MUKILTEO MULTIMODAL PROJECT
Level 2 Screening Results

Washington State Ferries

Washington State
Department of Transportation

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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 second level (Level 2) of the screening process.

The project team evaluated ten concepts in the 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
- Edmonds – Point Edwards

Everett
- Port of Everett South Terminal

Similar to the Level 1 screening, the project team developed a set of criteria for Level 2 to evaluate the concepts based upon the purpose and need statement for the project (see Attachment A). The Level 2 screening criteria are described in Exhibit 1. The project team used these criteria to evaluate the ten concepts in more detail than the Level 1 screening. The results of this evaluation are presented in this document by geographic area. The screening matrix shows the rating for each criterion and the basis for that rating.

For the criteria that evaluate safety and security or transportation options, each of the concepts is rated in terms of how well it meets each of the criteria.

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

For the criteria that evaluate environmental effects, green indicates that a concept is very likely to avoid adverse effects. Yellow indicates that the likelihood of the concept avoiding adverse effects is uncertain. This could be due to a lack of information at this stage of the analysis or because the concept would likely have a mixture of adverse effects and benefits that makes the net result uncertain. Red indicates that a concept is very unlikely to avoid adverse effects.

Green	Likely to avoid adverse effects
Yellow	Avoidance uncertain or mixed
Red	Likely to not avoid adverse effects

A brief screening results summary is provided at the end of this document.

Exhibit 1: Level 2 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 reduce conflicts between local and ferry vehicle traffic compared to existing conditions?	Green = Yes, no conflicts. Yellow = Yes, conflicts reduced but some remain. Red = No, conflicts similar or worse.
1(B) Does the concept reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists during ferry loading and unloading?	Green = Yes, no conflicts. Yellow = Yes, conflicts reduced but some remain. Red = No, conflicts similar or worse.
(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?	
2(A) Does the concept improve the reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations compared to the existing Mukilteo terminal?	Green = Yes, reliability improved. Yellow = Partial improvement. Red = No, reliability not improved.
2(B) Would the location of the terminal avoid ferry conflicts with maritime traffic that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability?	Green = No conflicts likely. Yellow = Infrequent conflicts likely. Red = Frequent conflicts likely.
2(C) Does the concept provide effective connections between modes (ferry, bus, and rail)?	Green = All modes within ¼ mile of each other. Yellow = All modes within ½ mile of each other. Red = No, all modes not within ½ mile of each other.
2(D) Does the concept improve or maintain the connection between Whidbey Island and Seattle-Everett metropolitan area for the majority of users?	
2(D1) How does the concept affect peak period trip time? [estimated travel time]	
Ferry/HOV	Change in trip time compared to existing location / total estimated trip time
Ferry/SOV	Change in trip time compared to existing location / total estimated trip time
Ferry/Transit	Change in trip time compared to existing location / total estimated trip time
Ferry/Rail	Change in trip time compared to existing location / total estimated trip time
2(D2) How does the concept affect service frequency on the ferry route?	Green = Frequency improved (report sailings/day). Yellow = Frequency same (report sailings/day). Red = Frequency worse (report sailings/day).

(3) How well does the concept avoid adverse environmental effects?	
3(A) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on stream habitat and species?	Green = High potential for avoiding: Avoids all streams and buffers or makes improvements to existing conditions. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding: Affects only buffers and makes no improvements. Red = Low potential for avoiding: Concept likely to adversely affect a stream and makes no improvements.
3(B) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on marine and near-shore habitat and species?	Green = High potential for avoiding: Marine/near-shore habitat footprint same as existing or net reduction. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding: Marine/near-shore habitat footprint greater than existing and no or unknown potential effect on important habitat features (e.g. eelgrass beds). Red = Low potential for avoiding: Marine/near-shore habitat footprint greater than existing and likely to have adverse effect on known important habitat features (e.g. eelgrass beds).
3(C) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on wetland habitat and species?	Green = High potential for avoiding: Avoids all wetlands and buffers or makes improvements to existing conditions. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding: Affects only buffers and makes no improvements. Red = Low potential for avoiding: Concept likely to adversely affect a wetland and makes no improvements.
3(D) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on upland habitat valuable to migratory birds?	Green = High potential for avoiding: Avoids upland habitat valuable to migratory birds. Affected area developed, with little or no vegetation. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding: Somewhat avoids upland habitat valuable to migratory birds. Affected area partially covered with vegetation. Red = Low potential for avoiding: Does not avoid upland habitat valuable to migratory birds. Affected area mostly covered with vegetation.
3(E) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on historic properties?	Green = High potential for avoiding: Site is unlikely to adversely affect historic properties (no potentially NRHP-eligible properties based on existing documentation, soils documented to be previously disturbed) Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding: Historic properties are known to be at or near the site, but have been determined to be avoidable; site is not within or adjacent to historic site or district; site is not within ¼ mile of a known or recorded archaeological site. Red = Low potential for avoiding: Historic properties are known to be at site and not avoidable or site is within ¼ mile of a known or recorded archaeological site.

3(F) What is the potential for avoiding the use of parklands (publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges)?	Green = High potential for avoiding: No anticipated use. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding: Would use a known resource but could potentially be a de minimis use. Red = Low potential for avoiding: Would use a known resource, use not likely de minimis.
3(G) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with land use plans and zoning?	Green = High potential for avoiding. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding. Red = Low potential for avoiding.
3(H) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with shoreline plans?	Green = High potential for avoiding. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding. Red = Low potential for avoiding.
3(I) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on neighborhoods from ferry traffic?	Green = High potential for avoiding: Ferry traffic queues in neighborhoods likely to be shorter than existing, fewer conflicts with driveways and local streets. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding: Ferry traffic queues in neighborhoods likely to be similar to existing, similar conflicts with driveways and local streets. Red = Low potential for avoiding: Ferry traffic queues in neighborhoods likely to be worse than existing, more conflicts with driveways and local streets.
3(J) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on navigable waterways from the placement of new structures?	Green = High potential for avoiding. Yellow = Medium potential for avoiding. Red = Low potential for avoiding.