

Existing Mukilteo Terminal Concepts

CRITERION	NO-BUILD		EXISTING SITE IMPROVEMENTS	
	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING
(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?		Existing conflicts between local and vehicle traffic will continue.		Existing conflicts between local and vehicle traffic will continue.
1(B) Does the concept reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists during ferry loading and unloading?		Existing conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists will continue.		Pedestrians and bicyclists going between the ferry and either the bus or rail facilities would no longer conflict with ferry vehicle traffic. Other conflicts would continue.
(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?		Would not change the ferry loading/unloading operations.		Concurrent loading of pedestrians and vehicles would improve reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations. Some potential conflicts would remain.
2(B) Would the location of the terminal avoid ferry conflicts with maritime traffic that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability?		Conflicts that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability not likely.		Conflicts that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability not likely.
2(C) Does the concept provide effective connections between modes (ferry, bus, and rail)?		Bus/ferry: 0.08 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.35 mile apart Rail/bus: 0.30 mile apart		Bus/ferry: 0.16 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.41 mile apart Rail/bus: 0.22 mile apart
2(D) Does the concept improve or maintain the connection between Whidbey Island and Seattle-Everett metropolitan area for the majority of users?		See below.		See below.
2(D1) Does the concept improve or maintain peak period trip time? [estimated existing travel time in minutes]				
Clinton to Seattle (downtown)		Ferry/SOV: 60 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 76 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: 73 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing.		Ferry/SOV: 60 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 76 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: 73 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing.
Clinton to Seattle (University of Washington)		Ferry/SOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 51 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 92 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.		Ferry/SOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 51 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 92 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.
2(D2) Does the concept improve or maintain service frequency on the ferry route?		37 sailings would be provided. Frequency of ferry service would not change.		37 sailings would be provided. Frequency of ferry service would not change.

Existing Mukilteo Terminal Concepts (continued)

CRITERION	NO-BUILD		EXISTING SITE IMPROVEMENTS	
	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?				
3(A) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on stream habitat and species?	▲	No potential stream habitat effects have been identified.	▲	No potential stream habitat effects have been identified.
3(B) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on marine and near-shore habitat and species?	▲	Overwater footprint would be the same as existing.	◆	Overwater footprint would be approximately 9,000 square feet greater than existing. No important habitat features identified at site.
3(C) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on wetland habitat and species?	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects have been identified.	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects have been identified.
3(D) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on upland habitat valuable to migratory birds?	▲	Affected area developed, with minimal vegetation.	▲	Affected area developed, with minimal vegetation.
3(E) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on historic properties?	⬮	Historic properties known to be at the site. No construction effects, but any existing operation effects would continue.	⬮	Historic properties known to be at the site, overlap not avoidable.
3(F) What is the potential for avoiding the use of parklands (publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges)?	▲	Would not use parklands.	◆	Would require relocating public fishing pier. Could be de minimis.
3(G) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with land use plans and zoning?	⬮	Current Mukilteo comprehensive plan calls for moving the terminal away from the existing site. Zoning designation: Downtown Business. Ferry terminal allowed by zoning as a conditional use.	⬮	Current Mukilteo comprehensive plan calls for moving the terminal away from the existing site. Zoning designation: Downtown Business. Ferry terminal allowed by zoning as a conditional use.
3(H) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with shoreline plans?	▲	Designated as Urban Waterfront I; management policy – “The purpose of the Urban Waterfront I designation is to provide for development and redevelopment of high-intensity, water-oriented (water enjoyment or water-related) commercial and recreational activities, transportation, and essential public facilities, while protecting existing ecological functions and improving ecological functions in areas that have been previously degraded.” Ferry terminal consistent with shoreline plans.	▲	Designated as Urban Waterfront I; management policy – “The purpose of the Urban Waterfront I designation is to provide for development and redevelopment of high-intensity, water-oriented (water enjoyment or water-related) commercial and recreational activities, transportation, and essential public facilities, while protecting existing ecological functions and improving ecological functions in areas that have been previously degraded.” Ferry terminal consistent with shoreline plans.
3(I) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on neighborhoods from ferry traffic?	◆	Would continue to have vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods.	◆	Would continue to have vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods.
3(J) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on navigable waterways from the placement of new structures?	▲	No new in-water structures.	▲	New in-water structures would be placed at existing location, outside of navigation channels.

Elliot Point Concepts

CRITERION	ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 1		ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 2		ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 3		MOUNT BAKER TERMINAL	
	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING
(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?	▲	No conflicts between local traffic and ferry traffic at the new terminal.	▲	No conflicts between local traffic and ferry traffic at the new terminal.	▲	No conflicts between local traffic and ferry traffic at the new terminal.	▲	No conflicts between local traffic and ferry traffic at the new terminal.
1(B) Does the concept reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists during ferry loading and unloading?	◆	Would eliminate conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists at the ferry slip, but would create a conflict between ferry vehicle traffic and people going between the ferry and the commuter rail station at a signalized intersection.	▲	No conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists at the new terminal.	◆	Would eliminate conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists at the ferry slip, but would create a conflict between ferry vehicle traffic and people going between the ferry and the commuter rail station at a crosswalk.	▲	No conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists at the new terminal.
(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?	▲	Concurrent loading of pedestrians and vehicles would improve reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations.	▲	Concurrent loading of pedestrians and vehicles would improve reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations.	▲	Concurrent loading of pedestrians and vehicles would improve reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations.	▲	Concurrent loading of pedestrians and vehicles would improve reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations.
2(B) Would the location of the terminal avoid ferry conflicts with maritime traffic that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability?	▲	Conflicts that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability not likely.	▲	Conflicts that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability not likely.	▲	Conflicts that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability not likely.	▲	Conflicts that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability not likely.
2(C) Does the concept provide effective connections between modes (ferry, bus, and rail)?	◆	Bus/ferry: 0.15 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.41 miles apart Rail/bus: 0.19 mile apart	▲	Bus/ferry: 0.08 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.19 mile apart Rail/bus: 0.18 mile apart	▲	Bus/ferry: 0.14 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.22 mile apart Rail/bus: 0.12 mile apart	●	Bus/ferry: 0.24 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.68 mile apart Rail/bus: 0.37 mile apart
2(D) Does the concept improve or maintain the connection between Whidbey Island and Seattle-Everett metropolitan area for the majority of users?		See below.		See below.		See below.		See below.
2(D1) Does the concept improve or maintain peak period trip time? [estimated existing travel time in minutes]								
Clinton to Seattle (downtown)	▲	Ferry/SOV: 60 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 76 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: 73 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing.	▲	Ferry/SOV: 60 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 76 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: 73 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing.	▲	Ferry/SOV: 60 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 76 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: 73 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing.	▲	Ferry/SOV: 60 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 76 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: 73 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing.
Clinton to Seattle (University of Washington)	▲	Ferry/SOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 51 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 92 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.	▲	Ferry/SOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 51 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 92 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.	▲	Ferry/SOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 51 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 92 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.	▲	Ferry/SOV: 55 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/HOV: 51 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/bus: 92 minutes estimated travel time, same as existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.
2(D2) Does the concept improve or maintain service frequency on the ferry route?	▲	37 sailings would be provided. Frequency of ferry service would not change.	▲	37 sailings would be provided. Frequency of ferry service would not change.	▲	37 sailings would be provided. Frequency of ferry service would not change.	▲	37 sailings would be provided. Frequency of ferry service would not change.

Elliot Point Concepts (continued)

CRITERION	ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 1		ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 2		ELLIOT POINT - OPTION 3		MOUNT BAKER TERMINAL	
	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?								
3(A) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on stream habitat and species?	▲	Would daylight a portion of Japanese Creek and provide a 50-ft. buffer. No potential adverse stream habitat effects have been identified.	▲	No potential stream habitat effects have been identified.	▲	No potential stream habitat effects have been identified.	▲	Would daylight a portion of Japanese Creek and provide a 50-ft. buffer. No potential adverse stream habitat effects have been identified.
3(B) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on marine and near-shore habitat and species?	▲	Overwater footprint would be approximately 119,000 square feet less than existing. Existing Mukilteo overwater ferry facility structures would be removed, along with existing Tank Farm pier. Several small, isolated patches of eelgrass known to exist in vicinity of proposed structure. Shellfish and Dungeness crab habitat also known to exist in this area.	▲	Overwater footprint would be approximately 137,000 square feet less than existing. Existing Mukilteo overwater ferry facility structures would be removed, along with existing Tank Farm pier. Several small, isolated patches of eelgrass known to exist in vicinity of proposed structure. Shellfish and Dungeness crab habitat also known to exist in this area.	▲	Overwater footprint would be approximately 132,000 square feet less than existing. Existing Mukilteo overwater ferry facility structures would be removed, along with existing Tank Farm pier. Several small, isolated patches of eelgrass known to exist in vicinity of proposed structure. Shellfish and Dungeness crab habitat also known to exist in this area.	▲	Overwater footprint would be approximately 142,000 square feet less than existing. Existing Mukilteo overwater ferry facility structures would be removed, along with existing Tank Farm pier. Eelgrass meadows known to exist on both sides of existing pier. Shellfish and Dungeness crab habitat also known to exist in this area.
3(C) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on wetland habitat and species?	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects have been identified.	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects have been identified.	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects have been identified.	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects have been identified.
3(D) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on upland habitat valuable to migratory birds?	◆	Area previously developed, but not actively used. Low to moderate quality habitat currently exists on some of the site.	◆	Area previously developed, but not actively used. Low to moderate quality habitat currently exists on some of the site.	◆	Area previously developed, but not actively used. Low to moderate quality habitat currently exists on some of the site.	◆	Part of area developed, with limited vegetation. Part of area previously developed, but not actively used. Low to moderate quality habitat currently exists on some of the site.
3(E) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on historic properties?	⬮	Historic properties known to be at the site, overlap not avoidable.	⬮	Historic properties known to be at the site, overlap not avoidable.	⬮	Historic properties known to be at the site, overlap not avoidable.	⬮	Historic properties known to be at the site, overlap not avoidable.
3(F) What is the potential for avoiding the use of parklands (publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges)?	◆	Would relocate parking for Port of Everett Mt. Baker Terminal public shoreline access.	▲	Would not use parklands.	▲	Would not use parklands.	◆	Would relocate parking for Port of Everett Mt. Baker Terminal public shoreline access.
3(G) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with land use plans and zoning?	▲	City comprehensive plans and PSRC regional transportation plan include relocating the terminal to this location. <u>Mukilteo</u> : Zoning designation is Waterfront Mixed Use. Ferry terminal is an allowed use. <u>Everett</u> : Zoning designation is Waterfront Commercial. Ferry terminal (as a facility of statewide significance) is an allowed use.	▲	City comprehensive plans and PSRC regional transportation plan include relocating the terminal to this location. <u>Mukilteo</u> : Zoning designation is Waterfront Mixed Use. Ferry terminal is an allowed use. <u>Everett</u> : Not affected.	▲	City comprehensive plans and PSRC regional transportation plan include relocating the terminal to this location. <u>Mukilteo</u> : Zoning designation is Waterfront Mixed Use. Ferry terminal is an allowed use. <u>Everett</u> : Not affected.	▲	City comprehensive plans and PSRC regional transportation plan include relocating the terminal to this location. <u>Mukilteo</u> : Zoning designation is Waterfront Mixed Use. Ferry terminal is an allowed use. <u>Everett</u> : Zoning designation is Waterfront Commercial. Ferry terminal (as a facility of statewide significance) is an allowed use.
3(H) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with shoreline plans?	▲	<u>Mukilteo</u> : Designation – Urban Waterfront I. <u>Everett</u> : Designation - Urban Multi-Use. Ferry terminal is consistent with shoreline plans.	▲	<u>Mukilteo</u> : Designation – Urban Waterfront I. <u>Everett</u> : Not affected. Ferry terminal is consistent with shoreline plans.	▲	<u>Mukilteo</u> : Designation – Urban Waterfront I. <u>Everett</u> : Not affected. Ferry terminal is consistent with shoreline plans.	▲	<u>Mukilteo</u> : Designation – Urban Waterfront I. <u>Everett</u> : Designation - Urban Multi-Use. Ferry terminal is consistent with shoreline plans.
3(I) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on neighborhoods from ferry traffic?	▲	The extent of vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods would be reduced because SR 525 would be extended approximately 3,800 feet to the new terminal.	▲	The extent of vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods would be reduced because SR 525 would be extended approximately 690 feet to the new terminal.	▲	The extent of vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods would be reduced because SR 525 would be extended approximately 2,075 feet to the new terminal.	▲	The extent of vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods would be reduced because SR 525 would be extended approximately 3,015 feet to the new terminal.
3(J) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on navigable waterways from the placement of new structures?	▲	New in-water structures would be placed outside of navigation channels.	▲	New in-water structures would be placed outside of navigation channels.	▲	New in-water structures would be placed outside of navigation channels.	▲	New in-water structures would be placed outside of navigation channels.

Edmonds Concepts

CRITERION	EDMONDS - EXISTING		EXISTING SITE IMPROVEMENTS		POINT EDWARDS	
	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING
(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?		Local and ferry vehicle traffic conflicts in Mukilteo would be eliminated. Increases conflicts in Edmonds because of additional traffic there. Adds a rail/vehicle conflict that does not currently exist in Mukilteo.		Adds a rail/vehicle conflict that does not currently exist for Clinton route. Increases conflict at Railroad Avenue in Edmonds because of additional traffic from Clinton route. Local and ferry vehicle traffic conflicts in Mukilteo would be eliminated. Closure of Main Street in Edmonds between Sunset Avenue and Railroad Avenue would reduce conflicts there.		Local and ferry vehicle traffic conflicts in Mukilteo would be eliminated. No conflicts between local traffic and ferry traffic at the new terminal. Eliminates a rail/vehicle conflict that currently exists for Kingston route.
1(B) Does the concept reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists during ferry loading and unloading?		Would have conflicts between ferry vehicle traffic and local pedestrian/bicyclist traffic during loading and unloading. Would also have conflicts with rail traffic.		Would have fewer conflicts between ferry vehicle traffic and local pedestrian/bicyclist traffic during loading and unloading because of grade-separated pedestrian walkway. Conflicts with rail traffic would also be reduced by grade separation.		No conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists at the new terminal.
(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?		Reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations adversely affected because of additional traffic and presence of at-grade crossing of railroad. Concurrent loading/unloading of passengers and vehicles would be an improvement compared to existing Mukilteo terminal.		Reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations adversely affected because of presence of at-grade crossing of railroad. Concurrent loading/unloading of passengers and vehicles would be an improvement compared to existing Mukilteo terminal.		New terminal would have fewer conflicts that could affect reliability. Concurrent loading/unloading of passengers and vehicles would be an improvement compared to existing Mukilteo terminal.
2(B) Would the location of the terminal avoid ferry conflicts with maritime traffic that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability?		Longer route would require additional travel within established navigation routes, increasing potential for conflicts that could adversely affect ferry schedule reliability.		Longer route would require additional travel within established navigation routes, increasing potential for conflicts that could adversely affect ferry schedule reliability.		Longer route would require additional travel within established navigation routes, increasing potential for conflicts that could adversely affect ferry schedule reliability.
2(C) Does the concept provide effective connections between modes (ferry, bus, and rail)?		Bus/ferry: 0.19 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.30 mile apart Rail/bus: 0.12 mile apart		Bus/ferry: 0.26 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.30 mile apart Rail/bus: 0.08 mile apart		Bus/ferry: 0.39 mile apart Rail/ferry: 0.82 mile apart Rail/bus: 0.49 mile apart
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) Does the concept improve or maintain peak period trip time? [estimated existing travel time in minutes]						
Clinton to Seattle (downtown)		Ferry/SOV: 81 minutes estimated travel time, 21 minutes (35%) longer than existing. Ferry/HOV: 78 minutes estimated travel time, 23 minutes (42%) longer than existing. Ferry/bus: 119 minutes estimated travel time, 43 minutes (57%) longer than existing. Ferry/rail: 99 minutes estimated travel time, 26 minutes (36%) longer than existing.		Ferry/SOV: 81 minutes estimated travel time, 21 minutes (35%) longer than existing. Ferry/HOV: 78 minutes estimated travel time, 23 minutes (42%) longer than existing. Ferry/bus: 119 minutes estimated travel time, 43 minutes (57%) longer than existing. Ferry/rail: 99 minutes estimated travel time, 26 minutes (36%) longer than existing.		Ferry/SOV: 81 minutes estimated travel time, 21 minutes (35%) longer than existing. Ferry/HOV: 78 minutes estimated travel time, 23 minutes (42%) longer than existing. Ferry/bus: 119 minutes estimated travel time, 43 minutes (57%) longer than existing. Ferry/rail: 99 minutes estimated travel time, 26 minutes (36%) longer than existing.
Clinton to Seattle (University of Washington)		Ferry/SOV: 76 minutes estimated travel time, 21 minutes (38%) longer than existing. Ferry/HOV: 73 minutes estimated travel time, 22 minutes (43%) longer than existing. Ferry/bus: 130 minutes estimated travel time, 38 minutes (41%) longer than existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.		Ferry/SOV: 76 minutes estimated travel time, 21 minutes (38%) longer than existing. Ferry/HOV: 73 minutes estimated travel time, 22 minutes (43%) longer than existing. Ferry/bus: 130 minutes estimated travel time, 38 minutes (41%) longer than existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.		Ferry/SOV: 76 minutes estimated travel time, 21 minutes (38%) longer than existing. Ferry/HOV: 73 minutes estimated travel time, 22 minutes (43%) longer than existing. Ferry/bus: 130 minutes estimated travel time, 38 minutes (41%) longer than existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.
2(D2) Does the concept improve or maintain service frequency on the ferry route?		17 sailings provided. Frequency of ferry service reduced by 54%.		17 sailings provided. Frequency of ferry service reduced by 54%.		18 sailings provided. Frequency of ferry service reduced by 51%.

Edmonds Concepts (continued)

CRITERION	EDMONDS - EXISTING		EXISTING SITE IMPROVEMENTS		POINT EDWARDS	
	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING	RATING	REASONING
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?						
3(A) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on stream habitat and species?	▲	No potential stream habitat effects identified.	▲	No potential stream habitat effects identified.	▲	Structure with holding lanes, exit lanes and overhead passenger loading would cross above Willow Creek, but the creek is currently in a culvert there. An additional pedestrian bridge would also cross the creek. Would daylight a portion of Willow Creek.
3(B) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on marine and near-shore habitat and species?	▲	Existing overwater footprint of structures at Edmonds would not change. Existing overwater structures at Mukilteo would be removed, resulting in a net decrease of overwater footprint of approximately 11,800 square feet. Eelgrass beds known to exist on both sides of the existing structure in Edmonds. Shellfish and Dungeness crab habitat also known to exist in this area. No important habitat features identified at Mukilteo site.	●	Overwater footprint would be approximately 49,000 square feet larger than existing, including removal of existing overwater structures at Mukilteo. Eelgrass beds known to exist on both sides of the existing structure in Edmonds. Shellfish and Dungeness crab habitat also known to exist in this area. No important habitat features identified at Mukilteo site.	●	Overwater footprint would be approximately 61,000 square feet larger than existing, including removal of existing overwater structures at Mukilteo and Edmonds. Small, sparse eelgrass beds documented in vicinity of proposed site. Some shellfish and Dungeness crab habitat also known to exist in this area. Eelgrass beds known to exist on both sides of the existing structure in Edmonds. Shellfish and Dungeness crab habitat also known to exist in this area. No important habitat features identified at Mukilteo site.
3(C) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on wetland habitat and species?	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects identified.	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects identified.	▲	No potential wetland habitat effects identified.
3(D) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on upland habitat valuable to migratory birds?	▲	Affected area developed, with minimal vegetation.	▲	Affected area developed, with minimal vegetation.	●	Area previously developed, but not actively used. Much vegetation is established on the site. Adjacent to Edmonds Marsh, known for high bird use.
3(E) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on historic properties?	▲	Not within ¼ mile of a known archaeological site. No known NRHP-eligible properties identified within or adjacent to site.	▲	Not within ¼ mile of a known archaeological site. No known NRHP-eligible properties identified within or adjacent to site.	◆	Within ¼ mile of at least one known or recorded archaeological site (not NRHP-eligible).
3(F) What is the potential for avoiding the use of parklands (publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges)?	▲	Would not use parklands.	●	Would use a portion of Brackett's Landing North (Edmonds Underwater Park) to north of ferry terminal.	◆	Would use a portion of Marina Beach Park, but would improve Brackett's Landing parks by removing existing terminal and connecting the two parks.
3(G) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with land use plans and zoning?	●	Continued use of existing terminal not consistent with local and regional plans. Zoning designations: Public Use along the waterfront to the north of existing terminal, Commercial Waterfont along the waterfront to the south of existing terminal, and Community Business east of the railroad tracks where the existing holding lanes are located. Ferry terminal is an allowed use.	●	Continued use of existing terminal not consistent with local and regional plans. Zoning designations: Public Use along the waterfront to the north of existing terminal, Commercial Waterfont along the waterfront to the south of existing terminal, and Community Business east of the railroad tracks where the existing holding lanes are located. Ferry terminal is an allowed use.	▲	Use of site for a ferry terminal consistent with local and regional plans. Zoning designations: Commercial Waterfont along the waterfront and Master Plan Hillside Mixed Use to the east of the railroad tracks. Ferry terminal is an allowed use.
3(H) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with shoreline plans?	▲	Site classified as Urban Mixed Use II. Immediately adjacent areas classified as Conservancy I Saltwater Environment. Ferry terminal allowed as a conditional use in Urban Mixed Use II area.	●	Site classified as Urban Mixed Use II. Immediately adjacent areas classified as Conservancy I Saltwater Environment. Ferry terminal allowed as a conditional use in Urban Mixed Use II area. Not permitted in Conservancy I Saltwater Environment. Expansion of the terminal into Conservancy Saltwater Environment area would not be consistent with shoreline plans.	▲	Site on border of areas classified as Urban Mixed Use I and Urban Mixed Use II. Ferry terminal permitted as a conditional use in Urban Mixed Use I and Urban Mixed Use II areas.
3(I) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on neighborhoods from ferry traffic?	●	Would continue to have vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods. Would likely be longer with a second route.	●	Would continue to have vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods. Could be longer with a second route.	●	Would continue to have vehicles queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods. Could be longer with a second route.
3(J) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on navigable waterways from the placement of new structures?	▲	No new in-water structures.	▲	Would expand existing in-water structures outside of navigation channels.	▲	New in-water structures would be placed outside of navigation channels.

Everett Concept

CRITERION	PORT OF EVERETT SOUTH TERMINAL	
	RATING	REASONING
(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?	▲	Conflicts in Mukilteo would be eliminated. No conflicts between local traffic and ferry vehicle traffic at the new terminal.
1(B) Does the concept reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists during ferry loading and unloading?	▲	No conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists at the new terminal.
(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?	▲	New terminal would have no conflicts that could affect reliability. Concurrent loading of vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists would improve reliability ferry schedules.
2(B) Would the location of the terminal avoid ferry conflicts with maritime traffic that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability?	⬮	Ferry vessels would have conflicts with US Navy and Port of Everett maritime traffic that could adversely affect ferry schedule reliability.
2(C) Does the concept provide effective connections between modes (ferry, bus, and rail)?	⬮	Bus/ferry: 0.14 mile apart Rail/ferry: 1.75 miles apart Rail/bus: 1.75 miles apart
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) Does the concept improve or maintain peak period trip time? [estimated existing travel time in minutes]		
Clinton to Seattle (downtown)	⬮	Ferry/SOV: 85 minutes estimated travel time, 25 minutes (42%) longer than existing. Ferry/HOV: 77 minutes estimated travel time, 22 minutes (40%) longer than existing. Ferry/bus: 111 minutes estimated travel time, 35 minutes (46%) longer than existing. Ferry/rail: 104 minutes estimated travel time, 31 minutes (43%) longer than existing.
Clinton to Seattle (University of Washington)	⬮	Ferry/SOV: 79 minutes estimated travel time, 24 minutes (44%) longer than existing. Ferry/HOV: 72 minutes estimated travel time, 21 minutes (41%) longer than existing. Ferry/bus: 121 minutes estimated travel time, 29 minutes (32%) longer than existing. Ferry/rail: trip not possible for this destination.
2(D2) Does the concept improve or maintain service frequency on the ferry route?	⬮	21 sailings provided. Frequency of ferry service reduced by 43%.

Everett Concept (continued)

CRITERION	PORT OF EVERETT SOUTH TERMINAL	
	RATING	REASONING
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?		
3(A) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on stream habitat and species?		No potential stream habitat affects have been identified.
3(B) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on marine and near-shore habitat and species?		Would expand pier at South Terminal over the water. Overwater footprint would be approximately 13,000 square feet larger than existing, including removal of existing overwater structures at Mukilteo. Marine and near-shore habitat has not been surveyed at Everett. No important habitat features identified at Mukilteo site.
3(C) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on wetland habitat and species?		No potential wetland habitat effects have been identified.
3(D) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on upland habitat valuable to migratory birds?		Affected area developed, with minimal vegetation.
3(E) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on historic properties?		Not within ¼ mile of a known archaeological site. No known NRHP-eligible properties identified within or adjacent to site.
3(F) What is the potential for avoiding the use of parklands (publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges)?		Would be adjacent to a recreational trail and public beach access. New terminal could avoid using these parklands.
3(G) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with land use plans and zoning?		Zoning designation is M-2 Heavy Manufacturing. Ferry terminal (as a facility of statewide significance) is an allowed use.
3(H) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with shoreline plans?		Site classified as Urban Deepwater Port. "Use of this land should be for port-related water-dependent uses, water-dependent and water-related industrial uses, water-dependent military use, and accessory supporting facilities and services." Ferry terminal consistent with shoreline plans.
3(I) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on neighborhoods from ferry traffic?		Vehicle queues likely to expand into adjacent neighborhoods.
3(J) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on navigable waterways from the placement of new structures?		Likely to impinge on navigable waterways and also conflict with adjacent security zones.

Summary Table

LEVEL 2 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 reduce conflicts between local and ferry vehicle traffic compared to existing conditions?	⬇	⬇	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬇	⬇	⬆	⬆
1(B) Does the concept reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists during ferry loading and unloading?	⬇	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬇	⬆	⬆	⬆
(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?	⬇	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬇	⬇	⬆	⬆
2(B) Would the location of the terminal avoid ferry conflicts with maritime traffic that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability?	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬇
2(C) Does the concept provide effective connections between modes (ferry, bus, and rail)?	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬇	⬆	⬆	⬇	⬇
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) Does the concept improve or maintain peak period trip time? [estimated existing travel time in minutes]										
Clinton to Seattle (downtown)	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇
Clinton to Seattle (University of Washington)	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇
2(D2) Does the concept improve or maintain service frequency on the ferry route?	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬆	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇

Summary Table (continued)

LEVEL 2 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
(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?										
3(A) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on stream habitat and species?	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
3(B) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on marine and near-shore habitat and species?	▲	◆	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	●	●	◆
3(C) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on wetland habitat and species?	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
3(D) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on upland habitat valuable to migratory birds?	▲	▲	◆	◆	◆	◆	▲	▲	●	▲
3(E) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on historic properties?	●	●	●	●	●	●	▲	▲	◆	▲
3(F) What is the potential for avoiding the use of parklands (publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges)?	▲	◆	◆	▲	▲	◆	▲	●	◆	▲
3(G) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with land use plans and zoning?	●	●	▲	▲	▲	▲	●	●	▲	▲
3(H) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with shoreline plans?	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	●	▲	▲
3(I) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on neighborhoods from ferry traffic?	◆	◆	▲	▲	▲	▲	●	●	●	●
3(J) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on navigable waterways from the placement of new structures?	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	●