



## Appendix A

### PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DECEMBER 1, 2003 - JANUARY 16, 2004 SCOPING PERIOD

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
<b>2</b> Mail	We are more worried about the Hood Canal operation and the total effect it will have on our lives. Thank you.
<b>3</b> Mail	I would like a copy of all sites being considered and pros and cons on all levels, money, environment, etc. What businesses (new with relocation) will be needed or added for growth (gov't grant monies available??) Growth projection for island Co., water and sewage accommodation.
<b>4</b> Mail	Very difficult access to booth for walk on passengers! --also cars can not turn around conveniently near booth, they must either drive to turn out which is far away or come in from the northern drive to drop off a passenger. How about a machine that sells tickets?"
<b>6</b> Mail	I am a concerned environmentalist BUT a new location for Keystone Ferry makes sense to me--get out of shallow waters and have a dependable run to Port Townsend. I hate the way it is now--I don't use the ferry in order to avoid trouble, not because I wouldn't like to.
<b>7</b> Mail	We'll definitely try & make the Dec.16th meeting. What about the old WWII Navy bombing range just North of Greenbank as a new terminal site? It has much better protection from WX than Keystone--good access to Hwy 525, and is dormant federal land
<b>8</b> Mail	Coupeville streets will not handle traffic from larger ferries. There will need to be an overpass on South Main Street over highway 20 to handle local traffic and a cloverleaf to merge ferry traffic with highway 20 traffic.
<b>9</b> Mail	Support Improvements.
<b>10</b> Mail	Important to preserve the eel grass beds in Port Townsend Bay q2 1. Eelgrass preservation 2. Avoidance of more traffic in Port Townsend, especially on Water Street 3. Help people with public transportation to go back and forth from Port Townsend to Coupeville, without using a car. q4 1. Reduction of noise, traffic, environmental degradation and automobile fumes in Port Townsend.
<b>11</b> Mail	If you decide to abandon Keystone Harbor in favor of the open beach area to the east, then please see that jetties and breakwaters now in place, can and will be left in place for transient pleasure boat moorage and tie-up, that is badly needed on the west side of Whidbey Island q2 (1) Cost (2) Dependability of service in all weather q3 Yes and you are considering them. q4 Money (cost), Dependability of Service
<b>12</b> Mail	Larger ferry boats carry higher volume of cars. Where/what area is being considered for an overflow parking zone?
<b>13</b> Mail	There is no doubt in our minds that a new, relocated or modified terminal is necessary. We like the Steel Electrics. (I'm the same age) but we realize that you need to modernize and standardize. Since we live near Keystone we would like the facilities to be as near as possible.
<b>14</b> Mail	I'm very interested--and use the ferry regularly. Please put my name on your list for any more information. Thank you.
<b>15</b> Mail	Rather than disrupt traffic or animal habitat, I suggest that a less costly alternative would be to dredge the landing-harbor and enlarge the dock and parking area."
<b>16</b> Mail	As per Para #1, How large is the ""Issaquah 130 Class"" and how much larger is it than the currently running vessel? As per Para #2, Why have there been cancellations for the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Route? If there are many cancellations, maybe it is due to not more people needing to go that route? If this is the case, definitely do not need a newer, bigger vessel and do not need to use funds that go back to the cost deficit or something actual."
<b>17</b> Mail	A way must be found, I think, to improve the Keystone Ferry Terminal in its present location to accommodate the newer larger ferries"
<b>18</b> Mail	It would be nice to have the dock out of the city with ample parking for cars to commute to the new location.

\* Numbers may appear omitted as a function of the database numbering system. No comments have been excluded.

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
21 Mail	As a commuter on the Keystone/PT ferry 3 times per week, I wholeheartedly support the need for larger ferries, fewer people in line, waiting for ferries for hours, etc. etc. Please make it happen quickly.
22 Mail	Thank you for informing us of the meeting.
23 Mail	I perceive the environmental impact to out weigh the possible benefit. It also will impact quality of life-don't need or want jumbo ferry service!
24 Mail	Remove the ferry terminal from Downtown Port Townsend--move it to the Glen Cove area where it should have been in the first place--this would eliminate lots of costs (i.e. traffic control, traffic jams, etc.) if people want to come to port Townsend to buy a "T" Shirt they still can get here from Glen Cove - One more time, move the ferry out of Port Townsend - It is one big headache there.
25 Mail	This is a good idea! A deeper terminal and a larger boat will solve many of the problems with this ferry run. Good Luck!
26 Mail	Use this run as a daily commute.
27 Mail	New ferries should have vintage appearance consistent with area tradition.
28 Mail	I don't believe that the people of PT should have a say in the matter. Why spend the time and \$\$\$. Should have constructed PT Terminal outside of town also in the area of the paper mill (too late).
29 Mail	It is difficult to make any comments not knowing what sites are being considered. I do think you should avoid a bobble like the past routing in Hwy 20 making it 7 1/2 miles further than direct in on Engle Rd. That was political, I'm sure."
30 Mail	I am a retired marine biologist/oceanographer and have lived & fished here on Whidbey Is for 20 years. I would like to see WSF proceed with the project as expeditiously as possible. Environmental impact is impossible to predict, but will be minimal and perhaps beneficial to fish both resident and migratory."
31 Mail	<p>It seems "you" wish to "fix what ain't broken." By your own data, this run seem both popular and profitable and the risks of improvement are little understood.</p> <p>q2 The Keystone Ferry Terminal is a part of the Ebey National Historical Reserve. It is, like Coupeville, the farms, the many characteristics in this area preservable! This is not Seattle, Everett, etc. but a specially set aside area whose total ecology includes this ferry landing and should be preserved</p> <p>q4 All three of the proposed sites have many environmentally risks and it is not possible to assess. But, why change what isn't broken? The ferry here is well liked and funded as it is.</p> <p>q5 The environment that needs to be considered is peculiar, non-standard, special environment of this piece of Whidbey Island. Do not plan to change what the public does not want changed.</p>
32 Mail	<p>q2: If at all practical, avoid the "spit" as an alternative site. It appears to be a good idea to abandon the present site in view of the decision to use the larger 130 class ferries. Also, I have property on the Kitsap Peninsula and depend on the Ferry for the most practical way of reaching my property. I live in adjacent Admiral's Cove and go often to Port Townsend as a "foot passenger" to shop and attend Special Events.</p> <p>q3 In my opinion the "Lee Farm" South of Admiral's Cove is the best choice. This was not discussed on the Tues. Dec. 16th mtg at Coupeville High School even though it was show on your display. TELL ME MORE ABOUT THIS OPTION. Questions, of course: is it (the farm) on the market? Cost? This location would provide direct access from Hwy 20/525, would provide more than adequate Parking and unless there is environmental impact other than disturbing farmland, I like this option. I am not too knowledgeable as to all environmental issues. Again, in my opinion, even if this location costs more in dollars, protection of the Spit and Crockett Lake would offset these monies.</p> <p>q5 The presentation on Tues Dec. 16 at the Coupeville High School was well done. It was informative and you presented your case in a logical, respectful manner. The questions from the audience were address diplomatically (even though I felt some of the "questions" were not logical). AS was pointed out by your staff--you did not have all the answers at this point in time. For my part, I felt you were there to get community input. And the staff members scattered throughout the audience were willing to listen and answer questions. I hope we can continue this friendly exchange and come to a conclusion that best serves out community.</p>
33 Mail	Please please keep in mind our wildlife and shoreline in your new construction!! Esp. since we don't even try to keep our population down!
36 Mail	As suggested many years ago the Port Townsend terminal would be better located at the Port Boat Haven or Glen Cove Area-easier access - more parking area - better protected from wind.
37 E-Mail	My husband and I chose to live in the Crockett Lake area for the sole purpose of its peaceful, quiet, non traffic area. We are horrified by the proposed ferry improvements. It will bring all the wrong elements to the area - noise, traffic, fumes and blight on the beautiful scenery. We are lifelong residents of Whidbey Island, taxpaying citizens and do not want this. We use the ferry and put up with the cancellations due to tides, or plan ahead as anyone can. It is actually part of its charm. This is the "country" not downtown Seattle, and would like it to remain so. My husband has enjoyed fishing along the beach since he was a small boy, and since then the state has taken away almost all of the fishing there is. Don't at least take away this. I walk my dog in the park and along the spit and enjoy the birds and wildlife, which WILL

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	BE GONE no matter what you try to say. Leave the Keystone area alone; it is splendid as it is. We don't need bigger interchangeable ferries on this run. We don't need lots of big trucks to clog up the roads and run over our pets. Just dredge out the already existent harbor when needed- think of ALL THE MONEY IT WILL SAVE US ALL!!
38 E-Mail	I cannot attend the meeting, but wish to be kept informed of the review process for the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project
39 Mail	Please provide/publish you site alternatives used in the feasibility study, and any more specific information. The goal of an interchangeable fleet is understandable, but may not be practical for Keystone.
41 Mail	Just a week ago I moved from my home on Sea crest Lane (formerly Donahey Rd.) into Coupeville. I do still own my home on Seacrest so am interested in what happens to the ferry.
42 Mail	Scope: Please consider scheduling (a) Run which would collect foot and car passengers at Keystone and Port Townsend to be routed to Edmonds (alleviate Mukilteo-I-5 Traffic, no deal with Hood Canal Bridge). Seattle boarders may also like this outlet to west.
43 Mail	Minimize down-time of ferries during Memorial Day to Labor Day to reduce impact on tourist-dependent businesses in Port Townsend. We will be recovering from the 2006 closure of the Hood Canal Bridge and need to survive that! 2007 is very soon after to begin a project that will reduce access to Port Townsend.
44 Mail	WSF is a major form of transportation taking "passenger only" ferries to Seattle from Bainbridge has impacted traffic "around" the Tacoma area--this kind of SNAFU needs to be avoided on the Peninsula.
45 Mail	Current management strategy for Crocket Lake should be retained. Lake level fluctuations currently minimize mosquito populations. Maintaining a constant lake level encourages mosquito growth. These salt water mosquitoes are extremely aggressive and bothersome.
47 Mail	"I may attend the meeting, not necessary--It will be in the local paper." Do whatever it takes to complete this project as soon as possible, this area does not have a lot going for it except tourism and the ferry is a big part of that, without that we are just at the end of a dead end street.
48 Mail	I cannot attend the meeting that is scheduled in PT. I do want to let you know that I am pretty much crazy for the whole ferry system and think you all do a fantastic job and I love using the ferries and do so whenever possible. I never "drive around" if I can possibly take the ferry. In two years I think I've been over the Tacoma Narrows bridge twice. Anyway, I want you to know I really appreciate the system and how it works and how kind an efficient and helpful the people are. I also love the boats themselves and will be sorry to see the old ones go. They are so darned pretty cruising across the sound. I do understand the need for efficiency and the financial impact of having larger boats which are like others in the fleet. I've only lived here a couple of years but the ferries are a huge part of the charm of the area. That they actually work and work well is pretty impressive. Thanks for doing your best for
49 E-Mail	I regret that I'll be out of town and unable to attend the meetings this week presenting plans for expansion of ferry terminals and larger vessels in Port Townsend-Keystone. Would you please put me on the e-mail list for all notifications about this issue? Also, will it be possible to see/read/hear any recording of these two meetings?
50 E-Mail	Use the old Blackball ferry area farther east on the Keystone spit. The old gravel pit area (where I used to swim), back in the early 1930s, could be utilized, banks are high enough, so Crocket Lake should not be endangered. As I remember back then, (I sometimes helped raise or lower the approaches), it took a very bad storm to slow the old ferries, and the currents could always be used to help land, low or high tide. I was born in Ft. Casey, and spent most of my early life there, up through 1934, and off and on for a couple more years.
51 E-Mail	We plan to attend the Dec. 16 meeting at Coupeville and will appreciate a full explanation why the existing Keystone dock cannot be upgraded as required. Specifically please address the following: 1) What is the source of silting at the existing dock and why can it not be mitigated? 2) Strong tides are prevalent the full extent of Keystone Spit. To alleviate problems why cannot the rock jetty on the East side be extended and a new rock jetty added on the West side of the slip extending into the bay as required? 3) Why cannot a long left turn lane be added to Hwy 20 in front of the ferry slip eliminating the mickey mouse system of having to go through Ft. Casey for westbound traffic to enter the holding area? 4) What is the true prime motivation for replacing the existing ferries with much larger class ferries? The small ferries appear to adequately accommodate Pt. Townsend traffic both summer and winter. q2 Ferry parking - what is the cost per hour to operate large ferries? What is the breakeven load factor? q3 Yes! Remain @ present location.
52 E-Mail	I think this is a complete waste of taxpayers' money. People should learn to adjust to Ferry backups and low tide closures. It is part of the charm about living on an Island. It is just simply a waste of money to relocate the terminal.
53 E-Mail	Can you provide me details of the potential changes to Port Townsend terminal as a result of replacing the steel electrics? Perhaps you can provide me a copy of the preliminary design work, such as how much larger the dock at PT would have to be, whether the dolphins will have to be removed and replaced, whether on-shore holding lots would need to be constructed to accommodate the larger vessels, whether the DOT is looking at relocating the PT ferry terminal to reduce traffic congestion caused by larger vessels offloading. I would appreciate any details you can provide. The Leader has published your PR news release about the upcoming meeting Dec. 17, but I would like to report more detailed information so people have a better idea what DOT wants them to comment on. You may email me or call 360-385-5100.
54	We were unable to attend the meeting last evening at the Coupeville HS, but would like to add a few comments. We

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
<b>E-Mail</b>	use the Keystone/PT ferry quite often and feel the change in the type/size of ferry used to be an issue long overdue for updating. We also feel it appropriate to make a change in the location of the terminal. We do believe that whatever location is chosen, consideration must be given to ensuring the life of Crockett Lake. We look forward to hearing more information about your ongoing study.
<b>55 E-Mail</b>	Thanks for the meeting on the 16th. I am a resident of Coupeville. Couple of things I would like to comment on and suggest. 1. I was sorry to hear a lot of people and active environmental groups running over the meeting about Crockett Lake. Your Meetings and agenda were clear. I agree, old Boats have to go. That is the primary purpose of Relocation or Expansion of the existing cove. 2. I would hate to see one of those boats split in half and sink, killing all. 3. I am concerned about the Environment also and it would be great if the Term. could be moved. People are worried about Crockett Lake. If the Term. was moved to the EAST location, they would not have to worry about Crockett Lake. 4. I think you folks are on the right track. 5. Migrating Salmon move along that whole shoreline also. That is a concern to me too. As long as they will not be affected by the dock? Hopefully they can go under or around it. 6. Extra traffic is a concern too. Bigger Ferries more traffic! On the highways, through town, etc. 7. Also the distance is farther to run across to PT from the EAST loc. 8. Expanding the Terminal at Port Townsend is OK by me. 1. EAST Location looks best to me! It will not block any home views and offer closer access to Highway and will not disturb Crockett Lake. 2. I would like to see the Keystone Cove be turned into an Underwater park for divers. Log boom off this new underwater Marine Park from the boat launch area. The old ferry parking lot can be turned into a grassy picnic area. 3. Improve the Crockett Lake out flow system also. Thanks for the forum to speak. I wish it could move quicker. I think folks have the right course. Thanks.
<b>56 Public Meeting</b>	General comment made to Celia at Coupeville Meeting: I spoke with this older gentleman on Tuesday night. He was a county engineer between '73 - 80, and said he is quite certain that Keystone harbor was only dredged twice in all the years he's lived there. He also said that silt building up in the harbor is not as much of a problem as everyone thinks it is: Dave Jolly 707 (or 101 - can't read his writing) NE 6th Street.
<b>57 Public Meeting</b>	<p><i>q2</i> Traffic impacts            Preservation of Crockett Lake and its bird habitat            Preservation of Excellent salmon fishing along Keystone Spit (human environment)</p> <p><i>q3</i> I prefer site "C" because it resolves the traffic issues, preserves bird habitat and preserves the salmon migration path.</p> <p><i>q4</i> Preserve bird and salmon habitat            Reduce traffic impacts</p> <p><i>q5</i> See typed comments.</p>
<b>58 Public Meeting</b>	<i>q5</i> I will mail or email comments later.
<b>60 E-Mail</b>	Hello! I heard that there is a meeting at Coupeville High School tonight about the relocation of the Keystone Ferry Terminal. I am unable to attend the meeting, but am wondering if the minutes or results will be put on the WSF website at all. I also would like to compliment the ferry system on their dock webcams. It helps to keep an eye on traffic before I head out. Is there any chance there will be a Keystone webcam up? Jefferson County maintains one on the Port Townsend side of the water. Thanks for your time.
<b>63 E-Mail</b>	Don, I need some more information about the Keystone Ferry changes. Specifically, what is the objection to enlarging the existing location of the ferry dock rather than moving it?
<b>64 E-Mail</b>	<p>This letter comes to you from the concerned home and property owners of Telaker Shores, which is immediately adjacent to Site Number 2 of your proposals. The purpose of this letter is to be included as an official comment from our group in the Environmental Impact Statement Study. We wish to state that it is imperative that all possible alternatives be considered to keep the ferry location where it is or in the immediate vicinity, which would include Site Number One. Our comment addresses the environmental impact on the residential community at the east end of Keystone Spit. The Central Option (Site Number 2) appears to be under very serious consideration as a main alternative, which would be devastating to our community for a number of reasons. There are three specific points we wish to address:</p> <p>First, as one studies the spit, consider the spit as having two bookends. The west end has become and will remain a very public area with the existing ferry terminal, Fort Casey, Seattle Pacific University and all the activities that attract scores of temporary visitors all on that end of the spit or "bookend". Now look at the other end of the spit - our "bookend" which is completely residential in nature. The ferry end of the spit is a hub of public activity which for the most part people are there, as we said, temporarily. The infrastructure is in place for the traffic of cars and people with all the constant comings and goings. There are already paved surfaces up to the water, and dredging that must continue regardless. There are bathrooms and sewage control, coffee shops, inns, and buildings that will continue to exist at that end because of the parks, camp, school facilities, etc. At our end of the spit, there is no infrastructure and we are entirely surrounded by wetlands or beach. We have built our homes that are extremely low key in our effect on the environment. There is no paving to the beach, sewers, serious lighting or high traffic mitigation - all of which would have to be brought in. Paving the beach and creating more impervious surfaces while these surfaces exist and will remain in existence means this: now you have both "bookends" to the spit with a much stepped-up public usage</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>particularly in regard to heavy car usage and the resultant pollutants in our extremely sensitive environment. We live in the country on a little country road. Second, Driftwood County Park and the Potholes Ponds are immediately adjacent to our neighborhood. The beach there is according to many local fishermen the best fishing beach in the state where one can catch salmon directly from the shore. We can track the salmon as they follow the shore from the very end of the bay past all our homes and continuing on through Driftwood Park where many many people catch their limits daily through the entire season. We also fish on our own beaches and enjoy the porpoise, sea lions, and occasional whales that follow the salmon. The disruption of the ferry traffic and the taking of the Park will eliminate fabulous access for sports fishermen and people who fish to eat. Fishing from the shore for a prize salmon for those of us without boat access is an aesthetic and recreational loss. Also, this park is not paved and one honey bucket is enough. Pouring concrete here? It's already at the other end! Our end would need to be dredged at great cost to the fish and grasses, and as we said before - dredging already must continue at the other end. Duplication is unnecessary and unhealthy for the environment. Third, the scoping and commenting is happening so you can determine what you will study as part of your Environmental Impact Statement. We want this EIS to study our environment and it's disruption to a quiet residential neighborhood who pay taxes to enjoy our right of quiet enjoyment on land we own. Every homeowner down here has donated an entire lot on the wetlands side because of the Wetlands and Migratory Birds Act that actually forced the taking of these lots. For us to lose the quiet solitude and be forced to watch the destruction of the wetlands due to the pollutants you will bring down here is absurd. Loud ferry horns in the fog next door will shake us from our beds literally. Down there, the campers go home. We won't see the night sky because of the lights in the parking lots. Summer tourists don't track schedules and will run their motors, play loud music, and rev their Harleys where we live- not at the other end where people don't live. The current ferry terminal is on the highway. You are bringing the highway to our street by doing this. Our street will be the drop-off and pick-up points for walk-ons, and side street parking where now kids ride bikes and people walk looking for eagles, herons, and marsh hawks - seen daily from all of our homes. It is so unnecessary, and such an egregious use of taxpayer dollars. Keep the ferry where it is now. Keep Driftwood Park the County Park it is best used as. Keep high traffic areas with all of the environmental impact of pollutants and run-offs contained in one area and not spread throughout. We demand our concerns be part of your study, and look forward to your contact for the appropriate consideration.</p> <p><i>q2</i> On the Keystone side of the Proposed Alternative Screening Criteria, I don't see any mention of the impact on the residential area of Telaker Shores. Please add that to your list.</p> <p><i>q4</i> See above.</p>
<p><b>65</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>It was a pleasure meeting you at the Coupeville scoping project meeting on December 16, 2003. Please consider this letter written comments to be made part of the official scoping process. I will be submitting more detailed submissions prior to the January 16, 2004 cut-off date. However, after reviewing this matter and hearing the comments at the December 16 scoping meeting, I believe based on the reasons set forth below that the Washington State Ferries' ("WSF") decision to use one Issaquah class ferry for the Keystone – Port Townsend run is so fundamentally flawed and so detrimental to the community's interest and environment as to be unable to withstand EIS review. The WSF has consistently set forth four criteria supporting retiring the current two smaller steel/electric ferries and going to one Issaquah class ferry on the Keystone ferry run. However, as detailed below and as brought out in the comments at the scoping meeting, the facts do not support any of the WSF's criteria:</p> <p>1.Missed Sailings. The WSF from the very beginning has stated one of the primary concerns is the number of missed sailings using the Keystone Harbor due to wind, tide and fog. Indeed, it is the fundamental principle stated both by the WSF prior to the feasibility study and the feasibility study itself. According to the ferry system and the feasibility study, there are 95 missed sailings a year due to wind, tide and other conditions. By moving the ferry terminal, the WSF and the feasibility study has indicated that can be reduced to between 21 and 46 missed sailings. While I have not had a chance to study these figures and do somewhat question their accuracy, it is important to note that almost of these missed sailings are during the low season. However, at the scoping meeting, during my questioning, it was finally admitted by the WSF that, in fact, the WSF system solely due to budget priorities since 2000 has eliminated 980 sailings during a two week period during the peak season of sailing. This, of course, was never put forth in any of the WSF's material or indicated in the feasibility study. Furthermore, the ferry system is proposing to use one Issaquah class ferry with a round-trip time of 1.5 hours. This, in effect, would further reduce the sailings by another 50% which would be a total loss of thousands of sailings over the year. Therefore, if the WSF'S concern truly is the number of missed sailings, why has WSF terminated 980 sailings during the peak season and why is it promoting a plan that will further reduce the remaining sailings 50% throughout the entire year? It is disingenuous for the WSF to note that a Issaquah class ferry carrying 130 vehicles during a 1.5 hour sailing period will ultimately carry the same number of vehicles as two 65 vehicle ferries running in tandem. Using the WSF's logic, a ferry that carried 1000 vehicles but only sailed one time per day would provide the same level of service as the two 65 vehicle ferries traveling every 45 minutes. Nowhere on any ferry run is the wait 1.5 hours, or anything approaching that between sailings.</p> <p>2.Reduction of operating costs. WSF has noted that by substituting one Issaquah class ferry for the two current steel electric ferries there will be a substantial reduction in operating costs. At the scoping meeting the WSF stated it costs \$600 an hour to operate the Issaquah class ferry while it cost \$450 an hour to operate each of the electric steel class ferries. Again, I have not had an opportunity to review the figures supporting this, but have questions as to why there is only \$150 more to operate the Issaquah class ferry which is twice as large and presumably requires close to twice the</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>crew as one steel electric ferry? However, as pointed out at the scoping meeting, for approximately eight to nine months a year, WSF only operates one electric steel class ferry on the Keystone – Port Townsend ferry run due to the very small ridership during off-peak seasons. Therefore, WSF even accepting their numbers will be losing \$150 an hour for approximately eight to nine months a year while they operate an Issaquah class ferry with a capacity of 130 cars and 1200 passengers on a ferry run that often has fewer than a dozen cars and a dozen persons on any given run.</p> <p>3.Retirement of steel electric ferries. Throughout its promotional material and feasibility study and other statements, the WSF has consistently maintained the need to retire the steel electric ferries as they are ending their useful life at 75 years old. However, as pointed out at the scoping meeting, the steel electric ferries were fully restored in the 1980's including new piping, electronics, electrical systems, etc. Only the hull and internal steel bracing are original and they are consistently upgraded and maintained as well. A maintained steel hull can virtually last forever. Therefore, there is no pressing need at this time, or in the near future, for need to retire these vessels. In fact, based on their complete overhaul and updating in the 1980's, they are some of the newer vessels in the fleet.</p> <p>4.Environmental mitigation. The WSF has maintained in its promotional materials and its website that by moving operations for the Keystone ferry there would be an environmental improvement or, at least, mitigation. According to WSF in their written materials, by moving the ferry from Keystone Harbor WSF would no longer continue to need dredging the Keystone Harbor. However, in fact, comments at the scoping meeting and WSF admissions showed WSF will need to continue dredging the harbor and maintaining the flood gates to maintain the proper flow of water of Crockett Lake. Also, if the dredge material is not continually used to maintain and replenish the bulkhead protecting the boat launch, buildings and parking lot for the boat launch, it will erode and wash away into the Sound. Therefore, by moving operations out of the Keystone Harbor, all the WSF service will be doing is doubling any environmental damage that current operations contribute to since the WSF system will need to continue to dredge the Keystone Harbor as well as the massive environmental damage that will be done in providing the requirements for a new terminal and use of 130 vehicle Issaquah class ferry. The detriments to the community service and the environment from WSF's unilateral decision to use a Issaquah class ferry on the Keystone ferry run are so staggering as to be untenable.</p> <p>By reducing sailings to one sailing every 1.5 hours as proposed by WSF, there are two important consequences: Service is reduced 50% and the need for vehicle parking doubles. This parking needs to be upland to avoid paving an entire shoreline or building a pier the size of an oil tanker. Both Port Townsend and Keystone present insurmountable obstacles. Port Townsend is an historical registered site with a large bluff backing a road with the water to the other side. At the scoping meeting, your project manager seemed to imply increased parking by widening the road, in effect paving the shore or for off-site parking which would increase operating costs by requiring additional staff, toll booth, communications and other ferry operations including bathrooms, buildings, etc.</p> <p>Keystone is nearly a 100% pristine habitat. It contains a federally protected bird preserve, wetlands and a large undeveloped state park. As noted at the scoping meeting, these three areas are synergistically related and serve as a staging habitat for hundreds of thousands of birds every year. While attending the December 16, 2003 scoping meeting in Coupeville I was impressed that virtually 100% of the comments were against moving the ferry terminal from the Keystone harbor and going to one Issaquah class vessel. Quite frankly, I was also disappointed in the WSF system's research and anything to resemble factual material to support the WSF's decision. Indeed, one potential site has been abandoned and one added in just the last two weeks. At this point it would appear that any site without high bank and that can accommodate an Issaquah class ferry is acceptable to WSF. But it certainly appeared by the panel's inability to answer or address my fundamental question as to where upland or any parking will be located that at this point there are zero parameters for site selection except to accommodate an Issaquah class ferry. How can a potential terminal site be proposed if parking isn't at least considered and required in the site selection?</p> <p>For example, the proposed eastern terminus site project coordinator indicated possibly widening the highway for parking along the state park. Not only does this in effect pave an enormous part of the park, the speed limit on that road is 50 mph. Is parking of cars along a highway a good idea, especially when children will be getting in and out of the cars frequently? How does one exit or enter the parking when speed limit on the road is 50 mph? Rather than taking a square peg (Issaquah class ferry) and putting it in a round hole (Keystone and Port Townsend) let's start with reality and the unchangeable factors of site location:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Both Admirals Inlet and Port Townsend geography have limited upland parking. Therefore, ferry departure will have to be every 45 minutes since there is not room for 130 – 200 waiting vehicles including parking for passenger walk-ons. It would be fiscally impractical to run two Issaquah class ferries (indeed it is impractical to run one in the off-peak season).</li> <li>2. Peak travel is high, but most of the year ridership is low. Therefore, the ability to go to a small, low cost, one boat, fall/winter/spring sailing schedule is required.</li> <li>3. The ferry service will have to continue dredging Keystone Harbor, maintaining the bulkhead and operating Crockett Lake floodgate. Therefore, environmentally and fiscally the terminal needs to be in Keystone Harbor.</li> <li>4. Environmental protections as well as historical protections in Port Townsend and community objections make a new terminal in Admirals Inlet prone for expensive litigation and the high unlikelihood of success under the environmental impact statement review.</li> <li>5. Only Keystone Harbor has access to upland parking in Admirals Cove. Even with two boat service, certain peak times together with parking for passenger walk-ons require large capacity overflow parking.</li> </ol>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>6. Politically and public relations-wise, the true facts of the project when \$100,000,000.00 is being proposed to decrease service, increase operation costs, destroy sensitive habitat, all contrary to the entire community wishes, will only confirm the public's deep mistrust of the ferry service.</p> <p>Starting with site parameters, environmental and fiscal concerns, the terminal must be in Keystone Harbor and rely on two smaller boats operating every 45 minutes. Looks like the ferry engineers had it right in 1974 when this is exactly the operations they implemented and that continues to work well today. While going to the single Issaquah class ferry seems to be WSF's great white whale, I do not see it surviving the rigors of EIS litigation. Fortunately, you have very experienced counsel in William Stelle, Jr., who has much more environmental expertise than I do. I would certainly be interested if his opinions differ in any way from my own.</p> <p>Again, it was a pleasure meeting you and your staff. Although I remain unable to understand the need for this project, I look forward to working with you.</p>
<p><b>66</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Dear Dana: Happy Holidays! I spoke to you briefly after the scoping meeting at Coupeville High School. My family has a home in Telaker Shores near the "Central Option". Below in this email is a copy of a letter we sent to Celia and I wanted to make sure you had a copy. When we talked you mentioned that you had not had a chance to walk the site and we would really encourage you to do this before the scoping period ends. We are also going to request a meeting for the community with Celia as soon as possible. If you are going to be in the area let me know and perhaps I could meet with you. We obviously want you to pursue other options and hope we can have our concerns fully evaluated.</p>
<p><b>69</b> Mail</p>	<p>The Keystone Ferry terminal definitely needs to be moved. The present site was never a good choice. It was chosen because of the influence of a Senator from this area. He and other members of his family owned most of the land bordering Crockett Lake on the north. If they could drain the Lake it would add a considerable amount of land. Bush Point was the other site being considered. After trying to drain the lake it was found to be impossible. The land under the highway is made up of rocks that allow water to rise in the lake at high tide and to lower with low tide. The lake never flooded the road before the drain. Some are afraid moving the terminal will disturb the birds. The birds were there long before that terminal and I'm sure will remain. Returning the area to its natural state might help the birds. There are many people new to this area and don't know the facts. This has been my home for 86 years and I am 91 years old. The terminal should be chosen on what is the best site for the ferry system, with the least environmental and property damage. Thank you, Leone M. Argent</p>
<p><b>70</b> Mail</p>	<p>To my husband and I, they're few things more pleasing than the natural curve of Keystone Spit, which we see from our 2nd home in Admiral's Cove. I would be concerned about any change (man-made) that might mar its natural symmetry.</p>
<p><b>72</b> Mail</p>	<p>Thanks for sending me the information. I salute your idea that replacing the ferries and expanding or improving the terminals. Since I have physical problems and the older ferries don't have elevators as a walk-on I have spent many trips on a cold and windy car deck. Best of Luck with this project.</p>
<p><b>73</b> Mail</p>	<p>Remodeling seldom fulfills a project's requirement--in particular: expansion--and does not achieve a satisfactory result--is wasteful and destructive to existing facilities. For consideration: The present Keystone Terminal could have uses beneficial for many years--as public access or an extension of Ft. Casey State Park for: Kayaking; Fishing-Diving; Small Boat Basin (only moorage available westside Whidbey Island); Restoration of Sound-Crockett Lake, now in dilapidated condition. A new terminal--either adjoining (and independent) of the present facility--or at the gravel pit area--seems logical. With adequate parking/waiting areas and a chance to exhibit some imaginative design solutions. P.S. Your Dec.16th presentation visually outstanding.</p>
<p><b>74</b> Mail</p>	<p>Dear Sirs/Madams, Thank you for accepting this written comment about terminal relocation and upgrades on the Keystone/Port Townsend run. My concerns/comments: Less frequent runs will interfere with jobs of the commuters that use and rely on this ferry run. Ferries that carry over twice as many cars will have to travel less often. Currently, slow season departures are every 90 minutes. Will runs remain as frequent with half the payload? Will it not be more expensive to totally relocate Keystone Terminal rather than simply move the breakwater to the South, widening Keystone Harbor? A breakwater could be built in a new location one or two years prior to the removal of the existing breakwater to allow an aquatic community to get established. Dredging of Keystone Harbor has been stated as a cost incentive to totally relocate. However, won't the migrating beach also fill any newly created harbor? I also note that in 13 years of commuting, there has been only one dredging event. The existing location, aside from already having parking, waiting, and even dining facilities established, is adjacent to a state park that allows people to recreate while waiting for departures. Other than beach walking, what is there in a new location for people to do while waiting? -- commuter since 1991 (contact info is on file via Bicycle pass program, and email earlier)</p>
<p><b>75</b> Mail</p>	<p>In regards to the hearings about the Keystone-Port Townsend ferry. In my opinion the state has no alternative other than moving the terminal out of the Keystone Harbor and relocating somewhere on the beach. Standardizing the ferries is a very feasible reason to make the system more cost effective. I am a member of the Whidbey Audubon Society, however I don't attend many meetings, and agree there will be a slight impact on the Environment. I have been on the Island since 1945 and have crossed the Keystone-Port Townsend many, many times as we have relatives on Crockett Lake out to the sound? I say move the Terminal! Whatever is done parking on both sides of the sound (Admiralty Inlet) is going to be an upcoming problem. However when you have to shut down because of Tides it only makes the problem worse. Thank you for Listening.</p>
<p><b>76</b></p>	<p>Will the change automatically create an increase in ferry fare? If not immediately, when will the increase occur?</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
<b>Mail</b>	
<b>77 Mail</b>	As residents of Whidbey Island, we frequently visit Crockett Lake and consider it a valuable asset for birding and natural beauty. We strongly urge that any ferry relocation not cause damage to the Lake and the nearby ponds and the water flow in and out of these natural preserves.
<b>78 Mail</b>	If deepening etc. of the ferry dock is required the Facility should stay within the "imprint" of the current facility.
<b>80 Mail</b>	Full speed ahead--we need new docks!
<b>81 Mail</b>	I support the desire to standardize the fleet. I am also concerned, though, about the environmental degradation of a new terminal. Please keep me informed. I am unable to attend.
<b>82 Mail</b>	After changing docks @ P.T. --cost \$150,000, trim the fat--Environmental impact/fish habitat imp.--Bigger isn't always better! We'll just be charged more to use the ferries. My income is fixed--EVERYTHING is MORE costly.
<b>83 Mail</b>	Why don't you give some financial information as to where the funds will be coming from? You may not know the amount but where is the source of the funds.
<b>84 Mail</b>	We need "modifications or other substantial changes in Keystone Harbor and Terminal."
<b>85 Mail</b>	I am in complete support of this project!
<b>86 Mail</b>	<p>1. I am a resident of South Whidbey Island and regularly use the ferry to Port Townsend for the purpose of shopping and recreation. I am a member of various environmental organizations but I am writing this letter in my personal capacity, with a copy to Whidbey Environmental Action Network. I am a management consultant with some background in transportation matters.</p> <p>2. As currently defined the scoping process violates SEPA rules. Specifically WAC 197-11-60. Section 3 (a) (iii) states "proposals should be described in ways that encourage considering and comparing alternatives. Agencies are encouraged to describe public or nonproject proposals in terms of objectives rather than preferred solutions." Instead WSF has already decided to replace the Steel Electric ferries with Issaquah 130 ferries on this route. It is this preferred solution that is driving the alleged need to construct either a larger harbor at Keystone or a new harbor altogether. There are two alternatives to this project which you are not considering, namely: (a) the renovation of two of the four Steel Electric boats and (b) the replacement of these boats by new ferries designed with the limitations of this route in mind. You need to consider these alternatives, which, prima facie, clearly have a lower or negligible environmental impact. Specifically, you need to suspend the current process entirely pending proper environmental review of the more fundamental decision on vessel replacement and service levels. Based on the information so far made available to the public, the basic economic rationale for the standardization of the ferry fleet appears to be questionable and seems to have more to do with the apparent short-term availability of capital than with the optimal long-term use of resources.</p> <p>3. You have included in the "Draft Keystone Alternative Screening Criteria" a number of different objectives, which have entirely different order of magnitude impacts without giving them appropriate weights. In the category "Purpose and Needs" you refer to criteria of an economic and service nature such as vessel size, operational reliability, distance from Port Townsend and so on. You are severely overstating the importance of operational reliability. Cancellations on this route have historically averaged 2% of the schedule, which, while higher than other routes in the WSF system, is nevertheless an extremely low absolute number by public transport standards. Moreover, the majority of the cancellations are due to tides and currents. These are predictable advertised in advance. Frequent travelers are aware of such limitations, which are, therefore, of minor inconvenience. Most of the other travelers are vacationers with inherently flexible schedules. Finally, cancellations are likely to amount of 0.75% of the service even with a new harbor. Thus the weight attached to this criteria needs to be lower than that attached to other criteria. You also draw attention to the need for improved vehicle ingress and egress without recognizing that WSF itself has contributed to this problem through its signage. The majority of ferry traffic is to and from Coupeville, Oak Harbor, and points north. The shortest route for these vehicles is to turn right at the Coupeville traffic light, but the signage takes them on down SR 20 on two sides of a triangle and then forces them to approach the Keystone terminal from a direction that makes for awkward ingress. Even for traffic from the south, there is an alternative, shorter and safer route that is not signed. Finally you have failed to identify service frequency as a screening criteria. Solutions that result in more frequent service are clearly desirable since they promote the use of the service. In fact it appears that you have selected the "Purpose and Need" criteria so as to wrongly bias the decision-making process against the alternative of "doing nothing" and against the option of upgrading the existing site, which again is likely to have a lower impact than new development elsewhere.</p> <p>4. You have failed to identify additional traffic holding areas as an "environment and community impact". Larger ferries require larger holding areas - in fact they require areas that are approximately twice the size of the current area. Moreover, if sites other than the current site are selected, the amount of paved land will be entirely incremental to existing development.</p> <p>5. You have failed to identify the need for a traffic study due to probable changes in the traffic patterns associated with different sites. As mentioned above knowledgeable travelers to and from North Whidbey avoid the section of SR 20 south of Coupeville by using a more direct route. This will not be feasible if you select the southernmost site you are considering. The standard of SR 20 between Coupeville and the official turnoff to Keystone is marginal. In particular</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>there are no cycle lanes. Increased traffic in this area raises public safety issues and may require the highway to be widened with consequent environmental impacts at an earlier date than will otherwise be the case.</p> <p>6. You have failed to identify light pollution as an environmental and community impact, particularly at the middle site proposed. This is immediately adjacent to a residential area. The lighting that is necessary for the operation of a ferry terminal and for the safety of waiting vehicles in the parking area will be visible from and intrusive to the residents of this area.</p> <p>7. You have failed to identify additional fuel consumption leading to greenhouse gas emissions as an environmental impact. Although the use of larger ferries will result in fewer trips (and therefore an less convenient schedule), the increased fuel consumption of these boats will more than offset the saving. Specifically, at present one boat makes 10 round trips per day or 3650 per yea. The second boat makes 5 round trips for about half a year (mid May to mid October), which is about 915 trips per year. Under the new proposal one boat will make 10 round trips per day year round. Thus the number of trips will decline by 20%. However the Issaquah 130 ferries are 5000 horsepower versus 2896 on the Steel Electric ferries (except Klickitat which is only 2400 horsepower). Approximately the average trip will use 60% more fuel on this basis.</p> <p>Please ensure that these comments are entered into the public record on this project and drawn to the attention of the relevant decision-makers.</p> <p>cc: Steve Erickson, WEAN</p>
<p><b>87</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I attended the Keystone-Port Townsend public "scoping" meeting at Coupeville on 12/16/03 and wish the following comments to be considered for the record: WSF is embarking on a ferry terminal improvement project that insists on the replacement of the current steel electric with the larger Issaquah 130 class vessels. Salmon fishing ground degradation, scenic area loss due to increased parking/road needs, near-shore marine habitat problems and the Crockett Lake (tide gate/bird estuary) problem, are all environmental dilemmas. However, there is another overriding environmental issue that I suggest puts Keystone in a special arena. This area is a part of the 17,000 acre Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve (a division of the National Parks System). This central Whidbey Island region was identified as a historically important region of this country and deserves special preservation consideration. This is not a place to enlarge and standardize to modern ferry vessels/terminals. Rather it is a place to preserve these beautiful older ferries just as the old (still working) farms and their buildings, the old forests and prairies, and even the town of Coupeville are part of this special effort to preserve an environmental link to history. The Keystone ferries, with their brass and hardwoods and wonderful old photographs, are a part of this and a special effort should be made to keep it so. Thank you.</p>
<p><b>88</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Dana: So far, just one question about the Keystone-PT terminal project and that has to do with surplusng the old steel electrics. Has the DOT looked at the best method of getting rid of the old ferries? What options have been discussed? What is the reasonable price for an old craft? What's the metal alone worth? I react to the Peninsula Daily News story which states, "When the old ferries serving the Port Townsend-Keystone route are retired in 2008, they could be placed on the online auction block." Has that decision been either made or considered? Also, did the MV Tyee go on eBay? and was WSDOT the seller? Thanks for your help.</p>
<p><b>90</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> All new ferry terminal at the old ferry landing of Keystone prd. - new Highway built north to connect to SR 20 that would do away with the (slow) speed trap at Ft. Casey State Park and the speed trap (slow) entering Coupeville Bypass SP College.</p> <p><i>q3</i> No all new larger ferry's that can be exchanged on the other ferry runs seems best to me.</p> <p><i>q4</i> The above is the best the community can adjust with (tour-bus small) or ls. Co. Transit.</p>
<p><b>92</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Lack of public input and transparency in making decisions about replacing steel electric ferries with I-130 class. What other alternatives were considered?</p> <p><i>q3</i> Are there alternatives to I-130 class which will fit existing terminal?</p> <p><i>q4</i> None of the criteria address the esthetic concern of destroying one of the remaining scenic public benches.</p> <p><i>q5</i> My wife and I bought that parcel of land to keep it undeveloped and to enhance it as habitat for Washington native plants and animals. Thus we have in interest in preventing industrial-like development of nearby properties. WE oppose construction of a new ferry terminal on one of the last pieces of undeveloped native shoreline on Puget Sound. As an older and experienced adult I have learned to view this type of public meeting with great cynicism. The important decisions have already been made without any public review or analysis, the choices we are given tonight are trivial compared to the big decisions already made, this hearing is held to check off a box on somebody's management flow sheet, nothing we say tonight will change the major shape of the project, the project presenters are all receiving fine salaries, get per diem or travel and meal allowances, have a staff of administrative assistants and lawyers at their beck and call and thus will easily outlast those citizens who pay all costs out of their pockets to attend these hearing. The big decision: was this: Unify the ferry fleet with super ferry class. Where are the data to support that decision? Was it just a whimsical decision on the part of a manager within the ferry system to make their job easier? Where is the analysis? Here are some of the costs involved in executing that decision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of new ferry terminal at Keystone</li> <li>2. Cost of super ferry versus a more appropriate sized ferry for smaller off peak service.</li> <li>3. Lifecycle cost of operating larger ferries versus smaller ferries. For example: wasting of precious fossil fuel running</li> </ol>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>a huge ferry for a few vehicles most of the year. The additional costs of cleaning larger floor areas, painting more surface areas, replacing more burned out lights, using more fuel to run more lights and services. The idea of a unified fleet may sound appealing for someone who wants to simplify their job, but where is the analysis of the lifetimes savings of such an idea. A subsidiary decision is that the Loss of service several times a year requires new terminal. Where are the numbers showing that this problem requires an expensive solution? It is a predictable problem and can be easily worked around.</p> <p>Summary. A friend involved in government planning summarized this type of hearing as follows. Someone for reasons that benefit them and without any real analysis has decided an appendage must be cut off. The engineering consulting firm has chosen either the hand or the foot as the most likely appendage and has prepared elaborate models losing hands and feet, cutting techniques, the relative amount of pain and blood lost, and the consequences of living without a hand or foot. Then we are consulted to help them choose which we want cut off.</p> <p>The decision to unify the ferry fleet which requires a new terminal has not undergone any rigorous cost analysis. The choice of which site to put a new terminal is both trivial and demeaning to the citizens at this meeting. Go back and do a proper analysis. That analysis will need to show huge benefits to the citizens of this state before we can allow a national treasure such as Keystone spit to be industrialized.</p>
<p><b>93</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> Farmland Reduction, Fish Runs, Wetlands, Wildlife, Beach Access, Weather/Storm Related Feasibility, Traffic Patterns, Effects on Economy (Tourism, etc), Cost (initial &amp; periodic)</p> <p><i>q3</i> Midway between the current location and the Keystone Hill Road (proposed) site, along the spit. This location would provide access toward the South and the North with equal availability, and would immediately expose passengers to the Crockett Lake Preserve and the wildlife. This might advance the causes of tourism and environmental</p> <p><i>q4</i> The criteria which effect the majority are of the utmost importance. Minority issues/groups which are affected must receive secondary attention.</p> <p><i>q5</i> We have seen, historically, that humans and their activity can disrupt biota and naturally occurring phenomena (deports, currents, etc.). We have also seen, historically that acute disruptions can correct trauma naturally, over time. A chronic abuse of the environment does not self correct as easily, therefore any activity must take that into account. A wetland will not reappear over asphalt. A fish run may not self restore. These permanent disruptions are the ones which concern me.</p>
<p><b>94</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> Building a terminal where the existing one is, utilizing the same design as was used at the Mukilteo terminal. Utilizing the existing dock--altering it is the most sensible approach, and change.</p> <p><i>q4</i> I don't understand what the criteria being used is. I will say that the parking along to accommodate the bigger boat would take up so much area of the existing area right at the beaches edge that it would ruin the central part of your plan.</p> <p><i>q5</i> If either of the two areas, central or EAST are implemented the ecosystem that exists throughout the Crockett Lake area to the beach of Admiralty Inlet would be changed forever. From the large birds of prey such as the Bald Eagles to the smallest of the rodents that many birds of prey feed on. As well as the fish and their predators, including the porpoise, seals, and orcas that pass through these waters. The traffic on highway 20 would forever disrupt the everyday lives of all that live in this area, including the human residents. Please note also that Admiralty Inlet is the only beach of its kind on Whidbey Island, where animals and people alike can and do share in the beauty and bounty.</p>
<p><b>95</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> Effect on the wildlife and shoreline of chosen areas. Effect of drainage of Crockett Lake for mosquito control</p>
<p><b>96</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> Environmental Impacts: (1) Shorebird and raptor habitat, Crockett Lake (2) Keystone marine Reserve (3) Salmon migration corridors (4) Return/maintain Crockett Lake as much like its historical estuarine ecology (5) Minimize paving over terrestrial surfaces, paving increases stormwater pollution runoff and eliminates habitat.</p> <p><i>q4</i> Currently the column under "Measure &amp; Rating Scale" lists mostly QUANTITY issues: "area," "proximity," "length,"... I'd like to see added QUALITY issues - type and extent and specifics of impact of this "area," "length," "proximity," etc.</p>
<p><b>97</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> Would like to make sure Crockett Lake can be drained in summer to prevent mosquito problem that occurred when lake wasn't drained.</p> <p><i>q5</i> We are happy that the ferries will be upgraded so that it will serve Whidbey and the peninsula more efficiently.</p>
<p><b>98</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> The impact on the community and homeowners in Telaker Shores and Admiral Cove area does not seem to be address at all. The ferry dock in the central location would be devastating to the views, noise levels, and property values.</p> <p><i>q5</i> Where would you park 130 cars at the central location option??? Can the current harbor be widened and dredged enough to handle the larger 130 car ferries?</p>
<p><b>99</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> Environmental Impact on entire Keystone Spit. Infrastructure will not handle impact of autos from "Central" site. Cars exiting present terminal are now directed in two directions.</p> <p><i>q3</i> The "Central" Site would not be acceptable to any local resident or environmental group. The "East" terminal</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>offers little or no impact any may be more desirable than the present location.</p> <p><i>q4</i> Parking lots &amp; drainage. Impact on wetlands and existing wildlife. Impact on Residents. Cost and feasibility of upgrading roads thru wetlands. Impact on Local residents would be overwhelming and un-acceptable at "Central" site.</p> <p><i>q5</i> If the existing location will not accommodate the larger ferries, the "East" location is the only logical and logistical location. The area of the "Central" site has been and will continue to be under water many time throughout a normal winter and spring and should be eliminated from consideration. The "East" side affords less impact environmentally, has much better and safer access to highways 525 &amp; 20 and has much less impact on local residents. Has the area at Greenbank (the Navy bombing range) been considered?</p>
<p><b>100</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q5</i> It is demeaning to have a "moderator" stand up before an intelligent and concerned constituent group and read "ground rules" designed for children--If this is the assessment of the intelligence, professionalism and appropriateness of the people assembled, it appears that you underestimate the group. I found the approach extremely offensive.</p>
<p><b>101</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Environmental issues and impact on the residents of the spit and Admirals Cove</p> <p><i>q3</i> Yes - however at this juncture the East proposal seems the most reasonable.</p> <p><i>q5</i> It seems very important to consider the practical and environmental impacts of enlarging the current site or building on your "Central" site. The central site is the worst alternative. The road in that area floods and the ponds often become one when the tides are right. The impact on the fishing beach, the wetlands would be devastating. The impact of enlarging the current dock would be devastating to the underwater ecology adjacent to the current site.</p>
<p><b>102</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Critical Environmental issue is Crockett Lake and continuing the annual lowering of the lake during the Spring and Summer to prevent the breeding of mosquitoes. If this is not done there could be an ecological disaster with West Nile virus possibly resulting in numerous deaths. I would like your environmental people to contact me personally on this issue and would be happy to provide them with information.</p> <p><i>q3</i> The 3 sites being considered appear OK. The most easterly of the 3 sites might be the best. It would have the least impact on fishing and probably the best water current situation. It also has short access to the main highway and plenty of parking area. Also less fog.</p> <p><i>q5</i> Has the idea of purchasing new boats of the same size been considered? What would they cost? They would have interchangeability with some boats that serve the San Juans. A better tide gate--new and improved--would be a welcome addition to any project.</p>
<p><b>103</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Impact to Crockett Lake - boat launch area.</p> <p><i>q5</i> I believe the best location for New Terminal will be at far east and end of spit. This will accommodate better ingress and egress for ongoing and offloading of cars coming form 525-20 Highway going North or South - and not funnel all the ferry traffic by schools using Engle Road.</p>
<p><b>104</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Greetings, I attended the 16 December presentation in Coupeville and have a request. It appears from the presentation that there are two main alternatives for ferry service at this point:</p> <p>[A] One new larger [Issaquah 130] ferry which needs new port facilities.</p> <p>[B] Two new smaller ferries which may require a small or no change to port facilities.</p> <p>I understand the motivation and driving forces for A, which gives a uniform ferry fleet. I would, however, strongly encourage you to spend some more time developing (or presenting your development of) option B. Further developing option B has several benefits.</p> <p>[a] it makes clear the financial case</p> <p>[b] construction &amp; development of new port facilities have environmental impacts, so that "due diligence" is demonstrated</p> <p>[c] public input I heard at the meeting suggested that a number of people are asking "why aren't you doing this [B]?", so I believe the issue will come up and not go away until it is addressed, so best to do it sooner. Thank you again for the early scoping presentation and your patience with a not always patient public.</p> <p><i>q2</i> - Fiscal &amp; Safety (Return on investment, alternatives analysis)</p> <p>- Loss of Service as measured by fewer ferries per day.</p> <p>(Larger ferry less often vs. smaller ferry more often)</p> <p><i>q3</i> The 3 sites discussed are sufficient.</p> <p><i>q4</i> - Relate financial impact to other choices. (What are the total costs W.R.T. each alternative)</p> <p>- Include development impact. (Increased desirability for development viewed negatively W.R.T. environment and tourism). East option will lessen traffic through main street of Coupeville. Loss of "casual" tourist business? How do/will you quantify this? (Is this covered under "business displacement?")</p> <p><i>q5</i> Thanks for doing this.</p>
<p><b>105</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q5</i> Add 98253 to mailing list - Central Whidbey</p>
<p><b>106</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q3</i> No.</p> <p><i>q5</i> Enlarge Original</p>
<p><b>107</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Sensitivity to the importance of the spit and adjoining wetlands for habitat and aesthetic consideration.</p> <p><i>q3</i> The issue of larger ferries should be considered much more as an alternative. Please present evidence that running larger ferries will be cheaper.</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p><i>q4</i> East seems to have less impact.  <i>q5</i> I am extremely concerned about impact on wetlands in the Central Alternative. No matter where the parking lot is placed the whole area will be impacted. Restoration is extremely difficult and should be an important consideration.</p>
<p><b>108</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Start at the beginning - feasibility of more maneuverable boats for this ferry run.  <i>q3</i> You have already opened a new site (#3) since publishing the "FINAL" "August 2003" Keystone Ferry Terminal Relocation Feasibility Study. I have no additions.  <i>q4</i> Please look at the most efficient way to move cars and people (lots of walk-ons on that run) NOT what makes the WSF systems a homogeneous unit. We live on a fragile island, not Seattle/Bremerton!</p>
<p><b>109</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Parking - traffic impact - Houses - Birds  <i>q3</i> No - nothing suitable.  <i>q4</i> Parking - not #2 Central or far right #3 choices - redo existing area - use larger parking from boat ramp area.  <i>q5</i> Consider improvements by using outside of existing space with rock seawall to cordon off existing water preserve for divers - use area where "Chicago" deck was. Keeps traffic the same - Does not impede views or property. Frees up old harbor for pleasure craft - marina possibilities for tourism - still a one stop destination for Ft. Casey.</p>
<p><b>110</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Please take into consideration not only parking for drive-on vehicles, but also for walk-on parking. This can be a huge impact during the summer months.</p>
<p><b>111</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Excess traffic on the island.  <i>q4</i> 1) Yes, move the existing terminal south.  2) Build three new 100 car ferries.  <i>q5</i> 1) Move terminal South of Keystone  2) Make Keystone a Marine Park for Divers  3) Build new 100 car ferries.</p>
<p><b>112</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Impact to Natural Elements  Impact to Local Residents  <i>q3</i> Yes - 2 - as presented. Any other site would be impractical.  <i>q4</i> Sound good to me--but the most southerly "new" terminal will increase crossing time by 10-15 minutes. More fuel; longer crossing time; fewer crossings. Sam comments apply to "Central" location minus a few minutes. * Main problem will surely evolve into where will you "hold" the waiting vehicles.</p>
<p><b>113</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I live on Whidbey and frequently take the ferry over to PT for the day. I wouldn't think of taking a car as the wait in Summer is sometimes three hours. In talking to people on the ferry I have found a lot of traffic is coming from up North. People want to get over to see the Olympics and PT on their way South. The reverse also seems to be true coming back from PT except here the people want to get North. I assume you folks know what percent of the total traffic falls into this category. I would guess that it is as high as 40% in the Summer. If this is true, then much of the congestion could be alleviated by running a ferry from Anacortes to PT during the Summer months. You might still need to update the PT side but that seems to be much less of a problem. During the Winter months the larger ferry boats might be used to reduce the commuter backup on the Clinton passage. You even have room to dock two boats at the Clinton terminal</p>
<p><b>114</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I would support a larger harbor and ferry as long as the natural beauty of the area was maintained. It is critical to this area to maintain a low impact, yet I realize we need to move ahead with the times and upgrade our service.</p>
<p><b>115</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Dear Mr. O'Brien, My name is Bill Zinck, and our family lives in south Bothell in unincorporated King County. We have lived in the area for 91/2 years, and our three children all attend Northshore schools. Six months ago, we purchased a second home near Camp Casey on Whidbey Island, and have spent the intervening time repairing and remodeling the house. The intent of this correspondence is to bring to your attention plans being submitted by the Washington State Ferry System to relocate the ferry terminal at Keystone on Whidbey Island. The ferry system is in the planning stages of moving the Keystone terminal out of Keystone Harbor, into Keystone Bay. The stated reason for this move is to accommodate ferries that are the same as the rest of the fleet, and to minimize the missed sailings that occur presently, primarily during the winter months. Upon examination, none of the grounds listed by WSF support their proposal to relocate the Keystone ferry. In fact, relocation would be a financial, ecological, logistical and public relations debacle. The estimated cost of moving the terminal is between \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000!!! Yes, over 50 million dollars to move a little used ferry terminal! Currently, two locations are being considered for this move, one directly next to the current location, known as the western terminus and one at the end of the park next to housing known as the eastern terminal. Two vessels both seventy-five years old currently run the route and need to be replaced. WSF contends major savings by standardizing the fleet. However, this route is unique due to its length and rough weather and does not fit current ferry models very well. I doubt that an Issaquah class vessel would be used due to the low ridership. Even so, amortized over seventy-five years for the ferry's life, the savings are miniscule compared to the cost of relocating the terminal. To move the ferry to the (seemingly preferred) eastern terminal, one of the last non-bulkhead wild parks will have to be paved! This park's shoreline is prime salmon ground for salmon returning to spawn due to the depth of the water and the rocky shore and tidelands. Any ferry relocation would cause massive disruptions to the salmon. This ferry terminal was moved to its existing location from the proposed eastern terminal in the 1940's due to too many missed sailings because of tides, current, fog and wind. Now, these are the exact same reasons WSF gives for relocation back to the old terminal location! According the WSF, newer boats apparently will resolve the difficulties of</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>the conditions; anyone familiar with this area and the location of the proposed western and eastern terminal has serious doubt about this.</p> <p>CONCLUSION Currently WSF is considering terminating all passengers ferries and possibly the San Juan Ferry Service and curtailing the runs of most car ferries as well as substantially raising fares. While there are financial reasons for these reductions, imagine the outcry when those stranded passengers learn WSF will spend \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000 to move the Keystone ferry (with it's miniscule ridership) one mile down the road to its old location to save a dubious seventy sailings a year. And, what about all the other state constituents, such as teachers, police, road and healthcare whose budgets are being slashed while WSF pursues this boondoggle It is understandable that you have not had time to fully evaluate WSF's claims or to review the initial feasibility report (commissioned and paid for by WSF). But I think a more thorough examination of relocating Keystone ferry will lead you to the same conclusion that this is not a rational strategy let alone a prudent course of action. I hope that you will conclude as I have that the WSF should not waste the \$5,000,000 for an environmental impact statement. It is a bad idea financially, environmentally, logistically and politically to relocate the Keystone ferry terminal.</p>
<p><b>116</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p>We attended the Dec. 16th meeting in Coupeville, WA (A very well run meeting) 1. We use the Keystone Ferry for Recreation &amp; Tourism/visitors, etc. 2. I am concerned that the Crockett Lake be maintained as the important environmental and bird habitat that it currently is. 3. No comment 4. No comment 5. I can understand the need for a more efficient/bigger ferry and one that can be used elsewhere as needed. 6. We learned of meeting by the Mailer - and the local newspaper. We would like to receive project information via e-mail.</p>
<p><b>117</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I am the president of the Bay Vista II Condominium Association at 1633 Water Street, #8, Port Townsend 98368. I attended the recent public meeting in Port Townsend held in the Pope Marine Building on 12/17. There are eleven families in our building and ten in the next door condominium building. We also have a substantial motel business and a busy restaurant in our two block long neighborhood just southwest of the current Port Townsend terminal. My husband and I have owned our unit for over two years and have become familiar with problems associated with the ferry traffic at our front door. I believe the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic must be controlled in front of our property so that the "hatched" areas indicating, "no stopping, no standing, do not block, etc." are truly effectively and safely enforced for our residents to enter and leave traffic in a timely manner. We have had many problems, including dangerous near misses, during peak ferry traffic periods in which there have been instances when the drives are blocked or sight distances reduced by traffic "crowding" the drives. Current signage is frequently ignored. On occasion we have had to call the police or attempt to dissuade violators ourselves. We should not have to suffer these conditions.</li> <li>2. There is insufficient attention paid to litter control, illegal alcohol consumption and sanitation in the immediate area of our residences. We are sometimes forced to pick up unsightly, unsanitary litter from our private property next to the highway waiting area. Our garbage dumpsters are used illegally. We have observed people in the ferry line drinking in their vehicles and exiting their cars to relieve themselves on our private property. We should not be faced with these problems.</li> <li>3. The increased capacity of the proposed new ferries and terminals will intensify the above problems. We request the DOT to plan very carefully for the prompt, efficient transit of vehicles from the holding area(s) to the dock. We ask that NO traffic be left parked between sailings on the two blocks mentioned above, (Water Street immediately southwest of the Bay View restaurant.) We ask also that there be strict enforcement of all laws and regulations, including citations, to completely alleviate the problems described in 1 and 2 above.</li> <li>4. There should be a "boarding chit required" and ticket pre-sale system established whereby the backed up ferry traffic is impounded in the Port Townsend Park and Ride and/or behind the Lighthouse Mall and released in a manner to keep Water Street free of parked ferry traffic between sailings. At such times as the "chit" system is in effect, the ticket booths on the dock should be used to receive the "chits" and pre-paid tickets and for information and other walk-up service only, i.e. walk-on passenger tickets. No chit, no dock access while the system is in use. This would include commuter book users, too.</li> <li>5. Sanitation facilities and litter bins should be provided at the holding locations with adequate notice that there are no other facilities until the dock! Per 3 above, traffic should never be held on Water Street longer than the minimum amount of time required for it to pass from the above mentioned holding areas to the terminal holding area; it should never remain parked on Water Street between sailings except in the first block immediately next to the terminal.</li> </ol>
<p><b>118</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>I want to thank Washington State Ferries for holding the scoping meeting on the changes to the Keystone Ferry Terminal on 16 December 2003. The information was well presented, the discussion was useful, and I am now beginning to think that many of the suggested changes will be beneficial. I will address 3 topics. The effects on fishing and the birds will be seen as definitely "environmental". The third, "human environmental effect", was not mentioned at the meeting, but I feel it is at least as important as the other two.</p> <p>Birds: Crockett Lake is a very important migratory bird resting spot during the late summer and fall. Birds returning from the arctic, especially the birds hatched that summer, need rest and refueling places on their journey south. Crockett Lake provides that function for thousands and thousands of birds. Appropriate lake water level and lack of disturbance are both critical for those functions.</p> <p>Salmon Fishing. There is a counterclockwise current in Admiralty Inlet. This brings many salmon close to the beach all along "Feasible" ferry dock sites. At certain times of the year the shoreline here is lined shoulder to shoulder with</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>fishermen, and most of them fill their limits quickly. The present "Keystone" does not disrupt this near shore circulation appreciably. But a new ferry dock at either location B or C will extend way out in the water. This will probably disturb the near shore current and drive the salmon out away from shore and away from the fisher folk.</p> <p>Human Environmental Effects. I feel you must look at the effects of vehicle flow to and around the ferry terminal (I hope I can express myself effectively - please bear with me and consult maps if necessary.) The main transportation axis on Whidbey Island is State Highways 20 and 525. The easiest and quickest way to the Keystone Ferry Terminal from this central axis is down South Main Street in Coupeville and across the Casey Conference Center ("Camp Casey") property to the tollbooths. But this route goes past 3 schools and through 2 small commercial areas in Coupeville. It then goes across the grounds of Camp Casey, where up to 500 children are attending soccer camp at any one time during the summer. The Town of Coupeville found this unacceptable and persuaded WSDOT to create a spur of Highway 20 to the ferry from the Highway 525 - Wannamaker Road - Race Road junction. This greatly increases the distance from Highway 20 to the ferry. And the vehicles cannot turn left to the tollbooths. They must go north through Camp Casey for a mile or more, go around a loop, return south through Camp Casey once again, and enter the tollbooths. It doesn't take a genius to figure out that this is a lot of extra driving. On the second and all succeeding trips the trucker, camper, or commuter ignores the signs and drives down South Main Street in Coupeville, through the commercial areas and past 3 schools to the ferry. Something must be done to improve this human environment and protect the children of Coupeville and Camp Casey from this vehicle stream. Option B would improve the situation; Option C would probably solve it completely. Thank you for considering my remarks and I look forward to the next public comment period a year from now.</p>
<p><b>119</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p>(Court Reporter Comment from Port Townsend Scoping Meeting) I would like to see it done. I've read quite a bit on it. I would like to see a better ferry service and less cancellations. Is there anything they can do about running extra runs at night when there are so many people that can't get home? There was one Sunday I remember, maybe more, but I think for the 8:30, they were sold out at 5:00, and a lot of people had to just sleep overnight in their cars. That's pretty discouraging. My wife started a gift shop here so we're interested in better service, more people. I would rather do the thing now than to spend whatever part of that money that's wasted, because they're going to have to do it anyway. I guess that's all I have to say.</p>
<p><b>120</b> Mail</p>	<p>We have no preference for relocation. Our main concern is the maintenance of the existing harbor so that it does not silt in. In 1990-91 Crockett Lake was kept at full level and mosquitoes were counted in the billions (this should be on record). At that time West Nile Virus was not a problem; however it is now and we will oppose anything that allows this possibility to occur by the silting in of the harbor. We believe a marine park is a good use of existing harbor.</p>
<p><b>121</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Try to address current problems with system when you plan for expansion, these problems include - (1) separate waiting areas, (2) Extra police help. <i>q4</i> Recommend dock extension. Also recommend maintaining Rotary Park and US Bank drop off- parking area (West of Bank) Possible purchase of Indian Point for public property as mitigation would be a real benefit.</p>
<p><b>122</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> - Eelgrass in vicinity re: terminal expansion/extension - Tourist traffic volume vs. resident/business/commuter volume - Weighing boat capacity against frequency of runs for efficiency &amp; convenience @ BOTH peak season &amp; "off" season.</p>
<p><b>123</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Site Relocation common sense. Form &amp; Function. <i>q4</i> First of all, thank you for asking. Confusing question. Go for the least impact - feel - most effective chance.</p>
<p><b>124</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Parking for vehicles in "holding" on the Port Townsend side.</p>
<p><b>127</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p>Attached, please find a copies of the Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce letters regarding the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project. We understand receipt of the letters today, via email, will ensure their inclusion as part of the official scoping process. We will mail copies as well. If there are any questions regarding our letters, please contact us at your convenience. <i>q2</i> Port Townsend Terminal: 1) Possibility of Queing all vehicles closer to the downtown historic business district. 2) Allow parked vehicles to remain until scheduled to board, eliminating the need for vehicle owners to return and move up vehicles from ferry loading they won't make. <i>q4</i> This is considered a "tourism" route. The tourism industry should be identified as a specific criteria. <i>q5</i> Keystone: 1) Provide facilities for day-use and overnight parking for customers wishing to walk-on and visit Port Townsend &amp; East Jefferson County (The Olympic Peninsula!) on foot. 2) Provide visitor information services to assist and encourage day-use &amp; overnight customers wishing to visit Port Townsend &amp; East Jefferson County &amp; the Olympic Peninsula.</p>
<p><b>128</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Ensure the Port Townsend Terminal is repaired and restored to handle any size WSF Ferry prior to the May-June, 2006 Hood Canal Bridge closure. This will allow for the possibility of an auto ferry (Edmonds-Port Townsend) mitigation. Same as the 1980's mitigation.</p>
<p><b>129</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> 1. Reliability - deal with # of cancelled ferry runs - predictability is more important than frequency! 2. (Holding Capacity) provide additional space for waiting vehicles in summer. 3. Protection of the environment - make sure that SEPA/NEPA process is transparent 4. Impact to local roadways.</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>5. Positive impacts of these improvements on the local economy.</p> <p><i>q4</i> See above. I always think it is important to try to anticipate unintended consequences of each alternative in each category environmental, transportation, economy, etc.</p> <p><i>q5</i> Will you survey regular ferry users? Seems like that would be a very important way to get info from frequent users. It would be fabulous to get this proposal in place before the closure of the Hood Canal Bridge. Try to get ferry arrival time changed from 5PM to 4:45 or 5:15.</p>
<p><b>130</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Keep the steel electric ferries Renovate the steel electric ferries Do not build expensive new ferries.</p> <p><i>q4</i> Interference with vessel traffic to and from Boat Haven, which is to be doubled in size. Interference with traffic downtown, no possibility of holding areas.</p> <p><i>q5</i> Double the runs, to 45 minutes intervals. Do not use huge Issaquah 130 size ferries - they are incompatible with the Port Townsend vessel traffic, downtown traffic. We do not need reduced service! WE need runs at 45-minute intervals. You will not do that with 130 class ferries. You will fill downtown PT with cars waiting for the ferry.</p>
<p><b>131</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Parking/Waiting area on the Port Townsend size: current overflow holding area is a bit of a hassle from the standpoint of business access. Also, is it feasible to eliminate or modify the current tally slip procedure to make it more user friendly?</p> <p><i>q4</i> - We often walk on the ferry from Port Townsend to spend time at Fort Casey. Thus, it would be preferable for us to keep the terminal in its current location in the Keystone Harbor. - We'd like to see travel time minimized (I.e. West Whidbey location)</p> <p><i>q5</i> If the central or east terminal location was selected, would the current terminal area be reclaimed and returned to a natural condition? We'll miss the character of the old boats!</p>
<p><b>132</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p>Thank you for allowing this opportunity for comment on the proposed scoping for the Keystone-Port Townsend ferry terminal improvement project. The City Port Townsend's interests generally are limited to the Port Townsend Terminal and the potential impacts that would most likely occur with a new vessel as proposed. Of greatest concern is the need for additional ferry holding that a larger vessel would require. This issue was recently discussed in connection with the Hood Canal Bridge mitigation planning. Several alternatives were evaluated in an attempt to provide for mitigation of the bridge closure. One such alternative included increasing the level of ferry services to Port Townsend. The impacts identified in this alternative are similar to the impacts we would expect to see in the current planned action. Traffic management and the related mitigation of traffic impacts would result in at least two key shoreline issues: the ferry traffic management plan and its related capital improvements; and shoreline impacts relating to terminal expansion and traffic mitigation. The City would like to explore these issues in greater detail and hopes that information gathered from these events will help you prepare an appropriate plan of action to address this critical public transportation service. CC: Port Townsend City Council, Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Kristen Anderson, Police Chief</p>
<p><b>134</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p>(Given to Court Reporter 12/16/03) My thought is since - since this whole thing is precipitated on the thought process behind standardizing the ferry system, I think maybe they out to rethink that and allow these ferries, since we've had them in the works so long, that they really have done a good job, these smaller ferries have done a good job for us here and they should be allowed to stay. That's my only thought. I just think that their process in the beginning maybe is a little flawed and in rethinking it maybe might bring it back into reality. That's all. All right. You just listen? Is that what you do?</p>
<p><b>135</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p>(Given to Court Reporter, 12/16/03) Anyway, I'm concerned. I'm a Whidbey Island resident. Ex-Department-of-Fish-and-Wildlife employee. Retired. And I'm concerned primarily with the fish in the area that they're talking about building some of the new sites. The west side of Whidbey Island from Partridge Point to below Bush Point is an area of near-shore migration of salmon into Puget Sound streams. A large percentage of these fish use the area inside the kelp line in water depths of one to 50 feet to migrate. This can be observed by seeing fish jump during their migration and watching the success of shore fishermen at that time. This starts with the Chinook salmon in July followed by pink salmon, Coho salmon, chum salmon, and winter steelhead ending in January. There are major numbers of migrating adult fish passing the west shore in all of the above months. Most of the fish use this near-shore area. I am uncertain about sockeye salmon as they do not jump and are not susceptible to shore fishery. All of these fish would be affected by the building of any pier, dock or harbor built in the areas proposed. Some of these fish are on the endangered or threatened species list. The effect of the disruption of their migration patterns can only be made presumptuously. Would the fish mill and become confused? Would they move to deeper water? Or move to the other side, Marestone Island side is unknown. Construction of a widened Keystone Harbor would destroy an underwater park that divers from many areas come to see octopus, eels, and other underwater creatures. Construction there would also destroy and put out of operation the only year-round boat launch on the west side of Whidbey Island. This launch was recently completed at a cost of over \$600,000 and it is used by businesses in Coupeville with income from gasoline, food, motel, and grocery sales. Construction near the Driftwood County Park would eliminate one of the most productive and easily accessible shore fishing areas on Whidbey Island. This area is also one of the areas with free access and is also capable of being used by handicapped and disabled persons. The Lake Hancock area is also a major near-shore migration area and has environmental problems such as wetlands and major loss of habitat for birds. That's about all. I should have said there, too, I'm not speaking as an employee of the Department, only as a private citizen.</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
136 Public Meeting	(Given to Court Reporter, 12/16/03) Ray Deardorf stated that there will be a separate SEPA process replacing the current ferries. However, the driving force and assumption behind the terminal relocation is that these boats will be the Issaquah 130 Class. Because there has been no environmental review of this decision, the scope of alternatives is being improperly limited; it must also include new shallow-draft and small boats.
137 Public Meeting	(Given to Court Reporter, 12/16/03) But I talked to numerous people before the meeting started and, like me and my husband, they fish off this shore along there. And this middle one or the-- It would be south one would disrupt the fishing. This is the only place because the flow of water, the fish follow the shoreline quite closely. If they put a structure out, it's going to change the fish movement. But it's the only place really that's accessible with parking for people. Like I can take my grandchildren down there to fish. I have only little friend that's got a bad knee; she can't walk too far. Everything else-- Just about everything else is private land or too hard for people to navigate, older people, people that aren't quite firm. And I find it very upsetting. They take up the parking. They disrupt the fish flow. There's thousands of people. Have you ever seen that in the summertime down there? The people will be that close together sometimes (indicating). And just having families, you know, just having a wonderful time. So I'm really concerned. I say widen-- And my husband agrees -- widen the existing. And this is what these other fishermen I was talking to said. And I can't imagine except these-- Now, basically, it was men I talked to. Too afraid to speak up or something. My husband won't let me speak up. That's why I run around the corner and talk to you. He's always shushing me, "Don't make waves."
138 E-Mail	The length of the run is indeed a problem. An extra 20 miles I would judge -- maybe even 30 miles. Actually it is difficult to say without looking at the distance through moving water, which is different than distance over land. At ferry speeds this could add as much as 50 minutes to the trip. But an Auto trip from the turn off towards Whidbey down to the ferry from Route 20 is also about 45 minutes. So a trip from Anacortes would add perhaps a half hour to the travel time for cars assuming that it takes about 30 minutes from the turn off to get to the terminal on Anacortes. You would have to charge more and under ideal conditions (i.e. no waiting) traffic would tend to follow the current route if time is the only consideration. However, tourists may find it more attractive to go through Anacortes for other reasons. I will give this some more thought. As for the treacherous waters, my suggestion is only designed to be applied in the Summer months so this might not be a problem. Thanks for considering my suggestion.
139 E-Mail	Many thanks, Celia. I'll look forward to reading it. Sorry I had to miss the meetings in Keystone and Port Townsend.
141 E-Mail	Thank you so much! That is indeed great news for the Ebey's Landing Historic Reserve!
142 E-Mail	I am a resident of Telaker Shores and am writing in strong opposition of the Central Option for relocation of the ferry. We have three young children (18 mos., 3, and 5) and specifically chose Telaker Shores as a safe, quiet, peaceful community where our children could grow up in an environment free of traffic, noise, and environmental pollution. The relocation of the ferry adjacent to our community will completely change that environment bringing the traffic, noise, lights, and environmental pollution, etc, we tried so hard to avoid. Little enjoyments we took for granted such as kids safely riding their bikes, or playing in a safe, peaceful community will disappear with the placement of a ferry terminal essentially right in the neighborhood. Additionally, as an avid fisherman, and as the many fishermen who line up on the public beach each year know, the yearly salmon runs come into Admiralty Bay and run along the beach line. I believe future salmon runs along the beach will be seriously affected by building a new terminal at the midpoint of the bay (which is the center of the salmon's run along the beach), as well as disruption to the other sea life (seals, porpoises, resident fish, etc) our community has enjoyed watching. The current ferry location provides the least disruption to the area. There is little if any residential housing in the area, it does not add to further environmental decay or chaos, does not affect the safety of resident children, or current salmon runs and sea life. Finally, every person who has settled in this area chose the area believing the ferry would remain in its current location, all infrastructure and development then followed based on that premise. Changing all that now will no doubt change the peaceful and safe environment the residents of the bay have come to enjoy. Thank you for taking the time to consider the above thoughts and please contact me if I can answer any questions.
143 E-Mail	I am writing concerning the proposal to investigate relocating the Keystone ferry to the intersection of Highway 20 and Keystone Avenue. I feel that relocating a ferry terminal to a residential community and to the middle of a wildlife sanctuary is contrary with the areas current use and would have a negative effect. Currently the ferry is located next to a University owned lake and public state park, which fits into the in a public access environment. By transferring the terminal to Keystone avenue the commercial activity of the ferry and supporting businesses would be in opposition to the residential nature of the existing community and the. I am not sure why the state would want to start having to balance the conflicting interests of commerce, wildlife, and residents. This seems to me a recipe for political, legal and economic conflict, thus I would be in strong favor of keeping the keystone ferry at its current location.
144 E-Mail	I am a family member of people who live on Keystone. I am OPPOSED to moving the ferry terminal. My parents chose to retire on Whidbey and have renovated the little cabin that was originally there. They should not be forced to move when they went through a lot to get beach-front property to retire on. The ferry is fine where it is. Please rethink your position. Thanks you.
147 E-Mail	My family and I live on Whidbey Island in sight of and within 4 miles of the Keystone ferry landing. We take the ferry to Pt. Townsend regularly for shopping trips and for recreation. We love Whidbey Island, its scenic beauty and rural

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>character.            Personally I look with dismay at replacing the existing steel electric boats with the Issaquah class ferries, because the Keystone - Port Townsend ferry is the only fun adventure ferry run in your system. Bigger ferry boats on this run are not going to improve anything. Trips will take longer as loading and waiting will be longer. The cost of improving the existing harbor and terminal or building new terminals will be very expensive. You should build a set of new ferry boats the size of the steel electric boats.            If you can't build a smaller vessel, than the existing harbor and terminal should be modified to handle the larger ferries. Keeping the existing ferry terminal in its present location allows for our enjoyment of the long spit between Admiralty Bay and Crockett Lake. We love its scenic beauty, open space and recreation (bike riding, wave watching, picnics and solitude).            Creating a new terminal in what you call the "Central" location would be a bad idea because it would have a strong negative impact on the existing open space and create an additional snarl at that location where one does not exist now. In addition, it would negatively impact the residents who live near there in Admiral's Cove. Also, destroying the existing terminal and its infrastructure costs a lot of money too.            Creating a new terminal in what you call the "East" location would be a bad idea because of the expense of new access, negatively impacting property values of residents, creating an eyesore, disturbing the rural character of the area, while destroying the existing terminal and it's infrastructure. Please keep me informed on project information by e-mail.</p>
<p><b>148</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>We would like to see the project go forward and improve the route safety &amp; efficiency. It is time to put the people before the critters. The route will be put to the test with increasing time and people pressure. let us make sure it will withstand the test.</p>
<p><b>149</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I am opposed to spending any funds for this project because several other issues have a much higher priority to ferry riders and citizens.            (1) The current practice of increasing fares and reducing service must be stopped. You need to build or rebuild good positive relations with the public. This practice only makes them angry.            (2) You need to address the long ferry lines that gather at many ferry terminals, especially during the summer months, as a much higher priority than the Keystone "Improvements." A third vessel should be assigned to the Edmonds-Kingston, Clinton, and Winslow runs during the summer as the top priority. Another vessel should work in the San Juan Islands, especially on weekends during the summer.            (3) The Steel Electric vessels currently assigned to the Keystone Run and in the San Juan Islands are doing a good job and should not be retired. Keep them! I have never had a problem when using the Keystone Ferry although the second ferry should operate more frequently during the summer and run longer into the fall.            (4) Use any new ferry construction to solve the problems listed in (1) and (2) above, and not to retire the steel electric class vessels.            (5) You would plan to spend millions of dollars on the Keystone project, and you can't even keep the galleys open. This does not make good sense.            (6) Several citizens have expressed important environmental concerns about this project. These concerns need to be addressed and are likely another good reason to stop the proposed project. Thank you!</p>
<p><b>150</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I am writing in regards to the proposed changes to the Keystone side of the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry route. As a scuba diver, I would like the committee studying alternatives to make sure they consider the recreational needs of scuba divers who frequent Keystone Jetty. The Jetty is considered one of the best scuba diving locations in the Puget sound region, and is a site that can accommodate all ranges of skill levels, from beginner to advanced. Go any day of the week, and you will most likely see many scuba divers getting ready to go into the water. Losing or altering the jetty would not only disrupt the multiple species who call that jetty home, but would also remove a valuable recreational site. Based on the alternatives for a new terminal currently listed on the WSDOT website, I would prefer to see a new terminal built away from the current scuba diving site. Building a new terminal would seem to benefit multiple parties as the ferry system would be able to improve service, and scuba divers can keep our recreational site.</p>
<p><b>151</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Environment  <i>q3</i> Please consider the "Farm": Economically and environmentally it makes good sense! (Lea Farm)  <i>q4</i> I agree with the Criteria as explained at the Coupeville Meeting of 12/16/03  <i>q5</i> To tear up the Keystone Spit would be a travesty!</p>
<p><b>153</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> safety, reliability, minimal environmental impact, adequate parking and holding area. Generous parking for walk-ons.  <i>q3</i> The new East option makes the most sense  <i>q4</i> The criteria should include an improved service schedule: I.e. A later boat so Whidbey Islanders can have dinner or see a movie in Pt Townsend and return home after 8:30 PM.  <i>q5</i> The central option is terrible. If you refuse to consider smaller boats, the existing option is flawed. The east option is best. If this is chosen, the tide gates at the existing terminal must be maintained to protect Crockett Lake. The east option will require a traffic light on SR 525 and new turn lanes.</p>
<p><b>154</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>As one of the very first people to build a house on Telaker Shores in 1960, I am alarmed and dismayed that there is the possibility that the Keystone Ferry dock might be moved to a location adjacent to our Association's land. My wife, children and I built our house with our own hands, in order to enjoy the beach, wildlife, fishing and, most importantly</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>blissful peace of this beautiful location. Since that time, my two daughters have taken over the original house and I have built a new home on the beach. Although, inevitably, more houses are being built on Telaker Shores, the place has managed to keep its charm and tranquility. We have already lost a great deal of value on the two back lots we possess, (approximately \$200,000.00), due to the passing of the Wetlands and Migratory Birds Act. My children and I have enjoyed this area for 44 years, picking agates off the beach, enjoying the spectacular views, walking our pets, sunbathing and generally restoring our flagging energies for the trials of a busy professional life. We built our house with a view to retiring on Telaker Shores in a year or so. If the ferry dock were to be moved to the end of our beach, we would definitely reconsider this possibility. We know that the streets would become busier and unsafe for our grandchildren. The wildlife would be severely impacted. (We have been watching with great interest, the successful breeding of the endangered great Northern harrier in the wetlands behind our house.) Also, the ferries' foghorns would add to the already, albeit necessary, noise nuisance of the touch-and-go jets which fly directly overhead at all hours, day and night. Please don't let our dreams and those of our children be shattered by what I consider to be an ill-advised decision. I thank you for considering this appeal.</p>
<p><b>155</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I am a resident of Telaker Shores in strong opposition of the Eastern Terminal just north of Telaker Shores. As a mother of 3 small children the concern of traffic is tremendous. In my previous life I was a construction manager overseeing development of waterfront highrises in downtown Seattle, I understand the feasibility studies, environmental studies &amp; legal battles that would be involved. These are all issues I am sure you are aware of, however, they concern the neighborhood as this is the reason we selected this location.</p> <p>1) ENVIRONMENTAL / LEGAL Impacting the major salmon run will trigger the Endangered Species Act. This location will also impact the Federal Migratory Bird Reserve. I saw gorgeous cranes this morning right on the lake where you plan to develop. The sacred Driftwood Park that is part of Ebey's Landing will certainly be impacted. Constructing a dominant commercial property in the center of the ring of driftwood will increase the fire issues. One small cigarette could ignite our entire 10 mile stretch of beach. Our private community has strict rules with fire around the driftwood and I do not foresee the public understanding that. This location does not have a full-time adequate fire department as it is and this project would need to increase the amount of resources to combat this issue. The fire department would need to be fully involved, would require additional building requirements and Whidbey Island's fire department needs a full time location closer to this site. The current location is definitely preferred because it is outside the driftwood.</p> <p>2) TRIBAL ISSUES The tribes would need to be contacted and negotiated with during this project. In my experience the tribes require full time archeologists during the excavation. The archeologists are expensive, can cause delays and many unforeseen conditions.</p> <p>3) NEIGHBORHOOD IMPACT The neighbors will be severely impacted. The noise throughout the day &amp; night will be significant, we will no longer see the night sky, the safety of our children to learn to ride their bikes will be gone, the traffic will be increased, the lakes where our children are learning to canoe and fish will be destroyed. Quite a few neighbors run and walk every morning through Driftwood Beach which will be impacted. Hundreds of Whidbey fisherman that line that beach for four months of the year will have no fish. We watch seals, sea lion, porpoises, birds, salmon, eagles, etc. from our windows. Our wildlife will be severely impacted. This is not good for Whidbey Island, for Coupeville, for Ebey's Landing and certainly not for Telaker Shores and Admiralty Cove residents. Typically I support development projects that further a community. In this case, I believe that it would severely impact our island and it is absolutely not cost effective to spend \$75 million. I drove by the ferry this morning and only saw 10 cars in line as the ferry pulled up to the dock. There is not the demand for this project 9 months of the year.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider these thoughts. Please feel free to contact me if you have any question.</p>
<p><b>156</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I am 10 years old and my family has a cabin on Whidbey Island. I like to fish, ride bikes and scooter on our street. I also like rowing on the pond near Driftwood Park that we have named Cheerio Lake. The little pond next to it we have named Lost Oar Lake (I bet you can guess why). I like it because it is very quiet and safe. It is also fun playing catch out on the road which we won't be able to do if the ferry is moved. I caught my first salmon this year off the beach and I helped other people land their fish. I was the net holder and one time I waded in and my shorts even got wet. Last summer there were people fishing shoulder to shoulder as far as you could see. I could tell when it was time to fish because you can see the salmon jumping. One time while we were fishing we saw a sea otter looking for fish too. My Granny and Grand Dad came from England and my Grand Dad got up at 6 o'clock every morning just to fish. One time my sisters and I made a bench out of driftwood so everybody could see the view. We also made a structure out of things we found all the way along the beach. If the ferry moved right next to us, I really wouldn't like that. It would block our view of the mountains and it would bring lots of people. There would be cars on our road and it would be very dangerous to ride bikes or scooters or walk along the street. We also would lose lots of our wildlife, like the bald eagles, hawks and fish. Another reason that I wouldn't like the ferry to be moved is that the two ponds might be filled in and Driftwood Park might be destroyed. I like to play in Driftwood Park and feed the ducks on Cheerio Lake and Lost Oar Lake. Thank you for reading my letter. Please do not move the ferry where we like to play and have fun.</p>
<p><b>157</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Last May my parents bought a cabin on Whidbey Island near Driftwood Park. That summer I had so much fun doing so many activities. If the ferry were to move to Driftwood Park, it would be so close to our cabin going up to Whidbey would no longer be any fun and it wouldn't safe. This summer my friends, family and I had so much fun. We would scooter and ride our bikes along the long flat road goofing off and making up fun games like whoever can go along the most yellow lines in the middle of the road. If the ferry were to be put in driftwood park there would be so much traffic it would</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

<b>Comment No. / Source *</b>	<b>Comment Text</b>
	<p>be hard to ride our bikes at all let alone in the middle of the road. Another fun activity that my friend Lauren and I did was we blew up a raft and we went out on the two small lakes right by Driftwood Park. On the lake closest to the park we would always eat cheerios and take turns sunbathing while the other person rowed. Once on the other lake we were both rowing and one of the oars fell in and before we could catch it, it sank to the bottom. So finally we decided to call those two lakes Cheerio Lake and Lost Oar Lake and so every time we drive to our cabin and pass the lakes we always say "look there's Cheerio Lake and Lost Oar Lake." If the ferry were to move into Driftwood Park then what would happen to the fish in the lakes and what would happen to Cheerio Lake and Lost Oar Lake? Would Lauren and I just have to walk two miles with a fifty pound boat on our backs to Crockett Lake? That would be no fun. In Cheerio Lake and Lost Oar Lake my brother, sister and I would go to the shore and catch little tiny minnows. We would keep those minnows for the time we stayed and at the end of our trip we would let them go and hope to see them the next time we came. Well... my siblings and I we would never get to see those tiny little minnows again if the ferry were there. Also I don't know if you have ever been to the spot where we have a cabin but WOW it has such a great view of the beautiful Olympics and the sunsets are so pretty with all of the reflections on the water, I love to sit outside and listen to the peace and quiet!! I really don't want to be looking out at a huge ferry boat and an ugly dock!! YUCK! And what about the silence that I wake up to every morning? Instead, if the ferry were there I would hear noises all night long of boat horns, cars, car horns and it would not be easy to even be outside. This summer I caught a big salmon right off of the beach and it tasted great!!! If the ferry were to move there then the fish may not run though the ocean right in front of our cabin and I would not ever get the fun experience of having a fish on my line again. The ferry would probably scare off the fish. Last summer was so much fun and I am still having fun until this very day. Why doesn't the ferry service just keep the spot where the ferry is now and not bug any body? I think it would be best if you can't keep the ferry where it is then move it to the other possibility and not ruin all of our fun and our hopes of growing up having a beautiful, safe, quiet and enjoyable cabin. Thank you.</p>
<p><b>158 E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I am writing to express my fervent opposition to the possible relocation of the Keystone Ferry to the central option #2 (Driftwood Park). Please consider the following comments when making your final decision. We purchased what we thought was our future retirement cabin along Keystone Avenue this past May. It is located three houses down from the "central" option that is being considered as a possible site for the ferry location. From my perspective and for many reasons this is an unacceptable choice. Firstly, from a quality of life standpoint. When we purchased the cabin we envisioned spending many summers before retirement and many years of our retirement in a natural and peaceful spot. If we had known that we would be staring at a ferry terminal instead of the Olympic Mountains or hearing ferry horns and heavy traffic instead of the sound of birds or of silence, we would never have considered purchasing this piece of property. We were attracted to this particular land because of the natural beach (no manmade bulkhead), the wonderful views, the wildlife, and the peace and quiet. Our children are free to run or to ride their bicycles in the street without fear of constant traffic, to feed the numerous ducks, to row inflatable rafts on the two potholes ponds by the park, or to play on the quiet beach without fear of "strangers" trespassing on our property which the ferry would inevitably bring. At the moment we greatly look forward to both coming up to Whidbey Island to relax on weekends and holidays and to envision ourselves in retirement enjoying the cabin - having a ferry that close to us would squelch all desire to spend any time at all in that location. The very reasons we purchased the property will be negated by a ferry located at the central option.</p> <p>Secondly, from a financial standpoint. We purchased our piece of property as an investment, knowing that waterfront property with an unobstructed view of the Olympics, a private beach, and the ambiance of the area would always appreciate in value. Now we are wondering "Who would buy this same piece of property with an unobstructed view of a ferry terminal and the constant traffic, people, ferry horns, trash, and all related problems that this would bring?" Would you? It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to resell this property at a fair price if the ferry were situated right next to it. Thirdly from an environmental standpoint. We spend many hours watching the various species of ducks and birds that gather right in front of our cabin in the water or on the potholes ponds by Driftwood Park. We enjoy watching the hawks hunting in the prairie in the preservation area across the road from our lot (these same back lots were recently lost to Telaker Shores residents under the Wetlands and Migratory Bird Act). The children can identify many species. Also we have spent a glorious summer salmon fishing right off the beach in front of our property. You can watch the salmon run just feet from the waters edge. We have spotted porpoise, otters, and seals close to shore and eagles are often seen flying by. Would this wildlife benefit from all the noise, people, traffic, and pollution that the ferry would bring to this pristine and natural area? It would drive them away, as it would our family and our dream. I implore you to consider another option other than the Central one #2.</p>
<p><b>159 E-Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you and your staff for the time you have spent keeping the community informed about the potential alternatives for improving the Keystone Ferry Terminal. We have attended all of the meetings that you have conducted on Whidbey Island. At the meeting in December at Coupeville High School, the aerial pictures and maps were especially informative, as were the many staff members and consultants that were available that evening. This spring, our family bought a vacation cabin in the Telaker Shores neighborhood, adjacent to Driftwood Park. Our house is the third house in from the park. Like our neighbors, after looking all over Whidbey Island, we settled on this spot because of the peace and quiet, stunning views, great beach fishing, and the calm, relaxing atmosphere. The news of a possible ferry terminal located next door to our peaceful community has caused great anxiety and upset for my wife and I, as well as our three children. While reviewing all of the information provided, the single thing that stuck out is the unsuitability of</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>the central option at Driftwood Park. My reasoning is based on the following:            Parking - None available! Are you considering paving the state park on the waterfront??? The Federal bird reserve??? On the highway, with the obvious danger to the public that presents??? There just is no possibility of meeting the requirement for hundreds of cars, with additional overflow during the peak season, at this location.            Wildlife - With a federal bird reserve and probably the best beach fishing spot in the state, the impact on the wildlife that use this area would be catastrophic. The salmon run along this beach is legendary among fishermen and the impact of hundreds of cars, with the oil and gasoline pollution would be devastating.            Beach - This beach along Admiralty Bay is a completely natural, unspoiled section of Puget Sound. How much effort, sweat and tears have been spent over the years to maintain this pristine, natural habitat?            Safety - This location is right next to a residential community. Children play and ride bikes, and people walk on Keystone Avenue to Driftwood Park, and this road leads to the community pool at Admirals Cove, which is heavily used in the summer. How would the safety of this community be assured while hundreds of cars, trucks and motor homes travel to and from the ferry?            History - Driftwood Park is the old ferry location, which was moved to Keystone Harbor for safety, easier docking and better foul weather access. It certainly cannot be a better location than the present one since it has already been tried and failed. The thought of retreating to a previously failed location just does not add up. I believe that the only sensible thing to do is to keep the ferry terminal at Keystone Harbor and make the modification necessary. This exact sentiment is expressed in the opening statement of your request for input: "Washington State Ferries is just beginning an environmental review process to examine potential alternatives for improving the Keystone and Port Townsend Ferry Terminals". Please consider how you and your family would feel if this terminal were moved into your neighborhood. The thought of a ferry terminal right next to the dream cabin that we have worked for years to acquire is devastating. Our property value would be reduced; the future that we dreamed of for our children would be shattered; and the place that we envisioned enjoying for years with our children, and eventually our grandchildren, would go up in smoke. Please do not allow this to happen. Your determination to keep the ferry at the present Keystone Harbor location should be the first priority. Please, do not move this terminal to Driftwood Park. Along with the reasons listed above, just plain common sense tells you that this location is not viable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
<p><b>160</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>... my family has a cabin up on Whidbey (near Driftwood Park.) I enjoy watching the sunset and the views. I also enjoy biking, jogging, fishing, and playing on the beach. Since we are on the water it is fun reeling in fish, playing in the water, and playing catch on the beach. It is safe to jog, scooter, and bike on our road because not many people use it. At night it is very peaceful and relaxing! When my friends come up with me, we enjoy playing soccer in the road and basketball at the neighborhood pool (there are hoops there). Over the time that we have had the cabin we have built many forts. Actually the forts that we made were in the exact same spot every time. The first time my sister and I made the fort and it was beautiful. Then it got torn down. So these kids helped us rebuild it (although it was not as beautiful as the first it was still really well built). Then we had some guest over so they helped us improve it and it looks better than the first one (which is pretty hard to believe). So every time we are up there we don't want to see a new fort we like it just the way it is! One day over the summer I was at a camping trip with my friend and we were going to Whidbey together and I was hungry and I looked in the fridge and it was filled with salmon! That was a shock! I had only seen other people reel in salmon (unfortunately nobody in our family). So here I was staring in the fridge full of fish (delicious!) So my friend I go down to the beach and see my brother reeling in this huge fish and I was amazed. That summer unfortunately I didn't reel in my huge fish but just looking at my family's faces was enough to satisfy me. Near Driftwood Park there are these two lakes. One we named Cheerio Lake and the other was named lost Oar Lake. On the bank of these lakes you would find tons of tiny minnows and see who could get the most. It took at least a couple of hours. We caught them with old, but clean, yogurt containers. When we were done we would put them in big yogurt containers and put some seaweed from their lake in. Then at the end of the day we would put them back in the lake. Then the next morning we couldn't wait to get more. It would be such a shame if you took away our fun and our safety!</p>
<p><b>161</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>As the deadline for the comment period for this project approaches, I wanted to be sure to share some of the concerns I have with the proposal of moving the ferry closer to the Central Option - my community of Telaker Shores. Currently, W. Keystone Avenue is a haven for joggers, bikers, walkers and their children and pets. The avenue stretches along wetlands and at its start is a small lake that is home to many species of birds: eagles; kingfishers; hawks; and herons. This same area, with its park, attracts many Whidbey Island residents during fishing season, and from what I understand is one of the few public areas from which to do some great fishing, allowing all residents of Whidbey equal access to a natural environment and park unequalled in many respects. My fear is that the natural beauty and serenity this area currently has will be destroyed by the pollution, noise and construction that comes with moving the terminal to this area (the Central Option). Where once kids played on the virtually unused street, I see parents worried about the traffic flow. Where, currently, on any given day only the seagulls and waves produce the most noise, I visualize ferry horns, car horns, car stereos and motors driving away the natural habitat and eliminating the current peace and quiet that now exists. Although we've had our home in this area for over 11 years, every day I'm there, I'm amazed at the sheer beauty and peaceful setting of the area. Please don't destroy this for our community and those who visit. Your consideration to keep the Ferry from relocating to this area is requested and appreciated.</p>
<p><b>162</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I am contacting you in opposition to relocating the Keystone Ferry Dock to the Central Option. The Central Option is located at Driftwood Park, which is immediately contiguous to my neighborhood of Telaker Shores. A large ferry dock</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>there would bring noise, traffic, late night lights, danger to children, and environmental damage. It would disrupt and largely curtail the unique salmon run along our beach. This salmon run provides for good recreational fishing not only for Telaker Shores residents, but for the general public at Driftwood Park and the beach to the west. Further, the Ferry Dock would require real estate for the dock, facilities, parking and traffic queuing. This size of this real estate would be orders of magnitude larger than Driftwood Park and the Potholes Ponds, necessarily displacing a great deal of protected wetlands, bird and wildlife sanctuary. Mitigating completely the environmental degradation of such a large complex would seem impossible. Substantial mitigation would seem extremely expensive. Enlarging the current location makes much more sense. The surrounding land use has adapted to the ferry terminal operation. The environmental impact would be relatively small, and the cost far less than a complete relocation. Some years ago, the back lots of Telaker Shores residents were lost to the Wetlands and Migratory Bird Act. This represents a lost value of at least \$100,000 per lot. However, offsetting this is the quiet wetlands and bird sanctuary enhancing our pleasant setting. Relocating the ferry dock to the Central Option has no value offset for Telaker Shores residents. Not only would we lose property value, the quality of the surrounding environment would suffer. I respectfully request serious consideration of my comments submitted for your scoping process. Please keep the ferry dock where it is now. Thank you.</p>
<p><b>164</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Subject: Potential Relocation of the Keystone Ferry Dock-scoping period comments. Please keep the ferry dock where it is. I am opposed to relocating to the Central Option, which is right next to our neighborhood. We have many families residing at Telaker Shores. Putting the ferry dock next to us would greatly increase traffic, both cars and people. It would take a lot of land away from the wetlands, and natural habitat away from birds, fish and wildlife. A large ferry complex next door would be very damaging to our community. We would lose our safe, peaceful neighborhood. We would lose the darkness and quiet of the country night. I can't imagine the noise and commotion of 130 vehicles, including motorcycles and trucks, leaving the dock at once. Not only would you have to take a considerable amount of the wetlands away, you would cause most of the salmon to stop running along our beach. We enjoy fishing right from the bank, which is very unusual to be able to do. Many people of the general public use the public areas along the beach for fishing, including people without boats. It seems like the current location is well suited for the dock. The surrounding land use has adapted to it. For the sake of my family and the other families and children of Telaker Shores, please leave the ferry dock where it is.</p>
<p><b>165</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Thank you for giving the Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce the opportunity to comment on the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry project. As you are aware, the ferry line, as the link for State Hwy. 20, is a vital component for the economic health of our community. It provides core transportation for visitors coming to and from the north, as well as Peninsula residents traveling to Whidbey Island and beyond. With this in mind, the Chamber is especially concerned with the impact this project may have on our community. First of all, parking is an issue that we would like to address. Any consideration to increase the vehicle holding area closer to our downtown businesses, so people can enjoy shopping and dining while waiting, is very important. Expanded parking on the Keystone side to encourage walk-on day use and overnight passengers also needs to be considered. Traffic flow is another major consideration. By doubling the number of vehicles the new ferries will accommodate, measures need to be taken to minimize congestion in our downtown area. The Hood Canal Bridge closure is also an issue the entire community is very concerned about. Even though your project is not slated to be completed until 2007, any efforts to expedite terminal construction in Port Townsend, so that it may accommodate larger ferries during the bridge closure time, would be a plus for us. Another area that we would like to explore with Washington State Ferries is that of visitor and resident information areas. Better access to information from both the Keystone side and Port Townsend side will assist ferry travelers prior to disembarking and help alleviate traffic congestion. The Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce stands ready to work with Washington State Ferries on any of these issues in greater detail. We would like to congratulate you on your efforts as of this date and want to reiterate the importance of this vital ferry link to our community. Cc: Jefferson County Economic Development Council</p>
<p><b>166</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>We are very disappointed the Ferry System continues to consider moving the Keystone terminal on Whidbey Island from its present location to the "Central Option" location. The current location has infrastructure that can be built upon to accommodate the larger boats. The so-called Central Option is undoubtedly the worst alternative that could have been selected for a number of reasons. The Central Option is the only one that would have a major impact upon the lives of those living in the residential community. We retired and moved to Telaker Shores (adjacent to Admirals Cove) over fifteen years ago. We have enjoyed the rural tranquility of this location and do not look forward to the noise, traffic and other disruptions that would occur every day of our lives should the Keystone terminal be moved. One of the presenters at the December 16 meeting at the Coupeville High School indicated that they had looked at putting the terminal midway down the Keystone Spit state park but had concluded they did not wish to split the park in two. It is most disingenuous to not wish to split a minimally used park in two and at the same time have no problem disrupting the lives and property of homeowners. It was pointed out to you during the December 16 meeting that there is no place for cars to be parked unless you take over park land, bird sanctuary or purchase homes in Telaker Shores. It was suggested by Mr. Moreland that a long dock could be built out over the water. Can the Ferry System really afford this expense? If it can then what are you going to do about the salmon that travel near the beach? The so-called Central Option is the location of one of the most popular public fishing beaches on the West side of</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	Whidbey Island. If a dock is extended the fish will have to find another route thereby ruining not only that fishing location but undoubtedly for the entire spit from Ft. Casey to the East end of Admirals Cove. Also at the December 16 meeting, the Ferry Captains complained about the very difficult landing conditions that exist at the present location. Their concerns are of course genuine. On the other hand the same conditions of wind, tide and fog exist the whole length of the Keystone Spit. They will be no better off if the terminal is moved. It makes more sense to make the necessary modifications to the present location to accommodate them than to start over at another site.
168 E-Mail	I am thrilled that the process is starting and don't care what you do as long as you enlarge the Keystone terminal so that larger ferries can be used on the route. My only concern is reducing the number of ferry runs in the summer. We need as many as possible. I do think careful consideration to the configuration of waiting areas on the Port Townsend side is important.
169 Public Meeting	<p>q2 Larger, more reliable (interchangeable) boats. Issue of low-tides at Keystone need to be addressed. I'm concerned that the ship size might increase yet the number of daily routes might go down. The cost and impacts of creating larger holding areas should be looked at in light of increasing route carrying capacity c/o a larger fleet of ships.</p> <p>q3 State park land south of current keystone landing should be considered. Fort Casey only utilizes it as day-use boat launch and parking. They should be able to maintain these recreational services with a land swap of the existing keystone ferry terminal, and make it easier for park staff to access this area c/o their existing camp ground area.</p> <p>q4 see above comment regarding route frequency and proposals of increasing car holding areas, esp. on Port Townsend side</p>
170 E-Mail	Thank you for responding so quickly. This issue is really important to us in our community.
171 E-Mail	Hi! - Wonderful presentation the other night. To bad we have so many nuts on Whidbey Island. I am one of the few people that really endorse relocating the wharf. The WEAN (Whidbey Environmental Action Network) organization will give you a really bad time. They are a well organized environmental group that has money and is not afraid to challenge land use decisions in court. The Audubon Society is also very active, but their main concern is keeping the tide gate functioning so the lake level will remain constant. I am a member of the Island County Marine Resource Committee (MRC), which is part of the Northwest Straits Commission. Our function is to study and preserve the near shore and we will be having some input previous to your January 16th deadline. I attached the research I did on the Keystone Sand and Gravel Company and also a picture of the wharf just to the east of the two ponds. The picture quality is not very good. It was taken from an old 16 mm amateur movie. I think the concrete supports are still there. If I can help...
172 Mail	<p>We of the Island County Marine Resources Committee (MRC) are troubled by apparent pre-conditions that seem to limit the scoping and deliberations for Keystone Ferry Terminal improvement. These include unwillingness to consider providing ferries of improved design suitable for Keystone Harbor and, beyond that, a foregone conclusion that the Keystone site itself must be replaced by a yet-to-be-built alternative. We understand WSF's desire to standardized the fleet and overcome problems with the Keystone approach, but are anxious that these preconditions force the "solution" toward an option that may not be in the best interests of the environment or the public. We ask you to seriously reconsider these given in light of our concerns, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Keystone-Crockett Lake area is a priceless ecosystem. Please reconsider widening, extending or modifying the existing harbor and terminal rather than developing a new terminal elsewhere that would disrupt another section of shoreline and uplands.</li> <li>- Please examine the feasibility of building ferries designed for this crossing, of similar capacity to the current boats, with the power, draft and maneuverability to negotiate the current and entrance to the harbor.</li> <li>- Help us understand how running a larger ferry half as often as the current boats in the summertime would constitute a service improvement, which we understand is one of the project's objectives.</li> <li>- Please note that the alternative site identified near the gravel ponds (where Highway 20 makes a right-angle turn) is at, or near, a county park heavily used by fishers. How would placing a dock at this site affect the fishing and migration of fish along the shoreline?</li> <li>- How would placing a dock at the above site affect the small artificial reef?</li> <li>- At the above site, have you considered the historical significance of the remains of the Keystone Sand and Gravel Company and the Fort Casey military locations?</li> <li>- The Crockett Lake tide gate controls the water level of Crockett Lake. Have you considered the consequences of abandoning the existing ferry dock site and the silting that will occur?</li> <li>- How would building new roads, parking lots and holding areas at one of the alternative sites impact the surrounding wetlands?</li> <li>- How would the run-off of oil, fuel and antifreeze leaks affect the water quality of Crockett Lake and the surrounding wetlands?</li> <li>- Please consider providing a parking area for the large number of walk-on passengers traveling this route.</li> </ul> <p>P.S. The reef is a tire reef, put in place by a group of local divers. It is on the bottom, close to the toe of the slope, just to the west of the old ferry dock.</p>
173 Mail	Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process for the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project. Based on comments presented at the Coupeville public

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>meeting which I attended on December 16th and on discussions with other interested parties, Ecology recommends that the following be thoroughly addressed in the EIS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ALL alternatives, including enlargement/enhancement of the present ferry terminal site and the use of shallow-draft ferries in lieu of the proposed Issaquah 130 vessels. A complete analysis, which should include short and long-range cost comparisons, will help alleviate any public perception that a decision to relocate the ferry to the east end of the spit in the vicinity of the two ponds has already been made;</li> <li>2) retention of the existing facility (requiring use of a vessel which may be unique to the Keystone/Port Townsend ferry run). In view of the impacts certain to accompany any terminal relocation, this option should be given equal weight in the evaluation of project alternatives;</li> <li>3) impact to salmonid species (pink [humpy], Coho [silver] and Chinook [king] salmon) that migrate along this shoreline and to the recreational fishery which begins just east of the present ferry terminal and continues south to Telaker shores (this shoreline area is one of the only few publicly owned marine shorelines in the state that are accessible and provide bank fishing. It is heavily used by both local and visiting fishermen - a typical evening during peak salmon runs finds fishermen lined up literally elbow-to-elbow along the entire spit);</li> <li>4) public access impacts in general;</li> <li>5) potential traffic and other impacts to residents in the Telaker Shores community should the terminal be relocated to the vicinity of the ponds. Even with careful planning, it is probably that automobiles entering and existing the ferry waiting area will periodically obstruct ingress and egress to Telaker Shores; and</li> <li>6) the effect of all alternatives on near shore habitat and littoral drift along the entire spit.</li> </ol> <p>The EIS should also note that Crockett Lake is privately owned and is therefore not likely to be available as a site for mitigating ferry relocation impacts. The lake level has been adjudicated several times and is presently functioning so as to avoid the impacts of previous attempts to fluctuate the lake level (mosquitoes, inundated septic drainfields, etc.)</p>
<p><b>174</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> - one later boat to give better service at night  - you are reducing passenger service 1/2 by using the larger ferries so a late boat might make up for this and allow islanders to use the amenities at Port Townsend.  - make sure to allow parking for passenger only use if the East site is chosen.</p> <p><i>q3</i> The central option is by far the worst and should not even be considered.</p> <p><i>q5</i> We prefer using the existing terminal with 2 new smaller shallow draft ferries but if the common sense approach is not allowed (use existing facilities as they are on both sides of the water) Then: the East option is the only reasonable and for the Issaquah class ferries. The central option would destroy the unique feel of the spit and would require enormous breakwater in the 70 mph southern storms. It is much too close to the bird sanctuary. It would require filling of the 2 ponds now used by birds and canoe classes.</p>
<p><b>176</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>In the public scoping meeting held December 16 in Coupeville, three possible sites were proposed for a new ferry terminal. The middle site (labeled the East area in the Keystone Ferry Terminal Relocation Feasibility Study) lies directly shoreward of a 17 acre wetland we own. This wetland was purchased several years ago with an inheritance from an elderly aunt as our contribution to the conservation of bird habitat on Whidbey island. We are extremely concerned about the impact a ferry terminal would have on this area. Specifically we would like the following points to be studied.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If large ferries replace the smaller ferries, then the parking lot must be larger to accommodate more cars. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Where will the parking lot be placed, on the state park land or the wet lands? Neither one is an acceptable choice.</li> <li>b. If the parking lot is going to be built on a pier protruding out in the water, what effect will that have on fish and birds that swim up the shore?</li> <li>c. How will the oil and other pollutants dropped by the parked cars be contained and treated? Non-point pollution containing heavy metals is a serious problem, especially around water.</li> <li>d. Even if our wetlands are not paved, what affect will increased traffic, light pollution and other activities have on birds?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Do we really need larger ferries? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is the cost of the convenience of a one size ferry fleet justified, especially in this time of a tight state budget?</li> <li>b. Is the cancellation of some ferry runs because of low tides (which are predicable) really that important?</li> <li>c. The Keystone ferry carries mainly tourists since it is no longer needed for military purposes. Is such a large outlay of tax dollars a good use of our transportation dollars? Have all options, including a foot passenger ferry, been examined? Please address these concerns in the next phase of planning.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<p><b>177</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>The major concern of Whidbey Audubon is the potential alteration of the habitat of Crockett Lake and the surrounding wetlands that could occur if the ferry terminal is moved and the current harbor is allowed to fill with silt. Currently the water level in the lake is regulated by a tide gate on the north side of SR 20. If the culvert under SR 20 is filled with silt the tide gate would be ineffective and it would not be possible to regulate the water level in the lake. If the water level is not carefully managed, the wetland could succeed to a shrub community with loss of the wetland habitat. Related concerns are:</p> <p>- Will this habitat be maintained? The Washington State Ferries needs to clarify the last sentence on page 18 of the feasibility report: "During the environmental process for the project, this connectivity would be studied and the existing flows would be maintained or improved as part of the project mitigation." Do they mean the connectivity between Crockett Lake and Admiralty Bay will be maintained during the environmental study only or as mitigation if the terminal is moved? Please clarify. How will the water level in Crockett Lake be maintained and regulated if the existing harbor is</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>allowed to fill with silt?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do you plan to provide parking for walk-on passengers? Currently walk-on passengers park along the shoulders of route 20. Toxic run-off from leaking oil, fuel and antifreeze can contaminate the water of Crockett Lake and the surrounding wetlands.</li> <li>- We were disappointed to find that the feasibility study of alternatives did not include improvements to the present site as an alternative. What kind of improvements could be done? Might it cost less than building a new terminal and mitigating environmental problems? As environmentally concerned, taxpaying citizens we're vitally interested in answers to these questions. The lake and its surrounding wetlands have been designated an Important Bird Area of Washington by the National Audubon society; i.e., a site that provides essential habitat for one or more species of birds and that is essential for the long term conservation of birds. Here are a few facts to document that designation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The lake serves as a "refueling" or staging area for an average of 167,000 (and as many as 222,000) shorebirds during the annual migration.</li> <li>- The 17 species of shorebirds that use the lake during migration attract raptors such as the peregrine falcon and merlin that follow the shorebirds.</li> <li>- There is a great blue heron colony of 15 to 25 pairs on the north side of the lake. Congregations of up to 63 herons have been observed feeding in the lake.</li> <li>- 213 bird species have been observed at this site; 47 of these species nest in the area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- In contrast to the feasibility report which states there are "occasional sightings of bald eagles over Crockett Lake", Whidbey Islanders see bald eagles at this site routinely and nests have been observed. In fact, it's one of the places we take visitors who request a bald eagle sighting.</li> </ul> <p>Clearly this important ecosystem must be maintained. It not only attracts birds but also birders who come to the island from all over the US, Canada and sometimes from Europe. These people support the local economy. We're aware of the need to replace the steel electric vessels. We hope you'll seriously consider our concerns in your deliberations.</p>
<p><b>178</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I was under the influence of the influenza during the recent ferry workshop/presentation in Port Townsend and missed it. One huge concern I have is with the media reported statement about something to the effect of the DOT goal of creating a privileged conduit for disembarking vehicles off the ferry and through town as quickly as possible, irrespective of the disruption to our community. That (narrow) goal is at cross-purposes to community values and should be addressed at all possible intersections. We do not want a downtown bisected by ferry vehicle off-loading and storage the way that Kingston, Edmonds, Bainbridge, are Mukilteo are. DOT goals are different than our community's; we want access for the vehicles, but not the disruption from their off-loading or temporary storage. The DOT goal is moving ever more vehicles efficiently; ours is maintaining a walkable and economically vibrant community. Drivers desires to "get somewhere" should never be at the expense of a community's need to have both planned and impromptu opportunities for exchange. If meeting community goals results in inefficient ferry loading AND unloading, we have then arrived at a reasoned understanding of the role and ordination of transportation. Moving vehicles is not a primary community goal; if DOT has trouble meeting its goals without excessive expense, it should not be allowed to take other values from the community instead. Let us never forget the purpose of cities is to maximize exchange opportunities while minimizing travel distances. If we allow those accessing an exchange to disrupt an existing exchange, we destroy the value of cities.</p>
<p><b>179</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>There is an old US Navy bombing range one mile north of Greenbank, WA. on the west side of Whidbey Island. There is a small lagoon on the shore of the range. The shoreline is only 300 to 500 yards from Hwy 525. I checked out the water depth with my boat and it is 40 feet deep right up to within 100 yards of the shore. The currant is minimal due to protection from Lagoon Pt. The bombing range was last used at the end of WW II, I believe. And then only practice bombs or flour sacks were dropped. Hey !! It's FREE govt. land !!! Get the Navy to give it up to the state and put your new terminal there. !!</p>
<p><b>180</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>First, I would like to compliment the Ferry System on this study. They will be looking at a solution for meeting terminal needs at Keystone for the next 50 to 100 years. This is the way planning for public works should be done. I have spent more than 30 years in the planning and development of airports throughout the United States and because of my professional background, I am thoroughly familiar with the public involvement and environmental review processes for public works projects. We have owned property about 1 mile north of the Keystone ferry terminal of 25 years and have lived at this location full time for the last 14 years. Additionally, I fish and boat a good deal in Admirals Cove. I am very familiar with many of the issues involved. This covers my background briefly. I will now present my observations for your consideration.</p> <p>POTENTIAL TERMINAL LOCATION: While we like the present location and enjoy watching the ferries come and go, I can think of several reasons why it might be best to relocate it to the most easterly site. 1. From an intermodal transportation standpoint, this location would be closest to the main highway on the island. 2. There would be very ample room for parking without interfering with the road system. 3. This site would have the least negative impact on fishing. Very little fishing is ever done in that location. 4. I would guess that the area would have the least problems with water currents. 5. This potential site should have the least fog problems. Fog problems are most severe at the existing site and decrease the further east one goes. Frequently, in the summer, there is thick fog on the point and none at all further east in the bay. Regardless of which site is ultimately developed, Crockett Lake drainage will be a most serious environmental consideration. It is absolutely critical that Crockett Lake be allowed to drain during the spring and</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>summer so as to prevent it from becoming a breeding area for mosquitoes. This has become every more important with the coming of the West Nile virus. West Nile virus is life threatening. From 1990 to 1992 some misguided people prevented the lake from draining during the spring as it always had. The reason for this was to use the lake for canoeing during the summer. The results created an environmental nightmare with the breeding of voracious daytime biting mosquitoes. Fro three years it was impossible for residents of the area to go outside during the daytime without being bitten severely. This also became a terrible problem for animals in the area. Ultimately, county government, the college and many people were involved in returning drainage to the lake in the way it had always been done. This action then solved the problem. The lake was allowed to drain, the mosquitoes stopped breeding and for the last ten years there has not been any mosquito problem. With the coming of West Nile virus, a similar condition would have serious health problems, possibly some fatal. Therefore, whatever is done with the ferry terminal, effective Crockett Lake drainage must be maintained. Finally, I would like to cover the recreation issue. The boat ramp near the existing terminal site is the only good boat ramp on Whidbey Island. At the very least it should be maintained as is. If possible, it would be nice to improve it. Perhaps, if the existing terminal were relocated to a new site, it would be attractive if the State Park system were able to create a small boat marina in the bay, similar to the facility at Coronet Bay in Deception Pass State Park. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this study and I intend to stay involved in the entire process. If anyone wants to contact me personally to discuss any of these issues or my observations from living here, I would be happy to assist.</p>
<p><b>181</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>We need those ferries replaced as we love making trips to Pt. Townsend and beyond. Building the new ferry terminal is a must. Hopefully it will happen.</p>
<p><b>182</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>I'd prefer the central location and hope the present site can be connected to a small marina.</p>
<p><b>183</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>I think more runs or bigger ferries are necessary, but how about adding passenger only runs with connecting bus service to Anacortes and Clinton.</p>
<p><b>185</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>Do anything you need to do to improve the ferry system in the shortest time possible.</p>
<p><b>186</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> - Port Townsend and Jefferson County drivers will find it almost impossible to enter or cross Sims Way or major routes going out of town (19 &amp;20) with the added, concentrated, stream of cars from the larger ferry. At present it is [expletive] difficult! Work with city planners-Dept. of Transportation (Highway) - Pre-loading parking - Shoreline and seabed disturbance.</p> <p><i>q3</i> I would like to attend a meeting along with Whidbey Island residents. We're in this together. We could walk-on an evening ferry - a special run where the meeting would be held. Publicize! Encourage participation/educate re: ferry history on Puget Sound. (We have thousands of new residents). Entertain and inform!</p> <p><i>q5</i> The Keystone-Port Townsend ferry route is NOT a commuter route. It is used primarily by tourists or residents of Whidbey Island who usually WALK ON and come to Port Townsend for the day. (Of course, Port Townsend residents travel over to visit towns on the island often taking visitors along.) Out-of-town tourists often travel to Whidbey - then on to the San Juans or vice versa. I am aware of these patterns because I work at the Jefferson County Historical Society Museum and Chamber of Commerce small information center which is also housed there.</p> <p>- It would be an error to assume that commuter travel patterns will prevail on this run, i.e. that users know the schedule and will arrive shortly before or just in time for the next scheduled departure. Many (most) travelers I see do not know the schedule and often do not even know where our ferry travels to! Many park on the dock and then walk around on Water Street to see a little of the town.</p>
<p><b>187</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>This law firm represents Island County Drainage District No. 6 ("Drainage District") in regards to its interest in and comments on the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project EIS ("Project EIS"). As the Project Purpose and Need document states, the current conditions at Crockett Lake are the creation of the government's decision in 1948 to construct Keystone Harbor on the southwestern shore of Crockett Lake and, in doing so, creating a berm separating Crockett Lake from Keystone Spit and creating a rock jetty at the mouth of Keystone Harbor. Associated with this ferry construction project has been initial and ongoing dredging of the harbor by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("the Corps"). The installation of tidegates in subsequent years has made it possible to meet the needs of Crockett Lake by allowing seasonal draw-downs and management of water levels in an environmentally sound manner that avoids property damage and disruption of activities, which in turn allows recreational and educational use of the lake. An Island County court order was issued November 17, 1987, putting in place water levels for Crockett Lake for different times of the year. The current tidegate system and lake configuration was created as part of the Keystone Terminal construction and initial and ongoing dredging operations at Keystone Harbor. The continued maintenance of the Corps dredging, which allows the successful operation of the tidegates to continue, is essential to preserving property, recreational, educational, and environmental uses at the lake for people, animals, and plants. In the alternative, the Washington State Department of Transportation ("WSDOT") may want to evaluate other options in its Project EIS, which also result in proper management of the Crockett Lake water level.</p> <p>In March of 1987, The Drainage District commissioned a Crockett Lake Drainage Basin Management Study ("Lake Study"), which is attached as Exhibit A. The Lake Study and its appendices lists the extensive number of plants, birds and mammals which have, in recent decades, come to depend on continued seasonal operation of the tidegates and</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>fluctuating water levels at Crockett Lake. The Drainage District takes no position as to the merits of relocating the ferry terminal. If WSDOT proceeds to authorize this relocation following appropriate environmental review, it should do so, however, only if it mitigates the potential significant environmental and other impacts which could otherwise result from discontinuation of the dredging in Keystone Harbor. The Project EIS must evaluate the probable significant adverse environmental impacts associated with relocation of the ferry terminal. The Drainage District proposes that WSDOT include, as part of the Project Proposal, a commitment to proper management of the Crockett Lake water level either through continued dredging of Keystone Harbor if and after the ferry terminal is relocated to an alternate location, or any other feasible design and engineering alternative. This dredging is essential to the ongoing successful functioning of the tidegate and weir system which manages Crockett Lake water levels. The current man-made and natural environment at Crockett Lake is a direct result of the government's actions in past decades to build and maintain the existing Keystone Terminal. Thus, preservation of the dredging of Keystone Harbor or some equally effective alternative, which is necessary to ensure the continue successful functioning of the tidegate and weir system which manage Crockett Lake water levels, is essential to avoid the number of significant impacts associated with the Project. The Project EIS should conduct a comprehensive analysis of the following elements of the environment which could be significantly impacted as a result of the Project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Water. The Project EIS should analyze the impact on lake levels of relocation of the ferry terminal with and without continue dredging of Keystone Harbor. Previous studies suggest that the result of not dredging would be to impair existing water levels, as the potential for flooding begins, if the drainage pipes become covered with silt. The Whidbey Audubon Society correctly notes in its scoping comment that "controlled water that is collected from the Crockett Watershed flows into Crockett Lake, then into Keystone harbor, and finally into Admiralty Bay through the operation of tidegates at the entrance to drainage pipes from Crockett Lake." The original project creating Keystone Terminal included construction of Keystone Harbor and a rock jetty. Part of Crockett Lake was pushed back as a result of this construction. The Project EIS should analyze the effect of abandonment of the present Keystone Harbor on water levels. One of the major potential consequences of abandonment of the dredging of Keystone Harbor would be the flooding of a portion of State Route 20 ("SR 20") located on the berm next to Crockett Lake. The Project EIS should analyze the potential for flooding as well as identify reasonable mitigation measures to avoid this impact.</li> <li>2. Plants and Animals. The Project EIS should analyze the impact on plants and animals which are located at or use Crockett Lake. The Lake Study identifies many of the plants and animals which in past decades have become dependent on the environmental conditions created by the government in the original construction of Keystone Harbor and the alteration of Crockett Lake and the ongoing dredging. The Project EIS should both analyze the impact on each these plants and animals as well as identify mitigation measures designed to avoid or minimize any probable adverse environmental impact. A list of some of the plants and animals dependent on the current ecosystem and lake levels at Crockett Lake is included in Appendices A, B, and C to the Lake Study. The Project EIS should focus in particular on the large number of birds which depend upon the current fluctuating lake levels at Crockett Lake.</li> <li>3. Built Environment. The Project EIS should analyze the impact of the Project on the built environment at Crockett Lake, which includes the existing tidegates, weirs, drainage ditches, residences abutting the lake, and the portion of SR 20 which was included as part of the original construction associated with the Keystone Terminal. As noted above, there is a significant potential for flooding of SR 20, which would be extremely disruptive for those who depend on this roadway. Proceeding with the Project could also adversely impact houses abutting and those in the vicinity of Crockett Lake, which could also be flooded as a result of discontinuation of the dredging. Thus, the Project could also negatively impact the value of property within the Drainage District service area that might be caused if Crockett Lake levels cannot be managed properly. Land and shoreline use should also be an element of the environment included in the Project EIS. This would include the impact on houses in the area, as well as the significant potential impact on recreational uses of Crockett Lake. At present, Crockett Lake's recreational uses include canoeing and bird watching. The Project could, unless adequately mitigated, result in adverse impacts on these important recreational uses. As noted above, the transportation impacts of the project on SR 20, which could be flooded as a result of discontinuation of the dredging, need to be analyzed in the Project EIS as well. The Project EIS should also identify the impact of the Project on public services and utilities which might be affected by flooded of SR 20. Flooding of SR 20 could reduce access to the ferry terminal as well as impair police and fire access in the area.</li> <li>4. Mitigation. The Drainage District urges WSDOT to incorporate, as part of its basic Project Proposal, either an ongoing commitment to the dredging of Keystone Harbor, or some other feasible engineering and design alternative, as required to allow the continued successful operation of the tidegates and weir system at Crockett Lake. In the alternative, WSDOT should exercise its substantive SEPA authority to include this continued dredging as mitigation of the probably significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposal.</li> </ol> <p>Please include this law firm, as well as the Drainage District, in any future communications associated with the Project or Project EIS. Direct your correspondence to the Drainage District to: Mr. Thomas Asmus, c/o Seattle Pacific University, Camp Casey Conference Center, 1276 Engle Road, Coupeville, WA 98239. Please contact us should you have any questions or comments relating to this comment letter.</p>
<p><b>191</b> <b>Other</b></p>	<p>Washington State Ferries want to relocate the Keystone Ferry Terminal - So, what's the problem? (Opinion piece sent to Coupeville Examiner, Whidbey News Times, &amp; South Whidbey Record) Washington State Ferries (WSF) plans to standardize their fleet by replacing the 1927 Steel Electric boats with larger Issaquah-type vessel. The new vessels are</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>not compatible with the present Keystone Harbor, which was constructed in 1948 and has been maintained by human intervention. If WSF abandons the harbor (in their language - allow the harbor to naturalize), a natural silting process will begin. Whidbey Audubon Society (WAS) views this terminal improvement project with concern since WAS see economic and environmental problems beyond the abandonment of the harbor. If the harbor is allowed to fill, drainage pipes from Crockett Lake which run under SR 20 will be blocked and there will be no means to control the water levels in Crockett Lake. Currently, the water level in Crockett Lake is controlled through tide gates at the entrance of the drainage pipes. Any interruption of this sequence may flood SR 20 as well as alter the habitat of Crockett Lake permanently. Crockett Lake, which has been designated an Important Birding Area by the National Audubon Society, is a critically important migration staging area for 17 species of shorebirds, and for raptors such as Peregrine Falcons and Merlin that follow the migration south. The lake also provides habitat for many other species; WAS has observed 213 species at the site. WAS strongly supports maintaining this important bird habitat. Positioning the Ferry Terminal outside the Keystone Harbor will also impact the Keystone Spit. The South End of the spit was identified by WSF engineering study as having the best "operability of alternatives in this analysis." This site is referred to as site 2 by WSF and is currently the location of Island County's Driftwood Park. It has a Navy Rake Station, old pilings left from the historic Black Ball Ferry dock, lots of driftwood, a fairly steep shoreline covered with rock and is one of the best public bank salmon fishing spots on Whidbey Island. What about the rest of the spit? Keystone Spit State Park takes up much of the area thanks to efforts of the Island County community and others to preserve it in a natural state. It remains that way today, even though history indicates that there were once 6 piers on it and there were other plans for its use until people said no to development. Thus, Keystone, Crockett Lake and Whidbey Island are now destinations for birders and fishers from all over the United States and Canada. These sportsmen and women support our economy by spending money in our hotels, restaurants, shops and even the ferries. Keystone Spit is not just for the birds. Whidbey Islanders are we willing to have larger ferries, more traffic and risk damage to prime birding and fishing habitats in a scenic area? Whidbey Audubon says no! -Brian Martin, Whidbey Audubon Society</p>
<p><b>192</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q4</i> What with all the options available to the Ferry System, taking the spit should not be an option. If the spit and the 2 lakes are taken, the impact on the wildlife and the people will be beyond description. If the ferry system must take land to expand the harbor then give consideration to enlarging the existing harbor by eliminating the few camp spots at the State Park. This park is huge and these spots could be located elsewhere within the park.</p> <p><i>q5</i> In addition may I comment on the use of a ferry 360 feet long to come in to pick up the very few cars and trucks during the months of Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. and part of March. To me this seems to be a huge waste of fuel, manpower and time on a ferry to say nothing of the waste of the taxpayers money. If you need to update these boats, do it with smaller boats that won't require more fuel and manpower.</p>
<p><b>193</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> First would be potential flaws in the assumption of need for capacity provided by the Issaquah class ferry. A good case was made for retiring the older vessel constructed steel-elec. At the same time that there is a slow growth and land set aside movement on Whidbey DOT is planning for high growth over the next several decades. Will there be conflicting goals in the future?</p> <p><i>q3</i> There were three sites explored at the 12/16/03 meeting. From the presence of survey crews and their location it's obvious that there are other sites considered. It's important that these sites are disclosed for public input. One of concern equal to Crockett Lake is Lake Hancock with survey crews at the north end of Smugglers Cove Rd. it can be assumed that the low bank area south of Lake Hancock was considered.</p> <p><i>q4</i> The fact that the East site was introduced indicates an awareness of and willingness to address the huge problems associated with the west and central sites. Environmental issues related to Crockett Lake, the shoreline, near shore habitat, traffic flow, surface water management, residential proximity, lack of holding area, public safety (high traffic vol. At times when Camp Casey is the most active) and marginally workable connection to existing transit services. Workable transit links seemed to receive the least attention.</p> <p><i>q5</i> If the Issaquah class is a foregone conclusion and ridership projections are correct then the East location would be the most benign. It's a contained site. There is sufficient area for vehicle holding, park and ride transit turn around and surface water management. The short straight run to 525 is better for transit general traffic and provides a sorting distance for south and north destined vehicles. There would be a minimum of shore hardening and minimized extension into near shore habitat. In addition this is already disturbed land. The source and content of professional input need to be more available to public scrutiny. For the public to submit informed opinion they need full and accurate information.</p>
<p><b>194</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> DOT's decision to replace existing steel elec. Ferries w/ Issaquah class ferries is their preferred solution to the objective of improved service on this line. Alternatives were not presented. The impact of twice the number of vehicles at one time, less frequent sailings, and the subsequent larger terminal needs were not weighed as heavily as they should have been.</p> <p><i>q3</i> 3 sites were presented at the meeting on 12/16/03 with no assurance that other sites might be considered. Each site has different unique concerns that the public should be informed about with enough time to review. It is obvious that the sensitive Lake Crockett Area (both West and Central sites) have strong adverse impact. The east site appears the more feasible but more review is necessary.</p> <p><i>q4</i> If the Issaquah class ferry becomes the solution the impact of double the number of vehicles at any one time are a</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>concern, i.e. traffic issues so that the problems Poulsbo experiences on Bainbridge because of the Jumbo class ferry do not become an issue here. The parking, holding areas, roads and add'l impermeable surface necessary will impact the surface water runoff and adversely affect the sole-source aquifer water supply of the island.</p> <p><i>q5</i> It was brought up at the meeting/presentation that experts in each field will be consulted to address the impact of the proposed project. A list of these experts should be made available to the public at large along with their comments. Additional experts and advisors/consultants as recommended by the public should be considered and their information included. The public should be provided with Draft copies of technical reports prior to the planned public meetings in Spring 2004 and 2005 as indicated on the time line.</p>
<p><b>195 Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Port Townsend-Keystone Ferry Project. A safe, reliable, dependable, and efficient ferry service is vital to the economic well being of the North Olympic Peninsula and Jefferson County, and we applaud your effort to upgrade the service provided. The ferry service, as currently configured, has created a number of community impacts, which we would like to see your new proposal address:</p> <p>Ferry Staging Parking: The existing staging area is insufficient to handle even the minimum overflow. With a larger boat this situation would be exacerbated without an additional off street staging area. Handling the current overflow situation takes an inordinate amount of personnel time from the law enforcement community. In addressing the expanded off street staging area, strong consideration should be given to future overflows and how best to handle them. This is a serious problem that was not addressed when the ferry terminal was relocated several years ago.</p> <p>Traffic Flow Exiting the Ferry: The existing system of off-loading of cars creates a number of points of gridlock and congestion, most notable is the intersection of Washington and Water Streets. With an expanded service this situation will only become more acute. In your proposal, consideration needs to be given to the management of the traffic flow leaving the terminal.</p> <p>Long Term Parking at Keystone: Port Townsend is a major tourist destination and many people walk on the ferry and enjoy the day or an overnight stay in the town. The need for an adequate, safe, and secure long term parking area at the Keystone terminal will encourage non-motorized use of the ferry system and relieve the traffic congestion in Port Townsend. We thank you in advance for the opportunity to comment and look forward to your agency addressing these and other community issues as the project takes shape.</p>
<p><b>196 Mail</b></p>	<p>I do not want to lose my recreational usage of Keystone Beach wherever you locate the new Ferry Terminal. I fish on the beach for salmon, walk the back road or beach with my wife and our dog. My grand kids play on the beach in the driftwood. With a new terminal in this area we will lose parking, which is maxed out now in August and September when the salmon are running. Beach access may be limited around the new terminal for security or liability reasons the new on water structure could very well change fish movement down the beach edge and take away the sport fishing that I and many other enjoy now. The salmon all follow the shoreline with the tides, from six feet of water for Silver out to twenty feet or more for Pink or Chum Salmon. A great deal of care needs to be taken in the design and siting of this terminal. I see a loss of up to sixty parking spaces as per current usage. The walk-on ferry passengers will also impact parking that is now used by recreation users. Labor Day weekend 2003 the walk-on people parked on the street from the Fort Casey main entrance to the east for approx. 1/2 mile clear past the private houses and down the road past to the Parks Land on both sides of the road where possible. Recreational usage of a State Park is a very big deal to me. Usage is not limited to a select few. In you meeting at Coupeville HS on 12/16/03 I feel that the possibility of the US Coast Guard pulling the vessel certificate per age of vessel and or per water of operation regard less of monies spent by Washington State Ferries in repairs or maintenance should be mentioned so that tax payers will understand more about the Steel Electric Ferry phase out. It is not just money but safety. Close the door on this so you can move forward.</p>
<p><b>197 Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> Recreation impact with the loss of parking and access to Keystone Beach. Loss of the Driftwood Park area and the ponds would take away 60 parking spaces.</p> <p><i>q3</i> no.</p> <p><i>q4</i> Limited area available with major problems from both wind and tides.</p> <p><i>q5</i> Crockett Lake is enjoyed by birders and duck hunters but is not open to the public for access. But do not lose sight of the fact Keystone Beach is used by all types of user group this is a very major recreational area as an open Beach access for the public. From the plants to the driftwood, to the beach this is a very unique Public Park.</p>
<p><b>198 Mail</b></p>	<p>As a native Washingtonian who lives in Port Townsend I use the ferries a lot. Is BIGGER BETTER! Is it possible to use the existing facilities to simply get newer ferries...possible 3 or 4 to sustain the present Keysothne/PT Ferry System? It would be cheaper. My second concern is the weather. The westerlies, current and southerly winds will dramatically effect the Keystone side. Is it possible to become more efficient with the present set-up and simply upgrade the dock and holding areas? Change we can't stop-</p>
<p><b>200 Mail</b></p>	<p>Here is my official list of issues. I am particularly and legitimately concerned about the proposed central site because my wife and I have purchased a large wetland (tax parcel 10712) which lies just south of SR 20 adjacent to the proposed site. We intended to use this land as habitat preservation for native flora and fauna of Washington State and add to the Crockett Lake preserve.</p> <p>1. Direct Habitat Destruction. Two large root ponds exist at the proposed Central Site between SR 20 and the shore and are visible in photos of the area. I have observed large numbers of various species of shore birds using these ponds as shelter and a source of food during storm conditions. When wind and waves in the open Sound are too strong for flying, floating or feeding, ducks, such as white winged scoter, common and barrows goldeneye, common and hooded</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>mergansers, scaups, and other species come to these two ponds for shelter from the storm and for feeding during storms. These ponds may be a critical source of protection and food at certain times for the remaining species of water birds in this area of Puget Sound. Because no studies have been done or could easily be done to quantitate the value of this shelter habitat, the ponds should not be removed. If they are removed, they need to be recreated in a nearby place. For replacement to be effective many parameters of the existing ponds need to be measured such as volume, salinity, pollution levels, hydraulic exchange rates with Crockett Lake, bioproductivity, existing biota, and variations of these parameters over several seasons. If these ponds are destroyed and moved then the new site will be lost as habitat. Ponds in a new site will also change the drainage pattern of Crockett Lake. All of these concerns should be submitted to a qualified estuary ecologist for review and amplification. Next, the list of concerns about habitat destruction should be studied and quantified. Consequences of habitat destruction need to be solved or mitigated before approval of the project is given.</p> <p>2. Habitat Degradation. Creatures, especially birds, are cautious and avoid areas frequented by humans and dogs, have loud and unexpected noise, or have 24 hour lighting. The ferry terminal will have all of these impacts and more. All of these degradations reduce the quality of Puget Sound Habitat. Species extinctions are now occurring at a rate of 100 to 1000 times faster than historical rates primarily because of habitat destruction. Loss of habitat is a serious issue that must be addressed by the study.</p> <p>3. Pollution of Existing Habitats. A newly placed ferry terminal will require all the amenities to accommodate ferry passengers and their cars. This will include rest rooms and parking lots. Since the new ferry will be larger with fewer runs, the parking lot and rest room use will grow in proportion. The treatment of human sewage must be done not only to remove pathogenic organisms from the sewage flow but also the prescription drugs and other organics people flush down toilets. The waste also needs to be free of BOD (biological oxygen demand) that could affect Crockett Lake. So a wastewater treatment facility needs to be part of the terminal. Its design and cost must be included in the study. Parking lot wastes are of two kinds. Promiscuous dumping by passengers of car refuse like ashtrays, urinals, and food wastes, and various drippings from automobiles and towed boats such as grease, oil, gasoline, coolant, non-petroleum lubricants, exhaust condensates and the like. The amount of such parking lot waste can be considerable. Seattle schools don't allow parking on paved school yards because of concern for children coming into contact with automotive wastes. A system of catchments for water runoff from the parking lot must be constructed and the waste stream fed to the waste water treatment plant. Otherwise toxic hydrocarbons and heavy metals associated with vehicles and boats will contaminate the surrounding habitats. Proposed scheduled maintenance must include not only regular emptying of garbage containers but meticulous clean up of the surrounding area where ferry customers will toss bottles, plastic litter, and other wastes including animal feces, condoms, and drug paraphernalia.</p> <p>4. Aesthetics. Like birds, many humans are very sensitive to conditions around them. They avoid noisy, dirty, cluttered, and degraded places. While not easily quantified aesthetics are enormously important to humans. People of all cultures revere special landscapes. Poetry is valued because it has the ability to evoke emotions humans feel when exposed to unsullied natural vistas. Lonely shores are able to stir these most precious human emotions. Consider quotes from the following celebrated poets.</p> <p>The tide rises, the tide falls, The twilight darkens, the curlew calls; Along the sea-sands damp and brown The traveler hastens toward the town, and the tide rises and tide falls. -Henry Wadsworth Longfellow</p> <p>Along the solitary shore, Where flitting sea-fowl round me cry, Across the rolling, dashing roar, I'll westward turn my wistful eye. -Bobby Burns</p> <p>I will arise and go now, for always night and ay I hear the water lapping with low sounds by the shore: while I stand on the roadway, or on the pavements grey, I hear it in the deep heart's core. -W.B. Yeats</p> <p>Listen? you hear the grating roar Of pebbles which the waves draw back, and fling, At their return, up the high strand, Begin, and cease, and then again begin, With tremulous cadence slow, and bring</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>The eternal note of sadness in. -Matthew Arnold</p> <p>The shattered water made a misty din. Great waves looked over others coming in, And thought of doing something to the shore That water never did to land before. The clouds were low and hairy in the skies. Like locks blown forward in the gleam of eyes. You could not tell, and yet it looked as if The shore was lucky in being backed by cliff, The cliff in being backed by continent; It looks as if a night of dark intent Was coming, and not only a night, an age. Someone had better be prepared for rage. There would be more that ocean-water broken Before God's last Put out the Light was spoken. -Robert Frost</p> <p>Placing ferry terminal with all its bulk, lights, noise, smells, pollutants, and motion will destroy the proposed Central Site as one of the last unspoiled sections of Puget sound public beaches. Such a loss will cheapen the human experience forever. Recent studies of urban crime indicate that public apathy towards maintaining human environment in a clean and orderly way increases crime. Controlling such dirt and disorder reduces crime. Humans seem to react the same way when a clean and functioning ecosystem is destroyed by human activity. The population of the State has risen by 10% in the last 8 years. There are fewer and fewer places for people to experience an unsullied natural environment. Don't waste this precious beach to accommodate fears of grounding and career damage by a few ferry boat captains.</p>
<p><b>201</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p>My wife and I bought that parcel of land to keep it undeveloped and to enhance it as habitat for Washington native plants and animals. Thus we have in interest in preventing industrial-like development of nearby properties. WE oppose construction of a new ferry terminal on one of the last pieces of undeveloped native shoreline on Puget Sound. As an older and experienced adult I have learned to view this type of public meeting with great cynicism. The important decisions have already been made without any public review or analysis, the choices we are given tonight are trivial compared to the big decisions already made, this hearing is held to check off a box on somebody's management flow sheet, nothing we say tonight will change the major shape of the project, the project presenters are all receiving fine salaries, get per diem or travel and meal allowances, have a staff of administrative assistants and lawyers at their beck and call and thus will easily outlast those citizens who pay all costs out of their pockets to attend these hearing. The big decision: was this: Unify the ferry fleet with superferry class. Where are the data to support that decision? Was it just a whimsical decision on the part of a manager within the ferry system to make their job easier? Where is the analysis? Here are some of the costs involved in executing that decision: 1. Cost of new ferry terminal at Keystone 2. Cost of superferry versus a more appropriate sized ferry for smaller off peak service. 3. Lifecycle cost of operating larger ferries versus smaller ferries. For example: wasting of precious fossil fuel running a huge ferry for a few vehicles most of the year. The additional costs of cleaning larger floor areas, painting more surface areas, replacing more burned out lights, using more fuel to run more lights and services. The idea of a unified fleet may sound appealing for someone who wants to simplify their job, but where is the analysis of the lifetimes savings of such an idea. A subsidiary decision is that the Loss of service several times a year requires new terminal. Where are the numbers showing that this problem requires an expensive solution? It is a predictable problem and can be easily worked around.</p> <p>Summary. A friend involved in government planning summarized this type of hearing as follows. Someone for reasons that benefit them and without any real analysis has decided an appendage must be cut off. The engineering consulting firm has chosen either the hand or the foot as the most likely appendage and has prepared elaborate models losing hands and feet, cutting techniques, the relative amount of pain and blood lost, and the consequences of living without a hand or foot. Then we are consulted to help them choose which we want cut off. The decision to unify the ferry fleet which requires a new terminal has not undergone any rigorous cost analysis. The choice of which site to put a new terminal is both trivial and demeaning to the citizens at this meeting. Go back and do a proper analysis. That analysis will need to show huge benefits to the citizens of this state before we can allow a national treasure such as Keystone spit to be industrialized.</p>
<p><b>203</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q2</i> * Mosquito Problem * Lake drainage * Parking * Traffic * Wildlife Impact</p>
<p><b>204</b></p>	<p>I am a citizen commuter that uses the Keystone-PT ferry route on a regular basis, as well as the recreational aspects of</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

<b>Comment No. / Source *</b>	<b>Comment Text</b>
<b>E-Mail</b>	<p>the south facing shore of Admiral Inlet, and am concerned about possible relocation. I feel the following issues need to be addressed and resolved before moving forward and selecting the final site for the Keystone landing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Federally listed threatened species of salmon use the south facing shore of Admiralty Inlet to feed, rest, and congregate on the way out to the ocean, or back upstream to spawn. Placing a terminal at the Central location would produce the greatest disturbance in salmon migration patterns, and could possibly lead to these species being listed as endangered. The least disturbance would be to modify the existing terminal and harbor. Will essential salmon habitat be disrupted or eliminated with the relocation of the terminal? Will irreplaceable juvenile rearing habitat for salmonids be disrupted or eliminated by relocation of the terminal?</li> <li>2. The habitat destruction that would occur with the paving over the Crocket Lake Salt Marsh area to accommodate parking is unacceptable. Water quality degradation due the impact of petroleum products and metals would poison waterfowl and raptors which utilize the area. This salt marsh are unique and cannot be replaced, and is essential habitat. The bald eagle is a threatened species which uses this habitat and would be disturbed by relocation. Placing a terminal at the Central location would produce the greatest disturbance on native habitat. The least disturbance would be to modify the existing terminal and harbor. Would essential terrestrial wildlife habitat be affected by the relocation of the terminal (i.e., Crockett Late Salt Marsh)?</li> <li>3. Currently, many vehicles exiting the ferry turn left and travel to Highway 20 via Coupeville rather than traveling through the wetlands to get to Highway 20. If the ferry was relocated to the Central Location, would every single vehicle travel through over the salt marsh? How would the increased travel through the Crockett Lake Salt Marsh affect the bald eagle, marsh hawk, and the resident and transient waterfowl that use this area?</li> <li>4. The currents that swirl in Admiralty Inlet are very powerful and regularly move and deposit material. Would building a terminal at the proposed central location be subject to silting and have the same depth clearance problems that we have with the existing terminal? Could operational reliability be affected by silting at the central location?</li> <li>5. Tidelands are private in Washington. The south facing shore of Admiralty Inlet represents a unique public tideland area for people to explore and is irreplaceable. Would ferry wakes degrade or erode the public tideland if the ferries traveled to any area aside from the existing location?</li> <li>6. Currently the proposed central location is used recreationally for fishing, diving, kayaking, and other uses. Relocating the ferry to any area besides its current location would reduce the recreational opportunities to the area. How would relocation of the ferry impact recreational fishing along the south facing shore of Admiralty Inlet (Driftwood County Park)? Would relocation of the ferry make kayaking and boat based fishing on the south shore of Admiralty Inlet unsafe when launching from the beach, and ultimately eliminate those possibilities?</li> <li>7. Could the current location be dredged out, modified or rebuilt, and used for the new class of ferries? Would this be the most cost effective decision?</li> <li>8. As a project manager with an office in Kingston and project at NAS Whidbey, I need to utilize the PT-Keystone routes at all times during the day. I very rarely have a problem getting on the route I show up for. Would increase in ferry size result in a decrease in the number of runs serving the route? Would the larger ferries be filled up during most of the year, or only during the summer rush?</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider my questions and comments. I would support the modification of the existing location, but do not support the relocation to the central location. I believe it is an ecological and economic nightmare that doesn't need to become reality. I look forward to seeing the questions addressed during this scoping process.</p>
<b>205 E-Mail</b>	<p>I am writing to you as a concerned citizen and as a mother. A few years ago my husband and I built a retreat at Telaker Shores with the dream of getting away from our busy work lives and having a safe oasis to create happy memories with children. We have been blessed with two small children: Olivia is 8 months and Jimmy will be celebrating his third birthday this weekend at our place on Whidbey. My husband and I have worked very hard for many years to be able to have this retreat, and we now feel its threatened with the possibility of the Keystone ferry being relocated just four houses north of us. Today, I frequently go to Whidbey by myself with the children. Traffic in front of our house is infrequent and I can safely walk or play with the children in the nearby beaches and fields. We have beautiful wetlands behind us where we see owls, heron and an assortment of birds and bird watchers. The summer salmon run on our shoreline is incredible. You can actually see the schools of fish coming through and neighbors develop camaraderie in sharing the shore and netting each others' catches. I am crushed by the thought that I may no longer feel safe here, with the incredible traffic and transient crowds the ferry would inherently bring. I am also unclear how the Keystone ferry parking could possibly be accommodated at our limited Eastern Terminal location. But more importantly, I do not want to endanger the wonderful balance that exists today: quiet wetlands for wildlife, pristine shorelines for children to play and an invaluable environment to create precious memories. Please respect the wishes of this community and remove the Eastern Terminal location from any further consideration for the Keystone ferry.</p>
<b>206 E-Mail</b>	<p>My family and I have owned a beach house since 1992 in Telaker Shores near Driftwood Park which has been designated as the Central Option. We are still reeling from the announcement that the WSDOT was even considering moving the Keystone Ferry Terminal to a location that would adversely impact a residential community, a State park, a County park and an ecologically fragile, legally protected wetlands that is home to an incredible amount of wildlife. Using some of the screening criteria from your website here are my comments:</p> <p>PURPOSE AND NEED: OPERATIONAL RELIABILITY (Number of cancellations due to wind, tides and fog)</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>-- Has the WSDOT done an analysis of the impact of the winds, current and tides at the Central Option? The tidal current is dramatically fast running parallel to the shoreline. The winds can also be very intense though out the year, commonly steady at 25-30 knots with gusts easily hitting the 40-60 knot range from varying directions. There is no protection for the ferry to avoid the wind or side currents during docking maneuvers which could make it difficult and/or dangerous for the passengers and crew. The low tides also move the water out from the shoreline very dramatically because of the steep drop off of the beach. Can a dock be built to adjust for these very low tides? Are you trading one low tide problem for another at this location? These issues could very easily cause more cancellations and defeat one of the reasons for moving the terminal. The huge drop off of the beach could also create very high construction costs for the dock.</p> <p><b>ADEQUATE VEHICLE HOLDING AREA</b> (Sufficient area with acceptable topography)          -- To the east there is the Telaker Shores residential community, to the northeast there is a protected wetlands, to the northwest is Crockett Lake, another protected wetland and to the west is the State Park which has two small lakes immediately adjacent to Driftwood Park. Unless you fill and pave over the two lakes, the State park or some of the wetlands there does not seem to be any area to meet this criteria at the Central Option. Are you planning to build a holding lane on Highway 20? If so, this would affect access to and from the State Park property on the south of the highway. It is also a 50 MPH highway and it would seem like that would cause safety issues for drivers and ferry riders. There would also be gas, oil and diesel from the idling and parked vehicles that would run off into the wetlands. This is a horrible option for the environment in this area.</p> <p><b>IMPROVED VEHICLE INGRESS AND EGRESS</b> (Assessment of turning movements, directness of vehicular approach and exit)          -- The Central Option does not have very much land to do anything to make the ingress and egress to the site work. As I will highlight later in these comments, Keystone Avenue is the only entrance to the Telaker Shores community and it is very difficult to imagine any entrance or road design that could mitigate access to the terminal and access to Keystone Avenue unless wetlands were filled in and covered with concrete. The corner of Highway 20 by Driftwood Park is also a very dangerous spot and we see several cars each year that are speeding down Keystone Spit and end up in the marsh because they are going too fast to make the turn. You should check with the State Patrol regarding the history of the area. This site would not seem to rate well for this criteria.</p> <p><b>ENVIRONMENTAL AND COMMUNITY IMPACTS:</b>  <b>AQUATIC RESOURCES</b> (Area of over water coverage)          -- There is a yearly salmon run that parallels the whole beach from the State Park at Keystone all of the way around Admirals Cove. Putting the dock at the Central Option would put a huge barrier right in the middle of the path of the salmon, possibly creating a very serious problem for the migration of the fish. There are also the bait fish, seals and birds that coexist in this ecosystem. The additional pollution from the operation of the ferries and the dock would be also be very harmful to all of the wildlife and our beaches. This area right now is very pristine, clean, and a great environment for the wildlife and the residents. It is impossible to operate a ferry terminal without having a huge impact on the surrounding environment.</p> <p><b>BEACH PROFILE</b> (Area affected by prop scour and wake wash)          -- This is a big concern that the community is already trying to deal with. As you travel east on the shoreline from the Central Option you will see how the beach is being affected by the current shipping traffic wakes, especially as you get closer to the Admirals Cove area. The beach is already eroding in some places and any increase in wakes from the new, larger ferries would dramatically increase the damage and cause more erosion. The driftwood that covers most of the beach needs to stay in place to minimize the shifting of the rocks and sand. This is a very scary issue because it may take some time to see the actual damage from the new ferries and there would not be any way to reverse it other than remove the ferries! I have read this was a very serious problem for the WSDOT on the Bremerton ferry run which caused you to slow the boats and disrupt your schedules.</p> <p><b>WETLANDS AND ASSOCIATED WILDLIFE</b> (Area of impact)          -- The surrounding area is almost entirely wetlands filled with a wide variety of wildlife. It is hard to imagine picking a worse site for the terminal and parking because of this. Everything would affect the natural environment and wildlife: air pollution from idling vehicles, run-off of gas, diesel and oil, noise, lights, etc. Our community water supply is from a well that is located in the wetlands on the north side of Keystone Avenue. If that aquifer and water supply were contaminated we would have no safe water for our homes. This is another very serious concern. There is no way that this site can rank positively for this criteria.</p> <p><b>THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES</b> (Proximity and extent of impact)          -- See above comments. I am sure that WEAN and the Audubon Society will give adequate input also.</p> <p><b>RECREATIONAL USES</b> (Area of impact, type of facility affected, and degree of proximity impacts, e.g. noise, traffic, visual)          -- Driftwood Park is one of the most popular public fishing spots on Whidbey Island. Literally hundreds of people can be seen standing shoulder to shoulder fishing from the beach when the salmon are running. The park is also used by the public as a scuba diving spot and a place where people just come to walk the beach and enjoy the view. The Telaker Shores community is adjacent to the park also enjoys the same recreational uses from their beach. If the Central Option were chosen all of these activities would either cease completely or be seriously damaged. This site would be a disaster</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>for the criteria mentioned.</p> <p>VISUAL QUALITY (Proximity to viewers and number and type of viewers affected)            -- Approximately sixty feet east of Driftwood Park is the Telaker Shores community which is made up entirely of single family homes. Every single person chooses this location for the beauty, the quiet and the view. It would be a nightmare to suddenly have a ferry terminal facility constructed and then have the constant large ferry traffic coming in and out every hour and a half. It is one issue to buy a home when such a facility already exists but it is entirely different to have it brought to your neighborhood which you had chosen so carefully as a place to live your life. This would obviously have a terrible impact of the views of the homeowners.</p> <p>NOISE (Same as above)            -- For all of the same reasons listed above, the noise and lights would be very disruptive and negatively impact the quality of life for the residents in the area. It is difficult to imagine the change that this facility would bring to both the humans and the wildlife. This is totally inconsistent with the land use in the area and hopefully this rating process on the criteria used for this analysis would be against locating the terminal at the Central Option.</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY:            LOCAL TRAFFIC (Assessment of impact from terminal traffic, including residential access)            -- Keystone Avenue at Hwy 20 and Driftwood Park is the only entrance and exit to the Telaker Shores community. To the east on Keystone Avenue is the Admirals Cove community which has a private road that is not county or state property. It is also barely passable for any amount of traffic. Locating the terminal at the Central Option location would create a terrible bottleneck for the community, especially during the loading and unloading of the larger ferries. There is simply not enough land to physically reroute the road any where else unless you pave the wetlands.</p> <p>Thank you for your time to review these comments. We ask you to look very hard at other options for this project, especially keeping it at or near Keystone Harbor. That area is already set up for this type of land use and the area has adapted to it. Using your own screening criteria, it does not appear that the Central Location would be a viable option. All of us homeowners came here for the wonderful area, natural beauty and quiet. This would be devastating to the members of our community for many reasons and we hope that you remove the Central Option from your plans.</p>
<p><b>207</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I am a family member of a Telaker Shores homeowner, and I am writing to express my concern about the possible relocation of the ferry terminal. I strongly oppose moving the ferry to the central option. My first choice is to keep the current terminal location, and second choice is to relocate the terminal to the east option with closer highway access and less impact on the local ecosystem. I feel the following questions need to be addressed and resolved in the environmental review process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What options exist for choice of replacement vessels in terms of dimensions, capacity, and emissions levels? I suggest that the replacement vessels be chosen at the appropriate size for the existing channel and tides. A vessel should be made that has a more shallow hull and can still accommodate more vehicles than the current vessels. This would eliminate or reduce the need for costly and destructive dredging of the near shore habitat. I would prefer more sailings that held fewer vehicles each to fewer sailings that held more vehicles each to facilitate the flow of traffic and reduce passenger waiting times. In addition, vessels should be chosen with the lowest emissions of air and water pollution possible.</li> <li>2. What legal restrictions must be adhered to in the choice of ferry terminal and route location? I believe the terminal location is in the jurisdiction of Island County, which should have regulations such as a Critical Areas Ordinance and a Shorelines Management Plan that delineate the criteria for protecting these natural resources.</li> <li>3. What long-term impacts would the ferry terminal location, ferry vehicle traffic, and vessel route have on the viability of all the terrestrial and marine species that depend on this unique ecosystem? The preservation of the environment should be the top priority in this issue due to the long-term negative impacts it will potentially create for the ecosystem, wildlife, and people alike. For example, the project will potentially impact a large area including Crocket Lake, the Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve, the extensive wetlands east of Crocket Lake, Driftwood Park, and Admiralty Inlet. As a field ornithologist, I have consistently observed a high diversity of bird species that inhabit this area as a year round refuge for breeding, foraging, and migration. This indicates that the ecosystem is currently functioning at a sustainable level, but minor changes to some ecological components or relationships can lead to a cascade of unforeseen, irreversible effects such as the extirpation of species as part of the food web. Of special concern are the salmon and other fish species that inhabit Admiralty Inlet. All parts of the salmon life cycle must be considered to avoid further degradation of these populations that are already subjected to many extinction pressures by humans from Puget Sound to the Pacific Ocean. A landscape scale approach should be used in assessing the ecological value of this ecosystem and in preserving its unique characteristics in our rapidly urbanizing region.</li> <li>4. How will the ferry terminal location affect the property values of the homeowners in this area, the tourism industry, and the local economy? Moving the terminal to the central location will increase levels of traffic, noise, and pollution for the residents and visitors to Telaker Shores. Most likely this will lead to a decrease in property values and a decline in the number of vacationing visitors who annually rent the homes in the area. Many other visitors use the area for fishing, boating, kayaking, wildlife viewing, bike riding, and other recreational uses. Removing these opportunities will in turn have negative affects on the local economy of Coupeville and Island County with a reduction in tourism and property tax revenue.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider my questions and comments. Please consider the long-term impacts the</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>project will have and make the decision that makes the most ecological and economic sense beyond the immediate terminal area. We cannot afford to waste our precious natural or fiscal resources through this project by causing irreversible and more costly damage in the future. I look forward to seeing my questions addressed during this scoping process.</p>
<p><b>208</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the informative meeting on December 16, 2003 where WSF and its consultant, CH2M Hill, presented the advantages and disadvantages associated with potential landing sites for the new class of ferries on Whidbey Island. Below are my comments relating to the proposed Keystone Ferry Terminal Project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Prior to final selection of the landing site, WDFW will need to review the results of a WDFW approved intermediate eelgrass and macroalgae survey at each of the three proposed landing sites.</li> <li>2) Work windows that will apply to all sites will relate to the protection of migrating juvenile salmon occupying the near shore area. No work will be allowed from March 15 through June 14 of any year for the protection of migrating juvenile salmonids.</li> <li>3) At this time there is no documented use by surf smelt, Pacific sand lance or Pacific herring. WDFW will not apply work windows for these species unless one or all of sites becomes recognized as providing spawning habitat in the interim period between now and the start of construction.</li> <li>4) The proposed central landing site, near the old burrow pits, is a popular recreational fishing site. WDFW would like to preserve the recreational fishing opportunity at this location, so design features will need to investigate this option.</li> <li>5) Regardless of which site is chosen, WDFW will view the restoration of historical connections between Crockett Lake and Admiralty Inlet as important mitigation for the project.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments at this time. I look forward to seeing more detail on each of the three alternative landing sites as you move forward in your screening process.</p>
<p><b>209</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I am writing this to express my opposition to the Central Option for relocating the Keystone ferry terminal. My family vacations at Telaker Shores each summer at my sister and brother-in-law's house. We also spend several weekends there throughout the year. This location provides a tranquil refuge from the busy and noisy city that I think would be ruined by additional car traffic and parking and the arrival and departure of the ferry itself. Our children have explored the beaches and surrounding areas for years and have delighted in observing the wildlife. I fear this experience will be lost for all. Please do not consider the Central Option as viable. Thank you for your</p>
<p><b>210</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I am strongly opposed to moving the Keystone Ferry to the Central Option. I have close friends that own a beach house on Telaker Shores. We visit often, and enjoy the peaceful setting. I love to relax on the beach, and enjoy the quiet. Our daughters play and fish on the beach. We look forward to leaving the stress of the city to spend time together in this wonderful setting. This will be destroyed by relocating the Keystone Ferry to the Central Option. We've used the ferry to travel to Port Townsend, and enjoy the current setting of the ferry. It's next to the park and camping area. You can spend time on the beach while waiting for the ferry, and property owners aren't disturbed. There's also a restaurant available, and plenty of parking. Please do what is necessary to keep the Keystone ferry at the current location!</p>
<p><b>211</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>The proposal "Central Option" to move the dock down the way to Keystone is both economically unsound and detrimental to the life and population of the island. For many reasons, including the wetlands, the area upon which this option encroaches is a calm, peaceful haven away from day to day strife. This plan puts that strife right on the doorsteps of the people who occupy the area with traffic for the Ferry and everything that brings with it. The environmental impact will completely devastate the area beyond any recovery. The number of people who use this ferry cannot possibly justify such an expensive option as a completely new location, roads, dredging, zoning, landfill, etc. Since the rest of the state, for years, has been resentful with having to pay state taxes for ferries they never use, I doubt such an expense will go over well with anyone else, once it is made public. If there were a genuine need for larger ferries, which I can't see has actually been justified, then the best option would be to renovate (or build immediately next to) the already existing site which SHOULD cost much less and have no further impact on the island's life and population. The savings in road costs alone should easily make the Central Option prohibitive by comparison.</p>
<p><b>212</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>As a full time resident on Keystone Avenue I would like to add my concerns to your request for comments regarding the placement of the Keystone Ferry Dock. The Keystone Ferry is a unique system and does not belong in a one size fits all category. Whidbey Island is not the Mainland. Do we build a new Deception Pass Bridge to handle the increased Trucking you anticipate? Do we widen our High Ways from end to end? Do we allow our Wetlands to be paved over? Leave the Facility where it is and enlarge it if you must but don't take away Whidbey Island's greatest assets, it's country roads and serene wetlands.</p>
<p><b>213</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you for giving the Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce the opportunity to comment on the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry project. As you are aware, the ferry line, as the link for State Hwy. 20, is a vital component for the economic health of our community. It provides core transportation for visitors coming to and from the north, as well as Peninsula residents traveling to Whidbey Island and beyond. With this in mind, the Chamber is especially concerned with the impact this project may have on our community.</p> <p>First of all, parking is an issue that we would like to address. Any consideration to increase the vehicle holding area closer to our downtown businesses, so people can enjoy shopping and dining while waiting, is very important. Expanded parking on the Keystone side, to encourage walk-on day use and overnight passengers also needs to be</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>considered.</p> <p>Traffic flow is another major consideration. By doubling the number of vehicles the new ferries will accommodate, measures need to be taken to minimize congestion in our downtown area. The Hood Canal Bridge closure is also an issue the entire community is very concerned about. Even though your project is not slated to be completed until 2007, any efforts to expedite terminal reconstruction in Port Townsend, so that it may accommodate larger ferries during the bridge closure time, would be a plus for us.</p> <p>Another area that we would like to explore with Washington State Ferries is that of visitor and resident information area. Better access to information from both the Keystone side and Port Townsend side will assist ferry travelers prior to disembarking and help alleviate traffic congestion. The Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce stands ready to work with Washington State Ferries on any of these issues in greater detail. We would like to congratulate you on your efforts as of this date and want to reiterate the importance of this vital ferry link to our community.</p> <p>cc: Jefferson County Commissioners</p>
<p><b>214</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you for bringing the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project scoping meeting to our community. We appreciate the opportunity to comment. As stated at the December 17th meeting, the Chamber's interests focus primarily on parking, customer service, traffic flow, and Hood Canal Bridge mitigation. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Parking. Increase the vehicle holding areas and locate them in closer proximity to the vessel docking area. On the Keystone side, to encourage walk-on day use and overnight passengers. On the Port Townsend side, for vehicle queuing adjacent to the downtown historic district retail area, and to improve commuter access to Whidbey Island.</li> <li>* Customer service. Provide services to mitigate Keystone Terminal's isolation. Incorporate a visitor information center in the construction plans for the Keystone passenger holding area. Better access to information on the Keystone side will assist ferry travelers prior to disembarking in Port Townsend, and help alleviate traffic congestion.</li> <li>* Traffic flow. Provide traffic control devices to mitigate the doubling of the time required to off load vehicles. The current vessels hold 65 vehicles. The replacement vessels will hold 130 vehicles. Peak season traffic flow will demand measures to minimize congestion.</li> <li>* Hood Canal Bridge mitigation. Expedite Port Townsend Ferry Terminal improvements. Currently, construction is scheduled to begin in early 2007. Port Townsend terminal improvements, completed by April 2006, would allow larger vessels to dock. This would provide the Olympic Peninsula a much needed detour route to mitigate the two month closure of the Hood Canal Bridge, scheduled for May-June 2006.</li> </ul> <p>The Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce would like to explore these issues in greater detail. Our intent is to assist you in preparing an action plan which meets our community's needs. We congratulate Washington State</p>
<p><b>215</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>We are owners of a parcel of property in Telaker Shores, a waterfront community in the heart of Admiralty Bay. My wife's father was the attorney who provided legal assistance to Pat Wanamaker and George Astel, original owners of this property in creating this beachfront development. Mr. Wanamaker's family were the original homesteaders of most of the land encompassing this waterfront and the surrounding uplands. Pat Wanamaker was elected to the state senate and served with distinction for many years. I believe that he was extremely active in transportation issues and issues directly involving our states ferry system. Were he still with us today, I'm certain he would be very opposed to any consideration being given to the possible relocation of the Keystone terminal to what is referred to as the Central Option in your scoping process that would place enormous adverse impacts on the Telaker Shores community he so proudly created and the wildlife preserve adjacent to this location that he assisted in creating.</p> <p>You have received from Douglas Nelson, a member of our community, a very detailed and accurate summation of the tragic consequences the relocation of the present terminal would impose if placed at this location. It is incomprehensible to us how all of the impacts associated with such a move can justifiably be mitigated and economically supported considering the constraints on our States finances at this time. The location of the present terminal is not burdened with land use issues and environmental impacts remotely as great as those associated with the Central Option. Any engineering challenges faced at making the existing terminal useable for Issaquah 130 class vessels would be, in our opinion, just as severe if not greater at the Central Option. I can assure you that reworking the existing Keystone terminal can occur much more quickly than the lengthy approval process the State is faced with if it should elect to pursue the Central Option.</p> <p>In conclusion we again refer you to Doug Nelson's transmittal to you of January 13. In our opinion, Doug has not over emphasized the specific adverse impacts the Central Option presents, particularly when these impacts are measured against existing environmental laws and regulations. Please place our name and address on your mailing list and keep up apprised of any meeting dates where this project will be the subject for public input and participation.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration of our comments. Our association with this community goes back many years and we are deeply concerned for its future.</p>
<p><b>216</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p><i>q5</i> Don't move the ferry back to Driftwood Park. The ferry docked there when I was a girl. I assume there was a good reason to move it to its present location. Moving it back appears to be folly with public money.</p>
<p><b>217</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Keystone-Port Townsend ferry project. The Port of Port Townsend Commission unanimously voted to send this letter. The Port of Port Townsend is one of 76 public port districts in Washington State. As such, we are charged by the state legislature with many responsibilities. Among those responsibilities is to aid in the transfer of goods and people through our district. We stand ready to help the state in accomplishing this mission. As you well know, the ferry system here in Jefferson County, is our lifeline. In addition to</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>being part of the state highway system, the ability to easily move goods and personnel over this ferry link has an enormous impact on the economy and livability of the entire Olympic Peninsula. Every year we see an increase in traffic. At the same time, the ferries and associated shore side facilities are not meeting the demand. The aging ferries are going to fail us and pose a significant safety hazard at some point in the near future. We need the facilities and the ferries themselves, upgraded at the soonest possible opportunity, to serve our community into the future.</p> <p>As with all projects of this magnitude - there will be issues raised and concerns which need to be addressed, but the state has a good public process to do so. We support your process. Please do not hesitate to call on us for any assistance you think we may provide. We will follow your progress closely and wish you the best in this important endeavor. You can contact me at (360) 385-0656 or by email at: larry@portofpt.com. Thank you for your time.</p>
<p><b>218</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Keystone - Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project. As you know, the current Keystone ferry terminal and all of Keystone Spit west of Wanamaker Road is located within Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, a unit of the National Park System. Significant community effort and public funding has been invested in maintaining Keystone Spit in its current open-space condition. The majority of the spit is now in Washington State Park ownership and is valued by the public for its open landscape and recreational value.</p> <p>We are pleased that WSDOT appears to no longer be considering the mid-portions of the spit as a possible site for a new terminal. Maintaining the open and undeveloped nature of the spit is an important goal of the Reserve and Washington State Parks.</p> <p>The existing Keystone terminal is in the vicinity of Admiralty Head and Fort Casey Historical State Park. This area hosts many important cultural resources that are managed for the public's benefit. Expansion of the existing harbor to accommodate larger vessels is certainly an alternative that should be explored. However, cultural resources in this area and state park infrastructure and operations cannot be compromised by such an expansion. We encourage WSDOT to seriously explore the "east" alternative, which is located east of Admirals' Cove Subdivision. This site could provide direct access to SR 20/525 and allow for ample area and flexibility for the long-term future.</p> <p>The Trust Board of Ebey's Landing NHR looks forward to continuing to work with you on this important project. If you have any questions, please contact me.</p>
<p><b>219</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>Please consider this letter a submission to be included in your scoping process for the Keystone/Port Townsend ferry terminal improvement project. My earlier letter of December 22, 2003, addressed several issues which I will not need to address in this letter. This letter is simply to address why I feel the eastern terminus or central option ferry terminal next to the community of Telaker Shores is the worst possible option and should be dropped from consideration under the scoping process. Should WSF elect to proceed with relocating the terminal to the eastern terminus at that time we would reserve the option of contesting all issues raised in my December 22, 2003 letter including an injunction requiring continued use of the steel/electric vessels until all litigation, including appellate review of the EIS, is completed.</p> <p>It is my understanding that four Issaquah class ferries have already been ordered by the ferry system. As noted in my prior letter of December 22, 2003, the only rationale for switching to an Issaquah class ferry is convenience for WSF. I would obviously conclude based on the ordering of the vessels that it has already been decided by WSF to go to one Issaquah class ferry prior to the scoping process which as noted before may be subject to attack on the EIS. However, this letter is to accept that a Issaquah class ferry will replace the two steel/electric class ferries and simply address what is the best location should that scenario take place.</p> <p>Since the ferry system has unilaterally decided, I believe, to replace the two steel electric class ferries with one Issaquah class ferry, and that this is simply for convenience for WSF, I believe an extra obligation exists by WSF to create as little environmental and community damage as possible. My conclusion is that widening or modifying the Keystone Harbor is the best location for Issaquah class ferries and the worst location is the eastern terminus next to Telaker Shores.</p> <p><b>1. ENVIRONMENTAL</b></p> <p>As we all know, the eastern terminus is the most environmentally sensitive. To the south and east are wetlands, to the north and west is a federally protected bird reserve and along the water to the north and west of the proposed eastern terminus is a large, wild state owned beach. This beach is very fragile due to its very narrow nature and the highway that runs behind it. As noted before, these three wetlands work in a synergy for hundreds of thousands of migrating birds protected under the Wetlands and Migratory Bird Act. Furthermore, this is prime fishing habitat and salmon spawning habitat that serves as recreational shore fishing for thousands of residents every year from the months of approximately June through November. Directly where the ferry would go are two large lakes that would need to be filled for any ferry terminus.</p> <p>The single biggest problem in switching to one Issaquah class ferry is the parking requirements of approximately two hundred vehicles for one sailing every hour and a half together with passenger parking. The eastern terminus offers no way to move this parking upland away from the shore and sensitive wetlands and bird reserve. Parking along the highway is impractical in that it would destroy a very large portion of the beach park together with cutting off access to other possible users of the park by a long line of cars. Furthermore, the speed along this highway is 50 mph and it simply would not be safe to have cars with children frequently getting in and out of these cars along a highway. The oil and pollution from this many vehicles would seriously degrade the shoreline. There is no possibility upland from the eastern terminus for parking due to the fact that it is a protected bird reserve on one side and sensitive wetlands on the other. The road leading from Highway 20 down into a proposed eastern terminus is narrow and also cannot be widened</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>as it directly borders the wild bird reserve on one side and the sensitive wetlands on the other. Therefore, an eastern terminus provides no possibilities for any parking let alone two hundred vehicles required by going to one Issaquah class ferry.</p> <p>Other environmental concerns would address the required widening of the road that leads from Highway 20 down to the eastern terminus. First of all, this road runs through two communities where children reside on both sides of the wetlands, including Telaker Shores. Secondly, the road is not equipped and wide enough for regular constant ferry traffic and, as noted above, is not subject to widening since it borders such sensitive land. Also it must be considered that the considerable oil and other run-offs from the vehicles into these wetland will have a deleterious effect.</p> <p>As you are probably aware, the Washington State Legislature has recognized the important and sensitive nature of shoreline such as the park where the eastern terminal would go. On December 17, new shoreline master programs to reflect revised guidelines were adopted by the Department of Ecology. These represent the first comprehensive update of the state guidelines in thirty years. As noted by Linda Hoffman, Ecology's Interim Director, the improved shoreline management will benefit the environment, economic assets and public safety. Issues necessitating these new guidelines include shorelines absorbing flood waters, recharging aquifer, filtering pollutants and supporting fish and other wild life. In connection with the new state shoreline guidelines, the Island County Commissioner established two marine stewardship areas on January 1, 2004, including the Admiralty Inlet marine stewardship area covering the entire Admiralty Inlet shoreline of Whidbey Island. Therefore, by both the marine stewardship designation and the new state shoreline guidelines, the waterfront park adjacent to a proposed eastern terminus has been recognized by law as a sensitive area subject to heightened environmental protection. Paving any part of this area for two hundred vehicles would not survive EIS review. Furthermore, the construction of a pier large enough to hold this number of vehicles is impractical due to the deep water and rocky nature of the shoreline as well as the prohibitive cost. Therefore, there is no parking provisions for one Issaquah class ferry at the eastern terminus.</p> <p>Every one of the screening criteria set forth by WSF shows the eastern terminus is unacceptable. There is no need to accommodate replacement vessels if an Issaquah class ferry is not used. Operational reliability is a hoax in that over 980 sailings alone were cancelled for budget priorities. Adequate vehicle holding area is only available upland from the Keystone Harbor. Keystone Harbor is the closest in nautical distance to Port Townsend. Environmental and community impacts are greatest at the eastern terminus. It is clear under WSF's own screening criteria the eastern terminus is unacceptable. I believe if this matter is contested under the EIS, WSF is most vulnerable under its first criteria, accommodate replacement vessel, since no other criteria are necessary if one Issaquah class ferry is not used.</p> <p><b>2.COMMUNITY</b></p> <p>Numerous commentaries have already been forwarded to you from residents of Telaker Shores and Admirals Cove. My wife and I together with our three year old boy and eight month old daughter have a house four houses down from the proposed eastern terminus. The greatest danger of an eastern terminus to the community is the loss of safety by having a large transient population so close to a community. My wife and my children would not feel safe and would not be able to use this house by themselves. I would not feel safe having my small boy or my girl as she grows older playing outside unsupervised at any time with such a large transient population of unknown persons. This would be most acute at night where mothers and children would feel virtual prisoners in their homes due to this transient population destroying the very aesthetic so cherished by these houses.</p> <p>One very important point to note is that every resident of Telaker Shores also owns the back lot across their access road situated in the wetlands. These lots were rendered unbuildable by the Wetlands and Migratory Bird Act in the early 90's. That means that every resident lost a buildable view that in today's dollars would be well in excess of \$100,000 in order to preserve the continuity of the wetlands and protection of the migratory birds. Placing a ferry terminal with all the population and other risks here would negate this enormous sacrifice made by every resident of Telaker Shores. Other losses to note in the comments would be the salmon fishing along the shore, possible damage to our well and aquifer, the sense of solitude, the bright lights and commercial activity and noise at night as well as the massive disruption of the wild life. Children, as well as adults, would lose access to a very large park, the traffic would be very dangerous for children and adults alike and eventually would seriously degrade any investment these community members have made in good faith into their houses and community.</p> <p><b>3. CONCLUSION</b></p> <p>I have had an opportunity to meet with Jim Horn, Chairman of the Senate Transportation Committee and my senator. It is my belief, based on conversations with him as well as the fact the four Issaquah class ferries have been ordered, that no matter what, the ferry service plans on one Issaquah class ferry for this run. Should the WSF select the eastern terminus next to Telaker Shores, it is our intent to contest this through the EIS and, if necessary, file suit and to contest relocation based on the reasons set forth in my submissions. I believe we will be successful in preventing relocation to the eastern terminus under an EIS review and I think that litigation could last as many as ten years during which an injunction would require use of the steel electric ferries out of Keystone Harbor during that litigation. The only way I possibly see a switch to one Issaquah class ferry surviving environmental review is to continue its location in the Keystone Harbor or directly adjacent to it where there is sufficient upland parking as well as already a commercial atmosphere without a community of families and children directly next door.</p>
<p><b>220</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I am writing to add my comments to other concerned residents of Telaker Shores regarding the Keystone Ferry terminal. As you know, many are concerned for the tentative plans to relocate the Keystone Ferry terminal, and are strongly</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	opposed to such a move. These concerns are founded both on hard environmental science, and the emotional and sentimental commitment we have to the area of the proposed terminal. We chose Telaker Shores for the beautiful place that it is, for the serenity it brings, and for the future it promises to plants, animals, and humans. Please set aside the "quick-fix" mentality that people believe the relocation will fulfill, and understand the need and importance for long-term vision to protect the present and the future.
221 E-Mail	I am writing as a concerned family member of a Telaker Shores homeowner in regards to the Keystone Ferry Project. Let it be known that I strongly object to the plan to relocate the ferry terminal from its current position to the proposed site adjacent to homes at Telaker Shores. I realize that there are many considerations that must be addressed when making a decision of this magnitude, and for clarity I would like to bring to your attention the one that I feel is of utmost importance--that being quality of life. Residents of Whidbey Island live in one of the most peaceful and inspiring places in the northwest. In addition, they are close to a major metropolitan area but experience little of the negative influences typically associated with such close proximity, such as congestion, large scale development and degraded natural areas. It would be a tragedy to compromise, if not destroy, this unique and cherished living condition for the sake of tourism, which is the industry that this larger and relocated ferry run would most closely serve. Whidbey Island should be able to be enjoyed by all but remember that a few people call it home. This quality of life issue does not stop with the people of Telaker Shores or surrounding Whidbey residents, rather it extends to the multitude of animals that inhabit the wetland of which driftwood beach park is an intricate part. The relocation of the Keystone ferry dock would result in a large negative impact on the quality of life of the many native animal species that live in this wetland. These rare open spaces for ducks, hawks and herons are continually compromised and often lost forever in favor of our pleasure and "need". Yet it is these very open spaces that make the northwest such an appealing destination for travelers and such a sacred place for the people who live here. It would be a shame to pave another natural jewel. I believe that it is the responsibility of the Washington Department of Transportation not only to offer high quality service but to manage its resources, as well as the regions, in the most thoughtful and uncompromising manner possible. In the case of the Keystone Ferry Project I would urge the careful consideration of options that would prevent the degradation of the quality of life on Whidbey Island, while at the same time utilize and enhance lands already impacted and developed by the ferry system. Please do the right thing and keep the Keystone ferry dock where it is.
222 E-Mail	We lived in Port Townsend 19 years and now have relocated to LaConner. We have traveled back and forth for many years and feel these changes are long overdue and are necessary. We applaud your decision to go forward with this project and hope we live to see its completion.
223 E-Mail	I am a full time resident of the Telaker Shores community and I have the pleasure to work out of my home. I am also a third generation Washingtonian. Reviewing many of my neighbors and fellow Whidbey resident's comments it gives me great comfort that we share the same opinion, that we live in an extraordinary area and that it must be saved and protected no matter the cost. Even though I have owned my property for 4 years it has not taken me that long to realize that the sanctuary that surrounds us is probably one of the last natural spits of it's kind. I have dreamed of living here since I was a child. Anyone who has come off of the 520 interchange and drives down the emerald green tree lined hill and then sees the magnificent wetlands flocked with hundreds of different bird species and then smells the salt air from water that seems to rise to meet the incredible snow capped mountains and the vast open skies, knows what a gift that has been bestowed to all of us. Thus comes my point- now imagine coming down that same hill with a wider road that is not flanked with tall reeds with birds hanging off of them and then see natural ponds laden with colorful ducks covered with concrete and parking lots. Hoards of people lined up in their cars playing loud music from their boom boxes, distributing their garbage along the beach as they wait for the next ferry. A beach that is known for long walks, contemplation, fishing dreams and golden scarlet hued sunsets that then becomes another victim to our greed and ignorance. This is not about Telaker shore residents, WSDOT, this about all of the residents of the state of Washington, it's bigger than all of us. We must leave something of this earth in the same form that it came to us, we have done enough damage to this area, let's keep it as minimal as we can use the site that already exists so we all can be proud to say that we took a stand and saved this magnificent area for us and the generations to come. Thank you for time and consideration.
224 E-Mail	I would like to submit scoping comments, on behalf of Washington Trout, to Washington State Ferries with regards to the proposed screening criteria for the Keystone ferry terminal, and the potential environmental effects of ferry terminal improvement on Keystone Spit and Crockett Lake. The measures and rating scales chosen as metrics for the screening criteria are insufficient to determine environmental impacts to Keystone Spit and Crockett Lake. The metrics that Washington State Ferries has chosen to measure the impact of potential ferry terminal alternatives on aquatic resources, wetlands and associated wildlife, and threatened and endangered species are not adequate to determine actual impacts to these screening criteria. Washington Trout has suggestions for improving the efficacy of the measure and rating scales in determining true impacts to the screening criteria. The measure and rating scale (metric) for the impact of ferry terminal improvement on aquatic resources, area of over water coverage, will not adequately determine the impacts of the proposed terminal improvements to those resources. Washington State Ferries needs to consider how each potential terminal site could affect the aquatic resources individually, with each site requiring different metrics. Aquatic resources such as macroalgae, eelgrass, and (forage) fish will respond to changes in the shoreline environment caused by ferry terminal improvement. These include, but are not limited to area of over water coverage. The central and east terminal sites have the potential to affect littoral

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>sediment movement along the spit by altering the wave climate of the shoreline adjacent to these sites. Changes in littoral drift cells will affect changes in how aquatic resources are distributed along the shoreline and near shore. Ferry terminal improvements are likely to result in changes to the physical environment along Keystone Spit; these changes will have effects on the near shore marine ecosystem and aquatic resources of the spit. In the forthcoming environmental document, Washington State Ferries needs to include, but not be limited to, metrics that assess the biotic response to changes in the physical environment due to modifications in littoral processes as a result of a new terminal site.</p> <p>The chosen metric for the effect of ferry terminal improvement on wetlands and associated wildlife, as it is described (area of impact), is vague, and will not adequately determine the influence of the proposed terminal improvements on those resources. The forthcoming environmental document needs to consider how moving the terminal site out of Keystone Harbor will affect the natural and anthropogenic processes that maintain Crockett Lake in its current state. Crockett Lake is important habitat for avifauna and planktonic macroinvertebrates. These invertebrates may also play an important role as food resources for juvenile fish moving along the Keystone Spit near shore. The forthcoming environmental document needs to consider the effects of terminal improvement beyond the direct a real impact to these wetlands, such as how road runoff from new staging areas will affect adjacent wetlands.</p> <p>The chosen metric for the effect of ferry terminal improvement on threatened and endangered species, proximity and extent of impact to critical habitat, is poorly defined, and may not accurately measure the impact of terminal improvement on these species. Does this metric refer to critical habitat as designated by NOAA Fisheries or the US Fish and Wildlife Service under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), or by some other definition of critical habitat? Currently, there is no federally designated critical habitat for two threatened and endangered species that are highly likely to be in the project area, Chinook salmon, and bull trout. Additionally, metrics need to be established that will measure the effect of terminal improvement on the behavior of threatened and endangered species. Ferry terminal activity can affect how endangered species use habitats by deterrence or attraction due to light, noise, presence of structure, etc. The forthcoming environmental document needs to include, but not be limited to, metrics that will assess secondary impacts (behavioral) to threatened and endangered species. It is also important that this document consider the potential for direct or indirect take (ESA) in both ferry terminal improvement construction and future site operations.</p> <p>Celia, if you have any questions, or if there are any comments that need clarification, please feel free to contact me. We look forward to working with you on this project.</p>
<p><b>225</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>The Island County Salmon Technical Advisory Group (Salmon TAG) was initially formed by the Washington State Conservation Commission to develop the Limiting Factors Analysis for Water Resource Inventory Area 06. Since the completion of the limiting factors analysis in 2000, the Salmon TAG has participated in the local salmon recovery efforts as the technical advisory committee reviewing and recommending actions for salmon habitat protection and restoration projects. The Salmon TAG developed the Island County Salmon Recovery Strategy which was adopted by the Island County Water Resources Advisory Committee in November 2002.</p> <p>We have identified near shore habitats as the highest priority areas and near shore estuary habitats as the second highest priority areas for protection and restoration in Island County. Crockett Lake is identified in our strategy as a key wetland area with high potential to serve as a resting and feeding area for migrating salmon if tidal connectivity were to be reestablished.</p> <p>We would like to see the following issues analyzed for the near shore habitat for each of your potential sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Affect of each alternative on coastal processes including: near shore drift, sedimentation, currents, upwelling, spit formation, and scour</li> <li>- Affect of each alternative on salmon migration patterns – juvenile and adult</li> <li>- Affect of each alternative on macro algae populations</li> <li>- Affect of each alternative on benthic communities</li> <li>- Affect of each alternative on nutrient cycling and nutrient availability</li> <li>- Forage fish spawning habitat impacts from terminal construction and operation for both new sites and existing operation.</li> </ul> <p>We would also like to see the following issues analyzed for the estuary/upland habitats for each of your potential sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Washington Trout will be analyzing restoration opportunities for restoring tidal exchange to Crockett Lake. If the current keystone harbor site is abandoned, what impacts are expected to occur at the keystone harbor site. In particular, what impact is the naturalization of the harbor expected to have on the current connectivity between the harbor and Crockett Lake. And what impacts would there be on future opportunities for restoring tidal flooding to Crockett Lake.</li> <li>- Affect of each alternative on potential maintenance or restoration of Crockett Lake</li> <li>- Affect of each alternative on benthic communities</li> <li>- Affect of each alternative on nutrient cycling and nutrient availability</li> <li>- What would be impact of operating at the current site given a full tidal opening to Crockett Lake at the harbor? Would this site remain operable under conditions of full tidal exchange?</li> <li>- Assessment of existing conditions in Crockett Lake</li> <li>- Assessment of potential restored conditions for Crockett Lake with tidal exchange</li> </ul>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>- Potential affects of Crockett Lake restoration on wetlands (salt and freshwater)                      - Affect of each alternative on fish and wildlife                      - Direct impacts of changes to roadway and parking areas and long-term impacts from these changes to water quality and wildlife habitat                      Thank you for this opportunity to identify our interests and concerns about the Keystone Spit and Crockett Lake</p>
<p><b>226</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I want to let you know that if the East Terminal is chosen, it is not an area served by Island Transit. This would be quite an inconvenience for the passengers and Island Transit. Thanks for listening.</p>
<p><b>227</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I concur with the following statement written by the president of Whidbey Audubon Society. Important bird habitat is diminishing at a rapid pace, while wildlife tourism spending and interest is increasing. Transportation choices should not come at the cost of losing vital wildlife habitat. Thank you for considering these concerns.</p>
<p><b>228</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I would like to submit the following comments with respect to the proposed changes to the Keystone Ferry dock on Whidbey Island.                      This area has a rural character to it and needs to remain so. The area is within the Federal government's National Historical Reserve. The goal of this Reserve is to preserve this area in as near as possible to the conditions that existed when the area was first occupied by human settlement. A modern well lighted terminal seems completely incompatible with the goals of the Preserve. The adjoining Crockett Lake is an important resting and feeding area for tens of thousands of migratory birds (mainly shore birds whose numbers have been recorded for at least 10 years). Most of these birds migrate at night to avoid predators and rest and feed during the day. An enlarged ferry terminal with its attendant lighting would have an adverse effect on these migrating birds. The light and noise pollution resulting from an enlarged terminal would also have a negative impact on resident birds as well. For example, there is a colony of Great Blue Herons that has only recently been established close to Crockett Lake. The birds from this colony regularly feed in and around Crockett Lake. The Great Blue Heron is considered a species of concern by the Washington Department Fish and Wildlife in the whole of Puget Sound. This is primarily a result of loss of suitable habitat for these birds. This is the only colony of Herons out of several now left on Whidbey Island. They need as much protection and lack of disturbance as possible.                      Just to the east end of Crockett Lake exists a cattail marsh in which Northern Harriers have been recently shown to be nesting. A first in recent times. These raptors also use the shoreline of Crockett Lake and the area between SR 20 and the salt water as a forging area. It has taken these two species and others many years to recover from the encroachment of human activity on their natural habitat. The proposed central location of a new ferry terminal would be devastating to both of these species as well as other fauna which utilize the adjacent wetland area. My experience with the ferry dock at Keystone is that it is busy for mainly 3 to 4 months of the year, i.e. summer time. The rest of the year there is little traffic. Part of the reason for the sometime long wait in the summer is that vacationers in their RV's or vehicles with boat trailers attached take up room on the ferry. So there will always be a missed ferry regardless of how big the ferry. Folks on vacation by definition are in no great hurry. They are after all on vacation.                      So rather than disrupting the existing patterns of both the birds and the fish which migrate along the shoreline and which will take years to recover from, if that is even possible, I suggest the following ideas. Replace the existing boats with new boats of the same class. There is little need to have a 130 vehicle ferry on a run which does not, for 8 to 9 months of the year, need that capacity. There is also the additional operating cost of larger boats during the entire year not to mention the initial investment for these boats to be considered. The channel and existing dock can be brought up to the needed standards for the smaller boats for much less money than a completely new facility would cost.                      Projections on the future of ferry traffic would indicate a slow reduction in ferry traffic on all routes. This will be inevitable as a result of increasing fares and the increase in security issues. Both of which will certainly have a negative effect on ferry traffic at Keystone in the near and distant future. So I propose making the necessary repairs to the dock and channel at Keystone as it now exists, building less expensive boats scaled to the real need of this crossing, and allow the rural nature of this area to continue to be nurtured and preserved. The benefits of this proposal do not out weigh the negative impacts on this very sensitive area. Thank you for your time in this matter.</p>
<p><b>229</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>I'd like to comment by close of period. Can it be any time today (say, tonight), or does it have to be by close of business to get it in within comment period.</p>
<p><b>230</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q5</i> In addition to comments I have made in other forums I would like to express concern with the public safety aspect of releasing 130 vehicles into the traffic stream of Whidbey Is. and Port Townsend. The congestion increase of a 130 vehicle release over a 65 vehicle (the steel electric boast) would have a great impact on both public safety, increased accident and death rates and congestion on the highways for many miles from the ferry landings. [sic]</p>
<p><b>231</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>After reviewing the documents provided on the WSF website regarding this subject, I offer the following:                      Summary of my recommendation:                      - Replace the PT-Key route with a PT-Edmonds route using existing vessels                      - Do not spend \$74 rebuilding/relocating the Keystone terminal                      - Abandon and sell the current Keystone site                      - Upgrade the PT terminal to accommodate larger vessels                      - Replace old vessels as soon as newer ones are built (auction off old vessels)                      Details:                      Add to the list of Screening Criteria (in "pt-key_boards.pdf"):</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>a. "Purpose and Need": Route utilization            "Measure &amp; Rating Scale": Number of passengers and vehicles carried</p> <p>b. "Purpose and Need": Route changes            "Measure &amp; Rating Scale": Number of passengers and vehicles carried</p> <p>c. "Community Impacts": Demand for service            "Measure &amp; Rating Scale": Increase tourism to PT and Olympic Peninsula</p> <p>d. "Community Impacts": Alternative route to Hood Canal Bridge            "Measure &amp; Rating Scale": Impact on PT/Olympic Peninsula businesses            Impact on Hwy 101 traffic</p> <p>Discussion:            1a. The current PT-Key ferries are underutilized most of the year. WS DOT's plan to replace the current, small, vessels with new vessels having twice the capacity, while at the same time maintaining the current sailing schedules, will result in even poorer route utilization. If this approach is used, WSF will ultimately be forced to cut schedules to control costs. This is a highly undesirable outcome.            1b. The current PT-Key route was started in 1948 to serve, primarily, the military. Demographics, populations, and needs have clearly changed since then. Today, the demand for local service to/from Whidbey Island would be a small fraction of the total potential traffic, most of which would be PT and Olympic Peninsula to/from the Seattle area if a more efficient route were available.            1c. Today's traffic demand makes it clear that a new PT-Edmonds route, replacing the current PT-Key route, would provide far better service to the majority of potential users. I believe the 1999 WSF Traffic Surveys bear this out. Users traveling PT to/from Seattle via the current PT-Key route must use the Clinton-Mukilteo crossing and drive across Whidbey Island. When the PT-Key route is changed to a PT-Edmonds route, people needing access to Whidbey Island will simply use the existing Clinton-Mukilteo route, driving to/from Edmonds-Mukilteo.            The PT Chamber of Commerce has recently suggested a plan that would promote parking on Whidbey Island as a means of increasing tourism; I do not believe that such a plan will result in any measurable benefit other than to slightly reduce the parking problem in Port Townsend. However, with a PT-Edmonds route, at least some of the \$74 million+ saved by eliminating the Keystone terminal should be directed toward expanding the parking and shuttle transportation systems in Port Townsend; this would help achieve the PT Chamber's goals and would also provide badly needed infrastructure improvements in PT.            1d. Currently, the only alternative available (other than the expensive, inefficient, 2-ferry route via PT-Key + drive + Clinton-Mukilteo) to the Hood Canal bridge is the long drive around highway 101. When the Hood Canal bridge closes for at least 6 weeks in the summer of 2006 (an uncertain, but likely to slip, date), estimates are that tourism in PT will drop by as much as 80%. Businesses in PT will, in general, suffer during the bridge closure because deliveries of all goods will be more costly. In fact, tourism and business throughout the Olympic Peninsula are expected to be noticeably impacted. Changing the PT-Key route to a PT-Edmonds route will greatly reduce the negative environmental and economic impacts of the Hood Canal reconstruction project on PT and the Olympic peninsula in general, and on highway 101 from Olympia north to the Olympic Peninsula. Please add my comments to the public record for the PT-Key project.</p>
<p><b>232</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>We moved to Whidbey Island because of walks on Ebey's Landing. My husband is buried at Sunnyside. My children have enjoyed the local beaches for years. We support the Beach Watchers and Island and State Parks. Please consider building smaller boats before you think about disturbing the beaches in the Keystone area. The docking area works for the locals, except for a few summer runs when the area is full. Larger ferries will still have the problem of fog, wind and low tides. Smaller new boats could have a lower draft and stronger engines. The cost of building a new ferry terminal is more than money. Currently many Whidbey Islanders are upset and more will be as they become involved in the future. Please know that we use and depend upon the Clinton Ferry, but the current talk is close the Keystone Ferry. I would like to see the Keystone Ferry run continue, but will not support moving the ferry landing. Thank you for asking my option. [sic]</p>
<p><b>233</b> Public Meeting</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Environmental Impact, Homeowners Quality of life Impact  <i>q3</i> The old ferry dock area from the 1940 (I believe) could be a viable site. Moving the dock to the end of the Driftwood park next to Telaker Shores is an extremely poor choice. Keeping it where it is the best alternative both environmentally and for the local community  <i>q4</i> I am extremely worried that the criteria identifying the least adverse environmental and community impact will be shunted aside in favor of what is perceived as the best way to save money. Everything else will be swept under the rug.  <i>q5</i> Moving the Dock closer to the homes will have an extremely adverse affect on our quality of life here. It will destroy the Silver Salmon Run as well as kelp beds needed by bottom fish for egg laying. It will affect the migration route of the humming birds who travel through here each year not to mention countless sea and other migratory birds. The pair of bald Eagles that live and fish here will be displaced. Access to the beach and fishing will be limited for those who do not live on the waterfront. There are very few places where recreational fishermen have access to the shoreline to fish left in the state of WA. Building a dock here would severely cut into the rights of these people. For my family, moving the dock will destroy our view. We live just 8 lots down from this site. It will fill our home with pollution, both noise and environmental. It will make driving through the traffic a nightmare and will destroy everything that we moved here for. It</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	will drastically reduce! e the value of our property and reduce what we pay in taxes to help Island County. Please reconsider moving the dock to this site.
<p><b>234</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>We wish to thank the WSF staff for conducting a public scoping meeting in the City of Port Townsend. Based upon the materials provided and the information presented at the meeting, we understand that the improvements to the Port Townsend Ferry Terminal may involve expansion of the existing dock, widening of Water Street into the beach area lying directly west of the ferry terminal, and/or possible development of a remote holding area. We also understand that a single ferry, with approximately twice the capacity of the current ferries, would serve the route. The Building &amp; Community Development Department (BCD) of the City of Port Townsend offers the following comments:</p> <p><b>Impacts</b></p> <p>In general, environmental analysis for the ferry terminal improvement project should be conducted in sufficient graphic and narrative detail to clearly assess the relative level of impacts and feasibility of each alternative. Some specific concerns related to potential impacts are briefly listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Air – Idling cars, especially in the winter months, have the potential to cause a CO “hot spot” of reduced air quality. The SEPA should address this potential impact.</li> <li>2) Water Quality/Stormwater – Dredging and new impervious areas should be quantified to allow a relative comparison of the proposed alternatives.</li> <li>3) Biological Resources – This section should include an analysis of impacts to both aquatic and upland priority habitats (e.g. eelgrass, dune grass) and species (e.g. forage fish, salmonids, migrating waterfowl, bald eagles, etc.). We recently completed a Shoreline Inventory and Atlas documenting sensitive biological resources along the City’s waterfront that we hope will be of use to you (see attached diskette).</li> <li>4) Land/Shoreline Use/Public Access –Analysis of land use compatibility should take into account noise, light, and glare, from the ferry terminal and holding area. The SEPA document should analyze the project’s conformance with adopted plans and policies including the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Shoreline Master Program, Urban Waterfront Plan, Parks &amp; Recreation Plan, and Chapter 17.30 Waterfront Design Guidelines of our Municipal Code. Port Townsend’s plans and municipal code are available on the Municipal Research &amp; Services Center (MRSC) website: <a href="http://search.mrsc.org/nxt/gateway.dll/ptwnpl?f=templates&amp;fn=ptwnpage.htm\$vid=municodes:PortTownsendCompPlan">http://search.mrsc.org/nxt/gateway.dll/ptwnpl?f=templates&amp;fn=ptwnpage.htm\$vid=municodes:PortTownsendCompPlan</a>.</li> </ol> <p>Analysis of public access impacts should consider impacts to the beach stairs located at the north west corner of the ferry terminal, impacts to the beach area west of the terminal from widening SR20/Water Street to add a new holding area lane, and also take into account the existing sidewalk and shoreline pathway running west from the terminal along Water Street.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5) Open Space/ Recreation – Analysis of impacts to open space and recreational opportunities should include analysis of impacts to formal and informal open space and park amenities, including Rotary Park west of US Bank. One alternative presented at the meeting was to incorporate Rotary Park into a larger ferry parking holding area.</li> <li>6) Aesthetics – Please assess the aesthetic impacts of both the terminal and holding area as viewed from land and from water.</li> <li>7) Transportation and Parking – Traffic impacts on SR 20/Water Street and local streets are a concern. Opportunities to widen SR20/Water Street are severely limited by steep bluffs, shorelines, and existing development. The analysis will need to provide a thorough review of the immediate and long-range effects of the project on the transportation system. The anticipated percentage of truck trips should also be calculated. Several options should be evaluated to manage the surge of cars exiting the ferry and the backup of cars waiting to board. Currently, cancelled ferries result in significant impacts as cars back up on to SR-20 and local streets. We request that WSF coordinate the scope of work for the traffic study with our Public Works Department. Impacts to pick-up and drop off parking should also be analyzed. Currently the parking area west of US Bank also serves as an informal pick-up and drop off area for ferry passengers. One alternative presented at the meeting involved incorporating this land into a larger ferry parking holding area.</li> <li>5) Existing Conditions/Public Services/Utilities – Currently, once the capacity of the dock is exceeded cars back on to the city’s rights-of-way. An informal holding area has been used at Gaines and Water Street behind the Lighthouse Mall. The City’s Police department handles the traffic backlog. Deputy Chief Conner Daily notes that this situation often obstructs access to the Indian Point shoreline area and to businesses on the waterside of the Lighthouse Mall. Sanitary facilities are inadequate (a single port-o-potty) and garbage cans nonexistent. The turning radius at Gaines Street is also inadequate for trucks, trailers, and large RVs. It is our hope that these existing inadequacies will be addressed with the improvement project.</li> <li>6) Cumulative Impacts pursuant to WAC 197-11-228 &amp; -792. State regulations require that SEPA review consider cumulative impacts. The EIS should consider the cumulative impacts of various alternatives. Given setbacks on the Hood Canal Bridge reconstruction, is it possible that the two projects may be under construction at the same time?</li> </ol> <p><b>Alternatives</b></p> <p>Relocate Keystone Terminal &amp; Maintain Two Boats – Maintaining the current number of boats while relocating the Keystone terminal should be analyzed as an alternative. Operational reliability would be improved with relocation of the Keystone Ferry Terminal and with the backup provided by two boats. Maintaining two boats reduces vehicle holding area needs and, unlike the single boat option, would maintain the current schedule. In regard to vehicle ingress and egress, a larger boat may better accommodate trucks, however, SR-20 from the ferry terminal west to the City limits has</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

<b>Comment No. / Source *</b>	<b>Comment Text</b>
	<p>limited capacity for increased traffic and widening the road is prohibited by steep bluffs, shorelines, and existing development. The traffic impact on local streets may also be less significant with two smaller boats. Alternative Location for Port Townsend Ferry Terminal – Given that a bigger, single boat alternative may significantly impact the City’s shoreline resources and cause traffic congestion when the boat is off-loading, we suggest that WSF consider an alternative location for the ferry terminal for the one boat option. We note that the WSF 1999 ridership survey indicates that, “westbound destinations have become more disperse, with a much lower percentage of riders destined for the immediate Port Townsend areas (50% in 1993 compared to 16% in 1999)”. This is a significant amount of pass-through traffic for the City to accommodate.</p> <p>Potential Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Potential restoration opportunities are presented in our Shoreline Inventory and may be further discussed with our planning staff. We appreciate Washington State Ferries’ efforts to provide reliable ferry service. If we can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call Judy Surber at 360-379-5084 or myself at 360-379-5081.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jeff Randall, Director, Building and Community Development</p>
<p><b>235 Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you for allowing the Economic Development Council of Jefferson County (EDCJC) to make initial comments on the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry project. This critical link for State Highway 20 is a key component for the economic health of our community. Having the terminal located in Port Townsend has helped define the community for many years, and the interest generated by the proposed upgrade in the ferry is of interest to many of the citizen here and throughout the county.</p> <p>The following areas of concern has risen to the surface first, and we encourage your panel to consider them as you move forward on the implementation of this project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic Flow in the downtown Port Townsend district. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The expanded number of cars using the facility, given the increased capacity of the boat, will have a definite impact on the movement in and around the terminal. Should some consideration be made re: moving the terminal from the downtown core?</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Parking and Queuing during the extended wait times. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Increased cars and increased duration between ferries means a substantial impact on the current procedure for holding vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Hood Canal Bridge closure is now predicted to occur in 2007. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The possibility of increasing capacity on the ferries entering Port Townsend (better facilitating semi trucks) could portend an unanticipated solution for rerouting of goods and services to and from county manufacturing and commercial concerns.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Certainly, these are not the only areas of concern and opportunity that will emerge from this exciting project. The EDCJC is ready, willing and able to help your committee and the people of Jefferson County work through the process that we feel can enhance the economic climate as well as the quality of life in this community. Thanks for your efforts to date. WE look forward to working closely with you on this project as it develops.</p>
<p><b>236 Mail</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project, located in central Whidbey Island, WA. The National Park Service (NPS) is a concerned party because of our legislate responsibility to preserve and protect Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve, a unit of the National Park system. The following general comments are based on the information currently available on the project, which is very conceptual at this time.</p> <p>The main concern of the NPS is that the nationally significant cultural landscape that is Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve (the Reserve) not be compromised in any manner or degree. The Reserve is a model for partnership parks and many organizations have worked hard to ensure the natural and cultural heritage of this area remain in place. The NPS understands the need for Washington State Ferries to be efficient and changing technologies require changes to vessels and routes. However, this must be done in a manner so as not to adversely impact the rural landscape character and historical patterns of land use and development that is in place in the Reserve and gives it its integrity. Millions of federal and state dollars have been expended in preserving these heritage lands, and projects such as this have the potential to both directly and indirectly affect these properties and the overall landscape. Visitors come to the Reserve from all over the nation and from foreign countries: they expect to see a historical, rural landscape that has not been compromised by modern intrusions. Development rights on lands in and around the Crockett Lake area were purchased nearly two decades ago to ensure open space retention and the preservation of historical patterns of development. The public deserves to have these protected in perpetuity and not impaired.</p> <p>Archeological, ethnographical, historical, and cultural resource background surveys must be completed before any ground disturbance occurs for any of these alternatives. The NPS’s archeologists and anthropologists would be happy to work with WSDOT’s consulting cultural resource team and would appreciate receiving copies of draft reports for comment and review. The NPS would also appreciate receiving any environmental compliance documents resulting from NEPA/SEPA requirements so natural resource staff can provide comments.</p> <p>Of the three alternative presented, the NPS prefers Alternative #3 (EAST), which creates a ferry terminal facility outside of the national historical reserve and historic district. It would impact privately owned land that is a short distance between the water and the highway, a short and direct route for those not interested in visiting the Reserve or the state park facilities. From a resource management and cultural landscape perspective, this alternative is the most desirable,</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>as it would have the least impact, possibly no impact, on the nationally significant cultural landscape of the Reserve. The large cleared areas currently in pasture would require minimal forest alteration and would appear to provide adequate space for vehicle holding areas away from the ecologically sensitive Crockett Lake. Relocation to this site would avoid potentially serious conflicts with the hundreds of thousands of migratory birds that annually visit Crockett Lake to rest and feed. Located on the Pacific Flyway, this area provides critical wildlife habitat. The creation of a new ferry terminal in this location would not adversely impact homes eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places. It would have the least impact on the Reserve physically, visually, and aesthetically. NPS encourages WSDOT to fully explore this alternative to the extent possible, to avoid impairment to the Reserve.</p> <p>Alternative #1, to modify the existing terminal (WEST), would likely have huge impacts on the existing facility because it would require enlarging it by possibly threefold. The extent that the road and parking configuration would be altered, and the potential visual and physical impacts to Admiralty Head's historic character and the surrounding environs, would likely have direct and indirect adverse impacts to the area, which is a contributing property within the National Register Historic District. The park's historical buildings of the former military reservation and its small-scale features, including lamp post bases, sidewalks and curbin, and the adjacent historic buildings on Seattle Pacific University property, would all be impacted by the enlarged ferry terminal facility. This alternative will be a difficult one to accomplish without impacting and/or impairing many cultural and natural resources. Location and construction of additional vehicle holding areas would require extensive clearing, grading, and sensitive site design for this complex area. Increased traffic speeding past the historic fort grounds and through historic Ebey's Prairie to reach Highway 20 (short-cut for those who know) is not a pleasant mix with the hundreds of student soccer players in the summer months and year-round conference center participants. This is an example of the indirect impacts an enlarged ferry terminal would bring to the Reserve.</p> <p>Alternative #2 (CENTRAL) is the least preferred alternative of the three presented. This alternative creates a new terminal facility at the foot of Keystone Road, on the eastern boundary of the National Register Historic District and boundary of the Reserve. This area is on the Keystone Spit, public land that the community, state and federal governments worked very hard to preserve as open space, a "wild" part of the Reserve, if you will. The nature of the landscape, with its wetlands to the east and the lake to the north, and the narrowness of the spit, make this alternative a difficult one to accomplish without adverse impacts. The visual intrusions of the modern and large ferry loading facility and parking in an area that is undeveloped, open space public land, would have a detrimental impact to the rural character of the Reserve. Birds, mammals, and other natural resources would experience increased traffic noise and interference in a concentrated way as vehicles, bicycles, and passengers load and unload and head toward the highway. The environmental consequences of locating, on Keystone Spit, a ferry terminal and associated infrastructure such as lighting, parking areas, water and sewer utilities has the potential to adversely affect numerous species in numerous ways. The importance to migratory birds of this Spit and the existing shore habitat on both sides of the road cannot be overstated. Numerous federal laws-including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 2000, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, and many other-indicate Congressional intent to protect birds and their habitat. The NPS is supportive of this intent, both in philosophy and in practice. Development activities on this spit will be difficult to justify under SEPA, and concerns about increased vehicle spill runoff into the Crockett Lake estuary; wetlands impacts from paving and installing underground utilities; loss or damage to foraging and resting areas for birds; and increased opportunities Alternative #2 (CENTRAL) is the least preferred alternative of the three presented. This alternative creates a new terminal facility at the foot of Keystone Road, on the eastern boundary of the National Register Historic District and boundary of the Reserve. This area is on the Keystone Spit, public land that the community, state and federal governments worked very hard to preserve as open space, a "wild" part of the Reserve, if you will. The nature of the landscape, with its wetlands to the east and the lake to the north, and the narrowness of the spit, make this alternative a difficult one to accomplish without adverse impacts. The visual intrusions of the modern and large ferry loading facility and parking in an area that is undeveloped, open space public land, would have a detrimental impact to the rural character of the Reserve. Birds, mammals, and other natural resources would experience increased traffic noise and interference in a concentrated way as vehicles, bicycles, and passengers load and unload and head toward the highway. The environmental consequences of locating, on Keystone Spit, a ferry terminal and associated infrastructure such as lighting, parking areas, water and sewer utilities has the potential to adversely affect numerous species in numerous ways. The importance to migratory birds of this Spit and the existing shore habitat on both sides of the road cannot be overstated. Numerous federal laws-including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 2000, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, and many other-indicate Congressional intent to protect birds and their habitat. The NPS is supportive of this intent, both in philosophy and in practice. Development activities on this spit will be difficult to justify under SEPA, and concerns about increased vehicle spill runoff into the Crockett Lake estuary; wetlands impacts from paving and installing underground utilities; loss or damage to foraging and resting areas for birds; and increased opportunities for introductions of invasive exotic plant species may conflict with values critical to the NPS in its Management Policies (2001).</p> <p>The NPS also encourages project managers to carefully consider all impacts to Port Townsend facilities. Port Townsend is a National Historic Landmark, the highest status a property can attain for its historical significance. The Victorian-era seaport town has special and distinct qualities that must not be compromised. Through a careful and</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>thoughtful design process that recognizes and understands the value and irreplaceable nature of cultural resources, modern improvements and alterations can be incorporated into this historic town. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important project. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. I can be reached at 206-2204318, or by email: Gretchen_Luxenberg@nps.gov.</p>
<p><b>237</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>Thanks for soliciting public comments and giving me a chance to climb up on my soapbox. Here are my comments on the Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As you know, the Keystone end of the ferry run is located within a National Park unit, Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. I note that one of the driving forces behind these changes is to retire the 75 year old ferries. Well, what's wrong with old? That is a critical element in the character of the Reserve, and I have had numerous out-of-town friends over the years comment on how beautiful the old boat is on the Keystone-Port Townsend run, with all the brightwork. I respectfully suggest you put some effort into considering how to keep these old ships in service: do you know if they are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places?</li> <li>2. You have outlined 3 alternative sites, and suggested that another one or more may crop up as comments come in. Allow me to express my grave concerns about the current location: it is overtaxed already with parked vehicles waiting for the next boat; the heavy current vehicle traffic through Ft Casey, with all the children playing soccer and people bicycling, flying kites, walking and bird watching is unacceptable; the holding area is an eyesore and a nuisance for local travelers; vehicles exiting the ferry race down Engle Road and enter Coupeville way in excess of the posted speed limit, speeding into a school crossing zone and a commercial district. Adding to this traffic by doubling the ferry capacity at this site will at least double the likelihood of pedestrian-vehicle-bicycle conflicts. Also, the quality of life for the campers at the campground, the recreationists using the spit, and the divers accessing the underwater park are negatively affected by all the hubbub of the terminal.</li> <li>3. Alternative 2 is the worst of the lot. Located on the spit, in the heart of prime migratory bird feeding and resting area, an area that is regularly used by hikers, birdwatchers, beachcombers, bicyclists, botanists, photographers, and artists, this ferry terminal would be a disaster. I beg you to dump this bad idea and never come back to it. There are no redeeming qualities to such a siting. It would be a visual intrusion, would cause untold environmental damage from the installation of water/sewer/electrical lines, and then where do all the hundreds of cars park? A holding area somewhere on the spit? And what about all the bored tourists waiting for the next ferry? What do they do? Throw rocks at the shorebirds? Litter? Watch their antifreeze and oil spills ooze into Crockett Lake? Please stay away from the spit. Leave it to the birds. It is a critical area for them to recharge as they move up and down the coast.</li> <li>4. Alternative 3, located outside the Reserve, and off the spit, is the most compelling alternative. The ground appears to be relatively level, unforested, and far enough from the spit to have minimal impacts on the wildlife. I urge you to favor this location, and to consider routing traffic off SR 20 to this location, avoiding the heavy traffic moving through Ft Casey/SPU campus, Engle Road, and the S Main St area.</li> <li>5. In addition, please be very careful about improvements on the Port Townsend side: more over water parking is unacceptable. I would encourage you to consider removing existing over water parking and setting up a large holding area away from the terminal site, in order to avoid vehicle spills dumping into the Sound.</li> </ol>
<p><b>238</b> <b>Public Meeting</b></p>	<p><i>q5</i> We have had little input up until this point, but we want to express our concern about the ferry project. We are dismayed at the prospect of our property being identified as a "solution" to the search for a new ferry terminal site. Our property is constantly being pursued by various developers and groups. It is very unique and special to us--one of the few areas on the island that is still agriculture and forestland--and one of the last. Our hope is that this process will yield an alternative site for the new terminal.</p>
<p><b>239</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>Island County is very appreciative of the opportunity to provide comment on the Keystone Ferry Terminal Relocation Feasibility Study and the planning efforts for future environmental review and permitting considerations. Washington State Ferries has given extensive consideration towards alternative locations and potential issues which provides a much better ability to comment on the proposal. Staff from the Department of Planning and Community Development attended your July 30, 2002 Stakeholder Advisory Meeting and your December 16, 2003 meeting with resource agencies and tribes and have found those very helpful. In response to those meetings and the Feasibility Study we would like to request that the following questions and issues be addressed during preparation of your environmental assessment, analysis of alternatives and permits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the alternatives analysis more detailed information should be provided that describes the possibility of replacing the current vessels with a vessel other than Issaquah 130. The alternatives analysis should describe the viability of designing a vessel that would overcome the limitations of the existing configuration. We understand that this would not address the WSF goal of a fully interchangeable fleet but we feel that in an alternatives analysis that it is appropriate to consider a vessel that has the desired vehicular capacity, has a shallow enough draft and provides the needed level of maneuverability. In other words, one of the alternatives should focus on the idea of changing vessels rather than changing terminal locations.</li> <li>2. Provide some quantifiable measure of the difference between the level of efficiency associated with using a unique vessel for this route versus an entire fleet of interchangeable vessels.</li> <li>3. It would also be appropriate to factor in cost estimates for the Issaquah 130 versus the cost of purchasing or designing another boat in order to determine if another vessel is an economically viable alternative.</li> <li>4. It appears as though the cost estimates in the Feasibility Study focus primarily on construction of the west and east</li> </ol>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>terminals. Is it to be assumed that long term and on-going maintenance costs associated with each area are the same? Or, is one area more costly for on-going maintenance?</p> <p>5. Additional information should be provided which describes the methodology for determining Level of Service Standards (LOS) for the ferry system. It is obvious that fewer cancellations will increase the LOS but if there are fewer runs per day how does that increase the LOS? Are ferry waiting times included in the LOS calculation or is it based on delays, missed boats, cancellations, etc.? If there are fewer runs in a day there will be longer wait times in between boats depending upon when the user arrives at the terminal. Also, provide statistics that demonstrate that current and/or future demand justifies the use of larger vessels. Additionally, it is assumed that less runs will require a larger upland holding area, if the site location happens to fall within a regulated critical area the size of the holding area maybe an important issue.</p> <p>6. Provide the number and frequency of vessel groundings on this particular route in recent history.</p> <p>7. The traffic analysis indicates that the LOS for SR 20 will increase from an LOS A to an LOS B. What will be the traffic impacts on Engle Road – a county road? For those ferry passengers coming from the North (Oak Harbor, Coupeville and off island travelers) Engle Road is the likely route to access the ferry.</p> <p>8. While the ponds at the eastern location are man made and therefore not regulated wetlands under Island County Code, a hydrology analysis will be needed if WSF intends to modify them (Not including Crockett Lake, which is a regulated critical area).</p> <p>9. Tribal comments indicate that mitigation opportunities are present which may benefit certain fisheries and their associated tribal benefits. Island County will insist that for any impacts that occur within Island County, compensatory mitigation must then be conducted within Island County. Island County will not accept mitigation that must be carried out in a different jurisdiction.</p> <p>10. The Feasibility Study touches on a number of environmental issues that have already had a limited amount of preliminary review and/or that will require further environmental review. The following environmental issues will need to be analyzed during the more comprehensive review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Both sites are located adjacent to a Marine Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area (FWHCA). FWHCA's include kelp and eelgrass beds, commercial and recreational shellfish beds, pacific herring spawning grounds and surf smelt spawning grounds. A comprehensive survey of the affected marine areas will need to be conducted in order to verify their presence, or lack thereof. A Biological Site Assessment will be needed which discusses alternatives and mitigating conditions.</li> <li>b. Crockett Lake is classified as a Category A wetland under Island County Code with a 100 foot buffer. If any work is proposed within this buffer it may only be done so in accordance with an approved Critical Areas Alteration Approval.</li> <li>c. Crockett Lake is classified as a Habitat of Local Importance due to the presence of high quality migratory bird and waterfowl habitat. Environmental analysis must address the impacts that may result from work at either location and offer mitigation to address those impacts.</li> <li>d. The western site is designated as Conservancy in the Island County Shoreline Master Program. Ferry terminals are listed as a Conditional Use in the Conservancy designation. As such, a Shoreline Development Permit/Conditional Use will be needed for this project. Shoreline Development Permits/Conditional Uses are reviewed by Island County and forwarded with a recommendation to the Department of Ecology who has final approval.</li> <li>e. The Eastern site is designated as Rural in the Island County Shoreline Master Program. Ferry terminals are listed as a Conditional Use in the Rural designation. As such, a Shoreline Development Permit/Conditional Use will be needed for this project. Shoreline Development Permits/Conditional Uses are reviewed by Island County and forwarded with a recommendation to the Department of Ecology who has final approval.</li> <li>f. Keystone Spit is a un-obstructed functioning littoral drift cell, in order to properly evaluate each of the three alternatives a Coastal Geologic Analysis will be required which addresses, among other things: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Identification of drift cells</li> <li>ii. Volume of drift by season or month</li> <li>iii. Direction of drift by season or month</li> <li>iv. Source of drift material</li> <li>v. Areas where drift is deposited</li> <li>vi. The affect of the existing jetty on drift</li> <li>vii. Identification of any protection measures needed for each alternative that reduces or modifies drift, e.g. new jetties, extending jetties, groins, bulkheads, etc. The affect of any new protection measures on drift.</li> <li>viii. Volume of material deposited into the harbor along with estimates of the frequency of dredging that has been needed and will be needed if it were to stay as is.</li> <li>ix. Amounts of dredging needed for each alternative and where the dredged material will go.</li> <li>g. Bathymetry data that is used to evaluate each alternative based on the length of pier required and associated potential impacts.</li> <li>h. A cultural resource reconnaissance and inventory for either site.</li> <li>i. Potential use conflicts with the existing boat launch and Keystone Conservation Area (dive park) located within and adjacent to the current ferry landing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>11. Provide the amount of impervious surface for the current site as it exists today, for the current site if the terminal</li> </ul>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>were to stay in this location and at the terminal for any other alternatives. If the amount of impervious surface is to increase describe efforts that can be employed to ensure that the adjacent and nearby surface waters will not be adversely affected by stormwater runoff.</p> <p>12. Provide estimates and discussion on potential noise impacts to neighboring residential areas.</p> <p>Once again, we appreciate the effort that WSF is making in seeking input on this project. We look forward to working with towards a long-term solution that is positive for WSF, the residents of Island County and the environment.</p>
<p><b>240</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I wish to express the fullest support of the Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society for the comments sent to you by the Whidbey Island Audubon Society. The environmental protection of Crockett Lake and its associated wetlands must be in the forefront and a major component of any modifications made to the Keystone ferry terminal. The Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society is a local Chapter of the National Audubon Society. It is comprised of over 450 environmentally concerned members from all walks of life who live and work on the northern Olympic Peninsula. We are dedicated to birds and the protection, preservation, and restoration for our natural environment. We are also ferry users and take pride in our great Washington State system. Please insure that as you work to improve the valuable service between Pt Townsend and Keystone that protection and preservation of the Crockett Lake ecosystem is an inherent part of the project. Would you please keep us informed of the status of the design and construction work for this project.</p>
<p><b>241</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I'm sorry I was out of town and had to miss the meeting. I did provide an e-mail response – I'm not convinced it's a good idea as currently construed but I'm looking forward to learning more and will keep up with the project. I'm really hoping that, with all the combined ingenuity of our combined communities and the ferries system we can together come up with a solution that serves both the needs of the ferry system and the communities' needs, not just the need to standardize the fleet.</p> <p>At any rate, you mentioned that you'd put together a report from the meeting and that I could get a copy of that from you. I'd very much like to have that. Is it available yet?</p>
<p><b>242</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>Below are our comments on scoping for the Environmental Impact Statement for this action. All of the issues and impacts discussed and listed below, and alternatives proposed should be studied and evaluated in the EIS.</p> <p>Comment-1: The decision that only one class of ferries will be used throughout the entire system is acknowledged as the primary driving force behind this proposed action. The decision not to include smaller, more maneuverable, shallow draft, faster, or passenger boats in the fleet where appropriate for high volume commuter routes, less traveled routes, or those with operational constraints (such as Keystone-Pt.Townsend), has numerous significant adverse impacts. Additionally, because smaller routes will be unable to support the operation of these larger boats during the winter, this is essentially a policy decision either ultimately to cease service to these areas or increase the cost of serving these routes. Because this is such a fundamental decision, an alternative needs to be included of using vessels appropriate for the existing conditions at Keystone harbor. Note that this is different from the "no action" or harbor enlargement alternatives.</p> <p>Comment-2: The proposed action will greatly increase the ultimate potential capacity of the Keystone-Port Townsend ferry run. Regardless of any initial plans, analyses of all alternatives must be based on the predictable ultimate capacity of the new infrastructure.</p> <p>Comment-3a: Initially, we have been told that there will be no traffic increase because the boats, though twice as large as those currently used, will only run half as often. This has several obvious immediate impacts that need to be analyzed.</p> <p>Comment-3b: The level of service will be decreased; the wait for the boat will be twice as long.</p> <p>Comment-3c: Traffic pulses will be larger from the less frequent but larger boats. This provides an immediate rationale for widening existing roads (for the harbor expansion and south Keystone alternatives), with commensurate impacts to Crockett Lake and associated wetlands (see comments-3f and 3g).</p> <p>Comment-3d: Parking areas will need to be commensurately larger, since turnover of ferry riders will be slower. This includes both formal parking lots and overflow areas. This is a significant issue on both ends of the run (Whidbey and the Olympic Peninsula, since parking areas are likely to be the largest terrestrial areas directly impacted. Obvious impacts include direct loss of vegetation and habitat, increased impervious surfaces, increased chemical pollution from increased numbers of vehicles, and increased biological pollution from increased numbers of and more widely dispersed vehicles and people. The last of these is discussed in more detail below. However mitigations analyzed to compare the qualitative and quantitative impacts of all alternatives should include more frequent ferry runs, use of pervious surfaces, complete capture and treatment of runoff from all parking areas (both formal and overflow), and methods of limiting dispersal and access to Keystone Spit of people waiting for the ferry.</p> <p>Comment-3e: Regardless of ferry scheduling and trip regimes, placing a terminal at south Keystone will mean vastly increased biological impacts to this area from placing large numbers of people in this area. The longer wait from decreased frequency of service simply amplifies these impacts. Predictable impacts include trampling of vegetation, harassment of wildlife by pets (dogs), and introduction of weeds. Social impacts include decreased and degraded recreational</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>experience, as well as lost recreational opportunities (fishery access). These impacts all need to be analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively at the level expected under the ultimate full capacity of the new infrastructure.</p> <p>Comment-3f: For the south Keystone and expanded harbor options, impacts to Crockett lake wetlands and associated flora and fauna need to be evaluated. These include impacts to hydrological function (tidal regime and lake chemistry), flora, and fauna. Analyses need to be based on immediate direct impacts and also secondary and indirect impacts, including those resulting from increased traffic pulses and volumes, and the inevitable road widening that will ultimately be necessary due to the enlarged infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>Comment-3g: Biological pollution from motor vehicles is particularly an issue for the south Keystone alternative. Wheeled vehicles are well known vectors of movement for invasive plants (i.e. weeds), generally from transport of seeds and plant material caught in tires and "hitchhiking" elsewhere on and in vehicles. Because of their relatively (and naturally) low vegetative cover, plant communities on Keystone Spit are readily vulnerable to invasion. This impact and the efficacy and feasibility of possible mitigating actions must be analyzed.</p> <p>Comment-3h: The impacts of increased traffic volumes need to be analyzed at least to Hwy. 20 and 525. This includes impacts on farm operations from interference with movement of farm machinery.</p> <p>Comment-4: There are several potential impacts that are peculiar to the south (Beach Farm) alternative. Aerial photographs show a pond on this property and it is quite possible that there are wetlands (albeit farmed and degraded) present. The property needs a thorough floristic inventory and characterization as well as faunal surveys. Because this alternative would require construction of an entirely new road, of particular concern is possible interference with movement of amphibians, particularly red legged frog (<i>Rana aroura</i>), as well as possible methods of mitigating any impacts.</p> <p>Comment-5: Impacts to near shore processes and functions need to be analyzed for all alternatives. This includes effects on littoral drift, submerged and floating aquatic vegetation (i.e. <i>Zostera</i> spp. and kelp), and function (i.e. as fish nurseries).</p>
<p><b>243</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>On behalf of the 5000 members of Seattle Audubon, many of whom have considerable interest in the well-being of Whidbey Island's Crockett Lake, we request that Washington State Ferries make any proposed changes to the Keystone landing in an environmentally sensitive manner.</p> <p>We support the members of the Whidbey Audubon whose major concern is the potential degradation of the habitat of Crockett Lake and the surrounding wetlands (which lie adjacent to the Keystone Ferry) that could occur if the ferry terminal is moved and the current harbor is allowed to fill with silt. The importance of the tide gate adjacent to the ferry terminal cannot be underestimated for its role in regulating the water level in the lake. If the culvert under SR 20 is filled with silt the tide gate would be ineffective and it would not be possible to regulate the water level in the lake. If the water level is not carefully managed, the wetland could succeed to a shrub community with the loss of the wetland habitat. Beginning in 1973, Seattle Audubon, with SWIFT (Save Whidbey Island for Tomorrow), mobilized public opinion and took legal action to protect areas of the Keystone Spit and Crockett Lake from proposed development that had little or not redeeming environmental value. As a result, the intervening 30 years have seen the wildlife and habitat be allowed to flourish. We would not hesitate to entertain such actions again.</p> <p>Fairly recently, the lake and its surrounding wetlands have been designated an Important Bird Area of Washington by the National Audubon Society' i.e., a site that provides essential habitat for one or more species of birds and is essential for the long term conservation of birds. The birds depend upon the water. Here are a few facts to document that designation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The lake serves as a "refueling" or staging area for an average of 167,000 (and as many as 222,000) shorebirds during the annual migration.</li> <li>- There is a great blue heron colony of 15 to 25 pairs on the north side of the lake. Congregations of up to 63 herons have been observed feeding in the lake.</li> <li>- 213 bird species have been observed at this site; 47 of these species nest in the area. We are aware of the need to replace the steel electric vessels, and, through the Audubon network, are willing to offer assistance to ensure that environmental safeguards are employed to the fullest extent possible. The integrity of this important ecosystem must be maintained.</li> </ul> <p>Sincerely, Tom Riley, President, 206-336-2268 Christina Peterson, Executive Director, 206-523-8243 ext. 15</p>
<p><b>244</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>Post-it note: "Celia – I'd like my comments to Ms. L entered into the Keystone records. Thanks!" Ms. Jennifer Langston – News Seattle P.I. 101 – Elliott Ave. W. Seattle, WA 98119-1909 Hi Jennifer – Thanks so much for being gracious when I called this afternoon to discuss your excellent article in today's P.I. regarding the Keystone Harbor and the steel-electric class ferries</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>Let me jot some information for you on these topics.</p> <p>Keystone Ferry: "Founded" 1920s and operated by Black Ball. Sold 1940s, and operated for many years by Capt. Oscar Lee, no relation. He used the Defiance for many years, once used on the old Tacoma (Day Island) – Pt. Fosdick run until completion of the Tacoma Narrows bridge (II) in 1950. Capt. Lee bought the steel ferry "San Diego" in August, 1969, and brought it to Port Townsend immediately after the San Diego – Coronado ferry service ended c. August 15, 1969. Capt. Lee ended his operation of the Keystone run in 1973. The state (C.C. Nichols – Toll Bridge Authority) claimed Capt. Lee did not own the slips as he was behind on his property taxes and did not want to pay for them. I attended the public hearing on this at the Nisqually room at the Seattle Center.</p> <p>There was some "bad blood" and the state (C.C. Nichols) did NOT buy the "San Diego," built 1930 and in good condition (San Diego eventually went to Vancouver, B.C. and became "Klondike Queen" and was surveyed for possible use on Hood Canal after the floating bridge sank Feb. 13, 1979). The state shifted the ex-Maryland (1938) ferry Olympic to Keystone, after Gov. Evans rejected purchase of the San Diego (economical for a short route and light traffic) on the grounds "there is a surplus of ferries," a BIG lie! Shifting the Olympic meant the state could no longer operate four ferries at Mukilteo-Clinton in summer peaks ("longer lines"), but then shallow draft meant Keystone Harbor could be used safely. The Olympic, now sold, was NOT too big for the route, as most WSF vessels are today. Initial years of state operation saw winter service added (started 3 or 4-days per week) and eventually the other shallow-draft ferry Rhododendron (1947) to the run. These two ferries were ideal – shallow draft meant dredging costs were minimal, and operating losses were low. Ferry operating costs rise rapidly as the vessel-size increases. Many months of the year, a steel-electric class ferry is too large for the route = 1) skyrocketing deficits and 2) ever rising ferry tolls. Steel-electric class ferries: Originally there were 6, all built by Southern Pacific Railroad in spring of 1927 for \$525,000 apiece – ruggedly built at zenith of SP prosperity – about twice the cost of boats at the same time for a private operator – Golden Gate ferries, a project of promoters Harry Spear and Aven J. Hanford. Phil Spaulding, who designed Black Ball's Coho, and many vessels for Washington State, B.C. and Alaska, once remarked that if an auto ferry is well maintained, it can last hundreds of years. Perhaps you can try to verify that. If so, I hope it would reduce the willingness of the P.I. to "smear" the steel-electrics by suggesting they are "old." (Ageism at its worst.)</p> <p>You are encouraged to report what's wrong with the steel-electrics and find someone outside the Puget Sound "good old boy" network (busy bunch drumming up business for the shipyards) say from Maine, or the Gulf Coast, to independently review the condition.</p> <p>Two, Willapa (ex. Fresno) and Enetai (ex. Santa Rosa) were sold in 1968 for \$22,000 apiece. The other four were extensively rebuilt in 1958, and again in the 1980s, and should be in good shape. They are probably good for one hundred years (to the year 2030) and if they remain active, will really keep operating costs, and the ferry tolls, DOWN. In the last few years, the four have been assigned: 1) Illahee – inter-island San Juans (serving the free-for-four passengers [&amp;] 8-mile Friday Harbor-Orcas run – same distance as Seattle-Bainbridge Is.)</p> <p>2) Quinalt – Portland-Keystone  3) Klickitat – Portland-Keystone  4) Nisqually – spare – active.</p> <p>See Seattle Times July 22, 2003 p. B-3. Nisqually was used on Fauntleroy-Vashon run after Tillikum went to San Juan Islands to replace Yakima, which had lost a propeller blade. I would place 55-car Olympic back on Keystone in off-season months, and send the two steel-electrics at Keystone to Mukilteo-Clinton to replace Issaquah-class boats Kittitas and Cathlamet – again far too large for the route, contributing to: 1) higher taxes, and 2) higher ferry tolls. Kittitas and Cathlamet would go to Edmonds-Kingston to replace Jamos Spokane and Puyallup – very expensive to run. Indeed, the early 1980s planning documents DID NOT MENTION any new ferries than the super class (160 cars). The two jumbos used then were FAR too large except for Sidney, BC-Anacortes in the summer, a route the state has wanted to end for many years. Walla Wall operated Anacortes-Sidney summer of 1973, and not since (unless in an emergency). See if you can locate a ferry boat buff named Leslie Bagley. I have never met him. Urban legend: Leslie moved from U.S. east coast to Seattle (late 1980s) to take an entry level analyst position at Pier 52. A few weeks after starting, he remarked (coffee break?) that "at WSF, on all the routes, the boats are too big for the route!" He was fired a few days later. Can't have the truth. It was like saying, "Mommy, the emperor has no clothes." The WILD expense of big new boats (\$ ¼ billion for 3 new jumbos) only is the START: Then terminal expansion starts and goes on &amp; on &amp; on &amp; on. We need additional ferry routes with steel-electric size ferries (256 ft. long, 1,800 hp, 80-car capacity):</p> <p>1) Des Moines-Vashon (Pt. Robinson) – to reduce crusher on both existing Vashon routes (Tacoma, West Seattle), returning an auto ferry ended 1930. One steel-electric.  2) Ballard-Shilshole (Ray's Boat House). Squamish-Indianola. Started 1920s, service from Shilshole ended c. 1940, from Pier 52, Nov. 1951. Would use 2 steel-electrics.  3) Seattle-Manchester – Restover service to Manchester started by Capt. Croshy c. 1926 – to Alki until 1935, to downtown Seattle until Oct. 1949 (Oct 19, 1949?). Two steel-electrics – to serve growing South Kitsap area (Manchester is 6 miles from Port Orchard).  4) Summer run to dwnw move tourists to San Juans – Friday Harbor to Canadian "Gulf Islands" ports of a) Otter Bay Pender Island (actually North Pender &amp; South Pender now connected by a bridge) and b) Long Harbour, on Salt Spring Island, closest ferry terminal to Ganges, largest town in the Fulg Islands. Two round trips per day with a steel-electric</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>class ferry to bring Canada tourists to U.S. without having to go through airport-like Ferry terminals, and to make San Juans more attractive as part of a circle tour – go on way (via Anacortes), return another (through “Canadian” San Juans, exiting via either Victoria or Vancouver. I believe if any new ferries are built (they are now ruinously expensive – a reason to keep what we have now); We should build 6 more new steel electrics, as much as possible to be identical in appearance to the steel-electrics as built 1927 in San Francisco.</p> <p>Can I be brash enough to name them for you? (S = steel electric)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)S into – Spokane Indian place name</li> <li>2)Sol Duc – former Black Ball steamer used Seattle-Anacortes-Bellingham</li> <li>3)Skamania – S. Central Washington state county and town</li> <li>4)Sacajawea – Female guide to Lewis &amp; Clark – made the 1803-1805 expedition a success.</li> <li>5)Simnasho – place name on Warm Springs Indian reservation – to which Walla Walla tribe war removed after 1855 war &amp; treaty.</li> <li>6)Skionwilo – In Onandaga dialect: “Skion” strong, powerful, mighty, etc. “Wilo” pleasant, beautiful, attractive, etc. History Points: Last SF auto ferry was May 15, 1940. All 6 steel-electrics were idled. A Brazilian firm bid \$330,000 U.S. for all 6 in July, 1940. But did not post any bond. Capt. Peabody bid \$330,000 one week later and got all 6 – for \$55,000.16 apiece. WHAT a bargain! They arrived in Seattle August, 1940. Illahee was feared lost, but survived a storm en route. Enetai (as “Santa Rosa” – no name change for 1st Navy Yard trip) arrived in a morning hour, &amp; after it was “inspected,” went to Bremerton that afternoon in SP colors, they were SO short of ferries. They were subsidiary SP Fresno – Willapa SP Stockton – Klickitat            SP Lake Tahoe – Illahee            NWP Redwood Empire – Quinalt            NWP Mendocino – Nisqually            NWP Santa Rosa – Enetai</li> </ol> <p>Thanks again for letting me bend your ears and now your eyes on this.</p> <p>You are free to contact me – evenings best. I’m a night owl.</p> <p>If you or another PI staffer would like to talk about steel-electric ferries and craziness/nastiness/massive waste in ferry system since Day One (June 1, 1954) please call. For a next day appointment, you can leave a message with Mary Jane Resch, (509) 946-7083 in Richland and I should receive that message 7-days per week by late afternoon.</p> <p>Yours for economical ferry operations, low tolls, and an end to waste in state government everywhere (including Afloat) Most sincerely, GC Lee, Jr.</p> <p>[Attached photocopy of front page of Discount Guide Hotel Coupons, Oct – Jan, 2003/04. Nothwest. Includes Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana &amp; Wyoming. www.traveldiscountguide.com. Features picture of Elliott Bay – a ferry in front of skyscrapers. Commenter added the following notes, pointing at the ferry:]</p> <p>\$\$\$\$</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE: A jumbo ferry “idling” in the dock consumes more fuel than a steel-electric ferry consumes underway at normal service speed. Sure adds to the cost of ferry fares... Up, Up, &amp; a-w-a-y!</p> <p>Steel-electric class ferry – 1,800 horse power            New jumbo ferry – 16,800 h.p. (13,400 at shafts)</p> <p>[Attached Editorial from Seattle PI on Friday, October 17, 2003. Headline is “Finding lessons in N.Y. ferry crash.” Points and comments on the second to last paragraph that states, “Risks can be reduced through screening and safety training for crews and preventive maintenance for the vessels, and by running modern, well-equipped boats. Many in Washington’s fleet are at least a half-century old. The four Steel Electric Class boats were built when Calvin Coolidge was president.” Commenter wrote:] Typical way in which steel-electric class ferries are smeared! Don’t be propagandized or stampeded.</p>
<p><b>245</b> <b>Mail</b></p>	<p>Packet #2            [spiral-bound packet of press clippings with his comments written in margins]            [Cover page:]            “January 16, 2004            Keystone Harbor Scoping            Hi Celia – Please enter this letter and enclosed materials to the record in opposition to = 1) Any work at Keystone Harbor 2) Sale of any steel-electric class ferries. To reduce ferry costs, a smaller ferry should be used at Keystone. The 3 new jumbo ferries are far too expensive to operate, and should be placed in layup or sold if not limited to Anacortes-Sidney, B.C. ONLY, summers only.I should be on your mailing list regarding these matters.Most sincerely, GC Lee, Jr.”            [Page 1; pages are not numbered]            Picture of ferry with caption: Super Jumbo class double-ended ferries built by Todd Shipyard for Washington State. (8, Pacific Maritime Magazine, November 1995.)            GC Lee comment: “FAR to [sic] large for the routes – destroying WSF as an institution. 747 afloat!”            Article with headline: More people, vehicles take Washington Ferries.            Sub-headline: Washington State Ferries sees its overall largest gain in six years, exceeds capacity at peak times</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>and plans to raise rates. (Oregonian 3-8-98)</p> <p>The following paragraph is bracketed: 'Fare increases are anticipated. New jumbo ferries coming online create sudden jumps in operating expenses that steady ridership growth doesn't fully offset, McCarthy said.'</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "This is a rare admission at WSF that big new ferries, too large for the routes they serve, cause BIG increases in ferry fares. It started Aug. 15, 1969 (!) when fares went up 15% to pay for super-ferries too large for the Bremerton &amp; Winslow routes (4 boats). The 6 Issaquah boats did the same, 1980s. 3 new Jumbos 1990s are destroying WSF with their high costs. Should be sold. WSF can't 'grow into' the Jumbos' costs as traffic is falling. (Death spiral)"</p> <p>[Page 2]</p> <p>Advertisement with a picture of a ferry and the header: Available for Lease! (SF Chronical, Nov. 3, 1980)</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "A symbol of WSF waste." [arrow pointing to advertisement] "Ex-WSF Enetai. Two WSF steel-electrics sold for \$22,000 apiece – a 5-digit number (to please the shipyards) and then \$7.3 mil. to \$10 mil. apiece was spent on the other four."</p> <p>Article with headline: Klickitat due back in service by end of week (Seattle Post-Intelligencer, 5-5-82)</p> <p>GC Lee drew underlined the following text in the article: '\$7.3 million, up from the original \$6.5 million contract price... Also underlined a quote from a ferry official: 'That is practically a new boat.'</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "practically a new boat in May, 1982 – why throw it away now? Let's not allow the WSF waste to continue. Retain all 4 steel-electric class ferries!"</p> <p>Article with headline: Here she is, the Klickitat, good as new (Seattle Post-Intelligencer, 4-11-82)</p> <p>GC Lee underlined the following text: '...one-third of what the new ferries of comparable size cost...'</p> <p>Also pointed to a paragraph that says the Klickitat carries 75 cars instead of the 100 accommodated by the new Issaquah-class ferries.</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "Issaquah class boats (at least 4) expanded in 1980s by adding mezzanine car decks."</p> <p>[Page 3]</p> <p>Picture of Klickitat (Seattle Post-Intelligencer, 4-11-82, page A5)</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "The economy class size ferry that really keeps your ferry fares LOW! (Wal-Mart class boats?) If any new ferries are to be built for WSF, they should be steel-electric class vessels, max length 256 feet, max horsepower 1,800 hp. At this time of economic difficulty, steel-electrics should 'bump' larger ferries to save \$. How about building 6 new steel-electrics (to 1927 appearance) and sell the jumbo ferries (B.C. might buy the jumbos). Names for new vessels (S class = steel electric): 1) SINTO 2) SOL DUC 3) Sacajawea 4) Skamania 5) Simnasho 6) Skionwilo."</p> <p>[Page 4]</p> <p>Photocopy from Marine Digest, January 29, 1977; Frank A. Clapp Editor</p> <p>Picture of ferry with caption: Pictured above is an architect's rendering, from Nickum and Spaulding, of what the proposed new ferry (or ferries) would look like. The ferry would measure 328 ft. long and would have a 100 car capacity.</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "This one-ferry plan turned into six ferries, all expensive to operate."</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "Steamboat Bill. Summer, 1984 Issue #170, p. 123"</p> <p>Two paragraphs of text, apparently from the Marine Digest. Text underlined is: ... inspector's hammer punched a hole in the hull of ferry QUINALT.'</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "This is how state officials failed to maintain older ferries so as to make a case (keep the shipyards happy) for expensive new ferries. Quinalt was out of service c. 2 years after this. A private company never allow this to develop/happen."</p> <p>Also underlined: '\$2.8 mn. contract to repair and modernize...'</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "\$28 mil."</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "If you are appalled by ferry waste, contact anti-tax activist Tim Eyman at address below. WSF can't get away with it if you cut off their funds."</p> <p>Text: 'Paid for by Permanent Offense I-722; PO Box 1641; Mukilteo, WA 98275; Ph: 425-493-8707; FAX: 425-493-1027; www.i-695.org; email: info@I-695.org.'</p> <p>[Page 5]</p> <p>Photocopy of a page with a chart of statistics on the Washington State Ferries Fleet. GC Lee comment: "List published after Kulshan sold, Oct 1982)</p> <p>Circled M.V. Quinalt, M.V. Ilahee, M.V. Nisqually, and M.V. Klickitat; notes "steel-electric class vessels; Best ferries in the fleet." Circles their horsepower level – 1800 hp for each – and comments "Economic on fuel" Circled M.V. Olympic, and notes "SOLD"</p> <p>At the bottom of the chart, wrote in "MV Sealth, built in Seattle, 1984, 460-ft. long, 90-ft. beam, speed 20 knots, 16000 hp, 2500 passenger capacity."</p> <p>Also: "**3 steel-electrics rebuilt sequentially in mid-1980s" In a separate chart, the 1977 Fleet list, GC Lee categorizes the following ships as:</p> <p>M.V. Vashon "SOLD – wrecked"</p> <p>M.V. Olympic "SOLD – unwisely"</p> <p>M.V. Kulshan "SOLD – unwisely"</p> <p>GC Lee comment: "The smaller ferries should have been kept: 1) Use all week in winter on light runs to save money</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>– keep tolls down 2) as extra boats in summer to reduce length of waiting lines on busy weekends.”</p> <p>[Page 6]            GC Lee comment: “Source: Addendum to long-range plan – summary, WSF. Fall 1984, p. 3. Don Nutter, WSF Planning director.” Photocopy of the Preferred Alternative; arrow pointing to Port Townsend/Keystone plan, which states ‘Maintain the route, however, consider rate adjustments or alternative funding to bring the operating deficit in line within the system average.’</p> <p>GC Lee comments: “Even in 1984, State was spending FAR too much at Keystone – 1) Too much service 2) Ferries used were too large for the route. If steel-electrics are sold, the route will be vastly worse financially, less summer service, higher tolls, reduced or NO winter service, like Sidney, B.C.”</p> <p>[Page 7]            Photocopy of editorial by James F. Vesely (Seattle Times, 12-14-2003) titled ‘Mega-projects: the end of an era of urban development’</p> <p>GC Lee comments: “Our society cannot afford massive spending on ferries. A new jumbo boat now would cost over \$100 mil. Let’s keep and upgrade what we already have. Steel-electric ferries: 1) exist; 2) are paid for; 3) are in reasonable good shape (best auto ferries ever built); 4) ‘like new’ after 1980s rebuilds.”</p> <p>[Page 8]            Abstract of an article titled ‘The ferry’s not full, but it’s pulling out: How come?’ Column by Susan Gilmore. (Seattle Times, 12-29-2002, pg. B1)            Abstract describes waiting several hours in the Edmonds-Kingston ferry auto line. When finally boarded, there was still space to board 20-30 more cars but ferry left in order to stay on schedule and the ferry line in Edmonds extended for several miles.</p> <p>GC Lee comments: The ferry rider, resident, citizen, voter, and taxpayer pays for every cardeck space moved, on every WSF sailing, whether that cardeck space is used or not! Jumbos ‘Spokane’ and ‘Puyallup’ are used on the Edmonds-Kingston route, and ARE FAR too large for that 4.5 mile route. They spend far too much time in port loading and unloading. They have empty car desk spaces all year. And when those cardeck spaces ARE needed: can’t be used! (see my next sheet)</p> <p>[Page 9]            Continuation of the previous page’s citation; this page has to text of the entire article            Underlined quote from a WSF official that the schedules were created before the traffic got as bad as it is now.            GC Lee comments: “A lie! (see below)”            GC Lee comments at bottom of page: “i.e. a bigger boat means less frequent service. Schedules were written for 130-car ‘Issaquah’ &amp; 160-car “super” class boats, at Edmonds-Kingston. The Edmonds-Kingston route was served by steel-electric class boats economically from fall, 1940. The E-K route is: 1) unreliable, 2) frustrating, 3) very expensive to operate because of jumbo ferries too large for the route &amp; should be sold.</p> <p>[Page 10]            Article by Craig Welch and Andrea Vogt titled ‘State stung by private contracts: Lack of consistent oversight leaves taxpayers with bill for waste, fraud’ (Spokesman-Review, 2-27-2000)            GC Lee comments: “Washington State Ferries has been plagued by charges of ‘irregularities’ since radar was placed on some steel-electric ferries in October 1951. No new ferries: it’s cheaper and less dishonest, to make ferries last!”</p> <p>[Page 11]            Continuation of article from previous page            GC Lee writes in the margin: “Tim Eyman, PO Box 1641, Mukilteo – 98275. phone 425-493-8707 FAX 425-493-1027 www.voterswantmoremorechoices.com”</p> <p>[Page 12]            Letter to the Editor from David Hackett of Vashon (Seattle PI, 11-13-03)            GC Lee underlines text stating that a statement by WSF is a ‘flat out lie’ and that the Tyee ferry was sold for ‘\$240,000 under market value.’            GC Lee comments: “Our WSF ferry system lies all the time – continuously, for decades. We should not believe anything WSF wind tunnel (p.v. dept) says – including badmouthing of steel-electric class ferries! Tyee sold for \$550,000. Resold a few weeks later for \$700,000. WHO pays?”            Article titled ‘Panel suggests privatizing parts of Alaska ferry system’ (Seattle Times, 11-23-03)            GC Lee comments: ALL of WSF should be privatized!            Article titled ‘Speakers oppose shutdown of ferry runs in San Juans’ (Oregonian, 2-26-97)            GC Lee circled paragraph that states ‘Washington State Ferry officials want to close the route because of declining ridership and costs.’            Article titled ‘Same ferry service seen’ (Vashon Beachcomber, 4-8-82)            GC Lee circled the text, ‘That run [third San Juan run to Sydney, B.C.] is a big money maker, she [ferry spokeswoman] said.’            With arrows pointing to both the Oregonian and Beachcomber articles, GC Lee comments: “Sidney = What is it – profitable, or not? They can’t have it both ways. What happened here?”            Also on the Beachcomber article, he underlines text that says doubling service in the San Juans ties up the</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>superferries. He comments: "They know how to do it."            At the end of the article, he comments: "A steel-electric used at Sidney, B.C. in winter might have saved the shutdown of Dec. 28, 2003."            [Page 13]            Article titled 'Late boats mark transition into new ferry schedule' (The Journal of the San Juan Islands, 9-6-89)            GC Lee circles the following text: 'Steel plating is to be replaced on the Kaleetan in the first step of several years of repairs to the Elwha-class ferries.' He comments: "This (steel-plate replacement) is normal ferry maintenance. You don't throw the car away because it needs new tires. Likewise, you don't throw the ferry away when the ferry needs new steel – except if you are a spendaway ferrycrat at WSF who exists to serve shipyard corporations. Steel-electrics need work, like all ferries, tugs, freighters, cruise ships, etc. Let's NOT throw them away."            [Page 14]            Article titled 'Shipyards may sink, Todd chairman says' (Seattle PI, 5-23-85)            GC Lee comments: "Getting rid of shipyards in Wash. State would mean a quantum leap in the states' corporate morals level. Waste in Wash. State Ferries has continued for decades to meet the needs of U.S. shipyards, which are dying because of very high costs. Yet Wash. State gives it away, like \$3.2 bil. To Boeing (reduced taxes) for 1,200 jobs at the 7E7 Everett-Paine Field plant! Steel-electrics are being disposed of to "make work" for inefficient shipyards. Retire state officials, not the s[teel] electric."            [Page 15]            Article titled "Ferry protest was not a crime" (Seattle PI, 9-18-02)            GC Lee comments: "This happened (your correspondent's take because ferry Issaquah is too large for F-U-5 route. Problems in the dreaded Fauntleroy-Vashon-Triangle (worse than Bermuda triangle, actually) a Cause = ferry Issaquah too big for the route—see next sheets."            [Page 16]            Article titled "How a tiff at ferry dock became a Very Big Case" (Seattle PI 10-23-02)            GC Lee highlights the following text: 'After a few minutes the mimiprotest faded and Issaquah left for the Fauntleroy dock in West Seattle.' He writes: "Ferry Issaquah (130 cars) too large for the route." Also highlights, 'But as the ferry Tillikum picked up the commuters and sailed,' and writes, "Ferry Tillikum (100 cars) NOT to large for the route."            Continues writing: "What happened? (My answer) On Aug 30, 2002, Friday before Labor Day weekend; heavy auto traffic. As Issaquah takes longer to load and unload autos (larger than Tillikum) Issaquah ran later and later, and Tillikum (on time through it all) stayed on time. To get Issaquah back [Page 17] on time, a scheduled F[auntleroy]-to-V[ashon]-to-S[outhworth], return S-to-V-to-F run was cancelled after F to V then Return V to F –saving 30 minutes (degree of late-ness) but stranding V to S commuters at both (1) Vashon (heading west) and (2) Southworth, heading both to Vashon and Fauntleroy. This would not have happened if 100-car twin ferry Klahowya (smaller) were used instead of Issaquah." Also notes, "This trouble could be solved by placing all small ferry on route to operate Vashon-Southworth only 5am-9pm!" Referring to drawing of Leschi Boat: "Would have been kept for Vashon-Southworth only service."            [Page 18]            Referring to personal letter from Rosie Atkinson, aide to Sen. Craswell. (3-15-1982)            Highlights: 'There has been much concern expressed regarding the expense involved in operation of the system, especially since the new ferries went into operation...' and 'stress of fights on the dock.'            Lee writes: "Note unsolicited letter. Higher expenses are from assignment of Issaquah class ferries – MUCH more expensive to operate than the steel-electrics the Issaquahs replaced. Fights on the dock: Still "social problems" in 2002 (20 years later) as WSF has never dealt properly with F-V-S "Triangle."            [Page 19] See hard copy diagram of "Proposed 4-Boat F-V-S Operations Layout"            [Page 20] Article titled "Fuel costs pinch ferries and State Patrol: Both agencies ask the Legislature for more money to keep fleets running." (Seattle PI, 1/22/01)            Highlights: "The Ferries use about 21 million gallons of diesel yearly, Green said. System fuel costs would have been even higher...in the wake of Initiative 695"            Lee Writes: "Thank Goodness for I-695 BLESS Tim Eyman! –P.O. Box 1641, Mukilteo, 98275, Phone: 425-493-8707, Fax 425-493-1027, www.voterswantmorechoices.com"            References "Source: Ferry System Folder, 1981 Annual Operating Data" 'Fuel Consumed, 13,660,433 Gal.'            Writes: "The cost of running 6 big Issaquah Class ferries and 3 new oversize Jumbos is readily apparent. The Rx for this massive increase in fuel costs (usage) is smaller ferries on several routes. Let's be economical, &amp; use steel-electrics (don't sell them) to save fuel."            [Page 21] "Gasoline Tax to Stimulate Economy?" AORTA Bulletin (Association of Oregon Rail And Transit Advocates), Editorial, March 2002.            Highlights: 'An economy based on waste is inherently and hopelessly violent, and war is its inevitable by-product.'            Writes: "In a philosophical sense, any waste in the ferry system eventually will lead to more violence in our society spending a lot of \$\$ at Keystone only will enlarge and accelerate waste in the ferry system. That = yet more harm to our society. State officials pushing this should be fired or retired. Let's get in ferries officials who can save money."            [Page 22] WSF Bulletin, 1985.</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>Writes: Note Steel-electric ferry insignia.            Highlights: 8.1% ferry fare increase.            Writes: "No mention of using smaller ferries to contain costs. More deception. WSF wind tunnel (p.r. dept.) doesn't mention WSF was really hurting in 1985 by increased costs of operating the 6 Issaquah-class ferries, --last of which, Stealth, entered service in 1984. It was easy to blame the Hood Canal toll problems, and NOT the oversize boats, so that even more oversize boats later could be build without complaints (they succeeded)."            [Page 23] "Ships Sailed into rough seas at start" (Vancouver Sun, 3/25/03)            Writes: "This is the path WSF is on! In 2003, the B.C. legislature wrote off \$1 Bil (Canadian) (1) \$456 mil. on 3 new ferries that did not work out (another bright idea bites the dust) and (2) about \$550 mil. in accumulated ferry operating deficits before "restructuring" B.C. Ferry Corp. Same Old Story – too many boats too big for the routes the boats serve!"            [Page 24] "Tourism troubles leave cloud over sunny San Juans" (Seattle Times, 7/29/02)            Highlights: "When you're in a seasonal environment and you have to make the majority of your profit in three months, any downturn is serious," said Tom Juliano, general manager at Orcas Island's Rosario Resort and Spa. ...riders on the Anacortes/San Juans route were down more than 5,000 last June ... the tourism slowdown seems to be specific to them.            Writes: "Sale of steel-electric ferries will rapidly increase costs of operating San Juans services. Those higher costs will lead to: A) Higher tolls B) Reduced service C) Reduced patronage D) A declining economy and rising unemployment. State should operate a steel-electric (low cost) to Sidney B.C., in winter rather than cancel all service. Boats too big and expensive for the route are destroying economies of ferry-sensitive areas. Let's (1) Sell, or (2) lay-up [mothball] the biggest boats and use upgraded steel-electric class boats instead. This will keep WSF from pricing itself out of business.            [Page 25 - Cont'd from page 24] Highlights: '...increase in ferry fares...'            Writes: "[unreadable in binding] ...destroying business and raising unemployment."            [Page 26] "Port Townsend, Whidbey Ferry Service Doubles" (PT Leader, 6/15/1983)            Highlights: 'During the winter, the ferry system dredged the channel at Keystone to allow better access by ferries the size of Klickitat'            Writes: "This dredging expense by the State adds to pressure for fare hikes on the ferries. Klickitat—a steel-electric class ferry, it too large fro this route except several weeks in the summer. State should return shallow-draft ex.Mayland ferry "Olympic," 55-car capacity, to Keystone route to save money, --not put a 130 Issaquah-class boat on the route. This could cause pressure to discontinue the route entirely.            [Page 27] "Ferry system pins its future on big Mark IIs" (Seattle PI, 3/26/1997)            Highlights: 'The cost: \$87.2 million.'            Writes: '\$87.2 mil x 3 - \$261,600,000 (!) Not a one was needed. Once here, a source of enormous pressure to raise tolls, as they are too big for all WSF routes, except Anacortes-Sidney B.C. in summer. Don't sell the steel-electric vessels, lest there be a "shortage of ferries" to prompt another round of expensive new ferry construction!            The \$\$ grows on trees for the welfare-sows afloat. Well over \$1/4 billion for just 3 ferries. Call Tim Eyman now! A route WSF would like to discontinue [pointing to Anacortes comment]            [Continues on Page 28] Highlights "...fourth Mark II is about \$10 million above the average of the other three vessels."            Writes: [cannot read in binding]...Scandal comes from no-bid contracts, including "change orders" after the contract is signed. It's been a candy store at WSF since Day One, June 1, 1951. It never stops.            [Page 29] "New Pacific Coast Ferries Under Construction" (Pacific Maritime Magazine, Nov. 1995)            Highlights: 'This \$81 millions project...' Writes: "\$281 mil."            Highlights: '460 ft long ... four EMD 4,000 horsepower ...Among the service's conventional ferries, the three steel electric boats, Nisqually, Quinault, and Illahee are to be given new propulsion control systems next year.'            Writes: "Lesson: They'll spend all the dollars taxpayers by default will let them have. In 1995, the steel-electrics were worth enough for new propulsion systems! STILL ARE."            Article: "Propeller Fix to Idle ferry in San Juans" (Seattle Times, 7/22/03)            Highlights: '75-car Nisqually' Writes: "Don't sell ANY steel electric ferry. It's nice to have a spare. Note: Nisqually is a steel-electric class vessel."            [Page 30] Photocopy, Genesis 7:21            Highlights: '450 feet long' Writes: "Note: Noah's Ark dimensions"            Writes: New Jumbo ferries are 460-feet long—90 feet wide. Bigger than Noah's Ark. Too big for WSF routes. Should be disposed of. We can't afford them. Keep the existing steel-electrics—dispose of the New Mark II jumbo (Tacoma, Wenatchee, Puyallup) instead! Source: NIV, Old Testament – Zondevuan—GrandRapids, Michigan"            [Page 31] "State chooses the fast lane" (Seattle PI, 5/14/01)            Writes: This is what WSF really wants—big contracts and little oversight. Sale of steel-electrics seems a part of this strategy.            Highlights: 'four midsize ferries, each capable of carrying 100 to 110 vehicles plus passengers.' Writes: "More high-cost Issaquah-type ferries to run up the Ferry fares with sky rocketing operating expenses. A retired Seattle PI official told your correspondent in 1985: "We know that the MP&amp;E act (Marine Power &amp; Equipment Shipyard builder of 6 Issaquah-class ferries ) sailed through the legislature on rolled...[unreadable]"</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>Highlights: 'In 1977, the Legislature authorized a design-build method for constructing six Issaquah-class ferries.'</p> <p>[Page 32] "Auction of ferry Vashon coming up on April 23" (Friday Harbor Journal, 4/14/82) Writes: "Vashon should have been retained to supplement smaller ferries summer at Mukilteo. Issaquah ferries now used at Mukilteo are too large for the route and contribute pressure to toll increases. This ferry (50-car capacity) also was unwisely sold, and later destroyed en route to Alaska, after \$250,000 of maintenance by WSF."</p> <p>"Capt. Oscar A. Lee" (Obituary, P.I. 10/17/82) Writes: Capt. Lee (no relation) operated the Port Townsend-Keystone run until Oct., 1973, first with "Defiance" (ex-Tacoma Narrows-Day Is.-Pt. Fosdick) and after 1969 with "San Diego," 208-ft. steel ferry in good condition. Terrible tempered C.C. Nichols, State "Director of Toll Facilities" quarreled with Capt. Lee regarding ownership of Capt. Lee's slips (Lee was behind on his property taxes). If there had not been bad blood, the state probably also would have purchased "San Diego." Gov. Evans said "not necessary—surplus of ferries" which was another lie...[unreadable copy]"</p> <p>[Page 33] "Public Hearing scheduled on Sale of Kulshan" (Marine Digest, c. mid-August, 1982) Writes: "Etc. missed the 'jump' One of the most disgraceful episodes in WSF history. Should be returned to Whidbey Is. Mukilteo run now that Coast Guard is closing Governor's Island. Would help reduce level of ferry fare increases 2004 and beyond. Sources "Steamboat Bill," publication of S.S. Historical Society of America—Summer, 1984, p. 115. Sale of Steel-Electric class ferries (now needed to replace larger ferries to cut costs) only would perpetuate the WSF Waste.</p> <p>[Page 34] "New York is to receive Governors Island, shown in a 1995 photograph" (NY Times, 1/3/2000) Referring to photo, points to: "Now-destroyed World Trade Center Towers"; "Staten Island ferries"; "Kulshan." "Here is our ex-WSF 65-car ferry Kulshan in NYC. Massive waste on part of WSF. In a personal letter to your correspondent, Gov. Gary Locke states WSF is not interested in re-acquisition of Kulshan now that Coast Guard is closing Governors Island. Kulshan should return to Mukilteo-Clinton run to help head off ferry toll increases!"</p> <p>[Page 35] "Old Ferryboat 'Fresno' Will Become an Office Building" (Fresno Bee, 11/4/1968) Writes: "Sold by WSF for \$22,222! When \$7.5 to 10 mil. was invested in rebuilds of 4 sisters! What a waste! Sale of the 4 remaining steel-electrics is a waste and should be stopped."</p> <p>[Page 36] "Summer Allocation and Schedule, Mukilteo-Columbia Beach Route" Writes: "This schedule &amp; ferry assignment should be returned to cut costs at Mukilteo. More frequent service and lower ferry fares will result, WSF could place two extra boats (for a total of four) in peak periods through 1973. Ferry Olympic was diverted to Keystone in 1974 when state refused to buy "San Diego." 3rd boat-Olympic, 4th boat-Vashon. ...[unreadable in binding] "Wal-Mart class" ferries = everyday low ferry fares."</p> <p>Highlights: 'Vessel #1 – Kulshan and Vessel #2 – Rhododendron' Writes: "65 Cars, 65 Cars"</p> <p>[Page 37] "Ferry Schedule, Summer 1960—Victoria Ferry Service (Summer 1960)" Highlights: "America's Most Beautiful Water Trip" Writes: "Great marketing slogan no longer used! Why? 14% of summer riders on B.C. Ferries Victoria-Vancouver run are U.S. Citizens – big untapped market for WSF (which WSF ignores) Note= 4 daily round trips Anacortes-Sidney, B.C., in year 1960 (as we write, 43 ½ years ago) when population was FAR less than in 2003. The only place jumbo ferries can be operated reasonably at WSF is summers to Sidney B.C. Jumbos could make 5 trips per day each way (Alternating night ports for the boats: 1 each side= (1) 6:30AM (2) 9:30AM (3) 12:30AM (4) 3:30PM (5) 6:30PM – Non-stop.</p> <p>[Page 38] "Ferry Schedule Summer 1965" (timetable) Highlights: 'Extra Service Weekends' (3x) 'Seattle-Bremerton: 3:00, 5:30, 4:15, 6:45' Writes: 3rd Bremerton auto-ferry p.m. peak only trips by Kalakala. 1965 and 1966 were last two good years for the ferry system. Not one boat was too large for the route, and tolls paid for all vessel operations. Extra capacity was used only on busy days, and not year-round (many empty cardeck spaces) as now. This is the economical way to run a ferry system with sharp peaks."</p> <p>[Page 39] "Summer 1965 Timetable, Fauntleroy-Vashon-Southworth" Writes: F-V-S often had unscheduled "extra boat" service on busy days in the 1960s. This trips shown here were by ferries NOT too big for the route. Additional "extra boats" ran up costs only when there was traffic to pay costs."</p> <p>[Page 40] "Summer 1965 Victoria Ferry Service" Highlights: 'America's Most Beautiful Water Trip' and '\$.40, \$.70' Writes: "Why has this wonderful marketing/advertising slogan been dropped?"</p> <p>[Page 41] "[Invitation] to preview the newly, refurbished M.V. Tillikum" Writes: "Tillikum cost \$3 mil. new 1959. Sister Evergreen State cost \$1.8 mil. new 1954. This was a very wise investment CTillikum built. Let's rehab &amp; regrade the four steel electrics just like this."</p> <p>[Page 42] [Cartoon of ferry crews being laid off—Vancouver Sun, 4/22/1976] Highlights: 'You could be right...it does say they would begin laying off ferry crews as soon as possible to save money' [people are dumped in the water] Writes: Ferries too large for the route, as proposed at Keystone, eventually cause much trouble: (A) Less service, (B) higher tolls, (C) reduced area employment (D) layoffs of ferry workers. I recommend vessels smaller than steel-electrics on the Keystone run. Also, formation of FVAW (Ferry Workers Against Waste) to crusade for less-expensive boats."</p> <p>[Page 43] [Cartoon of rowboat in rain—Vancouver Sun, 5/5/1976]</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>Highlights: 'Know something? I feel sorry for those people who meekly submit to doubled ferry fares.'</p> <p>Writes: If WSF continues to operate boats too large for the route, it will come to this. The Keystone route has been operated by ferries too large (i.e. "too expensive" for the route since Olympic and Rhododendron departed (Olympic sold, Rhododendron shifted to Pt. Defiance-Tahlequah where it is too large for the route). Shipyards are happy, and so are the ferries' spendaway bureaucrats. Tim Eyman: P.O. Box 1641, Mukilteo 98275"</p> <p>[Page 44] [Photos of older ferries]</p> <p>Writes: "Steel-electric class ferry Willapa (ex-SF Fresno) (shown here on Bremerton run) sold for \$22,000! What Massive waste and stupidity! When replaced by superferries, Bremerton operating losses skyrocketed—1st Big toll increases followed—15% toll hike Aug 15, 1969. Steel-electric class ferry Redwood Empire near Sausalito, California (Now WSF Quinalt). Best auto ferries EVER built. Still in good shape. Shipyards hate them = mean less work. Taxpayers, ferry riders, residents, citizens voters love them. Cheap to run. Keep tolls low. We need additional steel-electric (and they should appear as Redwood Empire) 256-ft long, 1,800 horsepower Max. new jumbos are 16,000 hp Expensive. You &amp; T pay. Call Tim Eyman."</p> <p>[Page 45] [Photos of Black Ball Line]</p> <p>Writes: "Source: 1944 Black Ball fleet list—just before "Elwha" went to San Diego and just before "City of Sacramento" entered service. No vessel was too large for the route it served. The ferry system made money (put \$\$ into the tax pot). WSF 1951-1966 saw all vessel operations paid for by tolls! First Superferry (too large for the routes) entered service July 29, 1967, and the four supers by Aug 15, 1969 cost so much—it was a 15% fare hike—not enough. Tolls increased to meet costs of boats too big for the route. Time to half that. No steel-electrics sold. No Keystone Harbor work."</p> <p>[Page 46] [Photos of older ferries]</p> <p>Writes: "Some Interesting Ferries. One of the first auto-ferry type vessels build in the mosquito fleet era-used mostly in the San Francisco area. The first Issaquah sailed through the newly completed Ballard locks in 1918, never to return to Lake Washington (Leschi-Bellevue-Medina run) and made her first trips to San Pablo Bay July 4, 1918. Crew referred to this vessel as the "Squash!" This economical ferry [pointing to Carquinez] should have been purchased by WSF in November, 1962, when Martinez-Benecia run ended. Would have avoided a \$750,000 contract let to build Hiyu in 1965. This ferry was purchased by state of Florida &amp; named "Blackbeard.""</p> <p>[Page 47] "Washington State Ferries look toward future" (Marine Digest, 1/29/1977)</p> <p>Writes: "When tapped by the Marine Digest editor to prepare this story, your correspondents 'marching orders' were to 'be collegial' discussing controversial topics. Did I do ok?"</p>
<p><b>246</b> Mail</p>	<p>[Stapled packet of typed statement and articles with underlined text]</p> <p>Celia Shorr-WSF: Celia-please enter this statement to the record re Keystone "scoping." Although 20+ years of age, this statement has stood the test of time, and the points made herein are still valid--allpoint to the very extreme foolishness of selling any of the steel-electric class ferries. A smaller ferry is needed at Keystone for economy. WSF should re-acquire Olympic and refir Olympic for the Keystone run. A shallow-draft vessel, it will not need a new terminal, and lower operating costs will lessen pressure for toll-hikes.</p> <p>[SEE ATTACHMENT STATEMENT AND SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS GIVEN TO TRANSPORATION COMMISSION MARCH 17, 1983 IN OPPOSITION TO AN INCREASE OF FERRY TOLLS.]</p>
<p><b>247</b> E-Mail</p>	<p><i>q2</i> Recreation</p> <p><i>q3</i> I want to express my support of these improvements; I believe they are necessary to the system. I am a resident of Whidbey and frequent user of this run. Though it may be an inconvient fpr [sic] a few, I think this project can be done in a way that is sensitive to the environmnet and to the immediate neighbors.</p>
<p><b>248</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Washington State Ferries -</p> <p>Although I was unable to attend the scoping meeting held in Coupeville in December, I am interested and concerned about the proposed relocation of the Keystone terminal. In reviewing the proposed alternatives, I believe the east site would be better suited to WSF's purpose as it should not be as directly exposed to the weather, i.e. southeast storm winds. I also believe this site would provide a better area for terminal parking as the land is somewhat higher than the area surrounding the Keystone Spit. At the other proposed location, I am not sure where parking would be located as most of the surrounding area is wetland. Also, the location at the end of the spit seems as much or more exposed to the winter storms than the current location. I am not sure of what eelgrass or other water environmental concerns may be at the two proposed locations. I am also concerned with the information I read in an article in The Coupeville Examiner on the schedule with the larger vessel. I believe it stated the runs would remain at one every 90 minutes during the summer. Living on the hill on the opposite side of Crockett Lake, there are many days in the summer when I see traffic backed up for quite a distance waiting for a ferry. Particularly on weekends, starting on Friday afternoon and continuing through Sunday. I would like to see the schedule remain with two boats in the summer months at every 45 minutes.</p>
<p><b>250</b> E-Mail</p>	<p>Moving the terminal down the beach will increase my bicycle commute time and force me to become a car commuter. I have been a year-round bicycle commuter for 13+ years.) A friend had the idea of "simply" adding a second breakwater south (east, actually) of the existing one, swapping land with State Parks. People waiting would then still be adjacent to one of our state's excellent parks that way, and the natural habitat further down the beach would not have to be disrupted. His suggestion also seem like it would cost less. There would be a net gain of underwater park area, too. Good luck w/your project.</p>
<p><b>252</b></p>	<p>I have concern that the future use of the Keystone Harbor boat launch may be impacted. As a fisherman and pleasure</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



*Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project*

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
<b>E-Mail</b>	boater, I use the Keystone Harbor boat launch often, since I believe it is the only public boat launch that has a dock on the entire west side of Whidbey. Please keep the boat launch intact and the Keystone Harbor waterway navigable for boaters.
<b>253 E-Mail</b>	<p>We are 3rd generation senior citizens of Coupeville and use the Keystone ferry occasionally for travel, recreation and showing tourists the area. Please consider our comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This ferry get so little use in winter (almost 9 mos. of the year) We find it rather silly to spend money making bigger ferries to service the route. We cannot believe it would not be cost efficient in the long run to simply make more of the smaller ferries for the run. Government agencies always feather their nests with favorable predictions about monies that will be spent to get just what they want. We believe there is some of this going on. Bigger is not always better, in fact our whole country would be well-off to do a whole parcel of down-sizing. The fact that bigger ferries would be run would not mean more people could cross because you would cut the number of runs in half.</li> <li>2. The options for the terminal as you present are interesting. But why not just enlarge the one we have. We've lived here all our lives and certainly cannot remember any groundings, other than the one last year or the year before. Of course some have to be cancelled because of low tides - but that really isn't a big deal.</li> <li>3. If you put in bigger ferries, you will need to put in bigger parking lots. At the present site and the other proposed site at the end of Keystone Pit, there just isn't any room to do this without severely impacting not only private citizens, but the important wildlife and migratory bird habitats of Crockett Lake and the potholes at the end of the spit. Also, the traffic route from 525 will have to be substantially enlarged, another expense that wouldn't have to be if you stuck with the smaller ferries.</li> <li>4. The Lea farm proposal would cost a lot of money for a totally new terminal to be developed and lots of money to punch a new road down to it.</li> <li>5. You are conveniently for you, not addressing anything except accommodating the Issaquah 30 ferries, and new sites. As they say so much these days "think outside of the box" for better solutions.</li> <li>6. Sometimes the best solution would is to do nothing. Consider that - just keep the small ones running and in good shape and work on building a few more small ferries over the next 10-20 years.</li> <li>7. Our tax dollars have more important things to do than this project.</li> </ol>
<b>254 E-Mail</b>	<p>Hello, Thank you for the chance to respond to the Washington State Ferries plans for the changes to the Keystone-Port Townsend route.</p> <p>Based on what little information is available on the Department of Transportation Web site, I am not in support of the plan. There appear to be no viable alternatives offered by the planners. And the "primary" purpose of the proposed changes to the ports, according to the WSF site, is to "accommodate the future use of the Issaquah 130 Class or other vessels with similar characteristics on this route." (The secondary purpose is "to maintain or enhance existing services along the route, including such aspects as operational reliability, schedule and improved safety," which strikes me as having your priorities positively backwards.)</p> <p>Radically altering the ecology (on the Keystone side) and the economy and traffic patterns (on the Port Townsend side) of this region so that WSF can standardize its vessel size is not a sufficiently compelling rationale for this project. Speaking as a Port Townsend resident, I live in a small town because I like small town life. I'm unwilling to give these small town bigger-town traffic headaches and other problems simply because ferry system bureaucrats think it handy to standardize their fleet.</p> <p>I understand that you have problems with an aging fleet and that standardizing the fleet may be the simplest way of solving that problem. But the most obvious way is not the best way. I beg you to go back to the drawing board on this one. The Puget Sound region is known for ingenious, small-is-beautiful, resourceful solutions that are respectful of communities. I'd be delighted to serve on a community advisory board to help devise a thoughtful solution to the WSF problem that is more respectful of the communities you serve than ramming this destructive, one-size-fits-all "solution" down the throats of our precious, unique small-towns and their fragile environments. I'll be looking forward to seeing the environmental impact statement on this proposed project. If you do decide to approach this project with honesty and ingenuity, please contact me for my energy and help.</p>
<b>255 E-Mail</b>	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I attended the open house in Port Townsend on December 17 and offered comments. At this time I am providing additional written commentary for your consideration.</p> <p>My use of the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry began in 1970 (i.e., prior to year-round operation) and I have been a regular user since moving to the Olympic Peninsula in 1977, occasionally needing to purchase a 20-ride ticket book. I can view the ferry run from my bedroom window in Port Townsend.</p> <p><b>REPLACING THE STEEL ELECTRICS</b></p> <p>It's only possible to concur that the Steel Electrics are obsolete, and must be replaced. They obviously take the blame for many of the weather-cancelled runs. But after seeing and hearing the WSF presentation, I can't agree that the Issaquah Class is the best or only alternative. Instead, I would argue that the Evergreen Class ought to be considered an equal or superior choice for reasons I'll discuss more under "Scheduling" and elsewhere.</p> <p><b>PORT TOWNSEND TERMINAL</b></p> <p>I support, in general, the expansion of the Port Townsend Terminal, in part because this will reduce the congestion on</p>

*q2:* What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

*q3:* Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

*q4:* What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

*q5:* Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>Highway 20 (Water Street/Sims Way) during times of peak use. Nonetheless, I am concerned about the proposed size of the expansion, as I think it will increase the maritime hazard as well as lessen some of the comfort/convenience of the existing facility. Expanding such a large distance further from the shore will expose the new terminal to even greater pounding from storm winds and waves, which could also interfere with docking. People leaving their cars to visit nearby shops as they wait for the next sailing, will have a greater distance to walk, often under very windy conditions. Designing for 130-car boats is forcing the issue. Designing for 100-car boats would certainly offer mitigation to the above concerns. I urge that WSDOT perform traffic studies at existing peak usage to fully understand the impact of releasing 130 cars into Water Street/Sims Way. At the current peak of 65 cars, it can take 10-15 minutes for traffic to clear the first mile westward of the terminal. During that time, movement all along the highway and the few adjacent streets (notably, Washington Street), and at the traffic signals at Kearney Street and Haines Street, is heavily impacted. There simply is no precedent for what 130 cars will do to these existing problem areas. But to my observation, there is insufficient infrastructure, and the problem will be magnified greatly. Of course I assume that any terminal expansion will be tied to successful implanting of new eelgrass beds as a means of compensation. I did note that there is an intention for this, and also I'm well aware that eelgrass can be difficult to establish.</p> <p>I reject the idea of using Indian Point in this project expansion, entirely. Please confine the ferry traffic activity to the smallest area of our precious waterfront as is necessary. Parking areas are not a highest/best use of shorelines, rather, they are a visual and environmental blight on a very limited resource. One such area on the Port Townsend shore is plenty!</p> <p>KEYSTONE TERMINAL</p> <p>I reject the idea of using Indian Point in this project expansion, entirely. Please confine the ferry traffic activity to the smallest area of our precious waterfront as is necessary. Parking areas are not a highest/best use of shorelines, rather, they are a visual and environmental blight on a very limited resource. One such area on the Port Townsend shore is plenty!</p> <p>KEYSTONE TERMINAL</p> <p>My first choice would be to maintain the existing facility which is advantageously located for Fort Casey and Camp Casey. Of course there will need to be significant dredging; but this is certainly far less expensive than establishing a completely new terminal elsewhere. I seem to recall an earlier proposal to reconfigure the parking area by moving the ferry access lanes to the east, perhaps through the area now occupied by the waiting room. The latter deserves to be replaced, anyway. Reconfiguring for 100-car boats seems possible, but for 130-car boats, not possible at the present site. I would suggest eliminating parking on the north side of Highway 20 opposite the existing parking lot, and moving employee and equipment parking and vehicles from the lane nearest the water (lane 9?) to another location. With these two changes it may be possible to hold 100 cars in the existing (revised) area.</p> <p>My second choice would be the site named "Central." The third site (to the east) is patently unworkable. "Central" looks expensive to me, and more exposed to storm winds than existing Keystone. It loses any advantage for convenient use to/from Fort Casey and Camp Casey. As poor as the existing Keystone is for services during the long waits (i.e., waiting room being inadequate, and food services mediocre or non-existent for much of the year), Central starts from offering even less.</p> <p>SCHEDULING</p> <p>Personally, this is the crux of issues of greatest concern. I DO NOT agree that swapping two runs moving 65 cars each, spaced at 45 minutes, for one run of 130 cars at 90 minute frequency, is going to provide equivalent service. To begin, as noted above, it institutionalizes peak traffic flux on both sides. Second, it will cause drivers to arrive even earlier than they do now in order to (maybe) assure boarding at the desired time, and raise their anxiety in the process (i.e., the consequence of missing a sailing means double the wait-time). On a practical level, if 130 vehicles have to budget even 10 extra minutes for wait time, each run will have wasted 1300 minutes (over 20 hours) of man-time--just for the drivers! You know, my time is precious and I find that waiting in ferry lines is not a productive use of that time. The more frequent service offered on the summer schedule certainly has advantages for locals and tourists as well. I assume that I am not much different from most other travelers in thinking that the less-frequent service will compel me to arrive earlier than I presently need to do. In the event that by 2007 and beyond, 130 cars per 90 minutes will itself be inadequate, the obvious consequence is that more drivers will go the long way around, to Kingston/Edmonds. That's a major negative: it means more congestion on that ferry and adjacent roadways on both sides, more people hurrying to cover extra miles, and more risk along the Highway 104 corridor that is already a deadly area due to drivers making unwise passing maneuvers and drivers becoming groggy after being at the wheel too long. Another negative is that each additional car avoiding the Keystone crossing will be using more fuel and adding more mileage on their cars. WSF provides better service when it shortens travel distances and wait times for more drivers.</p> <p>Again, my recommendation is to use Evergreen Class service here, perhaps in tandem with another class (Issaquah or other) to increase capacity and provide better, more frequent scheduling. I fully understand that the Evergreen Class draws nearly the same depth as the Issaquah class.</p> <p>A second scheduling consideration is that the present schedule dumps a full load into Port Townsend right at 5:00 PM, when the maximum number of local drivers are trying to leave the downtown area. I urge that the schedule be 'tweaked' so that the 5:00 arrival is moved to either 4:45, or 5:15. This simple shift would mitigate the conflict with local traffic movement. In the same vein, I would love to see a return to a 9:30 PM Keystone departure, from the present 9:15 final</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments



Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Terminal Improvement Project

Comment No. / Source *	Comment Text
	<p>run. For those of us who use the ferry to dine or attend cultural activities on the 'other side' that 15 minutes can easily make all the difference. Consider: a program (concert, arts show, movie) that ends at 9 PM leaves the bare minimum to reach the 9:15 sailing, whereas 9:30 is more accommodating. This is exactly what I faced in 1999 when I had weekly musical engagements on Whidbey Island, and I never failed to reach the 9:30 boat in time. With the present schedule, my choice would be to forego the event, or stay overnight (an inconvenience and expense).</p> <p>My overall sense is that year-round 90-minute frequency will have a deleterious economic effect on businesses on both sides, and especially in Port Townsend. If the 130-car, 90-minute capacity proves to be inadequate and the conventional wisdom sets in that Port Townsend is a likely place to get stuck in a waiting line, my point will be proven.</p> <p><b>SUMMARY</b></p> <p>My recommendation, based on service and convenience, and in consideration of the impacts on the two communities and the marine/littoral environments, is: At least one Evergreen Class, and one other boat at 45-minute intervals during the summer season; and one Evergreen Class at 90-minute intervals in the off-season.</p> <p>Modest expansion of the Port Townsend terminal. Retention of the existing site for the Keystone terminal with a reconfiguration of parking and ferry boarding/disembarking. Periodic dredging as required. I believe that the above approach will substantially reduce the overall project cost while upgrading service and capacity.</p>
<p><b>256</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>I think that keeping the terminal at Keystone is the best option. Even with the tidal problems, it seems more sheltered than any other place on Whidbeys west coast. But you do have a dilemma about how it will effect the wildlife refuge. You can remove the boat launch and redo the jetty, but will face an impossible task in encroaching the refuge.</p> <p>On a separate note if you can answer me back, who gets to pick the names for the boats, and do you take</p>
<p><b>265</b> <b>E-Mail</b></p>	<p>Sorry we couldn't attend the recent meeting regarding the above. We live on the hillside directly in front of the current ferry dock and are very familiar with the current problems - also have comments regarding the 3 locations under consideration.</p> <p>1st (and current dock location)</p> <p>Causes a nightmare of traffic problems for parking and line-ups, in addition to traffic speeding through the school zone at Camp Casey. When vehicles are parked on the shoulder overnight there are often break-ins and vandal problems. I understand when the ferry dock was built, the inlet to the lake was filled in to build the road, and a culvert was installed under the road to allow the water level in the lake to fill and drain with the tides. When we had the mosquito problem about 7 years ago, that culvert had been "blocked off" to prevent this from happening - as a result, salt-water mosquitoes became rampant and a nightmare followed. We did not live in the area at the time, but we visited friends who did and I can tell you - it was terrible. A person couldn't leave their house without being tormented. It's something we would never want to see happen again. We also understand the problems with docking at the current dock, and the need to dredge the area on a regular basis to keep it in service. If the ferry dock was re-located, it would be a wonderful location for a small marina - or an opportunity to open up the fill under the roadway and allow the lake to be an inlet once again (possibly even a small marina in the lake - or at least access to small boats from the sound).</p> <p>2nd location (at the far end of the spit)</p> <p>Has perfect access from the highway and it would curtail most of the problems we now experience at the current sight. There would also be good parking (out in the open to deter vandals). As for the lights (which some folks in that area have said they would not appreciate), we see the lights at the current dock and they are not problem for us. The type of lights currently used are pleasing to see at night, and they are enjoyed by the residents. This is a rural area with few street lights, and it's very dark in the evenings. There's a certain amount of peace and comfort in looking out at the lights at night - certainly nothing that takes away from the beauty or tranquility of living in this location.</p> <p>3rd location (just mentioned in the newspaper that would have direct access from the highway)</p> <p>It's a beautiful location and this area would have direct access from the highway and room for plenty of parking. We are concerned that: It would increase the ferry ride considerably, destroy a beautiful scenic piece of farming property, provide very little security for over night vehicles parked in the area, and would require a new road and access area from the highway. This would most likely be a very expensive option, even though it would accommodate the traffic and parking for many years into the future.</p> <p>Thank you for listening to our concerns! We would appreciate being kept informed of this project.</p>

q2: What issues would you like addressed as part of this project?

q3: Are there alternative sites that the project should consider to accommodate the Issaquah 130 class ferries when the Steel Electrics are retired?

q4: What are your thoughts on the criteria that will be used to identify alternatives for evaluation that are the most feasible and have the least adverse environmental and community impact?

q5: Other Comments