

## **Appendix A**

Governor Gregoire Letter dated March 8, 2010

CHRISTINE O. GREGOIRE  
Governor



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

P.O. Box 40002 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0002 • (360) 753-6780 • [www.governor.wa.gov](http://www.governor.wa.gov)

March 8, 2010

John Groundwater  
Executive Director  
Passenger Vessel Association  
901 N. Pitt Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Mr. Groundwater:

I am writing to request the Passenger Vessel Association's (PVA) assistance in convening an Expert Panel of ferry operators to conduct a management review of the Washington State Department of Transportation, Ferries Division. I am requesting the assistance of PVA because it is the premier passenger vessel association in the country that represents most public and private ferry systems. An Expert Panel of your members representing both management and operations specialists would bring best practices and state-of-the-art knowledge to this effort. There are reviews currently being undertaken to ensure cost effectiveness and efficiencies regarding our work force contracts. It is only right we do a review of management practices.

Since losing a majority of dedicated revenue, the Ferries Division has faced difficult financial challenges over the past ten years. As a key link in the state transportation system, the state's marine highways must be a cost effective and productive resource for our states' ferry communities and taxpayers. In an effort to cut costs and gain efficiencies in the system, there have been several reviews and audits of its operations and management including reviews by the Office of the State Auditor, the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee, and the Joint Transportation Committee. The Ferries Division has learned from these studies and has implemented many changes to improve its business practices. I'm seeking an Expert Panel of three to five of your professional members to review this body of work, as well as conduct its own review and make recommendations on how the Ferries Division can continue the progress it has made in effective operations.

Specifically, we would ask an Expert Panel to conduct the following review:

1. Review and comment on the studies and audits conducted on the Ferries Division over the past four years in areas of overhead and management organization structure and costs, maintenance practices, scheduling, and prioritization of preservation of vessels and terminals to ensure they represent current best practices;
2. Report on the implementation of the recommendations in these studies and audits, and report on their effectiveness compared to national best practices; and



John Groundwater  
March 8, 2010  
Page 2

3. Review and report on the procedures for crew and service scheduling and make recommendations on opportunities for improvement to provide the least cost of operations while maintaining service schedules that meet the needs of our customers.

I am requesting your assistance in selecting a three to five person Expert Panel of public and private ferry operators to conduct this review. I want to ensure that we are learning from national experts in ferry operations on the best practices available for operational and management efficiencies. I would appreciate receiving this report from the Expert Panel by August 1, 2010.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions please feel free to contact Paula Hammond, Secretary of the Washington State Department of Transportation, or David Moseley, Ferries Division Assistant Secretary.

Sincerely,



Christine O. Gregoire  
Governor

cc: Senator Mary Margaret Haugen  
Representative Judy Clibborn  
Secretary Paula Hammond, DOT  
Assistant Secretary David Moseley, DOT Ferries Division

## **Appendix B**

### Best Practices Examples

Requested Examples of Best Practices per Governor Gregoire letter dated March 8, 2010

**BEST PRACTICES MEMORANDUM**

Date: August 16, 2010

From: Wayne Lamson, Woods Hole, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket Steamship Authority

Title: General Manager

Subject: Finance

**Description of Best Practice:**

The SSA has developed a number of financial reports to measure its performance on a monthly basis. This includes the monitoring of actual receipts and disbursements, both on a cash and an accrual basis, compared to budget projections and the prior year's actual results. A monthly business report is also prepared summarizing:

- Monthly and year-to-date traffic statistics vs. the previous year
- Monthly and year-to-date net income (loss) from operations vs. budget projections
- Brief narrative of the reasons for any major budget variances
- Monthly and year-to-date cash balances for the various funds (operating and special purpose funds) vs. budget estimates
- Projected allocation of the annual revenues, cost of service and net operating income by routes to make sure each route's revenues cover their respective cost of service
- Market share data on the number of passengers carried monthly and year-to-date vs. our competitors

In addition to reviewing monthly financial reports, the SSA monitors fuel consumption reports by vessel, number of missed trips, vehicle reservation statistics, call center activity, number of reservations made via the SSA's website vs. by telephone or in person. The SSA also prepares and distributes weekly payroll reports comparing the total number of hours and wages paid, by cost center vs. budget projections and the related information for the corresponding period from the previous year.

**Benefits of Best Practice:**

The benefit of these long-standing practices is to track the SSA's performance each month and to make any adjustments that are needed due to changing or unexpected circumstances. Operating budgets and cash budgets are prepared annually and are occasionally revised during the year if necessary. Rates and fares are set by the SSA's governing board, as necessary, that are best adapted to insure sufficient income to meet the cost of service. Annual operating losses that exceed the balance in the SSA's Reserve Fund are assessed against the port communities (and passed on to each seasonal and year round property owner through higher real estate taxes). The SSA has derived sufficient revenues from operations to meet the cost of service in each year since 1962, except 1967, 1973, 1982 and 1996 in which years the SSA had operating losses of \$2,844, \$7,485, \$160,658 and \$146, 442, respectively. Each of these

deficiencies was met with transfers from the SSA's Reserve Fund. The Reserve Fund balance at the end of the latest fiscal year was \$2,826,557. The SSA's Reserve Fund balance is currently limited, by statute, to \$3,102,000 or 5% of the total principal amount of all outstanding bonds. The SSA's total operating revenues in 2009 were \$79,780,480.

The continuous monitoring of the SSA's performance through the use of various monthly reports allows corrective action to be taken immediately to help avoid operating losses, to the extent possible, and a potential deficit assessment against the port communities.

**Approximate time to Implement:**

Similar practices could be instituted within a short period of time, assuming the relevant information is readily available to retrieve measure and manage.

**BEST PRACTICES MEMORANDUM**

Date: August 16, 2010

From: James C. DeSimone, Staten Island Ferry

Title: Deputy Commissioner and Chief Operating Officer

Subject: Master Dry-docking Contract

**Description of Best Practice:**

The City of New York has now concluded two master dry-docking contracts for its fleet of ferryboats, namely: 1: a contract specific to six large ferryboats, and 2: a contract specific to two small ferryboats. Each contract has an initial term of five years with two one year options and addresses all items normally associated with routine regulatory dry-dockings, maintenance and repair and any emergencies which might arise during the term of the contracts.

**Benefits of Best Practice:**

The projected costs associated with routine regulatory dry-dockings are more accurate for budget planning; staff resources are better utilized because the continual preparation and bidding of dry-docking contracts has been reduced to twice in five years versus an ongoing annual requirement; the scheduling of dry-dockings is more predictable and, therefore, regulatory compliance is improved; and economies of scale and a better tracking of repair items and related cost should result.

**Approximate time to Implement:**

Approximately three years from inception until contract award.

**BEST PRACTICES MEMORANDUM**

Date: July 20, 2010

From: Heath Gehrke, Cape May – Lewes Ferry

Title: Director of Ferry Operations

Subject: Implement a reservation system for demand management

**Description of Best Practice:**

The CMLF has had a reservation system in place since 1997. Reservations were initially managed through the toll/reservations system called AFOS, manufactured by ANITE. The newer version of this system which they now use is CarRes. The system manages and matches tariffs to available capacity, seasonality, and restrictions in use based on time of day, day of week, and trip (i.e. return trip vs. one way). The system is used to sell foot passenger tickets and to manage tariffs for this segment as well as vehicles however capacity is generally not an issue for walk-on passengers. Reservations may be made through the CMLF call center via an 800 number or online at [www.CMLF.com](http://www.CMLF.com). The CarRes system is equipped with a Consumer Resource Database, which allows the CMLF to measure customer activity by name, user account, zip code, etc. and has proven very useful in many of our marketing initiatives.

Through this system, CMLF initially charged a \$5 reservation fee for the privilege of making a reservation being that it was guaranteed, subject to some restrictions. When the reservations system was implemented a maximum of 65 vehicles (out of a nominal 100-vehicle capacity) were able to reserve, leaving the rest of the capacity to those who simply show up.

In 2007, the system changed for the first time to allow 100% reservations, and in 2008, CMLF did away with the reservation fee and began to offer a \$2 discount for Internet reservations. Website renovations in 2009 gave displays to show customers how much capacity remained on a particular crossing.

Also in 2009, significant changes were made in the call center. These are the main focus of this paper, and exhibit what CMLF believes to be a best practice. In January of 2009, the call center went from being a standalone operation in New Castle, DE, to being consolidated with the Customer Service Department (tickets and tolls) in Cape May, NJ. Not only did this enable CMLF to consolidate managers of the two departments, more importantly, it enabled them to cross-utilize the staff from both functions.

While they were still able maintain a separate call center for the crunch of summertime operations (June – Labor Day), in the winter, calls are simply taken from points of sale where CMLF are already selling tickets at the ticket counter and tolls at the tollbooth. Today, when there are lulls between departures, the staff is occupied taking reservations or giving information to telephone customers. Even in the summer, if the typical business calls for 2 ticket-sales personnel, or 2 toll-booth attendants, CMLF will place a call-taker in the third booth

or at the third ticket sales location, so that if there is a surge in vehicle or passenger sales, this employee can put his or her phone system in standby and assist.

The call center also does some minimal outcalls for marketing purposes and also asks limited survey questions on in-calls for the same purpose.

**Benefits of Best Practice:**

The reservations system provides more certainty not only for the customer (who knows in advance whether there is space available) but also for operations. If CMLF anticipates an atypically busy day, they can schedule additional departures, or, conversely, can reduce the number of departures if need be. By prepaying for the passage, the transaction at the tollbooth takes an average of 20 seconds vs. one minute or more, meaning they can move a lot more vehicles through the tollbooth in a shorter time.

The reservations system provides much needed customer demographical information, including travel habits of customers, allowing CMLF to better serve them, or simply providing enough information to call them by their first name. This has also provided tremendous opportunity to follow up with the customer and with employees when the need arises.

The consolidation of customer service staff and call center staff has proven *extremely* effective, not only drastically reducing the numbers of abandoned calls and call waiting times from previous years, but eliminating most of the long queues for tickets/tolls. And, as mentioned before, it has provided better use of the individuals tasked with selling. Rather than making work for the lull between crossings (as much as 3 hours in the winter), now these employees are actively engaged in sales.

**Approximate Time to Implement:**

CMLF estimates that a limited implementation could be commenced within 90 days, with a 100% reservations system in place within 6 months.

**BEST PRACTICES MEMORANDUM**

Date: July 28, 2010

From: Matt Williamson, PMP, Elliott Bay Design Group

Title: Project Manager

Subject: Managed Public Process for Vessel Design

**Description of Best Practice:**

Public input is part of the design process for any public agency. An Agency can develop a vessel design and then unveil it. This guarantees that some of the public will be unhappy. Further, since those who are unhappy feel that they have not been heard, they are more likely than not to stop the project and prevent or impede construction. An Agency can also develop a partial design and then ask for input. This leads to disorganized input from the public. The Agency will not be able to satisfy everyone along the way and detractors will still come out who will stop or slow the process after the input period. Lastly, an Agency can manage the public process in parallel with the design development. This approach helps to manage the detractors. They exist and they will be vocal. Taking a managed approach from the beginning of design development will meet concerns of detractors head-on and provide a forum for reasoned dialog with them as issues arise.

A managed public process approach uses a methodology known as Systematic Development of Informed Consent. This methodology, developed by the Institute for Participatory Management and Planning (the Bleiker Institute) focuses on actively finding those interests with serious opposition, listening to their concerns and taking them from a state of "over-my-dead-body" opposition to a position of informed consent. In other words, those who are initially opposed are given a forum for being heard. In turn they also gain recognition and understanding that there is a problem to be solved, the agency is the legitimate organization to solve the problem, the approach to the solution of the problem is reasonable and that the agency will listen and respond to the concerns of the public.

**Benefits of Best Practice:**

Developing a disciplined approach allows an agency to identify and deal with potential opposition. It opens multiple channels for gathering valuable public input and helps grow public and political support for a project and agency, ultimately reducing naysayers. This process gives opposition a means to remain opposed while providing consent for the project to proceed. It also provides an agency and consultant a means for receiving and acting on good technical input from unexpected sources.

Tough economic conditions demand that public money be spent wisely. A managed public process is essential to gaining public agreement that a public project is necessary. It establishes or confirms the legitimacy of the agency, the project and the approach to the project. It

potentially reduces overall efforts due to reactive public engagement efforts and will likely provide more effective results.

**Approximate Time to Implement:**

Planning requires about one month. The project managers for both the public agency as well as the consulting engineers need to become educated about the process and commit to it. Following the Bleiker three-day course, it takes a full day to answer a set of questions that serve to identify specific issues that could kill or impede the project. This is followed by analysis and development of proactive responses and preemptive actions that need to be taken. The remainder of the time is spent planning the implementation of the responses and actions.

Once this groundwork is laid, time must be spent throughout the project development process to gather public input, respond appropriately to detractors, analyze survey data, hold project meetings, meet key community stakeholders, post information, etc. Overall, this requires about 25-30% of the agency PM's time throughout the project.

**BEST PRACTICES MEMORANDUM**

Date: July 16, 2010

From: Mike LaCroix, Washington State Ferries

Title: Senior Port Engineer

Subject: Environmental Management System

**Description of Best Practice:**

In 2001, WSF set the objective of complying with the environmental sustainability directives from the state governor's office (Executive Order E 1018.00), and the Washington State Dept. of Ecology (DOE), Environmental Management System (EMS) alternative to the required pollution prevention plan. Accordingly, WSF committed to developing an EMS and integrating it within the existing WSF Safety Management System (SMS). Specifically, the EMS is used to establish an environmental policy and to manage the environmental aspects of WSF's activities and services. The EMS is based on a continual cycle of planning, implementing, reviewing and improving the actions of the WSF to meet its environmental obligations.

WSF has done significant work in the area of environmental management. This includes implementation of the Vessel General Permits as required by regulation as well as partnership and permit work with local waste water treatment plants for documenting our sewage discharges and allowing WSF to use its oily water separator systems more effectively.

Previous work in this area includes WSF's voluntary early adoption of Ultra Low Sulfur Fuel, experimental use of biodiesel fuels followed by routine use of a 5% blend on several vessels where the product is readily available. Also, WSF's partnership with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency to work on cleaner diesel emissions resulted in substantial federal funding.

**Benefits of Best Practice:**

WSF was able to utilize the SMS and EMS policies and procedures as an alternative to a required permit. The benefits are standardization of the operations of sewage discharge to municipal wastewater treatment plants throughout WSF service areas. It saved the DOE and WSF substantial permit and monitoring costs (approximately \$100,000). This is one of several DOE programs that uses WSF's EMS as an alternate to planning and permit requirements.

**Approximate Time to Implement:**

This has already been implemented. The Environmental Program Manager consultant was first hired in 2005 and the first EMS procedures reflecting best management practices were published in 2008. Three years is a very standard amount of time to develop an EMS from scratch.

Specifically, the procedure and policy developed for the off loading of sewage effluent took approximately one year to implement.

## **Appendix C**

### Ferry System Comparison Table

System Name	Washington State Ferries	The Steamship Authority	Staten Island Ferry	Cape May - Lewes Ferry	Golden Gate Ferry	Clipper Vacations	Alaska Marine Highway System
<b>Governance</b>	Division of Washington State Department of Transportation	Independent Authority under the Commonwealth of Massachusetts	Division of New York City Department of Transportation	Division of the Delaware River and Bay Authority	Division of the Golden Gate Bridge and Transportation District	Privately Held	Division of Alaska State Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
<b>Director or General Manager</b>	David Moseley	Wayne Lamson	Capt. Jim DeSimone	Heath Gerhke	Jim Swindler	Darrell Bryan	Capt. John Falvey
<b>Title</b>	Assistant Secretary - WSDOT Ferries Division	General Manager	Deputy Commissioner and Chief Operating Officer	Director of Ferry Operations	Deputy General Manager, Ferry Division	President & CEO	
<b>Fleet Information</b>	(2009 Actual)						
Number of Vessels	21	9	8	5	7	3	11
Number of Terminals	20	5	2	2	3	2	32
Number of Routes	9	3	1	1	3	2	
Passengers Carried Annually	23,000,000	2,700,000	21,130,500	916,515	2,100,000	227,000	350,000
Vehicles Carried Annually	10,000,000	590,000	0	317,145		0	100,000
Annual Number of trips	180,000	21,445	35,116	5,319		1,200	7,110
Age of oldest vessel	63	55	45	(DE, NJ) 1974	35		1963
Age of youngest vessel	12	3	4	(CM) 1985	12		2005
<b>Financial Information</b>							
Total Annual Budget	\$ 359,530,770	\$ 79,063,000	\$ 240,613,000	\$ 24,388,467	\$ 96,859,000	\$ 26,000,000	
Capital Budget - Vessels	\$ 85,568,976		\$ 33,590,000	\$ 7,450,000	\$ 27,000,000	\$ 380,000	
Capital Budget - Terminals	\$ 45,773,000	\$ 7,856,000	\$ 25,023,000	\$ 7,070,000	\$ 45,000,000	\$ 100,000	
Total Operating Budget	\$ 228,188,794	\$ 79,063,000	\$ 91,000,000	\$ 24,388,468	\$ 24,859,000	\$ 13,340,000	\$ 141,600,000
Operating Budget - Vessels	\$ 174,921,654	\$ 41,426,000	\$ 91,000,000	\$ 16,132,550	\$ 13,000,000	\$ 6,600,000	\$ 121,776,000
Operating Budget - Terminals	\$ 39,476,079	\$ 15,425,000		\$ 4,984,604	\$ 3,359,000	\$ 3,540,000	\$ 5,664,000
Operating Budget - Overhead	\$ 13,791,061	\$ 22,212,000		\$ 3,271,314	\$ 8,500,000	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 14,160,000
Farebox Recovery (%)	65.4%	100%	0%	67%	45%	100%	33%
<b>Sample Fare Information</b>							
Route	Seattle to Bainbridge	Woods Hole to Vineyard Haven/Oak Bluffs	Staten Island to Manhattan	Cape May, NJ to Lewes, DE	Larkspur to San Francisco	Seattle to Victoria	Juneau to Haines
Route Length (n.m.)	7.5	8	5	14	11.25	72.5	68
Crossing Time	35 minutes	45 minutes	22 minutes	1 hour 25 minutes	30/45	~3 hours	4.5 hours
Season	Summer, any day	Year round	All	Mem. Day to Lab. Day	Year round	Summer	All
One-way passenger	\$ 3.95	\$ 7.00	\$ -	\$ 10.00	\$ 7.85	\$ 93.00	\$ 37.00
One-way vehicle & driver	\$ 11.85	\$ 74.50	\$ -	\$ 44.00	N/A		\$ 86, \$112, \$123, \$145
Frequent User Discount (%)	20%		0%	42%	30%		
Comment		Discounted auto excursion rate for residents		6- Pack Discount Book			by car length, w/ driver
Route	Anacortes to Friday Harbor	Hyannis to Nantucket		Cape May, NJ to Lewes, DE	Sausalito to San Francisco	Seattle to Victoria	Valdez to Cordova
Route Length (n.m.)	14	26		14	5.5	72.5	74
Voyage Time	65 minutes	2 hours 15 minutes		1 hour 25 minutes	30 Minutes	~3 hours	5.5 hours
Season	Summer, Wed - Sat	Year round		Winter, Nov - Mar	Year round	Winter	All
One-way passenger	\$ 11.20	\$ 16.00		\$ 8.00	\$ 7.85	\$ 85.00	\$ 50.00
One-way vehicle & driver	\$ 38.90	\$ 206.00		\$ 30.00	N/A	0	\$ 108, \$144, \$160, \$188
Frequent User Discount (%)	25%			15%	30%		
Comment		\$0.50 town-imposed passenger embarkation fee applicable on all routes		6- Pack Discount Book			by car length, w/ driver

System Name	Washington State Ferries	The Steamship Authority	Staten Island Ferry	Cape May - Lewes Ferry	Golden Gate Ferry	Clipper Vacations	Alaska Marine Highway System
<b>Number of Employees</b>	1841	643	620	434 (peak)	105	141	935
<b>Maintenance Staff</b>							
Total Number of Staff	102	26	103	27 (peak)	10	3	
Management Staff	3	6	12	5	1		
Number of Trades	7	6	11	4	4	N/A	
<b>Vessel Operations Staff</b>							
Total Number of Staff	1104	277	421	Marine 48 (P) 51 (S)	42		772
Licensed Deck Officers	164	50	82	11 (P) 1 (S)	14	13	
Unlicensed Deck	575	173	233	24 (P) 46 (S)	26	35	
Licensed Engine Officers	186	27	46	4 (P) 4 (S)		6	
Unlicensed Engine	179	27	60	9 (P) 0 (S)		2	
Other Vessel Staff			0	Food & Retail 4 (P) 40 (S)		7	
Number of Union Contracts	4	3	2	2	4	0	
<b>Terminal Operations Staff</b>							
Total Number of Staff	371	252	32	*160	20	75	
Number of Union Contracts	3	3	7	1	2	0	

## **Appendix D**

### WSF Maintenance Chart



## **Appendix E**

### Certificate of Inspection Summary

Vessel Name	Official Number	Year Built	Route	Total Persons	Pax	Length (ft)	Hull Material	Horsepower (hp)	Gross Tonnage		Net Tonnage		DWT	Master	Chief Mate	2nd Mate/OICNW	3rd Mate/OICNW	Master & 1st Class Pilot	Mate & 1st Class Pilot	Lic. Mate/OICNW	1st Class Pilot	Radio Officer	Able Seaman/ROANW	Ordinary Seamen	Deckhands	Chief Engineer	1st Asst. Engr/2nd	2nd Asst. Engr/3rd	3rd Asst. Engr	Lic. Engineer	QMED/Rating	Oilers	Watchmen	Wipers	Emerg. Evac.	Senior Deckhands	Radio Oper.	Assistant Engr	Additional Crew	Comments									
									R	I	R	I																																					
Cathlamet	636551	1981	LB&S	1216	1200	301.4	Steel	5000	2477		1772							1	1				3	1				1			1	1									6								
Chelan	643291	1981	LB&S	1217	1198	301.4	Steel	5000	2477	6472	1772	2578						1	1				4	1				1			1	1			2							6							
Elwha	512324	1968	LB&S	1221	1200	368.1	Steel	10200	2812	8275	1322	6281						1	1				4	1							1	1										5							
Evergreen State	268732	1954	LB&S	1000	984	298.7	Steel	2500	2041	4113	1388	1739						1	1				3	1									1	1									6						
Hiyu	508159	1967	LB&S	204	199	150.4	Steel	860	498		338							1					2	1					1															6					
Hyak	508160	1967	LB&S	2017	2000	369.0	Steel	7000	2704		1214							1	1				4	1									1	1										6					
Issaquah	624022	1979	LB&S	1216	1200	301.5	Steel	5000	2469		1739							1	1				3	1				1					1	1										6					
Kaleetan	508604	1967	LB&S	2017	2000	369.0	Steel	8000	2704		1214							1	1				4	1									1	1										6					
Kitsap	630023	1980	LB&S	1216	1200	301.4	Steel	5000	2475		1755							1	1				3	1					1				1	1										6					
Kittitas	627507	1980	LB&S	1216	1200	301.5	Steel	5000	2476		1756							1	1				3	1					1				1	1										6					
Klahowya	277872	1958	LB&S	816	800	298.0	Steel	2500	2055	4858	1397	2174						1	1				3	1								1	1											6					
Puyallup	1061310	1998	LB&S	2520	2499	440.0	Steel	16000	3926	12689	2066	5426	1393					1	1	1			4	2				1			1	1		1	1										6				
Rhododendron	251646	1947	LB&S	559	546	217.9	Steel	785	937		425		226					1	1				2	1									1	1											5				
Sealth	662478	1982	LB&S	1216	1200	301.5	Steel	5000	2477		1772							1	1				3	1					1				1	1											6				
Spokane	544785	1972	LB&S	2019	2000	429.5	Steel	8500	3246		1198							1	1	1			4	1								1	1												6				
Tacoma	1052576	1997	LB&S	2520	2499	440.0	Steel	16000	3926	12689	2066	5426	1393					1	1	1			4	2				1			1	1		1	1										6				
Tillikum	278437	1959	LB&S	1208	1192	298.0	Steel	2500	2069	4869	1407	2172						1	1				3	1								1	1												6				
Walla Walla	546382	1973	LB&S	2019	2000	429.5	Steel	11500	3246		1198							1	1	1			4	1								1	1												6				
Wenatchee	1061309	1998	LB&S	2520	2499	440.0	Steel	16000	3926	12689	2066	5426	1393					1	1	1			4	2				1			1	1		1	1										6				
Yakima	511823	1967	LB&S	2017	2000	369.0	Steel	8000	2705		1115							1	1				4	1									1	1											6				
Nisqually (retired)	226712	1927	LB&S	600	586	242.5	Steel	2500	1490		1013							1	1				2	1								1	1												6				
Victoria Clipper	8520757			331	297																																												
Victoria Clipper III	965831	1990	LB&S	294	285	85.5	Alum.	3200	88	235	60	105		1						1																									3	plus limited coastwise			
Victoria Clipper IV	991479	1993	LB&S	345	330	118.1	Alum.	2680		478		162						1	1				1	1																					10				
Island Home	1188126	2007	LB&S	1210	1200	235.2	Steel	6000	1567	4311	1066	1298		1						1	1		4	2																									
Martha's Vineyard	997221	1993	LB&S	1387	1376	224.1	Steel	3000	1297	2690	882	1215		1						1	1		4	2																									
Eagle	910026	1987	LB&S	816	799	219.5	Steel	3000	276		187		522	1						1	1		4	1																						7			
Gay Head	643770	1999	LB&S	147	140	217.9	Steel	2900	99	1277	73	383		1											3																						3		
Governor	267527	1954	LB&S	270	250	242.0	Steel	1000	678		352			1						1	1				2																						13		
Katama	653266	1982	LB&S	150	143	215.8	Steel	3050	99	1247	67	374	1100	1											3																					3			
Nantucket	556196	1974	LB&S	768	752	216.6	Steel	3000	1148	2532	781	1108		1						1	1		4	1																						6			
Iyanough	1185366	2006	LB&S	400	393	144.5	Alum.	9400	98	563	66	186		1						1					4																					1	plus limited coastwise		
Sankaty	640565	1981	LB&S	300	290	220.3	Steel	2520	749	1315	550	394		1						1	1		2	1																						2			
Alice Austen	696013	1986	Rivers	1288	1279	207.0	Steel	3100	499		321			1						1																													
Andrew J. Barberi	629314	1981	Rivers	6012	5992	310.0	Steel	7000	3335		2268									1	1	1																									5		
Michael Cosgrove	287626	1961	Rivers	152	149	60.8	Steel	440	139		94			1																																			
John F. Kennedy	298241	1965	Rivers	3533	3515	277.0	Steel	4110	2109		1434									1	1	1																									5		
Sen. John J. Marchi	1163079	2004	Rivers	4418	4400	295.0	Steel	9000	2623	5901	1783	1770								1	1	1																									3		
Guy V. Molinari	1154854	2004	Rivers	4418	4400	295.0	Steel	9000	2623	5901	1783	1770								1	1	1																									3		
Samuel Newhouse	629315	1982	Rivers	6017	5997	310.0	Steel	7000	3335		2268									1	1	1																									5		
John A. Noble	696014	1986	Rivers	1280	1271	207.0	Steel	3100	499		321			1						1																													
Spirit of America	1170221	2005	Rivers	4418	4400	295.0	Steel	9000	2623	5901	1783	1770								1	1	1																									3		



## **Appendix F**

### Summary List of Panel Recommendations

### Summary List of Panel Recommendations

1. The Panel recommends that the State consider studying the ferry governance model to determine if opportunities exist for positive change.
2. The Panel recommends that the vessel Master (Captain) should act as the management's representative for the vessel and all of its crew.
3. The Panel recommends WSF modify its capital projects design and management structure to be more in line with industry norm.
4. The Panel recommends that WSF study their 5 to 10-year roster of capital projects and adjust the staff sizing over time to reduce the numbers of engineers and designers.
5. The Panel recommends that WSF continues its policy of operating vessels for 60 years.
6. The Panel strongly recommends that a dedicated capital funding source for new vessel construction be identified and implemented.
7. The Panel recommends that WSF plan around a fleet of 22 vessels.
8. The Panel recommends that WSDOT bid the construction of their vessels nationwide.
9. The Panel recommends that current marine insurance policies for vessels, terminals and other ferry facilities be examined further to determine whether they have the proper types and levels of coverage.
10. The Panel recommends that WSF continue to develop a strong loss-prevention program for passenger and crew accidents.
11. The Panel recommends that WSF establish additional key metrics in following areas: Level of Service, Cost Efficiency and Safety.
12. The Panel recommends that WSF run a test project to contract dry-docking for one vessel class such as the Issaquah Class.
13. The Panel recommends that WSF not adopt the Cedar River Group suggestion that WSF require, as part of their shipyard contracts, that a vessel in intermediate maintenance at a commercial shipyard be available within 24 hours in order to provide back-up service.
14. The Panel strongly recommends that adequate funding and sufficient schedule be guaranteed to support a 60-year life for their vessels.
15. The Panel recommends that WSF continue to emphasize vessel construction, not terminal construction as a priority. However, terminal maintenance and preservation must be supported appropriately to maximize the life of all current facilities.

16. The Panel recommends that WSF explore different approaches to in-house maintenance.
17. The Panel recommends additional Eagle Harbor Maintenance Facility supervisory staff that is part of management and not part of the labor force.
18. The Panel recommends that WSF continue to transition to a zero-based budget.
19. The Panel recommends that the Washington State Legislature establish a vessel replacement fund.
20. The Panel recommends that WSF institute a policy of automatic fare increases tied to the start of the fiscal calendar and that WSF have authority to set fares.
21. The Panel recommends that WSF continue to take steps to implement a fuel surcharge program.
22. The Panel recommends that WSF investigate the pros and cons of a fuel price management program similar to that used by Clipper.
23. The Panel recommends that WSF continue to seek new technologies that are more energy efficient and to refine operating procedures.
24. The Panel recommends that WSF continue to evaluate the demand for extended hours of service and apply demand management tools as appropriate.
25. The Panel recommends that WSF continue to seek ways to reduce out-of-service time through increased maintenance while the vessel is underway and through the strategies identified in Reference 7.
26. The Panel recommends that WSF study ways to right-size crew levels when there are fewer passengers onboard.
27. The Panel recommends that WSF evaluate current staffing on the vessels versus the safe manning required by the COI.
28. The Panel recommends that short of the Master being assigned to a specific vessel, not to the route, WSF should identify alternate methods of building a sense of ownership by crew.
29. The Panel recommends a pilot program where only the Chief Engineer's position is staffed 24 hours per day.
30. The Panel recommends that WSF study the types of work performed by vessel crews while the vessel is in a shipyard and then determine the cost/benefit of this practice.

31. The Panel recommends that WSF should consider a set cut-off time for loading all vessels.
32. The Panel recommends that vehicles be unloaded ahead of bikes.
33. The Panel recommends that the "tunnel" be unloaded before the gallery decks and side decks are unloaded.
34. The Panel recommends that WSF continues to implement a reservation system for appropriate routes.
35. The Panel recommends that WSF evaluate their policies, mission statement and training to assure that the commitment to customer service is communicated to personnel and customers.
36. The Panel recommends that WSF develop an improvement program to ensure that all staff members who interact with the public are performing at high standards, as well as a recognition program when that standard is met.