Keystone Citizen Advisory Group
Meeting No. 2
Fort Casey Conference Center, Auditorium B
June 24, 2004 - 5:30-8:45 p.m.

Meeting Summary

Note: *This meeting summary represents notes from the Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) meeting, and is not a formal transcript or minutes. It is provided for the information of CAG members and other interested parties.*

AGENDA

I. Introduction; Review of 6/7/04 Meeting Summary
II. Technical Studies Background
III. Proposed Studies
IV. Study Schedule; Harbor Model
V. Final Report Contents
VI. Port Townsend Project Update
VII. Next Steps; CAG Meeting Schedule
VIII. Public Comment
IX. Adjourn

ATTENDEES

CAG Members
- ✓ Nancy Conard, Coupeville Mayor
- ✓ Clark Jennison, Tug Boat Captain*
- ✓ Forest Shomer, Port Townsend
- ✓ Tim McGuire, WSF Ferry Captain

* Absent, provided written comment

WSDOT Representative
- ✓ Paula Hammond

Facilitator
- ✓ Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Project Team Members
- ✓ Celia Schorr, WSF
- ✓ Dana Moreland, WSF
- ✓ Kojo Fordjour, WSF
- ✓ Joy Goldenberg, WSF
- ✓ Laurens Zuidweg, WSF
- ✓ Mike Anderson, WSF
- ✓ Bill Greene, WSF
- ✓ Charlie Torres, WSF
- ✓ Mark Nitchman, WSF
- ✓ Doug Playter, CH2M Hill
- ✓ Erin Pressentin, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Hadley Greene, EnviroIssues

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Harbor Modeling Handout
- Proposed Harbor Study Scope Matrix
- Clark Jennison's Comments

INTRODUCTION

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, opened the meeting by introducing herself, the Keystone Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) members, and all Washington State Ferries (WSF) directors and staff in attendance. Penny noted that Clark Jennison, one of the CAG members, would not attend but had submitted written comments to be included in meeting discussions.

Penny referred to the meeting summary from the June 7, 2004 CAG meeting and asked if members had any edits or additions. Tim McGuire clarified that he has been a licensed ferry captain for 13 years, but has only been on the Keystone route for six. With this clarification, the CAG approved the summary.

Penny proposed two changes to the CAG Goals developed at the June 7th meeting. She proposed removing the goal, "peak and non-peak seasonal data included in the study," as this is more of a study scope issue, and adding, "Outcome of studies contributes to safer operations," as a goal. The CAG approved the proposed changes to the goals.

Penny reminded the group of the ground rules and noted that the roles and responsibilities for the CAG, WSF, and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) had not changed. They will continue to be the guiding principles for the CAG over the next few months.

Conclusion

The following amended and finalized CAG Goals will govern the process in the coming months:

- **Agreed upon scope of study**
- **Agreed upon topics and organization of report**
- **Technical report will be developed in consultation with CAG**
- **Written and/or verbal participation by CAG in the presentation to the Legislative Transportation Committee at conclusion of Study**
- **Reports to be understandable by all (CAG, agencies, and public)**
- **Give CAG members sufficient time to review data ahead of meetings**
- **Take enough time to get the job done**
- **Outcome of studies contribute to safer operations**

TECHNICAL STUDIES BACKGROUND

Dana Moreland, WSF; Doug Playter, CH2M Hill

Dana Moreland, WSF Keystone Project Manager, and Doug Playter, CH2M Hill, presented previous technical studies pertinent to Keystone Harbor. These studies were conducted in conjunction with the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project, which is now on hold while WSF takes a closer look at Keystone Harbor with help from the CAG. Dana

said two preliminary terminal layouts were developed to carry through the environmental review process.

The first harbor design (Option #1) utilized the existing jetty and terminal footprint. Extending the jetty to elongate and widen the harbor would help increase maneuvering space entering the harbor, provide adequate slowing/stopping distance, and overall help decrease current cancellations that result from swift currents that predominantly run east to west across the harbor mouth. This idea would also involve taking part of the "state park bulge" on the west side of the harbor and constructing a riprap slope.

Option #1 would use the existing vehicle holding lot and add an adjacent holding area for approximately 160 vehicles, allowing for two vessels-worth of holding capacity. Dana emphasized this was only a preliminary layout, and other harbor options would also be studied during the CAG process.

Members of the CAG asked the following clarifying questions on Option #1.

Discussion

- What are the dredge depth and width of the channel for this option?

  The entrance of the channel on this design was 250 feet, approximately 50 feet wider than it is today. General guidelines state the width of a channel can be anywhere from three to five times the width of the vessel. (Issaquah 130 Class is 78 feet, 8 inches wide)

- Would the controlling depth be from the bottom edge of the riprap rockery?

  Yes.

- Is there a difference in operability when the tide is turning versus when it is not?

  During the feasibility study some current velocity studies were conducted. Current meter readings show that there is a general east to west current about 80% of the time.

- Does WSF know the velocity of the current?

  Yes. The current travels approximately 3 knots on average. There is a graph in the feasibility study showing the gradations of these velocities.

The second harbor option (Option #2) developed last fall during the environmental analysis process for Keystone Harbor used the state park and the existing jetty for the trestle. Like Option #1, it uses existing paved areas. A benefit of this location is increased public safety. One of the safety issues near the terminal involves the state park boat launch; Dana explained that for Option #2 the public launch could be moved to the other side of the harbor.

Members of the CAG asked the following clarifying questions on Option #2.

Discussion

- How many vehicles would be accommodated in holding for this option?

  Parking for this option would allow for 200 vehicles, or approximately 1.5 vessels. The traffic analysis to be completed during this study would help determine the amount of holding.

- For this option, would the route, approach, and entry to the terminal from land continue to be the same as it currently stands today?

  WSF would look at different ways to approach the terminal, possibly including not having vehicles travel so far to turn around.

- This option would not do well in a strong southeasterly wind.

  That would be a disadvantage for this option.

- Another slip would be necessary to accommodate the wind and current.

- These options were part of the environmental review, but does that necessarily mean they will be used for this study?

  These were simply preliminary layouts as part of the environmental review process. We wanted to show WSF is not starting from square one.

Dana also discussed several other technical studies that were begun during the environmental review. These included traffic studies up to SR 525, additional current studies, and preliminary studies of the water connection between Keystone Harbor and Crockett Lake.

PROPOSED STUDIES

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues; Dana Moreland, WSF; Doug Playter, CH2M Hill

The CAG reviewed the "Washington State Ferries' Proposed Harbor Studies" matrix. Penny noted that each study area is numbered according to the legislation that established this harbor analysis. Penny explained that the purpose of this exercise was to go through each of the study areas, ask clarifying questions and understand the matrix organization. She asked that the CAG confine their questions to clarifying questions, and to write down potential other study questions and hold them until the next agenda item.

Dana Moreland, WSF, talked through each study area and the questions WSF proposed to answer through the study.

Study Area #1: Options for Operating Out of Keystone Harbor

Dana noted that considerations for operating out of Keystone Harbor include WSF system-wide costs of each option. He reminded attendees that this terminal is linked to a broader system plan and that the study results should be organized to reflect this. Therefore, when the technical report is developed, organization of the results should reflect site-specific costs and benefits, as well as system-wide costs and benefits.

Dana explained that design considerations for operating within Keystone Harbor can be better understood by constructing and using the harbor model to show beach differences as well as how vessels can maneuver in and out of Keystone Harbor. If the CAG chooses to go forward with the harbor model, it would inform many of the technical studies and design considerations.

Study Area #1 Discussion

- Option #1 uses the existing harbor, but includes dredging and work on the park side of the harbor. What are the costs of that, as opposed to the second harbor option? Are there additional costs to doing Option #1 versus Option #2? What is the cost to build something over the water? Option #2 does not require any dredging, so it seems it would be less costly.

  WSF would have to consider the timeframe (i.e. near- and long-term) for identifying costs. Vessel costs are usually identified for 60 years (the assumed life cycle of a vessel), and terminal facilities over 30 to 50 years. The "options" presented at the beginning of the meeting may not be the only options brought forward for the CAG to consider. These were preliminary layouts from the environmental review.

Study Area #2: Ridership Projections

Ridership projections relate to service and ridership on the Keystone-Port Townsend route. Dana explained that one of the essential pieces of information for the analysis is the service plan that will provide ridership projections. Throughput and revenue potential would also be considered.

Ray Deardorf, WSF Planning, explained that in 1999 an origin/destination study was done to determine the type of riders who used the route.

Study Area #2 Discussion

- What is throughput? Is it related to the size of the boat?

  Throughput is the number of people or cars moved from one terminal to another per hour. Frequency, schedule, and size of boat all factor into this measurement.

- Is throughput also related to the service plan?

Yes. WSF is currently in the process of analyzing population and employment projections that will contribute to overall service and long range plans for all WSF routes. Additional considerations that contribute to these forecasts include size of vessel, speed of vessel, and schedule.

- 1999 may have yielded skewed origin/destination results as the route was recovering from a drop in ridership. 1999 ridership may therefore not correlate well to present-day numbers.

Study Area #3: Maintaining and Retrofitting Existing Vessels

This study area includes examining the requirements needed to continue operating the existing Steel Electric vessels on the route.

Study Area #3 Discussion

- Will WSF take into account lifecycle costs, such as maintenance?

  Yes.

- Does the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) have opinions on vessels other than the Steel Electrics? What is the Coast Guard's opinion on these vessels?

  If the Steel Electrics were built today rather than in the 1920s, the USCG would require a two-compartment hull rather than a single compartment. Because of their age, the Steel Electrics do not have to comply with current USCG regulations. This is a concern when considering new boats of the same size, as they would not be "grandfathered" when not in compliance with certain regulations.

- Is there any truth to the rumor that the USCG says the Steel Electrics will have to stop being used in five years?

  No. But in WSF's opinion these boats have to be replaced.

Conclusion

On Study Area #3, Maintaining and Retrofitting Existing Vessels on the matrix, the question should read: *"What are the regulatory concerns for the Steel Electric Vessels?"*

Study Area #4: Traffic Impacts

Study Area #4 looks at the impact of vehicles from the ferry on local highway capacity.

Study Area #4 Discussion

- The second bullet on "immediate area" and the last bullet on "neighborhoods" seem redundant.

Conclusion

The two bullets will be combined to include the immediate area and neighborhoods in one question.

Study Area #5: New Vessels

This topic will look at how many, if any, new vessels should be constructed, and the associated costs on terminal, operational, maintenance, and system-wide levels.

Laurens Zuidweg, WSF Director of Vessel Engineering, said that for the sake of efficiency and the time limit for this study, he would prefer to limit the scope of study to three vessel types. Acknowledging that there are other possibilities to study, his preference is to study the 130-class, the existing Steel Electrics, a "Keystone Special," or the 100-vehicle vessel.

Study Area #5 Discussion

- Would it be valuable or cost efficient to study an already-used vessel in the system such as the 100-car vessels?

  Earlier, the design concepts assumed a 130-class vessel, however the CAG and WSF will agree on which vessels to be studied during this harbor study.

Study Area #6: Environmental Process

Dana said that when the environmental process began last fall, many disciplines were planned for study as part of the official environmental analysis, including:

- Air Quality
- Vegetation
- Fisheries
- Wildlife
- Wetlands
- Coastal and Hydraulics
- Water Resources
- Groundwater
- Geology and Soils
- Noise
- Transportation Report
- Hazardous Materials
- Cultural, Historic, and Archeological Resources Report
- Land Use
- Farmlands
- Social
- Visual Quality
- Relocation
- Energy
- Economics
- Environmental Justice
- Section 4(f)
- Regulatory Analysis

From these studies, WSF has chosen (and listed in the proposed study matrix) those disciplines they feel will be the most important to this harbor analysis:

- Impacts to habitat and aquatic resources, such as Crockett Lake
- Impacts to cultural and historical resources
- Impacts to state park and recreational users

Bob Swope, CH2M Hill, explained that these studies would not be conducted on an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) level of detail. For instance, for the Section 4(f) study, WSF plans to look at how much land would be taken and if there would be impacts to facilities listed on the National Register of Historic Places. No geotechnical borings or field studies could be completed because of the short timeframe. For fisheries, studies of existing conditions already exist from the feasibility study, but some additional work would need to be completed.

Laurens Zuidweg, WSF Vessel Engineering, said his department would assess the environmental impacts of wake wash and vessel emissions.

Study Area #6 Discussion

- Can you give us a sense of the depth of study for these environmental impacts?

  These studies would not be as detailed as those conducted for an environmental review process.

The CAG's questions were put on the "blue wall" and grouped according to the appropriate study area.[1] The intent was to generate feedback and find out if the scope of the study analysis had been sufficiently defined.

Clark Jennison's Comments

Clark Jennison submitted comments to the CAG (see Attachment A) although he was unable to attend the meeting. The CAG reviewed his comments and discussed them.

The CAG suggested an option Clark put forth should be studied – to close the Keystone run. They added it to the list of additional questions they had compiled. The CAG also added Clark's concern about safety of the route to the list.

PROPOSED STUDIES – Continuation and inclusion of additional scope questions

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, conducted a workshop for the CAG to include additional topics for study using the blue wall brainstorming technique. Questions and study areas were incorporated into existing study topics after discussion and clarification with the CAG; the matrix below depicts these added ideas. Ideas generated during this workshop included the CAG's suggestions for which vessels to study.

[1] The "Blue Wall" is a facilitation technique used to organize and categorize information in a group workshop setting.

Proposed Study Area	Study Description	CAG-Added Topics
#1: Options for Operating Out of Keystone Harbor	Look at various options to maintain operations out of Keystone Harbor	• How are fog and weather closures affected by size of vessel? • Safety Concerns – Define issues: Stopping Distance, Divers, What else? • Dollar costs associated with New Dock Draft 1 (in harbor) or New Dock Draft 2 (at mouth of harbor) • Clark Jennison's final three paragraphs • Safety • Cost Analysis: Capital Savings vs. Operating Costs
#2: Ridership Projections	Look at the ridership projections for this route	• Characteristics of travelers: Commercial, Commuter, Tourists • Ridership depends a lot on Whidbey NAS remaining open • Ridership Numbers by: day, month, direction • Study close run? • How will type of vessel affect ridership? • Vessels currently have difficulties with large, tall and lengthy trucks • Length and Weights of vessels are not tall enough to handle all vehicles • Will the characteristics of the route be included, i.e. tourists vs. commuters?
#3: Maintaining and Retrofitting Existing Vessels	Look at what is required to maintain and/or retrofit the existing vessels for continued service on the route	• Cost Analysis: Capital Savings vs. Operating Costs • What are operational costs of existing vessels (by route) and system-wide

Proposed Study Area	Study Description	CAG-Added Topics
		impacts? • Vessels currently have difficulties with large, tall and lengthy trucks • Length and Weights of vessels are not tall enough to handle all vehicles • What are the operational costs of existing vessels? • What are revenue potentials of existing vessels? • Consider "out of the box" vessel design and service delivery • How do safety issues determine vessel characteristics?
#4: Traffic Impacts	Look at the impact of vehicles from the ferry on local highway capacity	• Consider truck routes • Coupeville, Deception Pass, Mukilteo Ferry as related to vessel capacity
#5: New Vessels	Look at how many, if any, new vessels should be constructed	• Cost Analysis: Capital Savings vs. Operating Costs • What are operational costs of existing vessels (by route) and system-wide impacts? • Vessels currently have difficulties with large, tall and lengthy trucks • Length and Weights of vessels are not tall enough to handle all vehicles • Consider "out of the box" vessel design and service delivery • If smaller vessels, how can they be used elsewhere? • Study similar sized boat to steel electric • How do safety issues determine vessel characteristics?

Proposed Study Area	Study Description	CAG-Added Topics
		• What size vessels should be considered? • Study vessels of size other than 130? 70? 100? • Need vessels that will interchange routes (if only two vessels exist when one goes down only 1 left) or 1 in a dry dock and 1 goes out of service – no boat!
#6: Impact on the Environment	Look at what impacts to the environment may occur from each of the options being studied	• Study cannot really be done until one option is picked

After the blue wall exercise, Penny asked the CAG if the group's goals would be achieved if all scope questions were answered. CAG members indicated they believed answering questions from both lists would help meet the goals of the study. CAG members discussed various combinations of boats to study. Members also suggested it might be best for WSF to suggest different vessels to study.

Discussion

- CAG members asked how the scope information would be organized, given that different options would be examined. Each option would have to look at vessel selection and the criteria questions, but the deciding factor may be cost considerations.

  WSF would develop options and then answer the questions for each one.

- It seems which environmental disciplines to study cannot be picked until one harbor option is chosen.

  It is common practice for agencies to conduct environmental and technical analyses on a number of different options. It may be that we study the various options and offer to the legislature all of these facts so they have an informed decision-making tool. There are currently two options, and there is the possibility for different or additional options, however, we have a short timeline to include numerous harbor options.

- It seems that for each option, an examination of the environmental implications, operations, ridership and costs is required. A matrix could combine existing conditional data as well as data from each study area.

  This might be the simplest format to present this information.

- How do we tell the legislature that four boats are currently being funded and built, but now they need to fund additional new boats?

  That might be one of the system-wide costs that we present and show as an expensive option.

- How much traffic analysis does WSF have already?

  We have some traffic analysis a mile away from the terminals, but do not have data for SR 20 or SR 525. Some data from WSDOT could be used for the highways.

- We should nail down what size boats to study tonight. What are the nuances of the Issaquah 130 versus the Steel Electrics versus the 100-vehicle vessels?

  Each vessel has a different draft, limiting operability in Keystone Harbor as it is configured today. A "Keystone Special," or a vessel built to today's standards with the size characteristics of the 77-year old Steel Electrics, would hold approximately 45 cars.

- Would the USCG grandfather clause be honored, if the Steel Electrics were totally overhauled?

  No.

- WSF's previously made strategic financial decision is what has driven us to this juncture. People in this region do not want the change. The driving factor here was a financial decision, otherwise the old boats would be kept running.

- Perhaps 100-vehicle vessels should be studied. There is the possibility in the future that if routes close down, WSF could have a surplus of boats. We do not want dinosaurs that simply get larger until they go extinct. I like the idea of the smaller boat that fits into a flexible boat system. A 100-car vessel represents the opportunity to grow from the 65-car vessel system. If we build the 130, this is simply a combination of two 65s, and the capacity remains equal. It does not serve a growing community well.

  It is very expensive to build new boats; generally the maximum amount of vehicles on the lower car deck is 100. Car decks can be added overhead to expand vessel capacity. A single-deck 100-car vessel would have roughly the same footprint as the 130-car vessel with dual decks.

- What is the difference between the existing Issaquah Class and the proposed Issaquah Class?

  The current Issaquah-100 class vessels have a length of 328 feet, beam of 78 feet, 8 inches, and a draft of 15 feet, 6 inches. The current Issaquah-130s are 328 feet long, have a beam of 78 feet, 8 inches, and a draft of 16 feet, 6 inches. The proposed Issaquah 130 class vessels may have slightly different specifications.

- What are the size specifications for the Steel Electric vessels?

  The Steel Electric has a length of 256 feet, beam of 73 feet, 10 inches, and a draft of 12 feet, 9 inches.

- Which of these specifications affects safety the most?

  Many variables contribute to safety. For stopping safely, the reaction time on the engine and the length of the boat are two of these factors.

- Due to the similarity of the footprint of the 130s and the 100s, would an analysis of the 100 be accomplished by studying the 130?

  No. Because of differences in rudder design and other factors, the two vessels have different maneuverability.

- We need to ensure we study an option that provides capacity to accommodate a growing community and that we look at the vessel's repercussions.

  On this route the 130 is the assignment of one vessel rather than two 65 boats. What would be required in 2020 or 2030 will be learned through ridership forecasting. Currently, the route has one 65-car boat during the winter, and often sails at less than full capacity. In the summer season two boats run 12 and 8 hours respectively. When the single 130 is on the run, capacity will not be filled in the early morning or evenings, leaving room to accommodate growth.

- If we go back to Option #2, one could have any boat for any time of year, without worry of running aground.

  We cannot reach that conclusion without analyzing all options.

Conclusion

WSF will make a recommendation to the CAG regarding the number and size of boats to study including the 130, the current Steel Electric, and a new "Keystone Special" built to Steel Electric size.

STUDY SCHEDULE: Harbor Model

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues; Dana Moreland, WSF Terminal Engineering

Dana Moreland reviewed the Harbor Modeling handout. He explained that it was created to explain the advantages of using the harbor model over computer modeling in response to public comments about the choice to build a physical model. WSF believes the harbor model will increase accuracy and confirm computer modeling.

Dana explained there is a tight time schedule for using the physical model in order to have the analysis done in time for the legislative report. Modeling information would be presented as studies are completed.

The CAG members discussed the harbor model and clarified how it would inform the different study areas.

Discussion

- This information reinforces the need for a matrix to help depict the study findings.

- Will the harbor model results be used to analyze each vessel type?

  The model will be used to assess the impacts of proposed harbor modifications and the operability of each vessel type.

Conclusion

The CAG concurred that WSF should proceed with the harbor model.

FINAL REPORT CONTENTS

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny Mabie asked CAG members to think about the content and structure of the final report to the legislature. She noted that CAG members had already mentioned a matrix as a way to show the results of the analysis. Penny asked the CAG for their thoughts on the report, review cycles, outlining, and structure.

Discussion

- Everything we came up with tonight (in terms of information and questions answered) should be included.

- The CAG should discuss whether to give a recommendation or input, even if there is not consensus.

- The CAG may advise the legislature by simply showing all of the different facts and options.

- The report should show vessel options, the alternatives for the harbor, and the effects of each.

- We will need to show "next steps" to the legislature, as this is not a true environmental review. The environmental review comes next, which may change the overall outcome of this analysis.

Conclusion

The following list includes the CAG's preliminary thinking on the content and structure of the final report to the Legislative Transportation Committee:

- **Include all CAG-developed informational questions**
- **Show either one recommendation from the CAG or input from each member**
- **Show technical analysis**
- **Show model outcomes**
- **Depict information in a matrix, showing ramifications and pros and cons for each choice**
- **Show information for each vessel option**
- **Make comparisons between vessel sizes and harbor options**
- **Show "next steps" to legislature –this report is not an environmental impact statement, and the outcome may change**

PORT TOWNSEND PROJECT UPDATE

Dana Moreland, WSF Terminal Engineering; Charlie Torres, WSF Terminal Engineering

Dana Moreland introduced Charlie Torres, WSF Terminal Engineering, who is the project manager for the Port Townsend Terminal Preservation Project. The Port Townsend Terminal Preservation Project has been separated as an independent project from the original Keystone-Port Townsend Terminal Improvement Project. This project will begin much-needed maintenance on the Port Townsend side of the route while studies are being completed at Keystone. Dana clarified that he and Charlie will closely coordinate between projects.

The top priority for the Port Townsend project will be to address the poor condition of the vessel landing structures, because without these there would be no service. A traffic study will also be conducted. Environmental implications of moving the slips offshore to help ease traffic will also be assessed.

Penny explained that there would be a Port Townsend project update at each CAG meeting so that people have a chance to hear about its progress. There will be an independent process to comment on that project.

Discussion

- Will the size of the boat studied on the Keystone side and the ultimate decision on the type of vessel have an effect on Port Townsend?

  Yes.

- How will the two projects work in tandem?

The projects will be closely coordinated because they are on the same route. For example, we would need to know the results of traffic studies in both Keystone and Port Townsend to address issues on both sides.

- Is there a schedule and budget for the Port Townsend Project?

  Funds are available now to begin preservation work and expand the docks. WSF wants to position itself to expand holding capacity offshore when funding is available. Today WSF is using dollars in the most prudent way to keep the route running and to accommodate future expansion.

NEXT STEPS

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny explained that the calendars completed by the CAG would assist WSF in planning a CAG meeting schedule that accommodates both CAG and WSF schedules. WSF will submit a study and meeting schedule to the CAG by July 12, 2004.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Penny noted that the public comment period was an opportunity for audience members to offer their thoughts to the CAG; it is not a question and answer period. No questions would be answered if posed.

Public Comment #1: W.L. Jones

It seems like originally when the Keystone talk started, the ferry system was talking about 225-car boats to replace the Steel Electric boats. WSF said it had already contracted to build new boats, and would put them on this route because they are interchangeable. What I am hearing is that you can insert any size boat on Option #2. The 225-car boats would accommodate all community growth. Of course these would also have many traffic impacts.

I had a question for Captain McGuire on variable size. My experience with ferries goes way back to when the Clinton-Mukilteo route had small boats. These vessels were scary to ride in the stormy winter months. Once, a tractor-trailer overturned due to the turbulent waters, and Coke machines were always roped to the walls. When those ferries were removed, there was a huge ridership improvement, because when Puget Sound was stormy, riders did not acutely feel it. How stormy does it get on this route with the Steel Electrics before it is uncomfortable for riders? I think this should be a consideration.

I also have a comment for Paula Hammond. The Keystone Project had been in the news for a while here in Coupeville, but there doesn't seem to be a lot of passion behind it. The run caters a lot to tourism, I think. I have not seen the tourism industry rise up and say they support modernizing the route. I wonder about state transportation-level priorities. If Whidbey folks don't care, will the route be shut down? If the environmental folks do care, will the project be

tabled? So far I have not heard passion for improving the Keystone-Port Townsend route, and I would like to know how vital this run is to the transportation network in the State of Washington.

Public Comment #2: Marianne Edain, WEAN

There are several items I think have been overlooked.

Keystone Spit has a lens of freshwater that prevents saltwater from migrating into the groundwater. Last year, due to the drought, plants browned and burnt along the spit because they did not have enough fresh water to drink. I do not want that lens of freshwater under the spit affected, and to in turn affect the vegetation.

Option #1 looks like it would take a chunk off of the state park. What would be WSF's relationship to the parks department? I am concerned with increasing the amount of impervious surfaces and the resulting environmental impact.

I also want some consideration paid to transportation demand management. I want to see more consideration of this rather than accommodation of SUVs.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Attachment A
Clark Jennison Comments Submitted

Clark Jennison
Keystone CAG member

Unable to attend Scoping meeting.

Options for Keystone ferry run

Close run.

This option might have the largest regional impacts. I feel it warrants a brief examination.

Ferry options

Continue to use existing Steel Electric ferries in current condition.

Rebuild Steel Electric ferries.

Build boats smaller than the Steel Electrics

Build new Steel Electric sized ferries.

Build Issaquah class ferries.

Terminal options

Continue using existing terminal configuration.

Expand holding Area
For Steel Electric sized ferries.
For Issaquah class.

Expand harbor to permit safe operation
For Steel Electric sized ferries
For Issaquah class

I know that the members of the Keystone CAG are not being asked to make any decisions regarding which options to implement. However, I feel I should express my opinions on which options deserve the most in depth analysis.

After hearing the presentations in the last meeting, reading the available material, and taking into account personal experience and opinions, I feel that the following are some of the CAGs' operating assumptions.

1. The current Steel Class ferries are at the end of their usable lifespan.

2. To refit the existing Steel Class ferries and bring them up to current regulatory standards would be prohibitively expensive.

3. Ridership on the Port Townsend-Keystone route will inevitably increase as state and local populations grow. This is one of the few routes accessing either the Olympic Peninsula or Whidbey Island.

4. Environmental impacts will occur with any terminal expansion/construction.

5. The ferry system, in their verbal and written presentations, has often emphasized maintaining a schedule and reducing cancellations. Aside from the predicted tide and current cancellations what is causing so many cancellations on this run? Safety.

Boats have more in common with planes than with trains in terms of scheduling. The cancellations that concern me are not the predicted tide and current cancellations. The cancellations that concern me are the ones forced on the ferry Captains by bad weather and poor visibility. The location and configuration of Keystone Harbor force too many judgment calls on the ferry Captains. Any time they have to start asking "should I or shouldn't I?" it means there is a safety risk.

I believe public safety should be our foremost consideration while considering Keystone Harbor operations. It is one thing to say lets just live with the tide cancellations. It is another matter entirely when you realize that many cancellations are forced on the ferry Captains because it is not safe to enter the harbor.

As a professional mariner it has always been my view that running a ferry into Keystone Harbor is a hazardous operation. Now that a public process has recognized this safety issue it is time to address it.