Most practical.

Good access to I-5 and Mount Vernon, also tourists to reach Whidbey Island.

Provides 3rd ingress/egress to island, relieving volume on existing north and south entry points.

Bridge moves traffic faster than ferry

Near population center.

The way to go - Mt. Vernon 15 minutes, Everett 20 minutes, Bellingham 45 minutes.

Probably best of all, but will change island forever.

Consider 4 lane bridge.

Need to also widen the road from I-5 to new bridge.

Best option, before LaConner and Camano bridge options.

Third choice after new bridge & Camano bridge options, and before new auto ferry, auto ferries to Camano & Stanwood options. Skagit Bay Flats is shallower crossing as far as construction cost.

Would be a faster route to I-5 corridor.

This would provide the most direct route to I-5 and would relieve SR 20 best.

Central departure from Whidbey - will avoid much Anacortes/Mt. Vernon traffic.

Get off Island and fan out in different directions (North & South).

Makes more sense than parallel new bridge or widening.

More central point of departure.

Ferry to anywhere over there would be fine.

New Bridge Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area: "Prefer This" (Cont.)

Looks as if it would be the shortest route to I-5 with minimum environmental impact on existing communities.

Perfect idea.

The closest route to I-5.

Any bridge should be high enough to let all marine traffic pass without requiring the bridge to be opened.

Closest to I-5 corridor.

Should have bridge close to cities.

Provides most direct connection to I-5.

Would cause least impact to existing facilities and people.

Population growth will be mainly north of Coupeville because of water availability.

Would preserve scenic atmosphere of Deception Pass area.

Seems least cost and best crossing location.

Use existing study prepared year ago.

Our household feels this is the best option.

Whichever is cheaper - this or LaConner bridge option.

Best idea. A lot of traffic is headed for I-5 and this won't pass through populated areas. This will truly relieve SR 20. Will also relieve ferry congestion.

If individuals cannot/will not utilize public transportation to reach areas of employment, a connection that does not require driving across the bridge seems logical.

Pick the cheapest and least environmental damaging option between this and La Conner bridge.

May be too expensive and create undesirable commercial development on Whidbey.

Toll bridge.

Provide southbound (Seattle-Everett) route which would reduce congestion on Deception Pass and Clinton ferry.

This would be the most logical connection between the highest population area of Whidbey and the I-5 corridor.

Would cause traffic to flow away from Deception Pass.

Best available existing road situation.

Best route thru open / state owned land.

Or Strawberry Pt. to Stanwood.

Second bridge choice, after LaConner and before Camano options.

This option if directed from Hansaker (sp?) Drive to the vicinity of the Utsalady Point boat ramp on Camano seems to be the shortest span and probably would be the most viable from a finance standpoint.

Least impact on populated areas off Whidbey.

Better for commuters to Everett.

Widen SR 20 Oak Harbor to Coupeville.

Would mean improving a few existing roads but is the best solution all the way around. Quickest connection to I-5.

If there were a bridge between Whidbey Island to Fir Island many people would use it instead of going across the Deception Pass Bridge.

Offers best long term business and global potential for trade access.

New Bridge Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area: "Prefer This" (Cont.)

NAS proximity and relief of North area SR 20 traffic jams.

Yes.

This is the most economical to build therefore the best option.

Would be no congestion in that area and it would improve the area without making a congested area because there is no industry to cause an impact of traffic tie-ups.

“Worth Considering” Comments:

Road would need to be widened to 4 lanes from Fir Island to I-5.

Limited community facilities. Poor Docking Choice.

This could work.

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost at this stage.

Although a bridge in either of these locations would relieve the traffic across Deception Pass area, it would not seem to help the South bound traffic from the island. The current drive from oak harbor (the population center) to Seattle (the most common destination) is very unbearable.

Whichever (of bridges to Camano, LaConner, Strawberry Pt.) is most feasible considering engineering and environmental problems, and which would best meet the needs of the people.

Good connection I-5, although farmland would be lost.

This is worth considering since Conway is fairly close to I-5.

Closer to I-5.

Conway I-5 interchange appears to be the least painful with reasonable road upgrades in an essentially low density area.

Impact on wetlands (since most of this area is currently farmed) should be minimal.

This is viable option with a causeway or low level bridge most of the distance, with a relatively short high bridge at the Whidbey end to provide passage for boats.

Limitations on access serve as a mild brake on excessive development. The impacts of greatly increased access on Whidbey, Goat and Camano Islands would be substantial and detrimental. I allowed for the Strawberry Point-Fir Island connection as a final fall back if it is considered essential.

If we must have a bridge this is the most acceptable.

Seems best!

A good alternative if a Whidbey/Camano bridge not possible.

People coming from the north already have a viable option in the Deception Pass Bridge. If transportation options are going to be expanded then the solution, be it ferry or bridge, should be farther south. That way people coming from the south have a quicker option.

Possible, but I have reservations as to the distance the bridge would take.

A different area should relieve some of the pressure from the scenic tourist route to a bypass or commuter route.

Why not Strawberry Point to Camano Island?

Would have to consider the impact on roads, farms, homes, etc. On either side - perhaps to a less populated area would be best.

New Bridge Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area: “Worth Considering” (Cont.)

The least evil of all the bridge options - only as a last resort!

Too much water to cross - isn't it? In looking at chart this water is shallow and could be filled at least 2/3 distance thus lowering expense.

One advantage is low population density, and shortest distance to I-5.

Second choice after Camano Bridge.

Yes - bridge would give rapid access to I-5 - free.

This would be the 3rd best option (after new Deception Pass or LaConner bridges), possibly 2nd best option. Access from I-5 at Conway thru Fir Island is pretty direct, having minimal impact on homeowners. Although bridge span would be great, this area would make a good access point to Whidbey Island.

My 1st choice - need traffic survey. Need to serve Seattle traffic, also traffic to Keystone Ferry and it would serve more of South Whidbey Island.

Since users are likely the ones who commute between Oak Harbor and the Mt. Vernon/Burlington area, these two ideas seem to be best. (Bridges to LaConner or Strawberry Point) The big drawback is the bridge would have to be built in wetlands.

Bridge must be tall enough for all marine traffic to go under.

This may have less stress on a community area if an alternative bridge is deemed necessary, but who are we serving - Seattle? Everett?

If this is not feasible then go to LaConner/Goat Island Crossing.

Makes more sense, shorter commute for Whidbey Islanders than crossing at Deception Pass.

Does not affect as many people as bridge to Camano does.

The span required may be too great for soil conditions and earthquake proofing.

Ranks first before LaConner and Camano bridge options, widening Deception Pass bridge option.

Least impact on populated areas.

Would improve traffic flow, time and decrease distance to anywhere east. Our time has come to consider a bridge equal to the one from San Diego to Coronado.

Could possibly be less intrusive to the environment and a quicker connection to I-5.

If you must.

“Reject This” Comments:

Of the four bridge options thus far this is superior to the others.

More emphasis should be placed on encouraging transit use and links between Island and Skagit counties. New bridges would encourage excess development and destroy the rural nature of Whidbey Island.

Is this a 2 lane or 4 lane bridge? Either way, what are we going to do with the added cars when they get here? Build more and bigger roads? Again, not a good idea.

Too expensive due to long span and channel depth. Visual eyesore - decrease real estate value on both Camano and Whidbey.

Unnecessary.

Too much money.

NO - Spend the money on Deception Pass.

New Bridge Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area: “Reject This” (Cont.)

We see no need to “optimize” every square foot of the Puget Sound area for transportation.

Islands of rural character, just as gated communities in the city should be allowed to exist for people who would prefer some of the other aspects of life rather than getting somewhere fast.

Focus on what the permanent residents of the Island want, not on the short term “desires” of the Navy population. They obviously would favor convenience, etc. since they don't have to pay for such improvements or live with their consequences.

We moved here to enjoy our rural environment. We do not want to see their beautiful island turned into yet another suburb of the I-5 corridor.

Never a bridge, please!

Costly.

If the essence of Whidbey is to be saved, LEAVE IT BE! If you build it, they will come. You will not ease current conditions by increasing access because more people will be flocking here if it becomes easier to get on and off Whidbey Island.

Too long and expensive.

Here or LaConner via Goat Island will be prohibitively expensive, will require additional bridge across Skagit River at Conway, will eat up valuable land and will be subject to flooding of Fir Island.

The problem is the main highway on the island, not getting here from off-island. Adding easier access via a bridge or bridges will only worsen the congestion on SR20. In many places, particularly central Whidbey, SR20 lacks shoulders and has power poles immediately adjacent to the road surface.

Would be a very shortsighted remedy which would have disastrous and irreversible consequences.

Will ruin all that is lovely.

With the growth of retailers here on the island the amount of traffic from the island to the mainland for purposes of shopping should decrease. I'm sure that over the next few years we will see additional stores locating here as population increases, further negating the need for a new bridge.

The enormous cost both for our pocketbooks and for the environment are reason enough NOT to spend any more time using tax-payers' money to even explore the possibility.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in such great numbers, and it would go on and on for months and eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees.

We will fight you every step of the way to prevent the building of any kind of bridge.

Chills my blood.

Water too deep in Saratoga Passage thus raising cost of bridge too high.

Too much highway needs to be built to connect with bridge.

It is proven that increased roadways or bridges do not lessen vehicular congestion over an extended period of time.

The people of Whidbey and Camano will resist in great numbers; the litigation will go on and on for years and it will eat up unbelievable amounts of time and money and court fees that could be better used in other ways.

Costly!

Would be a horrendous cost to taxpayers.

New Bridge Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area: “Reject This” (Cont.)

If this happens, be prepared for quadrupling Island traffic requiring 4-lane (or more) highways. Least impact to established residential areas, but what about accessibility on Whidbey and maximum benefit to all?

Why!! What major population area are you trying to access?!?

Pretty insane cost.

Why not just build a 4 lane bridge from Mukilteo to Clinton!? Then run a 4 lane highway all the way to Oak Harbor, put in lots of fast food restaurants, car washes and mini marts, this would complete the devastation.

Too much “flood condition” problems.

5 miles of bridge.

Not needed, not wanted, not welcome, not now, not for a long long time, no thank you.

Please drop this plan.

Huge environmental impacts.

No practical long term solution until transportation issues linked to land use planning. Any improvement listed would only result in more problems in the I-5 corridor. Any increase in traffic capacity would only result in increased growth.

Bridge options very expensive, may negatively impact neighborhoods, roads & environment. Flooding across Fir Island and potential for flooding across Skagit Flats makes this proposal unreasonable.

Would divert traffic south of Mt. Vernon, towards the Alderwood Mall.

Would invite not only more people, but more crime.

Would require either a new road from the bridge to the west, or a radically altered present roadway. Area is most prone to ice of any on Island since it’s the Island’s highest point. Either road extremely expensive.

While it would be good for those who use bridge regularly, it would seriously damage commerce for 40+ miles.

Devastating, not only to residents of north Whidbey, but to economics of surrounding businesses, e.g. Mt. Vernon, which depend to some extent on off-island shoppers.

Huge environmental impacts on very small geographic entities (Fidalgo, Whidbey, and Camano Islands).

We don’t need more cars or an easy route to I-5. We don’t need “passing through” traffic from the mainland. We have enough traffic now.

Will only be a short term solution - we will just have more cars and trucks until everything has to be enlarged again. Invent new solution that will last for years - using our waterways seems ideal. We’re lucky we have waterways to use.

Be aware: any attempt to build a bridge will meet massive opposition. We will have our bodies chained to your construction equipment - if the lawsuits fail.

At all locations a new bridge is a concept for the past, not for the future. This ecosystem cannot stand more air pollution, water pollution, sprawl, global warming and the continued paving over of all islands which are a part of the Puget Sound.

More emphasis should be placed on encouraging transit use and links between Island and Skagit counties. New bridges would encourage excess development and destroy the rural nature of Whidbey Island.

New Bridge Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area: “Reject This” (Cont.)

Even with a second bridge, there will be traffic gridlock in a few years. It’s a foolish, expensive “band-aid”.

Long bridge span would increase costs & lengthen time that tolls would be required.

Way too expensive and would be an eyesore.

Insufficient arteries on Whidbey to handle traffic.

Any bridge should join the two halves of Island County.

Route is over poor wintertime road and past school with 20 mph speed limit.

Would only encourage commuters and cause decline in our standard of living. Development and growth of Whidbey island should NOT be encouraged.

This is a big negative for the wildlife habitat.

Fir Island & Conway access is now satisfactory and will improve if South Whidbey ferry service improves.

I don't believe this would solve any traffic problems.

Could affect agricultural area.

Fir Island is subject to periodic floods (i.e. 1990). That would stop all traffic on the new bridge.

No additional vehicle access routes to Whidbey Island!

These should not even be an option! They are rural communities. Why should any of these people have to deal with the pollution, noise and unsightly view of a road and bridge for the convenience of people that come and go to the city when the Island would be changed forever because of it?

Would impact wildlife areas on Fir Island.

Fir Island periodically floods, so road would have to be elevated. Massive earth moving project.

Would lose rich farmland.

Please no.

Reduce the number of cars!

Too much additional highway to Strawberry Point.

Why destroy more precious farmland?

Rural, forestry and sensitive lands should be protected. This needs to be the top priority. There is no good reason to encourage a Seattle/Everett commute from Whidbey Island.

NO way!!!

Will require 4 lanes to I-5.

NO NEW BRIDGE

2.5 mile bridge leading to nowhere (environmental impact?)

Blasting rock formations, old trees & CCC fences is not only unnecessary, but a CRIME!

Would require widening all the way to and from the bridge.

Would destroy whole wild magnificence of this historic and nature-blessed area.

Don't change it - most beautiful bridge in Washington state.

Would drive development here, making us just like the places our visitors are trying to get away from.

We have a large and active community that will physically protest any bridge construction effort here and considerable media fire power.

Increased vehicle emissions would contribute to global warming, as well as degrade local air quality.

Financial burden of construction project of these dimensions is unnecessary and unfair.

New Bridge Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area: "Reject This" (Cont.)

Puget Sound ecosystem would suffer.

Stress to our fragile shorelines and runoff from oily roads would surely occur.

SR 20 & 525 have too low capacity to handle.

NO!

Absolutely not - never.

No way. It's quite a wide body of water there. We don't want another bridge to the mainland. This is an island! If you don't like it. Don't live here!

This would destroy our quality of life by turning Whidbey into a suburb of Everett and Seattle. We're already in trouble.

Rejected, but may have the benefit of being the least stupid of the bridge ideas.

Unfeasible, environmentally and financially for the return received.

Devastating impact on LaConner/Skagit Valley area.

“No Opinion” Comments:

Too hard to keep the channels open due to the mud in the flats.

“No Answer” Comments:

NO!

Would be incredibly costly! Not opposed to the idea.

Any bridge connecting to I-5 would devastate our Islands by over-development and would quickly be converted to another Lynnwood, Everett or Seattle, etc.

Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities

“Prefer This” Comments:

This option is in keeping with our NW spirit and would also create long term employment.

Seems to be the only reasonable solution.

Best solution.

Accepted mode of travel in Northwest.

Passenger facilities needed.

Prefer ferries if possible because this system is more in keeping with the Washington area as a whole for tourism as well as communities involved.

The best solution given that major rework of SR 20/525 are not included in this plan. The carrying capacity of the ferry system will automatically limit traffic to a level that will not greatly impact SR 20/525.

This would be less expensive than a bridge, but would be less convenient.

Roads are already in.

2.5 crossing - 15 minutes.

No cost to the county.

Don't want the added growth from a bridge.

Another ferry service would help relieve traffic in Deception Pass area.

A ferry would be a slow-growth improvement.

Also parking and buses to meet pedestrians. Have people only ferries.

We would only have the same problems with the ferries: long waits, traffic jam and a new place to have an accident.

We do not need to have increased problems with Washington ferries (bureaucracy and the Maritime Union).

Our population is enough and maybe a ferry would cut down the use of the bridge.

Much better option than a bridge - less environmental impact & more in line with island's character.

This is reasonable, but should include pedestrian ferries tied in with a modern transit system which would allow people to reach major destinations on the mainland, easily and inexpensively; perhaps at no cost being a public facility.

Clinton-Mukilteo ferry addition.

Seems to be less expensive too.

Please Yes - help us get where we need/want to go by bus, trolley, and ferry.

Definitely the best choice.

Instead of auto ferry service I would like to see foot traffic ferry with connecting bus service.

Prefer ferry to bridge to discourage excessive growth. Bridge is much too easy for people to move here.

I don't think a bridge from Clinton & Mukilteo should be ruled out.

This would be my second choice to a North Whidbey bridge with Highway to I-5.

Please do this! Best investment for 100 years!

Consider ferry dock directly to Oak Harbor plus/minus area/tourism. (Sic)

Ferries retain the "island mystique".

Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities: "Prefer This" Comments:

Central Whidbey to mainland, not Camano; or to Camano and on to mainland due East! (1) Best for me. (2) Takes pressure off Clinton.

Depends where terminal would be and only “small” ferry service. Terminal in Oak Harbor OK - not maybe base used. (Sic)

Best choice.

Camano Island residents need to be connected to Island for county business, jury duty etc.

“Worth Considering” Comments:

Focus on foot traffic with public transit connections.

On South End Whidbey Island “Only.”

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost at this stage.

Why not put in the additional ferry on the North of W.I., it wouldn’t take much to up date the roads.

Add additional ferry service to existing facilities (Pt. Townsend-Keystone) and (Clinton-Mukilteo) routes during peak demand.

Add in Mukilteo/Clinton if anywhere.

Walk on ferries.

Only solves Southend of Whidbey Island Mainland Link.

People who live on Whidbey Island chose it for its rural character and natural beauty. I believe the ferry service helps to preserve that character best.

Whidbey is partly defined by ferry services. This strengthens Island character.

As temporary measure until roads/bridges/tunnels could be constructed.

All year at Mukilteo and vacation season at Keystone.

At Mukilteo & Keystone/Port Townsend.

Especially South Island - bigger ferry - more frequent sailing during “rush hours”.

Stanwood would be ideal location. However, 532 would not handle extra traffic unless redone - several serious or fatal crashes this last year with numerous caused by someone going over double yellow. Would get like SR 522 with crashes unless redone.

If something MUST BE DONE, let it be a ferry run.

Should consider passenger only service.

Little confidence in State responding to needs - always too little too late.

Fourth choice after new bridge, bridges to Camano & Fir Island, and before auto ferries to Camano & Stanwood options. Or - increase frequency of Clinton ferry.

Only problem is at the mercy of ferry service, mechanical, weather and tides.

If you create uninterrupted traffic flow to/from I-5.

As an alternative to a bridge.

A bridge would be a better permanent solution.

Put it South of Oak Harbor to the mainland.

Worth the thought?

This cost would be covered by regular users. More realistic than bridges.

Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities: “Worth Considering” (Cont.):

Larger and faster ferries at both Mukilteo and Keystone.

Good alternative to bridges.

At Clinton expand facilities for Mukilteo-Clinton for 3rd ferry

Which would be more economical to do - bridges or ferry - considering purchase of land, ferry, building supplies and new/improved roadways to and from these new constructions.

I am hesitant to recommend ferry service as it is difficult to project future operating costs. I don't feel it is a cost effective transportation alternative for the long term.

I'd prefer passenger-only ferry addition & improved transit.

An auto ferry from Coupeville to Stanwood area would disperse away from congested North & South locations.

A possible solution to mitigate some problems.

No practical long term solution until transportation issues linked to land use planning. Any improvement listed would only result in more problems in the I-5 corridor. Any increase in traffic capacity would only result in increased growth.

North Whidbey to mainland.

A ferry is probably a cheaper option than a bridge, but would not move traffic as efficiently.

Let people rather than the Island bear some of the consequences and WAIT if they want to move here.

What is being underutilized now?

A third ferry at Clinton would be helpful.

Use ferry to provide service while a new bridge is being built.

Walk-on ferries are best, but parking becomes a serious consideration. (security issues)

The most reasonable monetary solution.

My only concerns with this are: the expense to patrons; and whether it would be as reliable as a bridge, i.e. we often "drive around" rather than go south to the Clinton ferry because weather or long lines could delay us for an unpredictable amount of time.

While this option is better than nothing, there are still many island residents unwilling to wait for ferries.

Whidbey is an island - emphasize ferries.

Probably the best alternative but would it be most cost effective?

Can this be done without further congestion for Oak Harbor?

High maintenance & operations costs vs. bridge.

Will require 4 lanes to I-5.

Maybe in the summer - services could be expanded somehow.

Needs to be south of Oak Harbor to serve central Whidbey without Oak Harbor congestion.

Consider passenger only ferries.

Where? Hoypus Pt. (Cornet Bay) to Dewey Beach has infrastructure problems; other north sites worth consideration.

Clinton to Mukilteo or Clinton to Seattle, a larger vessel commuter trip.

Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities: "Reject This" Comments:

Ferries are inefficient for the long term. Sooner or later a bridge must be built!

Ferry service should be avoided here and elsewhere when a bridge option is available.

Why not a passenger ferry?

Ferries are too unreliable, limited to tidal schedules and limited in size and number.

Consider foot ferries to either location, not auto ferries; foot ferry to Stanwood would avoid necessity of county road access and bottleneck of Mark Clark Bridge. State Hwy. access would be ideal.

Should add new passenger ferry or two from Keystone to Seattle and Langley to Seattle - would alleviate a great deal of “shopping” traffic.

Expand service at Clinton.

Continuing cost forever with limited service.

Good for freight truck traffic. Cheaper rates. More direct route.

Cost too much and people won't use it if they can cross a bridge for free.

As auto service. Passenger only service is plan by county from Coupeville to Camano.

If you're going to do something, do it right -- ferries are slow and we already have one for tourist novelty. Ferries don't move vehicles quickly.

Foot ferries only.

Costs too much for traffic it could carry.

Creates more traffic waiting times.

Ferries a) can't handle the volume b) are expensive (ongoing personnel costs) c) run only so many hours a day d) are unreliable in inclement weather.

I dislike the ferry system with a PASSION!! My opinion is not limited to just service to or from Whidbey Island but to the ferry system as a whole; fares continue to rise. There is NO alternatives, long waits occur just as demands increase, cancellations due to weather or tides leave you stranded, schedules are inflexible, unsafe driving conditions are instilled as drivers rush to catch their ferries and night-time travel is impossible because the ferries do not run late at night.

DO NOT ADD!

This would always be at the whim of the State Ferries for closure due to funds, weather, tides.

Never on time/or always have to wait in line.

NO. The State can't handle what it has now. Besides, you wait in line. Why???

PASSENGER FERRY ONLY.

No infrastructure on Camano Island to support any ferry.

A bridge can be built to include mass transit compared to a ferry.

Cost of ferries continues to escalate and is labor intensive.

A ferry does not accommodate an emergency vehicle in same manner as a bridge.

Not to North Camano area!

Ferries are not effective.

These should not even be an option! They are rural communities. Why should any of these people have to deal with the pollution, noise and unsightly view of a road and bridge for the convenience of people that come and go to the city when the Island would be changed forever because of it?

Except an emergency ferry in case of earthquake or bombing of bridge.

Not economically sound because of the little revenue it might generate - not enough to “feed” itself.

Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities: “Reject This” (Cont.)

Would have serious economic impact on Oak Harbor because large numbers who now pass through on their way to and from the Olympic Peninsula would bypass Oak Harbor completely,

as well as existing growing business corridor from Oak Harbor/ Anacortes/Mt.

Vernon/Bellingham.

Passenger ferry!

Enough ferry traffic, noise and pollution and EPA impact already.

If we must have a new bridge or ferry, keep the mainland access well south of the Mt. Vernon-Burlington area. SR 20 is already over-used and dangerous.

Increase number of runs Clinton to Mukilteo: least disruptive to citizens living in ferry terminal areas.

Ferries cannot effectively handle the projected traffic increase.

A new ferry would create the same problems for the island as a new bridge.

Should use passenger only ferries.

Won't pay for themselves.

Considering future costs and traffic, a bridge would be more cost effective.

Ferries are more costly over the long run - a toll on a bridge would pay for itself - a ferry never pays for itself

Ferry boats are the most expensive mode of transportation. Especially if operated by governments!!!

Add passenger only ferry from Camano to Coupeville and Oak Harbor (or from Stanwood).

Still too slow service.

The use of auto ferries adds time constraints (meeting schedules), also weather constraints (high winds/tides). Ferries don't run all night.

Those on south end of island will be needed simply to take care of increased population there.

These auto ferry options dump more cars onto North I-5 which is already severely congested.

Already planned and started and totally inadequate already!

Overall, ferries are too slow and schedules are restrictive.

No matter how you cut it, it is cheaper to drive from Oak Harbor than take a ferry.

"Walk on" ferries only to downtown Seattle from Keystone and/or Freeland

Too slow and unpredictable.

Prefer bridges, the ferry system would be too slow travel wise when I'm trying to make the bus.

(Bus commuter - Stanwood to Seattle)

Only a band-aid fix.

No - ferry fares too high, unreliable, long lines. Costs the commuter, not free.

Add passenger ferry services at South end. Increase bus service. Quit catering to the dreaded car-culture!

The idea is noble and it would probably cost less to implement, but it is likely the bulk of the traffic would continue to use the bridge, because it is cheaper to drive around.

Service too restrictive (times available) and too labor intensive

Enjoy the peace/quiet - plan ahead!

No more ferries.

Limited access/interruptions/high rates to ride.

Helping commuters should NOT be encouraged.

Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities: "Reject This" (Cont.)

Takes too much time.

Congestion on both sides.

Too slow, too much congestion.

NO.

Long term operating & maintenance costs. Ferry schedules interrupt the constant flow of traffic.

NO FERRIES

Traffic would flow faster on a bridge than on ferries.

Won't save time.

Ferries are low capacity transport means for vehicles not an efficient, high volume solution.

Passenger ferry.

This won't help me at all. I have tried driving to the Clinton Ferry. Too dangerous.

Where and What? Merely adding to Clinton - Mukilteo route would not change the time or improve traffic flow.

Possibly add more ferry boats Clinton Mukilteo.

Too costly, long term.

Ferries create congestion - lines - impact on communities.

NO

Merely a stop gap.

Rural, forestry and sensitive lands should be protected. This needs to be the top priority. There is no good reason to encourage a Seattle/Everett commute from Whidbey Island.

I'm afraid people would not use this very much because of the cost factor.

Ferries are also much slower than bridges.

No - we don't need more cars here. Add another ferry to the Clinton-Mukilteo run - they are backed-up now.

“No Opinion” Comments:

Improve current ferry service on Clinton-Mukilteo route.

The ferry system from Whidbey to Mukilteo is acceptable. The ferry from Keystone to Port Townsend sucks (numerous times spent waiting on either side with backlog.)

“No Answer” Comments:

Inefficient & too expensive

NO! NO!

Too slow and not as flexible as a bridge.

Add at Clinton/Mukilteo. Build new slip so four ferries are running. Better, faster service would be provided!

*Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities
North Whidbey to Camano Island*

“Prefer This” Comments:

Not so convenient as a bridge, however.

At least have a walk on or car ferry from Coupeville to Camano for county services access. This option is in keeping with our NW spirit and would also create long term employment. The ferry between Coupeville and Camano would greatly help citizens conducting business with Island County.

Provides 3rd ingress/egress, relieving volume on existing 2 entry points.

Connects Whidbey and Camano.

This is a big negative for the wildlife habitat.

I feel disconnected to Whidbey and Coupeville, our county seat.

I'm sick of relying on Stanwood for my needs.

Getting to Whidbey faster would be a boon for my family's business.

This would be less expensive than a bridge, but would be less convenient.

Coupeville to Mollina (sp?) Beach.

Passenger only Coupeville (government offices) to Camano.

Closest point.

Fifth choice after new bridge, bridges to Camano & Fir Island, new auto ferry, and before auto ferries to Camano & Stanwood options.

We would only have the same problems with the ferries: long waits, traffic jam and a new place to have an accident.

We do not need to have increased problems with Washington ferries (bureaucracy and the Maritime Union).

Much better option than a bridge - less environmental impact & more in line with island's character.

Camano needs a better link to its county services - if only a passenger ferry

This is an idea whose time has come, but must also be tied in with a modern, efficient transit system.

GREAT IDEA!!!

Please Yes - help us get where we need/want to go by bus, trolley, and ferry.

Depends where terminal would be and only "small" ferry service. Terminal in Oak Harbor OK - not maybe base used. (sic)

"Worth Considering" Comments:

Would require a great deal of other infrastructure improvements and development. Roads - parking, congestion on existing bridge (532).

Only worth considering if people want to go to Stanwood or Camano--I've lived on Whidbey Island 14 years and have never been to either place.

This would help Island County citizens have easier access to the court house and involvement of county affairs.

New Auto Ferry Service North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Worth Considering" (Cont.)

Connection to Camano Island, as part of Island County seems more important than to the mainland.

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost at this stage.

Most people are heading further inland.

Even a passenger walk-on ferry - if not an auto ferry.

To enable Island County residents transportation to County seat.

People who live on Whidbey Island chose it for its rural character and natural beauty. I believe the ferry service helps to preserve that character best.

Could strengthen identity and cohesion of Island County!

A mainland, Camano Island, Whidbey ferry connection would serve the same purpose as a bridge (tunnel) - highway - bridge (tunnel) connection.

Impact on northern Camano roads and traffic impact needs to be identified. Road upgrades might be too expensive.

A passenger only ferry from Camano to the Coupeville area is worth a try.

A bridge would be "all weather".

Only if passenger only ferry.

This is for Camano residents to decide.

Improvement but slow between ferry dock and I-5 - perhaps new good by pass this distance (ferry dock and I-5) would make much feasible. (sic)

This cost would be covered by regular users. More realistic than bridges.

Since Coupeville is the county seat of Island County I think it would be beneficial to both the county government and the citizens of Camano Island to have a ferry from Central Whidbey to Camano Island.

Foot ferry would be appropriate.

Would offer an alternate route to Oak Harbor without great impact on the "island environment".

Which would be more economical to do - bridges or ferry - considering purchase of land, ferry, building supplies and new/improved roadways to and from these new constructions.

Worth considering only if bridge alternatives are not feasible.

Under no circumstances should a passenger ferry be considered. Even with connecting bus lines, a passenger ferry would not reduce congestion on existing SR 20 corridor accesses.

Would divert traffic from NAS, away from Deception Pass.

Very useful, especially for Camano Island residents.

Would help connect the county for government services. But, it is redundant for commuters since SR 20 goes by here.

Some road improvements required

Use ferry to provide service while a new bridge is being built.

New Auto Ferry Service North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Reject This" Comments:

Ferry service should be avoided here and elsewhere when a bridge option is available.

Ferry service here would add burden to SR523 between Camano and I-5, noting in particular the unsafe nature of traffic to/from ferry landings.

Eyesore, disruptive to Camano Island community.

SR532 is already crowded.

Ferries are too unreliable, limited to tidal schedules and limited in size and number.

Too much traffic.

Consider foot ferries to either location, not auto ferries; foot ferry to Stanwood would avoid necessity of county road access and bottleneck of Mark Clark Bridge. State Hwy. access would be ideal.

Infrastructure for auto ferries to either location would be an expensive disaster. With single entrance to Camano Island, the bottleneck would be unbelievable.

NO

Camano doesn't want extra traffic.

NO - Mark Clark & #532 overload.

Foot ferries only.

Camano will never accept this, will require extensive property condemnation on Camano and bottleneck will occur in Stanwood.

Costs too much for traffic it could carry.

Camano Island has few services (gas, food etc.), heavy traffic while Stanwood has services and the ability to handle additional traffic and people.

I dislike the ferry system with a PASSION!! My opinion is not limited to just service to or from Whidbey Island but to the ferry system as a whole; fares continue to rise. There is NO alternatives, long waits occur just as demands increase, cancellations due to weather or tides leave you stranded, schedules are inflexible, unsafe driving conditions are instilled as drivers rush to catch their ferries and night-time travel is impossible because the ferries do not run late at night.

Terrribly unfair to Camano residents. We have only one access point. What would effect on Camano traffic be? Exchanging one problem for another - improving quality of life for Whidbey at expense of Camano's.

Tremendous impact on North Camano - roadways inadequate unless widened entire distance to I-5. High volume of traffic on SR 532 already a problem during peak hours.

NO. The State can't handle what it has now. Besides, you wait in line. Why???

Camano can't accommodate any additional traffic from Whidbey Island.

Route is over poor wintertime road and past school with 20 mph speed limit.

Would only encourage commuters and cause decline in our standard of living. Development and growth of Whidbey island should NOT be encouraged.

Passenger only service worth considering from Camano to Coupeville.

Local Camano roads over-burdened, Mark Clark bottleneck.

Camano already has its own traffic problems, including single access to mainland.

Additional "Whidbey traffic" would further jeopardize Camano lifestyle, environment and community.

No infrastructure on Camano Island to support any ferry.

A bridge can be built to include mass transit compared to a ferry.

New Auto Ferry Service North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Reject This" (Cont.)

Cost of ferries continues to escalate and is labor intensive.

A ferry does not accommodate an emergency vehicle in same manner as a bridge.

Walk-on only.

Camano is not a vast expanse of land which can take a lot of abuse.

An island (Camano) should be treated like a national treasure. It won't take much to ruin it by clear cutting, bulldozing and eventually destroying what limited aquifer there is. Once you destroy the balance of nature on an Island, there's no recovering it.

This would have a major impact on the Camano traffic. Find a place from the mainland.

Camano/Stanwood traffic problems.

Camano Island - existing traffic problems.

These should not even be an option! They are rural communities. Why should any of these people have to deal with the pollution, noise and unsightly view of a road and bridge for the convenience of people that come and go to the city when the Island would be changed forever because of it?

Why don't you hand everyone who uses the ferries a questionnaire to fill out and collect it before they leave - ask how, why & where they are going & if they would use carpool-vanpool if it were offered.

The ferry to Camano should be central - not north.

Camano still has quiet country appeal and needs to remain this way, limiting growth and using the Stanwood/Mark Clark Bridge area for growth.

County roads inadequate for additional traffic.

Cost too much and people won't use it if they can cross a bridge for free.

Don't disturb Camano Island.

Would serve the same purpose as a bridge and less costly.

Prefer a bridge but a ferry would be better than nothing.

Need specific options.

Camano-traffic is terrible now. Additional traffic would require additional lanes and bridges between Camano and I-5. Not a good idea.

Whichever ferry service is easiest and least cost.

The seals and other sea life have a tough enough time with the current ferry invasion.

Prefer bridges, the ferry system would be too slow travel wise when I'm trying to make the bus.

(Bus commuter - Stanwood to Seattle)

No - ferry fares too high, unreliable, long lines. Costs the commuter, not free. If it is a free ferry, I'm for it.

A ferry from Camano, like a bridge, would have maximum negative impact on an existing area. It would have to displace many homeowners and there would be major traffic congestion thru Stanwood & Camano.

This will congest Camano.

We have too much traffic in Stanwood and Camano Island as it is!

I should not have to pay to solve their problems - especially when they choose to live there.

(Stanwood resident)

Having lived on Orcas Island for 15 years we know how poor the ferry system is. Poor service, high cost. This should be the very last choice, if it is even considered as a temporary fix.

We don't want mainland traffic here - our roads on Whidbey Island are already too crowded.

New Auto Ferry Service North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Reject This" (Cont.)

Foot ferry only or we draw peninsula-bound traffic off I-5 & across both islands

Ferries are more costly over the long run - a toll on a bridge would pay for itself - a ferry never pays for itself

No more ferries.

Camano & Stanwood are too congested to handle additional traffic.

Camano Island traffic cannot sustain the impact of being a quick-easy passage to Whidbey Island. We have already said we don't want to be the thoroughfare-connector. Why aren't we being listened to?

Camano Island roads have no room...

NO.

Camano residents would reject.

NO FERRIES

Add passenger only ferry from Camano to Coupeville and Oak Harbor (or from Stanwood).

Would just put the congestion elsewhere; namely SR 532 and the Mark Clark Bridge which are congested already. Would ruin the quiet I have come to enjoy.

Would require 4 lane highway across Camano Island; new Mark Clark Bridge and widening of main street through Stanwood to make it work. Many homes and commercial properties disrupted.

With a 2 lane road now off and on to Camano Island, this would be a stupid idea.

Merely a stop gap.

No way!!

We have enough cars; hopefully Thorn will fight this as he rejects quick growth.

I moved here from the Kirkland, Redmond area; in an attempt to get away from the crowding and traffic congestion. I am adamantly opposed to bringing more congestion through Camano.

Camano Island has a major traffic constriction now (one 2 lane road on/off the island). Putting more traffic onto the island via bridge or ferry would mean major road expansion and destruction of present rural environment. Use existing SR 20 corridor to get traffic off/on Whidbey Island.

The use of auto ferries adds time constraints (meeting schedules), also weather constraints (high winds/tides). Ferries don't run all night.

Would cause terrible traffic problems.

Doubt Camano residents would welcome more traffic.

Not acceptable if I'm going to Seattle - then Clinton-Mukilteo is still the best way.

Too slow.

Already too crowded on Camano Island.

Camano Island has its own rapidly developing traffic congestion problems. Growth continues with no DOT plans (\$\$\$) to improve (widen) highways/Mark W. Clark bridge or resolve traffic congestion within Stanwood area. Dumping Whidbey Island traffic into essentially rural roadways is not the answer.

Camano Island has its own rapidly developing traffic problems and cannot be considered as a solution to Whidbey Island's traffic woes.

Camano is too rural to add a main highway through it.

Private citizen couldn't make it work, why should tax money be used to create a service that has shown no need?

New Auto Ferry Service North Whidbey to Camano Island: "Reject This" (Cont.)

Would be extremely expensive / would impact environment, private property, and forest land.

No matter how you cut it, it is cheaper to drive from Oak Harbor than take a ferry.
Rural, forestry and sensitive lands should be protected. This needs to be the top priority. There is no good reason to encourage a Seattle/Everett commute from Whidbey Island.
Too much impact on Camano and its already heavy traffic through Stanwood to access I-5.
Never on time/or always have to wait in line.
Anything that aggravates Camano's own traffic problem should be avoided.
The Hwy. 532 corridor has rush hour problems now.
No - I can't see transit/roads expanding there: It's an island too!... and rural.
Camano Island should not be part of Island County.
Langley to Camano Island to mainland is a better idea.
This option would be OK for a small number of cars.
How about all the traffic on Camano Island bridge and #532?
NO! We are not a stepping stone.
Except an emergency ferry in case of earthquake or bombing of bridge.
Camano road systems inadequate - adding traffic from Whidbey irresponsible.
Camano Island to Stanwood to I-5 already has traffic saturation. Take No. Whidbey some place else please, but not Camano or Stanwood. Do not route Whidbey traffic through Camano Island.
I would rather drive than take the ferry.
This would be a disaster. We already have enough traffic!
Why??
Let's not place Whidbey's transportation problems on Camano's roads and residents. Nope.

“No Opinion” Comments:

No safety landing area.

“No Answer” Comments:

Should Camano be part of Skagit or Snohomish County vs. Island County?
A passenger ferry is what's required.
Why!

*Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities
North Whidbey to Stanwood or other Mainland Locations*

“Prefer This” Comments:

Think Stanwood areas around Twin City Foods would be good location for passenger ferry site - dredge both passages to allow access to Port Susan or Skagit Bays.

Can join SKAT, Island Transit and Snohomish easily.

Growing community with Medical, Recreational and Expanding Cultural Shopping Areas.

Would cut the commute by road way down.

What's wrong with Strawberry Point - Conway ferry? Possibly it is more cost effective than bridge?

Can disperse from here either N., S., or to Camano.

Good tourism possible benefits.

Road expansion would seriously impact some commercial areas.

SR 532 already has heavy volume of traffic all 7 miles to I-5.

Auto ferry connection this route preferable to ferry to Camano to avoid severe congestion thru Camano island & Stanwood.

If a new ferry is considered it should by all means go to Stanwood.

Can connect to public transit.

Stanwood would be perfect to I-5.

Commercial boost to these areas.

Stanwood dock for public transit.

Stanwood is growing quickly and would be ideal location for an additional state ferry dock along the channel, which would obviously need to be dredged.

Ideal to increase Stanwood's business district.

This would be shortest time to implement, and requiring least road improvement, when measured from I-5. ferry cross to Oak Harbor or Coupeville.

We would only have the same problems with the ferries: long waits, traffic jam and a new place to have an accident.

We do not need to have increased problems with Washington ferries (bureaucracy and the Maritime Union).

An excellent idea.

Would eliminate slow Camano road across.

This needs to be considered, but equally important is the need to have it tied in with a modern system of public transit.

Excellent idea N. Whidbey to Stanwood.

Better access to I-5.

GREAT IDEA!!!

In addition to new auto ferry and facilities, would like to have passenger only ferries to Seattle & elsewhere (i.e. Everett).

Sounds great. Stanwood needs something like this.

Some road improvements required.

Best option for a new ferry service.

Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities

Ferry North Whidbey to Stanwood or Mainland: “Prefer This” (Cont.)

May offer the most bang for the buck, and preserve the environmental/rural feel of Whidbey Island.

Reduces road travel of over 40 miles. Would expedite traffic to south sound from North Whidbey. Reduce Clinton traffic.

Would preserve Camano's rural atmosphere best.

We think it would be better to route traffic to Stanwood rather than Camano, because traffic to & from Camano is already increasing.

This is most acceptable for immediate implementation.

Depends where terminal would be and only "small" ferry service. Terminal in Oak Harbor OK - not maybe base used. (Sic)

Passenger ferry for Everett Boeing maybe.

Great / logical idea - saves lives! / saves resources / saves time / seaplane base to Stanwood area = a natural.

Whichever ferry service is easiest and least cost.

"Worth Considering" Comments:

Locate east of Coupeville.

Only worth considering if people want to go to Stanwood or Camano--I've lived on Whidbey Island 14 years and have never been to either place.

How about ferry from Strawberry Point to Conway?

Wouldn't ferry service ultimately be much cheaper than building a bridge!?

Identified alternatives are a good starting point. Evaluation should look at all equally without respect to cost.

People who live on Whidbey Island chose it for its rural character and natural beauty. I believe the ferry service helps to preserve that character best.

Not to LaConner - too far north of I-5 corridor, not much gained destination-wise from present bridge.

Won't cut travel time very much due to load/unload and slower speed and drives too.

But puts congestion on SR 532 through Stanwood which is already congested.

Would ruin the small town feel of Stanwood.

If must be, a far better alternative than from any part of Camano.

Stay north of Stanwood or down by Arlington - leave the Camano, Stanwood area alone.

Shortcuts long commuters (but how many folks really go that way? Fiscally unviable probably.

Last choice after new bridge, bridges to Camano & Fir Island, new auto ferry, auto ferry to Camano options.

Would require more dredging to make a channel.

Only if passenger only ferry.

This cost would be covered by regular users. More realistic than bridges.

Good alternative to bridges.

Believe Saratoga Passage is too deep to bridge economically.

Ferry North Whidbey to Stanwood or Mainland: "Worth Considering" (Cont.)

Which would be more economical to do - bridges or ferry - considering purchase of land, ferry, building supplies and new/improved roadways to and from these new constructions.

Worth considering only if bridge alternatives are not feasible.

Under no circumstances should a passenger ferry be considered. Even with connecting bus lines, a passenger ferry would not reduce congestion on existing SR 20 corridor accesses.

This may improve the 2 major users (1) NAS Whidbey, (2) Navy Everett.

This connects the Navy and Oak Harbor most directly to the Navy and Everett. The only option I'd consider.

What other mainland locations?

Would divert traffic from NAS, away from Deception Pass.

Possibly useful, but no practical long term solution until transportation issues linked to land use planning. Any improvement listed would only result in more problems in the I-5 corridor. Any increase in traffic capacity would only result in increased growth.

Would be a feasible option for a ferry. Dredging would have to be done for a ferry North of Stanwood proper on Skagit Bay. Traffic congestion would still be a problem for I-5 thru Stanwood. Possible Fir Island from Conway would be a good spot for easy ferry access, minimal impact.

Good help to get to I-5. If a ferry is the answer this will help relieve SR 20 and mid-island traffic. Will help relieve ferry congestion.

Would be the best route for ferries as it would allow quicker access to I-5 both north and south bound.

Better for direct access to I-5.

This option appears to duplicate the North Whidbey to Camano Island option.

Prefer a bridge but a ferry would be better than nothing.

“Reject This” Comments:

Ferry service should be avoided here and elsewhere when a bridge option is available.

Ferry service here would add burden to SR523 between Camano and I-5, noting in particular the unsafe nature of traffic to/from ferry landings.

Eyesore, disruptive to Stanwood community. Potential impact to wetlands.

Camano Island to Stanwood to I-5 already has traffic saturation. Take No. Whidbey some place else please, but not Camano or Stanwood. Do not route Whidbey traffic to/through Stanwood.

Ferries are too unreliable, limited to tidal schedules and limited in size and number.

I would rather drive than wait for a ferry.

Consider foot ferries to either location, not auto ferries; foot ferry to Stanwood would avoid necessity of county road access and bottleneck of Mark Clark Bridge. State Hwy. access would be ideal.

NO

Merely a stop gap.

NO - #532 to I-5 overloaded now.

Cost too much and people won't use it if they can cross a bridge for free.

Ferry North Whidbey to Stanwood or Mainland: “Reject This” (Cont.)

The use of auto ferries adds time constraints (meeting schedules), also weather constraints (high winds/tides). Ferries don't run all night.

Foot ferries only.

Still not as good as passenger ferries.

Costs too much for traffic it could carry.

I dislike the ferry system with a PASSION!! My opinion is not limited to just service to or from Whidbey Island but to the ferry system as a whole; fares continue to rise. There is NO alternatives, long waits occur just as demands increase, cancellations due to weather or tides leave you stranded, schedules are inflexible, unsafe driving conditions are instilled as drivers rush to catch their ferries and night-time travel is impossible because the ferries do not run late at night.

We have too much traffic in Stanwood and Camano Island as it is!

I should not have to pay to solve their problems - especially when they choose to live there.

(Stanwood resident)

NO. The State can't handle what it has now. Besides, you wait in line. Why???

Route is over poor wintertime road and past school with 20 mph speed limit.

Would only encourage commuters and cause decline in our standard of living. Development and growth of Whidbey island should NOT be encouraged.

Skagit Bay is an important estuary for wildlife. This is not an environmentally responsible choice.

With continued growth in Stanwood roads are full.

NO.

No infrastructure on Camano Island to support any ferry.

A bridge can be built to include mass transit compared to a ferry.

Cost of ferries continues to escalate and is labor intensive.

A ferry does not accommodate an emergency vehicle in same manner as a bridge.

532 is not capable of handling Camano/Stanwood growth and provide a convenient answer for Whidbey Island's traffic. 532 I-5 interchange is ugly already! Previous DOT studies have identified this interchange as high volume.

These should not even be an option! They are rural communities. Why should any of these people have to deal with the pollution, noise and unsightly view of a road and bridge for the convenience of people that come and go to the city when the Island would be changed forever because of it?

No roads.

Except an emergency ferry in case of earthquake or bombing of bridge.

Otters and whales are already suffering as are the fish & other sea creatures - enough with the ferries already.

Ferries are more costly over the long run - a toll on a bridge would pay for itself - a ferry never pays for itself

Add passenger only ferry from Camano to Coupeville and Oak Harbor (or from Stanwood).

Stanwood already has traffic problems on main street. Where do the cars go after they reach I-5?

Not acceptable if I'm going to Seattle - then Clinton-Mukilteo is still the best way.

No matter how you cut it, it is cheaper to drive from Oak Harbor than take a ferry.

Prefer bridges, the ferry system would be too slow travel wise when I'm trying to make the bus.

(Bus commuter - Stanwood to Seattle)

Ferry North Whidbey to Stanwood or Mainland: "Reject This" (Cont.)

No - ferry fares too high, unreliable, long lines. Costs the commuter, not free. Need free access to mainland.

Support only if ferry would go to Seattle.

Having lived on Orcas Island for 15 years we know how poor the ferry system is. Poor service, high cost. This should be the very last choice, if it is even considered as a temporary fix.

We don't want mainland traffic "passing through" here - Whidbey Island roads are already too crowded.

No more ferries.

Why?

Private citizen couldn't make it work, why should tax money be used to create a service that has shown no need?

No one here wants to get to Stanwood.

NO!

"No Opinion" Comments:


Too hard to keep the channels open due to the mud in the flats.

"No Answer" Comments:



Travel time/arrival time reliability.

Walk on, passenger only.

Appendix D - Brochure & Questionnaire



Two studies are being conducted



Measuring the Success of the Access Feasibility Study

The different agencies working on the access feasibility study will be using criteria called "Measures of Effectiveness" to compare alternatives. You can help them do this by "voting" for what is important to you (use form on facing page). You have up to 10 votes to cast any way you want. You can pick 10 different items that are important to you and give each a single vote, you can use all 10 votes on a single item, or any combination you choose. To vote, simply write the number of votes in the boxes ... remember to limit yourself to a total of 10 votes.



SR 20 Baseline Information

The North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study will use the following information to evaluate access alternatives

✓ **Traffic Volume**

- Current traffic counts***
(actual counts taken August and October, 1998)
- Seasonal fluctuations**
- Tourist vs. Commuter traveler counts**
(from SIRTPO Survey April, 1998)
- Traffic forecasts***
(from Island & Skagit County Comprehensive Plans and from SCOG Model Update)

✓ **Safety Record**

- 1996: WSDOT designates SR 20 as High Accident (1992-95 data)**
- 1996: Safety Improvements List developed for SR 20**
- 1998: Comparison of 1995-97 safety data***

✓ **Profile Usage of Deception Pass Bridge**

- Current traffic capacity**
- Impediments to traffic flow:**
 - Landmark Attraction
 - Pedestrians
 - Stop & Walk Traffic
- Origin-Destination Data**
(from SIRTPO Survey April, 1998)

✓ **Washington State Ferries Service (For period 1998 – 2018)**

Planned increase in Mukilteo ↔ Clinton Service tied to Mukilteo dock expansion



* data compiled as part of this project

Input from citizens will be presented to the Technical and Policy Steering Committees. The Policy Steering Committee will then determine the 3-4 most promising alternatives for further analysis by the North Whidbey Access Feasibility Study Team.

	Technical Committee	Policy Steering Committee
Island County		
Island County	✓	✓
City of Oak Harbor	✓	✓
Town of Coupeville	✓	
City of Langley	✓	
Island Transit	✓	
Whidbey Naval Air Station	✓	
Skagit/Island RPTO	✓	
Skagit County		
Skagit County	✓	✓
Skagit Council of Governments	✓	
Skagit Transit	✓	
Skagit/Island RTPO	✓	
Swinomish Tribe	✓	✓
Snohomish County/Other Regional		
Puget Sound Regional Council/Snohomish County Tomorrow	✓	✓
City of Mukilteo	✓	
City of Stanwood	✓	
Community Transit	✓	
Snohomish County	✓	
Sound Transit	✓	
State		
Dept. of Transportation	✓	✓
Washington State Ferries	✓	✓
Department of Fish and Wildlife	✓	
Deception Pass State Park	✓	
Federal		
Environmental Protection Agency	✓	
Army Corps of Engineers	✓	

Here are some possible solutions ... we'd like to know what you think about each one.

Please check a rating box for each solution. On the right hand side there's room for comments about each possible solution.

	Prefer This ↓	Worth Considering ↓	Reject This ↓	No Opinion ↓	Comments ↓
Widen the Deception Pass & Canoe Pass Bridges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Build A New Bridge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
→ Parallel to the Deception Pass and Canoe Pass Bridges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
→ North Whidbey to Camano Island	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
→ North Whidbey to Mainland near LaConner, via Goat Island	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
→ Whidbey's Strawberry Point to Fir Island/Conway area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Add new Auto Ferry Service & Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
→ North Whidbey to Camano Island	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
→ North Whidbey to Stanwood or other Mainland Locations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Are there other possible solutions that you feel should be considered?

Turn Page ↗

This page left intentionally blank.

Appendix E – Survey Distribution Partners & Placements

SR20 North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study

Survey Distribution Participants
November 10, 1998

Financial Women International	Oak Harbor Garden Club
Friends of the Langley Library	Oak Harbor Lions
Amateur Radio Emergency Service	Oak Harbor Rotary
American Association of University Women	Oddfellows
American Legion George Morris Post	Oddfellows Rebekah Lodge
American Red Cross	Chapter #26 Order of the Eastern Star
Association of Naval Aviation	Pony Mailing
Camano Chamber of Commerce	Prairie Center Health Clinic
Citizens for Quality Community	Retired Officers Association
Citizens on Patrol, City of Oak Harbor	Sea Scout Ship 63
Clinton Community Forum	Shrine Club of Whidbey Island
The Coalition	Soroptimist International of Coupeville
Coupeville Festival Association	Soroptimist International of Oak Harbor
C.P.O. Spouses	Soroptimist International of South Whidbey
D.A.R., Governor Isaac Stevens Chapter	South Whidbey Garden Club
Friends of the Oak Harbor Library	South Whidbey Island Rotary Club
Genealogy Club of South Whidbey	S.S.H.H.H.
Greenbank Artists	Whidbey Audobon Society
Island Classic Mustang Club	Whidbey Cruisers
Island County Amateur Radio Club	Whidbey Environmental Action Network
Island County/W.S.U. Beach Watchers	Whidbey Island Bassmasters
Island District Econ. Development Council	Whidbey Island Computer Society
Kiwanis Club of South Whidbey	Whidbey Island Court, Order of Amaranth
Langley Community Club	Whidbey Island Stamp Club
League of Women Voters	Whidbey Island Masonic Lodge #15
M.A.D.D. of Island County	Whidbey Playhouse
Navy Wives Club #150	Women of St. Hubert's Catholic Church
North Whidbey Lions Club	Youth Dynamics
North Whidbey Sunrise Rotary	

SR20 North Whidbey Island Access Feasibility Study

Survey Placements
As of November 10, 1998

Information packets and questionnaires will be available at local post offices, libraries, city halls, Chambers of Commerce and other community locations throughout Whidbey Island and Western Skagit County, including:

NAS Whidbey

Swinomish Tribal Center

Camano Island County Annex
Utsalady Store

Clinton Post Office

Conway Post Office

Coupeville City Hall
Library
Post Office
County Courthouse

Freeland Library
Post Office
Chamber of Commerce

Greenbank Post Office

La Conner City Hall
Library
Post Office
Chamber of Commerce

Langley City Hall
Library
Post Office
Chamber of Commerce

Mt. Vernon County Courthouse

Oak Harbor Library
City Hall
Post Office
Chamber of Commerce
“Chocolates for Breakfast”
Senior Center of Oak Harbor
Safeway

Stanwood City Hall
Library
Post Office
Chamber of Commerce

