

**Washington State Department of Transportation –
Ferries Division
Mukilteo Multimodal Project**

**Communications Strategy and Public Involvement
Plan – EIS Phase**

Addendum to the Mukilteo Multimodal Coordination Plan

Prepared by:
PRR

Updated January 2, 2013



Table of Contents

Background	3
Regulatory Requirements for Public Involvement.....	4
Public Involvement Goals and Objectives.....	4
Guiding Principles	5
Key Messages	6
Risks	10
Audiences and Stakeholders.....	11
Public Involvement Approach and Milestone Schedule	11
Public Involvement Tools	13
Next Steps	14
Appendix 1: Public Involvement for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project 2004-2007.....	16

Background

This Public Involvement Plan (PIP) provides the strategic framework for communications and public involvement activities during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project. As an addendum to the updated public and agency Coordination Plan (March 2010), the PIP outlines the Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division's (WSF) public involvement communications goals, key messages, public involvement milestones, and stakeholders. The PIP also identifies tools and tactics to engage the public and solicit feedback, including those specifically required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). While recognizing that there are many audiences interested in the Mukilteo Multimodal Project, this PIP focuses on communications with the public, community groups, elected officials and other stakeholders.

The Mukilteo/Clinton ferry route is part of State Route (SR) 525, the major transportation corridor connecting Whidbey Island to the Seattle-Everett metropolitan area. It is WSF's busiest route for vehicle traffic and has the second highest annual ridership, serving more than four million riders in 2011.

The Mukilteo terminal has not had significant improvements since the early 1980s and components of the facility are aging. The current configuration of the terminal contributes to safety concerns, traffic congestion, and vehicle/pedestrian conflicts. The new terminal will improve operations and transit connections.

The environmental review process for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project began with a NEPA Environmental Assessment (EA) in 2004. Early in 2006, upon completion of environmental discipline studies, FTA and WSF determined that the potential impacts to natural and cultural resources would benefit from more detailed analysis in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). FTA issued a notice of intent to prepare an EIS for the project in February 2006. In 2007 the project was put on hold due to funding and constructability issues associated with the previously identified alternatives.

WSF and FTA reinitiated the NEPA/SEPA environmental process in February 2010.

Project Timeline

- **February 2010** – Reinitiate the NEPA/SEPA process
- **Spring 2010** – Revise the project purpose and need statement
- **Fall 2010** – NEPA/SEPA EIS Scoping process
- **Spring-Fall 2011** – Prepare Draft EIS
- **Winter 2012** – Draft EIS public hearings and comment period
- **Spring 2012** – Identify Preferred Alternative
- **Summer 2012 to Winter 2013** – Prepare Final EIS
- **Spring 2013** – Publish Final EIS
- **Summer 2013** – Issue Record of Decision (ROD); begin final project design
- **2015** – Begin construction

- **2019** – Project complete

Regulatory Requirements for Public Involvement

WSDOT and FTA have an extensive communications program to involve public, agencies, and tribes in developing this EIS in accordance with NEPA, SEPA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, WSDOT Executive Order E1025.01, the WSDOT Centennial Accord Plan and the federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

NEPA/SEPA

During the public scoping process and upon issuance of the Draft EIS, WSF met requirements for public outreach under NEPA and SEPA. General public involvement for the 2010 scoping period included:

- Targeted stakeholder outreach including briefings and interviews
- Four widely advertised in-person public meetings
- One online open house to reach residents who were unable or preferred not to attend a meeting in person
- An online comment tool that provided an easy and informative electronic method of learning about the concepts and submitting comments
- Notices and information on the project posted on the project website (www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal/)

Public information and involvement opportunities during the Draft EIS phase included:

- A 45-day comment period initiated with the public release of the Draft EIS and public notices
- Two widely advertised public hearings in Mukilteo and Clinton that were attended by approximately 175 people
- The project website, which served as an online resource with frequent updates, an online comment form, a project library of information and the full Draft EIS document

WSF and FTA anticipate releasing the Final EIS in the spring of 2013, which will address all public, agency, and tribal comments. A Record of Decision is anticipated in summer 2013, which will allow WSF to move forward with final design and construction, once funding becomes available.

SAFETEA-LU Requirements

The Coordination Plan outlines WSF's plan for public, tribal and agency coordination under SAFETEA-LU.

Public Involvement Goals and Objectives

WSF and FTA are committed to providing an open public involvement process with ample opportunities to inform and involve the public in the Mukilteo Multimodal Project. Stakeholders will have opportunities to interact with and receive responses from project team members on issues of interest or concern throughout each phase of the project.

The following goals and objectives will help guide the public involvement and communications strategy. These goals were developed in accordance with WSDOT's communications plan.

- Goal A:** Promote an understanding of the purpose and need for the project and the process leading to the final decisions.
Objective – Ensure that comprehensive information about the project and the decision process is available to the public and the media.
Objective – Explain the cultural significance and concurrent tribal decision-process in a clear and sensitive manner.
Objective – Deliver honest and consistent messaging to the public.
- Goal B:** Involve the community and other stakeholders early in and throughout the process
Objective – Involve new and existing stakeholders by providing a range of public input opportunities early and often.
Objective – Provide continued communication and feedback to the public throughout the process.
Objective – Engage typically underserved populations (low-income, minority, and limited-English proficient) early in the public involvement process by providing involvement opportunities designed to meet the unique needs of these groups.
Objective – Meet all NEPA Environmental Justice (EJ) and Title VI limited-English proficiency (LEP) requirements.
Objective – Publicize programs and activities through multiple and diverse communications vehicles and hold meetings in ADA- and transit-accessible facilities.
Objective – Notify affected communities of public involvement opportunities early and through a variety of advertising mediums and formats.
Objective – Facilitate constructive dialogue between WSF, FTA, and key stakeholders.
- Goal C:** Ensure that public input is incorporated into the decision-making process.
Objective – Provide involvement opportunities in conjunction with key project milestones and prior to decision-making.
Objective – Solicit meaningful input from affected communities on the range of alternatives and potential impacts.
Objective – Identify and resolve challenges in a timely manner.
Objective – Respond to public comments in a timely and thorough manner.
Objective – Report back to the community on how their feedback has been considered and incorporated into the decision-making process.

Guiding Principles

The following principles will guide WSF in its public involvement activities throughout all phases of the project.

- **No surprises.** WSF is the first and best source of information about our agency, whether the news is good, bad, or indifferent. Always provide honest, timely information to the public and the media.
- **Lead with the web.** Keep the web updated with the most current project information.
- **Enlist the media as a project partner.** The media can help get the word out on what's new with the Mukilteo project. Talk about the need for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project and how people can get involved during each phase.

- **Keep the Legislature in the know.** Educate and inform legislators and their staff about the project.
- **Use existing relationships.** Build on the project's long history of engaging the community. Continue to keep local officials, community members, and others informed and engaged and enlist them in reaching out to their communities and constituents.
- **Leverage other WSF communications efforts.** Capitalize on ongoing WSF efforts that will bring greater exposure to the Mukilteo project.
- **Manage expectations.** Educate the public about project alternatives without overselling the project benefits or the merits of a single alternative.
- **Use plain talk, graphics, and new media.** Tell the Mukilteo Ferry Terminal story so people understand. All project messages need to be consistent with WSF's systemwide messaging, WSDOT's communications standards and plain talk initiatives.
- **Measure and use data to tell the story.** Use Washington State Transportation Commission survey data, ridership forecasts, origin and destination patterns, and other data to support project information. Update numbers frequently to provide the latest possible information.
- **Use innovative and effective outreach tactics.** Make every effort to go above and beyond required NEPA public involvement. Be creative in finding effective ways to engage stakeholders.

Key Messages

These answers to important questions will be revised and refined as the project continues and project outreach evolves.

Why is WSF considering rebuilding or relocating the Mukilteo ferry terminal?

- The existing Mukilteo terminal is aging and needs major repairs to operate the terminal safely and efficiently. The current terminal configuration worsens congestion and has led to steady increases in vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.
- This route is a significant commuter route and has WSF's second highest annual ridership, serving more than four million total riders in 2011. The current facilities are inadequate to handle this volume of traffic, creating operational and safety problems and negative impacts to Mukilteo's downtown waterfront.
- The WSF 2009 Long-Range Plan forecasts a 73 percent increase in annual passengers by 2030. Since vehicle traffic is limited by the size of the vessel, creating a terminal with multimodal characteristics is critical to meeting future passenger growth. It would also make it easier for passengers to access trains and buses.

What has WSF done so far in the EIS process?

- During the scoping phase of the NEPA/SEPA process, WSF and FTA gathered and considered input from the public, tribes, and other government agencies to determine the adequacy of the draft statement of purpose and need, and to evaluate the range of reasonable alternatives for analysis in the Draft EIS.
- WSF and FTA released a Draft EIS for public comment in January 2012 and provided a 45-day comment period, which ended on March 12, 2012.
- WSF selected the Elliott Point 2 Alternative as its Preferred Alternative in May 2012 based on comments from the public, agencies and tribes, which considered the alternative's ability to meet the purpose and need of the project while providing the best balance of environmental benefits compared to impacts.
- Selecting a Preferred Alternative is a required part of the process of preparing a Final EIS.
- As it develops the Final EIS and proceeds with project design, WSF will continue to refine EP2. Refinements will focus on improving environmental performance, operations and other benefits, and they will include suggestions from public comments, agency partners, and tribes.
- WSF and FTA are developing the Final EIS, which will be released in early-2013.

What is a Preferred Alternative?

- The Preferred Alternative is the alternative that best meets the project's purpose and need, and is developed with full consideration of the social economic, environmental, technical and other factors affected by the action. As federal co-lead of the project, FTA will not identify a Preferred Alternative until the Final EIS is published.
- All four alternatives will continue to be studied in the Final EIS, but the Preferred Alternative will be developed in more detail than the other alternatives.

Will WSF make any changes to the Preferred Alternative?

- WSF will continue to refine the Preferred Alternative as it proceeds with design and environmental review.
- These refinements will help avoid environmental effects, meet the project's purpose and need, and best meet WSF's operational needs.
- The overall footprint of the Preferred Alternative and its major elements will remain very similar to how the Elliot Point 2 Alternative appeared in the Draft EIS.

What has changed since earlier phases of the project and why did WSF conduct additional scoping meetings in 2011?

- The project was put on hold in 2007 due to funding and constructability issues associated with the previously identified alternatives.
- In 2009, WSF released its Long-Range Plan, which presents a vision for the future of the ferry system that maintains current levels of service and includes limited terminal improvements.
- In light of the funding and constructability issues and to reflect the Long-Range Plan, WSF and FTA re-initiated the environmental review process for the Mukilteo project in 2010. The process should be complete in 2013, with construction starting as early as 2015.

How would the new terminal benefit customers and communities?

The new terminal will:

- Offer better and safer access for pedestrians, vehicles and bicycles.
- Improve the efficiency and reliability of ferry operations, including vehicle and passenger loading and unloading.
- Improve transit connections for riders who travel without a car and help ensure reliable multimodal connections.

Are Indian tribes and nations involved in this project? What is the process for coordinating with tribes?

- Out of respect for the tribes, WSF and FTA will continue to examine a full range of project alternatives to evaluate the potential for avoiding and minimizing impacts to this culturally significant site.
- FTA is the lead agency for consulting with interested tribes and nations in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and other federal laws. WSF's Tribal Liaison has been assisting FTA in coordination and communication with tribes to ensure a strong communication effort.
- FTA has a government-to-government relationship with Indian tribes. This special relationship is affirmed in treaties, Supreme Court decisions, and Executive Orders. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that FTA and WSF consult with tribes for undertakings that may affect properties considered to have traditional religious and cultural significance.
- WSF and FTA are consulting with 11 tribes to ensure the project recognizes the rich cultural history of the project area. Most recently, WSF hired an architect to incorporate tribal feedback and culturally-relevant design elements into the project.

Why is the site significant to Indian tribes and nations?

- Tribes have clearly emphasized the great cultural and historic importance of the Mukilteo waterfront area. The Elliot Point area has been used by Native Americans for at least 1,000 years.
- The project area was the site for the signing of the Point Elliott Treaty of 1855. The Treaty recognized the tribes as sovereign nations, ceded to the United States much of the Native American land in the Puget Sound region, and in exchange reserved tribes' rights to hunt, fish and gather.
- The project area includes several important historic and archaeological sites, including a buried shell midden created by Native American peoples, with deposits dating back over 1,000 years.

How is this project funded?

- The State Legislature has so far identified \$102.2 million for the project, including a mix of state funds and federal funds it could direct to the project.
- To date, WSF has secured \$29 million in federal planning and design grants, and current federal funding will allow WSF to complete the Final EIS. The project may apply for additional federal funds once the EIS process is complete. Because of its multimodal emphasis, the project is thought to be highly competitive for securing additional federal funding.

How much will each of the alternatives cost?

- WSF developed cost estimates for each of the project alternatives. Each estimate includes costs for construction, right-of-way acquisition and improvements, and engineering.
- WSF is currently developing a cost estimate for the Preferred Alternative that will include the changes made to Elliot Point 2.

Mukilteo Multimodal Project Alternative	Estimated Cost Range (in 2015 dollars)
No Build	\$60-65 million*
Existing Site Improvements	\$130-140 million
Elliot Point 1	\$150-165 million
Elliot Point 2	\$120-130 million

*Does not include overhead loading

What is the likelihood that funding for construction will be secured?

- It is necessary to complete the environmental process so the project is ready to proceed to final design and construction when funds become available. It is not uncommon for WSDOT/WSF to proceed with planning for unfunded capital projects.
- The environmental process is almost entirely federally funded; once FTA issues a ROD, the project will be eligible to compete for additional federal funds and its multimodal emphasis gives it a strong chance of succeeding.

What is being studied in the EIS?

- The Draft SEPA/NEPA EIS analyzed impacts for each project alternative in regard to a variety of environmental, social, and community resources. Examples include: transportation, ecosystems, cultural resources, hazardous materials, noise, air, energy, social and community resources, geology and soils, water resources, visual, land use and economics, and climate.
- The Final EIS includes an evaluation of the four project alternatives, with a focus on the Preferred Alternative. It also includes updated information on the project alternatives and new analysis that was not included in the Draft EIS.

What is happening with the Mukilteo Tank Farm property?

- The Mukilteo Tank Farm property, on which the Preferred Alternative would be built, is currently owned by the U.S. Air Force. The Air Force is in the process of transferring the land to the Port of Everett. A final EA was released by the Air Force in October 2012.
- The Air Force property disposition is a separate action by a separate federal agency. Its environmental process and timeline are not connected to the Mukilteo Multimodal Project.

- Once the Mukilteo Multimodal Project receives a ROD, WSF will proceed with property acquisition and could enter into an agreement with the Port of Everett to use the tank farm property for a new ferry terminal, if a tank farm alternative is selected to proceed.

Risks

The following are public involvement and stakeholder risks and proposed mitigation. WSF will develop strategies to address these concerns and will work to ensure the risks do not negatively impact the project goals and objectives.

Public and Stakeholder Communications Risks

Risk: Lack of organizational focus to support and guide this project. WSF's organizational focus is on replacing the aging fleet and delivering new vessels.

Proposed Mitigation:

- Emphasize the purpose and need for the project in all project communications, both internal and external.
- Incorporate systemwide messaging in public outreach materials and show how the Mukilteo project fits into other WSF initiatives as part of the agency's Long-Range Plan.

Risk: Conflicting interests among stakeholders, including the tribes, agencies, business owners, political leaders, and the public may prevent consensus around a feasible alternative.

Proposed Mitigation:

- Conduct early outreach to educate stakeholders about the alternatives under consideration and identify and clearly understand their issues and concerns.
- Develop displays and handouts that illustrate stakeholders' varying interests and outline the challenges and opportunities.
- Facilitate constructive dialogue between stakeholders to encourage mutual understanding of different perspectives, issues, and concerns.
- Provide workshops for stakeholders to work together on resolving issues and coming to consensus.
- Explain the cultural significance and concurrent tribal decision process in a clear and sensitive manner.

Risk: Lack of legislative support for the project could lead to additional project delays. Changes in leadership (due to elections or other events) may result in a shift in project support and focus.

Proposed Mitigation:

- Schedule legislative briefings throughout the environmental process to ensure key legislators are informed and involved in the process.
- Identify key leaders to serve as project champions to garner attention and support for the project.
- Develop executive briefing materials that highlight key findings, themes from public comments, and recommendations on the feasibility of relocating the Mukilteo terminal.

Risk: Tribal opposition to the Preferred Alternative

Proposed Mitigation:

- Maintain ongoing communications during EIS process to make sure that tribal concerns and issues are adequately addressed.

- Develop a negotiation process that allows for direct communications and negotiation with tribal decision makers.
- Make sure that tribes have all the information they need in developing their positions about the alternatives.

Audiences and Stakeholders

WSF will continue to actively engage stakeholders including ferry riders, community groups, agencies, tribes, elected officials, business and property owners and interested individuals.

Legislative Coordination

WSF reports to interested federal and state legislators on an ongoing basis, providing information about project milestones and the project status. Presentations and other materials include the latest project information and are made available electronically before all legislative updates. Briefings are coordinated in concert with WSDOT Government Relations.

WSF delivered the Mukilteo Multimodal Project Legislative Report to the Washington State Legislature in January 2011. This report was required by the 2009 state legislative mandate to answer the question of whether relocating the terminal is feasible. The report was based on the Mukilteo Multimodal Project Scoping Report and summarized key findings, public outreach, and recommendations.

WSF submitted a report to the legislature by December 31, 2012 on the status of the Final EIS.

Public Involvement Approach and Milestone Schedule

The following section outlines public involvement for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project to date and upcoming public involvement milestones.

Public Involvement Corresponds with Project Milestones

The public involvement activities have been and will continue to coincide with major project milestones. For a description of public involvement efforts from 2004-2007, see Appendix 1 – History of Public Involvement for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project.

Milestone Timeline of Activities								
Season/Year	Project Milestone	Public Outreach Tools						
		Stakeholder Briefings	Public Meetings	Email	Handouts	Comment database and/or web comment tool	Website	News Release
Fall 2004	NEPA EA Scoping	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Winter/Spring 2006	NEPA EIS Scoping	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Summer/Fall 2010	Additional NEPA EIS Scoping	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Winter 2012	Draft EIS Publication	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Spring 2013	Final EIS issuance	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Summer 2013	ROD issuance	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓

Scoping

WSF held public scoping meetings in October 2010 to formally reintroduce the project and provide opportunities for members of the public to comment on the revised purpose and need and the broader range of alternatives under consideration. Following a 30-day public comment period, the project team prepared a Scoping Report (January 2011) outlining the scoping process and summarizing the public involvement efforts conducted during this phase. The Scoping Report was posted on the project website. WSA and FTA considered scoping comments as they narrowed the range of project alternatives and developed the Draft EIS.

Draft EIS

Following the release of the Draft EIS (January 2012), FTA published a Notice of Availability. WSF and FTA held public hearings in Mukilteo and Clinton. The hearings included an informal open house, an overview presentation, and a formal hearing for public comment. During the hearing portion of the meeting, a court reporter recorded all public comments.

The 45-day Draft EIS public comment period ended on March 12, 2012. WSF and FTA received 154 comments, including 138 comments from the public and 16 letters from agencies and tribes. Most of the comments focused on support or opposition to one or more alternatives, but many commenters also noted environmental issues, transportation and traffic impacts, parking, and cost and funding. Elliot Point 2 received the most support and the least opposition.

Following the 45-day public comment period, the project team prepared a Draft EIS Public Involvement and Comment Summary Report outlining the public involvement process and summarizing the public involvement efforts conducted during this phase.

Final EIS

FTA and WSF will notify the public when the Final EIS is available. At that time they will also hold a project update open house to share the latest project information. This public meeting will be an opportunity to:

- Update the community on the EIS process, including information contained in the Final EIS.
- Maintain project momentum since it will be more than a year since the last public meetings.
- Share the latest project design information and gather input on design trade-offs and Context Sensitive Design elements.
- Provide a look ahead to the next steps for the project including the ROD and ongoing design and preliminary engineering work.

The Final EIS will be posted on the project website and all public information will be available in the project library.

Design

In accordance with the Secretary of Transportation's Executive Order on Context Sensitive Solutions (E 1028.02, dated March 17, 2011), WSF will engage the community in the design, planning and eventual construction of the new Mukilteo terminal.

Public Involvement Tools

In addition to public meetings and community briefings, WSF uses the following communications tools and tactics to involve the public and key stakeholders in the environmental review process. Offering a wide variety of public involvement and communications opportunities encourages groups and individuals with varying levels of interests and diverse objectives to understand the significant issues and participate in the decision-making process.

Project Website

The project website (www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal/) provides up-to-date information and announcements about upcoming project milestones and public involvement opportunities, as well as contact information for key Mukilteo Multimodal Project staff. An online project library serves as a resource for all past project related materials, including displays, fact sheets, meeting summaries and other important project documents. WSF updates the website frequently.

Information Materials

Key Messages/FAQs

The key messages/FAQ's document addresses key issues and concerns. It is used by project staff to respond to questions and to develop consistent project messaging and materials.

Fact Sheet

The fact sheet provides a brief project overview, descriptions of each alternative, ways to provide comment, and upcoming public involvement opportunities.

"Guide to the EIS"

This document serves as an overview of each phase of the environmental review process. The first version included specific information about the public scoping phase. The second edition was released in early 2012 and included specific information about the Draft EIS phase.

Video

WSF released a video in February 2012 to support the release of the Draft EIS. The video describes the project, the environmental review process, and provides a description of the four project alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS.

Google Map Comment Tool

WSF developed a web-based interactive comment tool using the Google map interface. The tool was used during the scoping comment period to gather input on the wide range of alternatives. A database recorded the comments and was monitored in real time by the project team.

Community Resources

WSF uses existing community resources to share project information and encourage participation in the environmental process by reaching people via communications sources that they monitor frequently. These resources include: community newsletters, blogs, Facebook pages for organizations in the project area, community websites and WSDOT's social media resources.

Next Steps

The Final EIS is scheduled to be released in Spring 2013. Once the Final EIS is published, FTA and WSDOT will issue a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register and the SEPA register, and they will send notices to project stakeholders, including all parties commenting on the Draft EIS. The Final EIS will be available for at least 30 days before FTA issues a Record of

Decision. A Record of Decision is anticipated in summer 2013, allowing WSF to move forward with securing funding and constructing the project. Following the ROD, WSF would begin the final design and permitting phases of the project. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2015.

Appendix 1

Public Involvement for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project 2004-2007

EA Scoping - 2004

WSF held two public EA scoping open houses during the fall of 2004. Outreach during this phase focused on providing the public and media with project background information and an opportunity for input on the scope of the analysis to be conducted under the EA. WSF mailed a newsletter to contacts in the project database that introduced the project and announced the opportunity to comment and the first public meetings. WSF also distributed e-mail notices to the Mukilteo-Clinton route list and notices on the vessels, at the terminals, and at libraries and other community facilities. WSF placed advertisements in local newspapers within the project area and sent news releases prior to the meetings.

At the meeting, interested parties and the public commented on concept alternatives, potential impacts and benefits. Comments were also submitted by mail and e-mail. WSF summarized meeting comments and shared them with the project team.

WSF mailed a second newsletter following the EA scoping period. It provided a summary of the comments from the EA scoping period and the first public meetings as well as a project update. It also explained how the feedback is being incorporated into the design and the environmental documentation. WSF continued to offer stakeholder briefings, web updates, and other on-going communication tools throughout this period. Comments were incorporated into the decision process.

NEPA EIS Scoping - 2006

WSF and FTA held public meetings on March 21 and 22, 2006. These meetings followed the publication on February 17, 2006 of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS. The purpose of the meetings was to allow interested parties the opportunity to provide information about potential significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives being evaluated under the EIS within a 30-day period stated in the NOI. Through agency, tribal and public comment, the NEPA EIS scoping also offered an opportunity to contribute to the development of the project purpose and need, and the determination of the range of alternatives.

WSF mailed a postcard announcing the meetings, placed advertisements in local newspapers, and distributed news releases. WSF also e-mailed notices to the Mukilteo-Clinton route list and distributed notices on the vessels, at the terminals, and at libraries and other community facilities.

FTA and WSF held an agency scoping meeting for the EIS on March 21, 2006. The meeting gave public agencies the opportunity to provide input on the range of alternatives, help identify potential impacts of the alternatives being considered and potential areas of mitigation, and continue the working relationship established with the initial EA. Public agencies were also invited to comment on the project Purpose and Need statement.