

MUKILTEO MULTIMODAL PROJECT

Level 1 Screening Results



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**



September 2010

Introduction

As part of the process to identify alternatives to be studied in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project, the project team developed concepts to be evaluated through a two-level screening process. This document describes the results of the first level (Level 1) of the screening process. A separate document describes the results of the second level (Level 2) screening process.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Washington State Ferries (WSF) will use the results of the two-level screening process, along with comments received throughout the scoping process, to choose which concepts will be studied in the EIS.

The project team evaluated ten concepts in the Level 1 screening process. These concepts are described in the document *Mukilteo Multimodal Project Concept Descriptions* (WSF, September 2010). The concepts are listed below, grouped geographically.

Existing Mukilteo Terminal

- No Build
- Existing Site Improvements

Elliot Point

- Elliot Point – Option 1
- Elliot Point – Option 2
- Elliot Point – Option 3
- Mount Baker Terminal

Edmonds

- Edmonds - Existing Terminal
- Edmonds – Existing Site Improvements
- Point Edwards

Everett

- Port of Everett South Terminal

The project team developed a set of criteria to evaluate the concepts based upon the purpose and need statement for the project (see Attachment A). The Level 1 screening criteria are described below. The project team used these criteria to evaluate the ten concepts.

Level 1 Screening Criteria

(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?	Green = All conflicts reduced. Yellow = Some conflicts reduced. Red = Does not change existing conflicts and/or makes them worse.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?	Green = Yes Red = No
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?	Green = Yes Red = No
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?	Green = All multimodal connections improved Yellow = Some multimodal connections improved Red = Connections not improved and/or made worse
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future bus transit service?	Green = Yes Red = No
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?	Green = Yes Red = No
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?	Green = Improved Red = Not improved or made worse
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?	Green = Avoids Yellow = Somewhat avoids Red = Does not avoid
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?	Green = Avoids Yellow = Somewhat avoids Red = Does not avoid
3(D) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?	Green = Avoids Yellow = Somewhat avoids Red = Does not avoid

Mukilteo Multimodal Project Level 1 Screening Results – September 2010

The results of the screening evaluation are presented in this document in the following screening results matrixes, grouped by the geographic areas described above. Each screening results matrix shows the rating for each criterion and the reasoning for that rating. A key to the graphical coding of the ratings is provided below.

 Green	Meets criterion
 Yellow	Partially meets criterion
 Red	Does not meet criterion

A summary screening results matrix can be found at the end of this document.

Existing Mukilteo Terminal Concepts

CRITERION	NO BUILD	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		No. Concept retains existing conditions, which will get worse as the number of people using the terminal increases in the future.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Would replace existing terminal with new structures.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		No. The existing facility cannot be secured. No changes would be made.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		No. Connections between modes would not change.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		No. Bus transit facilities are inadequate today and would not be changed. Existing terminal has one two bus bays.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. The current holding facilities would be maintained.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		No. Congestion at existing facility, which hampers the ability to maintain schedules, would continue. As demand increases in the future, the ability to maintain the current ferry schedule would be impaired.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Somewhat avoids. Existing terminal would continue to have the same footprint over the water. Shoreline erosion at the Losvar Condominiums would continue.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Does not avoid. Concept has the potential for new adverse effects on identified historic and cultural resources. It would be within a historic site and require at least some overlap with a known archaeological resource. Access to a popular city park may be affected.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Somewhat avoids. Terminal would continue to have noise and visual effects on adjacent residential properties and a nearby hotel.

Existing Mukilteo Terminal Concepts

CRITERION	EXISTING SITE IMPROVEMENTS	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		Somewhat. While the concept would reduce conflicts between ferry traffic modes, it would still have conflicts between ferry and non-ferry traffic of all modes. These conflicts would get worse as the number of people using the terminal increases in the future.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Would replace existing terminal with new structures.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		No. The existing facility cannot be secured. The proposed modifications would not allow it to be secured.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		Partially. Distance between commuter rail and ferry would not change. Distance between ferry and bus bays would increase, but bus bays would be closer to commuter rail.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		Yes. Could accommodate up to six buses concurrently. Circulation for buses improved by separating them from ferry loading/unloading operations.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. The current holding facilities would be maintained.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		Yes. Concept designed to allow reliable loading and unloading.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Somewhat avoids. Location of terminal would be slightly modified from existing, with a larger footprint over the water. Current shoreline erosion could be addressed. There would likely be some short term construction effects.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Does not avoid. Concept has the potential for new adverse effects on identified historic and cultural resources. It would be within a historic site and require at least some overlap with a known archaeological resource. Access to a popular city park may be affected.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Somewhat avoids. Terminal would continue to have noise and visual effects on adjacent residential properties and a nearby hotel.

Elliot Point Concepts

CRITERION	ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 1	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		Partially. Most conflicts would be reduced but passengers going between the ferry and the commuter rail station would need to cross the flow of vehicles going to and from the ferry.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Would replace existing terminal with a new structure.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow it to be secured if needed.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		Partially. Distance between commuter rail and ferry would similar to existing terminal. Distance between ferry and bus bays would increase, but bus bays would be closer to commuter rail.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		Yes. Could accommodate up to six buses concurrently. Circulation for buses improved by separating them from ferry loading/unloading operations.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. Concept could be designed to have adequate holding facilities.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow reliable loading and unloading.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Avoids. There would be a net decrease in overwater coverage. Overwater coverage of new facility would be less than the amount of existing overwater coverage removed (existing terminal and former tank farm pier). Design would prevent scour from ferry operations. There would likely be some short term construction effects.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Does not avoid. Concept has the potential for new adverse effects on identified historic and cultural resources. It would be within a historic site and require at least some overlap with a known archaeological resource.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Does not avoid. Would introduce new sources of light, glare, and additional noise (vehicles, terminal announcements) for adjacent residential area uphill from site.

Elliot Point Concepts

CRITERION	ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 2	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		Yes. Concept could be designed to avoid conflicts.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Would replace existing terminal with a new structure.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow it to be secured if needed.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		Yes. Bus bays would be close to ferry (like the existing terminal). Both the ferry and buses would be closer to the commuter rail station than the existing terminal.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		Yes. Could accommodate up to six buses concurrently. Circulation for buses improved by separating them from ferry loading/unloading operations.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. Concept could be designed to have adequate holding facilities.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow reliable loading and unloading.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Avoids. There would be a net decrease in overwater coverage. Overwater coverage of new facility would be less than the amount of existing overwater coverage removed (existing terminal and former tank farm pier). Design would prevent scour from ferry operations. There would likely be some short term construction effects.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Does not avoid. Concept has the potential for new adverse effects on identified historic and cultural resources. It would be within a historic site and require at least some overlap with a known archaeological resource.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Does not avoid. Would introduce new sources of light, glare, and additional noise (vehicles, terminal announcements) for adjacent residential area uphill from site.

Elliot Point Concepts

CRITERION	ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 3	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		Partially. Most conflicts would be reduced but passengers going between the ferry and the commuter rail station would need to cross the flow of vehicles going to and from the ferry.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Would replace existing terminal with a new structure.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow it to be secured if needed.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		Partially. Distance between ferry and bus bays would increase, but bus bays would be closer to commuter rail. Distance between commuter rail and ferry would be shorter than at the existing terminal.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		Yes. Could accommodate up to six buses concurrently. Circulation for buses improved by separating them from ferry loading/unloading operations.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. Concept could be designed to have adequate holding facilities.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow reliable loading and unloading.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Avoids. There would be a net decrease in overwater coverage. Overwater coverage of new facility would be less than the amount of existing overwater coverage removed (existing terminal and former tank farm pier). Design would prevent scour from ferry operations. There would likely be some short term construction effects.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Does not avoid. Concept has the potential for new adverse effects on identified historic and cultural resources. It would be within a historic site and require at least some overlap with a known archaeological resource.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Does not avoid. Would introduce new sources of light, glare, and additional noise (vehicles, terminal announcements) for adjacent residential area uphill from site.

Elliot Point Concepts

CRITERION	MOUNT BAKER TERMINAL	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		Yes. Concept could be designed to avoid conflicts.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Existing structure is designed for larger loads than would be necessary for ferry oriented traffic.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow it to be secured if needed.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		No. Ferry would be farther from commuter rail than existing terminal. Bus bays would be farther from ferry and commuter rail than existing terminal.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		Yes. Could accommodate up to six buses concurrently. Circulation for buses improved by separating them from ferry loading/unloading operations.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. Concept could be designed to have adequate holding facilities.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow reliable loading and unloading.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Somewhat avoids. While there would be a net decrease in overwater coverage with removal of existing terminal, this location would adversely affect known eelgrass beds (overwater coverage and scour). There would likely be some short term construction effects.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Does not avoid. Concept has the potential for new adverse effects on identified historic and cultural resources. It would be within a historic site and require at least some overlap with a known archaeological resource.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Does not avoid. Would introduce new sources of light, glare, and additional noise (vehicles, terminal announcements) for adjacent residential area uphill from site.

Edmonds Concepts

CRITERION	EDMONDS – EXISTING	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		No. Existing conflicts will get worse because of additional traffic from the Clinton route.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. The Edmonds terminal does not have the same structural deficiencies as the existing Mukilteo terminal.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		No. The existing Edmonds terminal cannot be secured.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		Partially. Buses are farther from the ferry than the existing Mukilteo terminal, but commuter rail station is closer to the ferry. Buses are closer to commuter rail than at existing Mukilteo terminal.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		No. The Edmonds terminal does not have enough space to handle additional bus service.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		No. The Edmonds terminal does not have enough space for adequate holding facilities to serve two routes.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		No. The Edmonds terminal could not reliably load and unload two routes and maintain schedules.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Avoids. Removes existing Mukilteo terminal without expanding existing Edmonds terminal, resulting in a net reduction in overwater coverage.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Somewhat avoids. Creates access issues between parks on both sides of ferry dock.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Somewhat avoids. No changes to the facility, but more vehicles would be there more often. Vehicles would back-up into adjacent neighborhoods on SR 104 farther and more frequently.

Edmonds Concepts

CRITERION	EDMONDS – EXISTING SITE IMPROVEMENTS	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		Partially. Would reduce bicycle and pedestrian conflicts with vehicles and trains but not address conflicts between vehicles and trains.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Would replace existing Edmonds and Mukilteo terminals with a new structure.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		No. The existing facility cannot be secured. The proposed modifications would not allow it to be secured.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		Partially. Buses are farther from the ferry than the existing Mukilteo terminal, but commuter rail station is closer to the ferry. Buses are closer to commuter rail than at existing Mukilteo terminal.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		Yes. Could accommodate at least eight buses concurrently.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. Concept could be designed to have adequate holding facilities.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		No. The terminal could not reliably load and unload two routes and maintain schedules because of the at-grade crossing of the BNSF Railway mainline.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Does not avoid. Expansion of Edmonds terminal likely to result in a net increase of overwater coverage. There would likely be some short term construction effects.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Does not avoid. Would require parkland acquisition to expand terminal and also to provide a bridge separating pedestrians and bicyclists from ferry vehicle traffic.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Does not avoid. More cars would be at the terminal more often. Ferry vehicle traffic would back-up into adjacent neighborhoods on SR 104 farther and more frequently. Extensive overhead structures for pedestrians and bicyclists would likely affect views.

Edmonds Concepts

CRITERION	EDMONDS – POINT EDWARDS	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		Yes. Concept could be designed to avoid conflicts.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Would replace existing Edmonds and Mukilteo terminals with a new structure.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow it to be secured if needed.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		No. All modes would be farther apart than at the existing Mukilteo terminal.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		Yes. Could accommodate at least eight buses concurrently.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. Concept could be designed to have adequate holding facilities.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		Yes. The terminal could be designed to reliably load and unload two routes to maintain schedules.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Does not avoid. Existing terminals at Edmonds and Mukilteo would be removed, but concept is likely to result in a net increase in overwater coverage. Industrial pier at site has already been removed as mitigation for a future Point Edwards terminal. There would likely be some short term construction effects.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Somewhat avoids. Would require parkland acquisition at new terminal location, but would benefit parks adjacent to existing Edmonds ferry terminal.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Somewhat avoids. Downtown Edmonds would be improved, but residential development adjacent to proposed location would be affected.

Everett Concept

CRITERION	PORT OF EVERETT SOUTH TERMINAL	
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?		Yes. Concept could be designed to avoid conflicts.
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?		Yes. Would replace existing terminal with a newer structure that does not have structural deficiencies.
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow it to be secured if needed.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	RATING	REASONING
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?		No. All modes would be farther apart than at the existing Mukilteo terminal.
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?		Yes. Could accommodate up to six buses concurrently. Circulation for buses improved by separating them from ferry loading/unloading operations.
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?		Yes. Concept could be designed to have adequate holding facilities.
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?		Yes. Concept could be designed to allow reliable loading and unloading.
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?	RATING	REASONING
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?		Somewhat avoids. Uses existing overwater structures. New overwater footprint at least as large as existing Mukilteo terminal. There would likely be some short term construction effects.
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?		Avoids. No known resources would be affected at this location.
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?		Avoids. No known resources would be affected at this location.

LEVEL 1 SCREENING RESULTS SUMMARY	No Build	Existing Site Improvements	Elliot Point – Option 1	Elliot Point – Option 2	Elliot Point – Option 3	Mount Baker Terminal	Edmonds - Existing Terminal	Edmonds - Existing Site Improvements	Edmonds - Point Edwards	Port of Everett South Terminal
(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?										
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?										
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?										
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?										
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?										
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?										
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?										
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?										
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?										
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?										
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?										
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?										
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?										

Attachment A: Purpose and Need