



**MEETING SUMMARY  
LOCAL AGENCY REVIEW TEAM MEETING #3  
FERRY FINANCING LEGISLATION  
2901 THIRD AVENUE, WSF  
MARCH 20, 2008  
2:00 – 4:30 P.M.**

Note: This meeting summary represents notes from the Local Agency Review Team (LART) meeting, and is not a formal transcript. It is provided for the information of WSDOT/WSF, LART members, and other interested parties.

**Meeting Attendees**

<i>Present</i>	<i>LART members</i>
X	Heather McCartney, City of Mukilteo
	Ian Munce, City of Anacortes
	Matt Shelden, Sound Transit
X	Greg Cioc, Kitsap County
	Mike Bertrand, Town of Friday Harbor
X	Ann Sutphin, City of Seattle
X	Stephen Clifton, City of Edmonds
X	Mike Sudduth, King County Metro
X	Mike Morton, Island County
X	Phil Williams, City of Bremerton
X	Kelly Dickson, City of Bainbridge Island
X	Rick Sepler, City of Port Townsend
X	Pete Rose, San Juan County
	John Clausen, Kitsap Transit
X	Stephen Kiehl, Puget Sound Regional Council
X	Mary McClure, Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council

*Staff:*

Ray Deardorf, WSF  
Celine Gihring, WSF  
Michael Hodgins, Berk & Associates  
Rob Berman, KPFF  
Kirsten Hauge, PRR

**Meeting Overview**

Ray Deardorf, WSF Planning Director, opened the third meeting of the Local Agency Review Team (LART). Ray said the meeting agenda included discussing the status of operational and pricing strategies, upcoming public meetings and evaluation criteria. In addition, LART members would have the opportunity to review the public meeting materials. Ray then asked if there were comments or changes in response to the



January 24 meeting summary. No changes were requested and the summary was approved.

Before moving on to the first agenda item, Ray provided members the opportunity to discuss any community conversations or concerns about the WSF work program.

LART members provided the following comments:

- WSF just presented new alternatives for the waterfront to the City of Mukilteo. The alternatives show unfavorable pedestrian connections. In order to discuss the alternatives, the City would like to invite Ray to meet with staff and council.
- It seems there are separate planning efforts regarding passenger-only ferries (POF). There needs to be interface between the POF discussions.
- With all the efforts happening now, it is important to work in coordination.
- The community is concerned about what real impact we can have on the decisions being made and that WSF will arrive at conclusions before there is an adequate opportunity to weigh in. It seems there is no true feedback loop in the process.

Ray said that they intend to have community conversations over the next two weeks about the basic building blocks of the long range plan. As a result of community feedback they will have the opportunity to make any needed course corrections. Another cycle of public meetings is then planned for June. WSF will conduct technical analyses to determine the most promising strategies, but will also want to receive input from the public about their preferences. From this process, WSF will build the revised long range plan. Ray also offered to meet with communities upon request throughout the process.

### **Progress Update on Technical Work Elements**

Next, Ray provided an update on the Washington State Transportation Commission survey. The onboard survey will be conducted throughout March and into April. The Commission will then take a subset of responders and follow up with them to complete a more detailed on-line survey in May. The purpose is to better understand how people respond to different strategies. The surveys will provide an important piece of information, but the timeframe to incorporate the findings is tight, since WSF is due to select the most promising strategies in June. A second phase of the survey is planned to capture responses from seasonal non-commuters that will help influence the final long range plan. WSF will have early results of the onboard survey in late April and more detailed findings in late May. The public report may be available by September. Copies of the survey were available through the Commission staff.

Rob Berman, KPFF, discussed the status of technical work elements. He said the technical team is looking at key operational strategies proven to shift demand, such as reservations. In June, they would go out to the FAC meetings for input. Michael Hodgins, Berk & Associates, said they are in a similar situation with the pricing strategies. He added that they are considering what the structure should look like and how the burden should be shared among different classes of users. They are initially focusing on the distribution of the burden among different markets. Ray commented that the nature of the work was challenging in that you can't identify the



dollars you need to operate the system until you identify the service you need. As such, their work would go through many iterations.

Michael added that it was critical to find a sustainable funding source. Nobody is expecting fares to be part of the capital solution. The Legislature made it more challenging to move operating dollars into the capital budget. Currently, only 15 percent of WSF funding comes from dedicated tax sources.

### **Look Ahead**

Ray said they added some new meetings to the regular FAC March meeting cycle, given the number of WSF issues to discuss. Ray added that ferry service would also be part of the discussion. The FAC meeting schedule was provided to the LART members for review. LART members provided the following comments:

- Please let us know when a June meeting is set for Mukilteo.
- Keep in mind WSF has three different types of audiences: service community, riders and the receiving community.
- Ferry service is even more critical to our inter-island routes.
- Ensure feedback from LART members is relayed to the FAC.

Ray commented that they had communicated the results of the LART's discussion from the January meeting with the FAC at the Executive Council level.

### **Evaluative Criteria**

Michael Hodgins then reviewed the evaluative framework and criteria handout. He said the best way to influence the outcome of the WSF process is through the evaluations. He said he wanted to ensure the team was capturing the key issues in the criteria. The criteria will help WSF think through implications in terms of operations and costs, but they wanted to hear from LART members to speak to issues related to communities and customers. He asked the LART what other things WSF needed to consider.

Highlights of the LART discussion are as follows:

- Add a statement about reviewing strategies on a route-by-route basis.
- Place strategies in a longer-term context (10-15 years out) so people may better understand the issues or be more open to different scenarios.
- Treat riders equally--don't follow a "Lexus-lanes" approach by letting people who pay more jump ahead of regular passengers.
- Consider extended hours to move freight from the commuter runs and onto later routes.
- Ensure consistency with local and regional plans.
- Craft the strategies within the context of the surrounding community.
- Incentives won't work in the San Juans, the ferry runs are critical to the Islanders' ability to get to the mainland. The marketplace simply won't accept incentives. Many people operate on conditional use permits and businesses would go bust if they had to pay staff to come in during the middle of the night.



Michael thanked the group for their feedback and asked them to e-mail him with any other key issues.

**FAC Presentation Packet**

Ray then reviewed preliminary baseline ridership forecasts. He mentioned that they involved the JTC consultant on the WSF work team to make sure assumptions were in sync. At the end of February the consultant brought up questions about how the team was forecasting employment in outer counties; however everyone was able to reach agreement on a revised approach. The forecasting model looked at the afternoon peak in May, during the mid-week. The ridership forecasts are now lower than projected in the 2006 draft of the long range plan. He noted that they planned to do further forecast refinements, but they feel comfortable that they now have a better data set. The results reflect the drop in traffic and the significant number of passengers who now tele-commute. By route, the team incorporated today's assumptions regarding fares, service frequency and travel times.

<b>Preliminary Growth Forecast 2006-2030</b>	
Overall trips	+37%
Vehicles	+27%
Passengers	+43%

<b>Preliminary Weekday PM Peak Vehicle Forecasts by Route</b>		
Vashon-Fauntleroy	+18%	Most growth occurs by 2020
Pt-Defiance-Tahlequah	+20%	Didn't grow much in last decade
Southworth-Fauntleroy	+63%	
Bremerton-Seattle	+15%	Most growth happens between 2020 and 2030
Bainbridge-Seattle	+35%	
Edmonds-Kingston	+38%	Most growth happens by 2020
Mukilteo-Clinton	+19%	
Pt. Townsend-Keystone	+60%	Most growth happens between 2020 and 2030

Ray added that Jefferson County's population projections were factored in and that the 2006 Origin & Destination Study showed that there was more of a relationship between Bremerton and Southworth than previously imagined. Celine Gihring, WSF, added that one dynamic less apparent is how ferry traffic flows given the effect of landside traffic. It is impossible to get to the bottom of the issue, but Celine said she trusted that the model is calibrated well to give the best assessment given all the factors. LART members commented that the Bremerton forecasts appeared too low, but in terms of evaluating landside impacts the numbers were meaningful. Celine noted that at this juncture, the forecasts do not account for seasonal trips. If anything, once seasonal trips are taken into account forecasts should be higher on routes that are less commuter based. The preliminary base forecasts are a starting point and the policies incorporated into the planning process will re-shape forecasts later.



Then Ray discussed level-of-service (LOS) measures. Given the directive issued from the Ferry Finance Bill, WSF has revised their approach and now proposes standards based on congestion and service effectiveness. The new approach would establish an interim step to implement pricing or demand strategies before triggering any additional service. Ray reviewed the approach as provided in the Vehicle LOS Standards & Baseline Forecasts handout.

LART comments:

- On the Bainbridge and Kingston routes it isn't possible to send cars somewhere else given growth in both locations.
- People should not alter their route to Southworth rather than Bremerton. Bremerton is a designated urban center. A third boat on Bremerton would help with the capacity.
- In addition to a third boat, POF, pricing and other issues also come into play.
- Show ridership numbers, not percentages.
- It is helpful to see the context of where growth is occurring (before 2020 or between 2020-2030).

Ray then thanked the LART for their comments and reminded the group that the next LART meeting is scheduled for May 15 from 1:00-3:30 p.m. at Colman Dock. The meeting was then adjourned.

#### Meeting Handouts

- LART Meeting #2 Summary
- FAC meeting schedule
- FAC meeting agenda
- Evaluative Framework and Criteria
- ESHB2358 Status Report: Vehicle LOS Standards & Baseline Forecasts