Washington State Department of Transportation

WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FERRIES DIVISION

FINAL LONG-RANGE PLAN

APPENDIX D
PUBLIC COMMENTS ON DRAFT PLAN

Washington State
Department of Transportation

PUBLIC COMMENT FORMS FROM PUBLIC HEARINGS

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Port Townsend / Keystone
January 5, 2009

Questions from comment form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. Plan A seems like bare minimum for Port Townsend. Anything less than 2 boats is disaster! Straightening the lanes is of minimal importance. Reduced ferry service here adds stress to Kingston route.
2. The reservation system scares folks off. Signs on Whidbey say, "Reservations Required" (not true!) I often opt to drive a longer way around to return home from Edmonds because I don't own a cell phone to check on reservations home. Leaving in the morning from P.T. is less of a problem.
3. No comment

---

1. Plan completely ignores natural "HUB" provided by Puget Sound. A passenger ferry that circles the sound would be extremely valuable and could connect local transit systems. Many disconnected "spokes" are not the same as a ferry system. Planning should be future oriented not a half hearted attempt to reinvent the wheel.
2. No Comment
3. No Comment

---

1. Without good ferry service Port Townsend will die. The business community sales drop 30% when the car ferries don't run.
2. No comment
3. Do away with reservations. No A way with change. Round off fares to the nearest dollar.

---

1. No comment
2. No comment
3. Without ferry service the town of Port Townsend will die.

---

1. Why are the "floating bridges" (that we call ferries) not considered a part of the state highway system? Every other bridge in the system is considered an integral part of the system and received appropriate funding so the entire system does not fall apart because of a lack of ability to transit from one end of a given highway to another (other than temporary blockages). What other bridges in the highway system are required to "pay their own way" as the bridges called ferries are being required to do. Some bridges in the system are more expensive to build and operate than others. EG. Floating bridges such as the 520 across Lake Washington

have unique operating costs. How many of the bridges have 70% of their operating costs paid for by the users? Why make ferry passengers pay 7-% (and more in the next few years) of that segment of the highway system when no other highway system user is required to do so for the segments of the system they use? Who is paying for the repairs to the floating bridges across Hood Canal? Why can't the same funding mechanism used for the "floating bridge" across Admiralty Inlet? The "marine highway" is part of the state highway system and should be funding as such.

2. No comment
3. No comment

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Whidbey Island
January 6, 2009

Questions from comment form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. What are the financial economic impacts of the proposed changes in business revenues, businesses going out of business, real estate values, tax revenues, etc.
2. Why haven't you put the ferry business out for bid by private businesses? Are the ferry systems around the world that have better solutions or best practices? How does the Mukilteo-Clinton ferry route do economically versus the other routes?
3. How about a bail our from the fed & the new administration to help with "economic recovery" How about a reservation system for the 520 bridge?

---

1. Need a back up for Pt. Townsend run and Mukilteo. Local entities are in no position to take on additional services – either financially or technically. Don't need fancy terminals for Whidbey.
2. With more passenger (walk on) usage, coordination with other agencies is crucial. We need more sounder trains and buses to Seattle with better connection times to ferries. Now only at commuter times, so doesn't work for me! Flexcar is a great idea! Reliability is critical – it's bad enough now with boat cancellations and emergency repairs.
3. None

---

1. This plan places the ferry system in a separate division of transportation. It is still part of the highway system and therefore should be addressed as such. Highways, bridges, tunnels, ferries are all one system – treat it as such.
2. What are the revenues for Mukilteo-Clinton regarding profit vs. loss figures. It would help if we could compare routes to see which ones contribute the most and lose same.
3. Place residents of island in a position that allows for some priority on ferry service.

---

1. No comment
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. Neither plan deals with the reality of the ferry being part of the state and federal highway system. We need the reliability of 2 ferries at Keystone. What about shovel ready infrastructure.

2. Keystone – Pt. Townsend: We need 2 ferries. Don't cut our service. The last year and 2 months (since last thanksgiving's loss) have been terrible for reliability. Those who work in P.T./Whidbey, small business, business routes, etc here all suffered.
3. Can you please have a phone number for Keystone Route to see it its cancelled/ the number yesterday and the website had technical problems and we could get any info at all. Who's idea was it to have this meeting on the south end of Whidbey? Many folks in Coupeville had no transportation to get here. Please hold meetings in Coupeville! REC Hall/Commissioner's room. Gas prices are increasing and more people are relying on public transportation. Don't cut service but work with other existing services to meet needs. WA counties don't have the money to pay for these ferries. Cpvl/Pt.Townsend is primarily tourist in the summer. Maybe the tourism board can help pay. Obama Admin. Has promised "shovel ready" infrastructure funding – look into this! If ridership is down in the Keystone/PT run, it's probably due to the unreliability of service, the early pulling of one of our ferries last year, and the sudden disappearance of our last ferry the day before Thanksgiving 2007. We had a whale watching boat delivering service. The straits are dangerous at times. We need SAFE, reliable ferries for this route- this is unacceptable. Why hasn't DOT provided a plan for the last 40, 20, even 10 years? You know boats need placing. Where's the money? Where the plan?

---

1. Ask the legislature to waive the ferries be built in Wash. State. If WA state can't get ferries built at reasonable rates, then open up contracts to west coast or all of U.S. it would help the economy f the U.S. Make the ferries more energy sources/sustainable/greener. The department of energy might help with money. Where did the money go? Where was the plan?
2. Keystone+Clinton. We are the island with the only one way off by road. Deception pass bridge. We need reliable multiple ferries as a backup ferry service at Keystone. We don't need less service. We need a separate phone # to call or Keystone cancellations separate from the number for WA state ferries. (Yesterday no info by phone available and website info link was down).
3. No comment.

---

1. Make the ferry system part of the highway system. We are being unfairly treated and taxed. Our ferry system is important to the viability of business and people's ability to live on the island.
2. Where did the money go? Why are the ferries way down on the list of priority? Why wasn't prior plans made to take care of the expenses of new ferries? Someone must be held accountable! Ill our feedback do anything to change the outcome?
3. Most of the plans to cut ferry service is ruining all of us who live here.

---

1. No comment
2. How can you assure that vehicles with reservations can get through the ticket booth before the boat sails? I was unable to get through the ticket booth even though I arrived 45 minutes in advance of my scheduled trip from Pt. Townsend.

3. No comment.

---

1. What is your return on your investments
2. How will I take care of my mom on a moments notice if I have to have reservations.
3. You do not hear us – We pay for roads in Spokane. Pay for our own ferries here.

---

1. Would you consider requiring a reservation for your concrete system?
2. Since the Mukilteo/Clinton route is the most consistently highly used in the state, this should be a priority to accommodations overall!
3. No comment

---

1. It concerns me that we charge for passengers! If a passenger is linked to the transportation system they should not be charged again. I would also build the number of charged passengers in vehicles to one or two. Encourage more linked transportation! Use "transfer" tickets?
2. For years the Mukilteo/Clinton passenger access and transportation schedule to encourage more passenger ridership(parking) do not reduce Mukilteo/Clinton schedule. We must have a back up vehicle at Port Townsend/Keystone. Add larger boat to Mukilteo/Clinton route to reduce back ups at peak times.
3. I agree that the ferries are state highways…with tolls! Will we add tolls to maintain pass or Lake Washington highways? I also support the reservation system with priority to residents.

---

1. Plan B – less hours on the Mukilteo run in the summer would be devastating! We need more boats in summer – never less!
2. Larger boats at all times on the Mukilteo run – our boats are full 80% of the time – no other run boasts that capacity.
3. Whidbey is an island of commuters – the majority to work on the mainland – a reservation system could never work!

---

1. No comment
2. No comment
3. On the ferry docks: The cost of the state patrol and sniffer dogs should be eliminated. The program is more political than practical.

---

1. The ferries are being considered as a "step child" to the highway system rather than integral to a statewide plan update. Ferries are already heavily tolled.
2. To offset operating costs, but mountain pass snow removal is "free". Televised meetings of the Transportation commission clearly indicates a bias in the setting.
3. Unrealistic and unsustainable. Farebox recovery goals including only ONE fare pricing strategy for the acclimatizes. It is doubtful that 90% recovery is possible without serious negative impacts on the system and the communities they serve. 2000-2006 fare blasting clearly show a significant ridership decline. Peaking fare increases on passengers will further impact commuting where average incomes are low and dependency on commerce and mobility is significant. Suggest

considering alternative recovery including tolling mountain passes, might also consider some sort of limited “pay reservation” system for peak periods reserving some capacity (20%) for autos. Use the above strategies to offset operating costs, not unreasonably impact passengers who probably can afford these costs.

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Vashon Island
January 7, 2009

Questions from Comment Form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. WSDOT is greatly damaging our marine highways if they implement the above plan.
2. By removing the Rhododendron from the Tahleguard – Pt. Defiance route, it greatly impacts our travel to and from Tacoma and Olympia. A two boat system on the north end would be an enormous impact on my husband's commute.
3. Please respect our community by NOT reducing our ferry service.

---

1. It is a terrible plan.
2. North end: the buses are standing room only on the two buses that have early in the morning. If you cut the ferries back then the bus schedule will be off. South end: There are a lot of people who live on the other island that go off south end to work. Cutting to the Hiyu would cause a mess.
3. No comment

---

1. No comment
2. No comment
3. We need three boats on the north end. We need a large boat on the south end. Reservations are unfair to occasional commuters.

---

1. This is our highway we need it to be funded properly. We need income tax.
2. Tahlequah/Pt. Defiance run needs a boat at least as big as Rhododendron especially if you expect more users. We need more runs Southworth/Fauntleroy/Vashon, not less
3. If you do reservations it will further erode the middle class from all the islands.

---

1. The plan is horrible. Take boats away from people who can drive from their home to work. Bainbridge.
2. No Comment
3. We use to go to dinner and a movie until you stopped the south end ferries at 10 p.m. Friends used to drive from Portland after they got off work to catch eh late ferry that is no more,

---

1. It seems to me that with the rewritten system, we want at times to walk to get off the stand.
2. I am concerned that we won't be able to get to Tacoma for appointments, shopping, etc. Taking in Rhody to the route is a way bad plan.

3. No comment

---

1. No comment
2. The south end cannot function with only the Hiyu.
3. No comment

---

1. Why hasn't the ferry system recommended to the state legislature that the mandate for in-state procurement on new boats be dropped?
2. Why des the ferry system insist on charging a fee for walk ons with a bike? No bus system I know of charges extra for a bicycle, even though they provide extensive hardware for this purpose.
3. No comment

---

1. What are we supposed to do to get on and off the island in plan B? No way plan B.
2. Ann Po Baptis – Do not cut service or I lose by job!
3. No comment

---

1. Vashon definitely needs three ferries on the north end range. People are having to move off the island to reduce huge hours commuting.
2. If Vashon ticket sales are about 75% of sales, then Vashon cars and trucks should occupy 75% of the space on the ferries. The ferries will have to enforce this concept.
3. State monies need to be allocated for ferry expenses. Ferries are not an incidental choice. To islanders, they are a necessity.

---

1. Concern that there is so little understanding of the support for the ferries do an absolutely essential part of economies – real people need to commute to Tacoma and downtown Seattle to survive.
2. What plans are there to quickly replace and repair boats? The last I heard there was little interest in the contracts to build new boats.
3. No comment

---

1. No comment
2. I don't think I could get to work at University Hospital by 6 a.m. reliably under plan B. patients depend upon me keeping this schedule. If I have to pay more, that's what I have to do. If I have to sell my home under Plan B I'll take a huge loss. I've lived on Vashon since 1972 and discovered that I could work and survive. Plan B means this will longer be true.
3. No comment

---

1. I understand that passenger only fares will increase less than vehicle fares, but how high will rates go? Some of us live on fixed income. Will there be rates for middle and lower incomes?

2. I am concerned that I may not be able to leave the island to visit my relatives or keep specialist doctor appointments because of the expense of travel. I agreed to pay reasonable costs of ferries 20 years ago and they need to remain reasonable.
3. I am an occasional rider. I have cut back my trips to Seattle or Tacoma because of rate increases. Now I am penalized if I don't use my card in time by having my card expire and my money confiscated.

---

1. Neither. No, no, no to Hiyu! At least for commuting hours, please.
2. South end – it is hard to be a walk-on. Public transit buses not always timed for walk-ons. North end – could only work is you offer more walk-on sailings.
3. Thanks for letting us speak.

---

1. Concerned over replacing the Tahlequah Pt. Defiance ferry with a too small one. Today many cars and drivers could not get to Tacoma timely as the little ferry carried so few.
2. Will gravel trucks be using the ferries when the company starts sending gravel off the island? Also, make senior cards (Both car and driver travel). And senior passengers not expire for a year.
3. Seniors – offer cards 5 car and driver along with 5 ride cards. This will save attendants time when we aren't required to wait in line each time we travel. Families should be considered-offer a reduced fare for children with an adult, in and out of a vehicle.

---

1. Vashon residents have no alternative to leaving the island to commute to work except the ferries. Consider a modification of this plan that recognizes this fact and preserves the current number of boats, boat sizes, and scheduled runs in the Vashon runs.
2. Already the Vashon southworth run as experienced a significant erosion of service (runs) in the last 10 years. To plan for a two boat system only under Plan B would result in a possible outcome of my being unable to commute five days a week from Vashon to Bremerton via southworth rode a house that would allow me to continue in my present job. Plan B is unacceptable to me.
3. No comment

---

1. Decrease of service to Vashon Island
2. Vashon -> Tacoma -> Vashon. I commute to Tacoma from the south end of Vashon daily and do not want the smaller capacity ferry as there are too many overloads.
3. None

---

1. The "tone" of the DLR Plan seems to continue to shift away from the concept of ferries being an integral part of the state highway system and supported as such. For isolated islands such as Vashon we require access to the mainland.
2. Tacoma -> Vashon You continue to downgrade the service. Which forces travel via Vashon -> Fauntleroy to and from the south sound. This is a terrible and expensive solution.

3. None

---

1. Reservation system appears to favor commuters- what percentage of space is available for non-reservation users? Which runs would be primarily reservation only? Can a commuter have a standing “6:30 a.m. reservation? If so, how does a non commuter make a reservation with relatively short lead time?
2. How will logistics of reserved/non-reserved vehicles be handled efficiently? Will “Plan B” POF run through day and evening on Vashon/Seattle route? How can cars safely be carried on small Hiyu on Vashon/Pt. Defiance run when riders don’t have room to exit vehicles in case of emergency during sailing? Is this even legal?
3. Recreation and commerce opportunities for Vashon residents in Tacoma are already seriously impaired by inadequate evening runs – will this improve if there is a smaller vessel?

---

1. Please work with us and the legislature and governor to make changes in funding. 32 Hiyu versus 60 Rhododendron – This is not reasonable. Please consider taking cars off roads like I-5 by using the south end ferry vs. north end ferry to reach Tacoma.
2. Purpose and cost of reservation systems? Cost to users in time, cost to operate and maintain a system? Process to make reservation? Are you using process improvement/lean etc. in the ferry system like businesses are doing? If not, when will you start? Please respond? I need a car to do my work in Tacoma 0 what do you suggest I do to be at work at 8 a.m. if the Hiyu operates? What data system is used to analyze demand- i.e. number of cars waiting?
3. Ticket process is broken – a what efficiencies do you plan? We like the Rhododendron – a very special classic boat – why do we loose it? What are the consequences for staff who do not show up causing delays on the morning ferries or cancellations? The current system does not work. Please reread the testimony on the inefficiency of loading the Hiyu.

---

1. My concerns are the very real costs to the community of Vashon resulting from the changes the ferry changes currently under discussion. If the community dissolves (the businesses, the schools, the homeowners) the cost/savings under discussion should be considered in total.
2. Vashon has no way to “drive around”! No bridge (don’t want one) The quality of life is decreasing with the decrease in service and it will show a resulting loss for the whole island.
3. Thank you for coming to Vashon!

---

1. I’m a school principal – when I moved to Vashon in 1990 the ferry staff pointing out which lane I should drive into were making a higher salary then my beginning Seattle Public teachers! No wonder our taxes aren’t going for enough for our ferry boats!
2. No comment
3. No comment

1. Tahlequah ferry maintain a constant schedule daily.
2. Noon cut off at Tahlequah
3. Are we not a part of the state highway system? From over all the budget of WA state! Please!

---

1. Input was too restricted on data. Options are too restricted.
2. We need to keep capacity on Vashon. Solutions to Vashon Island need to be specific for bringing supplies, getting people to medical appointments, plus commuting to work and school.
3. No comment

---

1. No comment
2. Waiting for 1.5 hours to get from Tacoma to Vashon is nuts. I cannot accept teaching jobs that start at 6 a.m. because the earliest ferry is at 5:20. This costs me money!!! Please get rid of the Rhodi – its always breaking down and get rid of the Hiyu and run some extra routes like 4:05 etc. as you do the north end. Right now I'm considering taking a job in S. Tacoma – 11 miles from Puyallup. A 40 min. ride plus 3 hours waiting for ferries and the ferry rides. Makes for a long day to earn $56/day minus $11 plus taxes for the ride. More boats, more trips, boats that work, on the south end! So I'll have to rent near my work because I can't rely on the ferry system that continually breaks down. Try doing that on a $56/aday plus a mortgage on Vashon.
3. No comment

---

1. Reservation system will not suffice on a boat half the size of the Rhodendron which at times is overloaded as well. No wheelchair access for elderly – no elevator for disabled – 2 B.R. for all passengers.
2. Not being able to get a ferry to work and back home in any time that is reasonable – 5-6 hour commute included to a 10 hour day job – what time is left to take care for a friend. Hiyu is too small to accommodate the logging trucks, buses for school events the many contractors and heavy equipment. Fuel trucks for the island – emergency vehicles and on and on. Our local and small businesses will "dry up" because of the added cost in time to get supplies to their stores. Already we pay high taxes (King County) Gas taxes on roads we don't use, higher food and other goods that are available on Vashon. (Lumber, car parts, UPS services, fencing, animal feed for farm animals, etc.) We are a whole city here with all of the needs of any other city. We are not a rich lot of citizens as many believed. We have lived here for years and have sacrificed many and time and conveniences to maintain our life. Your plan "B" would be devastating to our city and families here. We face the same issues as any other community. (Homeless citizens – poor/elderly- low income families, families who have one income and are struggling now. We need proportionate, reliable transportation to meet our daily needs – not a bare bones system invaluable to meet the growing needs and demands of today much less 15 years from now. For me personally – I am unable to use public transportation due to the daily change in job sites with no way to

carpool efficiently. I can't afford to lose my job or cut lives to feed my family. Medical needs are not met off island as well as an aging help or six taxes" are loading takes or something to help fiancé this much needed means of commuting. Please don't let us down.

3. No comment

---

1. I would recommend we address the law stipulating all ferries be built in WA. I see only 1 bid has come in for 1 ferry from Todd Shipyard at almost twice the estimated cost. This is not a valid bidding process.
2. I left my home at 2:30 p.m. yesterday (1/13/09) arriving at Tahlequah at 2:50 and was not able to get on the 3:10. I finally got to Tacoma at 4:30. That's a 2 hour commute (1 way) in the middle of the day. This is an unacceptable plan!
3. No comment

---

1. Has there been any discussion about making the ferry system. Part of the state department of transportation. The ferries are a part of our highway system like bridges and freeways. Our funding sources should be the same.
2. If plan B is implemental many people will be forced to move off the island because they can no longer commute to their jobs. The state has a responsibility to support the community of Vashon the same way it provides roads, highways, and transportation services to other Washington communities.
3. I am particularly concerned about the reservation system and lack for capacity at the Fauntleroy dock. With the limited number of lanes on the dock I don't see how those with reservations will be separated from those without.

---

1. Tahlequah, Vashon, Pt. Defiance, Fauntleroy, Southworht routes. Plan B is totally unacceptable! A larger boat is needed at Tahlequah route – not smaller. Reinstatement of service – not less. Reservation not workable to Vashon Island – holding lanes, dock capacity.
2. We need enough service to met all the needs of Vashon. We are water locked – no other way off – do not destroy the quality of our life! Do not put smaller ferry on the Pt. Defiance route!
3. Be proactive for the ferries to the legislature. Utilize the people who volunteered to help find other solutions for cost saving. PS – we use all routes off Vashon!

---

1. How can we spend money on highways and ignore the water highway? Can we use the highway funds for new boats or just new snowplows. Build more efficient boats!
2. How can the capacity of the Vashon – Pt. Defiance be reduced when the growth of riders is continuing? Hiyu for Rhodie) 40% increase is expected.
3. Greater interface to land transportation is required so more walk-ons. Enlarge parking facilities increase transit at both ends. Can we redesign ferries so they accommodate more cars as an increased speed? Can Seattle (King County) provide more passenger ferries (2-4_ over a better schedule? Can a consortium of counties be organized to provide funding for ferries for more than King and Kitsap are benefitting by their use? Parking lots are part of the problem! Need bus

connections to be reliable some but more are needed! Schools are impacted by both employee (25 and increasing) and students who use the system (100+) Perhaps we need to open your franchise to others!

---

1. The county and the state created the zoning of infrastructure for a population center here on Vashon. They reply on our taxes. They have an obligation to continue to provide access to our community. Perhaps a legal obligation. I think most of us accept the inconvenience of having to the leave in time to catch a boat, weather break downs, etc. What we can't accept is to be abandoned by the system that made it possible for us to even consider living here. Your option A is a reduction on our historical levels of service, yet King County continues to be building permits to increase population density. Our levels need to increase to keep pace with our growth; not decrease we all know Puget Sound is a very desirable place to live in, we also provide a lot for revenue in the entire state. Are you going to stop repainting the roads in Eastern Washington? Why not? I am very disappointed that there was no opportunity for questions and answers tonight.
2. Reductions in service with both options. With our overloads we cannot accept decrease in service.
3. There seems to be a "punish the elitist islanders" mentality. We pay for70% of the cost of our ferry system. What other highway system does that?

---

1. Concerns pretty well aired (as they are at every meeting): decreasing service and rising fare box ratios=death toll to the island as we know if; large bus increaser leave (as they already have), unemployment rises, people leave, small businesses close, seniors are isolated and also leave…
2. I am retired, use both Pt. Defiance and Fauntleroy routes. A way must be found to break a triangle route sooner than project. Reservations system seems a logistical impossibility while Southworth and Vashon are in some loading lines up the hill, but I don't see it working for 90% of the drivers in any case – cannot project when you will be able to reach Fauntleroy (or Pt. Defiance) for return trip.
3. Ridership will decline and the system be of shell of former self unless there is more creative thinking and willingness of the legislature to honor ferries are a marine highways and find stable capital funding.

---

1. Many questions + comments were expressed sufficiently @ the hearing on Vashon during your visit. Our concern is our livelihood.
2. Please find "attached" alert notifications for Pt. Defiance/Tahlequah. My wife commutes on this route 5 days a week. It's not a subject many would find acceptable: 1/7 – 3 delays, 1/10 – 1hr, 1/12 – 1hr, 1/14 – 3 delays, 1/16 – 3 delays, 1/21 – 1hr, 1/22 – 1hr, 1/23 – 2 delays
3. The 5 crews cars that "overnight" on the Hiyu when the crew sleeps off the vessel. The 5:30 Tahlequah departure leaves cars on the dock.

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Bremerton / Seattle
January 8, 2009

Questions from Comment Form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. The Long-Range plans will not work for the City of Bremerton or for the matter the Kitsap Peninsula. Plan "A" is unacceptable in its current form & Plan "B" is insulting. The people that live here need to travel to Seattle for work recreation, education and medical. To hold us "hostage" in this way is a travesty. We need increase service and additional funding.
2. I am a downtown city of Bremerton resident. I have always needed more options for late night return trips from entertainment activities. Examples are mariners, Sonics (former0, Symphony, Ballet.
3. My wife Elizabeth "sunny" Wheeler agrees with my above assessment and concurs.

---

1. My concern is having a dependable reliable system in place which will "get me from point A to point B". Will WSF provide service that I need?
2. I am a walk-on ferry rider and at times the commute is stressful enough. My being on a strict schedule. If at all possible, could the present system be improved upon without service cut backs?
3. I believe WSF is a vital part of the state highway system, one which we should be proud to be involved in.

---

1. Why not remove a boat from a shorter route like Bainbridge, which runs every 30 minutes/ It wouldn't be such a disruption for the lives of those riders as it would be for Bremerton riders who already have to wait an hour between runs.
2. The Bremerton route supports the Washington economy – we go to schools in Seattle, work there, shop, pay taxes, attract tourism. We deserve the same level of transportation services and support.
3. No comment

---

1. Two hours between boats does not get the flexibility of riding the boat for a commute. I would expect ridership would not be able to grow in Plan B.
2. Bremerton takes longer and connects us at two points that are closer together than Bainbridge and Kingston. Thus Bremerton should be cheaper than the other two routes.
3. If plan B is adopted it would cause us to move from Bremerton to the east side of the sound. The ferries should be looked at as an opportunity rather than a burden to the state.

1. Both plans are irresponsible for operating and maintaining a vital link in the state highway system. The WSF is a marine highway and should be funded as such.
2. Plan B would create an unfunded mandate to local transit to build and operate ferries from scratch. The shipyard, the economy, and the city of Bremerton would suffer. Plan A isn't much better. A third boar on the Bremerton route is needed.
3. Repeal the Jones Act and remove some top management to control costs. Stop tinkering with design that cause bid increases. And paint the Hyak. Where has the pride gone?

---

1. Shame on you all! Go back and do the work required to come up with something better than this.
2. Plan B is totally unacceptable. Plan B: one boat for Bremerton is not an option. Too many people rely directly and indirectly on a fully functional ferry run to Seattle.
3. Plan B exposes the Departments desire to cease all operations in Bremerton.

---

1. I am very sad and have decided to put my home up for sale. I have a wonderful job in Seattle – I have shifts that are well used there and there is nothing comparable on this side. How do you manage to feel comfortable that you are condemning a town to death.
2. That schedule is unacceptable to keeping my job then and staying in Washington> I was a good citizen. Good luck Washington. This schedule will keep Bremerton Silverdale, Gig Harbor, Belfair, Port Orchard down there were needed area for growth.
3. No comment

---

1. The results of the study referred to in section 1.3 are extremely limited and are not at all sufficient for any rational well developed plan. Who did this survey?
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. Have considerations been made for finding funding under the proposed US Government economic stimulus plan. It offers an opportunity to find more efficient form propulsion with US funding under innovation.
2. Evening service from Seattle essentially cuts off the kitsapers contribution to Seattle evening or even "all day" events – There are over 225,000 fold over here.
3. Buy ferries now while they are cheap! The deficit in the sate is recession driven and dogs fit as a situation in need of economic stimulus. Ferries are a national defense issue. Come and see the crowd of workers arriving from Seattle daily to Bremerton Navy Yard. Is the US Government ready to supply a permanent vessel to WADOT for naval base Kitsap support? The recent changes in late evening route times have resulted in making those ferries impractical so now for late evening I drive 74 miles because there is not satisfactory service.

---

1. Neither plan is acceptable

2. Why is Bremerton always the ugly stepchild of the ferry system?
3. In a notion that can find $700 Billion to bail out crooked bankers and Wall Street swindlers, why can't we find 1 or 2 billion to allow those poor schmucks stuck with the tax a bill to be able to do so?

---

1. Plan A is too expensive. Plan B is not viable. One boat for Bremerton will not work. Why not do one at Bainbridge?
2. If WSF can't fund any would cash strapped local government be able to fund? WSF has put the latest reliable boats on Bremerton so we do not trust WSF planning to adequately provide for us.
3. You need a different plan. Consider a WSF POF for Bremerton and for Bainbridge.

---

1. Reduction of service down to one boat for Bremerton – I need week night – late night ferry boats for work. Many people do not have the option to drive around. Government should supply transportation. We already suffer when other routes go down. Surveys done on Saturdays (no commuters) – no announcement of meeting on ferry. The reason there are less commuters due to problems/lack of timely and reliable service/employees seem indifferent. Will cause more people to drive and clog up roads and increase pollution. Many people don't even have the option to drive. We already have a big gap between boats. Many professionals as well as hourly workers depend on being able to travel at non-peak times – need weekday night routes. Cutting service strictly curtails the ability to even travel to Seattle. – Sporting events – concerts/cultural events. But shortfall is only a small amount per year over the 22 years.
2. Bremerton can not be cut down to one boat – Thousands of customers rely on this. We are already suffering through poor service and long gaps between boats. Also any time a boat breaks down on another route, Bremerton suffers.
3. The legislature needs to stand up and fix this. The reason you don't think there are commuter is that you conduct surveys on Saturdays – when "pleasure" riders ride! Stop ignoring the problem!

---

1. I think the survey states re commuting are incorrect. I see many commuters as I commute and more all the time – do people surveying with real commuter at real commute times! Commuting will always be critically important.
2. More creative scheduling of variable size ferries – identify size and type of ferry (people only, vehicles, trucks) in schedule. Solicit more on-board advertising on small kiosks on board small business opportunities on-board. Consider volunteers to handle non-critical task – downsize staff. Small economical ferries for late night. Maybe mid-day? Like Portland Fri-met off hours)
3. Work more closely with Kitsap Transit for more regular travel to/from terminal in Bremerton. Evening trip to get ferries, leave car at house, encourages more mass transit.

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Southworth
January 12, 2009

Questions from comment form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. Work for passing Plan A. Plan B reduces service to Southworth and Bremerton. Two boat runs get very late! Been there and do not enjoy it!
2. See above. Reduced service makes late arrivals at destinations making too long a day for commuters. Plan A is the best.
3. Why pick on ferries? No other roads are "sustainable" in terms of revenue generated, so why expect the ferries to be?

---

1. They're both unacceptable!
2. Cutting service from Southworth is not acceptable!
3. More direct boats from Southworth ←→ Fauntleroy.

---

1. It seems there wasn't a whole lot of commuter input in the planning process of these "options."
2. If there is going to be more growth in South Kitsap, why on earth would you consider downsizing the run? (Southworth to Fauntleroy)
3. It seems much more plausible to "refit" (rebuild) these ferries, which would significantly reduce costs.

---

1. Services, likely lead to more miles driven, increasing $ going overseas.
2. I am concerned that more folks will be driving. I believe we should get funds for mass transit and that there should be an increase in gas tax.
3. I like foot ferry – even displacement hull (less fuel) and run to downtown.

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Bainbridge Island / Seattle
January 13, 2009

Questions from comment form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. We need to study the economic impact of these alternatives and study the economic value of the ferry system on the entire state.
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. How will the reservation system work? Can we use commuter coupons? What if we miss our reserved run? Can commuters reserve a standard time each day?
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. Why does the plan <u>not</u> include a strategy for revenue enhancement <u>beyond</u> fare increases such as the "tipping point" of fare decreases that increase ridership → revenue, advertising, new routes, different route usage (freights), entertainment, etc.
2. Reduction in service, increase in rates, reduction in safety, reduction in quality of assets.
3. Poor planning.

---

1. We need to study the economic impact of these alternatives and study the economic value of the ferry system on the entire state.
2. No comment
3. No comment
4. No comment

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Kingston / Edmonds
January 14, 2009

Questions from Comment Form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. We attended the 1/14/09 meeting at the Kingston community center. The many speakers echoed our feelings that plan B was a disaster and plan A barely adequate.
2. We moved the Kingston in 2000. The fares escalated each year. The WSF is not making more profit (others also) as we have severely cut our crossings = changed doctors, dentist, etc to local.
3. About three months ago, the ticket taker rang me up for regular passenger instead of senior. He said he couldn't adjust it and both and gave me a form. I mailed it in. $3.25 is not a lot but I've heard nothing.

---

1. Review labor costs with union – (like general motors and auto industry). Labor costs are out of hand – review medical (All should go on medical option 65).
2. Eliminate 20 ticket takers – save labor costs. Maybe $1,000,000 with medical and retirement. By using transponder like narrows bridge. Benefit to user – faster loading – eliminate SARS OR frequent rider tickets – maive users would by pass.
3. Ticket taker giving us better access for loading – the tourist on non transponder upon would he in ticket taker line. Save money – load lot faster. Give better service to frequent users. Call me for details.

---

1. Need creative solutions and misimplementation of some basic cuts including (a) house boats (b) outsource maintenance (c) outsource operation (d) eliminate 2 levels of management (e) stop cross subsidies and charge per mile.
2. We need direct access to Seattle from Kingston. WSF needs to rethink what its business ? Design, build, operate, and maintain ferries? All of these or just manage those who do the work?
3. Kingston is subsiding the Bremerton/Seattle run and the San Juan runs. Plan A should be the bare minimum, Plan B is not acceptable! Your choices of A and B diverts attention away from operations reform.

---

1. The ferry system is a state highway and need the same attention as the major highways sole-source/WA state only bids are costly. Ferry overhead is way too costly. Community impact has not been studied. There have been many fare increases but no visible effect on budget.
2. Kingston/Edmonds pays way more than their share. Reservations would confuse people and drive tourists away. Summer fare increases are counter production.

3. But the I-695 there was plenty of money to put into capitol replacement – so don't blame it for our problems there two places are unrealistic choices.

---

1. The ferry system is part of the Washington State Department of Transportation. It needs to be treated exactly the same as every other part of our highways – over land or water.
2. We cannot discriminate against some of our citizens who happen to use a ferry system instead of a bridge, i.e. the floating bridge, simply because of a difference in the mode of travel.
3. No comment

---

1. Why is WSF even considering such a stupid idea? Plan A does not address 40% ridership growth. Plan A is bare minimum.
2. Why don't the sailors OS.Abs, maintain these vessels? They are filthy! I would not take my dog into those bathrooms!
3. This train has come off its tracks!

---

1. The state is not willing to support our part of the highway system – ferry system. These plans impact home values negatively.
2. Residents need evening ferries year round. We can't take ferries or the summer weekends because of congestion. Don't tell us we can't get home in winter evenings!
3. No comment

---

1. Discounts for motor homes+ large cars at night. Trailers and boats. The ferries are n extension of the freeway/road system. Ferries are no different than the Lake Washington bridge.
2. Money has been found for Seattle Viaduct replacement to meet that need – that is what needs to be done. This is a basic state transportation – let's find the funding. Ferries can be Spartans! Night-travel for trucking! – Yes
3. Kingston-Edmonds run is only 25 min. Bremerton is almost double that – yet they cost the same! Gas tax – yes 2-5 cents.

---

1. No comment
2. How can you possibly cut night service (9:00??) at Kingston? What incredible hardship this will put on our ferry users.
3. Cut your downturn overload. Thank you. Unlink fares. On the backs of Kitsap residents. Cut overload – accountability – law suit.

---

1. Is .06% a representative sample of 23,012,000. Auto use presented on Bainbridge and Bremerton not Edmonds which is #2 in vehicle use. Financing – operations products a 2 billion dollar decrease in fare box revenue with an increase in ridership – direct conflict. Relocate terminal in Mukilteo to tank state eq. current location. Legislature action can reinstate MVET – I 695 was ruled against in count – no longer a valid excuse. Ferries are part of the state highway system and as such should get funds outside of fares for operation – sound transit gets huge

subsidy. 30% of riders commute only 9% of those who travel in peak can change. Euphased by statement that raising “commuter costs” maximizes revenue. When presenting use constant money value one grab in 2008 and one 2005.

2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. Since the Washington State Ferries are part of the state department of transportation, why isn’t this marine highway, treated like any other highway in the state? Our taxes pay for freeways throughout the state – ones that we may rarely use – and yet the ferry system isn’t maintained like the other highways in the state. If the Lake Washington bridges go down they are repaired in a timely fashion. Our transportation across a body of water should be no different.
2. Has any consideration been given to the hundreds of people who commute to jobs form Everett to South Seattle everyday? This would cause a huge distraction for employers as well as employees if Plan B were used. The ferry entity is the only part of the DOT that in effect, pays a toll to use it.
3. No comment

---

1. What would happen is reservations were initiated for I-520? What percentage of the viaduct tunnel would sustain ferries?
2. Both plans are totally unacceptable. The marine highway system is no less deserving of support than any other highway. I am hoping and agitating for a full taxpayer revolt.
3. No comment

---

1. The plan to expend $1.4 million on moving toll booths to address bus access is unnecessary and wasteful. With proper cal management, as was practiced in the past when buses came down into the loading area, can accommodate the bus and move it safely. Congestion pricing is not reasonable for commuters and does not address problems. Incentive pricing of non-peak times will address congestion by removing vehicles from high volume times and changing behavior in a way you desire. You will loose more riders to avoid a trip or drive around behavior ultimately with congestion pricing rather than keeping the revenue and changing behavior.
2. Eliminating evening runs on Kingston/Edmonds is just ridiculous and represents and approach that is unworkable for all. The Kingston run represents access for all Olympic Peninsula and the North in mainland (Everett etc). Forcing the additional travel for vehicles to and from Bainbridge increases carbon footprint, gas usage as well, this is irresponsible in relation to climate change goals in our state. Little personal costs would be saved by night trip elimination. Dropping every other trip on all routes would address operation costs or eliminating Bainbridge evening runs – these extreme actions make as much sense as dropping Kingston/Edmonds evening runs – no sense at all just a move to create an uproar and hammer home the system needs proper management to meet revenue need and its responsibility as part of the marine highway.
3. No comment.

1. Ferry service is the lifeline of Kitsap County. The hood canal area and the Olympic Peninsula. Plans to reduce services significantly in pursuit of insignificant savings are foolish. Reservation systems will result in confusion and potential confrontations. Peak period pricing puts an unfair on numerous tax on those who use the ferry most.
2. These proposal are thoroughly unacceptable and must be rejected!
3. No comment

---

1. Don't change anything all the cuts you have made have made it hard enough to get back and forth I need to be able to get to Seattle and back often for my chemo.
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. Plan needs to be made for when fuel prices decrease – I propose putting savings towards ferry building fund.
2. I support Plan A for the Kingston run
3. Regarding non-residential pricing: All drivers have to carry a valid driver's license. I suggest a surcharge for non-Washington driver license drivers.

---

1. It seems like the government (Wash. State) could have access to helicopters for easier commute drops for commuters (i.e.) Poulsbo or Kingston pick up and drop off spots. Day to day time loss via Washington state ferries (i.e. Bremerton 2 hour daily trips and Bainbridge 1 to 1.5 hour daily trips, not including preparation for the trip etc. is just a waste of time – life is too short.
2. To use large helicopters buzzing people to and from destinations as the only solution for this hectic day to day commute. I cannot see a long term growth in commuters. This is too demanding and should be corrected.
3. No comment

---

1. More needs to be done to reduce overhead labor costs on the Kingston-Edmonds runs. I see a lot of ferry workers doing nothing while the boat is under sail. Why have such a large crew? I understand coast guard rules and union contracts, but there have to be some kinds of labor savings to be gained.
2. Instead of reducing service, reduce some employment.
3. No comment

---

1. The ferries are part of the highway system and should be treated as such.
2. Plan B is a disaster, who in their right mind would shut down a major highway in the evening? Mary Margauret Haugen should be replaced with someone with a brain.
3. Get the union influence out of the ferry system.

---

1. We people who need the ferries to go from the northern parts of the Olympic Peninsula and Kitsap Peninsula to Seattle end points East are very saddened to ready that WSDOT and ferry planning committee are again forgetting that the

ferries are a very necessary part of the state highway system. We need to be treated like other citizens of the state by having reliable and reasonably priced transportation to allow us to work at well paying jobs, seek appropriate medical care in outstanding facilities, attend special cultural events, and visit friends and relatives across Puget sound. (I am still concerned about getting to doctor's appointments in a reservation system)

2. We would like the same consideration as other automobile drivers. They don't begin to pay for the care and maintenance of the highways yet we are expected to pay 70-80% of the ferry operating costs.
3. Please do not cut ferry service, please do not increase rates beyond 2-3 percent a year (rate of inflation). We feel that tolls on high traveled roads might be a good idea for repairs, etc. Again, why not reprint the eastbound shoulder of hwy 101 to allow for ferry drivers to travel from Miller Bay Rd. to Kingston ferry to ease summer congestion and decrease likelihood of anger frustration and fender bender add vents? This would also require better signage plus shoulder widening just east of the Rite Aid property. The traffic is terrible there most of the summer, Sundays, and holidays. The Narrows Bridge, Hwy 16 and I-5 do not have the capacity to handle the congestion created by cuts in ferry services!!!

---

1. Please enact Plan A. WSF should be controlling fuel costs based on buying long range future contracts on diesel, no on the whim of price influctions swairliwas does this well.
2. Fare increases need to take into consideration that we are in a recession prices are dropping not going up. Any price increase should also say when they will go down. I have never seen a decrease in prices in over 20 years riding the ferry.
3. I took the online survey and my feelings is it was not a survey at all. If you answered that you walked on and did not drive on the survey ended. If you drove on it pestered you with questions after questions with alternatives to walk on. It would not give up until you at least partially walked on. This is intimidation and achieving the answer they wish to hear.

---

1. I agree service plan A is the best of our alternatives. I also agree 1.4 million to move ferry toll booth in Kingston is a poor alternative to keeping bus lane clear suing existing labor. 26 million is improve bus service in Edmonds is of course absurd, since the current solution on Railroad appears adequate, through not ideal. Money would be better spent to improve pedestrian safety as the inevitable fatality and laws we will see in the future will be very expensive to all involved.
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. Plan B is just not acceptable. If would leave us cut off and vulnerable. It shouldn't even be presented tot eh legislature.
2. Losing any sailing. In fact, extra boats should be added int eh summer as needed.
3. The legislature should revisit the car tax issue and reinstate it. The system is so dire because of the constant neglect by the legislature. The ferry routes are just as

impacted as any highway because it is a highway. We should be asking the legislature for more with the hope that we could get at least what Plan A offers. Even if it means more taxeds (car, gas) the state should support the ferry system and ot let it shrink. We should also allow our new boats to be big nation-wide. We would save a lot of money and be eligible for federal funds. There is no competition in Washington.

---

1. Plan A is not forward planning – it accomplishes nothing. Plan B is a joke…it was met with laughter! How embarrassing for you!
2. Are we not part of the Washington State Highway system?
3. Plan B – lets close the 520 bridge at 9:00 p.m. Please don't kill Kitsap County.

---

1. Both Plan A and B are totally disgusting – if one or the other must be voted in Plan A is the only one that is acceptable. De-unionize the ferry system; fire someone who knows how to run a profitable business; taxing the fuel on the ferries – this is double dipping. This state is totally irresponsible with "peoples' tax dollars and our state representatives are not representing the people. Why has the governor already included Plan B in her budget? Funding for a tunnel in downtown Seattle but no transportation or Kitsap Co. Jefferson Co. Etc.
2. No comment
3. No comment

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
San Juan Islands
January 15, 2009

Questions from comment form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. No comment
2. No comment
3. If there were more ferries (less wait), the Anacortes ferry terminal would be adequate and terminal remodel money could be re-assigned.
   What cost savings has WSF implemented in its administrative structure – specifically.

---

1. No comment
2. San Juan Islands – If you want a higher percentage of walk-on traffic, you can't charge for parking. When we have guests for more than one day with them, it is cheaper to drive on.
3. No comment

---

1. No comment
2. Ferries should be funded, just are highways!
   Reservation system will trap residents in cases of unplanned urgent travel (e.g. family emergencies).
3. No comment

---

1. No comment
2. Don't stop inter-island run! Don't charge for parking at Anacortes in winter. Getting rid of Sidney run will create more parking and get rid of customs which creates havoc. Get more Fed money. We have 2.3 billion for a tunnel. Where did that come from?
3. Build new boats on east coast – cheaper. Lower wages. Drop Sidney run. Create a standby vessel by doing this.

---

1. Plan B is unacceptable.
   Plan A does not address growth
   Where is the economic impact statement as ordered by ESHB 2358?
2. Who at WSF can help us plan for transit connections at the Anacortes Terminal? We are poised to work on this issue. Please have them contact me.
3. Thank you for a great public hearing. Please let us know how we can better support you.

---

1. How much more does it cost to maintain marine highway system compared to similar capacity, terrestrial hwys?
   Very important to keep alternative public systems going.
2. I would walk on more often w/cheaper parking @ Anacortes.
   Support same day block of spaces in reservation system.
   Improved SKAT & AMTRAK would help walk-on increase.
3. No expiration date on passes, I'd pay more for that feature.
   Important to me to keep Sidney route; the inter-island route.
   Encourage seeking federal infrastructure funds.

---

1. We must re-instate a solid source of funding. The auto licensing fee was lost years ago – the state funds other forms of transportation. We are not receiving our share of a crucial service.
2. We have great concerns for maintaining the current levels of ferry service for the San Juan Islands especially the inter-island ferries as we use those weekly. We are a ferry dependent community 100%.
3. No comment

---

1. The ferry system is essential for the survival of the San Juans. That is no exaggeration. The marine highway is a toll road for us and we accept that. How about setting up more toll roads throughout the state to bring in more $ for our state roads, including the ferry highway?
2. I am dependent upon the Sidney run for part of my income. Setting up a reservation system will cost more money, which I would think were trying to avoid. If you cut off the circulation of something, it will die. If you cut off any more ferry service, our life's blood in the islands. We will die. This will create a huge reduction in revenues to our county as well as the State of Washington. Ours is a water world. It is irrational to curtail ferry service here, AT ALL – to any degree!
3. No comment

---

1. Keep ferries state run – critical.
   Reservation system – it will be scammed – businesses will snap up large numbers of spaces so tourists will have an advantage over locals.
2. Friday Harbor route – Skip idea that 8:25 pm ferry is "inter-island". It should not go to Shaw/Orcas – there is already a ferry going there (about 8 pm) so no additional need and usually no one, or few, cars board at Orcas. Save fuel!
3. Fill potholes at Anacortes Terminal.

---

1. After reviewing the question always comes down to funding. Since this is our public highway it should be unconstitutional that the state can refuse our nights to use it at our convenience.
2. No comment
3. Also, since funding always is the problem. A long term plan on short-term basis will or should be advertising. Highways have billboards. Why not the ferries?

---

1. No comment

2. Ferries are vital in the San Juans! Need to increase or at least maintain service levels, particularly in light of population increases in the islands. More people and fewer sailings will bring chaos.
3. No comment

---

1. No comment
2. I am very concerned with the plan to eliminate the San Juan Islands inter-island ferry during weekdays. I live on Orcas, and have an Acupuncture Clinic in Friday Harbor – for the past 20 years. Eliminating the inter-island boat would threaten the viability of my practice in Friday Harbor. This would, in turn, make it very precarious for me to make a living, and would, therefore, not allow me to support my family. Please reconsider!
3. No Comment

---

1. How much does it actually cost to run each run (including Sidney)? Why do we have to re-do terminals? What workers are absolutely needed per boat? Per run? Per terminal?
2. Sidney Route – This route is an International link that has been in service over 80 years. Please consider at least 6 months on 6 months off. Shutting down this route would be like shutting I-5 to Canada.
3. Make ferry workers be port specific. Substitute people from many miles away that get mileage and time to travel to ferries – not good idea! Look for $ in how the workers use the system of WSDOT. Example: Why do we have a worker ($30,000/yr) to tell us which lane to park in? Can't the ticket person give a slip of paper w/# lane. Have you gone through your budget to look for ways of trimming jobs, etc?

---

1. The legislators who passed I-695 were very short sighted not to have simultaneously arranged alternate funding for the ferry system.
2. The orchestras, bands, choruses and choirs in the San Juans all involve members from various islands. Cutting back inter-island service will destroy these cultural assets.
3. The ferries are part of the highway system, but we pay tolls that residents of other counties do not bear.

---

1. Draft Plan A is the only acceptable plan with some fine tuning. Elimination or cut back on either the inter-island or Sidney run will present a hardship for many who live and work in the San Juans.
2. The domestic service of the Sidney ferry is absolutely essential. To cut one vessel is unacceptable in the SJs. As a former long time member of the San Juan FAC, I believe the only fair system has and should continue to be 1st come first served. A reservation system on the SJ route is subject to abuse and is not practical. I continue to be opposed to a SJ reservation system.
3. A reservation system favors tourism and could be a negative effect for locals. Try to define and enforce who is and who is not a resident. Martha's Vineyard reservation system has created a lot of angry citizens. It does not work! Maybe elsewhere but not in the San Juans. It is too complicated.

---

1. Parking expenses wipe out walk-on interest. Increasing passenger fairs at a reduced rate doesn't work for the San Juans. We return from the mainland with cars full of groceries, sick animals, building supplies. Try that as a walk-on!
2. Put capital building contracts out to out of state boat yards so we can get the best boats for the best price. "Job protection" hasn't worked for the Big 3 auto industry. Give it up, change the bidding regulations.
3. Replace our "old tax", that part of the MVT that was dedicated to WSF, with a 25¢/gal gas tax increase. Present it as replacement of an old/previous tax, not a "new tax".

---

1. If everyone had to use ferries, this wouldn't be a problem!
2. Do not spend money on a new terminal. It's all good as is! Or keep it humble & not Disneyland please!
   The ferry is a toll road. We pay for it.
   Health issues! Keep viable service.
3. We pay road taxes, the ferry is our road.
   Sidney route provides revenue & tax money. Sidney will contribute to the system. You haven't brought that out.
   We are not rich people. We serve rich people. We are community.

---

1. Decreased service in the San Juan Islands will severely impact my business (Fire Service Fleet Maint) of servicing the emergency operations fleets of San Juan County. I have no transportation options to the WS Ferries.
2. I can switch to reservations for scheduled work; however emergency repairs are directly impacted by immediately available vessels. San Juan County has no options to WSF. We cannot simply drive the long way around.
3. My contribution to WSF fare collection is over six thousand $ a year. I also service nearly 100 emergency vehicles in Skagit and Island Counties.

---

1. My major concern is the lack of dedicated funds for the ferry system. The "illegal" implementation of I-695 has left much of the transportation system statewide in deep trouble. An economic impact statement would be helpful in assessing the impact of reduction of ferry service in SJ County.
2. SJ County is ferry dependent. We cannot "drive around". Our entire economy is reliant on the ferries. I support Plan A, but would ask for future reevaluation & assessment of the economic impact of reduction of service.
3. Other sources of revenue should be explored. An increase in gas tax buried somewhere that could be renewed.

---

1. Obviously the legislature will not approve Plan A in a recession and Plan B leaves a skeleton fleet and much reduced service throughout the system. The ferry system needs to be funded as a highway.
2. The San Juans are totally dependent on ferry service in every aspect of daily living. Reducing service out here would have dire consequences such as loss of employment for those who work inter-island jobs, which would cause families to leave, loss of access to medical specialists when needed on the mainland which affects disabled and

elderly residents, restricted access to education for high school and community college kids who commute to Friday Harbor from Orcas, Shaw and Lopez Islands.
3. No Comment

---

1. No questions or concerns – just kudos to the boat crews that provide friendly/clean/courteous service – day in and day out!
2. Regarding public health and safety it is important to our company San Juan Sanitation and the citizens of SJ County to have access to an inter-island schedule enabling us to move solid waste and recyclable effectively throughout the islands and with sensible connections to the mainland. A "redeye" or approx. "noon boat" and a 205/300 pm) sailing are essential.
3. P.S. Eliminate all sailings after 6 pm. Inform the "night owls" – see ya in the morning!

---

1. Plan A is a must to keep the Sidney run. With the Olympics looming, lodging reservations are already picking up for that time in the San Juans. Note statistic or increase in passenger ridership vs. vehicle.
2. San Juans route – What financial/service advantages/disadvantages to have at least 1 passenger-only vessel/ferry?
   To begin: 1 faster vessel inter-island only with separate docking area, to allow the car ferries to maintain schedules.
   Trial period of a passenger ferry Anacortes-San Juans co-ordinate land transit with these ferries.
   Think "outside the box" to have car ferries redesigned to use a high % of space for vehicles. (Current ferries never are overfull with passenger spaces taken. Now is the time to do this thinking as millions will be spent for new vessels.
3. Hooray for reservations!
   Any chance of vehicle excise tax being re-applied?
   Partner with Canada (public or private) for the Sidney/Anacortes run?

---

1. We need to have ample ferries.
2. With the economy so bad, I thinkt eh reservation systems should be delayed. Building ferries should go out of for national bids. I really don't thinkt eh Anacortes ferry terminal needs to be replaced.
3. Good meeting. Think how much money goes for I-90 and all highway. Good ferry transportation is imperative for San Juan residences. When one thinks about tourism for Wash. St. Washing state ferries immediately comes to mind. We live in one of the most beautiful places in the world. Visitors come to the northwest to enjoy Puget sound, the water, san Juan islands…Wash. State ferries plays a very important role for tourism in the northwest.

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Anacortes
January 15, 2009

Questions from comment form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. I like the idea of increased transit/walk-on passengers.
2. I had hoped the State would view the Anacortes-Sidney run as a showpiece trip to offer Vancouver Olympics visitors. Winter visitors may not be able to visit mountain areas after all and the Sidney trip offers an impressive view of the glories of Washington State.
3. No comment

---

1. I am a small business owner of an art gallery in Anacortes. I am also active in Anacortes Sister Cities Association. I have participated in the cultural exchange opportunities with Sidney and also have experienced tourism business directly related to visitors on their way to or from Sidney. The last 3 years there has been a remarkable increase in visitors from Canada. My customers continually remark upon this wonderful area and the very unique chance to see it by boat. Please work to make Plan A work for us.
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. The only reason that WSF is not financially sustainable is that it does not have an identified and adequate funding source. WA State is making the choice to adequately fund some transportation systems and not others.
2. The Sidney ferry is <u>not</u> solely an international ferry. It is critical to the level of domestic service.
3. The WA State law that requires ferries to be built in state is causing us to miss a tremendous opportunity to utilize federal stimulus funds to pay for much needed new ferry construction. The reason for this law is to save/increase jobs with WA State, but the unintended consequence is a loss of jobs due to the loss of WSF level of service (fewer ferries = fewer ferry workers) including the loss of those jobs that depend on ferry transportation for their business and/or commuting. A cost benefit analysis is needed!
   The Governor told me that another reason for this law is in order to have in-state shipyards with the capacity to maintain and repair the ferries. Isn't this goal possible to achieve without requiring that ferries be built in state?

WSDOT Ferries Division
Public Hearing Comment Form
Fauntleroy
January 21, 2009

Questions from Comment Form:

1. *After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan, what questions or concerns do you have?*
2. *What questions or concerns do you have specific to your route?*
3. *Other Comments*

---

1. Re-route addition southworth/Vashon capacity to downtown Seattle. Replace Fauntleroy dock without increase operator structure area and no pedestrian bridge overhead.
2. Cost/benefit – downtown Seattle dock expansion does not decrease quality/near shore habitat, does it?
3. Southworth route should directly link to Coleman dock/not Fauntleroy. Focus on growing pedestrian ridership not auto. Think global warming and how to shift to a green transit plan not encouraging auto ridership. Widening dock and adding pedestrian bridge is unacceptable habitat at Fauntleroy cove for endangered Chinook juvenile salmon must be protected from pacts from dock expansion. Provide a route downtown from Kitsap and Vashon to the Coleman dock downtown. Let's provide a safe neighborhood and access to our parks. Reduce air pollution at WSP docks decreasing auto exhaust and diesel exhaust from ferry boat.

---

1. Traffic is already very bad in Fauntleroy. There are often accidents because traffic is backed up and its gets confusing. Passenger only ferry service southbound the focus. Most people are going to other places not West Seattle.
2. Pollution – when we walk to Lincoln Park it is often uncomfortable and difficult to breathe due to idling traffic. Safety accidents. High volume – suggestion for Fauntleroy to go to single lane with center bore will not handle the volume of today's traffic. The viaduct plan will make the next 5-8 years difficult as it is. My commute to the west Seattle Bridge is 8-12 minutes now. I believe it will take me much more if traffic is increase through Fauntleroy.
3. Kudos: On behalf of someone who couldn't attend: Judy Pisott. The water taxi is great. Request later service – 11 pm? So people going to Mariners games or want to spend an evening on the town have an alternative. Other suggestions: Vashon/Southworth people tell me there is not enough service to downtown. Need more mid-day options so those going downtown for a doctor appointment have an option. More issues specific to my route: Longer commute. Longer day. The West Seattle Bridge and Fauntleroy Way is already very bad during commuting hours. I have to leave the house earlier today because of the volume and commuting times. It will get worse. So that I'll have to plan an 11 hour day to avoid traffic (usually a 10 hour day today).

---

1. The biggest criticism is that it's reactive, nor proactive, and fails to deal with inevitable expansion and growth due to demand.
2. Budget planning is done in isolation and not in conjunction with other agencies beyond DOT – i.e. Kitsap Transit, Metro, City of Seattle, and Port of Seattle.
3. No comment

---

1. Noise pollution, congestion, increased accidents (bicycle, car, and pedestrian) West Seattle is going to have to deal with West Seattle bridge increased congestions due to viaduct repair making any movement of traffic in West Seattle infavorable!!!!
2. I live in Fauntleroy neighborhood. It sounds like the Daytona Beach Race track at rush hour starting at 4 a.m. – 10 a.m. and 4 – 8 p.m. The motorcycles and buses are especially loud on Barton Street. Ferry traffic climbing the hill at Barton is especially noxious – sound reverberates on Barton within one block from the water and between the hills there. There are two stop signs so the vehicles must stop and rev up/accelerate to climb the steep hill of Barton.
3. The state promised to never "enlarge" the dock at Fauntleroy! Don't do it! And don't increase capacity either! Send southworth Vashon traffic downtown.

---

1. I think you've seen a united sentiment expressed by the Fauntleroy community, opposing the expansion. I would not have known about this meeting without a notice from the Fauntleroy Community Association, and that was on short notice. If there were better advance notice on this meeting, I think you would have seen a far greater turn out. Southworth ferries should terminate downtown.
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. Fauntleroy ferry dock must not be expanded!
2. Fauntleroy neighborhood is terribly impacted. Do not expand volume of dock or build overhead walkway. It will result in visual noise. And air pollution. Motivate people to use rapid transit. Turn Fauntleroy into transit hub.
3. No comment

---

1. Too many people in the neighborhood had Parkinson's and cancer! If there is any extra money to spend on long range plan and ferries.
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. Agree that more transit is needed on both sides (Seattle, Vashon, Kitsap) to reduce auto oriented trips. This would require more routes, better frequency and improved shelters, pedestrian and bike connections.
2. No comment
3. City of Seattle is doing a road diet (narrowing from four to three lanes) on Fauntleroy (California to Alaska). If service is increased to Fauntleroy dock, and traffic volumes increase, this will pact Fauntleroy Way. There needs to be more

coordination and communication between the city and the Washington State ferries.

---

1. These plans do not have the support of the city of Seattle or the neighborhood they do not make sense. Do not do it. Move them to downtown.
2. Increase in traffic – increase in pollution – increase in
3. Work with other jurisdiction. People live on Vashon and Kitsap Co. by choice – our neighborhood should not suffer – it is not a destination!

---

1. The Fauntleroy terminal should not be enlarged – this was discussed in past meetings.
2. (See above) Why has the consideration to send the morning and EVENING commuter runs directly to downtown from Vashon and Southworth?
3. Consideration S/B given to peak hour fare increase.

---

1. Expansion is the worst idea since the monorail. Bring Southworth riders directly downtown where they want to go!
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. How will the state coordinate with other government entities to address the negative consequences of both plans as relatives to 1. Traffic flow through West Seattle and the city and 2. The environmental impact of current and proposed expansions.
2. We need to limit the traffic from the ferry through West Seattle not expand it. Eliminate Southworth connection to do this. Make Southworth downtown. Make Fauntleroy dock for passengers only.
3. Notification of tonight's hearing was inadequate and additional hearings with direct mail notice to West Seattle Residents should be arranged.

---

1. Very much against expansion of the ferry dock in West Seattle which would result in more pollution, more congestion more delay on W. Seattle Bridge.
2. West Seattle continues to grow and is already congested. This ferry proposal is a 100% subsidy for people that don't live in this community and world seriously degrade our community.
3. The beauty of our neighborhood would be destroyed by this expansion along with the sever impact to wildlife – whales seabirds, otters, seals.

---

1. I prefer Plan B minimum impact on W. Seattle.
2. No comment
3. Need passenger boats

---

1. Ferry planning does not appear to be co-coordinated with other transportation planning in the region. Continuing to increase movement of people through West Seattle to get other destinations does not make sense.

2. The Fauntleroy dock flushes 120 cans at a time into the local West Seattle street network, creating significant impacts on both pedestrians and vehicular movement. Move a bunch of the traffic directly to Coleman Dock is both logical and appropriate. It would be a good thing to limit the number of vehicles put onto Fauntleroy are about 10 at a time, to "pulse" the flow and moderate impacts.
3. No comment

---

1. Tonight, one thing most people have requested is to establish a Southworth to Coleman dock run – step outside the box. Collect ideas from the public as you have been doing. Then seek ideas from creative people and experts far and wide. Their charge should be – what things can be done to make a Southworth Coleman dock run work? Have a context? Give rewards for workable ideas? Find a way to make it happen – not plan A – not plan B – how about plan C or D or E or….
2. No comment
3. Thanks for the chance to give our view.

---

1. I would walk on the Fauntleroy – Vashon ferry much more often (vs. driving) if Metro buses on Vashon connected more frequently with the animals and departures of the ferries.
2. I would like to keep the Vashon-Fauntleroy ferry running because my daughter (with 80 other children) live in West Seattle but take the ferry everyday to school on Vashon. I would very much like the ferry schedule in the afternoon from Vashon to Fauntleroy to have a departure time around 2:35 or 2:45 so our children don't have to wait so long at the Vashon ferry terminal after school to catch the ferry home. A passenger only ferry at 7 a.m. Fauntleroy to Vashon and 2:40 Vashon to Fauntleroy would serve our children very well. Thank you!
3. No Comment

---

1. Increase in traffic for ferry terminal. Excessive noise – reservation system doesn't change noise. Major impact on property values with heavy traffic.
2. NOISE: Early AM traffic accelerating past residential areas; the more capacity, the more cars. Environmental: directing cars through West Seattle, when they really need to go downtown or to the freeways.
3. Propose: making a rapid transit hub, no cars (cars downtown), changing way people move through the city.

---

1. What in God's name were you thinking?
2. Are we just peeing in the wind by being in the wind?!
3. Ban motorcycles (noisy jerks) – send them to Bremerton which has almost empty boats.

---

1. Both ideas are very bad choices – more the ferry docks to Coleman.
2. No comment
3. No comment

---

1. No comment

2. This can't be efficient! It's not efficient to move ferry traffic through West Seattle when West Seattle is most often no where near the final destination.
3. Move Vashon/Southworth to Coleman! See the future which does not include commuting from Kitsap to downtown. Thanks!

---

1. The focus of these plans presented are shortsighted and most coordinated with other mass transit programs (e.g. Lightrail)
2. Lack of coordinated effort with proper focus on taking people where they want to go (e.g. Downtown) Which can then dump traffic onto I-90 if it is extended.
3. No comment

---

1. I do not want more ferry traffic on Fauntleroy – there is too much now
2. Route south traffic to Coleman dock rather than through Fauntleroy.
3. What will happen when Fauntleroy Way is deduced from 4 lanes to 2 lanes from California to Alaska.

---

1. I am very concerned about the proposal to increase the capacity in a zoned SF. Neighborhood for Faunt/Southworth ferry run. Why? The majority of riders wanted downtown access not West Seattle.
2. Pedestrian safety mitigation. Cost to the environment. Traffic safety/speed/access to rest of area.
3. Need strong study, coordination with other agencies for stronger metro, vanpools, bike lane, are options!

---

1. Need to move traffic to Coleman; reduce car ferry traffic and increase passenger ferries. Do not add elevated walkway (not needed) or widen dock.
2. No comment
3. Air pollution is a strong concern for this area. We are not I-5 not do we want to be. Encourage a healthier environment and work with metro to provide a better integration of service to decrease car use.

---

1. Increased traffic through West Seattle.
2. See above.
3. Add a 3rd boat to Bremerton – Downtown Seattle. Work for a flex pass with metro. Work with metro for better service not only to Downtown, but also S. King County.

---

1. In a continuation of my spoken comments. I live in the Morgan Junction Neighborhood. When the city restripes Fauntleroy, the busses will stop in lane. That will frustrate the white knuckled "I'm in a hurry" ferry traffic and I expect that they will start cutting through the neighborhoods to avoid the stack up. It's the severity of these unintended consequences that makes me say no expansion of the Fauntleroy dock and move the people where they want to go, which I believe is the Coleman dock.
2. No comment
3. No comment

1. The option to take some boats to Coleman dock has not been considered like it was supposed to. Now that the city is behind it, put an additional capacity downtown.
2. Southworth to downtown and more passengers only boats.
3. Motorcycle noise is unacceptable. Get rid of discounts for frequent users. Price higher for peaks.

---

1. Plan A is a real loser, both in terms of outrageous cost projections and negative impacts on the neighborhood. Plan A will hopefully be dropped as an option ASAP. A ridiculous option in this environment!
2. As a W Seattle resident, the best option would be to have Southworth run go downtown. With Bremerton run being reduced, this will open up space at Colman dock terminal. Also, why no plans for a passenger-only ferry from Southworth downtown? A much cheaper option to alleviate some of the vehicle traffic anticipated.
3. Better communication strategy about public meetings. We only heard about public meeting through FCA email. No notice seen in W Seattle Herald community paper

---

1. Additional traffic through West Seattle would have a severe and negative impact. In addition, I don't believe the streets and the bridge can accommodate your proposal plus the volume anticipated by the huge number of apts + condos under current construction. Daily near-misses by hurrying drivers!
2. The ferries have already damaged the ecological balance of the Cove. Since the arrival of the Issaquah-class ferries, the seaweed and kelp are pulverized and, thus, rot in the summer, filling the air with harmful odors.
   The racket from the ferries and cars and motorcycles is currently disturbing.
   Please do not pursue this plan.
3. Expand the terminal downtown. Of Vancouver, B.C.!
   Encourage more passenger-only ferry traffic
   Reduce reliance on autos. Help with the environment, the hearts of people and make a commitment to save our resources: fuel; air; lives of people.

Washington State
Department of Transportation

PUBLIC COMMENTS
SUBMITTED BY EMAIL

Date Received	Comment
12/27/2008	I have lived in this area my whole life, the solution to the crossing has been suggested ever since I can remember (about 50 years). My name is Gene Prall. I am 55 years old and have lived in Kitsap county my entire life with the exception of military time. The long term solution is to build three bridges, connecting roads and bus/ light rail service and reduce the ferry routes (get rid of the most expensive/ longest routes). If this plan would have been started when it was first conceived there would not be a ferry budget problem. Build a bridge between Illahee and Bainbridge Island with a limited access, partionally covered road from the bridge to a mega transportation center (ferry/bus/light rail). The ferries would run from the center to Edmonds and downtown Seattle terminals. There would be passenger only ferries from the transportation center in Bremerton to downtown Seattle and express bus/ light rail service to the ferry terminal on Bainbridge. The car ferries from the Bremerton run could be incorporated into the remaining crossings. More ferries less time between runs during rush hours. Then build a bridge from the Waterman/Wataga Beach side to Bainbridge and have the same type limited access, partionally covered road from it to the transportation center. Bus/light service could be incorporated with this crossing from Port Orchard or even Tacoma. This bus/light rail could solve some of the rush hour problems that occur in both directions, it would take care of people living in Bremerton/Port Orchard and working in Tacoma. The third bridge would be built from Ollala to Vashon Island with the same type road going across the island to a ferry terminal, which would have ferries going to Fauntleroy and downtown. By building this bridge the isolation of the island would be compromised, however the expense and inconvenience for all people using this ferry route would be greatly reduced as well as reducing the tax burden on everybody. These suggestions make the most sense and although expensive upfront are the very same as the second Tacoma narrows bridge would solve problems for years not just until the next budget term. With the economy problems being corrected with the fixing on the infrastructure, these are perfect projects for this economy. I believe federal money will be available as well as charging tolls would cover the cost. Thanks for listening.

Date Received	Comment
12/27/2008	I just read of the state's plan A and B for our ferries. Living in Coupeville, I am directly affected by our ferries and wish to comment. While I do appreciate the state's desire to keep jobs in our state, there comes a time when common sense must prevail in government. Having two plans for our ferries both with major budget shortfalls does not make sense. We all would like to be independent of the "other" Washington, but when it comes to our quality of life, then we should take federal monies and let the ferries be built for the least amount of money. I see no difference in accepting highway money for our roads and accepting money for ferries. I strongly urge you to consider a Plan C and partner with the federal government and build better ferries for less costs to those of us who pay for them--the citizens of Washington State.
12/26/2008	The Washington State Ferries should use Pres. Obama's stimulus plan to fund the building of new ferries and should build as many as you can get funding for. The 3 Island Home and 4 144 car and 3 Superferries with two full decks for passengers for the Seattle Bainbridge route should be asked for. Retiring the Superferry Class, Hiyu, and older boats early will save millions in annual maintenance.
12/22/2008	Having lived in Bremerton for about 10 years now and the last 5 in Illahee, I've always wondered "Why isn't there a bridge to Bainbridge Island from this very narrow point?" I'm sure construction costs would be great to start, but the net effect could quite possibly be to reduce dramatically - or ELIMINATE completely the Bremerton ferry runs, by providing a short way for everyone to access the Bainbridge runs. As a user, I can tell you I would prefer to take the Bainbridge run because it's shorter, but to travel to the Bainbridge ferry terminal requires me to drive 60 minutes vise 5 minutes to the Bremerton ferry. IF, I was given a choice of a 20 minute drive to the Bainbridge ferry, and the 30 minute commute - I'd jump at the chance. Possibilities: 1. Eliminate Bremerton run completely - or reduces to 2-4 runs daily during peak hours only. 2. Cost savings in fuel to make 30 minute transit from Bainbridge vs. 60 minute Bremerton run. Drawbacks: 1. New bridge and connecting road construction. Possibly part of the state or federal construction $$? 2. Ferry riders from outlying areas - Belfair, Seabeck, etc. may balk since it would add to their drive time, but having lived in Seabeck, at least half the time I would choose the Bainbridge ferry over the Bremerton even though Bremerton was closer, but I'd save time in the ferry travel time. Thanks for taking the time to review my suggestion!
12/20/2008	Only consider Plan A. Do not consider Plan B.The ferry system is like the road and bridge system. I don't see any plans to outsource the roads and highways because it won't work. If funding is an issue for our transportation needs then charge uses for all state highways just like users of the marine highways. Its only fair. Do not consider Plan B.
12/19/2008	This is simply not acceptable. Plan A or Plan C, but not Plan B, and since I don't see that you've added Plan C, I believe the State of Washington is letting us down. I don't see Plan C, which is that the Fed and the State jointly run and fund this critical HIGHWAY system?? Ferries are not optional, and cannot be funded by the users -as many have stated in other scenarios, no rural areas would even have roads if users had to fund the roads.

Date Received	Comment
12/18/2008	My name is Don Van Winkle and I live next to the Mukilteo WSF landing. We met a few years ago and last talked at the Mukilteo Oct. 14, 2008 Public Meeting. I was just looking at the Planning page that lists the upcoming Public Hearings. I didn't see a date scheduled for a follow up meeting at Mukilteo as mentioned at the October meeting. Did I miss something or is there a reason for not having a meeting at Mukilteo? As you know, I am very concerned about the timing of the terminal relocation. The intersection at SR525 and Front ST is a pedestrian accident waiting to happen. The only true safety cure is the planned relocation, where pedestrians won't have to compete with impatient drivers, buses and increasing peak period traffic. I sure hope Mukilteo hasn't been taken out of the loop of the Public Hearings.
12/29/2008	I am just one person – one who walks on and off the ferry 4-5 days a week for the purpose of getting to work (Edmonds-Kingston). But I foresee that I will be a much less frequent passenger if fares increase too much more. I will have to quit my job and try and find a different one in Kitsap County because the cost of commuting will negate the higher hourly wage I receive by working in Edmonds. I will have to look for a different job in a time of economic downturn and change my commute from a lower environmental impact (walking onto a public transportation vessel) to driving to work at a higher environmental cost. Kitsap Transit is not the most reliable of systems and is expected to reduce routes in the near future. I find the whole prospect daunting and depressing.
12/29/2008	This is simply not acceptable. Plan A or Plan C, but not Plan B, and since I don't see that you've added Plan C, I believe the State of Washington is letting us down. I don't see Plan C, which is that the Fed and the State jointly run and fund this critical HIGHWAY system?? Ferries are not optional, and cannot be funded by the users - as many have stated in other scenarios, no rural areas would even have roads if users had to fund the roads.

Date Received	Comment
1/1/2009	This comment is concerning the long range planning to be submitted to the legislature at the end of this month. My concern is the 2nd option that would cancel night service of the Edmonds-Kingston route. Many people, including myself, are dependant upon that service to be able to get home after 2nd shift work. I know many of them that work for the Boeing Aircraft company. I am always amazed at how quickly 2nd shift workers can become 2nd class citizens. The economic hardship for us, not to mention quality of life, is unthinkable. To quote that numbers, and economic viability for a traffic route, should drive this kind of decision is just not fair for people who actually have no say about the schedule they work. Longer tenured, higher paid, and corporate multi level management individuals work dayshift hours and they fill the boat. They also have access to much better public and commuter transportation, a savings and convenient option not available to us. People having to spend years to attain one of those catagories should not have to be isolated from an absolutely necessary transportation link, because the state needs money elsewhere. So the system is at 70% funding, will the minority be allowed to access their livelyhood, or will the majority of boatriders not wanting to pay higher rates be allowed to rule. The first option should be the one used, as the 2nd would serve to increase economic hardship for citizens of this state. A hard reality of present day working life is the expense required to get to work. Leave the commuter ferry run service schedule in place. Get the fleet viable. Phase in rate increases and get the problem fixed. Do not create a further extreme hardship for good people who have found decent jobs and need to get to them and then home again. Nobody benefits from that reality.
1/3/2009	please plan for FEWER, NOT MORE, ferries; please make the ferries that you do add PASSENGER ONLY. there are too many people and too many cars on these islands already.

Date Received	Comment
1/3/2009	I am emailing you regarding the meeting which is to be held on January 7th on Vashon at the McMurray Middle School. My husband and I won't be able to attend that meeting so I would like to make my request known. As you are well aware, the Ferry system is our highway system. We pay tax's for roads that most of us don't use, which is okay. But why are we treated like a stepchild? We need those ferries, on both sides of this island. And the cost to those who live here has done nothing but gone up yet you want to take away service. Try closing roads which people use to go to work or to the doctor and see how fast you'll hear from them. I've only lived here for 3 years and hear from those who live on Vashon that the residents here are treated as, which I already said, the stepchild of Seattle. I'm sure it cost plenty to run the ferries, but I can't believe that something reasonable can't be done to help us and you. One thing for sure, your car license fee is way to low. Why would you ever put it to the people to lower that fee and expect it not to pass. Of course it would, we all want to lower our tax's. But this was a foolish thing to do because I don't believe the average person realized that by lowering the car license tax it took money away from highways. This meeting that we can not attend is about getting rid of a 48 car carrier and replacing it with a 34 car carrier. That sounds stupid. And on top of that, take away a ferry from the North End. I gather you people don't have to use either one of these ferries to go to work or you would not be talking about it. Since I won't be at that meeting I would really like to know why you are taking away a North End ferry and replacing the South End ferry. If you take away a ferry, how about lowering the price to those who live here and raise it for those who visit? Hope to hear from you anytime after the 8th of January
1/3/2009	Have you not noticed a reduction on ferry comuters on the Port Townsend run since reservations were implemented?? Why would you want to do that to Mukeltio/clinton? I personally know people that do not use the Port townsend run anymore because of the reservations
1/3/2009	really, than why are there no ferry lines ....NO FULL boats. so what if theres a line... thats what we have payed for lines for.. Nobody is for reservations on the muck/clinton side Nobody

Date Received	Comment
1/4/2009	To Whom It May Concern, I am a resident of Port Orchard who commutes daily to Seattle via the ferry. I drive from my home to the Park & Ride on Sedgwick Rd where I park my car and meet the members of my vanpool. We take the 6:05am ferry departing Southworth and return on the 4:20pm ferry departing Fauntleroy. We stop at Vashon on our morning route, which adds 15-20 minutes to our total commute time. After reading through the WSF long-range plan, it appears there are no plans to re-route the Southworth ferry into Colman Dock in Seattle. The overwhelming majority of vehicles and walk-on passengers departing Southworth commute to Seattle, which adds to the traffic on Fauntleroy, on the West Seattle Bridge, on the Viaduct, and on surface streets. The structural integrity of the viaduct remains questionable and at some point it will no longer be available to traffic, meaning even more vehicles on surface streets or I-5. I would appreciate an explanation of why it makes sense to continue routing Seattle-bound traffic from Southworth into Fauntleroy. The Kitsap Peninsula serves as a suburb of Seattle, and Southworth is the gateway. My suggestion is simple: abandon the Southworth-Vashon-Fauntleroy triangle route and create separate Southworth-Colman Dock and Vashon-Colman Dock ferry routes. Sell the Fauntleroy dock property and apply the proceeds to upgrade Colman Dock to handle the additional ferry traffic and walk-on passenger staging areas. With direct access to downtown Seattle from Southworth, there will be far fewer people commuting by car given the transit options available to reach one's final destination. Please enter my comments into the public record as I will be unable to attend a public hearing.
1/4/2009	To whom it may concern: I am sorry that I will not be able to make the January 7th meeting on Vashon, due to my commute on the Pt Defiance-Talaquah run. As the Rhody is replaced by the Hiyu, I can't be there to make my comments. The Hiyu overloads during peak commute hours and I will probably be sitting on the dock as your committee meets. I have reviewed the executive summary as it relates to the Ferry System's Long range plan. I support the Plan A option. Here is my reasoning. For the last 10 years, the ferry system has continually made it difficult for commuters (cutting sailing times, smaller boats, poor maintenance, etc.) The ferry riders have paid higher fares and have endured lower levels of services and lots of hassles. During the years when the State enjoyed a surplus in its budget, it didn't add a dime to the Ferry System for capital improvements or new boats. Other projects and political pork barrels were funded.This is not the time to cut back further on the System! In addition, I do not support the replacement of the Rhody with a smaller vessel. I have a part time job in University Place, with longer commute times (assuming a smaller boat) it would not be feasible for me to keep my job. Thank you for your kind attention.
1/4/2009	I am very concerned over this Draft Long Range Plan. Living in Bremerton, I was very distressed when one part of the plan suggested going to one Bremerton boat and canceling evening services. The ferry system has been mismanaged for years. These boats have not deteriorated overnight, the maintenance has not been accomplished, was there no replacement plan ever in place? It's beyond my comprehension how we got in such a horrible predicament. I would be more than willing to pay my fair share, even if prices increased if it was to ride a safe, comfortable ferry system....and if I thought it was managed successfully and with any forethought. The thought of having to drive all the way around for doctor appointments or have to take a ferry two hours early is unacceptable. I often leave my ferry on this side to attend venue's in Seattle or spend the weekend with my daughter, so how can I do that if there is no evening service? You are making us pay for the mismanagement of the system.

Date Received	Comment
1/4/2009	I have done an initial review of the WSF draft long range plan released Dec 08 and have an important 1st comment. The significant statement that I do not agree with is copied below. The ferry system, as our marine highway, should be considered a part of our state highway system. We all pay taxes that go into the highway system. Those taxes should be distributed to all elements of the transportation system including the marine element. Supporting all elements of the system should be a given. Use of highway system funds for the ferry system should not be thought of as "Diverting funds".
1/6/2009	I would like to register a concern. At tonight's meeting, far too many people in the audience were of the opinon that their voices and statements would be ignored. This needs to be addressed, and should be addressed immediately, in the media is the most practical method.
1/6/2009	I attended the meeting on Whidbey Island this evening. 1) What cost studies have been made regarding building a ferry other than Washington State? I realize that current legislation is that this cannothappen - but, what is the cost of the boat bid on recently by Todd Shipyards vs. an expected bid from another State? 2) How many jobs does one ferry built in Washington provide? 3 ferries if built concurrently? 4?3) If the State legislation preventing ferries from being built out of State were changed, how much Federal funding would be available for our State's ferry services?
1/7/2009	Hello WSF: I am very unhappy at the proposed changes to Vashon Island ferry service. As a small business owner, I have watched with dismay for years as ferry service has grown simultaneously more expensive and less frequent. But your current plans are terrible. Specifically, replacing the Rhododendron the with Hiyu would result in constant overloads, forcing islanders to wait for hours to drive many miles out of the way to access north end boats. I frequently travel to Tacoma and Olympia for business, and I have many times been unpleasantly surprised by the Hiyu running in place of the Rhodie, and being full, forcing me to drive to the north end, wait for a boat to Southworth or Fauntleroy, and drive back south, wasting a couple of hours and a lot of gas money. Similarly, discontinuation of the third boat during peak travel times, especially in the summer, would result in occasional inconveniences becoming nearly constant. I would really like to see WSF collect and disseminate statistics on how often there is more than an hour wait for a ferry to or from Vashon Island. Based on my experiences traveling occasionally to other destinations in the system (Whidbey, Keystone, Bremerton, and Bainbridge), Vashon has longer and less predictable waits than other runs. When the ferry lines at the north or south end are half a mile long or more, it is incredibly frustrating, knowing that the current boats cannot provide needed capacity. It is even more frustrating to know that WSF does not even know how long the line is! And it is outrageously frustrating to see that WSF is proposing to further reduce service. Before you propose further cuts in already decimated service, I think you have a responsibility to be better informed about current situations, and to come up with better alternatives.

Date Received	Comment
1/7/2009	Public Comment On Keystone-Port Townsend Ferry Dear Gov. Gregoire, Sen. Haugen, and Transportation Executives, This ferry is part of our state highway system and we pay taxes and user fees for it to be built, and maintained to handle the level of demand. Right now, the demand is not being serviced and has not for many months. This ferry is about moving goods, services, and people. It is for military, business, tourists, and workers to use as part of our highway distribution system to move from point A to B, safely, conveniently and efficiently. Currently, the system is neither safe, convenient nor efficient. Please make this a priority and get this problem fixed. Do not say there is no money, for there is always money for what people really want to get done. And stop this silly nonsense that the boats have to be built in our state. Our cars, trucks, buses, bicycles, trains, container ships, and airplanes are not all built here. Just do it. Then, once you have the new boats working, create a sinking fund so that 30 years or so from now, you have the money to replace boats as needed. We just replaced two out of three county commissioners here in Island County who lost their jobs because they did not listen to what we, the everyday citizens, asked them to do. Why did they not listen? I do not know, but I know they are gone. We put you people back in office in the belief that you would quickly fix this problem. Please get on it. Thanks
1/7/2009	Dear authors of Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division Draft Long-Range Plan (December 2008) I have read the long-range plan and believe a lot of bright people have worked on it. Firstly I want to say that I appreciate the effort that went into it. In a nutshell (and in gross oversimplification), the outtake is that it's going to get worse before it gets better. My concern is that some areas can't afford "worse". Vashon is one such place. Barring private boats, helicopters and airplanes, Vashon has only 3 routes for getting off the island. And they all require WSF services. Because we have no alternatives for leaving the island, reducing the number of runs/cars per day on one route or port, affects the other routes too. In other words, the problem is compounded. I am also concerned that it will not get "better" in 2-3 years. If the ridership statistics are misinterpreted or abused to support that the temporary situation is good enough to be permanent, then it won't get "better" again. And finally, there is a tie between property values and quality of service from WSF on Vashon. Simply put, off-islanders will not value homes on Vashon if they cannot access them easily or commute from them. We are King County residents and pay the same levy rates as someone from Seattle. With the property taxes going up and King County pulling in so much money from Vashon, it seems that there should be a return on this mandatory investment. I realize that WSF functions at the State level rather than the county level, but since there is such a strong relationship something needs to be done. A loose analogy I came up with is that if the federal government (IRS) suddenly decided that they would not recognize Washington State sales tax as a deduction, we would essentially have a double cost as taxpayers. In this strange example, you have two levels of government not working together. Well… King county takes a lot of money from Vashon residents and (it seems) has little accountability or obligation to WSF. Thus we get hit twice; once with high property taxes and again with long waits and costly ferry rides. This does not seem reasonable.

Date Received	Comment
1/7/2009	To whom it may concern, Please include my comments below in the public testimony on the Dec. 2008 Draft Long Range Plan. In regards to eliminating a third summer boat, I support the idea of keeping a smaller boat year round instead of a Jumbo ferry which loses money in lighter seasons. The smaller boat would ease heavy summer use and keep evening runs available for residents dependent on this transportation. In regards to fare increases, I vehemently oppose season surcharges for commuters. The fact that people travel more for pleasure in spring and summer should in no way justify raising prices for commuters who depend on the ferry to go to work. In addition, giving priority access to those who pay more is an unethical use of public transportation. Finally, if a plan includes adjusting fares upward when fuel prices increase, then the plan must also include how it will adjust fares downward when fuel prices decrease. Thank you for considering my input
1/7/2009	My wife, Camille, and I attended the Public Hearing of the WSDOT Ferries Division on Vashon last night. We have beenresidents of the Island for three years. Nearly 900 (maybe 1/13 of the population) residents attended the meeting and we all heard from some very articulate and concerned residents about the WSDOT proposals. Before the meeting began, I started to write down my concerns, which I list below in the form of questions and comments, and I added to these during the Hearing. Let me list these in serial order. 1 What are the plans and decision to right-size the ferry system, specifically, management, bureaucracy, and that old concept of 'feather-bedding'? 2 How does the state rationalize its proposed fare increases with its proposed decrease in services? 3 How does the WSDOT Ferries Division propose to bring operational cots in line with ferry revenues? 4 How are cost and scheduling burdens being shared across the Puget Sound? 5 How is it the WSDOT FD appears to know than its ridership on Vashon routes? 6 Charging more for less is inconsiderate and counterintuitive? Even Apple's iTunes can do a better job with its new three-tiered pricing system. 7Please define 'adaptive management'. 8 How are projected demographics related to any 5- or 10-year plan? 9 How can the public examine all the numbers in the models? 10 WS DOT FD proposes no fees for reservations. Suggesting this to the Legislature only increases the likelihood the Legislature viewing this as a new source of revenue. 11 Proposals are political promises. We need creative solutions. 12 Overhead passenger loading at Fauntleroy is not something we need. We are used to getting wet and even more so if it saves us money and long-term maintenance. 13 Why does Vashon get hand-me-downs that are not without maintenance problems? 14 Ms Sontgerath's and Mr Richard's comments are realistic and articulate. 15 The proposed reservation system is elitist and unenforceable, not democratic like entry to parks and museums. We buy tickets for movies not tickets for special seats. 16 Why reduce services if ridership does not decrease? 17 Have tourists and other visitors to the Island pay increased fares. Let them subsidize. 18 Deferred maintenance equals a decrease in quality of service. 22 Good management requires clear thinking about workable and reasonable solutions. Common sense also helps. 23 Where is the straight talk in the draft plan? It's legibabble.19 Competition through partnership is an attractive alternative. 20 Communication of factual and analytical information needs to improve. 21 Why is the ticketing system not digitally automated as it is in other parts of the U.S. for tunnels, bridges and turnpikes? 24 The decisions WSDOT FD makes are about people, not about politics. Put people into your formulas. And, please plan accordingly for us.

Date Received	Comment
1/8/2009	While I did not comment at last night meeting on Vahson Island and while my comments have already been spoken, I think the points are important enough to be repeated. The ferries are part of the highway system and need to be funded. I realize that this is a legislative issue and not the Department of Transportation's issue. None the less you have to work with the money you are given. I do not see shortages of snow plows on the highways. This is a needed service to keep commerce and people moving. Our brick and mortor highways are keep open 24 hours a day seven days a week. While our marine highways may not need to be running 24 hours a day, we need them operating at an adequate level to allow the free flow of commerce and people. Restricting that flow impacts commerce, people's livelihoods, access to medical care and the freedom to travel. We have some of these restrictions now by having reduced service from our 2001 level and by having a winter schedule which is really unacceptable for weekend use. By having no back-up ferries, this is also a major restriction on our service and usage of our roads. These are our roads after all. Living on an Island gives us no choice of how we get on and off the Island. We should not have to beg every year to keep our roads open. We need to keep our three ferries at the North End of Vashon and the Rhodi on the South End. We need backup ferries to deal with ferry maintenance schedules as well as periodic breakdowns. I came home last night which was Wednesday January 7th, 2009 from West Seattle and the 7:05pm left cars on the dock. This is a Vashon Only ferry. If this middle of the week ferry sees overloads how can you possibly consider cuts. This is our basic highway. We need it and use it to survive. We have been promised more ferries for years. The legislature has to get rid of The Made In Washington law so we get qualify for Federal monies to help build these boats. The legislature needs a steady funding source NOW!!! The legislature took the Motor Vehicle Tax away, now is the time for them to reinstate it. That tax is not regressive like a gas tax is. Please take your jobs serious enough to realize that all highways whether made of asphalt or water need to be treated in the same way. They need to remain open and accessible and readily available for use by all.

Date Received	Comment
1/8/2009	Thank you for the presentation at Vashon last evening. We are all appreciative of your attention to our interests and comments.Reservation System: It is difficult to see what advantage there is of a reservation system over the current first in line system. Since there would be no difference in the volume of traffic using any specific ferry, and two holding facilities would be required (to separate the non-reservation holders from the reservation holders), no reduction in the size of the holding facility would be realized. In fact, because there are two different lines, the holding facility would have to be larger than the current system. The number of personnel required on the dock to process the two lines would also have to be increased. Taking the Pt. Townsend/Keystone project as an example, the reservation holders would have to show their reservation number and driver's license, as well has provide a fare card, before being admitted to the reservation holding lines. The current fare card system causes delays in loading as it is, the reservation system would compound delays. The Pt Townsend/Keystone system requires reservation holders to be in place by 30" prior to sailing and the space is open 90" before sailing. Assuming routes such as Vashon/Fauntleroy will not be near the level of reservation spaces used by Pt Townsend, there will be terminal overflow for most of the runs from 3:00 pm to 7:00 pm on the Fauntleroy end, regardless of the system used. The inherent inefficiency of reservations/first in line, will result in a reduction in the level of service on most of the commuter lines. The suggestion that spontaneous travel will be enhanced by the reservation system is contrary to the nature of the system. Reservations need to be in place 2 hours before travel; on popular runs, there will be no reservations available so close to the sailing. Spontaneous travel will require advanced reservations to be at all successful which might conflict with the meaning of spontaneous. Traffic levels will not be reduced by reservations and may be increased as individuals able to secure reservations might drive themselves rather than car pool or use transit. Proposing reservations as a way to avoid terminal development costs does not meet any of the standards you have identified for it. This proposal should be avoided and traffic management, improved capacity on over-loaded runs, and reliability of the service would better address the problems the system is facing. I am opposed to any reduction of service levels currently established

Date Received	Comment
1/8/2009	Comment and questions regarding the Public meeting on Vashon Island January 7 2009. I would like to comment on the information which was given in the meeting. The plan A appears to be the only viable plan. Plan B cuts very deep into existing service for this marine highway (ferry) service for Vashon. Both plans have some major unanswered questions. How will the reservation system be applied to the system during peak hours. I know that there is a reservation system for the San Juan Islands, but their situation is completely different. Because of their distance from any major city they DO NOT have a significant commuter ridership traveling in one direction during a commute period, as does Vashon with the commuters traveling to Fauntleroy terminal and on to Seattle. Most of their San Juan trips are inter-island, or summer tourists who can adjust their travel times. Most commuters on Vashon are constrained to certain travel periods by their jobs. Also, will we be leaving boats to travel half full to keep the reserved spaces open and just increase the wait time for everybody else? Where will the reserved cars be staged on Vashon or on Fauntleroy - both of which are short of loading space right now. None of these details appear to be addressed in the plan. The system must build for [no more]
1/8/2009	after reviewing...?--potential difficulty of actually using proposed reservation system, especiallyy considering how difficult it is to use current website & ticketing system. WSF doesn't have the best track record for such systems. concerns specific to my route?--study is right on that lack of/unreliability of bus connections is biggest potentially remediable issue. In my case, I have to transfer downtown, & try to go off-peak (as indeed WSF suggests is best for the system). Lack of connections adds additional 1/2-1 hour each way to the extra 1/2-1 hour each way that is inherent in using bus instead of individual car. other--1)Automatically increasing fare if fuel costs spike only is reasonable IF corresponding decreases when fuel costs decrease, or else keeping the surcharge in a fund dedicated to offsetting fuel-cost-related increases; 2)Wonder if overhead passenger loading facility reallyy cost-effective at Fauntleroy. mailing list—OK

Date Received	Comment
1/8/2009	I am a vanpool commuter on the Southworth-Fauntleroy run. My main concern is that there are a number of sailings to choose from at a fair price. My main impression of plan A as well as plan B is lack of funding. Under either scenario the proposed fare increases are too much. The fares are already too high. The rest of Seattle and the state needs to chip in because we commuters do contribute to the local economy. Even if most people do not ride everyday, they still benefit by us being connected to the greater Seattle area through the ferries. Commuters have different needs than the occasional users or tourists. For the commuter, a passenger only vessel could work. Separating the commuters onto a passenger only boat could be a good option for keeping fares low for the regular commuter. Also it makes sense environmentally to use the smallest boat possible for the job needed. It would be acceptable to work with transit agencies to increase their ferry services if and only if the state contributes a greater share of taxes to those agencies for taking over the responsibilities of the WSF. I do not like the idea of cutting service and letting the local transit agencies pick up the slack by establishing their own ferry services. The only way I would find that acceptable is if the state of Washington as a whole makes a greater committment in tax dollars to those transit agencies that will be replacing WSF routes and services. Otherwise it is not fair that other commuters in the Seattle area get a free ride on the roads we ferry riders pay for, but we have to cover a disproportionately large cost of our own commutes. One final thought: how come Bainbridge will not also experience cuts in the number/sizes of ferries under plan B? If there are cuts in service capacity, they should be applied in a fair manner, across the board. I hope these comments are constructive
1/9/2009	Why is it that we hear about supporting mass transit systems and WSF is considering cutting ferries and ferry schedules? Speaking of the proposed cuts to the Bremerton run to one ferry, which I am to understand cuts out the 4:50am & 7:20am runs, walk-on and auto/motorcycle/bicycle passengers will be forced to drive around to Seattle or loose their jobs. How does this help the environment, the economy, and your "use the mass transit system" approach?
1/8/2009	My comments: I have lived on Vashon Island since 1962 and have traveled all the routes during that time. The ferry service has not improved the service since the then. The boats are old, the majority of personnel are often surly, or indifferent, and the schedules are inadequate. Plan B is totally unacceptable. Vashon is being treated as a lesser customer. Why is that? I don't understand why Plan B reduces our service so drastically, and other parts of the system are not affected. i.e. Bainbridge Island. Why should we be one of the few that have their ferry service nearly destroyed! The state has a responsibility to provide service. WE ARE A PART OF THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM. We pay the taxes for the Sounder, and the highways that we seldom or ever use as well as the ferry use cost. I would like to see a better breakdown on administrative costs as well as a breakdown of the number of crew necessary to run each boat and rational for each. In the executive summary you mention that you need to "continuously improve the quality and timeliness of service". I don't see that in the plans, especially in reference to Vashon Island. The first duty of the ferries should be TO PROVIDE SERVICE! The sub priority should be cost and policy. The legislature needs to do whatever is possible to get money from the federal government to build the ferries. If this means getting rid of the made in Washington only legislation for our infrastructure needs, so be it! We need to be able to use the Obama federal incentive funds and cannot pass up this opportunity for our state. The reservation system is not practical for Vashon! I can just see the line ups on Fauntleroy Avenue! The police would be issuing tickets, the people who own homes would be angry and everyone would be frustrated. The reservation people wouldn't even be able to get to the dock! The dock and "holding lanes" (that's a joke!) are not adequate. What will you do if you have more people who want to reserve at peak periods than you have boats? Would you have to hire more people to manage this? And it wouldn't be any better on Vashon or Pt. Defiance or Tahlequah. Everyone on Vashon who

Date Received	Comment
	can avoid the peak periods do so already! Believe me; who would spend 30 min – 1 hour or longer in line if they could avoid it. Finally, does your department advocate for our ferries or you just a conduit for the legislature and the unions to pass on all costs without any response. You should be saying, "Hold It!. The ferries are your (the legislature's) responsibility to fund." I would like to see the Pt. Defiance run have a bigger boat that will meet the needs of the people of the south end of Vashon. I go that direction the majority of the time. My elderly mother is in Milton and I need to get to her often to help out. I would like to take in some of the culture events in Tacoma and cannot do that because of the schedule. (It was not restored after the last cuts. It is the same as it was in 1962. So much for progress.Please think of your customers and your service when you are contemplating your Long Range Plan. They are the ferry system's reason for existing and our state should be proud of the service of this system.
1/9/2009	I am a heavy user of the ferry system and offer the following comments on your proposed long range plan. I am a long-time resident of Vashon Island and attended your public hearing this week on the island. 1. Insufficient Ferry Service Will Kill Vashon. Bridgeless Vashon is unique among ferry-served communities. Every resident is 100% dependent on the ferry service for daily access to the rest of the world. As you heard at the public hearing, without ferry service, many Vashon residents will be forced off the island, and many more will chose not to live there. The vibrant, thriving community we know and love will cease to exist. The same cannot be said for any other community in the WSF system. The ferry service literally holds the future economic viability of the island in its hands. Your Plan B will be the death of commerce and property values on the island. 2. The Core Mission of the Ferry Service is to Move People and Vehicles. This seems pretty obvious, but I can point to a number of programs over the past two decades where WSF resources are squandered on yet another study or ridership survey or consultant or building or fancy advertising program rather than focusing on transportation. More engineers, less MBAs please. My pet peeve is watching a ferry leave the dock in Fauntleroy half-loaded with a line of cars waiting because the folks on the dock can't manage the line properly. Execution of the fundamentals is what it is all about. Three key areas I see in this regard are 1) transit connections, 2) safe, secure parking facilities (Point Defiance in particular) and 3) do everything we can to get riders to walk on rather than bring their vehicles. Passengers should be free – bicycle riders should be PAID, not charged extra. Neither of your plans focus on operational improvements. Ask the long-time users, we can tell you how to drive efficiencies into the system. 3. The Reservation System is a Solution in Search of a Problem. The proposed reservation system is a case in point of issue #2. Such a fanciful system will not move more people or vehicles, it will move less because of confusion, missed boats, traffic handling issues and frustration on all sides. It will not reduce the need for shore-side facilities, it will increase it. It relies on the false assumptions that ferry users can plan trips ahead and have unlimited access to a linked-in computer system, that the system works all the time and that infrastructure is in place to smoothly segregate reservation holders from the great unwashed. The reservation system is stupid idea (particularly for the Vashon runs) that needs to be shot in the head NOW.

Date Received	Comment
1/9/2009	Dear Mr Moseley, Ms. Hammond, Mrs. Ulatoski, and the WSDOT Ferry Planners, I planned to attend the January 6 public Ferry planning meeting on Vashon Island, but due to the flooding and associated emergency response situation could not leave work sufficiently early to reach Vashon on time. I would like to provide background information about my current ferry commute, relate the events/delays of January 6 specifically, and express some comments and preferences regarding future Ferry services. Background: My husband and I bought property on Vashon Island and built a house in 1991. Although he established a small business on Vashon, I understood I'd commute off the island for a job in my field (Forestry; Entomology). I have been employed in state government (Dept of Natural Resources, DNR, based in Olympia) for about 16 years.The commute to Olympia is a big commitment. I work four 10-hour days Monday-Thursday. I leave Vashon via Tahlequah/Pt. Defiance on the first boat (5:30 a.m.). It's predictable and does not overload. I arrive at my office at about 6:35 a.m. I leave work at about 5:10 p.m., arriving at Pt. Defiance at about 6:10 p.m. to catch the 6:25 sailing for Vashon. Sometimes I miss this boat due to highway traffic delays and/or overloading, but if I'm in line at 6:10 I'm just about sure to make it. Sometimes I share rides with other Vashon residents who work in Olympia. One night per week I work late at my office to catch up and/or make up for time shaved off other work days for commuting. I stay overnight at a friend's home in Olympia. This lets me me maintain my work productivity, avoid two commuting trips, and get some extra morning sleep. This is a tough schedule I've chosen and been allowed the flexibility by my employer to have taken on. There's not a lot of Monday-Thursday time at home with my children (ages 12 and 13). There's not a lot of wiggle room for school performances, youth sporting events (which often require leaving work early to attend), or healthy exercise. But we live in a beautiful place, in a small community, and I get more time to catch up with my home and family on the longer weekends. I have experimented with taking the bus. Even if I drive to Tahlequah, in the mornings riding the bus adds one hour to the trip to Olympia. In the afternoon it's usually more than that. The buses from Pt. Defiance to/from the Tacoma Dome or Tacoma Community College (where one transfers to the Express buses to Olympia) don't connect very directly with either the ferries or the Olympia buses (or both). January 6, 2009: On Jan 6, the Hiyu was serving on the Pt. D/ Tahlequah route. In order to be pretty sure I could make the 5:30 p.m. sailing from Pt. Defiance on the Hiyu and attend the 6:00 p.m. public meeting, I figured I'd need to leave work at 3:00 p.m. Arriving in the line at 4:00 should have done it. Did it work for the ferry officials who were attending that meeting? Because of the flooding situation that day, several people left work early to evacuate their pets in Puyallup or reach home before I-5 was closed at Centralia. I was asked to stay at work to be available to assist if needed with the DNR's emergency response activities. There was very little activity in Olympia, so I was able to leave work at about 5:15 p.m., close to my usual time. It was very rainy and I stopped for gasoline, but reached the ferry line at 6:25 p.m. I reached the tollbooth at 6:40 p.m. and was told I'd travel on the 8:10 p.m. sailing. The overload volume from the 6:25 sailing had exceeded the 7:20 sailing by at least 20 cars. I could have driven north on I-5 to Fauntleroy or on Hwys 16/160 to Southworth. Those highways are crowded and unpleasant, particularly in heavy rain. The congested interchange from I-5 to Hwy 16 and nearly all of I-5 as you near Seattle are especially challenging. The evening ferry traffic lines at Fauntleroy are always long. At Southworth, if you miss the 7:10 p.m. boat, you have to wait 1 hour and 20 minutes for the next Vashon sailing. It is more predictable and much less stressful to simply wait at Pt. Defiance. When the Hiyu is on the route, my commute is significantly more challenging (and demoralizing). Vashon residents sometimes do some innovative ride sharing and walking-on, but, in general, it adds about one to one and a half hours to my trip home. On January 6, delays added close to two hours. The future: The Governor's 2009-11 Budget and the WSDOT Long-Range Ferry Plan "Plan B" include replacing the

Date Received	Comment
	Rhododendron with the Hiyu permanently. I'm disappointed by and opposed to this proposal. I don't have a lot more "give" in my commuting or work schedule. The next step, for me, would probably be to buy another (crummy, cheap) car to enable driving to the ferry, parking, walking on, walking off, and continuing the commute in a car parked on the other side. There's a lot of overnight parking available at Pt. Defiance most of the time. Workday parking at Tahlequah is insufficient, but I'll arrive early enough that it will be a later commuter who suffers for my choice. I'll save some money on vehicle ferry fares, but am unlikely to break even after purchasing the vehicle, insurance, and registration. I'll probably gain some predictability regarding making the afternoon sailing of my choice without fear of vehicle overloads. I answered ferry commuter surveys in 2008. Most reductions in service will not cause me to move, quit my job, or stop commuting. I'll probably bear even significant additional burdens, such as if the Hiyu were assigned permanently to the Pt. Defiance/Tahlequah run. There are rumors that the Pt. Defiance/Tahlequah run could be discontinued. I'd strongly oppose this because it would impact the riders potentially traveling between Vashon and southern destinations (Tacoma, Olympia) very significantly. In this scenario, I'd likely quit my job - shifting to employment that doesn't require (or reward) my specialized education and skills on Vashon. It would be challenging to commute at all if there weren't a good wage on the other end. I don't think my family would choose to move away from Vashon Island. . My husband's business is on Vashon. Our children are happy and developing well in this community We'd be challenged to replace the value of our home and current mortgage payments at another site. Comments: In general, I'm very disappointed with the ferry system (not our deck hands or toolbooth staff or sailing crews ... the SYSTEM). Times are tough in the state budget, but island residents and other ferry riders have been paying for the consequences of I-695 (loss of car license tab fees) disproportionately for many years. What was once merely convenient bookkeeping for the state had extremely unfortunate results for the ferry system. As service changes come and fares rise, I'll weigh specific options and choose. - I think the ferry system should maintain or enhance its fleet and service ("Plan A" or better), and especially should not reduce service on the Pt. Defiance/Tahlequah route. - The Hiyu does not provide adequate capacity for the Pt. Defiance/ Tahlequah route. The current pattern of making 6-week substitutions is inadequate. Permanent replacement of a Rhododendron-size boat with at Hiyu-size boat would result in a heavy burden to me. - I will consider using a reservation system if one is developed, but do not understand it yet. - Improving bus service connections between Pt Defiance and transit hubs will probably not be sufficient to convert me to regular commuting by bus, but would likely benefit others. - Although I did not attend the recent planning meeting, please count me as someone who cares about and is affected by this decision-making process. I'm a ferry rider. I work hard to make a commute viable. I'm an excellent state employee who has been recognized for leadership and productivity. I'm very disappointed with continual contractions in ferry service to Vashon Island, especially its south end. You may contact me for more input in the future. Because I work in Olympia, I could provide personal communication with Legislators or planners if needed. Thank you for considering my comments and situation.

Date Received	Comment
1/8/2009	I was at the public hearing on Vashon last night but had to leave at 8:15 to pick up one of our teenagers from his job. However, I do have a couple of comments to add to those made by my neighbors last night. As you may know, Tim and I moved to Vashon 13 years ago. After living in Washington state for twenty years, we finally found a community that feels like a real home town. Our daughter, who is a 1996 Mercer Island high school graduate, is jealous of her four younger brothers because they had the opportunity to grow up on Vashon. However, paradise does not come without challenges. It was immediately clear to us that one of them was the ferry system. Its high costs and limited mobility influence many decisions: from where we live and work, to what time we wake up and leave home every day, to the fact that we always keep a book or two in the car in case we are faced with one of our legendary ferry waits. A great example of this impact is our decision to move to a house on the north end of the island. We did not want to leave our beautiful home on Quartermaster Harbor, but when Tim accepted a position with T-Mobile in Factoria, the 20 minutes drive each way on the island became untenable. He now keeps a 1991 vintage Nissan pickup in West Seattle (it also doubles as our garbage truck) and takes the bus to and from the ferry and his car. While we were willing to adapt our lives to the exigencies of the ferry system, during the last 13 years we have experienced an enormous increase in ferry fares in return for steadily deteriorating service. While we understand that we need to pay for this service, it is not acceptable to continue to pay high fares and receive less and less service. Plan B, as far as I can tell, appears to propose cutting capacity by somewhere between 25-30%. I wonder how other citizens of our state would respond if WSDOT proposed reducing road capacity by 25% or more and then requiring them to pay tolls amounting to 80% of the cost to maintain them? Or replacing bridges with smaller ones and charging tolls to pay the capital cost of new bridges with less capacity? I think we both know the answer, and I am willing to bet that the state legislature would find another way to fund needed road maintenance and improvements. Aside from this fundamental issue of equity, the drastic cuts in ferry service proposed by Plan B would have many, many deleterious impacts on our community. My neighbors discussed a substantial number of them last night, but I would like to point out one that is a serious threat to the welfare of our elderly relatives and friends. As a community, we worked hard to raise over a million dollars to replace our aging nursing home with a new building that now provides assisted living and nursing home service to about 75 residents. We have to work equally hard to raise operations funding because Medicaid doesn't nearly cover the cost of caring for our loved ones who have spent down their resources. In addition, there are about 5 or 6 small adult family homes on the island. The nursing home and the adult family homes rely in large part on employees who live off island. The proposed cuts in service would devastate the ability of these organizations to attract and retain employees; the access barriers would simply be too great. If these facilities were forced to close, older residents of Vashon would end up being isolated from family and friends if they needed residential care because they would be forced to relocate to off-island facilities. As someone whose father and uncle both lived in island facilities until the ends of their lives, I can tell you that this would have a traumatic impact on many older people and their families. From my perspective, Plan A really should be the "bare minimum" proposal to be sent to the legislature since it barely maintains existing levels of service which are already inadequate and costly to riders. Plan A does nothing to address the growth that we all know is coming to communities on the west side of the sound. The idea that the counties can pick up the cost of substitute services is certainly not realistic. King County has already taken the operation of the Passenger-Only boat from Vashon to downtown Seattle; while it is the largest county in the state, it is facing a serious budget shortfall and certainly is not in a position to do more. In closing, I hope you will reconsider this ill-advised approach to long range planning for the ferry system. The current draft plan does not even address present needs and issues, let alone long range demands for service growth. The ferries are truly part of the state highway system and need to be considered in that context. They aren't optional or a frill for tourists to enjoy--to us, they are every bit as important as the I-90 bridge was when we lived on Mercer Island. Thanks much for your attention! I hope you aren't regretting your new job, we need someone who is smart and willing to fight for us!

Date Received	Comment
1/9/2009	Good Morning: I have compiled my thoughts and suggestions after attending your presentation on Wednesday evening. Thank you for taking my written testimony. 1. Vashon is water-locked and ONLY has the ferry system as a connection to the rest of the State. Since the 1800's ferry service for Vashon has been in place. Vashon is unique in that way and different that the San Juan's as we are a working bedroom community NOT a tourist destination. I take Governor Gregoire at her word, "We are one State." 2. Ferry service is deteriorating. Now your department is presenting two unworkable alternatives A or B. Both are unacceptable because: 3. Vashon needs a Plan C because we have no alternatives. Look at the numbers of commuters from/to Vashon/to Seattle by ferry system Vashon needs its own unique plan. Look at the projected growth and plan. Don't destroy whole working communities due to "budget cuts." Are your planners undergraduate student interns? The plans appear to be put together by armatures The planning process was ignored and the A B Plans are incomplete and poorly designed. Again, that created a mistrust for all user groups --- ferry riders! Your CUSTOMER. I do this for a living and I would not be in business if I ignored the required early-input to planning by the stakeholders. If you think that the "survey" was sufficient then why are you including the reservation system in A and B? NO TRUST of your process = no trust of your plan. Where is the customer's needs in all this? Maybe government feels they can do what they want to others. But in the business arena...it does not work. It appears that you personally and professionally are a bright light to the department. I am not sure how much change through leadership you can bring to these "glazed-over" planners, but I look to you to SAVE VASHON not DESTROY OUR COMMUNITY. 4. Your duty is to provide quality service in a cost-effective manner. However, the cost effectiveness of your department is questionable. Examples: Too many staff at the ferry dock. One to sell one to take the ticket and 4 to show me where I place my car! You spent $3M on the unworkable new ticket system and hand-held electronic meters and training of the staff. These tickets are moving further away from quality service. The meters do not work for the workers either in the sun or dark! Secondly, the tickets are unworkable for the customer. You buy a 10 ticket stub. You are waived forward because you have a ticket and then on the dock find out that it has none left! The rude ferry worker says you have to use your personal computer to check how many you have prior to using the ferry. What if you have not computer? The worker says "Go to a public computer then!" Unbelievable! These problems are caused by your departments lack of attention and pre-planning input prior to implementing a change. Overtime is being paid to workers because you do not have a staff scheduling plan that is efficient. Workers are paid too much not commensurate with non-State workers with the same skills. Many workers are seated on a stool taking tickets smoking and talking among themselves causing inefficiencies and poor productivity. 5. Reservation System Are you kidding? Again you are moving away from service while generating more department cost! The written survey was to provide us the "perception of input" and not real time input. It appears that the 10 meetings are the same. You come with the plans overall but nothing about Vashon. Big mistake. You should have 10 presentations to demonstrate that you know each community.....poor trust-building when you are asking for change. Absolutely NO on reservations. It only serves you not the customer and I have no idea how that process could work without adding many more staff to the Ferry system to "take reservations and implement changes." Just like the ridiculous new ticket system, reservations are a nightmare for everyone! 6. Replacement of aging boats: need to repeal the WA State requirement. WA will not be hurt, if they are competitive they will get the contract. 7. Why are you not looking at a transponder system and charge by car not people in the car...faster, efficient, tied to a credit card for payment automatic! Why are you not seriously considering efficient ferry system processes in Alaska and No. Carolina etc? Where si you come from? You must have experience in this arena. Since we each only bring our own experience to a new job it is urgent that we look at the entire industry to garner more quality customer-service and efficient processes=QI (Quality Improvement). Conclusion: So scratch it, do individual plans, get MORE DATA, focus on the individual customers by needs and do 10 plans that each feed the overall goals but are the RIGHT SERVICES for the RIGHT CUSTOMERS at the RIGHT COST. Some may be more expensive because they are water-locked and contribute state taxes, ferry revenue etc. Don't make this a single across the board shot for all. That is a very immature business mistake.

Date Received	Comment
1/8/2009	First, thank you for your time and efforts Wednesday evening on Vashon. As someone who relies on your services daily, I can't emphasize enough how much I appreciate your efforts to provide a reliable service now and in the future. With so many commenting at the meeting I did not find it the best venue to provide my thoughts. Many offered thoughtful comments, a few seemed intent on shooting the messenger. Thanks for listening to all. It is always difficult for any group to draw accurate conclusions based on limited data. What I had hoped to hear was a meta-level view of the State's funding approach for transportation in general, hopefully one that reflected the need to broadly increase multiple user fees. I have no problem with increased fees for me to use the ferry system, it is only realistic that they should increase and likely more than the assumption in the 20 year plan. The comment regarding your interview on NPR needed to be more of a focal point in that I don't expect the caller to pay for the ferries (unless used), and I would prefer not to pay for the floating bridges (unless used). A self-supporting ferry system is challenging yet feasible. Can we do the same with other major transportation infrastructure? This spreads the funding burden broadly and fairly. This burden extends to your offices as well. I had hoped to hear a plan for head-count reduction (not a freeze) in the administrative roles within the system. This is the only credible approach in light of the current economy, budget shortfall and the certainty of needing to reach out to the public to enthusiastically fund a workable long term plan. Although any actions taken now can only be looked at as short term reductions and savings, it shows the appropriate intent to focus on on-water services with the absolute minimum administrative overhead. Consistent with spreading the burden, it appeared to me that Bainbridge escaped both plans without a (meaningful) scrape. This is not reasonable (and they have a bridge!). A more balanced approach in a two-boat Fauntleroy plan would be to send a super-ferry to the Fauntleroy route in exchange for one of our smaller boats. Everyone needs to share the burden of a minimalist approach. That said, Plan B is completely inadequate. The economic impact to the island and peninsula would be overwhelming and long term. If plan B shows any traction in the legislature I will be the first to put the for sale sign in the yard and will certainly leave a lot of equity behind. One comment seemed to focus on the condition of the boats, docks and crew. I can't express how much I appreciate each and every crew member's efforts daily. They are excellent. I could care less about a little rust. I know the boats are safe and the service as responsive as possible. This is a maintenance interval issue, and I completely accept that you have balanced this with the best use of existing funding as well as anyone can do. Same with the docks. The folks loading us are wonderful, helpful and friendly. Attitude is everything is a service industry and I have only positive comments on your shore-side and ship-side teams. On the reservation system – this might work for the San Juans as they have far fewer daily commuters and far more seasonal weekend traffic. I have to agree, however, with the general sentiment of the audience that it appears to have several (potential) flaws that will only lead to confusion, frustration and high-levels of dissatisfaction of your customers in high commute markets like Vashon. If possible, look for a hybrid plan where you start on less commute dependent routes, understand the challenges and problems before committing to implement the system on highly commute dependent routes. In all fairness, however, too little is known about the specifics of such a plan for anyone of us in the audience to make an accurate assessment (which makes my above comment pure supposition!). Thank you again for your time and efforts. I appreciate you making the trip to the island to meet with us. If Plan B becomes reality, you will need to leave your office much earlier, and the audience will be much smaller and not likely as cheerful!
1/6/2009	Recently you made available a draft plan to guide the future of WSF service. I can only presume that if ferry service is reduced or rates increased that the same will happen with the highways in the state - removal of some roads or tolls on ALL roads. A highway is a highway. Plan B would be a disaster. "Locally-funded entity or entities would take responsibility for a new marine transit system." HA ! You're not serious? What a total functional and political nightmare that will be.

Date Received	Comment
1/9/2009	Ever since the plans for relocating the Keystone Ferry dock to a new site east of where it is now. This was voted down by the people of Whidbey Island as I recall. Anyway...it was not going to happen. That is when the problems with the Keystone ferry started, i.e. the ferries just happened to be too dangerous to run over the Thanksgiving day weekend. They just could not last 4 more days....Then Port Townsend got a shopping ferry. How much did they spend in Port Townsend and how much did the ferry cost. Now they don't want to build 2 ferries. Hey...if Whidbey Island will back down and let the Keystone dock be relocated will you give us 2 larger ferries that can adequately handle the traffic that wants to go between Whidbey and Port Townsend? If so, how about presenting the relocation project again and lets see what happens.
1/10/2009	I believe gas taxes should be used to pay for 50% of the operational and maintenance costs of the ferries system wide, just as they pay for maintenance of the roads. The balance should be paid by fares. The some portion between 50% and 100% of cost of new ferries, which increase capacity, less the value of the old boat being reassigned to a new route, should be added to the ticket price for the run that it benefits and amortized over the life of the boat. In this way the ferry system would be integrated into the state highway system and new capital costs would mostly be born by the route that it benefits. Ferries should be treated like all other mass transit systems and should not be singled out for increases in fares or cuts in service. Can you imagine the state, county or city saying the fares from buses had to cover 100% of the capital and operating costs or the fares would go up and services would be cut?
1/10/2009	I have been forwarded WSF plans to reduce ferry services on Puget Sound. I would liek to share a few thoughts. I think for the immediate, people are going to reduce as much of their travel as possible. So this supports the reduction in service. Building a Toll Bridge from BI to Manchester would reduce alot of traffic that now has to cross Agate Pass to get back to everything South of Silverdale. Why don't we put a toll on the Agate Pass Bridge immediately? It's already there! And our hiways need to paid and cared for by USEAGE. I would also like to see more passenger only ferries. So that people would leave their cars at the terminals. This is working well in Bremerton.
1/10/2009	Washington State Ferries are part of the State Highway system and should stay that way. All people need to use them to connect the land based highway systems in place, and all communities in the Puget Sound area rely on a well funded and run highway/ferry system. The few cannot and should not support the many that need a properly connected and functioning highway system.
1/10/2009	Washington State Ferries are part of the State Highway system and should stay that way. All people need to use them to connect the land based highway systems in place, and all communities in the Puget Sound area rely on a well funded and run highway/ferry system. The few cannot and should not support the many that need a properly connected and functioning highway system.

Date Received	Comment
1/10/2009	This is to register support for Plan A of the Draft Long Range Ferry Plan. Neither plan addresses the urgent need for long-term funding for the ferry system; for the ferry system to continue to compete with funding for highways and bus/rail within the DOT budget is simply not right nor fair. Nevertheless, Plan A is vastly preferable to Plan B which would be disastrous for the vitality and viability of the state ferry system.
1/11/2009	How can the ferry system propose their "Plan B" in good faith? Our failure to support the infrastructure of the state of Washington is monumental!! The purpose of government in this country is to provide the infrastructure that we all depend upon. The ferry system is a MULTI-RIDER (i.e., mass transit) infrastructure system that connects STATE highways. What happened this year when the highway infrastructure failed? I-5 was closed due to flooding and the passes were closed due to avalanche danger..... Millions of dollars were lost as Western Washington was amputated from the rest of the country. How is that any different than the ferry system? You are proposing in "Plan B" that Kitsap County government take over the state infrastructure. This is the county that laid off 15 of their Community Development planners/inspectors severely impacting the cash flow of contractors in the county and slowing building activity to a crawl. You expect this county to take over running a ferry system when they can't even keep a planning department intact or run a bus system???? The state needs to step up to the plate and fund necessary services and infrastructure.
1/11/2009	Thank you for coming to Vashon on 1/7/09. Please respond to the comments at our meeting by revising your Plan B to leave the Rhody on the Tahlequah run and leaving a third boat for commuter hours on the north end. It seems the Rhody could be maintained to be operative for more than two more years. Legislators charged with trimming spending will (of course) choose Plan B over Plan A. They will not have attended the ferry meetings nor heard the same commentary you did. Given the huge disruption to Vashon economics and lives if Plan B is adopted as is and not modified, it behooves you to make the adjustments now before submitting this plan to the legislature. It is very troubling that the community of Vashon which is totally ferry-dependent is in line for more service cuts than any other run. Please reconsider and revise your Plan B before submitting it to the legislature. We have absorbed so many cuts in service over the past few years that it feels as if we are already down to bare-bones service to maintain our jobs off-island and for island businesses to employ those who come to Vashon for work. Those who have come to live on Vashon because they are wealthy and want an island lifestyle are in the minority. Most of us are working folks who have lived here many years. Please don't shut down our "highway" to neighboring communities (or clog it to the point it makes commuting to jobs unrealistic); please plan for continued funding of our necessary ferry service to prevent significant economic decline and hardship!

Date Received	Comment
1/11/2009	Dear Sir: I am writing to express my extreme disappointment with both options developed for the future of Washington State Ferries. Rather than reduce or maintain the current level of service across the board, WSF should be looking a ways to enhance the service on those routes that already pay for themselves, and develop a plan for either improving the performance of those that don't or eliminate them. Your own records show that the Edmonds-Kingston route covers its operating cost and then some, so why would you even consider reducing service? If a route is considered necessary yet the distrance or ridership makes it unprofitable, then raise the fares...on those routes only. It is time WSF operates like a business...and that includes getting rid of management fluff and negotiating a reasonable labor contract. The ferries look like floating pigpens, the crews disappear between distinations. Lastly, and perphaps most importantly, the ferry system is an integral part of the state's transportation system, and it deserves the same support as all other forms of public transportation...the highways, bridges, buses, light rail, etc. When and if the our constipated state government ever gets around to replacing the viaduct, I definitely want to see the users pay a toll equivalent to 80% of the construction, maintenance, and operating costs, along with a peak season surcharge. The inland waters of Puget Sound could be one of most beautiful and sustainable marine highways in the world...so rather than create a plan to dismantle the ferry system why not create a vision and plan grow it?
1/11/2009	Unfortunately we can't attend the 1/13 public meeting so we are voicing our opinion here. Apparently, the state is redefining the ferry system to as mass transit i.o being part of the state highway system in order to transfer some financial responsibility to local counties and cities i.o. the state. If this is so, it is utterly misinformed since obviously ferries fulfill the same role as highways by connecting the Olympic Peninsula, San Juan and Canada to the mainland and should therefore be financed and subsidized the same way as our highways are presently. The goal of the ferry system has been to collect ferry fare to cover 80% of the operating costs so the question is how much of the highway costs are covered by tolls (please send me the exact statistics where the money is coming from to build and maintain our highways and ferries)? The answer is very little and not even close to the 80% for the ferry system since most of the highway cost is covered by gas taxes. Therefore, the ferry system is already being treated as a permanent toll bridge that is never paid off i.o. as a highway paid for by all users. A transfer of more financial responsibility to the local governments on the Olympic Peninsula, etc. would increase the burden on the majority of ferry commuters unless all the counties on both ends of the ferry system share equally in the financial burden (should be offset by a local resident credit on the ferry fares so locals don't subsidize other ferry travelers from other WA counties and out-of-state). Why should Olympic Peninsula users pay both their share for the state highways through gas taxes and then again pay a disproportionate share of the ferry costs. I.e., we help pay for the expensive highways for the commuter from Issaquah to Seattle by our gas taxes but the Issaquah commuter doesn't help pay for our ferry commute to Seattle! We suggest that the state add a refund of our sales taxes that we spend for ferry fares each year to eliminate this unfair burden of the highway/ferry costs on Olympic Peninsula ferry residents. However, our position is that treating the ferry system as a highway and subsidizing it the same as a highway is a better macro-economic solution i.o. discouraging people from moving to the Olympic Peninsula that will simply raise society's costs of building more and more expensive infrastructure for the commuter from Issaquah to Seattle, worse environment, etc.?. Why should a commuter from Issaquah to Seattle pay less than a commuter from Bainbridge Island to Seattle. The water also has the advantage of being a lot easier to scale up on with increased ferry sizes, which should be a lot cheaper than squeezing in wider highways on expensive real estate. In short, does the state's decision have anything to do with overall economies and standard of living or is it simply another power play in politics that has nothing to do with the overall feasibility. WSF apparently also plan to decrease the ferry service to Bremerton and Kingston in a short-sighted analysis to save money but it will lead to a re-distribution of the balance between the communities on the Peninsula that will make long-term planning difficult since all these communities depends on the reliability and level of service of the ferry system for their economic viability. If the ridership has decreased surely it must have decreased on all routes? so an overall decrease of the ferry service would therefore seem more appropriate

Date Received	Comment
	and won't lead to a blow to economies of Bremerton and Kingston and increased cross-traffic and ferry commuters over Bainbridge Island. Would you then increase traffic again to Bremerton and Kingston when the economy picks up again to again change traffic pattern and disturb long-term economic trends? When did you reduce traffic/close highways in economic downturns? Again, this illustrates the wrong-headed philosophy of treating the ferry system as a separate transportation system when people don't really care if they ride the highway to Issaquah or the ferry to Bainbridge Island, they just want to go home. If this yo-yo policy is pushed far enough the extreme effect is that maybe we should sell our houses on the Olympic Peninsula and move to Seattle and then move back again when WSF will give us the ferry service/highway service we were used to. I don' t think the Issaquah commuter (and other commuters) would take very kindly to being treated as the second class citizens as we are by the state.
1/11/2009	WS Ferry Planning: Attempting to download the information base is flawed and how convient with a 21 Jan deadline for public input. None are fooled by the appearance of finding public input to an extensive document that is unavailable. Your feigned attempt at appearing receptive to public input is quite typical of a bureacracy that is only interested in passing the cost of Public Transportation to the local tax payer and playing the input concerned card. There must be some accountability from the "public servants" that are deaf to public opinion. Clearly there is no accountability when the Chairman of the Transportation Committee, Sen MM Haugen can point finders at the USCG, the designers of the vessels, the inspectors, but excludes the unions while blaming all but herself for the crisis we now face. The unions are designing the vessels to suit their personal needs. Not even the US Navy makes vessles last 80 years or more and finds fault with everyone else except her leadership. Nor does the US Navy play tax incentive credits to use our tax payer owned vessels to generate income on infrastructure that we already own for the sole purpose of the State's financial gain! How Las Vegas like, to gamble on the public safety for financial gain while making money on our own assets. If such a vessel had sunk, with loss of public life,...there would have been a litinery of excuses just has Haugen has already projected. These classic examples of avoiding responsibility and accountability hidden behind volumes of "studied" manuscripts. I've personally spoken with Haugen on these issues and all she can do is find fault with everyone except herself which is not leadership. Now we also have the huge problem of having had designed and available $238 million set aside for new ferry construction...Those monies were available over 3 years ago and have somehow disappeared with no one answering the question of where and who was responsible for wasting tax payer dollars??? Who is responsible and where did our money go?? It is very clear that huge beauracratic incompetence dominates and encourages excuses for behaviors that you now wish to pass on as the tax payers responsibilty to correct! Wrong!! You are not interested in public input, as much as to process this to death! You are responsible for the crisis we now face and it will crust the economy of Pt. Townsend, reduce traffic which may well be the goal of the State of Washington. After all you falsely believe the higher goal is to reduce CO2 emissions, save the planet, create a welfare city in Pt. Townsend, create more dependency on governmental bailouts and make private enterprise a public servant.The tax payers of this state need to oust you all from office. This is pure deception and none of us are fooled. Plan A is the only one that is responsible and the entire state needs to support financially the ferry system, just like it does the interstate highway system, bridge system, and I-5 to Olympia where we should all congregate and protest your complete designed incompetency! You must take responsiblilty for misguided and unexcused lack of accountability on a fiscal basis. No committee process can wash this responsibily away.

Date Received	Comment
1/11/2009	Please accept the following comments concerning the Draft Long-Range Plan as it impacts Kitsap County residents.A. I fully support the following strategies:1. All proposed transit enhancements - This would increase fares, but the improvements would be worth it. The proposal for a new Park and Ride at Southworth Terminal is p articularly appealing as this can significantly reduce individual, carpool, and vanpool commuting costs.2. 20% passenger discount for all times B. I am very concerned about the proposed changes to the ferry runs servicing Kitsap County, specifically the Southworth-Fauntleroy run for the following reasons:1. Vehicle Registration proposal – This is a good idea for daily commuters, but overtly penalizes non-commuters by making the ferry service all but unavailable for spontaneous visits to King county during peak hours. 2. 20% vehicle surcharge during peak hours – In an effort to reduce vehicle ridership during peak hours, you are making changes that force individuals to either adjust their work schedules to non-peak hours or to choose alternative routes, which will significantly increase their commuting costs (additional mileage and/or bridge fee) and will adversely affect congestion at other ferry terminals and the Tacoma Narrows bridge. 3 . Vehicle frequent user discount (based on time-of-day) – Instead of rewarding frequent users (a reliable source of income for the ferry system), including carpoolers, for riding the ferries to reduce congestion, you are increasing their commuting costs. You would reduce the overall vehicle trips, but most people will be unable/unwilling to shift to other times and may likely shift back to an alternate route, such as Highway 16 to Interstate 5. 4. Reducing the Fauntleroy-Southworth ferry run to only one vessel – Although this would keep utilization high, this would negatively impact commuters because it would significantly reduce the number of available runs, especially in the morning and afternoon. With less time options, congestion on the "peak" AM and PM runs would increase wait times. 5. Proposed Southworth direct to Seattle ferry run – This would significantly increase crossing time and cost for this run and would effectively increase congestion at the Seattle Terminal. Using the Fauntleroy terminal for Southworth traffic, spreads the traffic impact over multiple areas instead of through one choke-point. Moving "other" runs to Seattle will only exacerbate an already overwhelmed Seattle commuter corridor. C. My recommendations for the Southworth/Fauntleroy ferry run:1. Maintain current number of vessels servicing the Southworth-Fauntleroy ferry run. 2. Reduce the percentage for the vehicle registration proposal to 75-80%, so that this will lessen the impact on non-commuters who need to travel during peak hours.3. Execute all proposed transit enhancements. 4. Do not redirect service from Fauntleroy (West Seattle) to Seattle terminal. 5. Pass the financial burden of running each ferry run onto all of its riders equitably by evaluating each run based on its own operating costs and increasing fares accordingly. No one likes a price hike, but if the increase is applied to all users evenly, than everyone can better understand who will be paying for the bulk of the improvements. As I see it, vehicles operating in peak hours are being asked to pay for an inequitable portion of the cost increases. Even though I am a vanpool commuter, this seems unfair to me. 6. If you attempt to penalize peak time riders by increasing their ferry rates, they will not shift to other times because most of them cannot change their work schedules (as is suggested in this long range plan). They will simply change back to their alternate commuting options by driving over the Tacoma Narrows bridge, increasing congestion and vehicle emissions.

Date Received	Comment
1/11/2009	Hi - I am a frequent ferry user both for commuting, and for getting to and from Bainbridge and Seattle for shopping, visiting friends and doing city things, and going to and from the airport. While I am in favor of Plan A because it maintains service, I am very opposed to a reservation system. I understand that there will be no charge for a reservation, but except for my commuting schedule, it is very hard to predict the exact boat I will be on. For example, when picking up someone at SeaTac, if their plane is late or baggage takes a while, we would likely miss the boat we thought we'd be on. Then we would be stuck waiting potentially quite a while since we would be competing with everyone who had a reservation. Another example is that a dinner with friends would have to be much more structured to be sure we catch the ferry we have a reservation on. Another example is that we have family in Bellingham, and it is difficult to predict traffic in Everett, so having a reservation on a certain ferry will add a lot of stress to having to make a certain ferry if traffic is worse than we planned. Conversely, if we guess wrong and make an earlier ferry, we'll have to wait a long time to get on our reserved spot. Our lives are already structured around the ferry schedule, but to add another layer of needing a reservation makes it unpleasant. reservation questions include - how far ahead do you reserve? If you must partly pay ahead of time, how can you use transportation coupons that some of us receive? Do you lose your partial payment if you miss your ferry? Can all us commuters just reserve the same time far ahead? I have a different suggestion to help decrease the number of cars during commuting times - Let two people qualify for car pool status. If the incentive is there, more people would take advantage of it, thereby decreasing the overall number of cars on the boat. You could just devote one or two more lanes for van and car pools that are now used for regular riders, so you wouldn't need to expand the terminal to make room for more vehicles. The ferry system would still get the same amount of money, it would comport with other parts of WSDOT that define a car pool as two people, and by encouraging more people to car pool, would cut down on the overall number of cars waiting at the terminals. It is a measure that will help cut down on green house gases by encouraging more people to drive together. On the Bainbridge commuter ferries I am on, most cars in the parking lot have just one person. It would be worth trying to see if it makes a difference, and has little to no cost associated with implementation. You have little to lose - if it works, it would use more lanes, but the total number of cars would be less. If few people use it, there is no harm.

Date Received	Comment
1/12/2009	My perspective as a ferry rider is that I moved to Kingston, WA from Illinois, knowing that my business was going to be on "the other side" and knowing I was going to be commuting. It was based on the fact that the Ferry system is an extension of the WA State transportation department and the ferry lanes are just as important as any other interstate or major highway in the Puget Sound area. I park my car in Edmonds, so I am a walk on passenger and do not contribute to the congestion of the car traffic. Based on my business and the need for visiting customers and the such, bus commuting is not an option for me. I DO NOT SUPPORT PLAN B – AT ALL! The first thing that the governing body needs to realize is that they should not threaten to punish the citizens who rely on the ferry system any more than the citizens who rely on I-5, I-405 and 520. Does the state threaten people who take the I-90 and 520 bridge, 405, I-5 etc and tell them "unless we can make these roadways more profitable, we are going to have to shut down lanes or cease repairs until they can pay for themselves?" Of course they don't! So please let's cease and desist with the threats regarding the ferry system's profitability. I think the State should realize that the regular commuters who are residents of Kingston, Edmonds and the surrounding communities who are regular commuters each way, are the people who the state relies on every week to sustain the base budget of the ferry system. Let's not punish these people with fare increases etc. The ferry system should recognize that these people are the bread and butter of the ferry system and should work with them. Do not charge more for rush hour times, you are punishing the regular commuters. This should be the plan for resident – every day commuters. Decent prices for monthly walk-on passes and 20-pack driving passes should always remain in effect. Do not increase these monthly prices; find a way to reduce them. Work with the city of Kingston and Edmonds to provide a discount for parking, so that they have an incentive NOT to drive. For example provide these resident walk-on commuters with better incentives to stay that way. With more regular walk-ons, there will be less congestion at the terminals. Do not change the 6:25 a.m. sailing from Kingston to Edmonds. This gets into Edmonds at 6:55 a.m. and is a great time for everybody that needs to be at work and clocked in by 8:00 a.m. If you must increase fares find a way to do it to the tourists.
	They will pay any ways since many of them use the ferry infrequently. Provide discounts in the summer for residents and regular commuters do not increase their fares. Get the busses and trains to work with the ferry schedule. The current Edmonds-Kingston ferry schedule works good. Do not slow down the boats at night. Thank you for taking these suggestions into consideration. Following these steps will insure future success to the citizens for which the ferry depends on and is depended on. Remember always, you don't take away services from citizens of Seattle, Mercer Island, Bellevue and Kirkland who use I-5, I-90, I-405 & 520. You don't increase their cost of living to maintain their roads. Don't punish the people who support the ferry system either!I DO NOT SUPPORT PLAN B – AT ALL!

Date Received	Comment
1/13/2009	I attended the public meeting, held last evening at Colby Elem. for the Southworth Run. One point that I want to make is that Plan B seems to assume that there are healthy transit systems serving ferry commuters on both sides of the Sound. That simply is not the case. I attended a public meeting for Kitsap Transit last month, held to discuss service cutbacks that they are implementing in February. Their funding is heavily dependent on sales tax revenues, which have dried up considerably in the economic downturn. We had to beg Kitsap Transit to keep a single shuttle bus to the 5:00 ferry that departs from Southworth. My neighbors to the north lost theirs and now will have to find alternate means to get to the morning boat. I have been a ferry rider for almost seven years now. The service has deteriorated, right along with the fleet. I know that when my vehicle reaches a certain age, decisions have to be made. In the case of WSF, I think that decision making process has been pushed off to the next watch for decades. With the proposed infusion of infrastructure spending with the new administration, it's time for WSF to go to step up to the plate. Don't outsource the ferry service to the counties. You wouldn't turn Hwy 2 over to Snohomish County. Nor would you allow SR 16 to go the Kitsap and Pierce Counties. The ferries are part of the state highway system and should remain in that category, so that they are positioned to receive the federal funding needed to bring the boats and the runs back up to speed.
1/13/2009	People from all over the world are now, and will be, making plans for travel to the 2010 Olympics in B.C. Many will take the opportunity to explore areas nearby, including the San Juan Islands. This would be the absolute worst time to cancel the Sidney run while these tourists are deciding what routes they will take to B.C.. The San Juan Islands are one of Washington State's top tourist destinations and we are the top provider of property taxes per capita in the State. It would be smart on the States part to enhance our ferry system rather than make it worse
1/13/2009	I will be unable to attend the next meeting in my area on the 15th of January. I wanted to express my opinion on the Sidney ferry to my government; My husband and I own and operate a Gallery and frame shop in Friday Harbor, the Sidney traffic in the summer time was about 30% of our business last summer, in a down econmy it is huge for us. As taxpayers and buisness owners we urge you most passionatley to keep the run going in the summer months a least.

Date Received	Comment
1/13/2009	Thanks for your note ... I think the proposal is beautiful in its simplicity ... Shouldn't take too much of your time. On another matter ... specifically your "Plan A" for Port Townsend/Keystone I have a suggestion I didn't think of at the recent meeting: While a 3-new-boat solution is the only viable one I believe, please consider eliminating one of the other items from the plan ... namely straightening the lanes. You may not be aware of this, but in doing this you eliminate 15 parking spaces at the US Bank. Although technically, that parking is reserved for US Bank customers and employees, it is well known that this is defacto ferry parking ... especially on weekends when the bank is closed. There is no alternative in Port Townsend for parking more than two hours legally (with the exception of the Park and Ride lot which is a poor option for those with luggage as it's a mile away and the shuttle is extremely infrequent). In addition, the plan would destroy the charming little Rotary Park. The time saved unloading trucks is trivial considering the added expense and degradation. Thanks for considering this.
1/13/2009	I will not be able to attend tonight's WSF hearing on the new 2030 Draft Master plan. I will have someone hand deliver this email. I have hard time closely viewing either option A or B. The ferry system is part of the State highway system. Why do we not treat it as such? One more time I will tell you that none of your options deal with the cost of the highway connections to the terminals, i.e. route 305 on Bainbridge. If you do not enhance service to & from Bremerton, Kingston to Edmonds you will have to spend millions on expanding 305 including a new bridge at Agate Pass. A Kingston/Seattle route would help immensely on reducing the traffic on 305. No where in your ridership statistics do I find any information on ferry customers who have switched to using the new Narrows bridge. Maybe with better Bremerton service you can win some of those customers back. Just another example that the ferries are part of our highway system. Also why are using the archaic planning tool of % of rider fees for system income. Again the ferry system is a part of the State highway system. I still question the location and massive cost and a 2 year disruption of your Eagle Harbor Maintenance shop as it is being remodeled. I can find no mention of that facility or it's location in the Draft 2030 WSF plan. Why not use all the good existing ship repair that we have on Puget Sound. And do not overlook the inefficiencies of having a parts warehouse in South Seattle. Further more you sooner or later have to resovle the legal issue of a 2 1/2 acre community boatyard mitigation of a 1974 State Shoreline Hearing Board decision.

Date Received	Comment
1/8/2009	As a 5 -6 day Redmond commuter who works at Microsoft, I know MANY other MS people who commute every day to the our campus in Redmond from Vashon. We are encouraged by the company to NOT drive, connect with company transportation at Fauntleroy and in West Seattle. So your Plan B entirely destroys our direction to connect seamlessly and get to work, and Plan A is a step back. It is disappointing at best to hear your proposal for a reservation system. Whomever is working on it, misses several essential points, one being that when you have problems, what are you going to do with the backup? You have no excess capacity, no place to store all the passengers and cars – meaning you simply expect the system to clear itself. It was actually humorous to hear your proposals, as they clearly need improvement. Why don't you get someone from our company to work with you like myself having had experience with queing of critical needs, since we do it all the time. I want to emphasize that there are numerous MS people living on the island, if your org impacts us too much in our work schedule, then we have no recourse but to move off the island, which directs impacts commerce, builders / contractors and yes, even teaching at the college – meaning a direct hit in all those taxes and revenue. I would urge you to reconsider Plan A, get rid of the res system and consider Plan B a nonstarter. You also should work with MS on the Connector Service, as the schedules can be coordinated both for downtown Coleman Dock and Fauntleroy. One final thought – why didn't you touch the Bainbridge runs, are they sacrosanct or it is simply politics? I find that curious as many of our people come from Bainbridge and Bremerton which you also were considering....

Date Received	Comment
1/12/2009	I realize the meeting on Vashon was just one of many ferry-user meetings you've been attending, and frankly I'm curious what you and Mr. Moseley are actually taking from them beyond physical and emotional discomfort. You and I have known each other or a long time, and I'd like to believe we've always gotten along, so honestly my state of mind regarding the ferries isn't personal. But as someone who has relied on the ferries for close to 20 years as the only way for me to get to work, I'm weary, frustrated, and amazed at how service has continued to get worse, fares have continued to increase, changes have been implemented like the scanned tickets that are annoying, neither user-friendly nor value-added for customers, the system seems to have been incredibly mismanaged, and WSF "leadership" has ignored tackling what seem to me to some of the real issues related to maintaining a vital ferry service in Washington State.The situation we face on Vashon is unlike anywhere else the Ferry System serves, including the San Juans. And because its circumstances are unique, service here should be a priority rather than something to be continually whittled away. Other than the Airlift Northwest helicopters, a few single engine private airplanes and private pleasure boats, the ferries are the only access we have to and from this island. This is not just for work commuters but for emergency services, food, fuel, school buses and other essential supplies and services. Unlike the San Juans we don't depend on summer tourism to survive, nor do we have a large portion of our population who are off-islanders who own vacation homes here. Ray, the Hiyu is a joke. It was inadequate here in the early 1990's. It's worse now...and frankly dangerous.I doubt you can imagine what it's like to live on this island – between WSF and Glacier we are experiencing a near-total failure of state government leadership. We're being treated like second class citizens here, but ironically we get to pay more for this distinction. Looking at statistics I got from APTA, farebox revenues for transit when talking about buses and trolleys bears little relationship to farebox revenues when talking about ferries. It looks to me like revenue from bus riders nationally covers only about 35% of transit systems operating costs. With WSF we're in the upper 70% range, with the Transportation Commission pressing for 90%. If ferry riders have to pay that percentage then why shouldn't we own and

Date Received	Comment
	operate the system ourselves? Why would we need WSF...or care what the Transportation Commissioners, or the non-users wherever they are in Washington, think? In fairness to you, frankly I don't think there's much at this point you really can do. We're living with the results of a system that has been mismanaged for years. And now this seems like it's entirely a political matter, which maybe it should have been a long time ago. There's a limit to the number of possibilities to be achieved by continually re-arranging WSF's small decreasing number of puzzle pieces. I think the "ferry universe" and its rules need to be changed. While a small step would be changing the rules about boat-building only in Washington, I also think fundamental funding hurdles should be addressed politically and those rules changed as well. The ferries are part of the state highway system and similar funding sources should apply. So in my mind this is a political issue demanding that state elected and appointed leaders become champions for changing the "poor step sister" status of Washington's ferry system. Clearly islanders and other ferry commuters suffer an image problem. Too many folks living on the mainland, especially those outside the immediate Puget Sound area, seem to think of us as elitists and millionaires. The state's physical geography further exacerbates its political divide. The reality that Vashon is a community of predominantly ordinary working folks. I think it's about time WSF and WSDOT leaders, the governor and the state's elected and appointed officials tackle the systemic issues that are turning WSF into a rust pile. By the way, it was nice to see you...I wish the circumstances were different. This was sent to me and I thought you might be interested, so I'm passing it along. I think it's a pretty cogent description of one central portion of the ferry issue.
01/13/09	I have carefully studied the Washington Department of Transportation Ferries Division's Draft Long-Range Plan and wish to submit the following comments: First, I invite the authors of the plan to consider the likely public response if the state proposed removing and not replacing the 520 Bridge across Lake Washington and required motorists to make reservations to use Interstate 5. The resulting firestorm of public opposition would be of historic proportions, to say the least. State transportation leaders would not survive the upheaval. So why should anyone suppose the reaction of ferry users to recommended service cuts and a reservation system should be any different? The ferries are as vital and important to those who depend on them as the 520 Bridge and I-5 are those who depend on each of them. Ferry service cuts and a reservation system are simply not acceptable to the ferry-using public. "Plan A" and "Plan B" as outlined in the current draft strategic plan are both formulas for failure. The only difference between them is that the ferry system probably would collapse sooner under "Plan B" than "Plan A." Neither plan deserves serious consideration. I strongly urge those responsible for the draft to return to the table and start over, keeping a basic set of inviolable principles in mind. These should include: 1. The ferry system does not exist independently of the state transportation system, as the current plan seems to assume. Neither do its users. Both are integral and vital parts of the state transportation system. Any strategic plan must recognize that. 2. Cuts in the existing level of ferry service are NOT AN OPTION. 3. Ferry service on the Keystone-Port Townsend route must be restored to two boats capable of operating safely on that route. 4. A ferry reservation system is NOT AN OPTION. The attempt to impose a reservation system on the existing inadequate Keystone-Port Townsend run has been a fiasco. Any reservation system must inescapably discriminate against residents and business who depend most on ferries. Any attempt to implement a system-wide reservation plan will almost surely result in lawsuits. The existing draft strategic plan properly recognizes adequate funding as the key to maintaining current levels of service, replacing aging vessels, and providing spare capacity. However, it does not meet the Legislature's mandate for considering new or innovative sources for such funding. So I would like to propose some ideas for consideration: • Port subsidies. Port districts benefit greatly from ferry service but currently contribute little or nothing to support the ferry system. The Legislature should consider diverting the

Date Received	Comment
	current public tax subsidy of affected port districts to support the ferry system. Most affected ports no longer need or prudently use the subsidy anyway, so diverting the subsidies would probably be a popular move with voters. • Real-estate excise taxes. The Legislature should enable counties dependent on ferry service to adopt additional local real-estate excise taxes with the revenue earmarked for ferries. Since population growth in these counties is a main source of increased demand for ferry services, this would be an especially appropriate source for additional funding. • Traffic fines. The Legislature should approve at least a tenfold increase in fines for moving traffic violations and earmark all or a portion of the increased revenue to support ferry service. This would also have the salutary effect of reducing the chaos and carnage that currently exist on our highways. It would likely be a declining source of revenue, since motorists would behave better once they got the message that the state is serious about enforcing its traffic laws, but it would provide large sums at the outset. Local option gas tax. The cost of gasoline on Whidbey Island and in the San Juans typically averages 20 to 25 cents a gallon more than the cost on the mainland. This is far greater than the added transportation cost of delivering gasoline to the islands. Whether this price is established by wholesalers or retailers or both in concert, the fact is that someone is making a profit of thousands of dollars on every truckload of gasoline delivered to the islands. If a way can be found to tax these obscene profits and prohibit gasoline marketers from passing the increased cost along to customers, then this could be a steady source of additional funding for ferries. Shopping mall parking tax. The Legislature should impose a small tax on each of the hundreds of thousands of parking spaces in shopping malls across the state and use some or all of the revenue to help support the ferry system. Some of these ideas obviously would be politically or economically unpopular. But any attempt to implement the draft strategic plan in anything like its present form would be nothing less than political and economic suicide.
01/13/09	Planning Committee : The Washington State Ferries are our highway system. We do not have any other way to get to our home other than the Ferries. You should treat the ferries just as if they were the freeway or bridges. I dont see you planning to cut lanes or get rid of bridges or even stop the maintanence of those things. Some locations offer a way to drive around and still get there but there is no way to drive to the Islands. Any reduction in service would constute gross negligence on your part. I have no problem with cutting out the Victoria run though. Thanks for your consideration
01/13/09	Your draft proposal makes little sense in that both service options appear, on the surface, to carry the same cost. Assuming there is a difference, no meaningful choice can be made without knowing what the cost difference is. Regardless, the ultimate goal of 87% to 97% cost coverage by fares is unobtainable due to the simple fact that increasing fares sufficiently to achieve that goal will result in such reduced utilization that it will drive revenue down, not up. Ultimately lack of common sense will meet impossibility and this ferry system, like any public transportation system so hamstrung, will fail. Go back to the drawing boards.

Date Received	Comment
01/13/09	According to the flyer made available on the BI run yesterday, maintaining the current service or reducing the service will both incur the same increase in cost. So what is the point to reducing the service if it does not reduce the cost? This makes no sense. For those who cannot make the public meeting, their should be more information available.
01/13/09	Both Plan A and Plan B are unacceptable. These proposals offer more of the same - more money; decreased service. As a commuter for the past 15 years, I have witnessed the steady degradation of service on the Seattle - Bainbridge Island run. I offer an alternative proposal. Decrease passenger fares for in-state residents by 5%. Surcharge out of state passengers 10% Increase vehicular fares by 15% Surcharge vehicle transport during peak season. Turn off engines while docked to save on fuel. Upgrade on board catering and service. (Food service is abysmal; prices are way out of line). Emphasize professional dress and comportment of crews. Price fares based on 100% percent of cost less governmental subsidies. (Bainbridge rates are in excess of 100% of costs)
01/13/09	This is what downsizing to the Hiyu means. Overloads at 8:10PM on a Wednesday night in January. Ironic that this occurred while WSF was presenting this new service level to the public as an option to their customers. Subject: Ferry Alert: Point Defiance/Tahlequah The 8:10pm sailing from Point Defiance is full and they are now staging cars for the 9:00pm sailing. Please plan accordingly and we thank you for your patience. This alert was sent on 1/7/2009 at 7:42PM to subscribers of the Pt. Defiance / Tahlequah route.
01/13/09	The Lincoln Park neighborhood is already stressed by ferry traffic. A 30% increase in vehicle traffic will have a further negative impact, especially on those using Fauntleroy Way between the dock and the Morgan Junction. Fauntleroy Way is being restriped to one lane in each direction between Morgan and Alaska Street. This will extend the area of impact all the way to Alaska St. It is time remove this terminal from the neighborhood and terminate these routes downtown, where the vehicles will have more convenient access to both north- & south-bound freeways.
01/13/09	Three and one-half years ago, my husband and I moved to Bremerton from Bainbridge Island. We did this for a number of reasons, but primarily to be closer to my parents. We did some research before we made our decision that included taking with folks who lived in Bremerton, gathering information from the City, looking at the City's plans for the future, property values and how they had changed in the prior two year period, etc. I commute to Seattle everyday. I did not look forward to the longer ferry ride and we were sad to leave the Island. But, we put our faith in the City and were happy to be moving to a place where it appeared there was a great deal of thought toward the future. We didn't necessarily agree with all the proposed changes but the mood was certainly hopeful. Since then, the economy has worsened and we have seen a decline in our property values, as has everyone, and with the exception of the new tunnel, there is virtually nothing happening in downtown Bremerton. The mood is certainly not hopeful though Bremerton has so much potential. Please hang on, and please do not hurt our ability to commute to our jobs, to enjoy Seattle after hours, or contribute further to our falling property values. I understand that we, as ferry riders, have been asked to come up with a plan "C", and to that, I have no idea what to offer. I cannot intelligently recommend a bridge to Bainbridge or the widening of 305 to increase traffic flow on the Island. I cannot intelligently recommend that you reinstate the fast boats that have been repeatedly voted down – though this is what is believe to be the solution. I only know that there has to be some continued investment in Bremerton's future, even if it means considerable debt for now, or our town will not survive and grow. Less ferry service means less value in our homes, less freedom to perform our jobs and enjoy Seattle. It means a lower quality of life for my family and many many others. It means more people on the roads, and frankly it is a safety issue. It's just too bad. Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion regarding the proposed changes to the Bremerton ferry.

Date Received	Comment
01/13/09	Thanks for your prompt reply. I would like to go to the meeting on the ferry this Thursday, but I'll be working, and I just don't have that much time to spare. That's the case with most islanders. I think it's great your putting the meetings on, but I think WSF should also put more of an effort to gather opinions through the local news providers, (printed & online), giving more islanders the opportunity to provide their input. O n another subject, years ago I wrote WSF and asked that speed bumps (low profile like on some highway edges) and speed limit signs be placed in the car loading lanes in Anacortes. I can't tell you how many times I've seen cars speeding down the lanes, (and many times when the ferry wasn't even loading yet), while at the same time kids were going across the lanes to the picnic and beach area. I have four kids myself and it scares me to death when I see this happen. Would you please see if you can get bumps or at least speed limit signs put up? If some child does get hurt or killed someday, I will let the parents of that child know I have asked WSF to put up bumps and signs. I don't mean to sound threatening, but this is a very serious matter with a fairly inexpensive, (especially comparatively), way to fix it.
01/13/09	I understand there is to be an interisland ferry meeting Thursday January 15, 2009. I will be unable to attend a meeting during a work day, but would like to provide feedback on this important issue. I would like to express my support for Plan A, as opposed to Plan B (cut in service). As a physician in a remote location, the ferry vessels are an important resource for transporting ill patients to necessary medical facilities. The clinics on the San Juan islands serves a population predominantly of people over age 65 who have a greater need for specialists and hospital services than in many communities. For our schools, the ferries are our means of transporting groups of children to enrichment activties (theatre, science events, sporting events). For our businesses, the ferries bring supplies, means of transporting goods off-island and tourists. Seasonal tourists are a main source of income for the service industries (i.e.,restaurants, motels, whale watching boats, kayak guides) established in the islands. With fewer ferry vessels, this will trigger a further down turn in our local economy. The ferries are our "bridge" to the mainland. Please do not deprive us of an essential means of transportation.
01/13/09	It is high time for WSF to put aside their archaic and deeply entrenched thinking that they are the biggest and the best marine transportation agency in the country. Several years ago in a meeting with Cobi and citizens of Bainbridge Is. and representatives of WSF concerning the enlargement and redevelopment of the maintenance yard at Eagle Harbor and without any recognition of the Shorelines Hearing Board dedication of space in perpetuity for a Boat yard there in, a leading member of the WSF team took offense at our suggestion that WSF was engaged in an attempt to have it's way with Bainbridge Is. and said"How well are you funded to legally challenge our need to redo this facility". Remember that the consultants hired by the legislature &/or WSF to examine whether to upgrade & expand the facility recommended twice that moving it from Eagle Harbor to other sites on Puget Sound were ignored. Think back to the fiasco of the misguided high speed ferries that have proven themselves unsuited to Puget Sound operations as well as the legal judgment against the state for several million dollars for property destruction resulting from their use. Let us not forget the legal judgment for an employee reporting the deficiencies of operations. It is true that some recent moves have been made to try and overcome the attitude that we know best and have funds to do what we want and to maintain and build the boats here without competitive bidding from out of state and without penalties for cost and time overruns. These things have to be built into any resolution to overcome the operational and financial deficiencies of the system. To make the system financially, operationally and efficient the ferry system must change the operational & management culture as to vessel manning as well as maintenance and operations
01/13/09	I attended the Bainbridge Island hearing this evening. 1) This is the worst possible time to be developing plans for a statewide transportation system. We should be evaluating the cost effectiveness of alternative approaches, but instead are debating alternative approaches to cutting costs for the state. This is like a health care system skimping on preventive services because it can't afford them. And It's not just about cost savings for the system over the long run. Prevention produces health, which has many spin off benefits, such as more productive workers. Where is the detailed study of the benefits of the ferry system for the state, and for the state's future, which would allow us to evaluate whether additional investments are justified? What is the impact of reducing ferry service by X% for the affected communities and for regional economies? What is the effect on quality of life? The environment? How about property values and the tax revenues that accrue to the state? How can state leaders represent the interests of their constituents without this sort of information? 2) Where's the vision? Why build ever larger, ever more expensive ferries, only to run them less frequently? We are talking about an investment for the next 50 years or more. The state should redirect modest funding toward soliciting and debating alternative visions for the next ferry system, as has been done for the viaduct. The latest viaduct tunnel option was not even part of the formal discussions just weeks ago, and in my view is the most sensible (not the cheapest) option.

Date Received	Comment
01/14/09	Gary Tripp's comments below make a lot of sense. It is necessary and appropriate to treat the Ferry system as an integral part of the road system. How is the Ferry system functionally different for residents across the Sound than the bridges of Highway 90 are to Mercer Island? This is just one example. In general, the Ferry system is too important to exclude it from the revenue sources available to the road system. The argument that not everyone uses the ferry system and therefore should not pay taxes to support it simply does not hold water. We all pay taxes to support roads we may never drive on – but they are all part of a system that is crucial to the overall well being and prosperity.
01/14/09	Dear Ferry Planning Officials: I would like to express my opinion about the two plans being considered for ferry runs in the Central Puget Sound area. I live in South Kitsap, and I often take the Southworth, Kingston, and Bremerton ferries when I need to travel to Seattle or Bothell. Although I sometimes drive around, I usually prefer to take the ferry when the schedule fits with mine. I believe Plan A is the only workable plan for several reasons: Many people rely on the ferry system to help them commute to and from work. For the commuters this is a must have, not a nice to have option. Ferries reduce the number of people on the freeways, thus helping alleviate to some extent the traffic congestion in the Puget Sound area. Frequent ferry service is also very important for delivering prompt medical care to those who require it. Reducing the numbers of boats on a run or severely reducing the number of scheduled runs would cripple the Marine Highway system. Plan A is the only responsible choice.
01/14/09	Please do not implement your Plan B. To reduce ferry service would greatly reduce the value of life and of property in Kitsap County. We bought here with the belief that we would be able to travel back and forth to Seattle on a regular schedule. In fact, there have been many times that we have been led to believe that there would be foot ferries from Kingston to Seattle in addition to the present service from Kingston to Edmonds. To cut down on the existing service would be the same as if you abandoned well used roads after people had moved into the area. Also, eliminating the evening runs to Kingston would put additional traffic on the Bainbridge route and would greatly increase traffic on the roads between Bainbridge and the rest of Kitsap and Jefferson counties. Ferry fares have increased steadily in the 19 years we have lived here. Perhaps you would have greater ridership numbers if the ferries were a little less costly. The ferry system has a history of poor money management, including the dishonesty of fare collectors over a considerable period of time. Those of us who depend on the ferries for transportation should not be penalized for that. When there are increased costs for snow removal on highways, or avalanche control, or other maintenance issues you do not eliminate those roads from the infrastructure. The ferries are part of the Washington road system and I believe we have a right to expect that we will have dependable, affordable ferry transportation on a continuing basis.
01/14/09	As a regular weekday commuter from Kingston to Edmonds and back, I would like the morning and afternoon/evening runs to remain the same with short intervals staying in place (every 40 minutes or so). Mainly the 6:25/7:05 in the morning and 3:50/4:30 in the afternoon. I am a teacher in Edmonds who needs to drop off a toddler at daycare that opens at 6:30 so my window is tight in the morning trying to drop off after 6:30 and make the ferry run before school and the reverse in the afternoon picking child up as early as possible. Thank you for the consideration
01/13/09	The Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division Draft Long-Range Plan is a total FAILURE. 1. It fails to identify the source of the Washington State Ferry Systems current financial problems; and, 2. Having failed to identify the problem, the draft plan consequently fails to propose a solution to the long-term problem. Fact: The State Ferries are 40, 60 and 80 years old and obsolete. Correction: The 80-year old ferries were pulled out of service only after the Coast Guard refused to grant certification. This was not a decision made by WSF's management. Conclusion: The State now needs BILLIONs of dollars to replace ferries and there are no available funds. THE PROBLEM: The Draft fails to identify is that for 50 years the Washington State Ferry System has not budgeted for the replacement of the ferries; 1. There was no plan for the orderly replacement for the ferries; 2. There was no sinking fund to pay for the new ferries; and, 3. There are currently no capital funds available for the replacement of the Ferries. Having failed to identify the systemic problem, the Draft then proposes to solve the problem by either: 1. Cutting and rationing service and / or 2. Shifting responsibility to the counties. Neither solves the long-term problem and both have strong negative economic impacts on the future of the West Sound. SOLUTION: 1. Fund current ferry replacement with Revenue Bonds using a dedicated portion of gas taxes

Date Received	Comment
	from counties surrounding Puget Sound. 2. Establish a Mandatory Sinking Fund for the future replacement of ferries funded by a dedicated portion of gas taxes from counties surrounding Puget Sound Yes, this will be painful, but what do you expect from 50 years of mismanagement.
01/13/09	It is high time for WSF to put aside their archaic and deeply entrenched thinking that they are the biggest and the best marine transportation agency in the country. Several years ago in a meeting with Cobi and citizens of Bainbridge Is. and representatives of WSF concerning the enlargement and redevelopment of the maintenance yard at Eagle Harbor and without any recognition of the Shorelines Hearing Board dedication of space in perpetuity for a Boat yard there in, a leading member of the WSF team took offense at our suggestion that WSF was engaged in an attempt to have it's way with Bainbridge Is. and said"How well are you funded to legally challenge our need to redo this facility". Remember that the consultants hired by the legislature &/or WSF to examine whether to upgrade &expand the facility recommended twice that moving it from Eagle Harbor to other sites on Puget Sound were ignored. Think back to the fiasco of the misguided high speed ferries that have proven themselves unsuited to Puget Sound operations as well as the legal judgment against the state for several million dollars for property destruction resulting from their use. Let us not forget the legal judgment for an employee reporting the deficiencies of operations. It is true that some recent moves have been made to try and overcome the attitude that we know best and have funds to do what we want and to maintain and build the boats here without competitive bidding from out of state and without penalties for cost and time overruns. These things have to be built into any resolution to overcome the operational and financial deficiencies of the system. To make the system financially, operationally and efficient the ferry system must change the operational & management culture as to vessel manning as well as maintenance and operations
01/14/09	Ferry Traffic represent the lungs of the island communities. The State of Washington has given these "community bodies" an expectation of life. To withdraw support of the ferry system is to deeply injure or even kill the robust island life that currently exists. Basic Arguments & proposed lines of thought toward solutions: (1) A strong Island community is a good source of tax revenue for the government. (2) People live on Vashon Island so that they can enjoy island life AND be close to the mainland. The needs of our residents (which they base their residency upon) are different than those that live in Island County. Many residents (including my family) based their decision to live on Vashon Island upon an assumption that the WSFS was committed to supporting the island in the future. (3) It is hard for non-islanders to grasp exactly how important the ferries are. Vashon Island attracts people that expect to compete with the communities in the Seattle/Tacoma area. It is through tough competition that we see innovation and economic growth and success. Families on Vashon wish to provide the same expectations for their children. For example, consider sports. It is already very challenging (when the Rhodi is in operation) to attend off-island games that begin at 9am - but by being able to make it to these games our children can increase their skill by competing against other very good teams. To establish the Hiyu (permanently) would make it even more difficult - to the point where some sports may be too difficult to compete off-island. This would dumb down the sport - and you'd have a remote, small town limit to our ability to achieve - compared to the strong and vibrant competitive spirit needed to succeed in the future. (4) Washington ONLY made ferries? Give me a break. That's a great way to create a low-pressure environment that reflects a lack of inovation and improvements. We NEED the state to invest in ferries that are much more efficient - and ferries that are meant to last with PROPER care and attention. I demand that you widen your search so that local boat builders realize they have to be the BEST or they won't be building our ferries for much longer. (5) Ferry Worker Schedules. Right now, it is my understanding that there is a desire to provide the traditional 8-hour day to ferry workers. This requires that ferries continually run in order to give the workers "something to do." This forces ferries to run when they are virually empty. (6) NO - WE CANNOT HAVE IT ALL. However, there are MANY options of what we can give up. For example, (1) let's save fuel by cutting out some of the extra early and mid-very late ferry runs so we don't have fuel-guzzling ferries traveling with only 3 cars and 5 pedestrians. Extra early riders are often on their way to the airport - they can always leave the day before and stay at a hotel or go a bit earlier than they'd like or schedule their flight for a different time. This inconveniences maybe 3 or 7 families at a time - versus wasting fuel and requiring "everyone" to pay for it through increased ferry fees. (7) Let's not forget that the WSFS has failed in it's duties to properly maintain the ferry system AND properly predict future costs and investments needed. The "sudden" emergency we find

Date Received	Comment
	ourselves in reflects errors that have been largely beyond the control of the island residents that depend upon this system. YOU wanted the control and YOU HAD the control - now it is YOUR problem to SOLVE and not just dump on someone else - or the very people you were supposed to serve in the first place! In closing (although there is so much more to say), please remember that inefficiency always has a cause and we need to take a serious look at "everything" we can manipulate as we move toward a future that can sustain itself.
01/14/09	To chime in on this pressing problem, I would like to second the notion that WSF needs to establish realistic and long-range financial plans that will ensure maintenance and replacement funds- as a boat-owner it pains me whenever I see our ferries starting to show rust. On the other hand, as a West Sounder with a concern for the pressures of development, I would be happy to see reductions in service, but not if those reductions weren't shared equally- to lower Bremerton and Vashon service and leave Bainbridge where it is will put undue pressure and strain on my city. I know it sounds crazy, but cut my services too! Also, I don't think the ferry system should be completely bankrolled by the state; it's our choice to live over here. If we wanted easy access to Seattle and the Eastside we'd live over there. Mr. Tripp's suggestion of a regional gas tax makes sense; regional funding but not regional management (i.e. no foot ferries run by the counties). Yes, cut and ration our service and get WSF's house in order; we all need to be realistic and do some belt-tightening. There's no free lunch or free rides.
01/14/09	The information I have read indicates that if the Sidney ferry is discontinued by WSF that this would not be effective until September 2009 (also confirmed by calling WSF information line). I live on San Juan Island, and our 8th grade class is planning their annual end-of-the year trip to Vancouver Island in May 2009. Concern has been expressed that this ferry might not be in operation at that time. If this ferry is discontinued by May 2009, we will have to find another location for our 8th grade class trip. Please let me know if there is ANY possibility that the Anacortes-Sidney ferry will no longer be operating as early as May 2009 so that we can proceed with our planning.
01/14/09	Thank you and the other WSF folks for holding last night's hearing. I appreciate that this meeting was primarily focused on letting the community give WSF feedback. I also deeply appreciated how at the end of the meeting, you took as much time as need be to listen to every person that stayed. Those folks may have been uncomfortable with speaking to the entire group preferring to speak with you directly. You took the time to give them your full attention. I know you could've said - "oh, I have a ferry to catch." You didn't and that speaks volumes to your leadership. Thank you. I apologize for the one very beligerent community member. Unfortunately, that is that person's style. You and Martha Burke (FAC Bainbridge member) handled that awkward moment well suggesting that person sign up and speak during the comment period. Thank you for not letting the meeting be monopolized by one individual. One thing that really struck me last night was the opening statement: "The ferries are not sustainable". I had to think - is anything in our transportation system "sustainable"? Is 520 sustainable? Is the viaduct rebuild sustainable? Is Sound Transit sustainable? Is any portion of our transportation system sustainable? Help me here. Am I just misunderstanding the term sustainable? Maybe that is the core issue that needs to be addressed - ferries should not be self sustaining or revenue neutral. Riderships in no other system pay into their portion of the highway as much as we do. No where. My ferry costs were $6000 and that is with me even moving my office back to Bainbridge Island. And to know that there is a ferry in eastern Washington - that doesn't even charge users for their ferry service - is really insulting. I drove a car onto a WSF ferry in Keller, Washington for a 10-15 minute crossing of the Columbia River. I was charged NOTHING. This ferry runs 6 a.m. to midnight. What are its cost to the over all WSF system and how are those costs covered? Is Bainbridge Island's 110% farebox recovery rate paying for that free ferry? Here is the information on the ferry: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Regions/Eastern/KellerFerry/ So you can understand why folks in the Puget Sound region who are dependent on getting to work, doctors appointments, seeing family/friends, participating in the cultural life of the region and they have to take their cars on the ferry are quite frustrated and feel tapped out. What cost years ago about $6 to drive a car onto the ferry is now upwards to $14 each way in the peak season. It just seems completely unfair. The cat is out of the bag. Ferry riders know there is money. $2.8 billion of state money budgeted for the viaduct to rebuild a 2 mile portion of the highway and yet some how there is no money for an entire system that serves over 15 communities across the Puget Sound. It would be interesting to do a financial comparison of 2 mile viaduct

Date Received	Comment
	reconstruction cost to the many, many miles covered by the entire WSF ferry system. Ferries are a far better deal. And ultimately when viaducts fail and roads are covered in snow or flooded - ferries are still moving and are still on time. With potential of natural disasters (can you say a big earthquake) in our future, seems that we should be following San Francisco's example of getting more ferries on the water not reducing our fleet. Our ferries could be our future life saving link. Thank you for considering these thoughts and please answer what questions you can or direct me to someone who does have the answers. Also, would you also please let me know the important dates when the legislature will be hearing and having discussions about these WSF ferry plans
01/14/09	Joy Goldenberg, Last nights' comments at the Bainbridge Island meeting fairly well sums up my thoughts on Plan A - bad, Plan B ridiculous, and where is and acceptable alternative Plan C? I was unable to stay long enough to speak, but what I did hear would probably resonate with 95% plus of all residents on Bainbridge and in Poulsbo. If you were to mail a summary of the LRP to these residents it will confirm this. The only positive statement. I like the reservation system for commuter ease and reducing the impacts -queue on 305 as well as saving the cost for the trooper, who no longer regulates the Winslow Way 3-way demolition derby for access the fare area. But make the reservation system for all times such that we can arrive and board like the HOV folks. Specific questions. 1. Where in the State regulations or laws are operating costs pegged to a certain % for the ferry system? And if so why not also bridges and roads? 2. How can you reduce service to Bremerton after all the City and community have gone through to try and rebuild the blighted downtown using the ferry as a key selling point? Why have the new Bremerton tunnel to no-where if service is reduced? 3. How can you propose to reduce access in the evening on the Edmonds and Bremerton runs? This will only cause more traffic congestion and significantly increase greenhouse gases as people will be forced to drive further. 4. Why not improve bicycle shoulders lanes on all your roadway facilities within 15-miles of a terminal and give a discount to bicyclists and motorcycles to as they are both much more efficient to load and unload and will increase capacity. During last years period of $4 gas there was an increase of both user groups. 5. Take the money from the terminal redesign and expand bus system. The buses are already running full at peak periods. With the reservation system in place, there is more than enough existing pavement for creating more bus stop areas. Yes, and also kick-out the employees from parking at the terminals. Make them pay $10 a day and they to will quickly learn to use the bus. Ideas to challenge your decision making; 1. Instead of planning fare increases by the methods you proposed, which are commonly used in the former Soviet Union and now Russia, try a truly American approach - an incentive based program for the next 4 to 8 years. Peak vehicles can pay the 2.5% increase but reduce the off peak vehicles - to fill the mid-day and later evening boats which run 40% or less of capacity. It may take say 10 minutes to reprogram the ticket machines. The BI run is profitable so leave it alone. Create incentives to use the other terminals for those who live in Silverdale and other places who have a choice as to where they drive to. 2. Keep one auto boat at all times for Bremerton and add twice as many new pedestrian fast-low wake boats for Bremerton morning and evening. During mid-day switch the Bremerton pedestrian boat over to BI and run one auto ferry boat mid-day. Saves fuel and staff costs. 3. Give a 20% truck discount to use Edmonds - Kingston run as highway access is better and free up congestion in Seattle and BI. I hate to break it to WSDOT but all of the truckers have figured out that the Tacoma bridge is free Northbound. I'll bet there is a significant imbalance now in your east vs. west truck tabs. 4. Fix the food service -it is as bad a Greyhound! Create summer catering for the North Island roundtrip day sailing dinner and booze included. And close the on board service other and expand terminal takeout. The wages on land food service is much cheaper. The take-out food options in Seattle within 3 minutes of the ferry is expanding. Just a few thoughts and good luck in Bremerton!
01/19/09	Comments regarding WSF Long Range Draft Plan A & B ESHB 2358 stated that WSF shall develop fare and pricing policies that: “consider the impacts on users, capacity, and local communities”. Without data from the economic analysis impact study, WSF cannot make sound decisions about the fate and subsequent impacts. Presenting Plan B on the same day that Ferry Policy Committee was disbanded was pretty much pulling the voicebox out of the throats of our representatives who were there to speak and advocate on the behalf of ferry-served communities. They were disbanded before they could review, question, and comment on it. WSF did not speak with Ferry Advisory Committees or local officials and representatives in developing or reviewing of Plan B. Plan B is a non starter. And should be flat out rejected by every ferry-served community. Let’s focus on creating a Plan C – Citizen’s Common Cents 1. First, make a commitment to fund the system after all efforts for efficiencies have been implemented. This biannual scramble for funding has got to stop. Do the mountain passes have to scramble for funding of snow plows to keep the mountain passes clear each budget cycle? Is 520 looking at closing down two lanes to reduce its highway costs? Stop treating the marine highway & mass transit system as an oddity of WSDOT. Put funding in the budget. 2. Look for cuts in the system. WSF overhead should be immediately

Date Received	Comment
	cut before the legislature even thinks about reaching into our wallets again. The system has not changed drastically the number of crew, service, and boats in over 30 years. What has changed drastically is the amount of WSF administration - 5 times what it was! So at a minimum, we should be asking for 25% reduction in WSF headquarters. Use the money saved to build more flexible fleet of ferries. Regrettably the legislature sent WSF on a path of having to find its own money to float the system - thus 80% fare increases in 6 years and the rush to figure out how to raise more money - become landlords, collect rents from franchise (Starbucks, MacDonalds, etc), sell advertisement, get more money out of users! 3. Build boats not terminals. Stop the nonsense of the expensive terminal expansions and improvements! Terminals should be nothing more than glorified bus stops - shelter and spaces to pass through on the way to your destination. We don't want high end shops, hotels, and restaurant/coffee franchises at the ferry terminals...we want people to go to our towns to visit, shop, and buy from our mom and pop locally owned stores. Build boats not Terminals! The old terminal's were built like bomb shelters - built to last. 4. Have contracts for the life cycle of the vessels. All new vessels should have build/maintain bidding contracts. Now that we don't have steel electrics that needed hand-crafted parts and wood shop repairs - downsize the maintenance yard or better get rid of it and contract out maintenance as the majority is now already being done elsewhere. How is it that WSDOT spends $21 million a year maintaining 946 buildings and WSF is going to spend $22 million for one maintenance yard operation in Eagle Harbor? And why is Eagle Harbor Maintenance yard budgeted into the future up to $90 million dollars? That money could build two new boats! Is there something outrageous about this sort of spending? Is there room for cutting expenses? 5. Change law requiring ferries to be built only in Washington. Common sense would say - repeal the law that requires ferries be built in Washington only. Previous ferries were built at $220 K per vehicle space. The recent ONE BID ONLY came in at $1.5 million per vehicle space – 7 TIMES THE COST! With the new US administration talking about creating jobs for infrastructure - with the build only in Washington law we will not qualify for those federal funds. 6. Finally, increase the WSF portion of the gas tax from 1/2 a cent to 1.5 cents. Plan C: Citizens' Common Cents.
01/18/09	Thank you so much for your strenuous exertions on behalf of our ferry system. You do an excellent job of explaining the dire straits we are in. Since it appears that the legislature is not inclined to raise ANY taxes whatsoever, I wonder if it might be possible to request that a special lotto ticket be produced for the ferries. This is not my first choice because I typically would never buy a lotto ticket, but if all other possibilities are off the table, maybe a special lotto program would produce some money. How about "Sprinkle a little ferry dust into your life, buy the green and white ticket." I also wonder whether it might be possible to allow non-profit organizations to sell things on the ferries, returning a fraction of the gross to the ferries. I realize this plan could be a can of worms, but the Washington Ferries are so bereft of human presence so much of the time that any smiling face would, I believe, help to make visitors and regulars alike feel more welcome.
01/20/09	I am 100% opposed to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Please listen to what citizens and local leaders are saying. Make wise, enlightened, fair decisions on the ferry system. Don't continue dismantling one of Washington's most iconic, valuable and charming assets. Do not treat our ferries as if they are someone's private yacht. They are bridges in the highway system of western Washington....no different than bridges throughout Washington. I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Yes, we are in tough financial times, but that doesn't mean you need to hold a fire sale. Please do not make short-sighted decisions that will hurt our state for decades to come. This is a time for creativity. Consider using classic marketing principles to encourage ridership. Have you considered that oppressive pricing structures and poor schedules may be the cause of very trends you claim to so closely watch? The ferries are a Washington state treasure. It is time to get creative.
01/13/09	I am a member of the Southworth Ferry Advisory council but I am speaking as a private citizen. I have read all the documents available to the public. This is not a plan. This is two incompetent alternatives, unsupported with details. The "plan" did not provide any cost/benefit analysis or any description of how the proposed cuts produced a net benefit, much less for the items it proposed keeping. Cuts were not itemized in any way, so the "plan" could not be analyzed. The plan did not contain any information on community impacts or customer impacts although this is listed as a priority in http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/41834A0B-DABC-48FA-9700-DF0298AA65B4/52351/AppendixE2Final.pdf EVALUATIVE FRAMEWORK AND CRITERIA It contained no information on internal process approvements, although these have been suggested by all the FACs. In the public meetings, there were NO opportunities for questions, although "plan B", which Mosely assured us was not the plan they were pushing for, was unlike any of plans produced in earlier meetings.David Moseley

Date Received	Comment
	has expressly said, "the ferry system is unsustainable." That is a bizarre public statement from a man whose job is to sustain the state's commitment to transportation. The Southworth community does not feel that last night's public meeting met the requirement of presenting the plan and acquiring feedback. I urge you to reject both "plans" and require WSF management to come up the sort of analysis required in any business, if they can, or that they be replaced if they cannot.
01/20/09	The importance of saving the ferry connection between Sidney and our Sister City Anacortes extends beyond words. It will clearly affect the economic, cultural, and international interaction for both sides. I am chair of the Arts' Committee for Sister Cities and have made on going relationships for the advancement of the arts in both cities. The ferry has made this possible. Also, I own and run the Laroche Fine Art Gallery in Sidney and enjoy the visitors from Anacortes and surrounding areas. There are many other reasons to keep the ferry running including the economic growth of the surrounding communities in Washington State. With this in mind and all the other reasons not mentioned I beg of you to please keep the ferry running. It is so important.
01/12/09	The person at the booth told me that you intend to take one boat out of the Southworth/Fauntleroy route. This is unacceptable. It's already very difficult to get on the ferry you want due to overcrowding and that's on the 4:30 am Southworth ferry. We actually need more sailings, not fewer. The residents of Kitsap county should not be put out like this for what ever reason you have. It will cost jobs and reduce tax revenues to the state.
01/20/09	Relative To WSF Long Range Plans A and B Plan B is totally unacceptable due to its failure to meet the requirements of the State Constitution for Highways and the negative impacts (economic, social and cultural) to the WSF System, the riders and the communities served. Plan A is marginally acceptable because it maintains the current status. Both Plans A and B have significant points that need to be addressed, Some noted as follows: 1)They do not plan for growth and have not been coordinated with Growth Management Requirements. 2)They do not maximize utilization of existing resources 3) Instead of building on what is currently profitable they cut what is making the money -- they cut the Edmonds/Kingston and Mukilteo/Clinton runs which generate profit on operating costs. 4) They include attributes to hurt and penalize riders, commuters and ferry dependant Communities -- Examples - Peak Hour Pricing, Fuel Surcharge and cuts in Service during times of Peak Use and times of Need. There are many more items and you know well what they are as we have addressed them many times before --
01/20/09	I'm writing from Sidney BC. I know the Anacortes Ferry is a WA ferry, but I just wanted you to know that we rely on the ferry quite a bit. I belong to the UVic outdoors club, and we use the ferry for quicker trips to the States, that don't involve the 2-4 hour border crossings. If the ferry were eliminated, we would not visit the states nearly as much.

Date Received	Comment
01/20/09	Please do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney ferry run
01/20/09	I would like to add my voice to the others who wish to save the Sidney-Anacortes ferry run. I am not speaking from a business perspective but from the impact that loosing this vital link would have on me personally. Various family members and I make several crossings each year on the run. My sister lives near Mt. Vernon and I have numerous other family members living in both Washington and Oregon. This crossing is our preferred transportation link for visits. Collectively we are frequent users of the ferry. To loose this vital will reduce the number of times that our family can get together. Please save the ferry! I was not asked to participate in the ferry survey; however, I did want to express my views on the proposed cancellation of ferry service to Sidney, B.C. I moved to Washington State two years ago to be closer in proximity to my sister who lives in Victoria, B.C. Last year my sister was diagnosed with breast cancer and I made several trips on the ferry from Anacortes to Sidney to take care of her. I am the only family she has got and it is imperative that I be able to get to Sidney when she needs me. Without the Anacortes ferry service, I will be forced to drive to Vancouver and go that route which to me is not an option at this point. I am hopeful that when making this decision you take into consideration how many Canadians take that ferry to shop in our state, and the revenue that that generates. I would think that by eliminating the ferry to and from Sidney, you would be shooting yourself in the foot to save a buck. If you need to raise the rates and go with the optional plan that would be understandable, but I cannot fathom the cancellation of this route. I am very angry about this proposal and I would ask that you reconsider the cancellation of ferry service to Sidney B.C.
01/20/09	I am a daily commuter on the Kingston and Edmonds ferry. I work 2nd shift at the Boeing company in Everett. I am a driver in one of two Kitsap transit vans taking the Kingston 12:50pm ferry to work and the ll:45pm Edmonds ferry returning home. I hope these current departure times don't change since these work well with our work schedules. It would be an added hardship if these departure times changed since it would add time to an already long day. I hope 2nd shift commuters will be considered in your decision process.
01/20/09	Please do not cut a ferry from the San Juan ocal run. It is difficult as it is now! I have a cognitively disabled daughter living semi-independently on San Juan Island, from me, her mother, who live on Lopez. Her dad passed away last year at this time and I have had to take on more work, which means I cannot pay a hotel bill for staying over there if I cannot get back to do the evening chores that night. My finances have also become more limited and since I already budget for my Anacortes-to-the-Islands wave to go book and my Interisland wave to go book I just cannot factor in a large raise in travel money. I try to do my part in community and national volunteer work. Because of safety issues, this is the safest place for my daughter to live. There are many more needy than us who would be terribly affected by the loss of a boat and an increase in outgo. Pleas take us into consideration.
01/20/09	We are a 36 room Inn on the waterfront in Sidney. We repeatedly accommodate guest that leave from Friday Harbor to come and stay with us for a few days. Your citizens pay full fare from Anacortes to Sidney even though they only use ½ the run. We also check in and look after many U.S. customers coming off the Anacortes ferry. Symbiotically , thousands of travelers leave Sidney destined to the San Juan's and Anacortes. Killing this ferry will not serve either country or either business on either side. For the sake of good economic sense , please keep the ferry running.

Date Received	Comment
01/20/09	Please to not make use have reservations on this ferry. It would put a even worse hardship on the Whidbey Island Residences and business. It will end up cost far more that it will take in.
01/17/09	The Department of Transportation has misused ferry money for several years and nothing to show for it! Why is it the ferries are singled out? They are, whether you realize it or not, part of the highway system. Closing down routes or scaling them back, is like closing lanes on I-5 so they won't need resurfacing or repairing. The whole situation is rediculous to say the least. NO reservation system for the ferries; just more money needed for software and management. The rich get the advantage; those who work or in retirement are penalized if they can't come up with the extra fee!!! It is time for you people to rethink the ferries as an integral part of the highways and an important asset to the state of Washington. Lots of talk and action about a new tunnel in Seattle; a new Lake Washington floating bridge, expanding 405 but where or where do you list anything for the ferries. People on islands should NOT be penalized any more than those living east of Lake Washington. Get your thoughts on the right track and do what is right; something long overdo!!
01/20/09	Please save our ferry, I have lived here all my life and know what is at stake here if it should go away. Our little town needs the tourism as well as I am sure the other towns that the ferry goes to Anacortes must be in the same situation. In these times especially I would think its imparative to keep this little boat running, especially with summer coming an all, everyone biggest season.
01/20/09	Please do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney ferry run. I use this ferry every summer and can't imagine it being gone.
01/20/09	I am a widow, 78 years old, who is a constant rider of the Clinton-Mukilteo Ferries. I am dismayed at the proposed reservation system, and wonder if you have any idea of the problems it will create. Yes, I do agree that in times of an emergency, it might be necessary, but should be considered only in an emergency situation -- not for a regular schedule! My objections are as follows: I frequently must go to the mainland at the UW for medical care and follow-ups. I could imagine making a reservation for my outbound trip, since I know the time I need to be there for my appointments, but coming home is a different matter. I have no idea how long I will have to wait to see the doctor, whether he will require any other time consuming procedures (blood tests, etc.) so my return trip, out of necessity, must be left open since I have absolutely no idea when I will be finished. A reservation system for this return trip would be hopeless, and probably mean I would have to waste the rest of the day sitting at the ferry dock trying to get on board. I have had no problem learning to be patient when there is a long line of cars up the hill, since in good weather and especially, in the summer time with so many tourists, that is to be expected. I have learned to plan around it, but to have to prepay for a ticket and space for an unknown time of my getting to the ferry dock is ridiculous. Where do you plan to put all the cars who were not able to tie down a reservation? Will there be an extra holding pen provided for them? My next concern is my family coming to visit me on the Island. They fly in from Virginia and Utah, and rent a car to drive to the Island. How on earth can they make a reservation, when they have no idea how long it will take them to get their luggage, and to get the car rental? Let alone the traffic on I-5 that may delay

Date Received	Comment
	their even getting to the ferry terminal? It seems that this is being rammed through without even a consideration to those of us who chose to live on an island. I understand our Mukilteo-Clinton route almost breaks even, and since our ridership is high we help the DOT pay for those routes who have limited usage. I have no problem with accepting this, but you have gone too far in even entertaining thoughts that a required reservation on this heavily used route might work. Our ferry employees do a great job daily of getting us on and off, and we need a continuance of the present "no reservation, but first come, first serve" policy. I beg you to reconsider this foolish reservation idea, which will affect not only me and my family, but hundreds of people just like me, who depend on the ferry and its schedules. For us, it is as important as I-5 is to the multitudes who travel on it, and the ferry system is an important part of our transportation system. I plead with you that you rescind any fantasies that this reservation system "might work, since it works elsewhere." I am not adverse to change, if it causes am improvement in service. Your Wave to Go tickets are a good example of a change that works. If this required reservation is implemented, it will make my life on the Island much more difficult, and I ask that you drop such a poor idea. Thank you for your kind attention, and openness in addressing my concerns.
	Please do not make the Mukilteo/Clinton run have to have reservations, the idea is ridiculous
01/20/09	The severe budget problems facing Washington State and King County in particular are a major concern for me and for all the residents Vashon/Maury Island. The current state of the economy makes it imperative to make painful and rational cuts to spending in order to close the yawning gaps in the upcoming budget. As legislators, the job ahead of you will be difficult, but all of us desire that the reductions are fair and accomplish the goals without creating even greater problems. As an island dweller, I am particularly concerned about the proposals being considered for the ferry service to Vashon/Maury Island. Over the past fifteen years, I have experienced a steady erosion of ferry service accompanied by ever rising fares. Now it appears that we are facing even more draconian cuts that are both ill advised and contra productive. At a public meeting on Vashon last week, we learned of some of the plans being considered by the leadership of the Washington State Ferry System. There are two points in particular that I would like to bring to your attention. Inaccurate Studies of Cost Reduction for the Point Defiance Tahlequah Run Until earlier this month, the single ferry MV Rhododendron served this crossing. While the MV Rhododendron is now undergoing repairs, this crossing is now being served by the much smaller MV Hiyu resulting in numerous long waiting lines and delayed crossings by many. It was anticipated that the MV Rhododendron would soon be returned to service, but now it appears that plans are being seriously considered to permanently assign the MV Hiyu to this run as a cost reduction. Based on the information provided at the public meeting, the study used to quantify this cost reduction assumed that the Hiyu, (with a capacity of 34 vehicles) would be adequate to replace Rhododendron that was credited with a capacity of only 48 vehicles. Actually, the Rhododendron has a capacity of 60 vehicles, (or more) and that can be affirmed by searching the web site for the ferry system. It is distressing that the leadership of the ferry system does not seem to have accurate information about the ferry capacities in completing their cost studies for reduced service. If the Hiyu is assigned permanently to this crossing, the capacity will be almost half of that realized with the Rhododendron. Further, the study made no attempt to include the offsetting added costs associated with this severe reduction in service. The non-trivial costs of lost revenue to island businesses, as well as the cost of lost revenue to businesses in the Tacoma area were not considered nor was the reduced revenue to the State coffers a part of the study. In the final analysis, this reduction in service will have a devastating effect on many with very little actual reduction (if any) in ferry system costs.0 “Made In Washington” Mandate Denies Access To Capital Funds Anyone who is even a casual observer can see that the aging ferry system is sadly in need of replacement equipment. With the expected government funds coming available for transportation infrastructure there would be an excellent opportunity to pursue this avenue. However, the “Made In Washington” mandate placed into law several years ago denies access to those funds. While the intent of the legislation was to increase access to jobs within the State of Washington, the net effect is now just the opposite. I strongly favor a change in this legislation that would allow us access to federal funds. Washington State shipyards and workers would have to compete for any new work arising from any new federal funding and I believe they could be very

Date Received	Comment
	competitive. Our Washington State Ferries must be considered an essential link in our highway system. To close or severely reduce capacity of any of our highways would be unthinkable as a cost reduction. But, in effect, that is what is happening with the proposed reductions in ferry service. I would appreciate your efforts to reverse these impediments to progress in our great state.
01/20/09	How about approving $30 million for the greatest "bridges" in the state - Washington State Ferries! Surely, getting Kitsap county residents to work is as important as those of King, Snohomish, Pierce - or are citizens of this county considered 2nd rate citizens by the governor of this state? In only two years of living in Kitsap county, I have never seen this 2nd rate treatment more obviously displayed than in her negligence and nearly blatant disregard of the needs of the ferry system. Now a plan has been proposed to cut it down even more for the State to save money. How is money saved when employees using the ferry to get from Kitsap to their jobs in Seattle might lose them, because a ferry run no longer exists for them? Is it more cost-effective for the state to pay unemployment benefits than to invest in ferries? What about the economies of Bremerton, Silverdale, Port Orchard, etc. Does the Governor desire to see these communities spiral down and die, so that the State can "save some money"? The proposed Alaskan Way viaduct will cost over $2 billon, money she is willing to spend because "The Alaskan Way Viaduct plays a major role in sustaining our economy and maintaining our citizens' (read: King County, Snohomish County, Pierce County) ability to travel to and throughout Seattle. " The ability of Kitsap county residents to travel to Seattle - not so important. It has always been my opinion that Gregoire is incapable of running this state, as evidenced during her first four years of escalating debt and deterioration in state services, but she successfully hoodwinked the rest of Washington (courtesy of Barack Obama's coattails) so here we are. Starting 2009 in the same mess. Will she change into a State governor this time, representing all of Washington's citizens - I don't believe it's likely, but maybe she'll surprise. A good start would be paying attention to this side of the water.
01/20/09	Please route this info copy to the decision makers within the WSF. You should know exactly what we think on Whidbey Island of the proposed reservation system. Dear Senator Haugen: I read an article in this week's South Whidbey Herald authored by Paulette Becker. She attended a meeting at the Useless Bay Country Club in which WSF officials briefed Whidbey residents on proposed changes that were characterized as a "done deal." Though I was not at the meeting, it is my understanding that WSF will be implementing a reservation system and that they will be tying ferry rates to the price of gasoline. I want you to know that I think both ideas are wrong-headed and counterproductive. First, I think you should know a little of my background so you can put my comments in context. I live on Cultus Bay and have commuted to and from my job at the National Archives in Seattle for the last 10 years. I have about 8 more years and I can retire. So, I have about 4200 more business trips to make on the Clinton ferry. This computes to about $20-30,000 into the ferry system over the next 8 years. I usually take the 0510 ferry and return on the 4pm ferry in the afternoon, (traffic and weather permitting). In the summer, conditions permitting, I am usually able to catch the 4:30 or 5pm sailing. The commute is long, but not unduly complex. Your proposed reservation system will greatly complicate and vex this commute. Here are my concerns. I cannot tell you exactly how many times I have missed a boat because of accidents on the I-5 corridor or because of inclement weather. However, I can assure you that it has been hundreds if not thousands of times. With a reservation system, I will be required to call each time that I am not able to make my sail time. I pointed this out on the questionnaire that WSF gave me several months ago. This puts me and the public at risk each time I pick up the phone. Additionally, with current Washington State law, I will risk being cited by the State Patrol each time I pick up my phone to call and let WSF know of my delay. This will be multiplied hundreds of times as each daily commuter picks up his/her phone to call due to unforeseen circumstances. If I am unable to call, it is my understanding that I will lose my deposit for the reservation. (As an editorial comment, perhaps this is what WSF wants to happen…just more money in their pocket). This is a completely unacceptable outcome and I think that you will find that the majority of commuters feel exactly the same way. Essentially we will be penalized through no fault of our own. I strongly urge you to do the right thing and reject the reservation system that WSF wants to adopt. With regard to tying the ferry ticket sales price to the price of fuel, one might ask, does WSF not budget for daily operations already? How have they accommodated fuel price fluctuations during the last several decades? I suspect that they are like any other business and project ridership and other overhead costs such as personnel and fuel into determining how much a ferry ticket should be. If they are

Date Received	Comment
	contemplating tying ticket costs to the yo-yoing price of fuel, might they also be considering returning money to the ferry patrons when fuel prices drop such as they have over the last few months? A more practical question might be, why would they want to inject even more volatility and complexity into their business model. You should insist that they budget just like all the other businesses and private individuals. The bottom line to all this, is I voted for you (as well as many others) because you had experience that we thought might be brought to bear on these tough problems. Now is the time to lead. I urge you to do so by rejecting the reservation system and scrutinizing the other WSF proposals.
01/18/09	I am responding to the ridiculous time of the ferry information meeting held in the San Juan Islands. To have a meeting aboard the interisland ferry not only means that there is a lack of continuity with people joining and leaving at different times, but it also leaves out the people who use the ferry daily for work. Those of us who use the ferry to commute to work from island to island need to take a ferry much earlier than the meeting began and return much later than the meeting lasted. Is this a purposeful decision to eliminate participants who make up the daily ridership? I cannot think of a positive reason why the meeting of this importance is slated for daytime....unless of course it is more convenient for those representing the ferry system. But then that would mean service is not really a consideration. Please help me understand.
01/20/09	The recent announcement that the subject ferry run would be cancelled has made me send this email. The impact of this decision is going to have major economic impacts on both Vancouver Island and Washington I understand the Washington state regional economic loss you will face is 1.470 jobs with a 30 million dollar annual payroll along with 126 million in annual spending throughout the Skagit valley. It would seem as though the savings on operating the ferry would be seriously offset by the direct and indirect economic loss of sales and services in the Skagit valley, Sidney and the Saanich Peninsula. It would seem that the need for our two countries to maintain both an economic and cultural link has never been more important. There must be an alternative to shutting down this service and I urge you to consider all alternatives.Thank You.
01/20/09	I am writing to help save our international link between Sidney and our Sister City.....Anacortes. This ferry sails as a symbol, not only linking 2 countries, but also bonding our communities together. Here in Sidney BC, we are closer (in miles) to Anacortes than we are to Vancouver, British Columbia. Not only do Vancouver Island residents benefit from the Anacortes Ferry run, but also many of the San Juan Island residents too. The link provides employment not only for ferry workers, but those who work for cities, towns, municipalities, tourist shops, restaurants, and more. Everyone, right down to taxi drivers, street musicians, artists.....will be affected. The discontinuation of the ferry would affect EVERYONE living on the small islands, and many of us who rely on seasonal imployment in Sidney, the Saanich Peninsula and the Anacortes area and beyond. Besides the benefits of taxes and incomes to families from employment, the Anacortes Ferry run provides a pleasant, full-filling tour of our beautiful west coast. How many places in the world have so much beauty? It is comparable with the Greek Islands in pristine beauty. Please save the Anacortes Ferry - Sidney BC FERRY.
01/20/09	Please do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney ferry run since this will have a very serious and negative impact for the Skagit valley, Sidney & the Saanich Peninsula. The loss of jobs by so many totally dependent on the ferry, the affect on the tourism industry & of course the very important tie to both countries.

Date Received	Comment
01/19/09	I find it unbelievable that you would think of scrapping the Sidney Anacortes Ferry Run. It is such a wonderful ferry and a viable run for both the town of Anacortes and Sidney. It provides an opportunity for tourists to experience the quaintness of both towns, while providing revenue for the businesses. For the sake of both communities, please don't cancel the ferry.
01/19/09	Input from a Greenbank Resident. I just received another email addressing the ferry meeting. Please DO NOT consider having reservations on the Mukilteo/Clinton run. This would be a DEATH SENTENCE to the many businesses dependent on tourism. If you would go over the Deception Pass bridge and saw the sign saying RESERVATIONS for that Clinton ferry, tourist would never drive the 50 miles south to the ferry terminal to be turned back because they didn't have a reservation. This policy has killed the toursim in Port Townsend and Coupeville this past year. It is a perfect example of poor policies. Would you require reservations to go over the Mercer Island or Everygreen Pt bridges? I can just see it now! Whidbey's small communities are dependent on tourism. Don't continue to do things that will hurt them. Would you require reservations for the many truckers bringing items to the island for the residents? They run on schedules but probably couldn't begin to come and go with reservations. I can just see the mess.
01/19/09	I have utilized the Anacortes/Sidney ferry service often and was devastated to hear that it may be abandoned. I often visit the Skagit Valley and the towns of Anacortes and La Conner and have spent a great deal of time and money in the area. I will not be doing this any longer, in protest, if this ferry service is canceled. I respectfully request that you give serious thought to the economic havoc that will be placed on this area and the depreciation of good will that will occur between our communities if you persist in this closure idea. The economic loss could very well be extreme within the area and will result in less tax dollars to the State in the event businesses are forced out. It seems to me, as an experienced international city and tourism planner, that concern for tourism in Washington State should be in the fore front within this economy. The image and financial stability of Washington State Ferries is very likely to decrease rather than increase if this closure occurs. In the event ridership is a concern, I know a number of Ferry users who would be pleased to provide suggestions that could greatly improve the service at relatively low cost. Please reconsider.
01/19/09	I heard that the WSF planning might consider reservations for the mukilteo/clinton ferry. I think that is the worst idea I have ever heard. Right up there with the Port Townsend reservations plan. We have friends and family including ourselves that would find that very inconvenient. Do you really think that would solve the daily or summer traffic! How about no surcharge for residents! This is a double tax for people leaving fulltime on the islands.
01/19/09	I am sending a letter in regards to the saving of the Anacortes/Sidney Ferry. My name is Douglas Stuart and I am a Sidney business owner. Firstly, I will say that by now, you have probably received many many emails and letters regarding saving the ferry run. In fact, it is safe to say that many letters have mentioned all of the points with which you are very familiar. I don't wish to repeat everything you've already heard, rather I wish to add a personal statement. In addition to owning a business in Sidney for nearly seven years, my family and I have resided in the Victoria and Sidney area for 34 years. In the past 10 years, we have taken numerous trips to Anacortes and enjoyed a part of Washington state that is truly beautiful. Our trips, along with recommendations to other friends to take similar trips, have benefitted the local Anacortes economy. Removal of the ferry between Sidney and Anacortes will eliminate those trips which our family has grown to appreciate. Taking the ferry to Port Angeles and driving to Anacortes simply won't happen. The presence of the ferry when it docks in Sidney has the same economic benefit as when it docks in Anacortes. The people embark from the ship and spend their money in your state. The ferry run in remarkably convenient and would be a detriment to the local economies of both cities. In short, we look forward to continued travels to Washington state should the ferry run continue.

Date Received	Comment
	I sincerely hope you will take this into consideration into the planning of the Washington State Ferries' final decision. Our family would like you to know how important the San Juan Ferry system is to our ability to live on Lopez Island, Washington. It is the main road or highway to all of our needs- it is that simple. Without the wonderful system we have we could not maintain a home or reasonable life on the island. The San Juan Islands are the jewel of the State of Washington. The beauty and the life style is a gift and a blessing but without the ferry system as we now know it it would be an impossible situation. We urge you to consider the needs of thousands of people who use the system and to find a way to maintain the systems we now are able to access.
01/19/09	In short, I am opposed to the Plan B version of the long-range draft plans. Please, State of Washington Department of Transportation, do not abdicate your responsibility to fund the ferry-portion of the state highway system to a couple of counties. I've lived in Kitsap County 15+ years so have seen substantial fare increases, especially since 2000. I understand that the state's tax structure changed at that time; I understand that we're having an economic crisis now; I understand that it's more expensive to operate a ferry than to maintain a typical paved stretch of highway, and I understand that the legislature requires you to submit a plan for this session. What I don't understand is:· why the burden of funding a state system would fall largely on what feels like the shoulders of one county, Kitsap County, when it is practically guaranteed that (Plan B) would fail, especially in this economic climate (passenger ferry funding has already failed by county vote, twice, in better economic times), · why fares need to make up such a huge percentage of ferry system operating costs when others in the state don't pay for their use of state highways, and· why there are not other ways to fund the ferries -- which are part of the state highway system -- when money seems to miraculously appear for all kinds of other transportation projects as needed (snow/ice removal in the passes, and now the upcoming construction of the multi-billion dollar viaduct in downtown Seattle). The disparity here in Kitsap county -- and all ferry-dependent communities -- regarding how much we pay to use the highways is dramatic when compared with the rest of the state. Already, including tolls on the Tacoma Narrows Bridge, Kitsap County residents can not drive in or out of our county to the Seattle Metro area without paying a toll! (Ok, we could drive through Shelton and Olympia, but that is not a reasonable choice). This is an unfair burden. I ask you for three things: 1. do NOT push either of these plans now, in the midst of a financial crisis. A short-term crisis should not dictate long-range plans. Table it; float along as we have until times are better and formulate a new plan at that time 2. keep looking for cost savings (I applaud you for the advertising and other efforts!), and for alternate ways to finance the ferries – such as a larger percentage of the gas tax, and 3. look seriously at tolls throughout the state so that others can share the burden of the roads they use Here on Bainbridge and other ferry communities, we are already paying well over our fair share of the state highway system, and I think it's high time other Washingtonians experience that special thrill.
01/19/09	I am voting to save the Anacortes ferry…. I have a business in Sidney and would like the advantages that it offers visitors and locals in our community…
01/19/09	It is an important means of transportation and income for both cities. Please keep it running!
01/19/09	Save our Ferry Scrap Plan B

Date Received	Comment
01/19/09	I have to say that I am surprised and disappointed. I attended a WSDOT Public hearing meeting. I read the Draft Long-Range Plan, and the Full Draft Plan. And, I read the AppendixE1final Operating Strategies Evaluation covering "adaptive management strategies", "demand management", efficiency levels", "quality & timeliness of service", "growing demand and finite capacity", all about "costs, costs, and costs:, but: not one word anywhere on how plans and changes would effect the economies of the communities connected by the marine highway and of course, the state economy in the end. I asked one of the presenters at the meeting how Plan A or Plan B would effect the economy of Whidbey Island. He said, "I wouldn't even know how to find that kind of information". This disconnect is stunning. Based upon the materials for evaluating changes and the proposed plans, it is clear that the WSDOT Ferries Division and those in oversight do not connect any dots between the economy and Marine Highway. All the guidelines and proposals force the Marine Highway into an expensive " Public Service" min frame and reduce the entirety of focus on how to reduce and streamline costs with ideas such as the "incentives & disincentives of long waits". The Marine Highway is not a service. It is a core factor in the economies of the communities it connects and by extension, the states' economy. Would WSDOT propose plan A and plan B for a major highway in the central Puget Sound Region and not consider how it would impact business and the economy? During the snow storm the winter, it was costing the state 4 millions dollars a day for to stop traffic on Highway 5. What will it cost the state in economic dollars to cut or reduce marine highway connections. This question should at least be part of the equation. Where is the assessment of economic costs in changing Marine Highway connections? Where is the directive that states: Don't bring me a plan that does not improve or have the potential for growing the economies of the Marine Highway communities? Why would anyone who cares about Washington States' economy think any differently during a time when making the best economic plans and decisions is so important? Where are the invitations to businesses and investors on both sides of the Marine Highway to talk about how the Marine Highway can be changed to enhance and improve business and the Marine Highway community economies? The marine highway is not a service. It is a transportation system vital to the states economy. We all invite unnecessary peril to ignore this. PS. My wife's comment: The public hearing meeting room was set up so those wanting to make comment on the plans, had their backs to the audience. This made it uncomfortable for the commenter to have 50 people in the audience at their back and hard for the audience to hear comments. Not Good!
01/19/09	No mandatory reservations! You will force many of us to move off the island. You will devastate tourism. You will crush the Island's economy and free spirit. I look at this as holding Whidbey Islanders hostage. This takes away our freedom. I am sure there is something illegal about this. Did I purchase my home under false assumptions that I would be able to travel as I wish? Do you want the young people of the Island to vanish completely? This is not just a retirement community. I hope you listen to the people. Don't ask for their input in a whisper. It's OUR island.
01/19/09	Please do not cancel the ferry run
01/19/09	Save our Ferry and Scrap plan B The ferry brings visitors which is our livlyhood, don't give tourists another reason to not come to Victoria

Date Received	Comment
01/19/09	I am a resident of Lopez Island, WA. I've read the "Washington State Dept. of Transportation Draft Long-Range Plan: 2008-2030, Executive Summary" and portions of the expanded draft plan itself. After doing so, I wanted to let you know that from my San Juans Islands point of view, I think Plan B is a good approach to a difficult situation. I whole-heartedly support dropping the ferry service between Anacortes and Sidney BC, (let Canada run that route if it's important to them,) and I support the three principal strategies that Plan B entails, those being: 1.) a free, well-designed reservation system, 2.) transit enhancements, and 3.) strategic pricing proposals. I would, however, like to add a few comments relative to each of those strategies, please: • A Well-Designed Reservation System: I had the opportunity last month to make use of ferry reservation systems as I traveled from Lopez Island to Port Townsend (via Keystone) to Victoria BC to Friday Harbor (via Sidney BC) and back to Lopez Island. In doing so, I was able to experience/envision first-hand the possibility of eliminating the long, mind-numbing waits in ferry lines that result from drivers rushing to the docks as they try to secure a spot in line for the first-come/first-served system now in place. For the San Juan Islands routes, a free, well-designed reservation system at the Anacortes docks would be perfect. But I do have problems envisioning how this would be applied at the ferry docks on the islands. Some more detailed thought, (and perhaps some ferry line waiting area expansion,) will need to be done for places like Lopez Island. • Transit Enhancements: For the Anacortes/San Juan routes, this would be wonderful! Right now, even if I just need to go into Anacortes for a medical appointment or to do some grocery shopping, I have to take a vehicle because the ferry docks are about 3 1/2 miles from the business district. (That's a 7 mile roundtrip walk to and from the the docks!) Taxi service is expensive, and the Skagit bus service is infrequent and, (with its "buy a pass first" plan, no cash accepted at the bus,) is difficult to use. And good luck if you're trying to get to Mt. Vernon/Burlington! So really, the lack of a timely/reliable/cost-conscious transportation link between the Anacortes ferry docks and the Anacortes business district (and beyond) really forces me to take a vehicle when going off-island. I, personally, would rather do a walk-on commute, and I would welcome and use an enhanced/cost effective transit system that linked the Anacortes ferry docks with destinations like the Anacortes business district, Burlington, and Mt. Vernon. (Maybe as a data point for proving my preference for walk-on commuting... when free parking used to be available at the Anacortes ferry docks during the off-season, I would park a vehicle there all winter just so I could do walk-on commutes. But when the free off-season parking was eliminated, so were my walk-on commutes.) • Pricing Strategies: I like the idea of trying to increase walk-on ridership by not increasing those fares at the same rate as for vehicles. I would, however, like to add another thought. You note on page ES-3 that "Ridership has declined from 2000 to 2006 throughout the system despite population growth in counties served by WSF." That says to me that it's not the residents of those counties that are putting the pressure on the ferry system capacity. The pressure on the WSF capacity primarily comes from the non-residents. So it seems to me that in addition to trying to increase walk-on ridership, there should also be a focus on not increasing the fares for the county residents at the same rate as the fares for the non-resident riders to those counties. (i.e. Let's not penalize the people not causing the problem!) So how could that be accomplished? Well, one easy way would be to tap into the State's vehicle license data base. If a non-commercial vehicle pulls up to the toll booth that's not licensed by the destination county for that ferry route, then an out-of-county surcharge would be applied. Simple. And it applies the fare increase on those vehicles that are causing the pressure on the ferry system capacity, the non-resident travelers to the ferry route's destination. In my case, if the car pulls up at the Anacortes docks for passage, (and I'm excepting commercial delivery vehicles here,) and it is not licensed through San Juan County, then it should have a non-resident surcharge added to its fare. Simple. Well, thank you for your draft Plan B. I think it shows a lot of thought, it fairly outlines the situation, and it should be pursued instead of Plan A.
01/19/09	i justed wanted to ask you to reconsider eliminating the anacortes sidney ferry. i believe that it will have a disastrous economic effect on both cities, look at how many jobs will be lost , look at how much money will no longer be spend by ferry users. we need to keep connected to washington you are our neighbour. this ferry is very important. thank you for you consideration

Date Received	Comment
01/19/09	I am a small business owner in Sidney, BC. It has come to our attention that there are plans to terminate the Ferry service between Anacortes WA and Sidney BC. I would like to add my voice to ask you to reconsider this Idea, since it provides a important link between our two countries and affords many travellers a shorter route to visit each others communities. There are great job losses that could result on both sides of the border by this decision,and those losses surely would be greater than the subsidy your government is now providing. Maybe a somewhat smaller Ferry could be used, and certainly a refurbished vessel would attract more travellers on this route. My wife and I would rather visit your contry by means of the Ferry rather than make the long trip over to the mainland and then suffer the delays on the Peace Arch border crossing. There are also many clients of my small Restaurant that travel here by Ferry to visit and taste our Swiss style food. Your consideration would be appreciated
01/19/09	Please re-evaluate the economic impact of reduced or eliminated international ferry service between Anacortes WA and Sidney BC
01/19/09	1. My husband and I need to commute to Tacoma almost on a regular basis for medical treatments and to see specialists. We need to have the Rhododendron ferry, at least, available so we don't have to wait in line for 2 hours for a smaller boat - as had happened to us before. Even if we line up way ahead of time for the smaller ferry, others do also. Missing medical appointments creates havoc for us and our doctors in Tacoma. 2. Please do not cut out any of the ferries at the north end. The same waiting problems arise when there are less scheduled ferry runs: a lot of people arrive earlier to try to make sure they get on the next ferry. Sometimes, one may wait over an hour and still not get on a ferry. We have missed doctor appointments, plays, concerts, etc. in Seattle when a ferry was out of service, or there was a big sports event there. 3. You must demand more financial support from the state. We are writing to our representatives and the Governor asking for greater support for the WSF system.
01/18/09	I am Donald Lapworth, Past President of the Anacortes Sister Cities Assn. and Sidney B.C. is one of our four sister cities. I have been involved with the support of the Sidney B.C. ferry since 1992 ; have ridden on buses to Legislative hearings in Olympia and been a member of the WSOT Anacortes Ferry Advisory Committee. Everytime the State gets in a budget shortfall position, WSF recommends cancelling the Anacortes to Sidney B.C. Ferry. This ferry is an integral part of the economy and cultural relationship with Vancouver Island and produces and annual income for the four surrounding counties of $126 M and $4.6 M in taxes per the recently published report by E. D. Hovee & Company LLC. The WDF Plan “B” to eliminate the Sidey B.C. ferry I feel is totally unexceptable. Elimination of the International run would leave Anacortes with no international destination from which to draw its major portion. This run has been an integral part of the WSF for many years and each time it has come up for cancellation our leglistlator has found sound reason to see that it is maintained.
01/19/09	I thought it would be valuable to enter the attached Skagit Valley Herald Editorial (January 18) as a public comment for the WSF long-term plan. The Editorial Board has done a good job of telling the "Save Our Ferry" story. The last line is a good one. Regarding the idea of eliminating the Anacortes/Sidney run, legislators should "consign this unwise notion to Davy Jones' locker." On a related topic, I've heard from several folks who have made a suggestion that I happen to agree with. Not only should the Anacortes/Sidney ferry run be saved because of the obvious economic benefits for all parties, including the State of Washington, but consideration should be given to restoring full 12-month service, for two reasons: 1. The two sessions of the 2010 Olympics (regular Olympics in February, and para-Olympics in March) would be a "bumper-crop" time for WSF, and would be very helpful for all of the local economies involved. 2. The fact of the matter is that the operation of the Anacortes/Sidney run was more economically sustainable when there was year around service, with a farebox return of close to 80% as compared with 67% in 2007. When the Hovee Report's revenue numbers for the State are added in, that enhances the net gain even more.

Date Received	Comment
01/19/09	I am writing to you please reconsider the decision to eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney run. As a business owner (I own two businesses in Sidney) I feel that the the impact of this decision would have a disastrous economical effect on both of our cities, Sidney and Anacortes. The decision would also curtail the cultural alliance that has been fostered between the two sister cities. I am sure that there are other ways that your government can save money but the decision to discontinue the ferry has wide reaching effects (e.g., lost jobs, lost tourism dollars) both in Canada and the United States. Please do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney ferry run.
01/19/09	We have travelled the Anacortes /Sidney Ferry run, had visiting family and guests travel the Anacortes/ Sidney Ferry run and most importantly we have had feedback via our guest book at our vacation rental homes that guests have traveled the Anacortes/Sidney Ferry run as part of the great pleasure they experienced while visiting the west coast. All of these mean much to businesses and employment far beyond the dollars accounted for by the ferry crossings alone. The economic impact on communities on both sides of the border will be very significant. Please do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney Ferry run.
01/19/09	We enjoy the visitors which use this route and we hope you will reconsider the route and keep the ferry running.
01/19/09	I am writing as a resident and as a business owner in Sidney, BC to request that you do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney run. The impact would have a disastrous economical effect on the two cities, Sidney and Anacortes. It would also curtail the cultural alliance fostered between the two sister cities. It would have serious economic and culture consequences to Sidney, BC as well as Washington State which would feel a regional economic loss of approximately 1.470 jobs with a 30 million dollar annual payroll along with 126 million in annual spending throughout the Skagit valley. It would seem as though the savings on operating the ferry would be seriously offset by the direct and indirect economic loss of sales and services in the Skagit valley, Sidney and the Saanich Peninsula. Please do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney ferry run.
01/19/09	plan B is not an option. i live in kitsap county and i rely on the ferry system, specifically the southworth/fauntleroy run, to see my family. sometimes, especially on the fauntleroy side, the cars are backed up fauntleroy way. it's an important run. we need it and we don't need to have it reduced. vashon has 2 ferry options, north and south, they could lose a few runs a day.the bremerton ferry is not an option. that's my $0.02.
01/19/09	We want to express our appreciation to you for holding a public hearing on January 7th with respect to the recently issued Long-Range Plan. Hundreds of Vashon residents attended this meeting, and hundreds more were turned away for lack of space—proving that the ferry system is absolutely essential to our community and economic vitality! While we understand that the Washington State Ferry's financial sustainability is at issue because of devastating funding, taxing and economic challenges, a key goal of the Long-Range Plan is to develop a service program responsive to the needs of ferry customers. While Plan A generally meets the needs of the Vashon community, Plan B falls far short of reaching this goal and therefore we must adamantly oppose it. Our opposition to Plan B stems from several concerns. First it makes significant cuts in service to Vashon with no consideration as to how those cuts will affect our community. The economic impact of this reduction in service would be devastating to Island residents—forty percent of us commute off-island for work, an increasing number of people commute to Vashon for work, our local businesses depend on delivery of goods from off-island, and many people travel to Vashon to enjoy a get-away. Our ridership base

Date Received	Comment
	differs from that observed in your recent surveys; we are much more ferry dependent. We question the rationale behind Plan B with respect to adequately serving our projected traffic patterns and growth.Additionally, Plan B does not adequately address the issue of backup vessels available to fill in if there is a problem with a vessel. When a vessel requires emergency service, we experience significant cuts in service. The building of new boats should take priority, and it doesn't in Plan B. After the completion of the Island Home boat that has already been contracted for, no new boats would be built until 2021! This is not sustainable. Currently, the Point Defiance-Tahlequah route is served by the Rhododendron. While we understand that this boat must be retired, replacement with the smaller Hiyu is simply not acceptable. Experience shows that commuters to the south Sound cannot be accommodated by this vessel, and long-lines and back-ups will be the norm. The same holds true for the Triangle route. A two-boat operation will result in long-lines and excessive wait times as experienced during periodic emergency two-boat operations. With respect to the building of new vessels, our community supports a change in the "Build in Washington" law to allow for out-of-state bids. This would not only increase competition, but also allow the state to use federal stimulus funds, reducing the impact on state funding. We are exploring avenues to facilitate this legislative change. The ferry system is part of the State Highway system, and deserves sustainable state support, as any other part of that highway system. We are willing to work with you to implement Plan A, but will vigorously oppose Plan B. It would be absolutely disastrous for Vashon residents and our community. Please do not advocate for Plan B, and join with us in working with state partners to adopt Plan A.
01/19/09	I am writing to express my dismay and concern over the potential elimination of the Sidney/Anacortes Ferry run. Not only have I enjoyed the route a number of times myself, I and am a business owner/retailer in Sidney, and have customers throughout the summer who enjoy the access to our wee town. Please do not eliminate this very important link between our sister cities!!!
01/19/09	Please the two cities, Sidney and Anacortes need this ferry!
01/19/09	I request that you reconsider the elimination of the Anacortes/Sidney Ferry run. Transportation between these two cities and countries is crucial to the economies and progress of them both. I use the ferry system personally and also as a member of a Vintage Car Club. The club goes on regular outings to Anacortes and on to other Washington State locations contributing to the local economy.
01/19/09	Allow me to take the time to share my distress at hearing the valuable link between our sister cities may be eliminated. The impact would have a disastrous economical effect on the two cities. It is important to the international relationship of these two countries, to maintain this economic/cultural link and the prospect of eliminating the ferry is counterproductive to both countries. We are all in a bad enough situation with job-losses - this would be so many more, and have a terrible impact on this important transportation link. I urge you NOT to cease operations.

Date Received	Comment
01/19/09	Please do not stop this Ferry between Sidney and Anacortes (via the US gulf Islands). It would be a devastating loss to all towns. Jobs would be lost, and tourist dollars would not be spent in any of the towns. I implore you to reconsider.
01/19/09	Please do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney ferry run
01/19/09	I definitely support some sort of Plan C for the future of Washington State Ferries, as I find plans A and C unacceptable. One element of a workable plan whould be to capitalize on the interest out-of-state visitors have in our ferries. To someone from the midwest or another country, they are a romantic concept. When they visit Seattle they want to take a ferry ride. I'll wager that they would be willing to pay more for a "once-in-a-lifetime" experience than a daily commuter or lifelong resident of the Puget Sound area. Why should we charge them $6.70 for a round trip, when they would gladly pay $20? Offer narration and museum-style displays on the sun deck during summer months and they would pay even more. State taxpayers and frequent users should pay much less. To them -- us -- the ferries are mass transit. But we're missing the boat (sorry about the pun) when it comes to tourists.
01/19/09	I am a Kitsap County resident and a regular commuter on the ferries, mostly on the Kingston/Edmonds run. I normally walk on or arrive in a vanpool, but occasionally I travel by car (e.g., to go to the airport). I'm writing to comment on the draft long-range ferry plan. I have two primary comments and then some lesser ones. My overarching view is that you should offer as much service as feasible while minimizing or eliminating your dependency on state dollars. I recognize that your riders would consequently pay more, and a lot of them will be mad at you, but people are going to be mad at you no matter what you do. Main comment #1: I prefer plan A (maintain current service levels) over plan B (reduce service levels). However, in view of increasing ridership expected, you should be increasing your capacity, not just holding steady. Main comment #2: Your problems would go away, or at least decline greatly, if you exercised much more of your available pricing power. I believe that you intend to use more of that going forward, but I wish to amplify on that point and offer more specific suggestions, as follows. When you have a two- or three-hour wait for vehicles to ride the ferry, you obviously have a **lot** of pricing power that you aren't using. I think you could charge twice as much as you do and still have people waiting in line during your peak periods. You should take advantage of that. Your only competition for moving vehicles to and from Kitsap Count is a long drive around the south end of the Sound. Your vehicle pricing should be based on vehicle footage and demand. You use both factors now but not to sufficient degrees, and magnitudes matter a lot. There should be **no** vehicle-and-driver pass, per se. Hulking pickup trucks and SUVs should not roll onto the ferry for the same price as a small sedan. Push your per-foot pricing down below the 20' line, and also increase granularity of measurement for >20 lengths so as to capture increased fares between your current increments. This pricing strategy will require more accurate measuring of vehicle length, but I think you can find good ways to do that. And a foot is a foot is a foot (except that you can park a couple of motorcycles side-by-side in a lane), so don't give any vehicle size class a price break per foot. In your fare, include a constant for average distance between vehicles. Regarding demand pricing, think about what the airlines do. You want to ride first class? You want to buy a ticket at the last moment? You want to go to a prime vacation destination during peak season? Well, you can do all those things, but it will cost you. I've remarked that the only reason that airlines can stay in business is that they are competing against other airlines. You have no real competition. So think about the possibilities. I think that the reservation system fits well into this, but you realize that you could charge more -- a lot more -- for last-minute reservations. Don't try to issue a fare sheet. Put your fares online only. Your fares can be more stable than airline fares and still achieve the purpose, but

Date Received	Comment
	be ready to revise fares as necessary to respond effects of pricing on demand. You can still have frequent-user passes for vehicle drivers, but what they buy is not a certain number of rides but "ferry bucks" instead. Your current discount is basically 20%, so just apply that discount to the ferry bucks. Now for my lesser points. On most of your runs, you have a lot more capacity for passengers than for vehicles, as you recognize. I like that you want to improve your connections to to ground transportation to encourage walk-ons, but please don't use this as an excuse to reduce your service levels. I also like that you would not raise your passenger fares as much as your vehicle fares, though I would encourage you to concentrate on collecting higher fares from vehicles as much as possible, thus increasing the relative advantage for walk-ons and high-occupancy vehicles. Finally, it's fair to give frequent users a break because without those vehicles and passengers, you would not be in business, and everyone would have to drive around the south end of Puget Sound.
01/19/09	HI, I have read through the Draft plan. It seems that a fairly comprehensive study has been done. Many of the points I agree with. It seems that option two is the direction that would work best provided that Kitsap and King Counties step up and do their part to provide the needed passenger only boats. My concern would be that it will create twice the overhead that the commuter would have to support. If the ferry system would cut back to balance the costs that the counties will add then it would be revenue neutral from the overhead standpoint. Secondly, the ferry system is partially supported by state funds that the counties may not get. This would probably drive the costs to high for the average commuter. If option two is adopted then the car ferries would become used mostly by Vanpools and Tourists. The walk on boats would be the lowest cost for the daily commuter. I don't know where the motorcycles would fall. Low cost parking at the terminals would need to be greatly increased to encourage commuters to use the PO boats. Long term funding is needed to ensure the County PO boats would not be stopped in a few years. Kitsap county commuters are especially vulnerable to changes in the ferry system.
01/19/09	I'm writing to urge you NOT to cut the Sydney ferry run. The financial impact on our small town of Anacortes could be devastating in this troubled economy. And it's not just our town that will be impacted. This run provides visitors from around the world access to the wild beauties of Vancouver Island and the British charm of Victoria. And instead of sitting in cars, queued up in long lines at the Canadian border, they ply through the waters of the magical San Juan Islands, scouting eagles and porpoises and killer whales, watching dreamy sunsets color up water and sky. So many become enchanted, returning to the islands, and to our town, where they have stopped at a small cafe to sample fresh-off-the-boat seafood, cruised galleries for homegrown art or visited our famous century-old marine hardware store, a haunt for salty souls. They go home with pictures and stories that draw thousands more to this amazing place, where you can drive onto a ferry that takes you to another country, and another world. Please don't eliminate this run. You'll be eliminating not only an important lifeline for our town, but a magical experience that draws visitors from around the world to Washington State. Surely there are better alternatives.
01/19/09	For nearly 60 years, my family has depended on the WSF (and Black Ball before that) to get off and on Lopez Island. I understand that each of the San Juan Islands is a microcosm such that it can be difficult to justify designating state resources for such a specialized application. However, from my perspective, it is on par with how important the new roundabout on Highway 12 (Walla Walla) is to my way of life on the islands. Quite honestly, it's unlikely that I will every drive on that roundabout. However, all of the WSDOT's projects connect our state from corner to corner and everything in between. Maintaining this connectedness is crucial to tourism and to our daily lives (e.g., ensuring that food and supplies flow to and from all locations). Especially given the economic and global climate, getting food and supplies locally and traveling closer to home will become increasingly important. And a dependable ferry system is a vital part of this state-wide network. I urge you to continue to see the San Juan Islands this way. It would be a shame to lose or lessen access to and from this integral part of our state.

Date Received	Comment
01/19/09	I own and manage a business in Anacortes. We sell, install and service high end marine electronics on vessels of all types. The Anacortes/Sidney run is used by customers and employees for business and pleasure purposes. I employ six good people who all live, work and play in Anacortes. We will suffer a big hit if this important international ferry run goes away. Thanks for taking the time to consider my thoughts, email if you have questions
01/19/09	Please keep the Southworth route at Fauntleroy. We are West Seattle residents and we favor expansion of the Fauntleroy dock. Raise prices if you have to. A reservation system sounds like a good idea. I've read your prospectus on it, and it sounds like you've thought it out fairly well. We read on the West Seattle Blog that a few community organizations seem to find it "unacceptable" for Southworth traffic to continue to be routed through West Seattle. We don't agree. We (speaking for my wife and several friends) live in West Seattle and we have friends not far from Southworth, and we visit with them frequently, probably averaging twice a month. Visiting with them via the ferry is so much more relaxing and pleasurable than driving around through Tacoma, that it's well worth the price of the ferry, even when gas is cheap. When gas was $4, the cost was about the same. You have room to raise your prices, because the alternative is expensive and stressful. If we had to drive through the congestion and confusion of downtown Seattle traffic to get to Southworth via the Colman dock, we wouldn't do it. Especially since the Seattle waterfront is scheduled to be a construction-site disaster zone for the next ten years or more!
01/19/09	I am sure you understand that in WA State the ferry system is part of the highway system? It needs to be funded from the same tax sources as roads. The ferry system is not just a curious tourist attraction. To reduce or eliminate ferry service anywhere in the State makes no more sense than to put a gate across I-90 and highway #2 at their respective summits and inform the residents of Eastern WA that the State just can't afford to maintain these highways 24/7 anymore and they will have to be closed at night or reduced to just one lane of traffic. Maybe, just maybe, the State needs to rethink how it funds transportation throughout the entire State and not separate modes of transport for individual funding. Since we ferry riders already pay a toll for use why not add tolls to all major highways to provide resources for maintenance and expansion of all transportation elements across the entire State? Keep the big picture in mind. Don't carve up, cut out, isolate and reduce systems down to what you think you can afford to fund with the current narrow vision of transportation systems.
01/19/09	While we applaud the spirit behind the Passenger Only Ferry (POF) implications of Plan B, the short fuse-fuse-timing and development schedule are not possible. At this moment, Kitsap Transit (KT) doesn't have a POF plan or even permission to redevelop its historic POF plan until we prove conclusively that our prototype low-wake POF boat can transit Rich Passage at speed and with high frequency without causing damage. We expect this milestone to be reachable within two years, presuming that our funding needs can be fully met by our proposed combination of existing federal earmark funds ($3.5M), an additional federal earmark for $1.5M from 2009 funds and a stimulus package of $3.4M. Beyond that unavoidable delay, our historic plan was never intended to replace any part of WSF service, other than the Chinook-Snohomish program. Replacing an entire WSF vehicle ferry was never envisioned and or proposal never had the scope or the possible funding to approach that scale of task. We would be happy to share what we produce with you, even though I am sure you will see its inadequacies relative to your Plan B immediately. Only a few parts of it, particularly the alternate higher capacity terminal further north on the waterfront, are relevant to the scale of program you are proposing. I suspect that the current terminal would not be able to handle service from three ports: Vashon Island, Kingston and Bremerton. This issue, as well as the general scale of the project, would make it a six to eight year program (after the two-year test phase) and would require funding two to three times in excess of what KT envisioned or even could access under current state law.

Date Received	Comment
01/19/09	Just a personal postscript on your recent meetings in Kitsap and the clear disappointment and disgust you experienced as the messeger of a very old and completely inadequate set of options for an infrastructure element that needs the serious attention of more strategic minds than apparently exist in Olympia. Been in this area for 5 years from 20 years in central New Jersey. During the latter experience I was a daily commuter to Manhattan by way of rural roads, park and rides, buses, municipal trains, toll-based turnpikes, Amtrak, Hudson River Ferries, PATH Trains and subways, etc.; experienced it all! None of the latter was perfect nor was it cheap but at least it was available and the integrated system that had evolved over a long time met the needs to those of us who did not want to drive to Manhattan using gas, wasting time and then spending $30+ to park. Can't remember ever hearing the inane dabate that seems to part of this state's approach to Transportation that pits Ferries against highways; how truly idiotic, especially for a state which has the reputation of being more intelligent than most. Transportation Infrastructure Planning and Implementation isn't rocket science. It's been done before and is being done now with integration, the weight of clean air and energy cost considerations entering the discussion in a big way as well as offering the traveling public viable options to endless long distance driving. I believe our locally elected representatives get it. I truly hope the State-level political dysfunction/lack of creative and strategic vision around this issue moves to a different with a new national administration and potentially increased Federal Funding. If I were in DC looking at WA State's "Plan" for infrastructure, as I understand it, I'd probably look elsewhere to commit funds. Good luck, for all of us.
01/17/09	The purpose of this Email is to provide some suggestions concerning ferry service. I believe the following changes are necessary in order to maintain this vital service to our community; 1. Reduce all sailings by one half and eliminate several late night sailings. 2. Discontinue or greatly reduce Anacortes/Sidney sailings. 3. Reduce expenses by; a. Staff reductions or overall staff hours. b. Conserve fuel by reducing speeds, and engine shut down while in dock. c. Accurate cost/benefit analysis of concession operations. 4. Increase revenues; a. Increase ridership fees b. Increase car & truck fees c. Increase advertising fees Lets' work together to preserve this unique and vital service to our community I am sure we can find a way to provide appropriate ridership levels that are sustainable now and in the future. Please feel free to contact me if you wish to discuss this issue. My number is 360-981-7275.
01/17/09	As a San Juan County (Orcas) resident I've studied your Plan and watched the Jan 6 JTC Hearing video where you explained the basics of WSF to the Legislature's Trans. Committee. I believe, as do our county officials and FAC, that Plan B is totally unrealistic and unreasonable at least as far as San Juans service is concerned. You've made no distinction between our unique needs and the rest of the system, given virtually no consideration to the hard fact that we are totally ferry-dependent, that we have no alternative drive-around bridges as all other areas do. The San Juans route has for at least 60 years been considered an extension of Hwy 20, our sole access to the mainland. Your "B" proposal of community-owned POF or feeder transit service may be a viable sensible approach for some of the other routes, such as Bremerton, Bainbridge, Kingston, Vashon, and Mukilteo/Clinton where large population will justify such services. But the San Juans and Keystone/Townsend are simply not like that, as any careful study would show (which apparently you've not done at all). On Orcas, for example, a bus feeder service would be completely inefficient, prohibitively expensive to operate, and no one nor any govt entity would undertake that. We are not at all like Whidbey. The only way to greatly reduce drive-on demand would be to build a huge parking lot or multi-level garage some- where on Orcas, which could not be at the landing area as is no available land, thus would have to be sited at least 2 miles away, and people bused to the dock. And as we all know you have insufficient land at Anacortes for expanded parking either. Offsite parking was tried with SKAT a few years ago (down by March Pt Road) but was a failure due to vehicles being broken into, and in all respects not practical. One of the main reasons San Juanders drive their vehicles to the mainland is to stock up on supplies in Burlington, food and the many things and services including medical specialists and treatment we cant get locally; therefore walking-on (or POF) for these trips is just not practical nor feasible, and can never be. For us, trying to get around on the mainland without a car simply doesn't work. You seem to not realize that a lot of our residents need to visit medical specialists in Bellingham and Seattle (big city hospitals), and often it's an all-day trip to go and return with the present schedules. With a reduced schedule, let alone POF, our residents would be forced to stay in a motel overnight, at considerable extra expense, so it would be a major new hardship. This would inevitably drive many of our seniors to abandon the county, and thus damage our county economy considerably. All of this needs to be taken into account when

Date Received	Comment
	you formulate Plans like this. I find your Plan shallow and poorly done in some respects. At 105 pages some sections are way too wordy, unclear laborious concepts, and 30% of each page just blank paper (unnecessarily voluminous). You talk about increasing asset utilization significantly. But how? Other than having discounts for off-peak travel to achieve more even loads throughout each day, I don't see how you can accomplish much. This is one of those areas where a concept sounds great in theory, but in practice little substantive can be done that really saves money. "Transit Enhancements" are fine, and very sensible in areas where public transit makes economic and time sense (such as does on Kitsap Peninsula, Bremerton area and perhaps Vashon), but in sparsely populated areas like our islands, where density is far less and driving time to terminal greater it does not make sense, so it makes no sense to belabor it or argue that solutions can be all "A" or all "B" approach. One size fits all alternatives cannot work, since you well know there are disparate needs, the San Juans being the most widely different from rest of the system. Two ideas I heartily endorse: Reservations with no-show fees. Perhaps a "Fastrak" type prepaid fee system (used on all BayArea tollbridges) where regular users prepay via Visa a block of rides, and if they reserve if don't show and don't call to postpone reservation their account is debited say half the full car/driver fare. That system keeps track of remaining spendable $, not number of rides, and when the balance falls to a certain point it auto- matically debits the Visa a/c for a new block. It would be easy and fair, and would likely be widely applauded. I strongly endorse Fuel Surcharges, above a threshold for MDO cost (marine diesel oil), an automatic surcharge according to sliding scale. WSF's average current MDO cost you could show daily on the website, as well as Platts Daily Bunkerwire price for MDO at Seattle, so users can see complete transparency and know that you/we are not being taken advantage of by your fuel suppliers (without this there would be a tendency to do so). Fares could be adjusted every week in times of rapid cost fluctuation (one way to do this is via prepaid accounts like Fastrak), the goal being to make WSF whole. MDO cost is way beyond your control, and there's no reason WSF should be absorbing large jumps, up or down. The airlines have been stupid about this, you shouldn't be. Your surcharge discussion on pages 75-76 is far too labored and complicated. Who cares what the average price has been since 1952? You should simply use as Base the MDO price you paid on the date the tariff is set, since obviously your cost at that time was the basis of the fares. Then adjust up and down as necessary based on actual fuel cost, S/C adjusted monthly, weekly or even daily if fuel pricing variations indicate it. Customers understand the need for this, the same as they know the local gas station must change its price frequently when prices spike wildly. Sidney service: I know how important it is to islands and Anacortes businesses, but also know that a money-losing operation cant be justified when there are other more important uses of the available funds and boat capacity. The fact we've had Sidney service for 60 plus years is irrelevant. It has to be essentially self-sustaining. If it's not, kill it. I feel the fares are about 30% too low for the benefits users obtain from the service. The way I look at it is an extra $20 or 30 will not make any difference to most of the tourists who are using this service. It's not budget-constrained commuters or commercial users. Much more fare elasticity here than on any other route, most likely. But there seems to have been no in-depth study of cost/benefits from Sidney service, or whether Skagit county and Saanich govt should help subsidize it. Those towns or counties after all are the main beneficiaries from the big retail revenues (Canadians view our Burlington stores as prime shopping trips because of our historically lower prices) I suggest Alternative "B" should be explored with the other routes where it makes reasonable sense to do so, but that for the San Juans the users in this county cannot be put out in the cold and forced to establish either private ferries or island transit systems when there's insufficient demand to make it economically viable. We need the same level of ferry service as we have now, with no reduction caused by Sidney suspension. Beyond the Plan, I believe WSF has been making repeated bad decisions for some time. After watching your Hearing with the JTC (Joint Transportation Committee) on Jan 6 via WTV, some of WSF' weaknesses suddenly became obvious. You and Doug Russell were explaining basic WSF problems and goals to 10-12 legislators who seemed to have very little understanding of ferry operation, shipbuilding aspects (which are very important to completely understand before trying to make decisions). As I watched it I kept thinking "This is unbelievable - he's speaking to the JTC in very elementary terms, like they're a bunch of newbies or amateurs". When new Senator Kevin Ranker asked you about the feasability of building the 64's because they're "too small for use as backups on other routes besides Keystone, interisland and Rhody route", that exchange was astonishing. That Jan 6 hearing on the video demonstrated how weak and ineffective the policy-making procedure of WSF apparently is. I truly think we taxpayers/ users deserve FAR better than that. We need managers and policy-makers with sufficient background savvy in the unique aspects of running a major marine operation, who understand it from top to bottom, instead of just pretending to understand it, second-handedly. From what I've read the WSF staff managers are fine, very much professionals, but it's the overheavy political influence at the top, and not paying sufficient heed to staff manager recommendations, and the distrust resulting therefrom that's seemingly been a large part of the chronic problems. It's pretty clear from that hearing

Date Received	Comment
	video that JTC is insufficiently well-versed to be making recommendations as called for in 2358. I believe that until we finally get truly qualified strong management at the very top level, WSF will continue making poor decisions and service deteriorate further, lurching from one crisis to the next as the public gets increas- ingly angry, continuing to waste money with bad decisions, when in this extreme hardship time wasteful practices should be stopped. (I also believe far too much money has been wasted on unnecessary outside consultant studies, apparently used mainly to reinforce what WSF staff already know. I realize this is partly driven by legislature dictates, but it seems way overdone, by mostly amateurs, and wasteful of precious resources) I've felt for past 14 months that the decision to scrap the 4 SEs was a huge mistake; an incredible waste of valuable assets and taxpayer $$$, and has had enormous affect on the rest of the system. Those four boats still had substantial value, useful life and service-ability left in them, certainly compared to the cost of replacements. Entire superstructures seemed to be in excellent condition. I believe the corroded underwater hull plating could have been replaced so that one or two of them could have operated perfectly safely for another 20 or more years, serving KPT and for certain the interisland run. They in fact were not entirely 80 years old by any means, as you know. Only the underwater hulls were that age and in need of repair. I realize full well that replacing riveted plating with welded is very laborious and expensive, but compared to the extreme high $65M cost of building an Island Home there was plenty of room for savings by doing major repairs instead. I suspect you could have rebuilt 2 of the SEs, making them safe for 20 years, at probably less than $20M total. And get them back online in less than 12 mos. One of them I think would have been ideal for Interisland, for a long time. "Evergreen State" seems too costly in terms of manpower and fuel for the run (I assume SE consumption is much lower than Evergreen State). Hiyu is too small and slow, a terrible solution for the daily commuters (they hate her, because of the lousy accomo and terrible speed). But a SE was the perfect size, and to scrap them all I believe was a short-sighted wasteful decision. I believe Paula Hammond must not have considered all the ramifications thoroughly and didn't do the cost/benefit comparisons sufficiently when she made that decision. In the meantime, a year later, the user public and merchants are suffering enormously and you have no spares. As I recall your internal estimates in fall 2007 of replacement newbuilding cost were 10 miles off the mark. It sounds like your manager's dialog with Todd estimators must not be very good, as you keep getting huge surprises. It shouldn't be that way, not if you have a good 2-way relationship. Paying Todd $65 M for one Island Home strikes me as simply ludicrous. They've got WSF over a barrel, and are taking advantage of the predicament it seems, since WSF is apparently afraid of making any long-term sensible commitments, or using accepted practice (as you did in the past) to negotiate responsible contracts for both the 64s and 144s. I don't think you need three 64s, not at a price over $50M each. (K/PT requires that hybrid, but Interisland sure doesnt). Your point that it seemed better to contract for only one 64, and put two more out to bid again later doesnt make sense to me. Everyone with marine experience knows the economics of building one one-off vsl are always bad. But this could have been solved by negotiating optional 2nd and 3rd hulls in series, in one package nego, with the price of 1st, 2nd and 3rd dependent upon whether you opt or not. The way you and Doug Russell described the Todd contracts and how you got there to legislators at that JTC hearing was very surprising. I was in the shipping business for 40 years (large ocean-going tankers and bulkers, not US-flag ferries) and this contracting approach you outlined to the JTC does not accord with normal practices I don't think. Buyers of newbuildings typically drive hard tough bargains, but from the way you described it you guys don't sound like you're doing that, and seem to be afraid of making longterm commitments that the yard needs to give optimum efficient series pricing. I of course don't know the facts of your negotiations, and it's not my business, but the procedure you outlined seemed not as effective as it could be. I dont expect any reply, but hope my suggestions are of some value.
01/18/09	I am responding to the ridiculous time of the ferry information meeting held in the San Juan Islands. To have a meeting aboard the interisland ferry not only means that there is a lack of continuity with people joining and leaving at different times, but it also leaves out the people who use the ferry daily for work. Those of us who use the ferry to commute to work from island to island need to take a ferry much earlier than the meeting began and return much later than the meeting lasted. Is this a purposeful decision to eliminate participants who make up the daily ridership? I cannot think of a positive reason why the meeting of this importance is slated for daytime....unless of course it is more convenient for those representing the ferry system. But then that would mean service is not really a consideration. Please help me understand.

Date Received	Comment
01/18/09	I attended the public meeting in Anacortes this past Thursday, but did not speak. I am sending my request that Plan B, which greatly diminishes ferry service, including scraping the Anacortes-Sidney Run, not be implemented. Based on DOT's information, it is clear that an increase in ridership is anticipated, so cutting ferry service at this time would not serve the public. As for the Sidney-Anacortes run in particular, the DOT and legislature need to look at not only the expenses and revenue of the run, but also the amount of taxes that are generated by the riders of this run. Eliminating this run will decrease the amount of sales tax the state of Washington will collect and will negatively impact businesses in Skagit County and adjoining counties and tourism in Washington state. With the 2010 Olympics not far off, closing a "border crossing" does not make sense as it will increase the pressure on the remaining crossings, and there is the potential of many tourists coming and going to the Olympics on the Sidney-Anacortes run, which can not happen without this run. With the current economic difficulties, I understand that the State must find ways to save tax dollars, but I urge the DOT and the legislature to find other ways to save tax dollars as ferries are an essential part of the transportation system of the State of Washington.
01/18/09	After attending the State Ferry Commission's informational meeting in Kingston on January 14th, I felt I had several observations that need to be expressed. Since the State ferry system was the State's first mass transit system, it has been sad to see it falling to disrepair over the last decade. I hope it is not an omen of things to come for the current systems being constructed in our metropolitan area. I have found that on-going maintenance is less expense in the long run, than letting machinery go without, and then trying to make up for lost time. It seems that the people in Olympia don't realize that the ferry system is as much a part of the state highway system as any bridge or highway, and should be funded as such. The main reason why the system has taken a step backward and faces an uncertain future is because of money. With the uncertain status of the economy, we, as a State, need to look for revenue in ways other than taxation and increasing fares. We all know that I- 685 has caused the short fall for the ferry system. Those of us who are dependent on the ferry system realize now, what a silly short-sided idea that was. One possible solution would be to restore the excise tax on license tabs, especially since the initiative was declared unconstitutional. But instead of raising taxes, perhaps there are some alternative ways of doing business. One of the biggest expenses that the ferry system faces, apart from the cost of labor, is fuel cost. We all know that diesel costs are volatile, and will continue to increase in price. Why not follow the example of the Waste Management Company, who is converting their diesel fleets over to natural gas, which is cheaper and better for the environment? Or follow the lead of Foss Maritime who is building an ocean going tug boat for Long Beach, California, which will be a diesel-electric hybrid? I found it amazing that nothing was mentioned about mitigating fuel costs in either of the submitted plans. Another issue that came to light during the meeting was the fact that the contract for the construction of new ferries can only be awarded to an in-State company. An example was given by a speaker for a passenger ferry that was built for 32 million dollars in Maine, which was very similar to one the State had built for 65 million dollars. A savings like that would solve a lot funding problems. How can the State get competitive bids if there are only a couple of companies left in the State that can build that size of boat? Even if there were dozens of in-State companies capable of the construction of these boats, which there's not, why wouldn't the State be trying to get the most capable, and hopefully least expense, builder regardless of their location? The only reason that I can see for this rule would be by political pressure from the shipbuilding companies and their unions. Should 500-1000 people benefit from this ruling at the expense of tens of thousands of ferry customers who face fare increases because of it? By limiting construction to in-State companies, it disqualifies the State from receiving matching federal funds. The largest federal stimulus plan in history is due to pass in a few weeks, with much of the money earmarked for infrastructure improvements. The first thing this year's legislature should accomplish is the removal of in-State bidding restrictions. Lastly, I would comment on one of the Ferry Commission's ideas for raising fares. Specifically, I speak of the high traffic surcharge. I am not an every day commuter. But the high traffic surcharge is a direct detriment to the every day commuter, the system's best customers. I find that amazing. In the private sector, companies reward their frequent customers, not penalize them. A possible solution would be a three-tier payment system. One book of tickets would be designed for everyday commuters. It would be a 20-trip book that is good for 4-5 weeks. Then increase fares 10% in a book consisting of 20 trips for 12 weeks designed for frequent commuters. but not everyday riders. And then have full fare riders who don't use the two commuter books. This fare would be maybe 25% higher than the shortest-term book. Another thing that must be considered concerning fares. If fares get too high, people will just drive around, which cause traffic jams at the Narrows Bridge. That would be a shame considering the vast amount of money that was spent trying to alleviate that problem. Thank you for providing me with a forum for discussion. I believe that innovative, adaptive management and legislators can solve the problems that the system faces.

Date Received	Comment
01/18/09	Concerns surface whenever a ferry budget is proposed. It appears that vision has been lost. It has been said that the Washington State Ferry System is an integral part of our road network -- our water highway. And, people have planned their lives and location decisions around the state's commitment to that concept. I now watch troubling things happening. Statements have been made that the state wants to divest themselves from responsibility for that service, shifting the ferry responsibility to the counties. That is crazy. It's like saying I can't afford my car payments, so my five year old should make them! This is part of a STATE highway network. This is a Washington State responsibility. Between Port Townsend and Whidbey Island, the route names even reflect the fact that the ferry system connects a state route. Highway 20 leads to the Keystone Ferry Dock and picks up again in Port Townsend after a water crossing. For those of us living in the San Juan Islands, this is our ONLY route home. For others is the best route home. As we have seen, this is an area where forward thinking is mandatory. I am assuming that it was partly the cuts in funding stemming from the license fee fiasco that led us from forward thinking to the day to day budget based approach that got us into a mess. There were beautiful, historic and mechanically functioning vessels lost to the system due to compromised hulls. I have to believe that there were regular maintenance procedures that could have prevented the sudden withdrawal of these vessels. Or, if the degradation of the hulls was inevitable, it could have been foreseen and plans made (long ago) for building of new vessels without interruption of service. But, that forward thinking did not happen. No one rattled cages and objected that we have a highway system to maintain. So, now we are down vessels, short of back-up vessels, trying to purchase more vessels at once than a shipyard can build, and planning for a future service that has fewer vessels than are now afloat. Budget of course is a serious concern. But maintaining our road network is vital to maintaining and building our state economy as well as public health and safety. It has been a long time coming, but no one questions the fact that something needs to be done about the Alaskan Way Viaduct. This is a vital part of the road network. We've seen its age and structural twin in California pancake during an earthquake and we know that the structure of this one has been compromised by an earthquake. Even in tight economic times, there is enough vision to recognize that this must be addressed. It is even becoming a part of the economic stimulus plan. And, the needs of the users and of the city and the region are being factored into the plan. It does not appear that the same thought is being applied to our water highway. This is a state responsibility. And, the ferries are vital to the economies they serve. Yet it appears that this service has become a budget line item that is up for grabs. The needs of those who travel this route do not appear to enter into the formula. There is another element to most of these runs. Of course the needs of residents who depend on the ferries should be paramount. But, there is another reality. Our ferry system has been something that defines our state's identity. And, it has been used extensively by tourists. There have been some tourism campaigns that yielded less than our money's worth (think WA , for example). If some of the earmarked tourist money could have been put into upgrading and maintaining the systems they would use, word of mouth would have done what no slick campaign could have. Where is the vision? We have lost ferries already. Will we continue to degrade the system and withdraw segments of our water highway? A shortsighted approach brought us to this point. We need vision that rebuilds our fleet to former levels and vision to reach out to the needs of the future. The vessels themselves -- those being maintained now and those to be added to the fleet-- are the most vital part of the vision. In the interim, while vessels are being built, there may be some visionary ways to ease the capacity needs. At one time winter parking at the Anacortes ferry dock was free. I don't know how much this reduced vehicle use or if this is the right season. But, I know that there are tourists and visitors who head to the islands with vehicles simply because their length of stay brings them to the point where parking would cost more than the ferry. Available public transportation on the islands is limited to say the least. And, transit options connecting with ferry runs are unwieldy. If islanders could pop off the ferry and pick up shuttles to Anacortes doctors, perhaps a number could be eliminated for the day trips. If there were good bus service looping through Anacortes and zipping out to do a Burlington loop at convenient intervals, that would help, too. And, what about connecting the ferry docks with the train? There's a novel idea. A transportation network that is really networked. Here's where cooperation with county transit could be helpful. They can't take over your highways, but together you might be able to work out ways to

Date Received	Comment
	reduce some of the vehicle round trips during the current crisis of reduced fleet capacity. I know. I've tried it. Eye doctor, mammograms, etc. are off island services. I'd gladly give up the car if I could be met at the dock and whisked to my doc. I tried the current system. Have you? And I've also waited through two ferry fillings on a summer day before returning home with a passenger who went for a check-up after wrist surgery. We accept some inconvenience for living in a beautiful place. But, at some point inconvenience goes beyond what is reasonable. We do not need a vision that calls for fewer ferries. We do not need a system that allows for no back-up ferries when inevitable break-downs or regular servicing needs arise. We don't need a vision that asks someone else to do the state's job. We do need a vision that once again recognizes that our water highway is a vital responsibility of the state. We do need vision that meets the needs of people now and into the future. And, if a highway of concrete can stimulate the economy, can't we envision a way to make a water highway do the same? Thank you for your help.
	I would first refer to the article in the Kitsap Sun on Jan 14, by Pam Dzama. This is largely a problem for the legislature since it mainly revolves around funding. However, the Ferries Division undoubtedly bears some responsibility as well. Just one example is it's unwillingness/inability to implement "Wave to Go" which is over three years overdue. Clearly this would contribute to expense efficiencies as well as reduce pollution from vehicles idling in line. The survey, subcontracted out to consultants, was clearly biased toward foot traffic/passengers. Unless one is working in downtown Seattle, for the most part, it is simply impractical to commute without a vehicle. Besides, the ferry system was designed, as an extension of the highway system, to transport vehicles. If the problem is funding, the funding is what needs to be dealt with. If you simply want to expand passenger capacity, you don't need a car ferry. It would be interesting to know how much money the ferry system spends each year on consultants? The real question the legislature needs to ask is why is the ferry system being funded any differently than the rest of the state highway system? If western Washington tax dollars contribute to roads in eastern Washington, why aren't overall state tax dollars going toward the ferry system? What's the difference in funding the ferry system and clearing the passes in the winter? Further, while it once may have made sense, the existing law requiring ferries to be built in Washington State is idiotic. Name one good reason it shouldn't be repealed immediately? I attended the public comment hearing in Kingston last week. The common sense of the positions that people espoused there is encouraging. What is mystifying, is why the legislature can't operate in the same way??? It is utter nonsense to produce a plan that doesn't accommodate the projected increase in demand and even more ridiculous to propose one that cuts service. Why don't we cut out consultants throughout state government and use those savings to fund the ferries????? Already the operations of the ferries are substantially funded by fares. You don't find that on our highways. There is absolutely no reason a reasonable balance of a fair portion of highway funds can't be used to fund the system along with fares…
01/18/09	As many of the people indicated who testified at the hearing, I too believe the state has an obligation to manage the ferry system in an efficient and effective manner resulting in dependable transportation to and from Whidbey Island and other locations. What I don't see in either of the plans is anything relative to renegotiating one of the large expenses of the ferry system – payroll. Many of the jobs at WSF are limited due to the current Inland Boatman's Union contract. There has to be some give and take to keep the system both efficient and cost-effective. Recently, a new scanning system was installed – the result in Mukilteo was that it doesn't work because the scanner can't identify multiple people in a vehicle. However, added to that cost was the addition of another ferry worker on the dock to direct drivers, let on pedestrians and scan the vanpool and motorcycle rider's passes. High technology resulted in additional staffing from 2 to 3 workers – inefficient at best. I realize that the Coast Guard has requirements for safety purposes but what about having employees clean and do other tasks when the boat is sailing? Currently, the contract defines and limits the job tasks, it needs to be expanded to include many of the tasks that currently considered beneath some of the loaders. The union contract is just one of the items not addressed in the plans and yet it has to be one of the items that is evaluated to keep the system afloat. Of course, I am supportive of Plan A. We pay taxes as do all citizens in Washington, we have paid the ever increasing rates every year and yet we continue to have financial issues and a likely reduction in services. The Clinton/Mukilteo run is one of the only self-supporting run in the system – why in the world would you reduce service to that run! One last comment, ideally I would use mass transit to get to work. However, although we built a new 10,000 sq foot office building 6 miles from the ferry I found out too late that there was no transportation to that area even though more than 5000 people are employed in the Seaway Industrial Park. I would have to ride to Everett then transfer taking an hour and a half to get

Date Received	Comment
	to work. When people think mass transit works for everyone it doesn't, because the system doesn't get us where we need to go. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
01/18/09	I vote for Plan A!!
01/18/09	Thank you for allowing feedback I am not in favor of a reservation system. Having recently traveled as a tourist to Canada and not being aware of the reservation system there, my husband and I waited 6 hours in line to get on a boat. This is not very tourist friendly. Many of the areas depend on a lot of that tourist activity. Nor would I as a daily commuter to Seattle want to have to "book" an appointment to get in line for the ferry. The Ferry is my freeway and road. Given a typical month we put about 30 miles on our car going to the grocery store or other requirements on the island. Since we don't drive on the freeways through out the state that others do, we feel strongly that the ferry should be allocated taxes for "road"s just like all the freeways. The purchase of smaller vessels seems to make sense if these reduce fuel costs. Example: on average 100 cars are on the vessels from 8:00 pm – the last sailing then why do you need the larger vessel.. Analysis of route usuage is important to your strategy. Higher rates for non-regular users during peak season should be increased but need a means to keep the cost for year round commuter under control Purchasing only 5 vessels seems to make sense given the vessels just retired lasted 80 years. This is our means of transportation. WE on islands should have the same opportunities to travel as those on the mainland.
01/18/09	I have many concerns about your proposal. You propose to present the Legislature with two options: Plan A is more or less current service levels and Plan B is a much reduced level of service. The ferry service has been neglected for at least a decade which might be exemplified by the US Coast Guard forcibly removing the Port Townsend ferries when the State wanted to continue running them. So now the State has to play catch-up; the problems did not go away. You also seem to relegate the ferry system as a "poor cousin" to the transportation system and seem to say that major improvement projects (viaduct, bridges, freeways) are more important than keeping the ferry system as safe and at the assumed same level of service as currently. There is a statement from the Legislature that the ferries constitute a "marine highway "(nothing more or less important). Regarding the presentation of the plan: 1) You present a plan where the "goal posts" are continued service levels or something much, much less and ask the Legislature to choose between them. You seem to ignore your own projections of 40-70% rider ship increases over the 22 year time span 2) You present data that suggests that commuters would easily shift their commute times when your data doesn't support that idea. 3) Your plan doesn't explain the $520 Million "miscellaneous expenses". 4) Your plan doesn't seem to include the cost/benefit to Kitsap, Jefferson and Clallam Counties for each "goal post" level considering the loss of taxes, tourism, and general growth factors provided by current level of service A or very reduced service B 5) Your plan indicates a $3+ Billion loss over 22 years but I suggest that amount has no basis in fact. 6) You assume that ferries have to be built in Washington where there is no competition as evidenced by the latest ferry which seems to have cost about 3 times what a comparable ferry cost in Marthas Vineyard two years ago. 7) The plan seems to lock in a schedule that doesn't allow for additional funding sources such as Obama's infrastructure building plan while the viaduct seems to count on it. Regarding the Kingston/ Edmonds route. 1) I see Plan A (current levels) swamped by increased rider demand based on your growth projections. 2) As a commuter, I can't change my schedule as easily as you suggest. I work for a school system; schools start at specific times. I also can't afford to move over to Edmonds or take a 60% pay cut to work in Kitsap County. 3) Your Plan B doesn't have evening service during the week so I can't work late, take evening classes, or go to any events. Luckily, I don't work swing shift or I would really have problems. 4) The commuters/users on this run pay well over 100% of the M&O and yet we are facing reduced service. Where else in Washington do the specific users pay the same rate (maybe the

Date Received	Comment
	Narrows bridge)? 5) You talk about coordinating with public transit but, for example in Edmonds, only one of the 4 normal bus runs can even pick up passengers at the ferry terminal. On the Kingston side, the bus seems to leave just as the ferry is arriving in the morning. The recent proposed change in ferry run times to meet the Sounder train only allowed riders 1 minute to get off the ferry and go the 1/3 mile to the train station while avoiding the very same train while crossing the track. It removed a morning and afternoon run that did meet the trains. I don't see any effort to coordinate with any public transport other than van pools. Overall, these plans ignore the neglected state of the ferry system and will present the Legislature with a choice of somewhere between current service levels or a much reduced level. We marine highway users lose a little or a lot. We also lose because growth and tourism will be stifled and our tax base in 3 counties ruined. The ferry system is an equal part of the transportation system, no more or less. Before you increase traffic flow (bigger bridges, snow removal in the mountains, more freeway additions), you must plan on at least current levels of safe service in the ferry system. note: These comments have also been sent to my Legislators
01/18/09	I understand that the WSF has proposed to stop this ferry run. I have read the information and would like to ask that you look hard at this run again. First, according to a study, this run makes a profit for the WSF system. Why would you want to cut out a run that makes money? It just doesn't make sense. Second, the cities that are used by this run also benefit financially from the run. This is in addition to the profit that the ferry system makes on this run. Finally, in essence, the WSF is an extension to the highway system and provides a great deal of intangible benefits to all the communities and persons who use the system. Long term financing is something that the WSF can and should do to correct the mistakes of the past and build for the future. Thanks for considering our input.
01/18/09	My husband and I join the voices that would very much like to see the Sidney/Anacortes ferry run remain.
01/17/09	I was unable to attend the meeting on the ferry last week as I have to work during the day, but I would like to share my viewpoint with you as a Washington state taxpayer and recipient of ferry services. You cannot possibly imagine what it is like to live on a rural ferry-only island unless you hear about it from people like me. I have lived on Lopez Island for 18 years. I have raised 2 children here and worked on Lopez and on the mainland. I would like you to imagine what it is like to live where there is no place to buy shoes or coats, no orthodontist, no pediatrician, few musical opportunities for gifted children, and extremely limited employment. You would travel outside your immediate rural community to a larger urban area, would you not? You would not want to move because the rural community values and lifestyle were important to you. What if the state decided to eliminate most of the funding that paid for the local roads (with Tim Eyman's help) and decided that since your road was not travelled on often enough, they would open it 7 times a day for 10 minutes each time, and only allow a few cars through when it was open? And then they decided that you would have to pay for the road with your tolls and the local community--that has a very high rate of free school lunches, indicating serious poverty issues--had to start building and maintaining their own roads without state assistance? You'd think that was a crazy idea and you'd laugh at the absurdity, until you realized they were serious and that the death knell had sounded for you and your community. No more livestock--no way to get them to market. No more children--no way to take care of their clothing, education, and health needs. No more income from tourists. No more contact with the rest of the county. So you and your family, friends and neighbors would have to move, leaving behind a "ghost county". I would like to remind you of a statement by the Ferry administration when the Sidney run was under fire the last time: "The state is not in the tourist business." If that is so, why do we not have an interisland ferry on the weekends? Why are there so many boats on Friday nights? I agree that the ferry should be a ROAD and the state has an obligation in law to treat it like a part of the road system. And I would like to remind you that the people are the state and the state employees

Date Received	Comment
	are there to carry out the will of the people. As one of those people, I call upon you to look at the situation as it truly is, and do what's right for the ferry-dependent islands. Maintain service and improve it! And get the legislature to reinstate those car tab fees! And by the way, now that highway 20 from I5 to Anacortes is a 4-lane megahighway, where do you think all those people are going to go? Whidbey?
01/17/09	The International Ferry from Anacortes to Sydney is so obviously important to our local industry, it goes without saying that we (Anacortes) IS the international connection from the PNW to Canada. WSDOT employees keep their jobs, Anacortes businesses remain that way - in BUSINESS, (as does Canada remain in business!) and the ever-important "neighborly" relationship between the US and Canada remains steady. Use a smaller ship if you must, but do not cut this umbilical cord to our continental sister country. Thank you for listening -
01/17/09	I have read your long report and would like to make some comments and to definitely state that your Plan B is not an acceptable alternative. Some of the assumptions you make are also faulty. Funding is definitely a problem but the continuing whining by WSF and our legislators about I-695 does nothing to solve the problem. The state legislature has not stopped snow and avalanche removal from all the passes over the cascades, nor closed bridges across Lake Washington or Interstate 5 due to lack of dedicated funds. I do not use these roads or bridges but a portion of my state taxes supports these services. The people who use these services do currently not pay tolls for operation and maintenance. I do use the WSF Ferries on the so called ”marine highway” and pay a high toll for this use. The state department of transportation has now stated it will support a tunnel in Seattle to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct. The amount of money is nearly the short fall you predict for the WSF in the next 20 years. The question is not about the engineering of the elevated highway that most likely would fall in a severe earth quake but the state choosing an alternative that was voted down by 70% of the voters in Seattle and is most costly alternative is self serving. If the viaduct went away, I doubt that Seattle would drop from the face of the earth. A good example is the city of San Francisco. In all reports and information meetings by WSF that we have attended, there have always been general statements about cost savings to be exercises in the current system. Other than reducing speed and idling engines in port not much other ideas have been put forward. The much advertised WAVE TO GO program was touted to save money but there have no reductions in visible personnel due to the tickets and in some terminals the machine is tapped over and you still have to get a printed receipt. How much has this system save today? Many manufacturing industries have totally automated warehouse loading and unloading systems (in the food industry for at least 20 years). An automated loading and unloading system would eliminate more than ¾ of the people now directing these operations. Only permitting new vessels to be manufactured by in state manufacturers is a Victorian subsidy that adds cost. A US wide bidding processes for new vessels could save considerable expenses. If the Ferry System is required by the legislature to subsidize local boat building industry, the state should make up the difference to subsidize the short fall (70% users) from operating budget using the biding funds difference from derived business or other taxes. A major labor issue is that those who direct the cars onto and on the ferry as well as off do not do any visible work functions during the travel over water (15 to 20 minutes depending on the weather). From the Clinton to Mukilteo run, we have observed these employees sitting in the passenger area while a different employee mops the floor and rarely if ever during the crossing does restocking in the Bathrooms. We use the restrooms in the crossing and 99% of the time the water to wash your hands is cold (only when the outside temperature is 90 degrees F is the water Luke warm. 50% of the time there are no paper towels or soap. Why can not the parking directors take care of cleaning and restocking of the bathrooms and mopping the floors during the crossing? It is obvious from the lengthy report that regardless of the growth in population and the needs of those who are served WSF, WSDOT is more concerned with maintaining its bureaucracy and outsourcing its responsibilities to counties. If the legislature and governor truly do not believe that the waters of Puget Sound are marine highways, then so be it! But they should be prepared to build bridges (or should I say tunnels to connect all the taxpayers on the islands to the government in Olympia. I am extremely disappointed in the lack of creativity and innovation in our state agencies, governor and state legislature. It appears we need a major change in leadership and direction in these very troubled times! Why can not the Ferry

Date Received	Comment
	system contract in the long term for diesel fuel? This is how SW Airlines has been able to compete with lower fairs than competition! The so called fuel charge approved by the state legislature for businesses is a joke. I paid a local supplier for soil $1.50 for 30 seconds and to start and stop the front end diesel loader for a scope full of soil. The few ounces of diesel probably cost a few cents at the most. If the State bureaucrats can accurately calculate a daily up charge for fuel it would be an impossible miracle. The cost charged would most likely support a special Fuel Charge Department filled with Bureaucrats. We believe you all should go back to the concept your are proposing and think outside of the bureaucratic and State establishment box for a more reasoned and equable solution.
01/17/09	I believe the plan to abandon this run is very short sighted and detrimental to not only our local economy, but to the state's economy. 116,000 people use this run! It brings millions of dollars of revenue to our state. Many Canadians have purchased homes in our area after experiencing Washington thanks to this ferry run. The plan to stop the run is not fiscally sound.
01/17/09	This is to register extreme disapproval for both plans proposed by the state ferry system. Neither plan addresses the urgent need for long-term funding for the ferry system; for the ferry system to continue to compete with funding for highways and bus/rail within the DOT budget is simply not right nor fair. Nevertheless, Plan A is preferable to Plan B which would be disastrous for the vitality and viability of the state ferry system. The state ferry system IS part of the state's highway system, as defined in Article II. Section 40 of the state constitution. The ferries constitute waterborne highways, not pleasure boats taking tourists and residents on adventures. I urge a more comprehensive and regional approach to transportation planning that reflects an understanding of the required connectivity among the Puget Sound communites, and funded by a comprehensive funding plan for the elements - ferry, highways, bridges, light rail, and other surface transit.
01/17/09	Thank you for the informative meeting on Jan. 15th at the Senior Center in Anacortes. It is apparent that the Legislature needs to "go back to the drawing board" and redesign the expenditures of our taxes and fees. To even think of stopping the Anacortes/Sidney Ferry run is ridiculous. The state and county taxes raised as well as the benefits to local businesses in Anacortes has apparently not been considered. Considering the 2010 Olympics and the revenue in taxes, fares, etc. will be considerable....why even consider closing it in 2009! Plan B is the only plan that was presented that could work for the state and local communities....but it sure needs a bit of "tweaking"! Thanks again, Jo Fuqua fuqua4@comcast.net
01/17/09	Was unable to attend any of the Ferries meeting, but would like to add a couple of comments. I live in Kingston. I walk on the Ferries often to get to Edmonds to take the train, bus or airport shuttle. Also for shopping and restaurants. Currently the bus and train schedules match up with the Ferries. My main concern is with Plan B that would cut service during the daytime hours. This would make getting to the Edmonds very difficult. I would rather see a reduction of service, possibly alternating the route with walk on ferries only. Would recommend there not be more than a two hour wait between car ferries. On rates. Of course I woul d not be in favor of an increase in fares, especially if there is a decrease in service. I used the three month passes for both walk on and car, but cannot now as I don't use the allotted amount in the time frame. I noticed other comments that the long term passes not have an expiration date or could be good for at least a year from the date of purchase. I am in favor of this. This would also be a way of not increasing seasonally rates for locals Residents. Would like to see a better plan for a reservation system. On the Kingston side, do not see how this would work as there are many times locals cannot get into town because of the line ups. Even if you had a reservation, you couldn't get through. If the State Patrol is monitoring, it might work, but there are not there all the time. I am aware of the planning for a ferry terminal in Kingston with shops, restaurants, etc. The potential for this does not seem feasible if day time service is cut. Money for this project would be better spent on improving service, not in new investments, in my opinion. I believe your primary focus should be on the ferries and service from dock to dock. What happens during approach, routes

Date Received	Comment
	etc, as antiquated as it, is some cases is secondary. In today's economy and with the current Washington State budget, secondary requests should be moved to long term planning when our State budget is back in the black.
01/17/09	Legislation in 2007 defined future service and investment decisions parameters for WSF. It is my belief that it is only through reengagement with our State Legislature that we can resolve the issues that I and other residents of the Kitsap Peninsula have with this plan. I have read and understand the planning requirements as follows - Planning requirements: get better information about "customers" travel improve forecasting for future needs develop cost management strategies improve quality and on-time requirements of service while managing costs review operations to improve asset utilization and manage costs Change level – of – service standards to fit current realities. 1. Having participated in the surveys that went out to the riding public, and been a vocal critic of these same as red flags for reduced service and increased costs to local residents who commute on the ferries every day, I believe that information collection for the WSF was flawed and though it will be expensive, this information gathering must be revisited. Social Research of this nature needs to be randomized. Also, it is not clear that the number of responses as a subset of overall ridership is truly a representative sample. 2. The Puget Sound region is predicted to continue to grow in terms of population and in economic strength. Beyond predictions regarding the number of people and the number of jobs, a third consideration – how to maintain the environmental health of the region – must be considered. No forecast for transportation needs that does not address the WSF as a member of mass transit and public transit is complete. IT IS NOT clear that this plan attempts to engage the WSF as a public transit agency as well as a vital part of our state highway system that must be maintained. 3. Costs will increase – Funding issues for the WSF must be revisited and the entire State of Washington must be made aware that the Kitsap Peninsula and the Olympic Peninsula are just as big, and vital to the state's overall economic health as Eastern Washington. Highway passes must be maintained in the winter, passage across the Puget Sound must be maintained all-year-round. This is not an optional tourist route and should not ever be spoken of as a system that can by cut out of the budget. a. Discussion of tolls should be added to the discussion regarding the cost of maintaining the mountain passes, the 520 and I90 bridges and all other highway infrastructures at the same usage rate as is paid for by WSF users. Fairness may not be written into the language currently in use, but all citizens of the state must consider the cost of state infrastructure in light of the common good, not in light only of their daily route. If the goal is cost control versus transportation then the entire system should be measured by the same rules. 4. Improving the quality and on-time performance within current funding parameters appears to be an impossible goal. The system is going to fail, just as the Viaduct is predicted to fail and it is highly likely that Washington State Voters will continue to debate the problem until the next boat is taken out of service by the Coast Guard or a major accident destroys life and property. However it is the responsibility of the State Legislature to push for solutions to these problems before catastrophic failure occurs. It appears that our current legislature lacks the will to take a hard stance other than the one of allowing the current situation to worsen. 5. This is an area where I have no experience or expertise but I do have an opinion, which is to revisit Union agreements and see where private sector management practices can be applied. Pain needs to be spread around before everyone is willing to come to the table as equals in this issue. 6. Plan B appears to be what we will get based on the current economic situation unless the entire funding structure to the WSF is revisited. Go back, raise the issue loudly across the state, and make it clear that all the agencies have to work together in order to maintain one of the major transportation arteries of the state.
01/17/09	Plan A is the only one that makes sense. Reservations will be very unfair. Cut backs will destroy our economy. WE pay taxes to support roads and highways and the ferry is our highway. THINK about all the citizens of this state as you may be forcing many of us to move and thereby reducing your tax base.

Date Received	Comment
01/17/09	My commute from Kingston to downtown Seattle begins with the 5:45 boat to Edmonds. As we arrive at the dock in Edmonds, about 6:10, a south bound Sound Transit Train is departing at 6:11 from the Edmonds terminal. The next train is 30 minutes, a cold wait in the winter. In the afternoon on my return, the 4:30 ferry to Kingston is leaving the dock just as a North bound Sound Transit train is arriving at the Edmonds Station 4:30. Another 45 minute cold wait for the 5:15, if its on time. What I fail to see in Plan A or Plan B is any strategy whereby you expect to improve the revenues. WSDOT's approach is just cost cutting and not on methods of increasing ridership and improving revenues. WSDOT's strategy should be improving coordination and partnering with other state and local transportation agencies in an effort to help increase ridership. Last year it was proposed by WSDOT to begin a schedule that coordinated with three trains in the morning and three trains in the afternoon while cutting out some runs during the day. This was the right approach and why it was abandoned I fail to see. Finally, I fail to see why Washington State Ferries aren't treated as part of the highway system. They have put us on an island without federal funding by limiting our ability to tap much needed financial support. The "Buy Washington" must be dropped immediately. I can just see WSDOT buying trains and buses from Todd Ship Yards.
01/17/09	I am a permanent resident of Whidbey Island and I am very unhappy with the long rage plan with one exception and that is giving locals the responsibility for passenger only ferries. Beyond that it is bad. Washington state waters, islands and the Olympic Peninsula are major out of state tourist draws and more importantly, major recreation areas for the people of Washington and the Puget Sound general population in particular. These attractions are the major reason many people live here in this region. To limit access to these areas is short sighted and will boomerang and in the meantime you are choking the communities which are dependent on ferry service. Don't limit peak season service on the Muk/Clint route. Have two ferries on the Keystone/PT run. Get some savings out of the ferry union people. These aren't longshoremen. Get tough. Use the gas tax fairly, for the entire state transportation system, not just highways. Do not plan to choke us with fare increases anymore then you would a highway driver.
01/17/09	We strongly support sustaining the Anacortes-Sydney ferry run as a key to the economic engine of this region and the state of Washington. This ferry service is a significant key to many businesses and services for tourism and local economy that would greatly change should we lose this valuable service.
01/17/09	1. I am a resident of Orcas Island but unfortunately did not have the ability to attend the "floating meeting" that occurred on Thursday of this past week. I have read the Long Range Planning Document and have a few comments: The vehicle planning projections for the San Juan Island are way too high. Inherently the current residents and the County Council tend to discourage development in the San Juans. Lack of good year-round employment opportunities, the high cost of development etc will discourage future growth of residents. In fact, the WSF high cost of service reality provides a basis for further discouraging growth. That should not be interpreted as an anti-growth position on my part. Just the reality that many people cannot and will not be able to afford to live here. With the high cost of providing a marine highway, perhaps it is a good idea not to encourage growth by providing reasonably priced, convenient vehicle ferries. I recommend using a more modest growth projection and in high demand periods, pricing non-local, non-commercial traffic at an even higher fare differential to capitalize on the tourist market. That would reduce your capital requirements. The Anacortes Terminal project, at least as far as the Terminal Building was concerned was way over the top The existing cafe cannot economically operate long hours year round so adding more capacity is not required. In fact it discourages local non-terminal facilities (evidenced by the current lack of any other food service operating in the terminal vicinity). The terminal modifications that were proposed at the time do not consider reservation system which would, as your study indicates reduce the demand for holding areas. You may need to spend $$$ on vessel berthing areas but the terminal is a waste of money. Paint and repair what you have! 2. Introducing a reservation system would be an excellent idea. I tend to travel off-island almost every week and if I knew that I had a spot on a certain sailing, I could be much

Date Received	Comment
	more effective in the use of my time and have less anxiety over whether I will make it onto a specific sailing. I for one would be willing to pay a modest fee for that ability. I think that you could charge a more substantial fee during the summer peak season to capture those folks that are adamant that they want to be on the 600PM sailing on Friday evening from Anacortes. Let them pay for that luxury! Regardless of free or non-free reservations, space always need to be available for medical emergencies and those who's physical conditions do not align with extended waiting periods. 3. While I am retired and not living lavishly, I do feel the ferry system frequent travel discounts to the San Juans provide good value. I think the summer surcharge could be significantly increased for this route without significant impact. You could focus that increase on vehicle and drivers. Do not penalize regular commercial delivery vehicles. If costs escalate higher on the islands, that encourages more people to shop on the mainland, thereby driving up vehicular traffic. 4. Personally I favor discontinuing the Sydney ferry service although I am not necessarily advocating dropping a summer boat from the San Juans. Perhaps it would result in fewer runs by existing vessels or fleet sizing. Discontinuing Sydney means the double standard for vessel equipment required for International Sailings ceases which should provide you better flexibility, the Border Patrol station at Anacortes can disappear, etc. Victoria Clipper or another might then decide to expand some passenger only service connecting the San Juans with Victoria. 5. Most residents who board a ferry to and from the San Juans do not worry about the speed of the vessel. Whether the run to/from Orcas is 50 minutes or 1 hour and 20 minutes is insignificant. What is important is knowing that you can get on the vessel without showing up 1-4 hours in advance. Does that provide more flexibility in using winter weekend type schedules were more "all-stops" runs are made increasing the likelihood of obtaining a full sailing? 6. The WSF is part of the highway system. Just this past week, the Governor signed onto to a wild spending spree in Seattle with the viaduct replacement set to go underground. Oh what is another $400 million (if it can be achieved on budget). If the legislature can find that extra money on top of all the rest of their share, they can certainly fund the ferry system. 7. Shifting responsibility (and funding issues) to other governmental agencies (County?) is not the solution. Perhaps privatization should be considered with the state providing a subsidy in return for certain required service levels. A new operator could eliminate the inefficient and costly union issues and have other efficiencies. Why is privatization not on the table as an option?
01/16/09	I am sure you understand that in WA State the ferry system is part of the highway system? It needs to be funded from the same tax sources as roads. The ferry system is not just a curious tourist attraction. To reduce or eliminate ferry service anywhere in the State makes no more sense than to put a gate across I-90 and highway #2 at their respective summits and inform the residents of Eastern WA that the State just can't afford to maintain these highways 24/7 anymore and they will have to be closed at night or reduced to just one lane of traffic. Maybe, just maybe, the State needs to rethink how it funds transportation throughout the entire State and not separate modes of transport for individual funding. Since we ferry riders already pay a toll for use why not add tolls to all major highways to provide resources for maintenance and expansion of all transportation elements across the entire State? Keep the big picture in mind. Don't carve up, cut out, isolate and reduce systems down to what you think you can afford to fund with the current narrow vision of transportation systems.
01/16/09	Please, please adopt Plan A for the San Juan Island ferry service. The lifeblood of the islands is dependent on at least keeping service at the current levels. Thank you.

Date Received	Comment
01/16/09	I vote to keep service at it's current level (plan A) I managed the Sandpiper Condos this past summer and a lot of or guest went to Canada and then spent 2 to 3 days on our island before returning to the mainland. The revenue spent at our condos and other places in town is vital to our economy. My other issue is the fact that our wave to go tickets expire to soon. They should be good for at the very least six months. Even thou we go to the mainland for doctors visits we only go about once every two months.
01/16/09	I understood that the Ferry system was part of the State highway system and that a part of our gasoline tax goes toward funding the State highways. How much of the State Highway Budget goes toward the Ferry system? It sounds like "none." The ferry is the only highway most of us actually get to USE. I've lived on San Juan island since 1983 and I have always had issues with the way we are treated versus the residents on Bainbridge and Vashon. I've always had a limited income as a single parent raising two children and working for a wage of one third what I could earn on the mainland. Most of my friends are far from rich and yet we are the ones who get the service cuts and rate increases. At least Bainbridge and Vashon folks have an option—they can drive around. We have no option and get it stabbed to us every time you guys screw up your budget!
01/16/09	Interestingly enough I have talked to people from all areas of the U.S over the years who all have expressed their appreciation of Washington State and its natural beauty. Most of these people have specifically and especially loved their ferry ride from Anacortes through the San Juans on their way to Victoria B.C. This ferry run has been and should continue to be a tourism highlight to our state and to this region. It not only brings tourist dollars to the state and to our region, it is a public relations bonanza, especially with the Winter Olympics coming in 2010. Our state needs to cut spending all right; however this cut would be counter productive.
01/16/09	I am a member of the Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee, a commuter, a Washington State Ferry customer since 1959, and my family has been residing most of the time in Kitsap County since 1910. The Sidney service has operated for 85 years. It should not be eliminated. We would not tear up highways to border crossings, and WSDOT is actually doubling train service by Amtrak Cascades to Vancouver. The Sidney run needs to be managed better with improved marketing and particularly competitive pricing. It is a convenient service for Washington residents and a big tourist magnet for Skagit and San Juan counties. Reducing Port Townsend-Keystone to one vessel would shift excess traffic to Edmonds-Kingston which has no way of accommodating additional traffic during peak periods. Service reductions at Mukilteo and Edmonds would not change the requirements for the number of vessels. I do not understand why these service reductions were included in Plan B. Edmonds-Kingston needs a third vessel during peak summer periods. It would operate in the black, and help the bottom line of the whole system, as well as being a stimulus to the economy of the region and improving accessibility for all. There is no reason why a third vessel cannot operate. It has been done many times. There have been up to five vessels on the run in 1967. The delays due to the trains can be mitigated by careful scheduling and speedier loading. Vessels should load a predetermined set of vehicles and sail immediately without wasting five minutes on the last few spaces at the stern. Reduction of service at Bremerton and Vashon Island would choke our region. Given the economic reality, every vessel in the fleet should operate a minimum of 80 years before being retired. We need hard figures about what this would cost compared to the cost of newbuildings. There are well known examples such as Black Ball Ferry Line at Port Angeles and the Lake Champlain ferries in Vermont-New York. Their vessels are operated for many, many years through careful maintenance. Property values, commerce, and communities of interest are all at stake. Plan B is a disaster and Plan A is inadequate. I believe in regard to viaduct planning that there is also a budget shortfall, yet the plan was announced and is going forward with exploration how to finance it. The same has to be done with Washington State Ferries.

Date Received	Comment
01/16/09	Comments from the FAC Executive Committee on Washington State Ferries Long-Range Plan The state ferry system in Washington is a key icon of our state - more popular than the Space Needle on tourist souvenirs; certainly one of our most popular tourist attractions. More than that, however, it is a key component of our economic vitality, and critical to the economic future of the counties that are served, directly or indirectly by those ferries. We represent the users of those ferries, the people that ride them every day. And we are very concerned about their future – and ours – by the direction expressed in this draft long-range plan. Plan B results from a lack of leadership at the state level. It was developed at the last possible minute with no involvement from either the FACs or the local communities impacted by what is proposed. It makes significant cuts in service without considering how those cuts will affect those communities. It assumes that local governments will take up some of the slack by offering passenger only service, without estimating either the cost of such service or suggesting how such service would be funded. Despite repeated requests by the FACs, there has been no attempt, by WSF, the Transportation Commission, nor the Legislature, to evaluate the economic impact of either Plan A or B, although the impacts would be considerable, both at the individual as well as community level. It ignores the long-range growth plans of those communities, and despite the supposed integration of WSF with WDOT, it does not consider how the plan affects traffic patterns and growth. For the last two years we have been told that this planning process would come up with a ferry system that could be sustained over the long term. Plan B does not do that. If the goal was to avoid the transfer of funds from the Transportation budget, it doesn't accomplish that; it still requires a transfer of $1.4 billion from the MVET over the life of the plan. But it is also not sustainable from the standpoint of asset management. WSF currently operates a fleet of 20 owned and one leased vehicle ferry. The majority are 30 or more years old. For the past year the Ferry System has operated on the thin edge. A large part of the time there have been no backup vessels available to fill in if there is a problem with a vessel. This means that most runs will have a 50%, or greater, cut in service should one vessel require emergency repairs. The Super, or old 144 class, vessels are 40 years old. The Elwha has already suffered a drive motor failure causing a 12 month outage. The Kaleetan has at least one drive motor that is failing. One can only guess at the status of the Hyak. Currently the Ferry system is rushing maintenance on the larger vessels to keep the ferry system afloat, but they are undoubtedly stretching the timeline on some maintenance. We are just a fraction away from a major impact. If we were to start construction today to replace the 144s, this will continue, and increase, for at least the next 3 years. To extend the construction schedule out any length of time places all ferry customers at risk. The recommendations of the Cedar River Group on vessel size and timing are ludicrous. Using a fleet comparison with North Carolina where the largest vessel is only marginally bigger than the Washington State Ferry's smallest vessel does no good. Passenger service is highly regulated compared to cargo vessel service. Everything must be in order for the vessel to depart if it has passengers. The building of new boats should take priority, and it doesn't in Plan B. After the completion of the Island Home boat that has already been contracted for, no new boats would be built until 2021! As described above, this is not sustainable. We believe that actions can be taken to ensure that the needed boats are built: 1. Improve the efficiency of WSF, especially in regards to the design process for the boats. Much of this should be contracted out, with a smaller in-house staff, reducing the cost of the boats. 2. Shift priorities for capital expenditures to boats from terminals, except where terminal expenditures are needed for safety or for asset protection. For example, over $22 million of terminal improvements related to transit are proposed for the Bainbridge terminal. None result in actually increasing transit service itself. Use that money to build new boats and enhance actual service. 3. Change the "Build in Washington" law to allow for out-of-state bids. This would not only increase competition, but also allow the state to use federal stimulus funds, reducing the impact on state funding. The above actions can all be taken with no transfer of funds, but such transfer will still be needed, which brings us to the fact that the ferry system is part of the State Highway system, and deserves sustainable state support, as any other part of that highway system. The Governor talked in her recent campaign of "One Washington", but on this side of the water we are not feeling like that includes us. If you look at the allocation of highway funding, the counties on this side consistently give more than they get. To say "There is no money" begs the

Date Received	Comment
	question. Did Paula Hammond respond in that manner when I-5 flooded, or I-90 was closed due to snow or mud slides? Are Bellevue residents told that when improvements to I-405 are planned? If the ferries are not going to get the support they need, perhaps the growth targets for Kitsap, Jefferson and Island Counties should be negative, and instead all residents and businesses should be encouraged to move away to eliminate the need for state support. Because in truth, that is the long-run effect of Plan B. We suggest that WSF take more time to vet this plan with local governments before submitting it to the Legislature, and to involve them in a more collaborative process. But in any event, we do not believe that Plan B is sustainable, and we do not support it. Signed: FAC Executive
01/16/09	My name is Richard Riddell. I have called Anacortes my home for thirty years, and am the Anacortes Town Crier (a position where I dress up like Ben Franklin and try my best to bring excitement to our civic events). It has been my pleasure and honor to be included in the ceremonies marking the Spring inaugural run of the Anacortes/Sidney ferry. The ceremonies, held on the Sidney dock, are attended by political and business leaders from both cities and the San Juan Islands, as well as WSF officials and Sister Cities members (Anacortes and Sidney naturally are Sister Cities). The ceremonies have been very festive, and I am allowed a cry to mark the occasion. I thought it might be useful to forward a copy of my cry from last year to speak to the importance this Ferry Route holds for us Islanders. I appreciate your indulgence in including it as testimony for support of our International Ferry. The cry: Oyez, oyez, oyez Fellow North Americans!! We are here to celebrate the return of this link that connects our islands and our countries; to express our unabashed delight in it; and, most importantly, to renew the friendship that exists now and forever between our peoples. How lucky are we to have this quick and easy way to come together. This ship most handedly exists as a metaphor for a bridge that defeats division and isolation leading to understanding and compassion and friendship. Would that the rest of humanity had a ship as capable as ours. God Save your Queen! And God Bless the enduring friendship between the great countries of Canada and the United States of America!
01/16/09	My name is Chris Kendall, I am the owner of a local pizza place in Anacortes called Westside Pizza. I think the added business coming from the international ferry helps my business exponently. thank you for your time and consideration
01/16/09	I am an Anacortes resident, having moved here 6 years ago. We have lived all over the world, and moved to Anacortes for the natural beauty, the sense of community, and access to B.C. and Seattle. Our favorite destination in B.C. is Victoria, and love the ferry ride through Sidney. We make the trip with many visitors to our home.If the ferry run is eliminated, we would not make the drive up I5 or via Port Angeles; we would no longer visit Sidney/Victoria. I am a Realtor, and my wife donates time at the Chamber Visitirs` Center. Both of us are struck by how many people we meet who visit Anacortes are headed to Victoria. The economic impact to Anacortes and Sidney has been well documented by the "save the ferry" group. Anacortes is at a crossroads. Our retail establishments (restaurants, etc) are struggling to survive, even in a more positive economic climate. Virtually every restaurant in town is for sale. We need to stimulate economic growth, and our waterfront and ferry access to the San Juans and B.C. are critical to that growth. Eliminating the ferry run could be lethal to our economic health. We must not elimminate the Sidney ferry run.

Date Received	Comment
01/16/09	Comments on the long range planning for Washington State Ferries. Listed below are comments that I sent to the Transportation Chair. I have great concern with the direction as has been written about in recent news articles. A additional concern is that projections are 22 years in the future which indicates monumental shortfalls, is this a scare tactic to the public? Why don't the projected shortfall look at the short term as well as long term? Any future construction of ferries should be competitively bid and not be awarded solely to Washington entities. Is the legislative body of this state so beholding to union interests that we can not or will not look outside to save the taxpayers money. The recent article indicates that similar ferries of being build at substantially lesser cost than can be built by Todd Shipyards. $32 Million vs. $65, how can you in good conscience justify such a large discrepancy? ----- Original Message ----- Dear Transportation Committee Chair Haugen: I have great concern with the direction of the Washington State Ferries. 1. Granted the Ferry System is in need of added funds. Yet they are not a part of the highway system, they need to be. Gas taxes are collected to build and maintain Washington State Highways thru out the state, users of the Ferry System pay those taxes yet none go to Washington State Ferries. Why can't a part of the Gas Taxes be used for the Ferry System? 2. Why the Washington State Ferries pay a state fuel tax. 3. Why does the Washington State Toll collection still use paper receipts and Wave To Go pre paid tickets and not change any of it's labor intensive means at the toll stations? We should take the lead from the Tacoma Narrows methods of collection. Why not issue RF Technology with scanners and get rid of all the labor intensive costs. There has to be a better way. 4. I understand that the administrative costs of the Ferry System are one of the biggest drain of funds, bureaucratic, inefficient, and too many people. Has this reviewed recently? 5. Washington State Ferries wants to reduce the number of Ferries to reduce cost, yet they should be doing just the opposite and increase to add ridership. 6. It is most peoples feeling that Washington State Ferries holds a large amount of informational gathering meetings, a lot of ideas but they only seem to hear what they want hear. 7. We need some innovative forward thinking solutions from our elected legislative leadership.
01/16/09	The only workable solution for fixing this poorly managed situation is to simply get the funding for the equipment that is required to make the system work. The ferry service at Southworth has been poorly managed and has not worked properly for the 14 years I have ridden it. Every run turns away cars, yet there are never statistics collected. Why is this? There are more needs, not less. The ferry system is a mass transit project- equal in importance to the viaduct/tunnel, the 520 bridge or any number of added HOT lanes that have been dumped on the people of this county. Those are NOT generally mass transit systems and yet are funded. While King county is an exporter of taxes, so is Kitsap, as evident by the state website. To conclude: neither of the current plans fit the needs of the region which require more boats that fulfill the mission of the transportation system.
01/15/09	I do not support Plan 'B' in any way. This is a backward step for any service and future plan. I only support plan 'A' as it is the remaining option, but not an acceptable one. The Ferry system is now and has always been part of the highway system of Washington State. As our counties severed by any Ferry grow just like any county or city that part of the infrastructures need to grow and keep up with the needs of the population. To not include any plan for future replacement or capital funding in the WSDOT transportation budget now or in the past is not meeting the responsibilities of state government. Pulling state funding out and then leaving it up to the local communities does not distribute the taxes collected for state roads fairly to all users or possible users. I urge you to include Ferries within the Highway system, fund them as you would any roadway, and allocate maintenance funding as needed. Washington State has a unique need for a Ferry system which has been in existence longer than many of the other major highway projects currently under consideration. Kitsap county population has increased just like King county. We do not have less demand for transportation. We need to keep at least the service we have had at a minimum with plans now for replacement of the existing boats as required. We should not abandon Ferry service because past administrations have not had the foresight to plan for the future. Please fund Ferries with maintenance cost, future boat replacement planning, and do not cut current service.

Date Received	Comment
01/15/09	II would like to file my protest against returning the Hiyu to full time service on the Point Defiance/Vashon run. I was living on the island when it was built many years ago when it was built for this particular run At that time we were happy to get it. However, after a few years it was too small for the run and we were given a larger one. Now to return it to the run makes no sense at all. On almost every trip there are overloads. I am 94 and go to my island home twice a week. The rest of the time I live in a Tacoma retirement home. It is a terrible inconvenience to go to the ferry dock almost an hour early just to be sure to get on the boat. Please ask the Governor to let us keep the Rhody and maybe she can find somewhere else to save money.
01/15/09	1. Washington State Ferries are a part of the Washington State Highway system and need to be funded as such. Separate capital from operation/maintenance expenses. Get the legislature to find the funding. Increase the gasoline tax if necessary. Maintaining a portion of the State Highway system should not be passed on to Kitsap County, which does not have monies to underwrite this State obligation. 2. West-sound residents, businesses, and cross-sound commuters are being unfairly singled out to directly pay in the form of tolls for this part of the highway system. For example, users do not directly pay for the extensive highway system in eastern Washington, snow removal expenses in the passes, repair of flood damaged roads and bridges. In addition, some runs (such as Edmonds/Kingston) pay more than 100% of the cost to operate/maintain this run in tolls. It is unfair to force these users to subsidize other runs. 3. The proposed Plan B is totally inadequate to support even today's cross-sound traffic requirements, not to mention those expected by the year 2030. Scrap Plan B. 4. Plan A (today's service level) should be the minimum bottom line alternative proposal (i.e. the new Plan B), as it will itself be hard pressed to meet the needs of 2030. 5. A new Plan A should be developed. It should be designed to handle the projected regional traffic growth through 2030 (40% growth per study estimate). This should be the starting point that is presented to the legislature. Anything less is short sighted. 6. The ridership decrease seen since 1999 is due to people driving less with higher gas prices and to the accelerated increase in ferry tolls. Continuing to raise tolls will increase the number of drivers going around the sound, leading to higher gasoline consumption and pollution. This is in direct contradiction of other State goals. 7. Forget the reservation system. This is an unnecessary frill that will incur more overhead costs, require additional holding areas, and create confusion. The last round of changes that was supposed to reduce administrative costs (i.e. toll booth personnel) and speed up toll collection, has if anything slowed down the boarding process and has not reduced staffing. 8. Keep the multi-use discounted fares and give large vehicles a discount for using off-peak runs. 9. Elimination of weekday late evening runs to Bainbridge and Kingston is unacceptable. Any reduction in ferry service will negatively impact commuters, attendance at cultural/sporting events, west sound businesses, property values and taxes collected, access to the Olympic Peninsula, and will encourage people to either move out of Kitsap County or drive to the Seattle area through Tacoma (increasing highway use/congestion, increasing gas useage and air pollution).
01/15/09	The state needs to assess the value of ferry highways and the impact of reduced service on western Washington counties and cities. Because the reasons why ridership dropped despite increased population since 1999, this unknown factor could help with providing service and fare increases. When asked, non-riders say they would use vehicles to ride ferries if the cost was the same as the Tacoma-Narrows bridge. East-west travel across Puget Sound would surely improve business on both sides if vehicle fares were similar to bridge tolls. Because the ferries serve as transit service, foot passenger fares could be subsizied as well as increased. It is vehicle fares that are too expensive.
01/16/09	I was unable to attend the public comment meeting on Vashon last week because I was waiting for the ferry in Southworth. I got back to the island around 8:00 pm. I am a part time ferry commuter and am writing to object to the proposed cuts in service. I commute once a week on the Point Defiance run and have already experienced 2 and 3 hour wait times when the smaller, Hiyu ferry is in operation. I also commute to Southworth periodically and have to contend with the already sporadic ferry service on that run. Many Islanders will no longer be able to live on Vashon if they are unable to get to and from work in a reasonable amount of time. I think most of us would agree that a 4-6 hour daily commute is unreasonable. I also work on Vashon at the Vashon Health Center where we rely on "off-islanders" to staff many of the positions in our clinic. We have people who commute on all three ferry runs.

Date Received	Comment
	(Southworth, Point Defiance and Fauntleroy). Our clinic could not stay in operation without these staff members. I suspect many would no longer be willing to commute to their jobs on Vashon if they had longer ferry waits. I also object to the reservation system. As a physician, my schedule is always unpredictable. It would not seem fair to me that I would have to wait even longer to get on a ferry home because others had reservations and could board ahead of me. I urge you not to cut our service. The ferry is our "highway" to the mainland. I am willing to pay higher ferry fares and higher state taxes for transportation issues. I would love to see a repeal of Tim Eyman's car tab initiative which got us in to this mess.
01/15/09	Based on numerous conversations with the crew of the Rhododendron over ten years of commuting, it's become clear to me that there is simply no reason why that boat needs to be replaced--unless, of course, the Coast Guard shuts it down. Attached to this message is a detailed description of all the arguments why WSF should simply devote the funds to maintaining the Rhododendron according to the maintenance schedule recommended by its crew. My understanding is that if it is maintained properly, there is NO REASON why it needs to be replaced. The Pt. Defiance-Vashon run is one of the few places where WSF could actually avoid major expenditures over the next decade. Please keep the Rhody on that run and devote your boat-building funding to other routes! Thank you for reading this. Thank you, Secretary Hammond, for taking the time to come to Vashon to hear our concerns about the ferry system. I am here to urge...no, to beg you to require the Washington State Ferry system to reconsider its current plan to remove the Rhododendron from its current service between the south end of Vashon and Pt. Defiance sometime over the next 5-10 years. Such a plan makes little sense--from either an environmental, an operational, or a financial standpoint. At the very minimum, the ferry system needs to make a much more persuasive case to the taxpayers for their plan to scrap the Rhody than it has done to date. Just last week, Governor Gregoire signed into law legislation that requires the State of Washington to reduce its emissions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020. This means that we need to REDUCE the number of cars on the road, not increase them. Meeting this goal will mean building more capacity, more routes, and better connectivity into our PUBLIC TRANSIT SYSTEM--NOT building bigger boats. The money that the taxpayers are being asked to spend on a bigger boat to replace the Rhody should, instead, be spent on providing more convenient and frequent bus service to the south end of Vashon, and to Pt. Defiance. Among other measures, this should involve adding a Metro bus route down the west side of Vashon, and an express bus route from Pt. Defiance to downtown Tacoma--as well as more frequent service with better connectivity to all ferry trips. Experience has shown that the commuters off the south end of Vashon exhibit a tremendous amount of flexibility in their ability to use carpools, public transit or other means to leave their cars at home when they have to. Not surprisingly, when a smaller boat appears on this route, overloads do begin to occur--but they also dissipate over time, indicating that people DO figure out other ways of getting to and from the ferry when it becomes necessary. The increased demand for car space that the ferry system is using to justify its plan for a new boat is thus HIGHLY flexible. Despite many letters and conversations with officials in the ferry system, we have heard little, if any inclination on their part to work with public transit to get people out of their cars. You, however, have the power to TELL the ferry system that they HAVE to work with Metro and Pierce Transit to get people out of their cars--rather than simply proposing to build bigger boats. The solution to this problem MUST involve SYSTEMIC approaches that focus on the entire transit system--rather than simply isolated decisions made by one component of the system. Getting rid of the Rhody also makes little sense from an operational standpoint. Yes, of course the Rhody is an old boat. However, through many conversations over the past decade with the folks who work on the boat--including deck hands AND boat captains--I've learned that the Rhody is, in fact, built so well, and is so simple to repair, that with proper maintenance, it could run--and continue to be repaired when necessary--indefinitely. Unfortunately, though, over the past decade, the ferry system has apparently failed to provide the level of maintenance that the folks who actually run the boat have been saying is required in order to keep the Rhody in top running order--ostensibly because of I-695 funding cuts. This self-fulfilling prophesy of the impending demise of the Rhody is, of course, bad enough--but if the ferry system claims to not have enough money to keep the Rhody in top shape, how is it that they'll have the money to build a new boat? Either way, we taxpayers will have to pay the bill. So, why is it that the ferry system is not REQUIRED to PROVE to the taxpayers of this state that paying for what the BOAT CREWS would consider to be an adequate maintenance schedule--i.e., the schedule that was in place before I-695 hit--would cost MORE than replacing the boat altogether? This business of treating boats as disposable goods--rather than valuable assets that can last indefinitely if properly cared for--has got to stop. So, I'm here to beg you to require the ferry system to PROVE to you and the taxpayers of this state that replacing the Rhody with a new boat would, in fact, represent a LESS expensive alternative than the cost of increasing the scope, frequency and connectivity of the buses that now serve Tahlequah and Pt. Defiance. If the ferry system cannot demonstrate

Date Received	Comment
	this, then their plan to get rid of the Rhody must be STOPPED, and the money that would have gone to building a new boat should be RE-DIRECTED toward improving public transit to persuade people to get out of their cars. If we're as serious about reducing our greenhouse gas emissions in this state as the legislation passed last week seems to imply, replacing the Rhody with a bigger boat is clearly a step in the WRONG direction. According to the people who work with this wonderful boat on a daily basis--and thus know her best--if properly maintained, the Rhody can continue to service the south end of Vashon INDEFINITELY. I urge you to do whatever you can to allow her to do so. Thank you for your time.
	As residents of Vashon Island, we are very concerned about the proposed long range plan for the Washington State Ferry System. We rely on the ferry system on a daily basis for transportation on and off the island. As owners of a business in West Seattle, we are dependent on the ferries to get to and from work. Our West Seattle veterinary hospital employs nearly 30 people, several who are island residents in addition to ourselves, and we serve many clients from the island who bring their pets to our clinic while they are at work in Seattle. In additon to work related trips, we frequently travel off island on the ferry system for shopping, visits to friends and family, and medical appointments. Without reliable, frequent ferry service on and off the island, we would be forced to move both our home and our business out of state. We understand economic times are tough and the legislature is faced with having to make hard decisions regarding funding state services. However, choosing to help balance the budget by cutting ferry service would be a disservice to island residents who rely on the ferry system as part of the state transportation system. Currently, Vashon has high property values and resident incomes which provide a lot of tax dollars to the state. Cutting ferry service drastically ultimately would lead to decreased revenues as island businesses closed and residents moved out of the area. It is our understanding that part of the reason the cost of new vessel construction is so high is that current law requires the boats to be built in Washington State. We would like to see this changed so that more competitive bids could be obtained and so that the ferry system would have more access to federal transportation funds for the ferry system. This could help off set some of the costs of replacing older boats. During the fourteen years we have been island residents we have seen the ferry fares steadily rise with no increase in service. While not ideal, Proposed Plan A helps maintain the current level of service to the island and would be an acceptable solution to the need to replace aging boats. Proposed Plan B would severely cut service and make it difficult us to remain on the island. In addition to restricting our ability to get to and from work, it would probably lead to the closing of numerous island businesses, which would in turn make us more dependent on the ferries for off island services and shopping. For these reasons, we urge the legislature to support Long Range Plan A for the Washington State Ferry System.
01/16/09	I wanted to write my input on the WSF Long Range Plan. I would have loved to attend a public meeting, however there was only an inter island and Friday Harbor meeting. Work obligations prohibited me from participating during normal business hours and now meeting was scheduled on Orcas. Therefore, I'm forced to write my comments on e-mail to the best of my ability. While I understand budget gaps and economic challenges we are all facing, I wanted to write in support of the San Juan County Council Letter explaining concerns, limitations on Plan A as well as the rejection of Plan B. Having seen the statistics regarding the survey sample, I was greatly disappointed in the pool of surveys taken. The majority of the surveys were done in counties other than San Juan. For those surveys conducted in San Juan, the largest percentage was in the summer. There is no question in my mind that the research conducted was flawed and a clear picture of the needs of the year-round residents in San Juan County was not captured. Though I understand the reservation system, I do not support it. I believe it creates more work for the staff (not less) and discourages tourism or spontaneous trips along ferry routes (it is not an easy system to operate). Traffic and other obstacles can cause missed reservations and increased frustration among residents and tourists alike. I also don't believe that enough exploration has been placed in finding additional funding sources within the ferry system nor our percentage of the highway funds being allocated to our "highway". Rather than go on , again, I endorse the letter from the San Juan County Council. I highly recommend that careful attention be placed when re-evaluating the San Juan Island Routes. I do endorse the elimination of the Sidney Run.

Date Received	Comment
01/15/09	We are unable to participate in Thursday's meeting onboard the inter-island ferry. However, we want you to know that we strongly support Option A of the Draft Long-Range Plan for the reasons stated in the January 13 letter to you from the San Juan County Council. We question why the State would reduce the ferry to the San Juans/Sidney, when there is no discussion of cutting costs, such as the reduction of snow removal equipment at Snoqualmie Pass, opening the 520 bridge during storms regardless of traffic needs to eliminate employee expense, or similar transportation expenses. The San Juan ferries are a necessity for travel and the service must be maintained and improved.
01/14/09	Instead of cutting the subject ferry run, why not charge the users enough to cover the cost? In the mid-'70's I understood this was the only run that operated in the black. What happen?
01/14/09	The ferries are over water highways and they should receive the full support of our Legislature. As a citizen who lives west of Puget Sound and depends on the ferries to reach many of the areas east of the Sound I am appalled that the Governor and the Legislature is willing to just cut off our major transportation system. They would never consider closing the bridge to Mercer Island after 6pm or say that I-90 or Route 2 can only operate from 6am to 6pm or close lanes but they think that citizens living west of Puget Sound can be cut off from their major means of transportation at that time or reduce their crossing. I travel to Edmonds and Lynnwood several times a month. I then have family or friends pick me up or use public transportation. If there are no ferries after 6pm I will be stranded at the dock or have to limit my visit. My family and friends who live east and north of Puget Sound often use the Kingston Ferry to visit. If Plan B is put into effect they will be denied access to their family and friends for any events that occurs after 6pm or have to spend 4+ hours driving all the way around Kitsap, Peirce, and King County rather then take a 30 minute ferry ride. You cannot reduce the evening ferry runs in Kingston. I am also concerned about eliminating frequent fares, senior fares, plus increases in regular fares. There are thousands of commuters who depend on this ferry to provide transportation to their jobs. Many need ferries that run after 6pm. There are also many ferry riders who travel to places east of Puget Sound for entertainment. They will be stranded if there are no evening ferries or chose to limit attendance at events across the waters. Maybe it's time for other areas of the state to pay their share of travel to and from the Seattle area. Why is it only Kitsap County that has to pay a toll or a ferry to travel out of its area? If you have to vote now please consider Plan A. Then reconsider how important the marine highway system is to the economic and emotional health of West Sound residents and develop a viable and reliable ferry system.
01/14/09	Having suggested this previously with no visible success or response and without any follow-up by me I am forwarding it one more time for consideration at a time which may be more favorable for further investigation and consideration . First some background to support . I am a retired Ferry employee and served as one of the Chief Engineers on MV Evergreen State for several years on the Anacortes to Sidney run , so I am familiar with the times of travel to and from Sidney. In September 2004 I had the occasion to travel from Bar Harbor Maine to Nova Scotia and return on the High Speed Cat Ferry . While onboard I noted an area dedicated to a small Casino Activity. It was very active for the entire trip to and from Nova Scotia , Canada . During the trip I encountered one of the Engineers assigned. I asked him about the Casino's productivity and he said that he believed it paid for most or all of the fuel consumed and contributed considerably to the Crew wages. I have no documentation to support this but I expect that current data could be obtained from that Ferry Authority. I would like to propose that consideration be given to studying the effectiveness of such an installation on a dedicated Ferry assigned to the Anacortes Sidney run. It would require a space on one end of the Ferry Boat large enough to house enough slot machines to accomplish a positive return, to include manning and maintaining the equipment and contributing financially to the operation of the Ferry itself. On the High Speed Cat this space was no larger than one fifth of one end of the passenger deck on the Evergreen State. I know this an "out of the box" idea with respect to the current focus on saving the run but it is a positive approach at a time when budgeting funds for Ferry Operations are at a critical point. I would be happy to make myself available for further discussions and ideas related to the suggestion should the necessity arise.

Date Received	Comment
01/14/09	ESHB 2358 stated that WSF shall develop fare and pricing policies that: "consider the impacts on users, capacity, and local communities". Without data from the economic analysis impact study, WSF cannot make sound decisions about the fate and subsequent impacts. Presenting Plan B on the same day that Ferry Policy Committee was disbanded was pretty much pulling the voicebox out of the throats of our representatives who were there to speak and advocate on the behalf of ferry-served communities. They were disbanded before they could review, question, and comment on it. WSF did not speak with Ferry Advisory Committees or local officials and representatives in developing or reviewing of Plan B. Plan B is a non starter. And should be flat out rejected by every ferry-served community. Let's focus on creating a Plan C – Citizen's Common Cents 1. First, make a commitment to fund the system after all efforts for efficiencies have been implemented. This biannual scramble for funding has got to stop. Do the mountain passes have to scramble for funding of snow plows to keep the mountain passes clear each budget cycle? Is 520 looking at closing down two lanes to reduce its highway costs? Stop treating the marine highway & mass transit system as an oddity of WSDOT. Put funding in the budget. 2. Look for cuts in the system. WSF overhead should be immediately cut before the legislature even thinks about reaching into our wallets again. The system has not changed drastically the number of crew, service, and boats in over 30 years. What has changed drastically is the amount of WSF administration - 5 times what it was! So at a minimum, we should be asking for 25% reduction in WSF headquarters. Use the money saved to build more flexible fleet of ferries. Regrettably the legislature sent WSF on a path of having to find its own money to float the system - thus 80% fare increases in 6 years and the rush to figure out how to raise more money - become landlords, collect rents from franchise (Starbucks, MacDonalds, etc), sell advertisement, get more money out of users! 3. Build boats not terminals. Stop the nonsense of the expensive terminal expansions and improvements! Terminals should be nothing more than glorified bus stops - shelter and spaces to pass through on the way to your destination. We don't want high end shops, hotels, and restaurant/coffee franchises at the ferry terminals...we want people to go to our towns to visit, shop, and buy from our mom and pop locally owned stores. Build boats not Terminals! The old terminal's were built like bomb shelters - built to last. 4. Have contracts for the life cycle of the vessels. All new vessels should have build/maintain bidding contracts. Now that we don't have steel electrics that needed hand-crafted parts and wood shop repairs - downsize the maintenance yard or better get rid of it and contract out maintenance as the majority is now already being done elsewhere. How is it that WSDOT spends $21 million a year maintaining 946 buildings and WSF is going to spend $22 million for one maintenance yard operation in Eagle Harbor? And why is Eagle Harbor Maintenance yard budgeted into the future up to $90 million dollars? That money could build two new boats! Is there something outrageous about this sort of spending? Is there room for cutting expenses? 5. Change law requiring ferries to be built only in Washington. Common sense would say - repeal the law that requires ferries be built in Washington only. Previous ferries were built at $220 K per vehicle space. The recent ONE BID ONLY came in at $1.5 million per vehicle space – 7 TIMES THE COST! With the new US administration talking about creating jobs for infrastructure - with the build only in Washington law we will not qualify for those federal funds. 6. Finally, increase the WSF portion of the gas tax from 1/2 a cent to 1.5 cents. Plan C: Citizens' Common Cents.
01/14/09	Please consider the demographics and the growth areas on the Kitsap Peninsula when planning a ferry transportation system. The proponents of a Seattle to Manchester ferry understand where the growth is. Seattle, Manchester, Port Orchard, (the county seat) and on to Bremerton makes the best water/land connection. This is the time for forward looking political leaders on a state and local level.

Date Received	Comment
01/14/09	I want to add my voice to those who feel disenfranchised by the transportation system in this state. Regarding the ideas on the ferry system, I find both plans (A & B) unacceptable. While we are hearing ' We want input from the citizens' there is a mad rush to get plans to Olympia. Isn't that what is referred to as " throwing them a bone?" Lets vet these ideas properly. Why are there only 2 possible solutions? Give the citizens a chance to speak up. The ferry system in this state is an integral part of the highway system. That being said, the ferry system *requires* funding at the same level as any other part of the highway system. Those of us who use the marine highway do so wishing we had the confidence of those who use the asphalt highways. They don't worry about their right to use those roadways disappearing suddenly. I ask for fairness when deciding on a solution to the problem.
01/14/09	It should be possible for less than $200,000 to define the state of the art for at least the next 10 years with estimates for ticket prices. Elasticity in the market can have a profound effect on ridership. The economy of scale cannot be realized without including all positive factors. I didn't detect any coordination with regional transportation plans in the WSF plan. Any study should take advantage of regional interests that intersect. If interest rates are less than inflation then capital facilities should be financed and included in the ticket price just like a toll bridge. Taxpayers should not be forced to borrow money at credit card rates to finance government capital facilities. The real question to be answered is: What should the Puget Sound transportation system look like in the 21st century and how should it be financed?
	1. The two strategic plans, and where is WSF going ? Well done. The Plan A / Plan B contrasts provide a good way to engage the leg. What the leg will do with this plan this coming spring, we don't know. The other message I read is that regardless of what the leg does this spring WSF is going ahead with a reservation system. Bravo! Rather than 'A' and 'B,' give the two plans names that telegraph their strategies: Plan A: Maintain current service. Plan B: Austerity plan (Fewer vessels, fewer trips) 2. ID what decisions the leg needs to make this session. Since the Gov's 2009-11 cap and op budget proposals are already set where do we go with this? To avoid the plan ending up as only a discussion piece, identify the plan-driven decisions the leg should to make this session. What decisions does WSF want to see made? Capital commitments beyond 2009-11 Operating strategies beyond 2009-11 Fare structure (the leg will at least informally approve the proposed structure) Concur with the proposed a sys-wide reservation sys More? 3. Raise fares far more than proposed Over 3 biennia raise fares to cover 90% of op costs and 1/3 of amortized cap costs. This may be the most important issue for leg concurrence this spring. Highly unpopular, but worth going for. Educate the leg, and you may get further on this. Higher fares can open the political door to capital funds. This may be even more important than the sound economic principle that users like me should pay our full cost of ferry service. In the ops budget, dedicate a portion of the higher fares to paying off the service on the general revenue bonds issued (in part) to finance WSF improvements. Once you dedicate a portion of fares to paying off bonds WSF will gain legitimate political access to capital funds. And more than anything else, WSF needs capital funds. 4. Reservation system – Yes ! In other transport systems reservations are commonplace, so why not for our ferries? Can anyone imagine airlines or ships operating without reservations? Naysayers will raise all sorts of objections (p 54-55), but airlines and cruise lines address these issues successfully, and so can WSF. Once WSF institutes reservations, attitudes will follow quickly, and in time we'll look back and wonder how the ferriy system could have run without reservations. Today's de facto priority system is horrifically costly. WSF.allocates peak-demand boarding first to commuters, then everyone else in order of arrival. (Commercial trucks may get priority.) But waiting is inherently costly for everyone on the wait line, and so if you offer reservations most people would gladly make reservations to save their own time and money; truckers especially, but also most everyone else. Iin short, WSF customers will jump at the opportunity to schedule their trips with more certainty and save time and money too. Other reservation considerations: Drivers making reservations will spread demand toward off-peak. Commercial vehicles deserve priority, even if they don't come to public hearings. Don't charge for reservations – we want to encourage reservations. Rather, give vehicles with advance reservations a small discount, whereas last-minute users pay full-fare (…like the airlines do it). To discourage abuse, require a refundable deposit, returned if reservation is used or cancelled, say, at least 30 minutes before sailing. 5. Congestion pricing? Reservation pricing may be the better way to implement this. Congestion pricing per se might be difficult to implement for frequent users like me who buy

Date Received	Comment
	prepaid bulk transit passes. (I suppose that at peak times WSF could charge pass users $2 additional cash at the toll booth.) Congestion pricing would become more practical if WSF adopted Good-to-Go transponder technology (as mentioned in Ex 24, p 74, but not discussed further). But there's a work-around here. Once a reservation system is in place, the reservation-driven deposit-and-fare pay transaction could easily accommodate congestion pricing as well. That system could also handle us frequent users with our prepaid bulk passes. Since WSF already has our credit card #s, at the point when we make our single or recurring reservation a peak period fare adjustment could be executed against our known credit cards. Plan needs to address sizing options for replacement vessels As demand grows over the next 20 years upsizing replacement vessels may help WSF meet peak demand. This strategic option needs to be aired, but it is hardly mentioned in the draft. One has to read closely to even discern the proposed sizes of replacement vessels (like on p 67). Granted, there are downsides to larger vessels (higher cap and op costs), and limits to their practicality (terminal sizes and configurations, turnaround times, etc) At a minimum the plan needs: a. A chart showing vessel inventory and sizes, and proposed replacement sizes b. A discussion of the pros and cons of upsizing when replacing, and a justification for the proposed replacement sizes. While on this subject: The paragraph on 'Growth and Ridership Demand…' on p ES-3 leaves me dangling and should be fixed. It states that "There are policy choices regarding the type of service that should be provided to balance customer convenience, community needs, and effective use of resources." What policy choices are these? None are identified. Do you mean to say something, here or is this hot air? (On the whole, the draft is pretty direct, and doesn't suffer much from flummery.) Shouldn't certain strategies be pursued under both Plans A and B ? This may be intended, but not clear in the draft plan. Exhib ES-1 lists reservations, tgransit enhancemenbts and fares as worthy operational and pricing strategies under Plan A. Why aren't theyt listed also under Plan B? Mention future fuel prices in discussing occupancy-per-vehicle forecasts In that discussion (Ch 6). I saw no mention of fuel prices. Fuel prices are likely to go up again, permanently. Higher fuel prices would bend vehicle demand downward: more ferry riders would double-up and use mass transit. But as price forecasts are very uncertain this factor doesn't belong in a numerical forceast, but does want to be mentioned in the text.
01/14/09	In previous testimony during this process as a member of the Ferry Advisory Committee Executive Council, I stated that I was looking for courage. Today as a Bremerton commuter, I am returning to say that I am still looking for that courage. This draft long-range plan put forth by Washington State Ferries is the last key milestone in the two-year ferry financing study. There has been a great deal of distrust expressed about the process, and I am not at all certain anything is going to come from the two years of work. I am concerned that the State will continue to cobble together some sort of program and that Plan A and Plan B somehow will get institutionalized for future action without more dialogue in a community-oriented public process. So I again call for leadership and courage from Washington State Ferries management, labor, the Transportation Commission, the State Legislature, and the Governor and Transportation leadership. Each carries a role in orchestrating the final steps of this work, and the same public that supported change at the national level is looking for change at the state level. Washington State Ferries management I was dismayed at the definition of the core marine highway system. By taking the position of keeping some service on every existing route, you thwarted any creative approach to the design of transportation service and committed to spending hundreds of millions of dollars in your capital program on a plan that may not be the best choice. It takes courage to reform an organization so deeply entrenched in labor rules and bureaucracy. In choosing someone who is not a maritime industry person to lead the organization, you have chosen to pursue systems reform and innovation. You need to go beyond simple budget cuts and service reductions. There has been no report-out on operational efficiencies, other than mention of the elimination of 25 budgeted positions, which certainly does not represent the actual number of reductions; the plan is silent on efficiencies recommended by the consultant through this two-year process. This is the window of opportunity for fundamental operational shifts, and more importantly, a change from an employee-oriented system to a customer-oriented one. Your customers will support you if you take on the transformational work necessary to get the ferry system operating soundly, with expenditures under control and revenues to support it. Labor Leadership As stated earlier, I find that WSF is an employee-oriented system, not a customer-oriented system. There is a pervasive sense of entitlement that I struggle with day-to-day as I ride. I know there are employees who earn six-figure salaries when overtime is included, and yet I hear multiple conversations about the need for new chairs and about not being willing to visit Bremerton because of the obligation to pay for parking. I don't want to trip over brooms and plungers when I know you are being asked to keep boats cleaner - I would much rather encounter people who take pride in their work. We are all working harder and not gaining ground. In these economic times and as a fellow state employee, I feel very fortunate that I have the benefits I have. I am looking for courage from you in epic proportions.

Date Received	Comment
	Bremerton is facing a 50% reduction in service from a system that is tangled in complex, burdensome work rules and lifetime benefits. As I look at other public agencies doing transformational work, I have seen no evidence of labor being at the table during this last two years, expressing a willingness to take on the reform work necessary to save this transportation system. I would invite you to come to a Ferry Advisory Executive Council meeting and hear from the communities you serve. There are many opportunities for better and more efficient service that are thwarted by a system that cannot change. Transportation Commission I am looking for courage from you to advocate for increased revenue from the State for ferries. Do not fall into the trap of the State Auditors Office mentality of getting revenue from customers either way – by driving the Narrows Bridge or through ferry fares. I have been clear in my belief that ferry customers should pay more. But farebox recovery cannot be the sole source of new revenue; it already carries a disproportionate burden compared to other transportation systems. WSF needs some intense support right now with the Legislature - you need to use your own studies and fight for new sources of revenue. State Legislature The courage I am looking for in the Legislature is to face your own Growth Management mandates, recognize the ferry system as an integral part of the state's transportation system, do the hard work of defining the core system, then properly fund it. That's all. I do not believe it is productive to take the punitive approach of not providing more money because of voter support for I-695 and funding. If this conversation continues, I can assure you that ferry communities will organize and focus on equitable reductions of funding from other communities in the state that supported I-695, also looking at tax dollars paid vs. tax dollars returned. Please do not pass on these reform efforts for yet another decade or two while patching together some scheme to pay for a system that is deteriorating rather than improving. Other issues to consider: ▪ Look at the trade-off your Build in Washington policy brings vs. the loss of access to federal dollars because of it. • Eliminate the retire-rehire law as part of your own economic stimulus package. When the state and other agencies are laying people off, retire-rehire allows double-dipping in the state system. It also does not develop a new workforce and encourages the status quo rather than looking at new ways of doing business. Putting more cars on the roads by reducing ferry service flies in the face of the work you are trying to accomplish with the restoration of Puget Sound. As a commuter, if my options are reduced by 50%, I will reluctantly shift to driving. Governor Gregoire, Secretary Hammond, and senior policy staffs Courage will be most important here. We need long-term sustainable leadership that will leave a ferry and transportation legacy that future generations will benefit from. Do not let this reform opportunity go by. Do not let the Legislature and the ferry system take a pass on the difficult decisions that lay ahead. Ferry customers and communities will help with the work. We need leadership, however, that is willing to confront the old system, create a new one, and commit to its future. Other: My remaining comments deal with specific issues raised in the plan. Bremerton-specific issues: • Plan B shifts the entire focus of ferry service north, reducing service in central and south Puget Sound. That is not where the population is currently or where growth projections are in the future. • I will not belabor the point too much about the 50% reduction in service from the only run that has shown an increase in use. WSF's approach to Bremerton service is one of capacity and numbers, not access to service. Dropping one boat from this run will shift the burden to Bainbridge and put more traffic on Hwy. 305. • The super-class ferries are the best design for Rich Passage and can be sped up to achieve a 45-minute run. If you do that, you will dramatically change the ridership for both Bainbridge and Bremerton. Passenger ferry service: I have long been a proponent of passenger ferry service connecting communities around Puget Sound and believe that it is not just our past but our future in transportation. The nature of the Bremerton commuter runs supports a water transit system. However, rather than just arbitrarily handing the responsibility off to local agencies in three years, Washington State Ferries needs to be at the table, actively participating in the design of the Puget Sound transportation system. And the local agencies will need a ten-year transition period with some state funding included to get the service up and viable. Information technology: ▪ I am delighted with the move toward better systems through better information technology and would encourage an even quicker move in this direction. A reservation system and expansion of electronic ticketing is more efficient and is the norm in all other transportation systems. Providing a way to purchase tickets with cash via a machine of some kind will also support more efficiency. ▪ Should the State pursue passenger ferry service as a local-only option, we will need WSF to ticket their walk-on passengers on both sides of the run; maintaining the current

Date Received	Comment
	system will undermine the success of passenger ferry service. This should not be a negotiated item for WSF, as they are abdicating their responsibility for providing service.
01/09/09	Attached are my comments regarding this shameful attempt by WSF to "resolve" (and I use this term loosely) the problem. If it is not completely legible, it's because was getting worked up a second time in writing it. This page couldn't possibly contain the outrage I feel at the WSF at this time. Why do you keep telling us that you're working on our behalf, when the presented DRAFT plan suggests anything but. Please consider the people using the ferry, and the interests of Kitsap County not only your pocketbooks. I am just disgusted with these supposed "efforts" on your part. As I said in my comments - obviously there was number crunching, but in the end, people crunching ruled the day!
01/10/09	3) I've used the ferries consistently from South Whidbey for 17 years with 15 years of regular commuting. I think you (the ferry system) do a very good job and I like your operation. I particularly enjoy the 'down-home' atmosphere on the ferries. Let's face it – it hasn't changed much in 40 years or so and a few changes might be in order. So here's my suggestions: Idling cars. How about putting up a sign in the car hold area like the one on the boats that says, "Please don't idle cars while waiting for the ferry to load". Your workers have to breathe these fumes all day and global warming is not some sort of pipe dream. In my view of things it's imperative that we Americans become a little more conscious of our wasteful personal actives with respect to the automobile. Seems to me you are in a very good position to encourage such consciousness and as a public organization maybe this is somewhere in your mission statement. I know your using biodiesel. 2) The petty department. There's at least 2 or 3 workers on the Clinton/Mukilteo run that find the time to go around and tear in two the front page of newspapers that passengers leave. I certainly have no problem with them picking up and throwing papers out but who is paying them to tear the front page in two so others can't read it. Could this be related to the free papers that they get form the local paper distributor? I've noticed on other runs (i.e. Vashon) that newspapers are left out for others to read – how about extending this courtesy to the Clinton run? Car size. Have you noticed they're getting bigger over the years? I feel your antiquated system of one charge of everything under 20' is missing a ton of revenues in addition to not fairly charging for space occupied on the boats. Please see the attached letter on this subject. I think your mission should be to move people across the water. You've been focused on moving cars across the water, which might be why you're seen fit to cancel the passenger only service to a couple locations over the last few years. I really wonder how one could get to a position that it's economically feasible to move cars but not to move people because you can't charge them as much. There's something wrong with this picture. As we all know the Puget Sound has a significant traffic problem. Why is the ferry system, as a public transportation organization, not doing something to encourage and facilitate the movement of people rather than adding more cars on the road? I think some progressive thought by your organization could go along way in this area. Some would say your 'business model' needs tweaking. 5) That obnoxious repetitive message that is broadcast over the intercom about where to go in case of emergency and be sure to watch your belongings. It would sure be nice if you could avoid that annoying intrusion but no doubt it's in like cement now. Maybe turn the volume down a bit. I find it curious why you operated for decades without that message and now it's so essential. Thanks again for you time and as I said earlier – I like the ferry operation. Your workers are most courteous and you certainly keep a schedule. I offer these suggestions to encourage you to look toward the future and to use your influence to lead and encourage in a progressive manner.

Date Received	Comment
01/08/09	Thank you for all the time you spent with us last night. Please convey that to the other members of your team who also participated. I hope the hearing gave both islanders and WSF a better idea of what we are up against. Cookie cutter solutions don't work with such diverse destinations as the triangle route. We are so appreciative of all the efforts you have made on our behalf in the past. It is my hope that we can see this thing through and that WSF FINALLY gets the funding it needs. As one of the speakers last night said, that's OUR job. I have also asked that King County take a more active role in supporting our Vashon community down in Olympia. Still, I hope that you will be able to convey the appropriate message to Olympia. Please cheer us on when we go to Olympia on 2/17!
01/08/09	It was too dark and rainy to attend a public meeting held on South Whidbey Tuesday night regarding the Washington State Ferries' Draft Long-Range Plan through 2030. Plus, it was from 6-8 PM, right during the dinner hour. And I wasn't in the mood for dinner theater at Useless Bay Country Club. So I did the next best thing and emailed Farmer Bob this morning: "Could you send me your thoughts about Washington State Ferries Draft Long-Range Plan, honey? Please try to keep it short and succinct. I'll edit as necessary. XO, Sue." Here's Farmer Bob's response: The way in which the state presented Plan A and Plan B in its executive summary is too complicated for the average citizen to comprehend. In a nutshell, what they are saying is that they don't have the money to keep the system going. What they fail to realize is the economic impact that a reduction in ferry service could have from (a) tax collections surrounding capital expansions as well as (b) state and local tax collections from the purchase of goods and services. Their study and analysis is a closed loop look at the system and the customers who use it; but there is no attempt to link that to the economic viability or lack thereof in the communities and counties they (the Marine Highway system) serves. They should have taken a zero based approach to understanding the total impact that the ferry system has on statewide commerce and economic development, especially as it relates to tax revenues generated by visitors and tourists (who they say make up the highest user group). If Obama and the Feds are focusing all of their economic recovery plans on infrastructure upgrades throughout the nation, shouldn't Washington State be thinking that way too? They need to make a case that improvements in the state's Marine Highway system are as important as bridges and roads that will be rebuilt. There is not a lot of creative thinking in either approach; it reads like the entire plan was written by the State Auditor. The plans totally focus on finances without regard to other factors, including lifestyle choices. Maybe it would be simpler to build a bunch of barracks on the other side so people won't have to be inconvenienced by trying to get home on the ferry.
01/07/09	I attended the meeting on Whidbey Island this evening. 1) What cost studies have been made regarding building a ferry other than Washington State? I realize that current legislation is that this cannot happen - but, what is the cost of the boat bid on recently by Todd Shipyards vs. an expected bid from another State? 2) How many jobs does one ferry built in Washington provide? 3 ferries if built concurrently? 4? 3) If the State legislation preventing ferries from being built out of State were changed, how much Federal funding would be available for our State's ferry services?
01/06/09	I am emailing you regarding the meeting which is to be held on January 7th on Vashon at the McMurray Middle School. My husband and I won't be able to attend that meeting so I would like to make my request known. As you are well aware, the Ferry system is our highway system. We pay tax's for roads that most of us don't use, which is okay. But why are we treated like a stepchild? We need those ferries, on both sides of this island. And the cost to those who live here has done nothing but gone up yet you want to take away service. Try closing roads which people use to go to work or to the doctor and see how fast you'll hear from them. I've only lived here for 3 years and hear from those who live on Vashon that the residents here are treated as, which I already said, the stepchild of Seattle. I'm sure it cost plenty to run the ferries, but I can't believe that something reasonable can't be done to help us and you. One thing for sure, your car license fee is way to low. Why would you ever put it to the people to lower that fee and expect it not to pass. Of course it would, we all want to lower our tax's. But this was a foolish thing to do because I don't believe the average person realized that by lowering the car license tax it took money away from highways. This

Date Received	Comment
	meeting that we can not attend is about getting rid of a 48 car carrier and replacing it with a 34 car carrier. That sounds stupid. And on top of that, take away a ferry from the North End. I gather you people don't have to use either one of these ferries to go to work or you would not be talking about it. Since I won't be at that meeting I would really like to know why you are taking away a North End ferry and replacing the South End ferry. If you take away a ferry, how about lowering the price to those who live here and raise it for those who visit? Hope to hear from you anytime after the 8th of January.
01/03/09	please plan for FEWER, NOT MORE, ferries; please make the ferries that you do add PASSENGER ONLY. there are too many people and too many cars on these islands already.
01/02/09	The 6:00 p.m. timing of this meeting is not responsive to public input. Ironically, many people who would like to attend will be waiting in a ferry line to get back to the Island. Why would you schedule at such an inconveniente time?
01/01/09	This comment is concerning the long range planning to be submitted to the legislature at the end of this month. My concern is the 2nd option that would cancel night service of the Edmonds-Kingson route. Many people, including myself, are dependant upon that service to be able to get home after 2nd shift work. I know many of them that work for the Boeing Aircraft company. I am always amazed at how quickly 2nd shift workers can become 2nd class citizens. The economic hardship for us, not to mention quality of life, is unthinkable. To quote that numbers, and economic viability for a traffic route, should drive this kind of decision is just not fair for people who actually have no say about the schedule they work. Longer tenured, higher paid, and corporate multi level management individuals work dayshift hours and they fill the boat. They also have access to much better public and commuter transportation, a savings and convenient option not available to us. People having to spend years to attain one of those catagories should not have to be isolated from an absolutely necessary transportation link, because the state needs money elsewhere. So the system is at 70% funding, will the minority be allowed to access their livelyhood, or will the majority of boatriders not wanting to pay higher rates be allowed to rule. The first option should be the one used, as the 2nd would serve to increase economic hardship for citizens of this state. A hard reality of present day working life is the expense required to get to work. Leave the commuter ferry run service schedule in place. Get the fleet viable. Phase in rate increases and get the problem fixed. Do not create a further extreme hardship for good people who have found decent jobs and need to get to them and then home again. Nobody benefits from that reality.
12/30/08	1. Some version of plan A is required... plan B is simply not viable and will be a destructive force negatively affecting Puget Sound growth and development. 2. WSF needs to send it's entire management team to basic marketing training... the WSF management team is truly clueless in this aspect of business. Instead of punishing people for using ferries at peak times by raising fares and cutting service as you propose... which reduces overall rider-ship and reduces total fare-box revenues... you should be rewarding people for using non-peak travel times with SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER FARES on those runs... which: WILL pull people from peak time runs, WILL increase the total number of riders and car traffic, and WILL increase total fare-box revenues. In addition, it will make having more frequent bus connecting service on both sides of the

Date Received	Comment
	water throughout the day a more viable venture due to increased mid-day rider-ship, and it will increase cross sound shopper travel thereby benefiting businesses on both sides of the water. Raising fares and cutting service will kill viability for bus service and will further hurt businesses on both sides of the water. 3. Your letting the condition of the boats go in the toilet is a visual destruction of one of the ICONS of the Seattle and Puget Sound region. The US travel community has taken notice and is already talking about this... and warning travelers to check ahead as to the condition and viability of the Ferry system when considering travel to the Puget Sound Region. Your lack of insight regarding the impact Ferry services have upon tourism in the Puget Sound Region is truly amazing... the region stands to lose millions in tourist dollars because of WSF poor marketing, maintenance and planning. 4. The Ferries are truly a part of the state highway system and either should be fully funded in a similar way, or the rest of the state highway system should become fare based and pay as you go as well. This is the message WSF should be advocating, instead you are caving in to the road construction industry and other interests who benefit from taking money from ferries and funding other pet transportation projects. 5. Ferries are a critical part of our state infrastructure and need to be treated as same. Ferries are not bastard children of the freeway system... they are critical transportation corridors.
12/29/08	I am just one person – one who walks on and off the ferry 4-5 days a week for the purpose of getting to work (Edmonds-Kingston). But I foresee that I will be a much less frequent passenger if fares increase too much more. I will have to quit my job and try and find a different one in Kitsap County because the cost of commuting will negate the higher hourly wage I receive by working in Edmonds. I will have to look for a different job in a time of economic downturn and change my commute from a lower environmental impact (walking onto a public transportation vessel) to driving to work at a higher environmental cost. Kitsap Transit is not the most reliable of systems and is expected to reduce routes in the near future. I find the whole prospect daunting and depressing.
12/29/08	This is simply not acceptable. Plan A or Plan C, but not Plan B, and since I don't see that you've added Plan C, I believe the State of Washington is letting us down. I don't see Plan C, which is that the Fed and the State jointly run and fund this critical HIGHWAY system?? Ferries are not optional, and cannot be funded by the users - as many have stated in other scenarios, no rural areas would even have roads if users had to fund the roads.
12/29/08	If I were you guys I would Figure out the peak commuter times of day. Run all the boats during the peak hours, then during non peak hours tie up one boat. As for the crews, Keep the most senior people full time to run the all day boats and put the less senior people onto part time. Also restart your passenger only program. But instead of using big gas guzzler boats like the Chinook and Snohomish buy smaller, lighter alumium catamarans. I'm not sure who builds them but the Chilkat Express that runs between Skagway and Haines Alaska uses them. These boats are fast, fuel efficent and carry large loads of people. Run these boats not only east and west but also north and south. Give people a alternitave to the freeways.

Date Received	Comment
12/27/08	I have lived in this area my whole life, the solution to the crossing has been suggested ever since I can remember (about 50 years). My name is Gene Prall. I am 55 years old and have lived in Kitsap county my entire life with the exception of military time. The long term solution is to build three bridges, connecting roads and bus/ light rail service and reduce the ferry routes (get rid of the most expensive/ longest routes). If this plan would have been started when it was first conceived there would not be a ferry budget problem. Build a bridge between Illahee and Bainbridge Island with a limited access, partionally covered road from the bridge to a mega transportation center (ferry/bus/light rail). The ferries would run from the center to Edmonds and downtown Seattle terminals. There would be passenger only ferries from the transportation center in Bremerton to downtown Seattle and express bus/ light rail service to the ferry terminal on Bainbridge. The car ferries from the Bremerton run could be incorporated into the remaining crossings. More ferries less time between runs during rush hours. Then build a bridge from the Waterman/Wataga Beach side to Bainbridge and have the same type limited access, partionally covered road from it to the transportation center. Bus/light service could be incorporated with this crossing from Port Orchard or even Tacoma. This bus/light rail could solve some of the rush hour problems that occur in both directions, it would take care of people living in Bremerton/Port Orchard and working in Tacoma. The third bridge would be built from Ollala to Vashon Island with the same type road going across the island to a ferry terminal, which would have ferries going to Fauntleroy and downtown. By building this bridge the isolation of the island would be compromised, however the expense and inconvenience for all people using this ferry route would be greatly reduced as well as reducing the tax burden on everybody. These suggestions make the most sense and although expensive upfront are the very same as the second Tacoma narrows bridge would solve problems for years not just until the next budget term. With the economy problems being corrected with the fixing on the infrastructure, these are perfect projects for this economy. I believe federal money will be available as well as charging tolls would cover the cost. THANKS FOR LISTENING.
12/27/08	I just read of the state's plan A and B for our ferries. Living in Coupeville, I am directly affected by our ferries and wish to comment. While I do appreciate the state's desire to keep jobs in our state, there comes a time when common sense must prevail in government. Having two plans for our ferries both with major budget shortfalls does not make sense. We all would like to be independent of the "other" Washington, but when it comes to our quality of life, then we should take federal monies and let the ferries be built for the least amount of money. I see no difference in accepting highway money for our roads and accepting money for ferries. I strongly urge you to consider a Plan C and partner with the federal government and build better ferries for less costs to those of us who pay for them--the citizens of Washington State.
12/26/08	The Washington State Ferries should use Pres. Obama's stimulus plan to fund the building of new ferries and should build as many as you can get funding for. The 3 Island Home and 4 144 car and 3 Superferries with two full decks for passengers for the Seattle Bainbridge route should be asked for. Retiring the Superferry Class, Hiyu, and older boats early will save millions in annual maintenance.
12/26/08	Would you send me the links to the Appendix A thru K for the Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division Draft Long-Rang Plan December 2008.

Date Received	Comment
12/22/08	Having lived in Bremerton for about 10 years now and the last 5 in Illahee, I've always wondered "Why isn't there a bridge to Bainbridge Island from this very narrow point?" I'm sure construction costs would be great to start, but the net effect could quite possibly be to reduce dramatically - or ELIMINATE completely the Bremerton ferry runs, by providing a short way for everyone to access the Bainbridge runs. As a user, I can tell you I would prefer to take the Bainbridge run because it's shorter, but to travel to the Bainbridge ferry terminal requires me to drive 60 minutes vise 5 minutes to the Bremerton ferry. IF, I was given a choice of a 20 minute drive to the Bainbridge ferry, and the 30 minute commute - I'd jump at the chance. Possibilities: 1. Eliminate Bremerton run completely - or reduces to 2-4 runs daily during peak hours only. 2. Cost savings in fuel to make 30 minute transit from Bainbridge vs. 60 minute Bremerton run. Drawbacks: 1. New bridge and connecting road construction. Possibly part of the state or federal construction $$? 2. Ferry riders from outlying areas - Belfair, Seabeck, etc. may balk since it would add to their drive time, but having lived in Seabeck, at least half the time I would choose the Bainbridge ferry over the Bremerton even though Bremerton was closer, but I'd save time in the ferry travel time.
12/20/08	Only consider Plan A. Do not consider Plan B. The ferry system is like the road and bridge system. I don't see any plans to outsource the roads and highways because it won't work. If funding is an issue for our transportation needs then charge uses for all state highways just like users of the marine highways. Its only fair. Do not consider Plan B.
12/19/08	This is simply not acceptable. Plan A or Plan C, but not Plan B, and since I don't see that you've added Plan C, I believe the State of Washington is letting us down. I don't see Plan C, which is that the Fed and the State jointly run and fund this critical HIGHWAY system?? Ferries are not optional, and cannot be funded by the users - as many have stated in other scenarios, no rural areas would even have roads if users had to fund the roads.
01/20/09	On this side of the pond, if we could divert traffic through Sidney rather than out of Sidney, this ferry run would be a huge benefit to our economy. I have relatives living in Anacortes and visit often, I feel the same is also true in Anacortes. If traffic were diverted through these fine cities so people could get a glimpse of what we have to offer, I'm sure they would return. Rather then cancelling the run, maybe both communities should look at how this ferry can support us, especially during these difficult times. And then, most important, support the ferry. Why not consider a big screen on the ferry? Switch between current events on the news and advertising. This way you keep the attention of the customer. When the ferry is heading toward Friday harbour, include advertising for Friday harbour. When the ferry is heading toward Sidney include advertising for Sidney. Then sell the advertising!!! Jane Albee of Local Starz in Anacortes certainly has the expertise to give you advise on this matter her number is 360-420-9727. Another way to improve income would be to look at your restaurant. B.C. Ferries takes 1 hour and 35 mintues to cross and they make a ton of money from their restaurant. You, also, should be able to make a ton of money. They have sold their restaurant business to White Spot and I would bet that White Spot pay dearly for it. Do you think McIvers, Reb Lobster, Denny's, etc. might take it over??? I was just reading on www.fastfood.freedomblogging.com that "...Carl's Jr. said today that its new restaurant in Marysville, Wash., posted a record-breaking $105,063 in sales in its first seven days of operation." If one of these restaurant chains were to take over your restaurant on the ferry you would be relieved of the cost of employeeing the people that presently run the restaurant and you would be able to offer better service to your customer. I, personally, would love to have a nice restaurant to dine in when I go to Anacortes. Another suggestion would be to try to attract some more of the big traffic. For example, one of the suppliers to our store is Ashley Furniture and they make regular runs to the island. If you could get them to commit to use your ferry that would make a huge difference to your revenue. With the price of fuel and the ferry cost being approximately the same, how much would they save by not travelling that extra 1 1/2 hours to the border. The driver could even have a nap, once he's had a nice meal of course. I hope you give this your consideration and maybe we can all work

Date Received	Comment
	together to make the Anacortes/Sidney run a great and profitable resource for all.
	I have reviewed the documents posted on the Washington state ferry website describing the draft long range plan, and have the following comments: 1. Managing any marine activity requires skills and expertise that are specific to the marine environment. The state ferry system over time has developed these skills, and has staffed positions that can knowledgably supervise operations and maintenance of the ferries and shore facilities. If Option B is adopted, multiple additional government entities will need to develop this same management capability. I find it hard to believe that these additional redundant layers of management will do anything other than add net cost to the taxpayers for what would most likely be a lesser level of service. 2. The reductions in service under Option B are severe, and represent a major reduction in the state's commitment to the citizens of the Puget Sound area. Residents of the communities affected by these cutbacks bought their homes and took jobs based on a reasonable expectation that the ferry system would continue to provide reliable service. The scale of the proposed cutbacks strikes me as unfair to these people. 3. The state ferry system serves more than the locals who commute to work or routinely ride the ferry for non-work related activities. Tourism is an important part of Washington's economy, and the ferry system helps to support tourism. I strongly disagree with adoption of Option B.
01/20/09	We write to convey our grave concerns over the Governor's proposal to eliminate the international ferry run between Anacortes and Sidney, B.C. The run is a vital link between Washington State and British Columbia, and it provides essential transportation for inter-island passengers. As you are no doubt aware, the Sidney ferry provides significant economic stimulus to the entire northern Puget Sound region, to an extent that is difficult to overstate. The operation supports close to $30 million in payroll and $126 million in annual spending, according to an independent economic analysis. This economic activity is unlikely to be replaced by other sources if the ferry run is eliminated. Ending the Sidney run would have devastating economic effects on our community. Many tourism-dependent businesses throughout our region – restaurants, retail shops, transportation services, hotels – would be unable to recover from the devastating blow. We appreciate that budgets are tight at all levels of government. However, economists across the political spectrum are advising against short-sighted cost cutting measures that only serve to further damage an already battered economy. In these tough economic times, elimination of the Sidney ferry would be a crippling blow to our regional economy, further reducing local government revenue and hampering our ability to provide critical government services to our constituents. In addition to its economic significance, the Sidney ferry run is an important component of our region's transportation infrastructure. Thousands of international travelers use the Sidney run to avoid cross-border congestion associated with overland transportation routes, congestion that will substantially increase as the Games approach. Safe and efficient transportation around the Olympic Games should be a top priority for local government, as well as capturing the economic activity the Olympic Games will clearly generate. As we approach the 2010 Olympic Games, cutting our regional links to international commerce should be the furthest thing from the mind of State government. We strongly urge you to make protection of the Sidney ferry run one of your highest priorities, and champion this vital service. Please advise how we can assist your efforts toward ensuring the Sidney ferry run's survival.
01/20/08 (This email sent by 7 customers)	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Please listen to what citizens and local leaders are saying. Make wise, enlightened, fair decisions on the ferry system. Don't continue dismantling one of Washington's most iconic, valuable and charming assets. Do not treat our ferries as if they are someone's private yacht. They are bridges in the highway system of western Washington....no different than bridges throughout Washington. I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Yes, we are in tough financial times, but that doesn't mean you need to hold a fire sale. Please do not make short-sighted decisions that will hurt our state for decades to come. This is a time

Date Received	Comment
	for creativity. Consider using classic marketing principles to encourage ridership. Have you considered that oppressive pricing structures and poor schedules may be the cause of very trends you claim to so closely watch? The ferries are a Washington state treasure. It is time to get creative.
01/20/08	Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee Paper on Current Ferry Issues, November 25th, 2008 Summary Water transportation has been an integral part of Kitsap County since our county's beginnings. Today, the Kitsap economy and social environment is inexorably tied to ferry service. Just as highways through the mountains link eastern and western Washington, so does the Kingston-Edmonds route link north Kitsap County and the Olympic Peninsula with the eastern Puget Sound. Changes to this maritime highway have profound effects on the region that it serves. This paper is offered by Kingston's Ferry Advisory Committee to help decision-makers align the resources of the Ferry System with the needs of ferry riders and to our community. Representing ferry riders and our community we are committed to working with Washington State Ferries and other state leaders to sustain this vital service. Community Goals A sustainable ferry system that provides affordable, accessible, and reliable basic transportation as follows: Sustainable: The ferry system must have long-term, reliable funding. Affordable: Total transportation costs, including fares, should be affordable to our communities' median income rider. Fares should not exclude ferry use by the greater part of the community. Accessible: Ferries should be available to regular riders and those who are dependent on ferries. Reliable: Ferries must meet the scheduled arrival times. Basic: Priorities for Kingston-Edmonds must be focused on transporting the large numbers of vehicles and people this route serves and connecting with transit. Business Model • We strongly support legislation directing and funding a study of alternative business models and governance for WSF that would result in sustainable maintenance, operations and capital repair and replacement practices. We consider this critical to the system's long-term success. Reservations: • We conditionally support a reservation system to reduce congestion, reduce terminal costs and make better use of existing ferry capacity. Rider concerns must be thoroughly addressed in the implementation of reservations. These concerns include convenience for frequent travelers, a priority for those who must depend on ferries and for commercial traffic, and the ability to accommodate short-notice travel needs. Successful implementation will require an effective working relationship between WSF, the FAC and our local governments. • We oppose reservation fees. Reservation costs should be recovered through savings and cost avoidance. • We support a no-show penalty from the reservation of a pre-paid ticket. Fares • We oppose fare increases beyond those equal to the rate of inflation for operating costs. The large fare increases over the last 7 years have eliminated use by many riders and have had an adverse effect on our community and the region. •We oppose system recovery rates beyond the current 70% of operating. • We strongly oppose any reduction of, or new limitation on frequent user discounts. • We support the Tariff Route Equity fare policy. • We support legislation for a mandatory public process before any fare change decision is made to minimize the negative impacts to the system. This includes: One month of public outreach to inform riders of proposed fare increases Public hearings after the public outreach program Formal review and official comment by official rider representatives, now the FACs An avenue of appeal beyond the WSTC Strategies • We strongly support incentive strategies that will improve ferry utilization such as full car discounts, car pools, small vehicle discounts, incentives to foot passengers and reducing the gaps between ferry and transit service. • We support strategy implementation only when the implementation costs will be recovered through savings or cost avoidance. • We strongly oppose peak pricing. Peak pricing would impose significant costs on riders and our community without benefit. We support reservations instead of peak pricing as a constructive means to address congestion concerns. • We oppose any strategy that has not had a formal assessment of the impact on riders and communities. Local FACs and/or local governments should provide this assessment. Level of Service Standards • We strongly support the direct participation of local governments in developing and assigning Level of Service standards. • We oppose new LOS standards that would prematurely trigger strategies to increase rider costs. Capacity Adding Capacity • We support building new ferries to sustain the current fleet. New ferries should be sized to optimize their net revenue for the routes on which they will operate, and capacity should be added where that will be cost effective to do. • We do not support building additional Island Home ferries beyond the two currently planned. • We give our strongest possible support to proceeding with current plans to build up to three 144-car ferries and two Island Home ferries in the upcoming biennium. Any decision to change ferry acquisition plans should be deferred until the next round of ferry construction. • We support

Date Received	Comment
	extending the planned service life of our current ferries. • We strongly support adding a third, unscheduled ferry to the Kingston-Edmonds run to absorb summer traffic overflow when a boat available. This arrangement has worked successfully in the past and will both add capacity and provide a positive revenue stream in the future. Traffic • We strongly support taking near-term action to reduce ferry traffic congestion in Kingston. This includes reservations and the interim use of an existing parking lot as an auxiliary holding area. • We support the Kingston Circulation Study Plan as the long range SR 104 plan of record. • We strongly support improving the staffing, traffic controls and procedures of current holding lots to maximize their utilization. • We support transponder and pre-ticked traffic lanes to improve traffic flow and taking measures to reduce ferry turn-around times. Multimodal Transportation • We strongly support the Governor and the Legislature in taking measures to improve the collaboration between WSF, WSDOT and transportation agencies in the Puget Sound area in providing an effective transportation network. Financing • We support a state-wide solution to fund ferries. If WSF is not sustainable then it is WSDOT that is not sustainable and remedies should address this as their first priority. • We support cost reduction actions and the inclusion of local FACs and governments in that process. This includes action on previous study and audit recommendations, involving workers in process improvement, using business performance benchmarks, and action by the legislature to reduce restrictions that increase costs. Policy • We support legislation to define the role of rider representatives and local communities in ferry decisions. Riders should have a voice that is commensurate with their contribution to ferry operating revenue. • We strongly support formation of Ferry Commission or Board as the single point for oversight of ferries. This should include state, legislative, local government and rider representatives. We believe this will both improve WSF efficiency as well as oversight effectiveness. • We do not support passenger surveys as having merit in representing rider views unless the survey has been reviewed and agreed to by the FAC beforehand. • We support coordination and cooperation between WSF and passenger only ferry service providers, including coordinating fares. Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee Paper on Current Ferry Issues, November 2008 This paper has been prepared by the Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee to reflect the views of north Kitsap County residents on ferry system issues and our experience as a ferry advisory committee. The Summary has been vetted with Kingston's Citizen's Advisory Council and the Greater Hansville Advisory Council. The comments and recommendations in this paper have come from our own observations, public input received through many public meetings, briefings to community organizations, and from our own surveys. We appreciate the current high quality of ferry service being provided by the employees of Washington State Ferries. In our dealings with ferry employees we have found them to be consistently constructive and motivated to provide a high level of service to ferry riders. We greatly appreciate the enlightened leadership that David Moseley has brought to WSF. His sincere interest in our communities' needs and his willingness for dialog will be a key to sustaining the quality of this exceptional ferry system. We also appreciate the time and attention that our Legislators, County Commissioners and other State and local officials have taken out of their schedules to understand and address ferry issues. We understand the constrained resources available to support our ferries. This paper is being offered to help decision-makers best apply this limited resource to meet the needs of ferry riders and our community. Representing our community, and its leadership, we are committed to working with Washington State Ferries and well as our state and local leaders to sustain this vital system. Background North Kitsap County is a ferry dependant community of commuters and other regular riders for whom the 100+ mile trip driving around the Puget Sound to reach King and Snohomish Counties is not a practical transportation alternative. The Kingston-Edmonds route is also a critical transportation link for communities of the Olympic Peninsula. Ferries serve commuters, students, and the movement of goods and services throughout the region. It is also an essential avenue for those living west of the Sound to reach professional specialists such as medical treatment, and extended families. Finally, Kingston-Edmonds is a principle state recreational route to the Olympic Peninsula. Because of these factors the Kingston-Edmonds route carries the greatest vehicle traffic in the system. Besides providing critical transportation this considerable traffic also provides the Kingston-Edmonds route with high recovery rates. The downside of this traffic has been growing summer congestion that can all but shut off local access to our downtown. Since the 1860's our economy and community has grown with the continuous improvement in cross-sound transportation. Changes to the ferry system have profound effects on local and regional residents. As the ferry financing process goes forward we believe that the impacts of system changes must be thoroughly understood to determine if the financial benefit to the ferry system outweighs the social and economic costs to local residents and the region. It is for this reason that we have prepared this paper. Community Goals We and our community's leadership are committed to working with WSF and other leaders to achieve a sustainable ferry system that provides affordable, accessible and reliable basic transportation as follows: • Sustainable: The ferry system must be structured to provide long-term, reliable funding for necessary, operations, maintenance, safety, and capital repair, and replacement

Date Received	Comment
	costs. It is also needed to subsidize the essential service to communities with low route recovery rates. To do less endangers the reliability, accessibility, and basic operations of the entire system. • Affordable: Total transportation costs, including fares should be affordable to the median income rider. Fares should not exclude ferry use by the greater part of the community. Fare increases since 2000 has increased the median household income of ferry riders to over $80K/year in a county with a median household income of $53K/year. This is a disturbing public policy trend. The daily use of ferries by those who must drive to work or school is out of reach for 80% of our community. As fare increases outstrip the income growth, workers, students and extended families become increasingly isolated by the Puget Sound. We think this is unhealthy for our community and for the region. • Accessible: Because of the lack of practical transportation alternatives, and the growth of north Kitsap County as a bedroom community for east Puget Sound workers, ferries need to be available during congested periods to regular riders and to those who are dependent on ferries for critical needs. • Reliable: Ferries move many riders to work, and foot passengers require transit connections. It is important that ferries meet their scheduled arrival times. • Basic: The Kingston route has the largest vehicle traffic of all routes. It is also the principle commercial route to the Olympics. WSF '06 plan also identified the Kingston-Edmonds route as needed to absorb growth in North Kitsap County's foot passenger traffic. This means WSF's priorities for our route must be focus on moving large numbers of vehicles and connecting with transit. For example we are concerned that ventures into commercial co-development, while attractive, may detract from the time, attention and resources WSF spends on its transportation mission in Kingston-Edmonds. Business Model We strongly support legislation to direct and fund a study of alternative business models and governance for WSF. We consider this critical to the system's long term future. We think there is a lack of a defined WSF mission and defined funding for business operations, maintenance and capital projects. Both are needed to set the direction for planning, investment and to serve as the basis for assessing performance. It is also necessary to avoid counterproductive cost reductions. This is especially critical in today's environment where currently ferries must respond to direction from a wide variety of oversight groups, all with differing priorities. Currently Ferries answers to the Governor, WSDOT, WSTC and the Legislature. While we see this accountability important we also have observed that the direct role in ferry management of many groups with differing priorities can detract from efficient operations and business decisions. Reservations: • We conditionally support a reservation system that reduces congestion, terminal costs and makes better use of existing ferry capacity. Riders in our community however think that public transportation should normally be on a first come first serve basis. They will support ferry reservations if their concerns are addressed in the system's implementation. Commuters and business riders are concerned that reservations will be cumbersome to use and will impede their regular use of the system. Without a priority for these riders in making reservations, they fear that they would find themselves unable to get to work or conduct business especially during our summer traffic periods. Local, infrequent riders are concerned that they will not be able to respond to unplanned essential travel such as births, deaths or sudden illness due to the lack of space available for non-reservation customers. All are concerned that events such as traffic delays, weather and bridge openings could prevent riders from making their reservation without the recourse of a later boat or refund of pre-payment. The reservation system design should also facilitate movement of freight throughout the region. • We strongly support a new and more efficient working relationship between WSF, our local governments and the FACs for the implementation of reservations on Kingston-Edmonds. While the success of reservations at the Anacortes-BC and Port Townsend routes are promising starts, implementation here will involve many times the traffic and will present significant new challenges. • We oppose reservation fees. As the intent of reservations is to reduce costs and improve efficiency, implementation costs should be recovered through savings and cost avoidance. If the implementation costs cannot be recovered, the system needs to be reconsidered. These savings need to be on-going as many in the community are convinced that although there may be initially no charge for reservations, in the future they will be required to pay a significant premium. While survey results may indicate a willingness to pay some fee, these reports do not differentiate those who would pay the fee daily from those for whom the fee would be occasional. Nor did report differentiate how that willingness would be driven by rider income levels. With a large percentage of the boat reserved reservation fees become in effect a "priority pricing" strategy for frequent users. This discriminates against the less financially and allows the more affluent to receive a disproportionate benefit from the use of public funds. • We support a no-show penalty from the reservation pre-paid ticket. It is essential to have some penalty to prevent abuse of the system • We do not support reservation implementation until there are sufficient back-up boats in the system. Reservations would compound rider problems when boats are out of service. Fares • We oppose fare increases beyond those equal to the rate of inflation for operating costs. In our community the 60% fare increases to replace lost MVET revenue have had a negative impact on the mission of the ferry system on Kingston Edmonds. Frequent use by low income riders became

Date Received	Comment
	unaffordable and adversely affected our community. In today's recessionary economy we believe that another round of increases would do significant harm. Rider surveys taken before the economic downturn have questionable accuracy in today's economy. In our assessment median and low income ridership will fall off significantly and the financial burden will be considerably greater for those riders who remain. This in turn we believe will depress local housing, small businesses, and retail sales. Although we can support increases that follow inflation even those will be difficult for our community while employment and wages remain stagnant. As labor is 60% of operating costs, and WSF has raised wages to within the norms for maritime workers, we think that WSF should be able to control cost increases within the rate of inflation. The improved utilization of assets and ridership growth should, as described in the 2006 plan, should result in significant long term revenue growth. • We oppose system recovery rates beyond the current 70% of operating costs. With our Governor, we think that through 60+% fare increases since 2000, riders have met a reasonable expectation of their response to the loss of MVET funding. We appreciate the cost of ferries in our state highway system's budget. There are however other costly parts of our highways. For example, maintaining our mountain pass highways is costly, yet the mountain pass highways have no user fees nor are they considered to be unsustainable. With the Tacoma Narrows bridge, the Kitsap Peninsula and the islands are the only regions in the state that is effectively tolled on all its primary access routes. • We strongly oppose any reduction of, or new limitations on frequent user discounts. The continued use of discounted fares for commuters and frequent users is essential to our communities. North Kitsap residents depend on frequent ferry use for employment, school and access to specialized services. Kingston's car commuters pay about $4,500+ per year in fares. Eliminating their frequent user fares is a 40% increase. This puts the transportation costs of median income commuters well above the "red flag" used by budget counselors. Without frequent user fares for car commuters, the ferry system would be affordable only to workers making over $100K/yr, or 5% of our county. This is questionable public policy. It's been commented that ferry commuters should pay more for using a "scarce resource". As it is only commuter routes that pay their way, arguably then it's the commuters' revenue that provides the ferry resource for occasional riders to use. • We support the Tariff Route Equity policy. ESB 2358 removed the legislative basis for system-wide tariff equity and it be reinstated. An equity policy is essential to a public transportation system as diverse as WSF. Under Tariff Route Equity all riders pay the same rate for the time or distance traveled. This recognizes that some routes, by their nature, are more efficient in delivering ferry service than others. Tariff Route Equity has taken 7 years to implement and now provides a rational basis for the differing recovery rates among the routes. We support this tariff policies even though Kingston-Edmonds riders do not financially benefit from either and routinely riders question the recovery rate differences that these policies create. Where we benefit is by having a cohesive system that serves all users. We think that it is essential to avoid the counterproductive "every route for themselves" environment that would exist without an agreed system equity policy. • We support legislation defining a mandatory public process before any fare change decision. While prior legislation had established a public participation process for all fare changes the process is vague in the current legislation as it only addresses the public process for fare strategies. In the future reaching a Level of Service (LOS) standard could trigger implementing a strategy which in turn would raise fares. Currently this may all happen without a public process. We believe that the public process should include: one month of public outreach to inform riders of proposed fare increases, public hearings after the public outreach program, formal review and comment by rider representatives (now the FACs), and an avenue of appeal beyond the WSTC. Strategies • We strongly support incentive strategies to improve ferry utilization such as full car discounts, car pools, small vehicle discounts, incentives to foot passengers and reducing the gaps between ferry and transit service. While ferries into Seattle benefit from established transit connections to their destinations, Kingston-Edmonds riders are faced with a growing diversity of work destinations and poor public transit connections. As a result, car pool incentives and transit improvements are needed. We also need affordable parking at the Edmonds terminal to enable car commutes to shift to walk-on travel. • We support strategy implementation only when the strategy costs will be recovered through savings and when that strategy will not increase costs elsewhere. As this process is being driven by financial considerations, we believe that all strategies must demonstrate that they will pay for themselves. • We strongly oppose peak pricing. It would impose significant costs on our riders and community without benefit. The intent of peak pricing is to delay the need to build new ferry capacity by leveling demand. Although the criteria for building ferries in the past has been to add capacity when Level of Service standards are exceeded, this is not the criteria for building ferries today. It's the need to replace 60% of the aging ferry fleet by 2030 that is driving ferry construction today and for the foreseeable future. The cost to riders of a peak pricing strategy to address a past method of ferry acquisition is not justified in today's environment. The concept that peak fares will shift riders to off peak times assumes there are meaningful "off peak" times that riders can shift to. While some riders in the survey showed a willingness to shift their travel

Date Received	Comment
	these results are misleading. The survey unfortunately did not give these respondents information on the actual peak and off peak traffic patterns for Kingston Edmonds which would be necessary for a travel decision. In the summer, our Kingston-Edmonds congestion doesn't taper of off until about 10PM. Summer riders will drive around Puget Sound and across the Tacoma Narrows Bridge rather than take a ferry that late, adding to road congestion and pollution. During the rest of the year the predominant traffic direction on the Kingston-Edmonds run follows the workday. It's eastbound in the morning and westbound in the evening. Peak pricing cannot expect to change these directions nor should it expect to shift ferry riders to night work. Peak pricing will disproportionately target fare increases on commuters who not only pay the most into the system but who also have the least flexibility in their travel. For example, eliminating the use of frequent user fares during peak hours would raise a commuter's ferry costs to over $6,000 per year. Workers do not drive by choice. As shown by WSF's Origin and Destination survey more workers are driving because they must use cars in their work, and because their worksites have become more dispersed and are not supported by transit. The ability to shift work and school schedules is limited and regular riders have already adapted their travel to the extent feasible to avoid congested travel times. Local non-commuters also have adapted to avoid long ferry lines. Peak hour fares have been used elsewhere to significantly raise revenue. While in other systems peak fares may also encourage using alternative transportation, here there are no practical alternatives for Kingston-Edmonds ferry riders. Rightly or wrongly riders see peak hour fares a means by which a transportation monopoly will raise revenue the expense of riders who have no other transportation choice. We believe that reservations are a more constructive and effective way than peak pricing to address congestion. While north Kitsap County and Olympic Peninsula residents strongly oppose the "peak hour pricing" they generally support reservations. With reservations riders will check the ferry space ahead of time and shift their demand to the boats with available room. By showing up near to the loading time, lines of cars will disappear along with wait times. • We oppose any strategy that has not had a formal assessment of the impact on riders and ferry communities. This is especially critical in today's recessionary economic environment. While legislation requires WSF to consider the impact of strategies on riders and communities it does not specify how that impact assessment is made. There has not yet been a process to formally assess that impact. Although we recommended to WSTC that they include this in their survey, they unfortunately declined to do so. While WSF has held many public meetings, the meeting focus has been a discussion of strategy alternatives and not impact. At this point we believe that only representatives of riders and communities can credibly provide an impact assessment. Level of Service Standards • We strongly support the direct participation of local governments in developing and assigning Level of Service standards. LOS standards have a critical impact on communities. To be meaningful with reservations and other strategies LOS standards must be fundamentally revised. To date there has been little or no involvement of local governments in determining and assigning new standards. When the LOS standards were last revised local governments had a pivotal role in the process. We think that engaging local governments in developing and assigning LOS standards will be absolutely essential to the success of this planning process. That this has not yet occurred is of great concern to us. • We oppose new LOS standards that would prematurely trigger strategies to increase rider costs. Standards set below current LOS standards could have riders paying premium fares to reduce congestion that did not, and might never exist. The new LOS standards for disincentive pricing strategies should be no lower their current wait time equivalent. Adding capacity • We support new ferry construction to sustaining the current fleet. Sizing new ferries to optimize their net revenue may mean building larger boats than the boats being replaced. We also support adding capacity to accommodate growth where that is cost effective to do. We do not support building additional Island Home ferries beyond the two currently planned and we strongly support proceeding with the acquisition of the 144-car ferries that are currently under bid Excellent work has been done by the Cedar River Group on the cost implications of new ferry size and timing. We support those recommendations except the recommendation to building additional Island Home ferries instead of 144-car ferries. The limited revenue generation, versatility and capacity for growth of a smaller size ferry would adversely impact both ferry financing and ferry system service. While the Island Home is optimal for the Port Townsend-Keystone route and possibly the Point Defiance-Tahlequah (non-summer) route, it lacks the versatility to meet needs elsewhere. Over the last year we have seen ferries shifted throughout the system in response to unplanned events. This will continue given a smaller size fleet in the future and versatility is key attribute for new ferries. The Island Home cannot meet the current demand on any Kitsap routes if called upon to do so. While the Island home may cost less to run than an expanded Issaquah ferry , according to the consultant's report, Island Home's cost per car is about twice as high as the 144 car ferry. The smaller boat also has less revenue generating capacity than the larger boat. The consequence of using Island Home on other routes will be to increase congestions and reduce recovery rates. As Island Home does not have the capacity to meet the currently documented ferry traffic on other routes it will become increasingly

Date Received	Comment
	problematic in meeting future needs. . The ferry acquisition currently under bid of two Island Home Ferries and up to three 144-car Issaquah ferries has been thoroughly, researched, analyzed, documented, and vetted. To change to that decision, a substantial portion of that analysis and vetting process should be repeated. To do otherwise would incur a substantial risk of making a poor long-term decision. The points raised in the recent ferry acquisition study have merit in considering follow-on ferry acquisition programs but they should not set back the program now underway. • We support extending the planned service life of our current ferries. Our 80 -year old ferries had serious hull structure degradation because the concrete in their bilges allowed hull corrosion to continue unobserved for decades. Modern inspection and preservation methods should extend our 1960's era ferries well beyond their assumed 60 year life. • We strongly support adding a non-scheduled ferry to the Kingston-Edmonds run as a summer, overflow boat. Given that WSF will eventually have back-up boats, stationing one in Kingston-Edmonds during the summer months will both add capacity and provide a positive revenue stream from the asset. A third, non-scheduled ferry has operated effectively with our scheduled ferries in the past. For example if the Sealth was on the Kingston run it would need to be about 40% full to pay for its operating costs. This would be easily exceeded at Kingston-Edmonds in the summer. While Sealth may be needed elsewhere from time to time, when not otherwise being used, putting Sealth on Kingston Edmonds we believe provides the best opportunity for it to provide a positive net revenue into the system and meet a known capacity need. Traffic • We strongly support taking near-term action to reduce ferry traffic congestion in Kingston. This includes reservations and the interim use of an existing parking lot as an auxiliary holding area. The impact of ferry traffic on Kingston is one of the most severe traffic impacts in the system. As ferry traffic runs through the center of Kingston's business district, summer traffic can make our downtown all but inaccessible. Queues of cars with running engines also create air quality problems. Kingston has two routes into town. When summer traffic exceeds the shoulder holding capacity the primary access road into town is shut down leaving the only other access by a circuitous local street. Stopped ferry traffic in SR 104's traffic lane is a safety hazard as well as stranding riders in areas with no public facilities. For these reasons a near term solution is needed. Reservations will solve much of this problem. We believe that for some years there will need to have a substantial part of the boat unreserved as well. The current holding lot has about 1 ½ boat capacity. We believe that a 2 boat capacity is needed in the near term before reservation are implemented and for several years afterwards as reservations become fully integrated. This can be easily achieved by the use of an existing parking area as an auxiliary holding lot. When the need for the auxiliary holding area declines it can be easily returned to a parking area. • We support the Kingston Circulation Study Plan as the long-term SR 104 plan of record. While the use of parking lots as an auxiliary holding area may address immediate needs, we may need more holding lot capacity in the future. For this reason the Kingston Circulation Study, which establishes a holding property currently owned by WSF and redirects traffic around our main street, should remain available for future implementation. • We strongly support improving the staffing, traffic controls and procedures of current holding lots to maximize their utilization. We appreciate the work done this summer to address this problem. Holding utilization however continues to impact Kingston with lines of cars backing up into town with their engines running. This results in clogged streets, unhappy riders and local citizens, as well as significant waste of resources (fuel and time). With the increased Kingston ferry traffic holding lot operations are due for reexamination. • We support transponder and pre-ticketed traffic lanes to increase traffic flow through toll booths. This will require collaboration with WSDOT on the traffic approaches to the terminals. • We strongly support a process to identify ways reduce the time needed to unload and load ferries. It appears that system performance could be significantly improved by reducing or eliminating the time spent on the non-unloading/loading activities that are conducted at the dock other than the conduct of security checks. Multimodal Transportation • We strongly support the Governor and the Legislature in taking measures to improve the collaboration between WSF, WSDOT and transportation agencies in the Puget Sound area to provide an effective transportation network. We also consider it essential that ferry transportation planning be an integral part of county and community planning under the Growth Management Act. Too often ferry planning ends at the toll booths, leaving a significant gap in transit, street and highway planning. As a result discontinuities inhibit transportation efficiency and, as has been pointed out in the traffic section of this paper, eliminate highway access to our community. The lack of coordination between ferry and transit operators frequently results in missed connections and underutilized transit assets. In Kingston we routinely see busses pull away as ferries start to unload. In Edmonds, AMTRAK and Sounder do not share the station building facilities, causing riders to stand in the weather. These are examples of why the general public perceives that these agencies lack an effective working relationship. • We strongly support increasing the collaboration between WSF and passenger only ferry service providers. Currently state ferry planning appears constrained to put on blinders to consider other cross sound transportation. For example, the recent rider survey intentionally

Date Received	Comment
	avoided collecting data on riders' interest in shifting from vehicles to walking on a Kingston-Seattle foot ferry. We see this as a significant lost opportunity. As observed in the 2006 WSF plan, Kingston-Seattle passenger ferry service is needed to address the long term needs of cross sound transportation in north Kitsap County. This passenger ferry route has the highest priority PSRC's recently completed passenger only ferry study. The Port of Kingston has assumed responsibility for a Kingston- Seattle passenger only ferry. We think the Port's success in developing this service will be important to our community's future follow on passenger and to ferry projects throughout Puget Sound. While WSF is not allowed to provide passenger-only service the level of their collaboration can make or break the business plans of those who do. Financing • We support a state-wide solution to fund ferries. If WSF is not sustainable then it is WSDOT that is not sustainable and remedies should address this as their first priority. While the proposed strategies may have a positive influence on traffic patterns and ferry utilization we do not believe this will resolve the underlying problem which is the lack of a stable, predictable source of funding for operations subsidy, maintenance and capital assets. After repealing MVET, a greater amount of revenue was subsequently raised through increased gas taxes. WSDOT transportation tax revenue has grown to about 25% greater than when it had MVET. The need to transfer funding within the WSDOT to support WSF was created when not enough transportation tax money was earmarked to sustain the ferries. The language of I-695 said nothing about defunding ferries and we do not believe that was the voters' intent in passing it. Taxes and where they go is our political leaders' responsibility and we assume that the current allocation of transportation tax revenue reflects their considered decision. With the 60+% increase in fares, ferry riders think, as has been stated by our Governor, that rides have already done their part to close this gap. On the Kingston-Edmonds route fares already cover operating expenses. Asking for significant fare increases beyond the inflation of costs is requiring riders of one route to subsidize another route. While we strongly support subsidizing affordable ferry service to these routes, we also believe this is a state-wide responsibility just as are the roads that connect our remote towns throughout Washington. If WSF cannot continue to be funded out of current WSDOT revenue sources then we recommend that legislation be proposed to re-establish a statewide tax to provide that stable funding. Cost Reduction • We support cost reduction as having a central role in the Ferry financing process. Before asking taxpayers or riders for more revenue, WSF must demonstrate that it is substantially reducing costs and that cost reduction targets are a part of the long range plan. Like barnacles on a ship, we think it's the long term accumulation of small costs that drags ferries down. These extra costs are spelled out in many studies and audits. To sustain the system WSF leadership and employees must have a culture determined to eliminate costs not directly associated with providing basic services. The recommendations in current studies and past performance audits should be closely examined and if not initially accepted, reexamined. Kingston's FAC and local governments should participate in considering cost reduction trade-offs. • We strongly support a program of continual process improvement through which workers partner with management to improve efficiency and reduce costs. Cost initiatives should not be limited to responding to external studies but should also be an internal process. • We support tracking WSF performance against commonly accepted business performance benchmarks. This would enable WSF to better identify areas for likely cost reduction. Use of accounting tools such as activity based costing would facilitate WSF in making business decisions. • We strongly recommend that the Legislature review current legislation that may add unnecessary cost to WSF. For example state taxes paid for fuel and ferry construction should be returned to the WSF. Many work rules constrain operating efficiency. Ferries should be allowed to hedge fuel purchases. This is a common practice in the transit industry. to reduce the financial impact of fuel price volatility on fixed budgets and provide fare predictability. We think this would be preferable and less administratively complex than a fuel surcharge. . • We strongly endorse the steps WSF has taken to reduce its administrative staffing. We remain concerned over the demands that the current WSF oversight structure places on the time and energy of WSF's staff. While the cost of this cannot be estimated, we believe that these demands seriously compete for time WSF leadership should be spending focused on WSF's basic mission. Policy • We strongly support legislation to clearly define the role of riders and local governments in ferry decisions. We think that the voice of the customer is a key to the long term success of our ferry system. Currently the role of ferry stakeholders, as defined by the RCWs, is spotty and vague. Frequent riders and local communities have the most to gain or lose in ferry sustainability decisions. We see projects where money may be better spent yet have no input into the proposal. For example $6M is proposed to move toll booths at Kingston for reservations and to allow improve transit access to the terminal. There have been no communications with the community on this project. The current terminal design allows busses to drop passengers off at the terminal. This transit drop-off may achieved without cost through operational procedures and coordination with Kitsap transit. The resources would be better applied in putting in the traffic controls, signs and lights which would allow the use of an auxiliary holding lot. This would both cost far less and meet a high community priority. Riders

Date Received	Comment
	pay a substantial amount into the system yet they have little or no voice in the trade-offs that drive WSF's costs. We believe that involving local governments and FACs in setting budget priorities would result in improving the system's cost effectiveness. • We strongly support forming a Ferry Commission or Board to be the single point for overseeing ferry operations. This should include representation from the legislature, the Governor's office, local governments and riders. It should also include expertise in areas relevant to our ferry system. This form of oversight is the norm for transit agencies. The current system of diverse oversight, with differing priorities and limited continuity, we believe impedes the efficiency of WSF. Although well intended, this oversight environment makes demands on WSF leadership and staff that unintentionally competes with their focus on the basic ferry system mission and increases system cost. A Ferry Commission or Board would provide more effective oversight through the collaboration of stakeholders and continuity of direction. While the composition of the State Transportation Commission is well suited to address a wide range of state transportation issues it is not suited to its current extensive and deep involvement in ferries. Given the wide range of Commission responsibilities it is not reasonable to expect them to have in-depth ferry system knowledge and experience nor hold their meetings in near ferry areas.. It has become apparent to us that as the ferry financing process moves from the current planning phase to implementation phase, the challenges will be considerably greater and the value of more efficient governance will become essential. • We do not support surveys as having merit in representing rider views unless the survey is concurred to by the FAC beforehand. It has been proposed that public meetings be supplanted by surveys as a means for public input. While surveys are effective in collecting data they fall short in representing rider views on ferry issues. Riders believe that a direct, two-way dialog on ferry issues remain essential to their interests.
01/20/09	Thank You for Coming to Kinston Wednesday, listening to what every one had to say and incorporating our comments into the plan. This was most likely one of the best and most disciplined hearings we have had in Kingston. Thank You, that is really important to us. There were three comments that really struck a chord with me and I hope they did with you as well. We sincerely hope you will find a way to incorporate them into the plans and your presentation to the Legislature and Senate at the end of the month. The First was that the plans are hard to read and figure out what is really what. Part of clarification would be clearly separating Operating Costs and their necessary Subsidy from Capital which would enable the representatives in the Legislature to make better Decisions. Also Suggest all the preparatory/back up information be moved to the Addendums and then say clearly "WSF Plans to: 1,2,3". We think that would reduce the plan itself to a manageable 10 or so pages. Second was that it seems the plans start at the bottom line -- why not plan for the finest Marine Highway, the best transportation service, the best schedule, the best maintenance, the best tourist attraction, the best appearance (like the Bainbridge Boats) the lowest fares, supporting growth management and communities needs. That is the State's Constitutional Obligation. Then you would have some wiggle room in the negotiations.-- this type of planning is frequently done in industry and the military. Third, recognizing you don't have control here but you can state the need. That was comments about a region wide comprehensive transportation plan including trains, buses, light rail and ferries of all types that is economical, coordinated, timely, fast and easy to use to go any where. It would seem that we should be asking for some real action and genuine leadership in this arena coming out of the Governor's Office, DOT and all of the transportation committees in the Legislature and Senate.
01/20/09 (This email sent by 6 customers)	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Please listen to what citizens and local leaders are saying. Make wise, enlightened, fair decisions on the ferry system. Don't continue dismantling one of Washington's most iconic, valuable and charming assets. Do not treat our ferries as if they are someone's private yacht. They are bridges in the highway system of western Washington....no different than bridges throughout Washington. I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Yes, we are in tough financial times, but that doesn't mean you need to hold a fire sale. Please do not make short-sighted decisions that will hurt our state for decades to come. This is a time for creativity. Consider using classic marketing principles to encourage ridership. Have you considered that oppressive pricing structures and poor schedules may be the cause of very trends you claim to so closely watch? The ferries are a Washington state treasure. It is time to get creative.
01/20/09	I am a retailer in Sidney, B.C. and am writing to urge you not to allow the cancellation of the Washington ferry, It is a VERY important link between the 2 countries economically and during this time tourist dollars are appreciated on both sides of the border. Thank you for your consideration.

Date Received	Comment
	The following is my response to the Washington State Ferries Draft Long-Range Plan. I live in Kingston Washington and as a daily commuter ride the ferries every weekday. I am very concerned by the direction expressed in this draft long-range plan. Comments on both Options Neither Plan A or B attempt to address growth projections for the areas served by the Kingston Edmonds ferry (north Kitsap, Jefferson and Clallam county commuters, shipping and other business interests). Neither plan attempts to address foundational state transportation and growth management goals – traffic management on overused highways and density of population growth planning. Since WSF is an integral part of the state transportation system, this is a large oversight. Neither option seeks to rectify a lack of stable funding, either through a range of adaptive management strategies such as outsourcing some or all routes, adding new markets and new operating and boat technologies for cost containment and reduction, expansion of the system to accommodate growth and increase revenue using lower cost technologies, and so forth. In short, neither address Kingston's needs, nor lead to long or short-term answers. Additionally some of the strategies in place for both options, particularly reservations, require implementation of technologies that WSF has not proven capable of elegantly or successfully implementing in the past. No details are included for how this will be accomplished in such a short time frame as suggested in the plans. Plan B Plan B is a weak solution to a short term issue; the apparent lack of state level funding. I do not consider plan B to be a viable alternative, as it does not come close to meeting growth projections for Kitsap County and in no way will be accepted by me as a feasible option. For the last two years ferry riders have been told that this planning process would come up with a ferry system that could be sustained over the long term. Plan B does not do that. It is unrealistic to expect local governance to develop passenger only ferries within the time frame outlined in the plan. This is especially telling as past experience shows this type of system is also not self sustaining. Plan A Plan A provides the minimum service levels below the growth projected by this very plan. The plan is inconsistent with growth projections for Kitsap, Clallam and Jefferson Counties (all counties served by WSF). Fares proposed in the plan are many and varied. Base fares for walk on passengers should decrease, not increase. Fares for vehicles should not increase more than that of inflation. In general, I've had enough of fare increases. Of course WSF does not set fares, only the Washington State Transportation Commission can do that. Frequent user fare incentives must continue. I am opposed to congestion pricing as I feel a reservation system can have a greater impact on controlling demand. Level of service standards should not be included in the plan until WSF consults with the affected local governments and Ferry Advisory Committees. I encourage transit enhancements for all terminals and specifically for Kingston. The $1.4M proposed to move a Kingston toll booth is unnecessary. All that is needed is consistent transit access to the curb lane at the terminal. The bus used to wait at the bottom of the ramp at the curb until WSF changed traffic patterns. When I've talked to the local ferry workers at the Kingston terminal, each has admitted they have plenty of room to accommodate transit. We highly recommend the congestion remediation plan proposed by a joint Kingston/WSDOT/WSF/Kitsap County task force be implemented. I support reservations as long as there is no additional fee. There must be priority systems in place for car and van pools, commuter/frequent users, local residents and commercial traffic. Capital improvements and direct replacements are important and necessary to have a sustainable system. Plan A's ferry replacement proposal does not meet the projected growth as outlined in the plan (or previous plans). The current proposal actually provides fewer boats than is needed in the plan. I believe that actions can be taken to ensure that the needed boats are built.
01/20/09	This a copy of what we have sent to Mary Margaret Haugen, We are very concerned about the current proposals offered to correct the ferry budget problems and maintain adequate and safe service for commuters. I would like to start by agreeing that the ferries are a crucial life line to the communities they serve as are the state highways. In fact the ferries are really part of the state highway system and should be treated equally and maintained by the state, not partially parceled out to individual communities who have far less sources of income than the state. The residents of Whidbey Island pay to maintain the state highways, and they are paying ever increasing fares to use the ferries. It is the state's responsibility to maintain and replace ferries and plan ahead to do so. If the current state sources of funds don't adequately cover this part of the transportation system other options that are paid for by all the state residents such as toll roads or higher gas taxes should be considered. I believe that the reservation system would not work well. One major problem with it would be the unpredicibility of traffic on the mainland for those coming to Whidbey. People could easily miss the reserved ferry spot by such delays. Please consider us an integral part of the state highway transportation system and do not downgrade our service.

Date Received	Comment
01/20/09	I am a regular commuter on three ferry runs--The Edmonds-Kingston (3-5 times a week Sept - June), the Bainbridge-Seattle (2-3/wk Sept - June), and the Port Townsend-Keyston (1-2/mo Sept - June & 2-5/wk July - Aug). I have a series of comments and questions that I would like to have included as public comment on the WSF long range plan. 1) First I would like to state that Plan B is unacceptable and does not meet the state mandate to offer the highest quality service. Cutting night service (which was defined as anything after 6:30 for me) on runs like the Bremerton-Seattle or kingston-Edmonds run is the equivalent to closing a state highway for nearly 12 hours every night! This kind of service would be unacceptable for state Hwy 99, it is also unacceptable for State HWY 104! 2) The reductions to ferry service seen in Plan B are also detrimental to both the West Sound and East Sound economies. Cutting service make it more difficult for commuters to get to their workplace, more difficult for tourists to get to their final destination, more difficult for goods to be delivered to stores. Additionally, cuts in service will force more commuters into their cars, and onto roads (HWY 305 through Poulsbo & Bainrbdige as well as on the highways into and out of Seattle) because commuters cannot use public transportation to get from home to one ferry run to their work place to a different ferry run and back home. This will increase traffic congestion and parking needs in both the West Sound and East Sound communities. 3)Similarly, with cuts to night service, commuters will not be able to stay after work to take advantage of restaurants, shopping, and entertainments because they will not have a way home after the last boat. 4) Both Plan A and Plan B lack the necessary details to truly understand the impacts they will have. After reviewing the plans and the appendixes, I find that neither plan provides detailed information on fare collection (there were so many possibilities, but no analysis or ranking of options, what service cuts will be made (does cutting night service mean cutting all ferries between 6:30PM and 5:50AM, or does it mean reducing service between those hours). 5) i do not understand the current method of calculating Fares, nor is it clear what the method preferred in the long range plans will be. For example, why is it that driving on a commuter, cross sound, run like Kingston-Edmonds, which takes about 25 minutes cost more than driving on a tourist, cross sound, run like Port Townsend-Keystone? Does it cost less to operate the Port Townsend-Keystone run? If everything is based on cost, shouldn't the runs that currently collect more $ than the cost of maintenance and operations (Kingston, Muklteo, and Bainbridge) cost less than the others? 6) When other highway users pay 0% of the maintenance and operation of their highways (beyond their tax contributions), why is it that the 87% paid by Ferry users (in addition to their tax contributions) is not enough? When WSF had a designated funding source, other than fare collections, the system was working. Rather than try to make cuts, or raise fares such that individuals and economies suffer, we should be working to identify a steady source of state funding to replace the source of funding cut by the legislature after the I-695 initiative. West Sound commuters generally pay for 2 bus passes and a ferry pass (totaling about $180/mo) to travel as little as 15 miles to and from work. Those same commuters could purchase a single bus pass for about 1/4 the cost to travel the 15 miles from issaquah to seattle. It is difficult to imagine how many people will be able to continue to live in West Sound communities if the fares continue to increase at the ridiculously high rates at which they have been increasing these last 10 years. 7) If WSF continues to focus on providing service at the lowest possible cost, rather than at the highest possible quality, the state puts itself and WSF riders in danger of the worst case scenario--a sinking ferry. We've already seen how skimping on maintenance resulted in the uses of Ferries that were determined to be unfit for service by the Coast Guard in Port Townsend. If we continue to force WSF to operate in such a way that only money is important, we will need to worry, not only about the Via Duct falling, but also about a Ferry sinking. 8) Having participated in the surveys conducted by WSF (and their contractors), I was offended as a rider. At no time did the surveys ask about how I am served by the ferry runs, and what would improve my experience as a rider. Instead, I was asked a series of questions trying to determine how much money I would pay to ride the ferries (until what I earn is discounted by what i pay to get there?) and if i was willing to ride an earlier or later ferry (my job begins at 9AM...I do not intend to arrive 3 hours early or 3 hours late, just because the ferries are crowded). The ferries need to come up with a plan to best serve its customers--of which there are two groups, the commuters and the tourists/irregular users. Designing a plan to meet the needs of these riders (rather than to mean the $ needs of WSF and the state) would allow WSF to design a plan that would improve ridership and revenues, while cutting losses. 9) The Ferry system is part of the WSF highway system and is an essential service. Plan B treats the ferry system as if it is optional for the state and the riders. Plan B is totally unacceptable. Thank you for including my comments in the public record.

Date Received	Comment
01/20/09	was with dismay that I learned that the Sidney-Anacortes Ferry route is in danger of being cut. This is an important route to many people, including those who live on San Juan Island and Orcas Island as well as in Sidney, Anacortes, and the Skagit Valley. San Juan Island is a popular getaway for people from Vancouver Island and from the US mainland; the economic impact of losing the route from Sidney will be enormous. It seems counter productive, in the current recession, to cut a route that gives employment to many people on the Island. The same can to be said for Anacortes. What will be gained if the ferry is cut? A saving of $9M on paper. What will happen to the people who are thrown out of work? Will they be absorbed into other jobs in WSF system? More than likely they will be left high and dry and will become a drain on the social welfare system. So the bottom line for the WSF looks good but the State and Federal budgets will need to be increased to cover the increased costs in unempleyment. Admittedly in the fall the ferry is not as busy as in the summer and perhaps some cuts in service could be made there - maybe three or four ferries a week instead of seven. Consider ways of cutting staff? Perhaps do away with the duty free shop and the cafeteria (I always take my own food on board). I have taken part in the 4th July and Christmas Parades in Anacortes as a member of the Sidney Sister Cities Association and have always been impressed by the very warm reception we receive from the bystanders as well as those I have met in the shops in the town. Sidney and Anacortes are true sister cities, supporting each others events, not just parades,but also sports and cultural events. and tattempts to scupper the ferry route . With the economy in recession, more people will travel locally and the larger view should be considered. The Anacortes ferry provides quick and easy access from Vancouver Island to the American Mainland and points south and east. The only other connection from the Island is via the Victoria Clipper (which doesn't take cars), the Coho - and Port Angeles is not the most convenient of jumping off spots for visits to the States, and the BC Ferry system with its heavy traffic in Vancouver and long waits at the border crossing. Cut the service in the fall, cut unessential staff on the ferry but keep this important link between two countries and communities open.
01/20/09	I don't know whose idea it is to have reservations on our ferries on Whidbey Island, but it is the most crazy idea anyone has come up with since I moved to the island 20 years ago. I have doctor appointments sometimes arranged quickly, like the same day. I have family members who live out of town who decide on the spur of the moment to come and visit. We are an island that depends much on tourist trade which having to make a reservation for your trip will greatly inconvenience them and thus, eliminate revenue for the island making us more dependent on state programs than usual or people will move off the island, also adversely affecting island revenues. We have people coming from out of town who have to deal with the traffic through Seattle from the airport. That is always a throw of the dice as to how smooth the traffic will flow. I work with business reps who come to the island, and it will be quite an inconvenience to them also if they get caught in any of the traffic on our highways in trying to get to the ferry. I have lived on the island for 20 years. I knew that there would be times I would have to deal with ferry difficulties when I moved here – it came as a package deal. It is not any different than I-90 or Highway 2 being closed because of weather or need for snow removal. It is part of the issues in dealing with this or that highway. Having a ferry go in for maintenance is just part of the deal. Better our ferries be serviced on a regular basis than breaking down in the middle of the sound. People who have issues with this should move off the island. I have sat in 2 and a half hour long lines while the ferry dock was being repaired in Mukilteo with the ferry running back and forth to Edmonds. It was part of the deal in living on the island and depending on the ferry – at that time I worked in Mukilteo, about 10 minutes from the ferry... I just did my work in my car for those months and had an extra long drive from Edmonds back to Mukilteo. Also just for your info. I have not once used the Keystone ferry since it went on the reservation system. I used to use it 4 or 5 times a year to visit relatives and on the Peninsula or just to go to Port Townsend for the day... Not any more... I just don't want to deal with making a reservation and being stuck with a certain time. Again, I do hope you will NOT put a reservation system on the Mukilteo-Clinton run.
01/20/09	I am a Canadian and have been living in Anacortes, WA for the past 8.5 years. I regularly use the ferry to get to Sidney, B.C. where two family members live. Although the ships are old and the food service is terrible, I would be lost without this important transport service. My health is not good and, at times it has taken me the better part of 6 hours to drive up through the border and take the B.C. Ferry to Sidney. I know you can't run a ferry service for the sake of one person but in all the times I have taken that ferry - either as a walk on or taking my car - I have never been the only person on board. This is a service that is used by many Canadians and Americans alike (by the way, I was surprised to find how many Canadians are living in Anacortes!) If nothing else, perhaps you could consider running to Sidney 3 times a week. Then, at least there would still be availability and people could plan their trips around the schedule. PLEASE DO NOT CANCEL THIS FERRY SERVICE UNLESS YOU BUILD A BRIDGE! Thanks for your time.

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09 (This email sent by 61 customers)	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Please listen to what citizens and local leaders are saying. Make wise, enlightened, fair decisions on the ferry system. Don't continue dismantling one of Washington's most iconic, valuable and charming assets. Do not treat our ferries as if they are someone's private yacht. They are bridges in the highway system of western Washington....no different than bridges throughout Washington. I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Yes, we are in tough financial times, but that doesn't mean you need to hold a fire sale. Please do not make short-sighted decisions that will hurt our state for decades to come. This is a time for creativity. Consider using classic marketing principles to encourage ridership. Have you considered that oppressive pricing structures and poor schedules may be the cause of very trends you claim to so closely watch? The ferries are a Washington state treasure. It is time to get creative. Thank you so much for your kind consideration of my letter!
01/21/09	I am a thirty-year resident of San Juan Island, and have worked at the Port of Friday Harbor for twenty-three years. I am writing to express my personal opinions regarding the Draft Long-Range Plan, although my perspective is filtered by my years in working with community, economic and transportation issues here in Friday Harbor. I am strongly in favor of the "Plan A" service levels. Any cuts in service would create large negative economic impacts which I don't believe you have addressed. We need access for visitors and part-time residents to support our small towns. While tourism is important to the state economy, it has a huge impact on our local businesses. We cannot afford any service cuts, including the Sydney run. Can this run be managed more effectively, such as one trip per day rather than two? I want to reinforce comments made at the public hearing on January 15 regarding the difference between the San Juan routes and other routes in the system. These islands are ferry-dependent, not just ferry-served. In addition, the small size of our communities means that we have to rely on our connection to the mainland even more than in communities where more goods and services are available. The current level of service is the minimum we require to make our communities work. You heard quite a bit about the importance of maintaining interisland service. The fact that WSDOT chose the interisland ferry as the venue for a public hearing reinforces the importance of that run. Why have you not suggested removing the requirement that ferries must be built in Washington state? This seems contrary to our own best interests, and to the concept of getting the best value for our money. It is absurd that we do not allow true competition for these bids. The legislature should address this, and our Washington shipyards should be required to prove themselves in a fair bidding environment. Remember that many small communities in other parts of the state are supported by state roads and highways that have no user fees. Is it time to think about "pay for use" throughout the transportation system? Toll roads are well known and accepted in other parts of the country. And I want to fully support the ideas raised by others concerning our need to find substitute funding for the MVET, including a reinstatement of that fee, or an increase in the gas tax. Transportation funding is one of those difficult decisions we have been avoiding. Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts.
01/21/09	My concern relates to the new vessel being constructed for the Port Townsend/Keystone route: this vessel needs to be equipped with a controllable pitch propeller. I believe that the fixed-pitch, gear-reversed propeller as planned, will seriously compromise maneuverability and result in an expensive vessel grounding (due to rudder design and external propeller shafting).

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	As a registered voter and tax paying citizen in Washington State, I think the Plan B proposal should be rejected out of hand. Ferries are a vitally necessary component of our transportation system, and need to be funded adequately. In this time of fiscal crisis, budget cuts are essential , but cutting spending on the ferry system is like cutting out the heart of this state. If anything, the ferry system needs to be expanded and improved. Funding must be found.
01/21/09	The information I have read indicates that if the Sidney ferry is discontinued by WSF that this would not be effective until September 2009 (also confirmed by calling WSF information line). I live on San Juan Island, and our 8th grade class is planning their annual end-of-the year trip to Vancouver Island in May 2009. Concern has been expressed that this ferry might not be in operation at that time. If this ferry is discontinued by May 2009, we will have to find another location for our 8th grade class trip. Please let me know if there is ANY possibility that the Anacortes-Sidney ferry will no longer be operating as early as May 2009 so that we can proceed with our planning.
01/21/09	As a resident of Sidney I feel compelled to comment on reports that the ferry service will be eliminated due to proposed cuts in the State of Washington Budget. The economic arguments against this course of action are well known and expressed by community leaders here and in your State. The San Juan and Gulf Islands together form an amazing asset for residents of both BC and Washington. The fact costs associated with maintaining "water highways" is seen only as an expense, in both jurisdictions, when public resources spent to create and maintain land transportation systems are seen as essential infrastructure investments, is a false construct of the issue before us. I understand that residents of Washington State have repeatedly voted to refuse permission for the WSF to raise financing to renew the fleet. I wonder, if maintenance budgets for the road network in the State were subject to the same process, what the impact would be on the sustainability of the road system if only residents of the San Juan Islands and other coastal communities were given the vote?? BC and Washington are maritime jurisdictions. Cancelling this service as a part of a downsizing and restructuring, necessitated by the refusal of people who never use the service to recognize its necessity would be a breach of faith to citizens of your state, and impact very negatively on your economy and that of your neighbours to the North. I wish you and your colleagues well with your deliberations and hope for a positive outcome.
01/21/09	As frequent users of your ferries from Sidney to Anacortes and return, I wish to state emphatically that it would be a terrible shame to lose this service. Both the towns of Sidney and Anacortes would be hard hit by taking away all those tourist dollars, not to mention the convenience of your ferries in travelling to the Pacific Northwest. I hope this will be given every consideration before making the decision to do away with the service.
01/21/09	Looking at the historical data on the impact of the Anacortes -Sidney ferry run, it becomes rapidly apparent that this run is a vital component of our regional economy. Projections for the future viability are easily and accurately predictable, based on this historical data. The proposal of the Governor to eliminate this transportation link is ill conceived. At the time when the federal government and most states are attempting to revitalize their economies, Washington can not afford to eliminate roughly 1,500 jobs, directly or indirectly associated with this ferry run. There are certainly many areas within the ferry systems where savings could be achieved, without eliminating positions such as: Renegotiating of Landing fees at Sidney, Reviewing union contracts and bring them in line with the private sector (fringe benefits), Renegotiating the Parking arrangement at the Anacortes terminal, to have the revenues go to ferry system, rather than a contractor, Inflation adjusted fare increases, These are just a few thoughts that are obvious to a casual observer and frequent user of the ferry. In dept study of the issue would likely reveal a series of other possibilities that could make it clearer that even under the current arrangement this run is generating revenue for the

Date Received	Comment
	state. It takes money to make money and I would hope that the Governor and all the concerned lawmakers realize that a small subsidy comes back manifold in the form sales taxes. Or, for that matter unemployment benefits not having to be paid,
01/21/09	Our small business on Orcas Island will be significantly effected by the discontinuing of the Sidney ferry run. Recently the summer schedule has not served Orcas Island properly. To have our guests forced to wait until 10 p.m. to travel to our island has been a major deterrent in reservations. We remember when the 1:30p.m. sailing from Sidney stopped in Friday Harbor allowing our guests to arrive on Orcas at a civilized hour. In the past few years, this has not been possible but many of our clientele have been determined enough to take what was available to them. Although the schedule is not the best, it does serve the San Juan Islands which is, we think, the purpose of the ferry system. The ferry runs are our highway. To eliminate one is like taking out a length of our roadway. We also ask you to please look at the taxes this small business collects for the county and state and do not cut our ability to continue serving the traveling public in both directions; from Anacortes and from Vancouver Island.
01/21/09	Thank you for coming to Vashon Island to hear about my community's concerns regarding the Washington State Ferries Division Draft Long Range Plan. I would like to thank you for opening up the Ferry Division to more sunshine after many decades of darkness. I am the Vashon Island School District's representative to the WSF Ferry Advisory Committee, appointed by the Vashon-Maury Island Community Council. On behalf of the Vashon Island School District, I would like to say that any reduction in ferry service or rescheduling that doesn't coordinate with our school schedule would be harmful to our mission of providing the best education possible to our children. Previous service reduction at Tahlequah has been harmful and incurred additional costs to our District. Previous rescheduling of the Vashon-Fauntleroy run has also had negative impacts to our District. Additional reductions in service or uncoordinated schedule changes at either end of the Island will cause further hardship, pain and financial costs to our School District, our students and our employees. The VISD has about 135 students that commute from Fauntleroy, Pt. Defiance and Southworth via the WSF system. These students are an integral part of our business model that allows us to be fiscally sound. We also have about 25 teachers, administrators and other staff that commute via the ferry to get to work. This number will be increasing as teacher's and other staff's wages don't keep up with the rise in the cost of living and fewer of our new teachers can afford housing prices on the Island. Furthermore, any reduction in ferry service or rescheduling that doesn't coordinate with our school schedule would be harmful to our interscholastic co-curricular activities and field trips that enrich our students education. The other schools that we compete with in debate, band, athletics and math Olympiad, to name a few, are on the mainland and require taking a ferry as it is our only means of getting off the Island. Just as important is the fact that these other schools are also stressed when the difficulty level of travel to Vashon Island is made more difficult and costly. In the late 1990's, as President of the Vashon-Maury Island Community Council, I worked with WSF in the formulation of the 1999 20-year Long Range Plan. That 1999 20-year Long Range Plan called for a second boat on the Tahlequah-Pt. Defiance run in the year 2012. The 2009 "Plan A" now calls for only one boat still in 2012 and beyond and a smaller capacity boat at that. In the 1999 20-year Long Range Plan the Vashon-Fauntleroy run was to have larger boats as well. Now the 2009 "Plan A" doesn't call for capacity upgrades until 2017 or 2019. This major shift in policy after 10 years of a 20-year plan strains my faith in your understanding of the issues. The 1999 20-year Long Range Plan understood those issues. It took the bold, politically incorrect but accurate position that Vashon Island and the San Juan Islands have no other transportation options than the Washington State Ferries and that it is the responsibility of the State to address those needs. The document that expresses this is the "Plan C" alternative of the WSF 1999 20-year Long Range Plan that similar to the 2009 "Plan B" explores the what if of minimal funding. "Plan C" of the 1999 20-year Long Range Plan recognizes the fact that Vashon Island and the San Juan Islands are the number one priority for ferry service as they have no other options. It recognizes this by providing service only for Vashon Island and the San Juan Islands in the worst case scenario of minimal WSF funding from the State. You must accept this underlying principle also. The solely ferry-dependent communities of Vashon Island and the San Juan Islands should not have to share the pain equally with those communities that have other transportation connectivity options such as bridges and state highways. Another cause for concern is that despite repeated requests for WSF to

Date Received	Comment
	communicate and collaborate with the Vashon Island School District on changes in service levels or scheduling, it does not seem to happen as no one at VISD was contacted in formulation of this plan. I asked you myself at the last Island meeting that you attended if you would do this and you seemed to nod in agreement. Therefore, I ask again that you please keep in touch with us because ferry changes can have severe adverse impacts on the education that we provide our students. As we both know, the State's paramount duty is the education of our children.
01/21/09	WA State Ferries are an extension of our highway system,connecting towns,cities and surrounding communities. Historical data show that the ferry between Anacortes and Sidney is not loosing money and projection show that it will increase the revenue to the state in the future. The ferry run is vitally important for our regional economy. Halting this ferry run would cause businesses to close adding more unemployed people to the already growing number of them nationwide. Beside roughly 1500 jobs directly related to the ferry run would be lost. Under the current economic conditions it would be irresponsible to cut the ferry run between the two cities. People , who have relatives on either side of the border would have to drive many miles, using precious gas(we are trying to curtail the amount used) and pollute the air (which we are trying to decrease). Other ways have to be found to achieve savings. Renegotiate the landings fees with the BC ferries, who are leasing the Sidney terminal from the city of Sidney. Inflation adjusted fare increases Reviewing some union contracts with the WA State ferries employees union The Parking fees currently assessed in Anacortes should go into the coffers of the WA ferry system, instead of private contractors. The winter months, in which the ferry does not run creates already a hardship for many businesses. Cutting this ferry run is not an economical way of saving money for either the state ferries nor the State of WA, who would have to spent more money on unemployment and loose tax revenue.
01/21/09	We were most dismayed when we heard that the Washington State Ferries were considering the cancellation of the ferry between Anacortes and Sidney. This has been considered before and we have worked long and hard to preserve this ferry route. We have continued to promote the ferry by parading our model of the ferry in Sidney and Anacortes several times a year. We have also used a smaller model at table top displays in our information booth at the weekly street market in Sidney during the summer. The financial benefits to the two communities are well known and the benefits to many other communities on the San Juan Islands, Gulf Islands and Vancouver Island are obvious. Dare we suggest that you consider maintaining the service year round, albeit on a reduced level in the winter months? Perhaps just several times a week instead of every day? Running an empty ferry obviously makes little sense but a schedule that allows people to stay awhile at either end could be to everyone's advantage. Our mission as a Sister City Association is to promote international friendship and relationships, understanding and cooperation at the grass roots level, person to person and between organizations. We have succeeded at a high level over many years with Anacortes and we wish to continue our friendship. Discontinuation of the ferry run will hurt this great effort. Please save our ferry.
01/21/09	This is my response to the draft long range plans for ferry service. I am apalled at the 2 options (Plan A and Plan B) that were developed! Neither is within budget, and neither provides an acceptable level of service to the taxpaying public. The ferries are supposed to be part of the state highway system, and that service is paid for by we, the taxpaying people. Those that pay (state taxpayers) MUST be provided the service we are paying for, and we are not. I have lived in this state all my life, and commuted on the Southworth-Vashon-Fauntleroy ridiculous triangle route for 20 years. When we make complaints, we are told, “You can drive around!” What a comment when the ferry system is supposed to work to support viable transportation and unclog the way too crowded highways and freeways—shame on you all! I could go on and on, but here is what I say: Scrap both Plans A and B and start over, Develop something that really will work (for once) We as taxpaying users of the system (and supporting your jobs!), demand it! Please listen to our needs and our ideas—we have experience because we use the systems! Lose the top-heavy executives in the system—yes, cut out the high paying bureaucrats within the ferry system! If need be, hire a new person or a couple of persons that will come up with a viable plan. Once you have a plan, ask more money of the State Legislature if that is what you need. The cuts in both plans A and B are

Date Received	Comment
	unacceptable. Thank you for considering my response.
01/21/09	The long term plan put forth by WSF is woefully inadequate, as it fails to plan for the regional growth that is expected to occur in both the West and East Puget Sound areas. Here's what to do. Scrap plan B in it's entirety, as it is a non-starter. Using the same logic you have for cutting ferry service, you might as well save money by sinking the 520 bridge across Lake washington and telling all those bellevue folks to make due with the 1-90 bridge. That makes about as much sense planning to cut ferry service because you failed to adequately plan for boats. Make the current plan A, plan B - the woefully inadquate status quo approach. Write a new Plan A. It needs to address future population growth by increasing Ferry service - rather than cutting it back. Get out of the I-695 " loss of funding" box you've had yourself in for the last several years. Part of plan A needs to compare the costs of Auto ferrys for Central Sound routes wtih the cost of a well placed bridge from the West sound to the Seattle area. Go visit Oakland, SF and take a look at the Oakland Bay bridge. I think you will find that the cost of running ferries will be much less expensive. The point is stop whining about the loss of funding from I-695 and get boats funded. Or build a bridge from Bainbridge or Northern end of Kitsap to the East Sound. Then you could fulfill the idea of all passenger only ferry service, Or perhaps you could do away with ferry service in a responsible manner, since then you could develop bus service that would be properly funded. Absent that, you need to stop soaking the direct commuters so much for the ferry revenue. Start treating the ferry service as part of the mass transit system AND highway system. No more than 50% of ferry revenue should come from the commuter paid fare. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I look forward to your revised plan.
01/20/09	I am a resident of Sidney, British Columbia and I support the Anacortes Ferry. Recently the ferry terminal was even upgraded so it would be a shame to waste that. We rely on tourism in our small town and taking away the Anacortes Ferry would be detrimental to our livelihoods.
01/21/09	After hearing your recent interview on National Public Radio and reviewing the facts of the budget challenge WSF and your state face, for the sake of our large Northwest regional economy, The Butchart Gardens strongly urges the scrapping Plan B and continuation of the international ferry service between Anacortes, Washington and Sidney, British Columbia. There are many economic, cultural and international reasons to keep this run, and my company views this issue as a regional concern that has a large impact on many layers of the complex economy that spans Washington State and British Columbia. Indeed, during these challenging economic times, tourism and many other business sectors are depending on multi-modal transportation options to maintain our diverse NorthWest economy. The efficiencies such options provide are key competitive factors in helping our region cope with the current recession better than many other regions. We therefore urge you to collaborate with such organizations as the Pacific NorthWest Economic Region (PNWER) to ensure that all economic and cultural impacts of this decision are evaluated as objectively as possible. When combined with the facts contained in the Hovee report, we are confident that the facts generated by a regional analysis from a 'PNWER perspective' will give you and your legislators the clear mandate to enhance the Sidney-Anacortes ferry run as we move towards the 2010 Olympic games. As the Hovee Report clearly states, cancelling the Anacortes/Sidney Ferr run will adversely affect Anacortes and the counties of Skagit, Whatcom, Island, San Juan, Snohomish, Sidney and Greater Victoria. When combined with the current direction of our national economies, the timing of such a cut could in fact devastate these hard working communities. The numbers that spin out from this are enormous; a loss of $1.3 millon in local taxes, 1470 jobs taken from the economy with a corresponding $30 million loss in payroll

Date Received	Comment
	and a staggering loss of $126 million in spending. This is simply not the time to cut such a service, and surely these figures and social consequences diminish any short term line item savings to a net of zero. Mr. Mosely, despite the current economic challenges that we all face, this is a time to be optimistic and demonstrate novel fiscal leadership. To be frank, cutting is easy. In times such as we face, the key to long-term success is determining where to maintain funding and increase investment. In my home town of Victoria, our current challenges have given birth to a new spirit of destination marketing cooperation, and a true belief that as a regional destination we are greater when working together than the mere sum of our individual municipalities or organizations. There are many stakeholders in our city who feel that ridership can be increased on the Anacortes/Sidney run through targeted marketing campaign directed at the 'tourism-in-you-own-backyard' trend as well as at traditional international and domestic tourism markets. It must be recognized that the passengers such marketing initiatives will attract are high value tourists who spend in our respective communities more so than a commuuter would do on a daily commute. My company has been in tourism for almost 105 years, and there is little doubt that we, along with a host of other businesses, have greatly benefitted from easy multi-modal transportation connections to the United States. Through cross-selling and various other partnerships, large US companies such as Blackball Ferry Ltd., Clipper Navigation, MTR Western, Gray Line of Seattle, Horizon and Kenmore Air have also benefitted from these options. Personally, to quantify the cultural loss that losing this run would represent, I need only to think back to last spring when I was invited to be a keynote speaker at the San Juan Master Gardeners Symposium. Through the convenience of this ferry run I discovered that less than thirty miles from my home there was an amazing community of keen horticulturalists who were the most friendly people I have ever met. Our friendships have been enduring and this experience has deepened the commitment I personally feel towards building tourism between the US and Canada. It would be a true shame for our nations to lose a service that facilitates such connections.
01/21/09	I understand that you are planning on cancelling the Washington State Ferry service from Anacortes to Sidney due to low ridership and thus economic feasibilty of the service. While I do not know the financial details of the savings you are hoping to achieve by this cancellation, I can see that such a cancellation would negatively affect the businesses that rely on the ferry service in the communities at both ends of the service. So I am asking you as a Sidney resident to give serious consideration to the financial losses incurred by a complete cancellation of the service. In addition to financial considerations there are of course the international and humanitarian aspects of the step you are considering. As a member of the Sidney Sister City Association under which auspices we have been actively pursuing contacts between our community in Canada and your community in the United States of America, viz., the Anacortes – Sidney sister city agreement, I am asking you to take these primarily non-economic considerations into account as well.
01/21/09	Integral to the city of Seattle are those who commute on the ferries. Heralded as one of the safest such systems in the world, the Washington State Ferries are a vital link across Puget Sound and a reduction in service only diminishes the vibrancy of the greater Seattle metropolis and casts a pall over a public transportation system that is and rightfully should be a hallmark of the city and its waterfront location. I selected my home and work locations largely based on a single factor—proximity to public transportation on the ferries. Please don't let long-term planning overlook the existing and potential growth of a cleaner, more eco-friendly means of transportation for people contributing to the health and vigor of this great city.
01/21/09	My husband and I would both like you to know how important the Sidney Ferry is to our city of Anacortes. For over twenty years, we owned and operated a restaurant in town located at Cap Sante Marina that we had to close down for environmental remediation last year. During those years of operation we served thousands of people that used the Sidney Ferry. Most of those people were repeat ferry riders and the rest of the people were visiting our fair city for the first time. If we didn't have that volume of business directly related to the Sidney Ferry we would not have received at least $8,000 a year in gross revenues and we would not have employed at least 2 people each summer. Those are meaningful numbers when you consider we were just one small restaurant! Cutting the Sidney Ferry run would adversely impact our small city's economy immediately. We are already struggling with the declining sales tax revenues that are pervasive around the state, but this decision would set Anacortes at such a disadvantage, I am not sure we could recover in my lifetime and I certainly don't want to pass this problem onto our son and future grandchildren. You have to know how important this is to our city. Currently we are a marine based economy with all the related

Date Received	Comment
	revenues. Please hear our voice and reconsider this disastrous decision!
01/21/09	Please DO NOT cancel the Sidney/Anacortes ferry run. The impact would have a disastrous economical effect on the two cities, Sidney and Anacortes. . It would also curtail the cultural alliance fostered between the two sister cities. I would be concerned about the Washinton state regional economic loss....1.470 jobs with a 30 million dollar annual payroll along with 126 million in annual spending throughout the Skagit valley, and it would seem as though the savings on operating the ferry would be seriously offset by the direct and indirect economic loss of sales and services in the Skagit valley, Sidney and the Saanich Peninsula.
01/21/09	I am a long time resident of Sidney, BC, a member of the Sidney Sister Cities Association (our first sister city is Anacortes) and a travel agent in my work life. The ferry ride between Sidney and Anacortes is world class! But it needs to be marketed. I would venture to guess there are many residents of Washington and BC who have never heard of this ferry link and if they haven't you can be certain that tourists from all around the world won't have heard of it either. I realize that Marketing takes money but you have to spend to make it. I truly believe that the run could make money. I am sure the many benefits of the ferry link to both communities has been well documented by others, particularly the economic impact. I add my name to many others from Sidney and environs who send our pleas to the Washington State government to continue of this ferry route! I am also sending a letter to David Hahn, CEO of BC Ferries, to ask about BCF reducing the lease payments of the Sidney terminal from WSF, which I understand are extremely high.
01/21/09	I am requesting that you do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney run. The impact would have a disastrous economical effect on the two cities, Sidney and Anacortes. . It would also curtail the cultural alliance fostered between the two sister cities.
01/21/09	I am writing to you in support of keeping the Anacortes/Sidney ferry operating. I have worked at the Sidney information Centre and have provided service to just under 7000 visitors in 2008. A majority of these visitors were from the USA travelling via the ferry service. The impact would be devastating to the local economies should the transportation route be cancelled and the wonderful experience for visitors eliminated.

Date Received	Comment
1/20/09 (This email sent by 111 individuals)	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) As President of the Orcas Island Chamber of Commerce, Orcas Family Health Center, and business owner for 25 years it is imperativethat you listen to what citizens and local leaders are saying. Make wise, enlightened, fair decisions on the ferry system. Don't continue dismantling one of Washington's most iconic, valuable and charming assets. Do not treat our ferries as if they are someone's private yacht. They are bridges in the highway system of western Washington....no different than bridges throughout Washington. I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Yes, we are in tough financial times, but that doesn't mean you need to hold a fire sale. Please do not make short-sighted decisions that will hurt our state for decades to come. This is a time for creativity. Consider using classic marketing principles to encourage ridership. Have you considered that oppressive pricing structures and poor schedules may be the cause of very trends you claim to so closely watch? The ferries are a Washington state treasure. It is time to get creative.
01/21/09	I am writing this letter to ask for you to reconsider removing the Washington State ferry between Anacortes and Sidney. 1: It seems to me that this ferry is in great need to keep the friendship between our two countries intact. 2; Also this ferry has been in Sidney for many many years and the loss of income for the town of Anacortes and Sidney will be very substantial. 3; You are also taking away a beautiful scenic route a lot of us so enjoy. Please reconsider this move, with many many thanks,
01/21/09	Please consider keeping the route from Anacortes to Sidney in tact.
01/21/09	I am writing to support legislation by Rep. Christine Rolfes to repeal or alter the Jones Act that is keeping us from getting bids nationally to build ferries. This outdated law limits us from receiving any federal funds to build ferries because federal funding requires a national bidding process. With President Obama stressing investing federal funds to rebuild infrastructure, repealing or altering the Jones Act would position us to be able to receive funds and build ferries sooner rather than later -- and most likeley at a significant savings to taxpayers.
01/21/09	The proposed plan to replace the 55-car Rhodendron with the 34-car Hiyu on a permanent basis would make my husband's commute to Boeing's Auburn plant very difficult. As it is he leaves the house now at 4:30am to get the 5:30am boat. I am especially concerned for my mother (79) who must go weekly to Tacoma for a doctor's appt. My sister's partner works at a health clinic in Fremont several times a week and I commute to Seattle where I work for a local television station. This change would also impact our need to care for our grandchildren. This change not only would make our lives difficult but even more so for the elderly folks with serious health conditions and for parents with children in sports. Removing a boat run from the north end and technically doing the same thing by giving us the tiny Hiyu as a replacement for the Rhody, is not a workable plan. It seems to me that this is another attempt by the WSF service to make us uncomfortable enough to consider a bridge. The Hiyu, I believe, belongs to Pierce County which causes me to question this arrangement. Also, I know that the population of Anderson Island is much less than that of Vashon. You need to know that I lived on South Hill in Puyallup for 20 years prior to moving to Vashon 6 years ago. I drove 90 miles a day to get to my job. Not one of those days was I charged an extra penny for the opportunity of working in Seattle (more free-way and gas usage) so I could bring in a bit better wage. Now, I pay a large amount to ride the ferry. My husband and I live in a 1166 sq. ft 1918 bungalow. We are not wealthy. Our move to Vashon was

Date Received	Comment
	precipitated by the desire to live a simple life in a place that controlled growth better then South Hill. We knew we would have to make compromises but this is unfair. It feels like you are squeezing many of us off.
01/21/09	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) There are three points to be raised regarding the current conversation about the future of the WSF capital program. The first relates to the proportionality of each capital plan as it relates to both terminal and vessel investments. The 2 billion in difference cost between plan a and plan b is not explained by the difference in vessel construction plans. Such a cost difference could pay for 20 of the 144 car vessels. Is the difference in cost between the two plans also a factor of two different approaches to future terminal construction that parallels the two vessel plans? If so, it would seem logical to ask why we don't develop a plan which builds plan a ships and plan b terminals? There should be a plan which builds the ships we need and limits terminal investments to stabilization. Terminals should be as simple and as utilitarian as possible. A second thought is that we need to look at the project list costs and the source of funding differently than we are now. For example we have not been told how much of each project list is Federal money and how much is state money. Much has been inferred by how WSF is representing the cost differences between the two plans a and b. One plan requires 2 billion more in new money (new taxes)than the other but people assume that one will cost the STATE 2 billion more than the other. This is simply not the case. In virtually every major highway project the federal government pays a substantial portion of the cost. This has been less so in the WSF for many years but still a very great amount of federal money is used by WSF. We need to know what the state portion of that actual cost difference will be in order to fully understand the financial gravity of going with plan a vs plan b. It is important to emphasize that federal money is fully available for the construction of terminals, for the purchase of vessels, propulsion systems and the preservation of terminals and vessels. This is even more true now than ever before because of the economic stimulus efforts underway at the federal level. By example, WSF built the Snohomish and Chinook with 90% federal money. They cost the state very little money to build. More recently, WSF built four propulsion systems for the four 144car ferries with federal money. Between just these two projects over 70 million federal dollars went to WSF vessels. A third point to the legislature is that WSF does not suffer from a lack of planning. They are actually very good at planning but are absolutely horrible at execution. Dreadful is the only term to describe their record in this decade. The point to be made is that it does not matter what the planners bring forward in terms of Plan A or B. It does not even apparently matter what the legislature agrees to fund as the well funded 144 car program clearly demonstrates. What matters is delivery of projects. WSF has not been able to execute its own plans to build ships and terminals since the 1990s when it successfully built five ships. WSF has become too process oriented by the WSDOT parenting effort to deliver anything. We must get back to basics and expect three things from a project: On Time completion On Budget completion On Schedule production WSF's inability to deliver it's very well thought out plans is at the root of the current crisis. Consider this: In 2002 WSF had a firm plan to start retiring the Steel Electrics in 2008. Their sudden retirement in November of 2007 would have had no impact on WSF if the 2002 construction program executed according to schedule because the first deliveries of the new class of vessels was to take place last year. WSF has to deliver on it own plan. WSF needs to be depoliticized by creating a public corporation along the lines of the very successful Alaska Railroad. Work out a formula for funding that will be predictable and allow the corp to float bonds. Additionally, we should concentrate on three classes of vessels: Jumbo MK II's, 144's, and 64's; along the SW Airline model. Some stop gap measures like reworking two SE's, would fill the gap. It seems Vessel construction will recieve no Federal Funding under the current "build in Washington" requirement. Portions of the Vessels may be funded, like the propulsion plants if open to all bidders. Though ridership is all for building in Washington, right now it looks like we do not have the funds to do so from the State. If we want to have the boats we needed two years ago built anytime soon we will have to let the country bid on the projects. Plan or no plan it looks like a stable funding policy to replace the MVET needs to be first. Without leadership in how we are funding the future none of the plans are worth the paper they have been written on. Restrictive bidding direction from the top down has been a big part in the delay of construction to date. Now there is no time to make it anything other than a rush before the system crashes. Please do not rush into making a decision on this very important matter that will impact a large portion of citizens for a long time to come.

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	I have recently moved to Bainbridge Island and attended the public hearing regarding the long range plan for the ferry system. I must say, that I was quite disturbed by the lack of "forward-thinking" of the Legislature and by the management of the ferry system. It appears that no one has looked at the "Big Picture" of transportation issues in Western Washington. As a new resident, I have noticed that the number of ferry crossings between Bainbridge and Seattle during off-peak hours is too high and the boats are not being filled to even half capacity. Seems like the crossings should be reduced during those slow periods—sure some will complain, but a half hour difference in their lives is not a big deal…people need to make sacrifices this year, right? Another issue is how the ferry plan impacts the tiny island of Bainbridge. It is not set up to handle a huge amount of cars stacked in line for the ferry. Did no one look at this impact? I also do not believe that the whole transportation system is being reviewed properly. I thought that WA state was progressive in their mass transit policy, but the ferry reduction and lack of planning and the motives to build a car tunnel in downtown Seattle did not show me that WA state has any interest in moving its residents around via mass transit. Why would we build a new car tunnel when we want to preach a low carbon footprint? It seems that funds should go to the light rail project and more passenger ferries (run by WSF, not a county) to encourage a population to stand out in the crowd. My criteria for moving to WA has been reduced by this move to make this very political statement to WA residents that we want you to have to drive your cars. I truly thought WA state was more eco-friendly.
01/21/09	The whole system should be absorbed into the state highway system as this is our state highway. How much do people pay to go to Eastern Washington via the many road systems? When people think about traveling to Wasington State the scenic ferry system is very attractive and pulls people through all of the towns served. If you make the ferries much harder to use, the State will loose much of the accumulative tax revenue stream created by the tourist. If you make the San Juan's much more difficult to get to, you will lower our desirablility and further compound our labor and housing problems
01/21/09	My business in Friday Harbor is called Arctic Raven Gallery www.articravengallery.com. We are a native art gallery and get most of our work from Canada. Much of it comes from Vancouver Island. Cutting out this piece of marine highway would sever my main tie to my suppliers. My business requires me to cross the border on a regular basis. This is one of my lifelines to visit my Northwest Coast artists. I can see the lights of Victoria from my house. If you stop this vital run, then I will have to take a ferry to Anacortes, drive up to Blaine to cross the border, drive out to Tswassen to take a 2 hour ferry ride back to Schwartz Bay and then drive clear down to Victoria. This is very expensive and requires two extra days of travel time. This is more than an inconvenience for me, it is devastting to my business. Stopping the commercial opportunites at this time could be crippling. There was the hope of getting some spin off business in 2010 from the Winter Olympics. Perhaps you could at least wait until after this opportunity.
01/21/09	I would like to make it a matter of public record the following comments about the WSF long range plan. 1. The cutbacks proposed under plan B are similar to the loss of roads and highways recently experienced during the winter storms of 2008-2009. Therefor the legislature needs to provide funding to the current level of service or better, and provide permanent funding for the capitol program. 2. The HIYU does not fit in the docks at PT Defiance or Tahlequah as currently configured. The cleats slip under the apron unless the vessel is kept straight in the dock. The added expense of fuel, along with the added risk of damage and injury do not justify the HIYU as a permanent option for PT Defiance/Tahlequah. 3. The proposed long range plan does not include a previous option of the M/V Evergreen State as the permanent vessel for PT Defiance/Tahlequah. This is the best long range option for the run since it adds future capacity while keeping with the current LOS (Level of Service). 4. As a property owner on Vashon, I pay for the county roads thru property taxes. Since there are no roads on Vashon provided by the State of WA, there is a sense of "taxation without representation" when paying the gas tax. 5. Vashon and the rest of the communities served by WSF have undergone severe cutbacks since the passage of, (and repeal, but supported by the Leg.) I-695. Now that the economy is feeling the effects of recession, are we to be subjected to more cutbacks? No! It is the Legislatures duty under law to maintain the LOS that is currently enacted, and provide an increase when necessitated by more than a 1 boat wait. 6. The reservation system does not take into account the dock at Fauntleroy not being large enough to stage the vehicles. Rather than wasting 10 M+ to create a new system, why not try making the current schedule with an asterisk showing the trips that consistently overload. Then a customer could plan discretionary trips with ease and maximize the

Date Received	Comment
	unfilled vessels. Thank You for considering these options.
01/21/09	I am writing to show support of the Washington State Ferry - Anacortes to Sidney route. I am a long time resident of Sidney and I have traveled on this ferry many times, over the years – and so have many members of my family – both Canadian and American. This particular ferry route is marvelous, a real gem – for both our countries. The conversations that I have had with others over the years, while sailing along this gorgeous route, have been priceless. Not only have I spoken with Americans on their way to visit my country, or other Canadians on their way to visit yours, but I have also spoken to people from around the world who marvel at the beauty of both our countries and the friendship that exists between us. There could not be a better Ambassador for both Canada and the United States, as that ferry. Forget Plan B! Keep this route. The monies that flow into both our communities, our province and state – is only a part of this story. And, yes, it is an important issue. Although I can't believe that there wouldn't be significant financial benefits in keeping this route going. However, the benefits of retaining this route go far beyond dollars. Surely they do. Thank you for all the pleasure that I have received from Washington State, via this ferry route.
01/21/09	Our small business on Orcas Island will be significantly effected by the discontinuing of the Sidney ferry run. Recently the summer schedule has not served Orcas Island properly. To have our guests forced to wait until 10 p.m. to travel to our island has been a major deterrent in reservations. We remember when the 1:30p.m. sailing from Sidney stopped in Friday Harbor allowing our guests to arrive on Orcas at a civilized hour. In the past few years, this has not been possible but many of our clientele have been determined enough to take what was available to them. Although the schedule is not the best, it does serve the San Juan Islands which is, we think, the purpose of the ferry system. The ferry runs are our highway. To eliminate one is like taking out a length of our roadway. We also ask you to please look at the taxes this small business collects for the county and state and do not cut our ability to continue serving the traveling public in both directions; from Anacortes and from Vancouver Island.
	I am writing to state my strong opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Do not treat our ferries as if they are a luxury for a select few - they are not. They are pieces of the State highway system .... no different than any other bridge or highway throughout Washington, and the State has a duty to fund, operate, and maintain them as such. They are a lifeline to the western Sound. The ferry service is how many of us access our jobs, medical care, and higher education opportunities. They are pipeline for the transportation of goods and services, and a vital piece of the economic infrastructure of the region. Both draft long-range plans (A and B) are completely unacceptable. For years, service has been lagging, and riders have demanded improvements and more frequent service - and now we are faced with either severe cuts or the status quo? We can not handle service cuts - we need service increases. Scrap the draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. The only way to save the system is to improve it. We are in tough financial times, but slashing ferry service will only make things worse. It will start a domino effect - without reliable service or reasonable commute times across the Sound, fewer job opportunities will exist, less money will flow into local economies, residents will move away, and housing prices will continue to decline. It will have deep environmental impacts - instead of using park & rides and transit, people will instead be forced to use their cars - more pollution and more traffic. There will also be increased demand to improve highway corridors to access the few remaining ferry routes that provide adequate service. The unintended consequences will be disastrous, and put our local economy and quality of life in an even deeper hole. It is penny-wise, but pound-foolish. The loss of tax revenue, increased environmental costs, and future demand for road improvements would cost the State more in the long run than any short-term savings from gutting the ferry system. If the WSF Planning Committee and the State are willing to be creative, there are plenty of possible solutions to the current crisis, without having to cut service. Eliminating the in-state build

Date Received	Comment
	requirement for new boats would be a good start. Yes, it is important to preserve jobs - but is the State telling us that the jobs of a hundred or so unionized shipyard workers are more important and deserving of protection than the jobs of the thousands of commuters that rely on the system? Has the State fully investigated ways that it can trim fat from it's operational costs, specifically with regards to labor? Has the State considered that poor schedules may be the cause of the declining ridership trends you claim to so closely watch? Has the State investigated different pricing structures? Speaking personally, I would much rather pay extra user fees for a service I depend on, rather than see that service go away entirely. The ferries are a Washington state treasure - a functional highway that also serves as a post-card tourist draw. It is time for the State to correct the past decade of mismanagement and save the system it has been charged with maintaining - not look for the easy way out or excuse to eliminate it.
01/21/09	I am writing to state my staunch opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Please listen to what citizens and local leaders are saying. Make wise, enlightened, fair decisions on the ferry system. Don't continue dismantling one of Washington's most iconic, valuable and charming assets. Do not treat our ferries as if they are someone's private yacht. They are bridges in the highway system of western Washington....no different than bridges throughout Washington. I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Yes, we are in tough financial times, but that doesn't mean you need to hold a fire sale. Please do not make short-sighted decisions that will hurt our state for decades to come. This is a time for creativity. Consider using classic marketing principles to encourage ridership. Have you considered that oppressive pricing structures and poor schedules may be the cause of very trends you claim to so closely watch? The ferries are a Washington state treasure. It is time to get creative.
01/21/09	I attended the Kingston meeting to listen to the DOT presentation on the future plans for ferry service. I came away with two clear thoughts: 1. Neither plan addresses the departments own study which shows a 40% increase in ridership over the period of this plan. 2. The rule that ferries must be built by a Washington company are not in the interest of the state or taxpayers. It seems we don't have a strategic plan for the ferry system. Both these plans are funding plans based on there being no money available for the long term health of the ferry system. If that was the approach that was taken for any other DOT project (the viaduct, 520 etc.) we would have no plan to replace those either. Ferries are part of the state highway system. Plan accordingly.
01/21/09	I am a resident of Kingston, Washington, and consider the Washington State Ferries, especially the Kingston-Edmonds and Bainbridge-Seattle runs, as part of the state highway system. Rather than mountains or flood plains, my highways traverse over water. My highways need maintenance and repair just like the ones that need plowing and replacement after snowfall or flooding. However, when I use my highways, I pay toll, even if I'm only walking on them. I haven't noticed that the residents that use the mountain highways and the frequently flooded valley highways have to pay toll. Isn't that a little unfair? Most of my medical care is in Seattle and, being an old guy, it seems that I'm traveling over there from Kingston more and more. I use public transportation, including the ferry system, most of the time to get to my appointments. My point is that the ferry system is a vital link in Puget Sound's mass transit system and should be viewed in that way. I hope that these two stories point out that funding for the ferry system, including capital, maintenance and operation should come from highway/gas taxes and from mass transit allotments, not solely from riders. However, if the “powers-that-be” determine that the ferries should be paid solely by user fees, then I think that the entire State of Washington highway system should be converted to toll roads so us folks in Kitsap County don't have to pay to clear Stevens Pass and rebuild the flooded roads near Chehalis each year and maintain roads in Eastern Washington that we never use. You can see the absurdity of carrying this line of thinking to its logical conclusion. I only ask for fairness in your decisions about our highway and mass transit connections. Our dependence on these public infrastructure elements is vital to our lives, economy and well being.

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	At Southworth, neither Plan A or Plan B is acceptable. Plan A is only status quo, and doesn't address future projected growth of 70%. Plan B is tantamount to abandoning us. With the 70/30 service split, that would essentially allot us one half of one boat. You've got to be kidding. Plan B was concocted without any input from local electeds. The biggest issue, at Southworth, is the unfairness exhibited by WSF. Bremerton and South Sound bear the impact of cuts, while Bainbridge and Kingston go unscathed. WSF unfairness is further demonstrated by subjecting Southworth riders to the 70/30 split for the last 20 years. For those 20 years, you taken 40% of our capacity and given it to Vashon with only 10 of the population on the triangle. That has translated into loading quotas, as well as a diminished number of sailings calling at Southworth. To have access to the ferries, most of our commute hour riders have to van pool, car pool, or walk on, while Vashon riders can drive on in SOV's with impunity. Further adding to the indignity, is having to wait at Fauntleroy for as mant as three boats, to finally get on one that goes to Southworth. At Southworth, we feel much like the racial minorities, of the pre civil rights era, that were forced to ride in the back of the bus, while white folks rode up front. You need to examnine your treatment of riders, which is not fair or equal among different terminals. I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) I am a teacher and coach at our local public school and have lived on San Juan Island most of my life. The ferries are our lifeblood, our link to the rest of the state, and I feel should be treated like the valuable transportation system that they are. While I may not be excited to pay for new roads, highways, and bridges in other parts of the state, I do so recognizing that we all need to share the responsibility to keep our state transportation functional for everyone who relies on it for their daily needs. From my perspective as a teacher and coach, reducing the amount and/or limiting the times ferries operate, will drastically limit opportunities for students to experience other parts of our great state. Field trips or atletic events are sometimes the only times students get to participate and enjoy off island venues. We will be unable to offer these if the costs continue to increase or the times are not condusive for young students. Please consider my request to increase numbers of ferries and state funding into the ferry system to keep our lifeblood and links to the rest of the state healthy.
01/21/09	We wish to add our Names to the list of supporters and Positive comments about KEEPING the local ferry run alive by "scraping" Plan B such that this Ferry service will continue. We are new residences & newly retired to Sidney, BC area and look forward to travelling on this Ferry in our many trips to USA for vacations with family and friends.
01/21/09	I am appalled at the possibility of reducing the number of ferries on the San Juan Routes... It's like eliminating one lane on I-5 or I-90. We pay our gas taxes and all the other taxes like everyone else who benefits from a network of roadways on the mainland. *In fact, our taxes help pay for mainland roads also.* We would rather pay a higher ferry fee than see a ferry eliminated. Also, we would like to see non-residents pay more, *much more.*
01/21/09	I am writing as the owner of three tourism-based businesses in Friday Harbor, San Juan Island – the Harrison House Suites, Tucker House Inn and Coho Restaurant, a resident of Friday Harbor, and a board member of the San Juan Island Visitors Bureau. I am also a Town Council Member for the Town of Friday Harbor. The Friday Harbor Town Council sent a letter supporting Plan A. This letter represents my personal views as a business owner and resident and also flatly rejects Plan B. Tourism is the economic driver for the San Juan Islands. My businesses are dependent on tourism and are important economic drivers to our Town and County economy generating $866,000 in tourism revenue. This tourism spending not only has a direct impact on tax revenue but has a “trickle down” effect throughout our community. The Washington State Ferries bring my guests to the Island. Other than private boat or plane, there are no other cost-effective and practical ways to get to the San Juan Islands. The Anacortes/San Juans/Sidney ferry is not a short cut but plain and simply a continuation of Highway 20. We are a ferry dependent community. Coincidently, the San Juan Islands were designated as the State’s newest Scenic Byway. Part of the byway includes the WSF marine route from Anacortes to our islands. Tourism is Washington State’s fourth largest industry, and the ferries are as iconic to Washington State as the Space Needle is to

Date Received	Comment
	Seattle. These iconic ferries need to be properly funded in order to exceed our visitors' expectations and to private basic transportation needs for our residents. The 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver B.C. will put a spotlight on our State, and we need to be prepared to welcome guests from around the world. In addition, the Anacortes/San Juans/Sidney run will become even more viable during and after the Olympics. Eliminating that run will not only impact the number of boats between San Juan Island and Anacortes for the transport of commercial goods and residents between Anacortes and the San Juan Island but cut off an important tourism revenue stream on the International run. Ferries are our residents' and visitors' lifeline, just as roads and bridges are on the mainland. Plan A is the absolute minimum service that will allow our Island economies to maintain status quo. Cutting or eliminating service would not only cripple our tourism industry and in turn our local economy. The WSF system must remain affordable to island residents, small business owners and visitors. Please formulate a long-range strategy that will work for Washington's island residents and our tourism-dependent economy. If you would like any additional information, I can be reached at 360.378.3587 or via electronic mail at innkeeper@harrisonhousesuites.com.
01/21/09	I am writing this email to ask that you not discontinue the Anacortes/Sidney Ferry Run. The Governor's case that it would save 9.2 Million from the biennium budget certainly does not take into account at all the revenues that are generated by the five northern counties from this run. According to the 2006 E.D Hovee & Co. report, this run generates $126 million in annual spending in Skagit, Whatcom, San Juan, Island and Snohomish counties. I have been a real estate broker in Anacortes for the past 30 years and I can tell you that to discontinue this run would have a devastating economic effect on this community directly. Motels and restaurants would be directly affected. The Majestic Hotel estimates that they generate $100,000 per year from travelers using the international ferry. Cap Sante Inn states that it would cost them 3,000 rooms per year or more that $120,000 annually. Storks Restaurant, one of the communities favorite places for breakfast, would lose well over $100,000 from travelers getting an early morning breakfast before departing to Sidney. From a real estate perspective I can assure you that over the years travelers have discovered 'Anacortes' through their travels to or from Sidney on the international ferry run. When you have 131,600 people pass through your community they talk to their friends and acquaintances about their experience and that draws more people to our area. By diverting those travelers to Canadian ports we lose revenue, jobs and exposure. The most compelling argument is that terminating the Anacortes-Sidney run would cost the state more money than it would save.
01/21/09	I am writing you as a concerned citizen and business owner of Sidney, British Columbia. It has come to our attention that once again, Washington State Ferries is planning on shutting down the Sidney/Anacortes run. My concern is not only for the financial impact that this would have on business in our area as well as Anacortes and the other stops along the way. There are many jobs and livelihoods that would be affected and this would in turn have repercussions on all aspects of the economy in these areas. A person whose job has been terminated will of course cease to spend money on any items other than the bare necessities, therefore creating a domino affect. There are also the political and neighboring benefits that have been built up over the years and this would be lost. On a personal level we use the ferry service ourselves and find it to be such a wonderful way to vacation. It is also a stepping stone for us to visit other parts of Washington that we would otherwise not see. I implore you to please reconsider before it is too late.
01/21/09	We live on San Juan Island. Like many other concerned citizens, we are writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) You will be loosing revenue with this plan. We will be paying fewer business taxes because it will be harder for our customers to get to us. If you live on Mercer Island, your ability to get to your homes is never reduced. If you own a ski related business, every winter all the citizens of WA help pay to keep the roads clear. Our "ferry roads and bridges" are no different. No wonder ridership is falling off. The service has gotten worse and worse every year. Lots could be done to increase ridership. Not only are our ferries a great attraction for visitors to WA, the are a vital link to our home and business.

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	I urge you to develop a plan that respects the needs of taxpaying citizens who depend on ferries for their transportation to home and work. State funding to support the ferries must be found, to remedy the funding problems that have arisen since the changes in vehicle taxes several years ago.
01/21/09	Undeniably a wonderful and (weather permitting) spectacularly scenic area to live in, the Puget Sound poses a formidable logistical challenge to many residents. As a member of the Armed Forces stationed here, I routinely travel to/from bases on both sides of the Sound; inconsistent and/or limited ferry service simply compounds these commuting challenges. Sailors, in particular, are subjected to a unique dilemma: we are, in many cases encouraged to "homestead" in a particular geographic region in order to maintain a more stable household for our families. The Pacific Northwest is home to a variety of afloat and ashore units that offer ample career/occupational diversity that is both appealing to families and professionally conducive to the idea of "homesteading". Further, the availability of reliable ferry service helps mitigate the commuting challenges for Navy personnel who elect to call this region "home": a Sailor residing in Bremerton may complete a sea tour aboard the carrier there, and then obtain a shore billet at NAS Whidbey Island or NAVSTA Everett; thus a Sailor may retain his residence (and keep any school-aged children in the same school district) while taking on diverse assignments in the area. By reducing or eliminating ferry services, the appeal of homesteading in the PACNORWEST is significantly diminished. In my view, reliable and (relatively) robust ferry service throughout the Puget Sound figures decisively in most Sailors' minds, when deciding whether to call this area "home".
01/21/09	I attended the 1/15/09 meeting and would like to submit the following concerns/thoughts: 1) Terminals: I am not in favor of continuing the plan to build a new Anacortes terminal during this time of cutting ferry service. The current terminal is adequate. It is more important to have good ferry schedules, boat maintenance, and new boats. 2) Reservations: At this time I am not in favor of reservations. It is too costly to setup ($12 million) and changes at terminals ($30 million). I would rather arrive early & wait for the next boat when I am needed off island (disabled son); emergency vet appointment; and for too many 'reasons' to list. Some folks would overbook (similar to restaurant/hotel/airline overbooking). Perhaps only registered voters for S.J. County should be allowed to vote whether they support a reservation system for our county. 3) Ship Builders: Change the RCW (?) that limits bids to WA State companies only. 4) Union: The 3 Auto Makers are being required to look @ their union contracts. We should do the same. Do the workers want to keep their jobs? 5) Fares: People who get on a bus pay a 'fare'. We pay a 'toll' in the same way some pay to cross a bridge (which will need to be/or should have been maintained). The toll is only part of the financial need to operate the bridge/ferry. Raise the toll too high & you loose revenue. 6) Mountain Passes: The passes are very expensive to maintain all year long & especially in the winter. Everyone who uses the pass should pay a 'toll' to compensate DOT's budget. 7) Parking Lots: Yes, more lots may be needed. Park & Ride lots throughout a community seem to work for bus riders. When I walk on the Lopez ferry I would be willing to park elsewhere & take public transportation to the ferry terminal. Airports have free shuttle service to their terminals. 8) Advertisement: If the state is not willing to finance the ferries then why use pictures of ferries to advertise the beauty of our state & the uniqueness of our WA ferry systems? Tourist do shop/eat/stay @ hotels in eastern WA on their way to the Space Needle and to our beautiful islands. Lastly, thanks to David Moseley and Ray Deardorf for an informative meeting.

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	I testified at the January 5, 2009, public hearing held in Port Townsend on the subject Plan. These comments are in addition to, and in some cases an expansion of, my testimony at that hearing. These comments are my own views, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Jefferson County Ferry Advisory Committee (FAC) of which I am a member. 1. The manner in which the Plan was produced violates both the letter and the spirit of several areas of ESHB 2358, the "Ferry Bill". In particular, WSF and the Transportation Commission both failed to obtain adequate input from FACs during the development of the customer surveys and the development of proposed fare and pricing policies. It appeared, in fact, that WSF deliberately chose to conduct their work with minimal input from anyone other than their paid consultants, preferring instead to develop their proposals behind closed doors and then present them as a sets of very limited choices to the FACs and the public, as faits accomplis. 2. "Plan (option) B" was never discussed in any way with the public or the FAC before it appeared in the Plan. As such, it is a complete non-starter and does not deserve consideration at this time regardless of its possible merits. 3. Neither "Plan A" or "Plan B", as set forth in the Plan, comes close to adequately addressing WSF's 35% overall growth projections for both vehicle and passenger traffic over the next 22 years. For example, traffic on the Port Townsend-Keystone route is projected to grow by 96% by the year 2030, and yet no part of the Plan allows for any growth in ferry capacity; only two 64-car ferries are designated for this route in Plan A, which is exactly the same capacity as existed before WSDOT removed the Steel Electric ferries from service in November, 2007; during the tourist season, the PT-Keystone route already suffers from long waits (sold out reservations, now), and failing to add vessel capacity simply guarantees that the projected growth in demand will never be adequately served. 4. The sizes of replacement vessels, as proposed in the Plan, is illogical. The "baseline" approach on which the Plan's cost estimates are based assumes that vessels will be replaced with new vessels that are exactly the same size. Why would one replace a 144-car ferry with one of the same capacity when the route on which the existing 144-car ferry is currently operating is already experiencing long wait times? Why would one not replace such a ferry with a 200- or 250-car ferry to accommodate current and projected traffic growth? The Plan's proposal is analogous to simply repaving a 2-lane highway that is already operating below acceptable service levels instead of planning to replace it with a 4-lane highway. The Plan makes no sense. 5. The task was to develop a plan for long-term sustainability of the ferry system. The proposed Plan attempts to barely maintain status quo which, as shown by current experience, is the very definition of non-sustainable. The ferries are falling further and further behind in their maintenance; routes suffer decreasing levels of service due to increasing traffic demand, equipment failures, and the total lack of back-up vessels. 6. The Plan proposes to develop an enhanced Reservation System for use on many/most routes as the primary means for managing demand; I completely support this idea.
01/21/09	The Island County EDC represents Island County's economic activities. Our Council met in retreat on January 21, 2009, and discussed the proposed changes outlined in the latest Washington State Ferries long range plan for services and investment. The Council feels strongly that further degradation of service to Island County will have a negative impact on our economic future. We urge you to consider activities which enhance our service capabilities.
01/21/09	I am strongly against eliminating the International ferry between Anacortes and Sidney, B.C. and cutting the support for the San Juan runs by the state. I am a full-time resident of Lopez island and travel 4-5 times per year to Vancouver Island. I do not want the International run eliminated. It would add days of travel coming and going, having to travel east to Anacortes and then either north or south and then west to catch alternative means to get there. It would also add substantial costs. Thank you and the other WSF folks for holding last night's hearing. I appreciate that this meeting was primarily focused on letting the community give WSF feedback. I also deeply appreciated how at the end of the meeting, you took as much time as need be to listen to every person that stayed. Those folks may have been uncomfortable with speaking to the entire group preferring to speak with you directly. You took the time to give them your full attention. I know you could've said - "oh, I have a ferry to catch." You didn't and that speaks volumes to your leadership. Thank you. I apologize for the one very belligerent community member. Unfortunately, that is that person's style. You and Martha Burke (FAC Bainbridge member) handled that awkward moment well suggesting that person sign up and speak during the comment period. Thank you for not letting the meeting be monopolized by one individual. One thing that really struck me last night was the opening statement: "The ferries are not sustainable". I had to think - is anything in our transportation system "sustainable"? Is 520 sustainable? Is the viaduct rebuild sustainable? Is

Date Received	Comment
	Sound Transit sustainable? Is any portion of our transportation system sustainable? Help me here. Am I just misunderstanding the term sustainable? Maybe that is the core issue that needs to be addressed - ferries should not be self sustaining or revenue neutral. Riderships in no other system pay into their portion of the highway as much as we do. No where. My ferry costs were $6000 and that is with me even moving my office back to Bainbridge Island. And to know that there is a ferry in eastern Washington - that doesn't even charge users for their ferry service - is really insulting. I drove a car onto a WSF ferry in Keller, Washington for a 10-15 minute crossing of the Columbia River. I was charged NOTHING. This ferry runs 6 a.m. to midnight. What are its cost to the over all WSF system and how are those costs covered? It is part of WSDOT still whether it is Eastern Region WSDOT. And remember, the Governor is champion "One Washington". Possibly we should be learning from how does Eastern Washington manage and fund its ferry? Here is the information on the ferry: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Regions/Eastern/KellerFerry/ So you can understand why folks in the Puget Sound region who are dependent on getting to work, doctors appointments, seeing family/friends, participating in the cultural life of the region and they have to take their cars on the ferry are quite frustrated and feel tapped out. What cost years ago about $6 to drive a car onto the ferry is now upwards to $14 each way in the peak season. It just seems completely unfair. The cat is out of the bag. Ferry riders know there is money. $2.8 billion of state money budgeted for the viaduct to rebuild a 2 mile portion of the highway and yet some how there is no money for an entire system that serves over 15 communities across the Puget Sound. It would be interesting to do a financial comparison of 2 mile viaduct reconstruction cost to the many, many miles covered by the entire WSF ferry system. Ferries are a far better deal. And ultimately when viaducts fail and roads are covered in snow or flooded - ferries are still moving and are still on time. With potential of natural disasters (can you say a big earthquake) in our future, seems that we should be following San Francisco's example of getting more ferries on the water not reducing our fleet. Our ferries could be our future life saving link. We also just witnessed recently how fortunate New York was to have so many ferries on the Hudson River...the ferries helped save 155 lives. Thank you for taking the time to read these thoughts/comments.
01/21/09	As part of our on-going collaborations with Washington State Ferries to reduce ferry-related air emissions, the Clean Air Agency appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Long-Range Plan for the Washington State Ferry system. Our region faces serious challenges to improving our air quality and protecting the global climate. We support the Plan's emphasis on demand management, as opposed to capacity expansion, to meet future needs because of the positive role that demand management strategies can play in reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gases, both of which contribute to air pollution and adversely impact global climate. The Plan can be a positive force for meeting the Governor's greenhouse gas and VMT reduction goals. It can be improved by addressing climate change and air quality and explicitly examining how the Plan strategies affect ferry-related emissions. For example, improved transit service and pedestrian connections can help reduce VMT by reducing the number of vehicles boarding the ferries. Considering customer travel distances to terminals when investigating ferry service changes can avoid increases in emissions resulting from people traveling farther to a alternate terminal. Implementing demand management strategies such as tolls and HOV lanes on the state-operated roads connecting ferry terminals can supplement the emission-reducing effects of the Ferry system's demand management strategies. And technological improvements to engines, cleaner fuels and improved docking methods can directly reduce harmful emissions from routine vessel operations. The strategies in the plan can be strengthened through coordination not only with transit agencies but with local governments, such as the cities and counties in which ferry terminals lie; regional transportation agencies, such as METRO, Kitsap Transit, Community Transit, and Pierce Transit; and regional agencies such as the Puget Sound Regional Council. Growth management strategies such as transit and pedestrian-oriented development complement the Plan's demand management strategies. But to be effective in maximizing the potential air quality and climate protection benefits, the coordination needs to be continuous from the development of this plan to design and operation of ferry system facilities, such as terminal design, pedestrian access, and coordination of bus and ferry schedules. More and more money for less and less service, over the past 23 years that we've lived in the San Juans. The ferries are our lifeline to the rest of the world, and are part of the state highway system, as has so often been pointed out. We have to take the ferry to get to medical appointments, to get to the airport, to visit our families. We can't afford to take the seaplane. Heck, we can't afford the ferry either, but we have no choice, so we go to the mainland only a few times a year and only when necessary. We used to go more but it's just too expensive and too inconvenient. We have to take our car because transit and ferry schedules don't mesh - we love the train, but can't get home from visiting our daughter in Portland in time to catch the last ferry. What choice is your plan going to leave islanders who

Date Received	Comment
	depend on getting to the mainland and home again, except never to leave the islands or else sell out and move to the mainland? Please come up with a better plan. Thank you.
01/21/09	My husband and I would both like you to know how important the Sidney Ferry is to our city of Anacortes. For over twenty years, we owned and operated a restaurant in town located at Cap Sante Marina that we had to close down for environmental remediation last year. During those years of operation we served thousands of people that used the Sidney Ferry. Most of those people were repeat ferry riders and the rest of the people were visiting our fair city for the first time. If we didn't have that volume of business directly related to the Sidney Ferry we would not have received at least $8,000 a year in gross revenues and we would not have employed at least 2 people each summer. Those are meaningful numbers when you consider we were just one small restaurant! Cutting the Sidney Ferry run would adversely impact our small city's economy immediately. We are already struggling with the declining sales tax revenues that are pervasive around the state, but this decision would set Anacortes at such a disadvantage, I am not sure we could recover in my lifetime and I certainly don't want to pass this problem onto our son and future grandchildren. You have to know how important this is to our city. Currently we are a marine based economy with all the related revenues. Please hear our voice and reconsider this disastrous decision!
01/21/09	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) The bottom line is that the ferry system is not a pleasure boat for lolling away an afernoon. It is part of the highway system and imperative for comuters, shoppers, business people, and patients of doctors and hospitals in the Seattle and Edmonds areas. Would you consider shutting down I90 or I12 of I5? We all see the mess that the Alaska Way Viaduct has become and would like that resolved as well. However, count how many people it affects versus the number of people who ride the ferry each year. That would be an interesting statistic. We have elected officials to represent the will of the people, not exert their own wills or creative brainchildren on the rest of us. I ask that you go back to the drawing board and start over, using the comments and recommendations of the committee which has been working on this problem.
01/21/09	Any fare increase will result in reduced ridership. This is evidenced by the previous fare increase which resulted in less riders. The amount of the fare increase may not make up for the overall total loss as a result of ridership reductions. As fares continue to rise, the ferry system no longer remains an economical means of transportation. People who may have decided to take the ferry will no longer consider it as driving around will be cheaper. Please do not raise fares any higher unless you want to risk the ridership decrease to a level that is no longer sustainable for maintaining the operation of the ferries.
01/21/09	By suspending their application King County politicians and our governor killed plans by a private company and Kitsap County to provide passenger only ferry service to downtown Seattle. That ferry service would have provided 25 minute crossing time to downtown Seattle. Currently it takes a little more than 60 minutes for me to go from Southworth to downtown Seattle using the car ferry to Vashon and the passenger only boat to Seattle. That is a cost to me of 70 minutes a day, 5.8 hours a week, 303.3 hours a year. Time I don?t have to spend with family, volunteer in my community, be involved in local government, or spend on past times. The yearly cost of time to 100 commuters is 30,330 hours, 758 work weeks, or 14.5 work years taken from our families and community. Since you killed our chance for a better commute and better life through a private ferry you are obliged to provide Southworth riders better service! And if you can?t you should build a passenger ferry dock at Southworth and allow the private sector to provide service that you won?t.

Date Received	Comment
	Comments regarding WSF Long Range Draft Plan A & B ESHB 2358 stated that WSF shall develop fare and pricing policies that: "consider the impacts on users, capacity, and local communities". Without data from the economic analysis impact study, WSF cannot make sound decisions about the fate and subsequent impacts. Presenting Plan B on the same day that Ferry Policy Committee was disbanded was pretty much pulling the voicebox out of the throats of our representatives who were there to speak and advocate on the behalf of ferry-served communities. They were disbanded before they could review, question, and comment on it. WSF did not speak with Ferry Advisory Committees or local officials and representatives in developing or reviewing of Plan B. Plan B is a non started. And should be flat out rejected by every ferry-served community. Let's focus on creating a Plan C – the Citizens' Plan - Citizen's Common Cents 1. First, make a commitment to fund the system after all efforts for efficiencies have been implemented. This biannual scramble for funding has got to stop. Do the mountain passes have to scramble for funding of snow plows to keep the mountain passes clear each budget cycle? Is 520 looking at closing down two lanes to reduce its highway costs? Stop treating the marine highway & mass transit system as oddity of WSDOT. Put funding in the budget. 2. Look for cuts in the system. WSF overhead should be immediately cut before the legislature even thinks about reaching into our wallets again. The system has not changed drastically the number of crew, service, and boats in over 30 years. What has changed drastically is the amount of WSF administration - 5 times what it was! So at a minimum, we should be asking for 25% reduction in WSF headquarters. Use the money saved to build more flexible fleet of ferries. Regrettably the legislature sent WSF on a path of having to find its own money to float the system - thus 80% fare increases in 6 years and the rush to figure out how to raise more money - become landlords, collect rents from franchise (Starbucks, MacDonalds, etc), sell advertisement, get more money out of users! 3. Build boats not terminals. Stop the nonsense of the expensive terminal expansions and improvements! Terminals should be nothing more than glorified bus stops - shelter and spaces to pass through on the way to your destination. We don't want high end shops, hotels, and restaurant/coffee franchises at the ferry terminals...we want people to go to our towns to visit, shop, and buy from our mom and pop locally owned stores. Build boats not Terminals! The old terminal's were built like bomb shelters – built to last. 4. Have contracts for the life cycle of the vessels. All new vessels should have build/maintain bidding contracts. Now that we don't have steel electrics that needed hand-crafted parts and wood shop repairs - downsize the maintenance yard or better get rid of it and contract out maintenance as the majority is now already being done elsewhere. How is it that WSDOT spends $21 million a year maintaining 946 buildings and WSF is going to spend $22 million for one maintenance yard operation in Eagle Harbor? And why is Eagle Harbor Maintenance yard budgeted into the future up to $90 million dollars? That money could build two new boats! Is there something outrageous about this sort of spending? Is there room for cutting expenses? 5. Change law requiring ferries to be built only in Washington. Common sense would say - repeal the law that requires ferries be built in Washington only. Previous ferries were built at $220 K per vehicle space. The recent ONE BID ONLY came in at $1.5 million per vehicle space – 7 TIMES THE COST! With the new US administration talking about creating jobs for infrastructure - with the build only in Washington law we will not qualify for those federal funds. 6. Finally, increase the WSF portion of the gas tax from 1/2 a cent to 1.5 cents.
01/21/09	I let the time slide and almost forgot to send this in by Jan 21. I hope it is not too late. My main comment is that I find the whole approach somewhat intellectually dishonest. Maybe politically it makes sense to get so many people aroused and going to the legislature. What I (as a former urban planner) would have liked to see is an approach that says: this is what we need for acceptable service and this will take a major new on-going funding source; if we don't get this funding source our service would have to be cut drastically to unacceptable levels. But with your approach you make it seem that Plan B is a possible outcome. And as a Vashon resident that is just not acceptable. Also, the Plan B approach of shifting the burden to local government, where there is no expertise or willingness to fund (Kitsap Co. will NEVER approve additional funding) is not acceptable on the State's part. Even if it happened, there still would be public costs, just not at the state level. And I am sure that the TOTAL public costs would be more. I won't go on about the impacts on Vashon - you have heard all this from many, many people. But one last point I want to make, also as a former urban planner, is that the very high percentage of revenue from the fare-box is ridiculous and flies in the face of sound public policy - policy to get people to use alternative transportation modes. No place in the country, or world that I know of, has such high fare-box recover rates (97% under plan B is absurd). We not only subsidize public transit to a much high degree, for legitimate reasons, our subsidy to auto travel (highway programs, etc) is enormous. And don't even get me started about the lack of coordination between WSF and Metro bus service. To think this would change in the future would require a political commitment that

Date Received	Comment
	has not been there to date.
01/21/09	Here are some off the cuff suggestions to create some wsf revenue * Offer one-year prepaid passes at a slight discount. You get more $$ up front *Change venue of ships so you can cater events (Ie. weddings on San Juan route(s)) *Increase incentives to create more walk ons. *Quite runs during slow times *Automate ticket booths (similar to parking garages) * Take notice that there is a huge boredem factor, there is a huge opportunity to increase ammenities for entertainment = more reveue.
01/21/09	The ferry system administration should be a strong advocate for Plan A, on behalf of the Puget Sound communities that rely on this system for their economic viability. The Hovee study, which analyzed the economic impact of the Sidney run, clearly showed that approximately 1,500 jobs are dependent on this single run, and the net annual loss to state and local tax revenues from its elimination would be nearly $6 billion (in 2006). If one single run has this much economic impact, it is clear that cut-backs in other runs throughout the Sound could have a devastating effect on the economies of many communities, particularly on the west side of the Sound. And if those communities falter, their contributions to state and local tax revenues will be reduced. It is absolutely essential to analyze the "big picture" economic impact of all ferry service decisions, and not just the internal ferry budget implications. Full funding of ferry operations must come from some source. No state entity will be eager to share their revenues with the ferry system. But if they don't give up a little here and there to make up the $159 million per year needed to keep the system fully functional, they may find that in the long run they lose even more. As communities thrive with full service from the marine highway system, they will pump back into the state coffers many more dollars than that system costs. Please do the homework to quantify the potential losses from reduced ferry service, and then find a way to fully fund the vital ferry transportation links to our Puget Sound communities. Visualize it this way: The entire state budget is an iceberg, and the tip sticking out is the ferry system budget. If a chunk of the iceberg breaks off, cutting back the ferry budget, it can take a really big chunk of the general budget along with it. Don't let that happen.
01/21/09	As Sidney residents we find the possible discontinuation of the Sidney-Anacortes ferry very disappointing. The Town of Sidney, along with the Sidney Sister Cities Association, has maintained for a number of years a very strong link with the Town of Anacortes, largely due to the presence of the Washington State Ferry which plies back and forth for nine months of the year. Both towns, and their immediate surrounding areas, benefit immeasurably from the ferry's presence. The economic benefits, both directly and indirectly, are of significant importance to each town and are well documented. As a revenue generator for the communities of Sidney and Anacortes the ferry is unsurpassed and such revenue should be reviewed in full before any draconian action is instituted. Personally, we love the convenience of using the Washington State Ferries to travel to our various vacation destinations in Washington State from Birch Bay to Port Townsend.

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	There is a new LARGE SCALE battery technology now available that would allow a ferryboat to be powered by batteries and be charged in 10 minutes by shore power. Please check out www.altairnano.com . This technology has already passed tests to supply power to the high voltage power grid.
01/21/09	I could certainly write a longer note - but I believe that the shortest messages are often the most powerful. In reviewing the full report, I see the focus is to provide quality service at the least cost to the State - I understand and support that rationale. The problem that I have with both Plan A and Plan B - is that they are framed around lowest cost without regard to highest service. Generally when budgets in the private or public sector are cut - poor managers look to cut all services. The problem with that mindset is that you risk cutting those successful and profitable practices that help sustain the operation. More specifically, the Bainbridge and the Kingston runs - based on your own computations are both profitable runs. Any service cuts to these runs hurts the very "cash cow" that you would want to milk. I am aware that fares are lower for all ferry runs with the exception of th Bainbridge and Kingston runs. I suggest that the State use the same matrix that are used on your profitable run. For example, charge more on the other runs to make them in line with the Bainbridge and Kingston runs fares that support operation. Reduce service on the other runs so that you are having more sustainable runs. Also, since both Bainbridge and Kingston are predominately commuter runs (versus the other routes) the reservation system can only be successful in non-commuter runs. So as the State plans service changes - please don't change the Bainbridge and Kingston runs - if you do it will cost the State more money and reduced service for its riders. Be smart about this and use the model of your profitable runs as the practice to replicate throughout the ferry system.
01/21/09	As a lifelong resident of Kitsap County with a few years in Seattle, it is discouraging to know I can no longer afford to travel across Puget Sound whenever I wish. The fares are prohibitive. Yet I do believe in a certain level of user fee for this service. Your plan B draft places a detrimental, unfair financial burden on Kitsap County. Ferries are a service that belong in the realm of state government management and funding. The ferries are our roads and bridges across the water, yet they are not used exclusively by Kitsap residents. They should be funded by the Transportation Department in the same manner as other road projects. I am willing to pay additional taxes to fund an expanded Transportation budget if that is what it takes to "pave" our watery road with adequate ferry coverage in the same manner as you "pave" in other locations when needed. Reducing service is not a good option. That will make it difficult for not only those who commute daily to jobs across the water but also for those who have medical needs that can only be met across the water and for those who travel for cultural, recreational, and retail or whatever other purposes. Please treat the ferries as you do other roadways and bridges and get the funding you need in a manner that spreads the cost equitably. Kitsap County residents are not the only people who benefit from a robust ferry system. The entire state benefits from taxes generated by recreation and retail dollars spent when people are able to travel freely as a result of convenient, affordable ferry transportation.
01/21/09	I attended the public hearing on the "Draft Long-Range Plan" (the Plan) for Washington State Ferries (WSF) in Bremerton on January 8th, 2009. Many of my fellow riders and others spoke in regards to the impact of both Plan A and Plan B to Bremerton specifically, particularly the cuts to service proposed in Plan B. I can only echo their sentiments in terms of the economic and social damage Plan B would inflict upon Bremerton and Kitsap peninsula communities in general. Short of suggesting that the costs associated with that and the increased road traffic the cutting of ferry service will cause are unaccounted for by the plans I don't feel it is productive to rehash the discussion points brought up at the meeting. My main aim in this submission is to instead focus on the overall direction of the Plan itself. For a 20 year long range plan, the first thing that struck me is the paucity of vision. For the sake of practicality I don't question the inclusion of Plan A or Plan B, but the most foresighted of these, Plan A, details a "steady as she goes" strategy, while Plan B appears to be the start of a lingering death for WSF. As a taxpayer I'm appalled that these, or an option somewhere in between them, are the most innovative and visionary long range plans for a publically

Date Received	Comment
	funded, vital piece of the State's transport infrastructure. This, surely, cannot be the case. Economic times may be difficult now, but one shouldn't construct such a long range plan in a state with an otherwise vibrant and modern economy based on our current difficulties -- except as a fallback. So I would urge you to at least consider presenting another plan to our honourable representatives. A bold plan which re-commits the state to its original decision to invest in sustainable mass transit that connects the western Washington communities that dot Puget Sound. A plan which invests in the future of this system and the growing population and transport needs it will serve as we forge ahead into a future where the limits of individual motor vehicle transportation are realised and the damage it causes our state, country and planet are addressed. A plan which seeks to stimulate and facilitate the economic growth of this vital region of the state. A plan worthy of the innovative spirit of a state which has seen the emergence of tech giants such Microsoft and Amazon.com. Unfortunately I am not a maritime engineer or someone who can speak with any authority on nautical or public transportations issues, so I'm not about to presume to come up with such a plan. However, if I may, it seems to me that one of the core problems faced by the ferry system is one of fixed capacity. If peak service on a route requires a ferry with capacity for 150 vehicles and 1000 passengers then this vessel is currently operated on the route throughout the day, even during the majority of the runs where only a fraction of this capacity is required. Buying both large vessels that service routes during peak and smaller vessels that only run during off peak may well bring no cost savings since their capital costs could well exceed the potential savings in operating costs. Still, I can't believe this is an insoluble problem. Surely an innovative ship builder could come up with a way to build a modular vessel, or a way to link smaller vessels together during peak times? Perhaps instead transportation companies could be offered guaranteed spots during off peak times at rates that would ensure a cost saving for them compared to road travel to defray the cost of off peak runs? I urge you to think outside the box, as they say, Plan A and Plan B cannot be all there can be in WSFs future.
01/21/09	My commute from Kingston to downtown Seattle begins with the 5:45 boat to Edmonds. As we arrive at the dock in Edmonds, about 6:10, a south bound Sound Transit train is departing at 6:11 from the Edmonds terminal. The next train is 30 minutes, a cold wait in the winter. In the afternoon on my return, the 4:30 ferry to Kingston is leaving the dock just as a North bound Sound Transit train is arriving at the Edmonds Station 4:30. Another 45 minute cold wait for the 5:15, if it's on time. What I fail to see in Plan A or Plan B is any strategy whereby you expect to improve the revenues. WSDOT's approach focusses only on cost cutting and not on methods of increasing ridership and improving revenues. WSDOT's strategy should be to improve coordination and partnering with other state and local transportation agencies in an effort to help increase ridership. Last year it was proposed by WSDOT to implement a schedule on the Kingston/Edmonds route that coordinated with three Sounder trains in the morning and three in the afternoon while cutting out some runs during the day. This was the right approach and why it was abandoned I fail to see. Coordinating with other transit agencies' schedules is essential. Finally, I fail to see why Washington State Ferries aren't treated as part of the highway system, or as a transit agency--it is so much more than a tourist attraction. The laws requiring that state ferries be constructed within Washington State put the ferries at an unfair advantage when vying for federal transportation dollars. The "Buy Washington" laws must be dropped immediately.
01/21/09	I am a 26 year resident of Lopez Island as well as having worked full-time at the Lopez Ferry Landing for the past ten years. I feel I am in a unique position to understand both sides of the financial challenges facing the ferry system and island ridership. I'd like to offer a few creative solutions based on my years as both resident, and privately contracted ferry employee. It's clear the San Juans are being specifically targeted for cuts because unlike Down sound, our runs are longer, more expensive, and involve communities that are perceived as being in a higher income bracket. At the same time, the vast percentage of revenue in the San Juans comes from the summer tourist season and WSF cannot afford to drastically cut service, raise prices, and expect ridership to cover 100% of ferry costs. This seems virtually impossible. Here are a few creative ideas to save money and make the system more efficient: Cut late night boats to and from Anacortes: From about October through April (excluding holidays) nearly all boats after about 7 p.m. often run with minimal traffic from Anacortes to the islands, especially Mon-Thurs. On average, the last boat of the day leaving the islands has hardly any traffic at all. In the summer, the late-late boat (leaving Anacortes at 12:30 p.m and running back from Friday Harbor at approx. 3 a.m.) is a joke. It takes an average of ten cars both ways. I am aware that part of the reason for that late round trip, is that it completes an 8 hour shift with that particular crew. But surely there are other possibilities (saving gas?) besides running a fully-crewed super ferry all the way out to the islands and back in the middle of the night. Same with weekday boats at night in the winter. Dedicated Boats: Shortly before I-695 passed, there was serious talk of running

Date Received	Comment
	primarily dedicated island-only boats, with a small inter-island boat doing the local runs. This makes a lot of sense for several reasons. Number one, most people going to the mainland want to leave in the morning and come back in the afternoon-early evening. Naturally, this causes a lot of overloads with the combined sailings. In the winter, if there were, say, two round trip, dedicated, sailings to the mainland from each island in the mornings, and two back in the afternoon-evenings, I believe this would serve the vast majority of islanders and tourists alike. One super-ferry could conceivably serve two islands, or two rotate between F.H., Orcas and Lopez. I could list off a sample schedule, but I'm sure there are plenty of folks better at this than me. Time and again, islanders have agreed they would MUCH rather have fewer boats that they were guaranteed to get on. No one, tourists or locals alike, wants to waste hours in ferry lines. Small interisland boat geared toward foot traffic: A smaller interisland ferry such as the Hiyu could easily serve the local runs. We MUST have interisland service year-round for the many folks who commute to work, as well as school children. Our island economy is suffering enough without taking away people's ability to support themselves. However, most commuters walk on the ferry. The greatest need for vehicle capacity is for service and freight traffic who transport goods to our communities. We couldn't adapt to a walk-on ferry only, but we certainly could adapt (and have!) to a permanent, small capacity boat like the Hiyu. Shaw: I have seen the stats. This island accounts for 2% of San Juan traffic and has the highest per capita income. I realize Orcas is right next door, but why do so many boats stop at Shaw? Shaw discourages tourism and provides almost zero revenue for the system. Unless they decide to build a Rosario, maybe Shaw residents should have to take an inter-island boat to Orcas to get to Anacortes. Dropping them out of the schedule would free up a significant amount of time for the bigger boats to serve the primary traffic islands that are actually paying for the system. I have many other ideas (example: eliminate the person at the Anacortes terminal who tells people what lane to get in. Can't the ticket seller do this, instead of funneling 4 lanes into one?) but I'll stop here. My main point is this: BE CREATIVE!! This could be a backhanded opportunity to actually streamline and improve the existing system. People will grumble, as they always do, but in the long run, we'll adapt.
01/21/09	Your plan blows, and everyone knows.
01/21/09	After reviewing.... what questions or comments do you have? 1. The reservation plan is an answer to a non-existent problem. Maybe helpful in the San Juans, definitely essential on Martha's Vineyard, but doesn't seem necessary system-wide. 2. Put less emphasis on facilities, more on fleet. 3. Work w/legislature to eliminate Washington-built requirement AND to increase funding to transportation budget. 4. Reduce size of WSF naval architect department. 5. Work with local providers to develop POF. 6. Make fuel economy a priority in future vessel design. ...specific to your route? (Seattle-Winslow) 1. Working with local parking providers to increase the number of 4-6 hour parking spots. Your own data suggests most trips are discretionary. (Background: During those times when transit is not available on the Island, we know we need to drive the 7 miles to the terminal. When it costs $10 to park (even though we've just got a quick appointment on the other side and may need only 4 hours for round-trip) + $5.36 for ferry fare, it becomes perhaps more convenient and not a lot more expensive to just "take the _ _ _ _ car." If the differential between park+walk-on vs. drive-on were greater (during those hours when transit unavailable), we'd have even more incentive to park and walk.

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	I support Plan A for long range planning. The ferry system is an integral part of the transportation system. For those of us who live on a true island, it is the only option for getting into Seattle, Tacoma, or Southworth. The population will continue to grow, and must be accommodated. One of the bases for Plan B is to "encourage" more mass transit. The coordination of mass transit with the ferry system at Vashon/Faunterloy works reasonably well. However, the coordination at Point Defiance cannot be effective because the commuters' destinations vary too greatly and thus, mass transit cannot meet the demands. It is difficult when the funds are limited. But, it is the duty of public servants to be visionary for the future and ensure that the quality of life does not suffer. Thank you.
01/21/09	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Do not treat our ferries as if they are someone's private yacht. They are bridges in the highway system of western Washington....no different than bridges throughout Washington. I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Tough financial times require more access to transportation, NOT LESS!!! Do not make short-sighted decisions that will hurt our state for decades to come. This is a time for creativity. Consider using citizens to help with marketing plans to help protect their livelyhoods. Have you considered that oppressive pricing structures and poor schedules may be the cause of very trends you claim to so closely watch? The ferries are a Washington state treasure. It is time to get creative. Ask the people who live here to help us solve these problems. Many are ready and willing, and well suited for the job(s).
01/21/09	We are writing to state our opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Please do not dismantle the ferry system. Another plan must be developed. And in that plan we call for reduction of rates, parking improved, and that it is easier and more comfortable to be a walk on passenger. Regarding rates: A little background: My husband, Michael, and myself moved down from Alaska in 2004 to Hansville, WA to be near my mother on Whidbey Island, my sister in Duvall, and my brother in Silverdale. We chose Hansville because of its relatively central location to my entire family and the access via ferries to Edmonds and Seattle. Having been raised in Seattle Yvonne was used to a fair and reasonable passenger/car rate for ferry. When we left Seattle in 1999, the rates were reasonable. We were not aware that, in the meantime, I-695 was passed and that ferry rates had skyrocketed. Since our arrival the rates have increased dramatically. The rates, as they stand, prohibit us from visiting my sister or my mother as often as we like. In fact, we see them almost as rarely as we did while in Alaska due to the outrageous cost. If the tickets cost less, we could visit more often. We would also do more shopping in Edmonds and Seattle. Our family could visit more often. Bottom line: lower rates, more ferry rides. Higher rates, less ferry rides. Improved parking: Parking in Edmonds, walking on the ferry, and spending the day on the other side is expensive. Parking in Edmonds costs close to 12.00 for the day. Plus the walk on fee of 6.70. My sister finds that the savings are not worth the inconvenience of walking on the ferry. Inexpensive or free parking on the Edmonds side would provide incentive to walk on. Walk on passenger: As dog owners, we cannot consider walking on the ferry because 1)we have an old dog who cannot walk up the stairs and 2)we have nowhere warm to stay on the ferry during the blustery winter. This is particularly a problem on the Port Townsend ferry where we have had to huddle outside in the a sleet storm with a sick dog for the duration of the bouncy ride. Provide us dog people with a more comfortable place to be during the ride and we can guarantee that you will see more people walking on -- with their dogs. After that experience on the Port Townsend ferry, we will NEVER walk on again with my dog. The walk on passenger waiting area in Edmonds is lacking seating and facilities such as restrooms. Once through the gate there is rarely a place to sit and we are unable to use restrooms. Who wants to be stuck there with a child who just might have to go to the bathroom? Or someone who is frail and needs to sit? These are just a few ways to increase the amount of walk on passengers. Please, please consider another plan and please please listen to us. Our lives and livelihood is at stake.

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	I would like to respond to the proposed Plan B put forth for the WSF ferry system. Simply put, Plan B is unacceptable and a disgrace to Washington State. Plan A, essentially status quo is barely acceptable. How the legislature can decide to ignore and completely put in turmoil our section of the state is beyond me. I am a single mother who lives in Hansville and has been commuting nights to Seattle to work for 12 years now. If the ferry service is decreased I will no longer be able to work at my job as driving around is not a viable option (a 6 hour daily commute)! As it is, I already have a 3 hour commute which many people would consider ridiculous, but it is what I have accepted to live where I do. Am I supposed to uproot my children from their schools, friends, church? When I get on the ferry boat in Kingston, I take Hwy 104 to get there and when I disembark in Edmonds, I am again on Hwy 104. That means it is a marine highway. Now the state has decided to reduce service to this highway? Will we be seeing then the equal closures of the 520 or I90 bridges? Or how about closure of the passes and highways in Eastern Washington when it snows, because it takes more money to keep those open during the snow. It is only fair to equal treatment. The ferry fees have tripled/quadrupled since I started using this service. We can no longer bear the brunt of the poor planning of the Washington state legislature. I-695 was deemed unconstitutional, yet we are still paying for the reduction in monies that were allotted to the ferry system. Every piece of Washington State ad/tourism touts the ferries, yet the legislature has decided that they can no longer support this. What a disappointment. If I have to leave my job because I can no longer get there, I might as well leave Washington State period because their local government has no idea how to run a state. Thank you for reading my comments.
01/21/09	I am a long time resident of Lopez Island in San Juan County. I knew when I moved here there would be issues with the Washington State Ferry System. The fleet is aged. New vessels are very costly to build since they MUST be built in Washington state. So, we the People cannot negotiate competitive bids for new vessels. For the residents of San Juan County the WSF system isn't just a quaint Sunday cruise. The ferries are our lifeline to mainland services and to marketing the goods and services offered by the people of the Island communitites to our fellow Washingtonians. ONLY one of San Juan County's growing business sectors is tourism. San Juan County is already at rock bottom regards ferry service, and we more often than not are provided the most aged of the fleet. It is imperative that PLAN A be continued. Plan B is absolutely unacceptable to these communities. If you have questions please do not hesitate to contact me.
01/21/09	In brief: I think you have a clear sense of how frustrated we are with the service off the south end of Vashon. The prospect of continuing to commute on the Hiyu is causing many of us to reconsider our lifestyles and options (which are pretty limited in the current economy). Comments: 1. It is high time to reestablish a stable funding source for transportation in general and the ferry system in particular. We support services across the state; the rest of the state needs to understand that the ferries are essential to daily commerce and connections in the Pacific Northwest. I would like to see the fee on car tabs taken up again. Just as we pony up for the services we receive from WSDOT in the form of ferry fares, the users of the highway system need to pay their fair share. A fee for tab renewals that is linked to vehicle weight and/or annual mileage would not only place the greatest burden on those who contribute most to wear and tear and congestion, it would also be a factor in the decisions people make in the purchase and use of vehicles. After all, lighter cars cause less wear on roadways and are usually more fuel efficient and a fee based on total annual mileage would encourage people to drive less. This approach would promote fuel conservation and support public transit ridership. 2. I encourage WSDOT to ask the legislature to consider an emergency rule to lift the made in Washington limitation on ship building to allow the state to seek federal funds for a capital investment in our system. 3 The Hiyu is not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The boat has no elevator leaving those who cannot climb stairs stuck on the car deck. The bathrooms are too small for wheelchair access even if a wheelchair could get upstairs. 4. The difference in auto capacity between the Hiyu and the Rhody is greater than 14 cars. The Rhody holds about 62 cars. This is documented in boat specs and confirmed by the workers who load the boats on the Pt Defiance/Tahlequah run. 5. I don't believe your surveys took into account the full complement of commuters because of the time of year they were conducted. When schools are in session there are many students and teachers using the boats. The August timeframe also missed many regular commuters who are on vacation that time of year. 6. I don't know the exact number, but I estimate that 25% of the students at Vashon High School and more than half of the teachers commute to the island each weekday. If service cuts become too painful we will lose our student base and worse yet, be unable to recruit and retain good teachers. 7. Many Vashon commuters are essential professionals who need to be on time for shifts in hospitals, client

Date Received	Comment
	appointments and university schedules. Predictability and timeliness are really critical for these commuters. I don't believe the current capacity is adequate to address this need. 8. If we are stuck with the small boats, something must be done to limit the use of the small boats by logging trucks in the morning which take the boat from Vashon to Tacoma. They are a major problem during commuting hours and they don't pay their fare share. When they buy their tickets they are collapsed to a much shorter length. When they leave the island filled with logs they are more than twice as long. They shouldn't continue to be allowed to exit the island off the south end. Perhaps there needs to be a restriction on the length of vehicles that can use the south end boats in order to accommodate the regular auto commuters. Those with longer rigs (recreational vehicles, horse trailers, logging trucks, etc) should use the north end boats. Thank you for considering my comments.
01/22/09	As a long time resident of the Saanich Peninsula and until my recent retirement the operator of a major tourist attraction on the Saanich Peninsula, past president of the Saanich Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, past director of both Tourism Victoria and Tourism Vancouver Island as well as past chairman of Attractions Victoria, not to mention also a frequent user and supporter of the Sidney/Anacortes ferry run. This is to advise you that I wholeheartedly support and concur with the comments and observations made by Mr. Dave Cowen, General Manager of The Butchart Gardens in his recent correspondence to you. One day you and your family or board members should board the ferry for the trip to Sidney, BC from Anacortes, WA..or vice versa. I am quite certain that you as I do with every crossing would feel exhilarated and enthralled by the fantastic scenery through the Gulf Islands and the many options available for a truly enjoyable mini-vacation or retreat upon arrival at the destination with the relative ease of the accessibility and cost between these great countries of ours as currently afforded by the Washington State Ferry Services. To lose this vital service would be to say the least devastating for everyone involved, local residents and business, travellers on the I-5 corridor and citizens of both of our great countries. I am also cognizant of the fact that marketing and packaging of the service would I believe, result in excellent long term results offering a good return on investment for the Washington State ferry service. I truly believe that to paraphrase your newly elected President Obama "We must work together" to achieve our common goals and our ultimate success both as neighbours, companies and the services that we currently offer to our clients. I sincerely thank you in advance for perusing my thoughts and beliefs on the viability and the need for the continuance of this irreplaceable service!
01/22/09	I urge you to be a strong advocate for the ferry system's Plan A, on behalf of the Puget Sound communities that rely on the marine highway system for their economic viability. The Hovee study, which analyzed the economic impact of the Sidney run, clearly showed that approximately 1,500 jobs are dependent on this single run, and the net annual loss to state and local tax revenues from its elimination would be nearly $6 billion (in 2006). If one single run has this much economic impact, it is clear that cut-backs in other runs throughout the Sound could have a devastating effect on the economies of many communities, particularly on the west side of the Sound. And if those communities falter, their contributions to state and local tax revenues will be reduced. It is absolutely essential to analyze the "big picture" economic impact of all ferry service decisions, and not just the internal ferry budget implications. Full funding of ferry operations must come from some source. No state entity will be eager to share their revenues with the ferry system. But if they don't give up a little here and there to make up the $159 million per year needed to keep the system fully functional, they may find that in the long run they lose even more. As communities thrive with full service from the marine highway system, they will pump back into the state coffers many more dollars than that system costs. Please do the homework to quantify the potential losses from reduced ferry service, and then find a way to fully fund the vital ferry transportation links to our Puget Sound communities. Visualize it this way: The entire state budget is an iceberg, and the tip sticking out is the ferry system budget. If a chunk of the iceberg breaks off, cutting back the ferry budget, it can take a really big chunk of the general budget along with it. Don't let that happen.

Date Received	Comment
01/22/09	Ferries are just floating highways. If we need more money to cover them why not but in toll roads in those limited use roads in the east of Washington to cover their roads or make toll bridges. We could go on and on but we all in the state pay equal highway taxes and ferries deserve there fair share. You limit or put restrictions on ferries to the islands you will cut sales tax in those areas because of lack of tourism. The Islands are a big attraction to the state of Washington. Why not a quarter of a half percent tax on the islands and surrounding counties to help cover the cost. Look out side the box. You cut ferry services you cut sale tax that has already been limited because of the times. We want to encourage the spending of money in the state not discourage. Other simple fixes take away the free rides on ferries to ferry workers families. 2% pay cut to ferry works.(They already make more then I did as a teacher! Simply limiting ferries are requiring reservation is simply cutting off your nose to spit your face!
01/22/09	The San Juan Islands Visitors Bureau (SJIVB) supports the San Juan County Council, San Juan County Ferry Advisory Committee and San Juan County residents in rejecting Plan B. The SJIVB represents over 350 tourism-related businesses in the San Juan Islands, primarily on Lopez, Orcas and San Juan Islands. As you are likely aware, tourism is the economic driver for our islands, and approximately half of the residents here depend on the direct income from or the "trickle down" effect of "new" tourism dollars left behind by visitors. The Washington State Ferries bring most of these visitors to our islands – visitors who contributed over $127 million to our economy in 2007, according to the latest Washington State Tourism research. Our new designation as the State's newest Scenic Byway, including the WSF marine route from Anacortes to our islands, will bring even more visitors to this beautiful area. Tourism is Washington State's fourth largest industry, and the ferries are as iconic to Washington State as the Space Needle is to Seattle. These iconic ferries should be properly funded in order to exceed our visitors' expectations when they visit our unique corner of the world. The 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver B.C. will put an even larger spotlight on our State, and we need to be prepared with a first-class transportation infrastructure. In addition, the Anacortes/San Juans/Sidney run will become even more viable during and after the Olympics. There seems to be a disconnect between Washington State Tourism and the Washington State Ferries. Ferries are our residents' and visitors' lifeline, just as roads and bridges are on the mainland. The WSF system must remain affordable to island residents, small business owners and visitors. Please listen to your customers and formulate a long-range plan that will work for Washington's island residents and tourism-dependent economy.
01/22/09	I am distressed to learn that in the midst of a financial crisis, Washington State in an attempt to find money that was allocated and spent for things other than Ferries now finds that the only way to deal with this is to foist the problem on the Counties or cutting and rationing service, Neither of which is satisfactory as they particularly impact the future of west sound. It would seem that a more logical solution would be to fund current Ferry replacement with revenue bonds using a dedicated portion of gas taxes from the counties surrounding Puget Sound. Establish a mandatory sinking fund tor the future replacement of ferries funded by a dedicated portion of the gas taxes from Counties surrounding Puget Sound, It is painful but at least it places the system on a sound basis after many years of ignoring the problem.
01/22/09	As an Oncologist practicing at Swedish Medical Center and a resident of Fauntleroy, I have growing concerns regarding the health of our immediate community. As addressed in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer Nov 13, 2008 publication, it is well studied that carcinogenic byproducts from high density public transport (planes, cars, ferries) cause cancer. Obviously, it is cost prohibitive to place pollution monitors in and around the neighborhoods of the ferry terminal which could track volatile organic compounds such as Benzene, butadiene and formaldehyde. Even if we could, I understand that there are no federal air quality standards for air toxics. The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's research shows these toxics are abundant enough to pose a health risk. Why should this residential community allow further industrialization of it neighborhood, when a large monitored industrial facility currently exists at Coleman Dock? This dock has the existing permits and can better regulate its air pollution. I have no doubt that the Port of Seattle can be national leader in environmental management. Please make preserving the quality of health for the residents in Fauntleroy a priority project.

Date Received	Comment
01/22/09	DO NOT ENLARGE FERRY DOCK. DO NOT ALLOW MORE FERRY COMMUTERS THROUGH OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. first of all fauntleroy is a community, neighborhood that has been ruined by the fast dirving, u turning, street parking hogging ferry drivers. fauntleroy way had been turned into a race track. walk ons park all over our neighborhoods clogging our streets with their parked cars on nights and weekends now. planning to enlarge and expand the ferry dock in fauntleroy is short sighted. think about the plan to remove the viaduct and downsize the number of traffic lanes on the proposed tunnel. where do you think this extra ferry traffic will go? while trying to limit commuting west seattle residents to 2 lanes through downtown, why are you encouraging more drivers to use the ferry? why not increase the opportunity for them to become bus commuters. this ferry system does not belong in our west seattle neighborhood, ferry traffic should be diverted to the coleman dock with limited service.
01/22/09	I just sent my public comment. However I forgot to include one point. Resident discounts: During our summer months we have peak season pricing. Currently we can still get regular price when we buy multi-use tickets. Please do not take this feature away. We cannot afford the current summer rates as it is and I know they will only continue to increase. We need the multi-use discount to remain. Another proposal is a Resident discount. Residents could receive a discount by showing a valid ID from Vashon. We need visitors in teh summer for our economy, however, as residents, we need the discounted ticket prices. Please do not take away the mulit-use discount.
01/22/09	We need a ferry departing Southworth bound for Fauntleroy at 7:15 A.M. The gap from 6:40 to 7:55 during the height of the commute hours is utterly ludicrous.
01/22/09	Plan A is tolerable for the time being, but Plan B had better be a very, very bad joke. One boat from Bremerton? WHY? And who came up with those departure times? Is the goal to make sure as few people as possible can actually make use of the one measly boat to get to work by the standard office start times of 8:00 or 9:00 a.m.?
01/22/09	1). Reservations would put a serious damper on my ability to get to work at variable times. 2). The Hiyu is obviously proving itself to be a horribly inadequate boat for the Tahlequah-Pt Defiance run. Switching to it permanently will cripple us commuters. 3). An incremental improvement for the Hiyu mess would be to switch to 40 or 45-minute cycles. Now, the boat fills to capacity then waits 5-10 minutes for the scheduled departure time. You fit in another run at each rush hour by doing this. 4). More people would be willing to walk on if they could be reasonably sure their car wouldn't be broken into during the day. 5). Working with the transit organizations in Tacoma and Seattle to ensure synchronous schedules would help.

Date Received	Comment
01/22/09	I urge you to re-evaluate your first two plans and work hard on "Plan C." The concept of keeping terminals minimal is sound. The poor service of Plan A and the injustice of Plan B are not tolerable. Those communities depending on tourism and those depending on commuting will both suffer serious economic hardship if the State fails to recognize that the ferry is the highway to the Kitsap and Olympic Peninsulas.
01/22/09	1st Why are the Bremerton boats always filthy? It is as if we are the red headed step child of the Ferry system. Between the non existent workers(always vanish as soon as the boat takes off) and the complete dirt encrusted boat no one seems to give a dam. When taking the Bainbridge boat you feel as if you are on a lovely cruise, Bremerton maybe a prison ship..... to harsh? maybe someone should ride the two, with out notifying anyone and check it out. 2nd Taking away a boat would make it impossible to continue to live in Bremerton for many people. Why oh why do you always punish us? You took away the passenger boats, which the morning and evening boats were always full. And know you want to make it impossible for us to get to work,school or have any sort of life in Seattle So I guess I need to contact a realtor and start packing, how many more families are you pushing out of Bremerton and the surronding areas?
01/22/09	Especially regarding Vashon Island. The Wa State Ferries should be viewed in the same light as buses and highways. The ferries are no more a luxury than the other critical components of public transportation that support the framework of our society. We. common people can come and go from our home town only when the transit routes are open. We do not have private means to cross the water. Nor can we sprout wings or transform to polar bears, sweet as that might be. Ferries must be as easy to access as buses and highways. Otherwise we set up a trap that ultimately erodes our community. Is this your goal? A boat should be leaving the island at least 1-2 times every hour. Boat schedules should align with buses. Car and driver should be able to get on a boat within 30-60 minutes of arrival. This is no different than your expectations of the bus you board or road you travel to work, school, shopping or medical care every day. We are no different than other communities. We have common expectations of public transportation. We pay our taxes and give of ourselves to make Washington State the fine home we all love. Why are you threatening to take away our road to the world outside our community. This will only undermine the strength of our town and our state.
01/22/09	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) Before my husband and I moved to the Kitsap Peninsula, I thought one nice thing about it would be easy access to Seattle by ferry. We first moved to Port Orchard, and it rarely seemed convenient to ride the ferry. Now that we're in Bremerton, we ride a bit more, but not near as much as I'd like. So what's the problem? High cost and too few runs. And I can only assume the two of us are multiplied by many. We too often must choose between getting to our destination over an hour early -- or walk into an event 15 minutes late. Returning home, we again find we must leave an event early -- or just wait around. So we often drive around through Tacoma. So what's the problem? Well, the roads get more crowded and abused. Seattle gets our business less often. There is more pollution and waste of gasoline. I really feel sorry for commuters. I had thought at one point I might continue to work, and would be able to take the ferry to Seattle. The prices are too high and the schedule inadequate. Then there are periodic breakdowns, and the awareness of the poor condition of our ferries. One would think that environmental damage would be of concern to all of Washington. One would think that road over-use would be of concern to all of Washington -- or at least all of Puget Sound. One would think that when the ferry is an option to driving a car, that it should be, as I believe was originally intended, treated as yet another road. OK, so charge the same for a ferry ride as for going over the Tacoma Narrows bridge. That would make much more sense. You folks are going the wrong direction. I can even understand that perhaps some years ago you -- and possible ferry riders -- weren't thinking environmentally enough, and the ferries were under-used. But now, if they seem under-used, I believe it's because of the combination of high prices and too few runs. Think green. Think long-term. Think the good of the wider community. President Obama encourages thinking of the wider good and the long term -- and environmentally. Let's get with that program. Don't put the burden on one side of the water. It wouldn't be right, even if it only affected those on the West side. But it affects more people than even they may realize. We need a plan C.

Date Received	Comment
	I live in the Fauntleroy area and I have some concerns you may have not heard from the very vocal group that met in a meeting last night in our area. My concern is over the City of Seattle' plan to reduce traffic lanes on Fauntleroy Way SW from Calif. Ave. SW to SW Alaska St. They are planning to reduce the lanes for motor vehicles from 2 each way to one and then add bicycle lanes. I have tried to point out the congestion this going to create to no avail, they seem bent on their Social Engineering project. If this happens you are going have a lot of ferry commuters missing their ferry or else jammmed up for at least a half mile trying to leave West Seattle. You will be deluged with complaints from your patrons. I'm hopeful WSF may have some strong influence to discourage this idiotic plan by the City from happening. We have lived in Fauntleroy since 1965 and I think for the most part you people have tried to be good neighbors. Since they replaced the clanging metal plate on the ramp years ago, I really have no complaints. We certainly enjoy watching the ferries from our front windows up the street on Trenton. Anything you can do to stop the City on this project would be appreciated.
01/22/09	I understand the need to make cuts. However, I think the Vashon cuts are too deep. I can see the merit of having the Hyiu replace the Rhoddie (although as someone who uses that route to take my son to medical specialists four days a week, it's a bit of a hardship!). However, what makes that work at all is that some people are choosing to use the Southworth route instead. To severely cut both routes (two boats on the North end AND cutting the south end by more than 50%) is just too deep. A different option would be to remove the passenger-only boat and leave three boats on the Northend. p.s. I would have been at the 6:00 meeting on Vashon, but the Tacoma ferry overloaded!
01/22/09	Revised fare structure. It seems to me that the major cost of ferry service to Vashon is tied to the volume of vehicular traffic that must be transported. I would suggest charging for vehicles only, with foot passengers not being ticketed. If this results in less vehicular traffic because people are “cheating” and walking across or piling into fewer cars, then ferries could be resized to fit the decreased vehicular demand. This could greatly reduce ticket staffing and expedite loading with the potential for more automation. I assume that the trips per vessel could be increased with faster and lighter vehicular loading. It is the perception of many people on the Island that much of the ticketing structure is for the benefit of those in the Inland Boatman’s Union and not for the users. The split ticket collection for the route from Southworth to Vashon is one example that is often joked about.
01/22/09	When I first rode the ferry from Seattle to Bremerton, then rode the passenger boat I thought how wonderful it will be to commute this route. Since then the passenger boat started charging, then the passenger boats went away, then my commute went to more hours. Then the ferry system did not communicate with metro on its new times,and metro did not change their routes so, on the 4:50am we wait for the bainbridge boat to come in before the buses arrive. Then parking down town was not financially a benefit. Know they have spent several millions on a tunnel (what a waste). They should have built walking overpasses. We have had more problems with boats then any other service. Now Kitsap County has started cutting services. This is getting ridiculus on how bad we are getting treated. The short route from bainbridge should sacrifice some routes. Being a coach and trying to support my country and my community is becoming harder and harder. I work in Seattle spend in Seattle and in Kitsap. The ferry system guides my support. The better they get me home the better my contribution to my community. If you make it worse I will move back to King county and clog the road with my vehicles. I better not here another politician complain about 695 you have had over 10 years to deal with it. Hire a financial person instead of a politician
01/22/09	Charge what you want, but please keep the Clinton-to-Mukilteo run robust enough to allow us to earn a living on the mainland.

Date Received	Comment
01/22/09	My name is Clinton Jones. I work for WSF deck department as an on-call employee. I am writing to you to comment on the recent public hearings that have been held throughout the sound. I would like to comment with my own preception of what i see and what i think would be good changes to the system. Obviously the system needs new boats. Since the steelelectrics were decomissioned the system is crippled. If any of our vessels have mechanical problems the system is broken and customers are furious with the system as a whole. I think that having a vessel sail from Southworth to Seattle is a fabulous idea. If this can be accomplished; than this would do a world of good for both passengers and the system. Im sure, that you are aware of the continuous backups at the fauntleroy dock. With a three boat schedule….. When one car breaks down on the cardeck or a boat has to hold in for a category 1, 2 or 3 (ambulance), it throws the whole system off. Countless times there are two boats waiting to get into fauntleroy at one time and we waist more time getting into the dock than we do making way or load/unload. It is an incredible waist of time… getting a third vessel to make a run from Southworth to Seattle #2 slip would free up the fauntleroy terminal and would be able to continue the service from fauntleroy to Vashon and Southworth on a two boat schedule freeing up the triangle. This vessel would only require two crews. A morning 4am-12pm and an afternoon crew 12-8pm. During peak times. The vessel could either be put to bed after 8pm at either Colman dock in the #2 slip or at Vashon island in the tie up slip. My thought is to have the issaquah be the Southworth to Seattle vessel and keep Vashon h watch (morning watch) and Vashon j watch (afternoon watch) to run this vessel. Nothing would really change. Having a vessel route from Southworth to Seattle would minimize the impact the faunleoroy terminal has in regard to traffic congestion. Since there is only one lane for Southworth traffic at the fauntleroy dock; there is a very big problem with lines up fauntleroy way. The drivers havent even been cashed out at the booth yet, and the boat has to wait for about 50 or so cars to give/take money at the booth and then be able to load the boat for Southworth. Having a vessel route from Seattle to Southworth would minimize traffic in fauntleroy and push the traffic to Colman dock where they have ample amount of room and would be able to handle more traffic flow between lanes 6-12. These lanes are always empty infront of the #2 slip. I have never seen a backup at the Southworth dock. So i have no sugesstions except that people there are frustrated that they have a quota as to how many cars they are allowed to take to fauntleroy
01/22/09	We attended the meeting on board the ferry, and heard all the different comments. We firmly believe that Plan B is not acceptable. In order to reduce ferry building costs, wouldn't it be better to produce one model ferry only, that does the best job to fit all needs, and just keep building this model, like the old volkswagon philosophy. All parts interchangeable reduce costs and delays.
	I am most concerned about those of us who are absolutely ferry dependent – We here on Vashon Island and those who live in San Juan County have no alternatives. Unlike those who live or travel to and from all other ferry serviced destinations, we do not have the option of taking an alternate, albeit less convenient, route by simply driving around and bypassing the ferry. When Washington State is considering paying for the most expensive way replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a tunnel. Any of us who learned to exercise critical thought, certainly realize that much of the well-meaning citizenry was hoodwinked into believing that the tunnel option would be done so as to preserve a view to be had "from the parks that will be constructed." Those of us who might be a little more realistically minded realize that this land and those views will, like all other assets of value, be traded to the wealthy for various meaningless trinkets within a few years and the view will have been squandered. So on two counts, maintaining a viaduct is a sound option. First of all, it will preserve the view – at least from the perspective of those driving – and it is a more utilitarian view than that view provided only to those politically connected or wealthy enough to purchase same. The second count concerns there not being enough money to fund the ferry service. How can this be when there is money to waste selecting the most expensive and also the most childish option for allowing the flow of traffic flow through the city. And, of course, neither of these even begins to consider the impact of a terrorist attack on this artery once it is built. A strong enough blast that might bring down a hundred yards of elevated highway would likely render a tunnel permanently inoperative. This is yet another reason to provide this money to the operation of the ferry service rather than as a luxury to the wealthy so as to preserve a view – the benefits of which will ultimately benefit THEM, alone. I am concerned also about the use of what is known as the inter-island ferries operating within San Juan County. Unless things have changed since I became informed of this several years ago, pedestrians are free to ride

Date Received	Comment
	ferries within the islands on a more or less permanent basis so long as they don't return to Anacortes. This seems to be wasteful and contradictory to policies employed everywhere else within the ferry system. While I don't know how much money WSF gives away here, I suspect that it does add up to a significant number when the number of "free" trips are considered over the course of a year. As one looks at all of what may seem individually inconsequential "leaks", the aggregate turns out to amount to a serious flow which could better be spent toward the preservation of a reasonable ferry service for those of us who live in the state and have paid taxes here for many years. As for the pedestrian only ferry, this represents a much more expensive method of quickly ferrying pedestrians between Vashon Island and downtown Seattle. Many people abuse this service by riding for free in the morning from Vashon to downtown when no ticket is required, yet in the afternoon, they return to the island by the far less expensive bus / car ferry route. They effectively and very purposefully cheat the ferry system here. Now that electronic ticketing has been instituted throughout the system, it should be employed on the pedestrian only ferries and the round trip ticket should be replaced by two, one-way tickets – each of which are valued at ½ the current round trip fare. In Europe, the rail system sometimes relies on a very effective spot check of tickets wherein the fine for not being in possession of a valid ticket when a spot check is made, is extremely high. This tends to promote compliance. That is certainly an option. And should someone not be in possession of one of the tickets to travel on the pedestrian only ferry, they still have what is required to ride the slower route on the car ferry. This is another of the many, minor "leaks" that can be easily plugged and the savings applied to more reasonable projects.
01/22/09	As a whole I find both plans to be unacceptable. While drastic changes in plans elsewhere within the ferry system might work, the plan for Vashon Island is an exception for that very reason, we are an island. My major problem is with the reservation system, this might work for another route served by WSF because people have the option to drive but for Vashon the ferry is the only way off and onto the island and reservations are not the way to go. Some people have to leave the island at the drop of a hat so how does WSF propose to deal with that? What about returning to the island, what is the plan for the cars who have reservations and not, where do you propose on putting those vehicles? Many people do not have internet access to make reservations and this just makes leaving and returning to the island an incredibly difficult task when it should be something that we can do as we please rather that we are told to. As far as I can see the way the ferries are loaded on Vashon at present seems to be working just fine and to make life more difficult for people to get around in order to maximize usage of boats is a ridiculous thing. You don't see roads and highways shut down during times of lesser travel, so if as we know the WSF service is an extension of our roadways then this really needs to be taken into consideration. Plan B is a no go, to reduce a community of more than 10,000 to such few boats is ridiculous, what makes Bainbridge and Bremerton more important that they get to keep their boats yet they have the option of driving. To me Plan B is there to make Plan A look good and Plan A is not a good system for an ISLAND community. I hope that the powers that be with WSF, namely David Moseley, will take all of this into account and also what the people of Vashon had to contribute at the public hearing (I was in attendance to the end). It is up to him to convey to the legislature what we think of these plans and while I feel that he was sincere in his concern at the meeting I don't know if our voice will be heard in the legislature. He needs to convince people who don't have to deal with the ferries or use them on a daily basis that we want a plan that will work for us and not make our lives more difficult as both of the plans offered do. I thank him for taking the time and extending the public comment hearing and hope he does his best for us in Olympia on the 31st.
	I am writing to comment on proposed changes for the Edmonds Kingston ferry run. I must state clearly that I firmly oppose cutting service. I am unable to find employment in Kitsap County and must commute on a daily basis to the east side of the sound. I also have financial reasons which prevent my family from moving, and quite frankly, we don't want to. We like living in Kitsap County and have no desire to take up residence on the other side of the water. To maintain this quality of life we enjoy in Kitsap County, I am willing to put forward the time, money, and effort required to commute to the other side, as are many others who live in this county. Thus, shutting down the ferries is like saying we're going to close I-5 for 8 hours a day and asking users of a major transportation thoroughfare $20 for the privilege of driving on it. The reality is that we are a state with a lot of water, and a lot of people who are separated by that water. Thus, it is the state's responsibility to maintain the marine highway system just as they do all the other roads. I understand that money is tight, and that there are multiple pressures on the state budget. But ferry riders have borne enough of the state's abdication of responsibility to maintain a state highway. It is not fair to keep telling us that we can pay when all Washingtonians benefit from the commerce and contributions to Washington's economy that result from this cross sound travel. I hope you will seriously consider

Date Received	Comment
	the impact your proposed changes will have on those of us who use the ferry system on a day to day basis and make the equation that our ferries are like our highways. You wouldn't close highways made of asphalt to save money; you cannot close this highway either.
	I would like to express my opinion on two particular areas being discussed as part of the draft long range plan. 1. Fauntleroy dock: I do not support an elevated pedestrian walkway. I see no reason why we need that. People can easily walk on and off the ferry, and I suggest asking them to pick up the pace a bit if they are delaying the exit of cars. Another option would be to have a very short ramp/staircase similar to what airports have when you board a plane from the tarmac. Then the neighborhood would not be so bent out of shape about impacting views and having an eyesore. 2. Southworth to Fauntleroy route: I am a huge supporter of keeping the Southworth route coming to the Fauntleroy dock. There are many people who take that route and then head south for work. Not everyone goes north into Seattle. Many people work in South Seattle and other south cities. The downtown Seattle docks are so full and chaotic as is, it does not make sense to add to the congestion there. Think about the mess with all the viaduct construction going on for the next 10 years! Spare us.
01/22/09	Take half of the boats and runs off of Bainbridge and give those runs and boats to Bremerton. Bremerton has never had good runs or boats and they are packed.
01/22/09	Of course, you know that most of us that live on the island don't think it is fair that you are cutting back on the ferries while you continue to support road building. So, what can I say to add on to comments that people have already made. Ditto is what I say. I also have comments on your parking situation, esp at Mukilteo and Clinton. It is the weirdest thing I ever saw to have people turning right from the left lane, right in front of the people in the right lane. If I were from out of state or not accustomed to catching these ferries, I would be totally confused. You really need ferry parking rather than lining up along the road. It is such a waste of gas in these times of high prices and talk of energy conservation. I just can't believe that you don't realize this. Also on the Port Townsend/Keystone ferry, the wait times are so long. There must be a way to arrange it so that people on either side can do something rather than wait in the car and then move it inch by inch towards the ferry when it is loading. For one thing, the ticket sellers could walk along and sell tickets to the people waiting in the cars so that when the ferry comes in, the cars just have to drive on. And for another thing, people could shop in Pt. Townsend until their ferry is ready to leave. Same thing in Keystone. Sometimes they could be going for a walk along the beach or catching the bus into Coupeville until it is time for the ferry to leave. You need to work with the communities on both sides to make it a good thing for everyone. Surely there are smart people there in DOT who can solve these dilemmas! Saying all this, I must say that if the ferries are indeed cut out, you should at least have passenger only ferries between the car ferries and work with the communities on both sides to coordinate buses, etc. so people can get around. It would be possible for passengers to go ahead of the cars in some cases so that they could enjoy the communities while the driver waits for the ferry to get their car over. Think of something positive!!!! So, I guess what I want to say is that I realize that we all won't get what we want, but you should at least be doing something proactive and using your brains to make the situation better. I know you must have brains.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	My feeling is that the tunnel that has been adopted for Seattle proper via DOT has quite a bit of funding that needs to be accomplished and that the State of Washington is searching for monies to fund this project. I do not believe that cutting back routes on the ferry system is an answer. It was a GREAT MISTAKE to take the electric boats off the routes especially the Klickitat on the Port Townsend route. That boat could have run at least until sometime in 2009 - like maybe until August or September and then pulled. It is obvious that there was not much forethought given in pulling all the boats for the Port Townsend run. It is a very unique run that requires a very special boat. The tourist, commercial travel and businesses on Whidbey Island and the Olympic Peninsula (Port Townsend, etc.) have all suffered very heavily for that serious mistake! Cutting a route to Sydney, BC is also a mistake! There are a lot of tourists that depend on that route. And then there is the Clinton proposition. Maybe it might work but there are a lot of commuters from Whidbey Island as well as the mainland that depend on the route for employment purposes - such as Boeing, etc. The bottom line is that DOT should look towards other means of financing than cutting out very imperative routes that people depend upon for work or pleasure. The ferry system has been an integral part of NW Washington's travel routes and should not be jeopardized because of DOt's search for finances for their tunnel - or anything else for that matter! The governor's office should definitely re-evaluate their priorities. Being down in Olympia they obviously do not realize the importance of these routes and how they affect tourist, commercial, business and personal travel. Shame on them!
01/23/09	1. It is my understanding that the ferry system is under the jurisdiction of the Dept of Transportation. They ARE a state highway. If a road needs repaired, it is repaired. If a bridge needs replaced, money is magically found to replace it. Yes, I agree that the fleet is getting old. Several boats are nearing retirement. They will need to be replaced. The ferries are also a big Tourist draw and tourists spend money. TAXES for the state coffers. If the Elwha and the Yakima were built in San Diego, why can't bids be submitted out of state which could result in competitive bids. 2. historically, the Vashon Southworth route has been and by your own words," is a 3 boat route." you would be fools to make it a 2 boat route. If you did, use 2 Issaquah class boats for capacity mix the loads so more Southworth cars are on the ferry, you would alleviate extra congestion on Fauntleroy way. A one boat schedule for Bremerton is exceedingly foolhardy. A 1 hour run with 2 hours between boats at each terminal would lose riders to the roads. I have pointed out to Bremerton drivers that it is faster to go through Southworth instead of to Bremerton. 3. look at growth. The Kitsap peninsula is growing. There will be a need for expanded transit.
01/23/09	We live in Friday Harbor, WA. I am a social worker for DSHS Children's Administration and my partner is a retired elementary school teacher. We are not wealthy. We have no bridges to the mainland, yet we must go there from time to time to receive medical care, to shop for items not available here, and to travel to visit relatives. Taking small airplanes to the mainland is not realistic due to very high cost and due to the lack of public transit once at those mainland airports. We are totally dependent on the state ferry system. We are different from the commuters in many other ferry-served areas. San Juan County residents are citizens of this state and pay sales and other taxes that fund roads. San Juan County has no state highways, so we do not receive local benefit from state funds that go to pay for state roads. Our ferries are our state highway. WA State Ferries must find a way to maintain services to citizens of San Juan County at an affordable cost. I understand that there is a law that disallows resident discounts for the ferry. Maybe this should be re-evaluated. However, visitors/tourism is one of the vital parts of the islands' economy, so costs for visitors also must be kept reasonable. If ferry riders must pay 50% to 100% of the cost of operation, this is totally unaffordable for everyone. It is like charging people tolls on all state roads to equal the cost of their construction and maintenance. I doubt that citizens of the rest of the state would support that. We have read in the media about the Plan A and Plan B approaches to the Anacortes-San Juan Islands ferry route and the Anacortes-Sidney route. We are supportive only of Plan A. We must have good ferry service here. The route to Sidney is vital to the economies of the San Juan Islands and Anacortes. To fund new ferries, why don't you apply for some of the funding that the federal government is planning to make available to stimulate the economy? Get those plans ready to start immediately. Please do not end the ferry to Sidney. Please adopt Plan A. Keep working to fund new ferries and support services here for residents and visitors.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	I read in your plan that there are talks about removing boats from almost all the runs except Bainbridge Island. All the other runs have more than 2 boats and are less than an hour long. However, the Bremerton only has 2 boats and is already an hour long run. So removing a boat from this run would be detrimental to the Bremerton community who commute. Please do not remove any boats from this run. It's already a hardship for some people that there is no boat from 12 to 3p. But they make it work. Removing a boat would cause an even greater hardship, especially for those who have emergencies and need to go home (e.g. children, etc.). I just had a baby and I, along with many other people rely on the routes that we currently have. I am also distraught that with the talks of removing some vessels from the runs, not one mention was made of disrupting the Bainbridge Island run. If anything, they're run could make the sacrifice because it's such a short run (30) mins. But please, PLEASE do not remove a boat from the Bremerton Run
01/23/09	I am so sorry that the most damage to the ridership is Bremerton Route. We have the least amount of runs during the day. We have no Sat and Sun routes like the others. We need peak hour trips. A lot of people have to get to work and if they only have one boat, we would not make it on time. Passenger boats during the non-peak hours would be good, since there aren't that many people traveling at that time. Don't know why I am even doing this because the powers that be are going to do what they want to do anyway. The only thing I ask is please search all options before making a decision that you may regret in the long run. Remember, all the work done on the waterfront in Bremerton needs ferries for people on the other side to come and use it. Also, why the tunnel if you are going to cut the ferries?
01/23/09	As a regular commuter on the Southworth Ferry, I was extremely dissatisfied to learn of the state's plan to cut a route entirely from its schedule since the ferry is already operating on a reduced schedule and the passenger ferry system that so many citizen fought so hard to maintain were terminated at other ferry terminals such as Bremerton and elsewhere. As such, since I was unable to attend the voting session, if my vote holds any weight please submit as a DECLINE to the new proposed changes. As a follow up to be appended to my previous response, I read the plan in its entirety and in comparing plans A and B realized there is a wealth of questions I have in assessing the true differences between the two other than the substantial cost savings for the plan under the Marine Highway. Will more details be fleshed out for public to comment on? What opportunities will be available to be involved in planning and specifics of proposed changes. Have all public meetings ceased at this juncture.
01/23/09	What I would like everyone to look at is the growth potential on the west sid of Puget Sound. The state cannot conitue to grow to the east, north and south and handle the traffic as it is now. They need to start looking at better serving the west side of the sound. All monies are spent on the east side roads. You have got to have better ferry service to achieve this. You plans A & B are not going to work to get this. When new comunities are built you give them decent roads, give Kitsap the same. I want this logged and sent to Olympia.
01/23/09	Please do not diminish the size of the boat on the Talequah/Pt. Defiance run to anything smaller than the Rhodedendron. We on Vashon have already had to endure being cut off from the southend because of the huge gaps in the afternoon schedule. The Hiyu is totally inadequate & overloads constantly.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	We bought our house in the Fauntleroy area last summer so that I would be able to commute to my job in Port Orchard on the ferry. People in both West Seattle and Southworth have built their lives around the ferry system. It would be a severe hardship if service from Fauntleroy to Southworth was completely aborted. Additionally, the businesses in West Seattle would likely suffer from reduced traffic through the Fauntleroy terminal if service was transferred to downtown.
01/23/09	After reading the plan, I find several huge flaws. I have been a commuter on the ferry system (Bremerton run) for 15 years. I have yet to take one of your surveys that does not skew the information when results are publicized. To say that commuter ridership is down is absolutely ludicrous. I have seen commuter ridership quadruple in the last 15 years. During peak times, boats are so crowded with commuters that often seats are difficult to come by. Commuter ridership is up, not down - that is the first flaw in your plan. Second, every commuter I talk to is absolutely disgusted with the lateness of crossing times. Ferries never leave on time and they never arrive on time. The schedules are not conducive to a good majority of the commuters. If you slow the boats down, we will go from a supposedly 60 minute trip to an 80 or 90 minute trip. What about all of the commuters who have varying times to get to work? I, for one need to be at work at 7:30, some other commuters need to get to work by 8:00, and others by 8:30. For those who need to arrive by 7:30 AM, this will necessitate taking an extremely early boat and then cooling their heels for an hour or so before starting work. Customer Service on the ferry system is deplorable. Workers show by attitude that they could care less about what the ridership wants. The whole premise of the ferry system is based on its own needs rather than the needs of its customers. This is one of the reasons the ferry system is failing. Plan B is even worse than Plan A. If the entire state ferry system can't afford to maintain the ferries, why would Kitsap County be able to afford it? And why should Kitsap County be made responsible for 3 different routes when other counties are also benefitting from the ferries? There seems to be an inherent unfairness here. I also am wondering why the ferry system is expected to pay state fuel tax when it is currently a state-run facility? That makes no sense whatsoever. In order to fix the ferry system, reverse thinking needs to be applied. Instead of forcing the customer to accept whatever is decided by those running the ferry system, start by finding out what your customer wants, then apply principles to make that happen. I believe that your customers would be willing to pay more if they got the kind of service they want. Your customers want reliable service. We want a safe vessel that gets us to and from our destinations on time, every time. We want ferry schedules that fit our needs (I personally am in favor of several smaller passenger boats). I do like the idea that bus schedules should accommodate walk-ons. We want good customer service whereby our needs and concerns are met with positive responses and a willingness to fix whatever problems might arise. You had a wonderful system with the passenger ferries to and from Bremerton/Seattle. Everybody was happy. There were enough boats and schedules to accommodate commuter needs. Then you took it all away and ever since we've all been miserable. The waterways are considered state highway systems. Funding should be allocated for the waterways in the same manner that roads are funded. When you expect your ridership to pay 90-100% of the fees, we consider that double-dipping. After all, we pay taxes for highway systems, and then we have to pay again to ride the boats. Do we pay double to drive on the roads? If you can't fix the system, turn the whole thing over to private enterprise or an organization that can do better.
01/23/09	Please do not go with plan “B” of the Long Range Plan. Living on the San Juan Islands is difficult enough without having the ferry runs curtailed. As it is, the Winter schedules are very inconvenient but, they are an order of magnitude better then the proposed “B” plan. We only have one way off our respective islands and the reductions proposed in the “B” plan will cause an inordinate hardship for the 14,000 residents of San Juan County. Currently, in the summer, we have to deal with excessive wait times and, in the winter, with long delays between ferries. Please don’t impose additional burdens on us.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	PLEASE do not cut or change our ferry service!
01/23/09	I am very unhappy with the DOT suggestion to require reservations on the Clinton-Mukilteo ferry to and from Whidbey Island. 1. Those of us with homes on the Island should not have our travel to and from te Island restricted by a reservation system. One does not always get to plan a day that easily and should not be penalized by the need to alter a plan for a sick child, senior or self. Other reasons also may render planning for ferries untenable. 2. The south end of the Island is inaccessible except via ferry service or a lengthy trip up I-5 and a lengthy trip from teh north end of the Island. Having to make the long drive at night can be dangerous on the unlit roads and costly in terms of gasoline. Not everyone has access to an auto. 3. As the Bush administration left office, we have learned how much the government has spied on it's citizens without cause. By requiring Island citizens to register every time we want to use the ferrie, the government is acquiring more unnecessary info and restricting the freedom of its citizens. Does Gov Gregoire really want to beresponsible for further unnecessary intrusion in the lives of her constituents? I think not. 4. In these times of budget short falls and cutbacks, it i fiscally irresponsible to purchase computers to track reservations, and add another layer of bureaucracy to the already strethced budget. The governor recently initiated a hiring freeze. Will this foolish proposal becoem an exception? 5. The ferries should be part of the highway system as it is regulated by the DOT. Our tax dollars should suport the ferries as well as the passes. Thank you for your attention to my concerns. I have listed my office address below for correspondence
01/23/09	I am currently a Southworth-Fauntleroy commuter, (potentially soon becoming an Vashon/Fauntleroy commuter). Obviously, I don't have any support for Plan B in either of my commuter possibilities. It drops service to unacceptable levels. Plan A is minimally acceptable, since it at least doesn't remove service (and in fact gives marginally higher capacity.) I also do feel that some increase in service to Southworth is warranted--if for nothing else than pr. (Seeing several "Vashon only" boats in a row depart is kind of a slap in the face to Southworth commuters.) Some revision of routing on the triangle might make sense as well (more direct boats to Fauntleroy from each location, with a "shuttle" between Vashon and Southworth has some merit, I think.) However--the primary thing I wanted to comment on is the misconception that I heard brought up several times at the public meeting in Port Orchard. It would not be a good thing for "all" commuters to re-route even a major portion of the Fauntleroy traffic to downtown. A good number of van pools (and other commuters) head south from Fauntleroy (to Boeing, Southcenter, etc) as well as head towards downtown. Making the assumption that downtown is a good solution for all if a very bad one. Thanks--and good luck with the tough job of pleasing all.
01/23/09	As a Vashon family business owner (and home owner) we oppose cutting ferry service to our community. We offer a needed service on our island, health insurance and financial services. People who don't do well with the internet come into our office to get help with these services. However, we cannot rely on the island's people as our sole source of income so we have to travel off island to help our additional clients. Please see our ferry service as an overwater freeway, much like a bridge. Let's get creative with our ferries Making money.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	Dear Mr. David Moseley / Joy Goldenberg My name is Fraser Ramsay, Vice President, Ramsay Machine Works Ltd. I am writing you to express my concern over the discussions and possible decision to cancel the Sidney to Anacortes ferry service by the Washington State department of Transport. I understand that in today's economic environment that all sectors of government and the economy are looking at cost savings and cost cutting measures, but on the other hand all facets of government provincial, state, and federal levels on both sides of the border are looking at ways to stimulate the economies of their respective economies. In my opinion, the decision will have an accelerating and debilitating financial effect on the economies, both directly and indirectly, on both sides of our borders, from the community of Sidney, Saanich Peninsula, to the community of Anacortes, Skagit Valley, and other areas of Washington State. It will inflict economic loss of a potential 1500 jobs with a 30million annual payroll along with 126million in annual spending throughout the Skagit Valley. It is also an historical link between sister cities, that has moved people between the two countries, that has bound the two areas for decades. Please make the right decision, support and maintain this ferry service; it is a vital link, and a needed service, in so doing you will support the economy of an entire region.
01/23/09	I think the Sydney run should be dropped. I've been on it with only 3-4 other cars. If it is a financial drain on the WSF system, it should not be supported. Plan B overall looks good to me.
01/23/09	Although times are tough and a locking down consistent source of funding has proved difficult. I feel that this long range plan is simply giving up and will inevitably lead to a complete shut down the system. It has long been known that there are only a couple of "profitable" runs in the ferry system. Runs that pay for themselves, and perhaps even provide enough funding to pay a little bit to the more subsidized runs. One of the primary goals of the ferry system (in addition to providing a way across the sound) should be to make every effort to make each run as profitable as possible. It is absolutely understandable that in this process there will be runs so heavily subsidized that they will not be able to ever be self sustaining. The ridership on these runs will not increase, and tough decisions will have to be made to reduce service to match ridership, or perhaps even cancel a costly run altogether. The Baffling thing about these long range plans, is that there seems to be absolutely no consideration given to making a run self sufficient. There have been countless studies done over the years, and all have concluded that the South Kitsap area, and more specifically the Southworth ferry run would be as popular as the self sufficient Kingston/Edmonds, or Seattle/Bainbridge runs if the ferry system were to improve the service and logistics of this route. Currently the ridership on the Southworth run is limited by the threshold of time/frustration/cost to make the commute. The Southworth to Downtown Seattle has long been considered one of the most difficult ferry commutes, and as such only the die-hard riders are left making that commute. Any reduction in service or increase in cost will obviously lead to a reduction in ridership. On the other hand, it has been shown any improvement in service will absolutely lead to increased ridership. A direct ferry to Downtown Seattle from Southworth should be a "no brainer". This would ensure that the ferry sytem has three self sustaining runs, and change Southworth from being one of the more highly subsidized runs. However with the continued insistence on a triangle route (which makes far less sense when there is no longer a Passenger only boat from Vashon that will cater to Southworth riders, as the soon to be extinct state service has done) it ensures that the boats will sail half empty, leaving waiting cars behind at the dock, reducing the efficiency of the whole system. It further ensures that folks won't be patient enough to wait 1:15 minutes (current schedule) for the next "peak commuting hours" boat, and will instead drive around thus causing a further reduction in revenue. It is a foolish idea that reducing service on a run that could be self sufficient is a "long term" strategy. It obviously would reduce ridership and revenue to the point that further cuts will be necessary in the future, ultimately with the cancellation of a run that everyone acknowledges would otherwise be the most in demand route. Cutting the service seems more like a knee jerk reaction than anything. Sometimes in business and government, paying a bit more up front can lead to enormous cost savings down the road, that is "long term planning". In the mid 90s the Volkswagen company was facing bankruptcy, their cars designs were long in the tooth and their customer satisfaction and reliability was at an all time low. As opposed to the standard method of just cutting costs and further cutting corners (as they had been doing for years prior) they realized that they needed to invest in producing a product that would increase efficiency, increase satisfaction, and as a result increase demand and

Date Received	Comment
	provide a steady stream of revenue. As a result Volkswagen, while on the verge of bankruptcy, invested heavily in the most state of the art factory in the world. They then used that factory to produce a vehicle that everybody wanted, the New VW Beetle. This decision single handedly changed VW from being on the verge of failure and collapse, to being one of the most profitable and powerful car companies in the world. The thing that was so remarkable about this particular turnaround, is that it was not rocket science. Everyone knew at the time that old Beetles were in high demand (people were even illegally smuggling them in from Mexico). Furthermore, it was common sense that a nice, reliable, affordable, well built car would sell well. The only thing that made this decision so monumental is that instead of choosing the knee jerk reaction of cutting costs and cutting corners, they made the more logical, and obvious choice of investing in something that works. The Washington State Ferry system is in a similar situation. No additional studies need to be done to realize that a direct 35 minute ferry run from Downtown to Southworth were land is still relatively cheap, plentiful and the quality of life is superb would be a high demand, self sustaining run in a very short time frame. This choice would actually improve the sustainability of the ferry system as a whole, any other option will do nothing in helping to ensure the long term sustainability of the ferry system, and just be more of a funding burden. Go back to your original plan to route Southworth to the Coleman Dock. The Viaduct construction will be far less disruptive now that they have chosen a deep bore. The 50 million dollar upgrade/expansion to the Fauntleroy dock isn't wanted. The city of Seattle is actively trying to reduce Fauntleroy way to a two lane road to discourage any more traffic to the dock. Spend the 50 Million on the Coleman dock as originally planned where it will be appreciated, rather than be fought continually. I have more to say about other portions of the service. I would suggest getting the state to overrule the reluctance of some of the island folks, and mandate a few bridges, eliminating the need for a few terminals and corresponding higher subsidized runs. However I have vented long enough and I am impressed if you have actually made it this far.
01/23/09	Allow me to belabor the obvious on the answer to the ferry system. That is, of course, a bridge between Bainbridge Island and the Kitsap mainland in the Illahee area. If a stranger to our area were to look at a county map, they would likely be curious as to why a ferry runs to Bremerton, instead of just Bainbridge. Abridge could be built cheaply, south of the Brownsville marina. The water is shallow there and the tide currents are very low. It could be build, mostly as a causeway, with a short span at allow marine navigation. The causeway could also serve as a breakwater for additional badly needed moorage and as a public fishing and recreational area. Shuttle busses could cycle on routes through Poulsbo, Silverdale and Bremerton, and to parking lots located where space is more cheaply available. Fewer ferries would be needed as the crossing time is much less than from Bremerton, so each ferry could carry more cars per day. This would allow a more flexible and compressed schedule. For example, if auto backups started to appear, go to an accelerated load up and leave schedule. This would be possible with the reserve capacity available. I think that this would work better with three ferries, than we can presently do with four ferries in our present situation. I understand that that the idea of a bridge is not new, and that the forces against it are based only on selfish self interests; but it is the best way. It could not be accomplished without standing up to the special interest groups.
01/23/09	Please make every effort to maintain the San Juan Islands ferry schedule as it is. With fewer runs the gaps in transportation for jobs, health and other necessary transportation to the mainland and to other islands is greatly jeopardized. The livelihood and survival of islanders is interdependent with this access to other places nearby that are only accessible by ferry. To change it would be no different than closing State routes for half of each day. It's unacceptable anywhere else and so must be seen as unacceptable here.
01/23/09	Please don't divide Washington into two states down Puget Sound. The ferry-served communities depend on the green and white boats as much as mountain towns and cities need bridges and well-drained highways. Safe, dependable, well-run ferry service is not a luxury, it is a necessity for the islands and the western part of the state.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	I have been an Orcas Island resident for 30+ years and have watched the service to the San Juan Islands decrease over the years while, at the same time, costs for travelers (both county residents and visitors alike) have increased to the point of absurdity, in my opinion. The currently proposed Plan B is simply not acceptable. Plan A is bare bones at best, but the only choice at this point in time. I wish our legislators could get through their heads that ferries in San Juan County provide our "roadway." Perhaps there should be toll roads leading into Olympia, and those funds be used to help fund critical ferry service.
01/23/09	I work for the City of Seattle, but live on the Kitsap peninsula, and commute to work every day on the Bremerton ferry. It is simply incomprehensible to me that WSF would propose to cut back the Bremerton run to one boat service. To take the position that some other entity (county or city government) would be able and willing to step in and take responsibility for providing passenger ferry service between Bremerton and Seattle boggles the mind. Both WSF and a private contractor have tried and failed to provide Bremerton to Seattle passenger ferry service in the past. Ballot measures in Kitsap County funding passenger ferry service have failed twice. To even consider reducing Bremerton ferry service when WSF projections expect Kitsap county population and demand for ferry service to increase is irresponsible and negligent. The ferry system is a part of the State highway system and allows many people to work in jobs that are simply not available where they live. A disruption in service of this magnitude would wreak havoc on the lives of thousands of people, and cause severe economic hardship for the community as a whole. Many of the people affected by this cut in service would take the Bainbridge ferry instead, further disrupting an already overworked ferry run, and causing massive congestion on already crowded Bainbridge Island roads. I strongly urge you to reconsider presenting this poorly thought out plan to the legislature.
01/23/09	Because we live on an island, we have no alternate means of getting to the “mainland,” where once a sign read, “Welcome to Washington.” I’m sure that was meant for the travelers from Victoria. The ferries are critical to our way of life, and part of the state highway system. Lessening the frequency of runs and raising the fares are a terrific hardship for us. Because we are an island, our commuting does not incur wear and tear on the mainland highways, and that savings should be reflected in our ferry fares. It seems to me that there could be some sort of reduced fare for those of us who rely on the ferries. I’ve heard there is the concern that people who are not full-time San Juan County residents may finagle a way to get a ‘locals fare card’ or whatever form the reduced fare could take. A few dollars more in ferry fare to visitors is but a very small part of their overall expenditure, and would not be the wrenching pain we feel when the fares rise. The five-ride card is helpful and I have no problem with that fare. I do have concerns when the frequency of ferries is diminished, though, mainly due to the waiting time for the ferry in Anacortes. The border crossing into Canada has a lane that frequent travelers can use and not wait in line. Something like that would be welcomed by all San Juan Islanders, I’m sure. If for instance we go off-island to go shopping, we have to cut our time short by nearly two hours to hopefully catch the ferry that gets us home at a decent hour. You have no doubt received many notes with similar concerns; I hope they are taken into account when the WSF long-range plan is finalized. The ferries are our highways. We are stuck without them, either not being able to make appointments (doctors) on the mainland, or trying to get back to our homes.
01/23/09	As a residents of Kingston and frequent ferry users, my wife and I are appalled at the plans put forward for future ferry management. This is an integral route to access other parts of the state just like any road is. If the state can choose to take the highest cost alternative to replacing the Alaskan Viaduct, it can certainly find a solution to the ferry problems that do not sacrifice service and user cost. We pay transportation taxes like everyone else and expect that money to keep the ferry system current and useful. It is time to listen to the users and recognize that as Obama was elected because the country needed change to occur, the same change is needed for our ferry system management or more change will be demanded.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	We really need the larger ferry on this run since there is only one ferry an hour. If you can't get on the boat you don't wait 20 or 30 minutes for another boat, you wait an hour. This is just not acceptable.
01/23/09	I am writing to oppose expansion of the West Seattle ferry dock at Fauntleroy. I have lived in West Seattle for nearly 30 years, and I have seen traffic increase on the Southworth and Vashon ferries as Seattle job holding commuters have moved to both Vashon Island and the Kitsap Peninsula. I also have seen the West Seattle Streets, the West Seattle Bridge and the Alaska Way Viaduct get more and more clogged by vehicles coming from the Faunteleroy ferry run, most of whom go straight downtown. In an era when we are trying to reduce unnecessary car use, to avoid freeway congestion, to lessen our carbon footprint, to move toward inter-modal transportation model that places commuters near the train and bus services they need, to provide them with reasonable alternatives to cars, the Fauntleroy Ferry Dock should be under consideration for removal altogether, not expansion. The bulk of the people who drive onto the Ferries from Vashon and Southworth are not going to West Seattle. When they get on the freeways to go downtown or north, they add to the already bad congestion. If the Ferries all went to Colman Dock, they would have access to the Region's expanding coummter rail, RTA tunnel, and bus service, taxis, and other public transportation amenities, and soon, Seatac airport and the UW via RTA. Instead of spending money to expand the WS Ferry Dock, covered pedestrian access should be considered to connect Colman dock with the RTA tunnel downtown to the heavily used destinations like the airport and UW. In my view the West Seattle Ferry Dock should be removed, because its odd and antiquated location is designed entirely for car traffic. Instead, large car ferries should all go to Colman Dock, and a new foot ferry dock should be consdered for the Des Moines or Burien area with quick rotating bus or trolley access to directly to Seatac airport. A Sea-tac dock would accommodate future foot ferries for airport bound travellers to and from Tacoma, Gig Harbor, Southworth, Vashon, Bermerton, Kingston and all over the West Sound area as the population there and its travel needs expand. The new Viaduct - tunnel will accommodate fewer cars than it presently handles, and we don't need to bring more of them in from the WS Ferry to plug up the new tunnel. Our present highway system cannot handle northbound commuters car traffic as it is, and we don't need more. On the other hand, if the Vashon and Southworth car ferries landed downtown, the following positive results would occur: Many people would not need their cars at all, and those who did need to take their cars could take either 99 or I-5 to their non-downtown destinations (includling West Seattle) in a "reverse commute," against the strong flow of rush hour traffic, so they would not add to the congestion in the direction of most morning and evening commuters. As an alternative, foot traffic ferries from the west sound could stop at the new Harbor Avenue West Seattle Water taxi dock which will be built in coming years, which already has dedicated rotating quick bus service to the junction, admiral, and alki beach areas. Please do not expand the West Seattle Ferry dock. If you do anything you should take it down and replace it with one near Seatac airport. Urban Intermodal transportation is what we need, not ferry dock locations based on user patterns from the Model T Era. As a follow up note, in addition to commuter use, I understand that the WS ferry at Fauntleroy is "handy" for a people who have come to rely on it as a convenient and fun way to reach vacation homes on the peninsula or hood canal, etc. I have friends in that situation who sometimes still use the ferry way, but most of them now drive over the new narrows bridge to their peninsula vacation homes. I also know that a small number of students from west seattle go to school on vashon now. However, for serious long-term planning purposes, (which will also allow families to plan things like long-term school choices and home location), the current dock location really must be seen as an anachronism from an earlier time, much like the old ferry dock for Bremerton was once located at alki point. Prior to autos, ferries and boats were once the primary transit available around here. Then, as car use grew more common, the ferries became viewed as mostly auto-oriented "extensions" of highways. Now, our ferries have once again become a major part of our regional mass transit system, and ferries are seen as large part of the future solution to our huge regional people moving problem. In this modern time, it no longer makes sense to view ferries mainly as "vehicle movers" or as simply extensions of our roads and highways. When you consider the constant horrible vehicle traffic here every day, it seems crazy to have our ferries docking at locations that are not destinations for either the foot riders or the vehicles on them. All that does is create unnecessary traffic with cars and additoinal buses on our already overcrowded roads. Even the Kingston Ferry terminates in Edmonds ot a major commuter train station, which makes perfect inter-modal sense. We should do the same for vashon and southworth, which are much

Date Received	Comment
	changed from their previous mostly rural circumstances, and have now become major bedroom communites for seattle workers
01/23/09	Please find enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Burlington, expressing the City of Burlington's support for the continued operation of the international ferry run between Anacortes and Sidney, BC. We wish this resolution to be added to the record in this matter.
01/23/09	There are several flaws in the approach taken by the plan; the most basic is the way in which the ferry system is viewed by the WDOT. The plan argues that allocation of funds to the marine highways system is a diversion of funds from the landside highway system. This approach pits the two systems against each other without recognizing that they really are the same system. Long term capital outlays for building roads and building ferries should be viewed as the same; while yearly maintenance of the landside system and 'subsidies' for the marine system should be viewed as the same. Rebuilding 520 and buying a new ferry should have the same priority and procurement system. Putting a toll on the bridge can be viewed just like tolling the ferry. Plan B is totally unacceptable according to your own planned growth, ridership demand and service needs. This option is a complete failure of leadership and vision. Plan A is also unacceptable when what we should be doing is planning a marine highway system that excels in it's mission of providing services and economic benefits to the communities they serve. Plan C: 1) Study the real growth and demand forecasts; design a plan to deal with this and even more. 2) Study new and improved service options for riders; show us a plan to improve and expand our system. 3) Plan for improved terminals, new ferries, more jobs; let the WA Ferry System be a showcase, rather than a collection of broken down rust buckets. 4) Eliminate words like 'subsidies' and 'funding gaps', replacing them with ongoing maintenance and capital expenditures. 5) Put the onus for finding ways to pay for the entire highway system back on our legislators, tell them what a first class system costs and let them do what we've elected them to do; don't pit the marine system against the landside system. Our ferry system should shine; we've got great people working in impossible situations to provide much needed services to our state. Let's invest in our state's future and make our ferry system second to none.
01/23/09	In regard to the Vashon boats. There seems to be an assumption that the service we residents of the Island have, is adequate, and that you are only soliciting comments for the "best" way to make it worse. Here are suggestions for making it better. It would be enormously helpful to have more runs directly to downtown Seattle. The access to the freeways is already near, and many more people would walk on. The Ferry officials said they were concerned about "green development" but none of their proposals encompass any green strategy. How about an HOV lane with priority loading? Plug ins for electric cars? Lower rates for small vehicles (our Toyota Yaris is exactly half the length of a Suburban), incentive rates for the return runs that are mostly empty? And, building fuel efficient ferries? If you had two boats going back and forth constantly, you would never have to print another ferry schedule. It was disappointing that all the proposals put forth so far are the same old thing (cut down on service to Vashon, take out runs, put on small boats, charge more). No one is trying to "Jump out of the box" to explore more creative options. With a budget as large as the Washington State Ferry System's, its hard to believe there is any decent management at the top. I suspect a smart private company would show a profit.

Date Received	Comment
1/10/09	I am writing to add my voice to the thousands of people who would be terribly hurt by WSDOT's Plan B for the Bremerton-Seattle ferry. This economically limited community lives and breathes via its access to the other side of the water. Commuters, families, and goods travel both directions, and rely on what is an already limited and outdated service. The Plan to seriously reduce vehicle service is unfair to peninsula residents. Like everyone else in WA, we pay into the state highway system and, as a result, deserve a functional state highway. The Plan is poorly conceived and economically damaging. It would kill an already struggling community. It also places an unfunded mandate on local government to try and replace the already mediocre service that we get from the state. That is not saving money - it is merely shifting it around. NO ON PLAN B!!! What are you people thinking anyway?????
01/23/09	Please tally my voice in support of two issues very important to our San Juan Islands communities…first in support of Long Term Funding Draft Plan A…and second in support of continuation of service to Sidney BC. I'm a 9 year San Juan Island resident with a wife and two small children, trying to make ends meet to sustain our family in our home for many years to come. The economic and social consequences to Long Term Funding Plan B would be dismal for residents, businesses, and visitor's using the San Juan Islands Routes. Losing the International run would have devastating consequences to Anacortes and San Juan Island economies.
01/23/09	The two plans you have proposed the ONLY viable one is plan A – plan B should be scrapped and never even shown to the legislature it is a slap in the face to all ferry communities. The status quo is the least amount of service that should be offered, cutting out service is not an option so don't give the legislature an easy way out, which is what you are doing with plan B. Secondly (yes I live on Vashon) we and other ferry communities who are TOTALLY DEPENDENT on the ferry system should have priority over all other ferry communities. We don't have any other transportation on\off the island. To cut our service on the North and South ends is just ludicrous. All other ferry communities can at least drive where they need to go. Please don't tell me to move that isn't an option or a choice, WSF is part of the hwy system, my tax dollars provide transportation to all parts of this state and the rest of WA should be doing the same as in funding WSF.
01/23/09	Please understand that the Clinton-Mukilteo ferry service is vital for employers and employees and retail businesses on both sides of the water. If you add a reservation system or anything else that in anyway interferes with the ease of the flow of traffic coming and going, it will have a disasterous impact on the economy of South Whidbey, and it could make it impossible for some of the people who live on Whidbey and commute to continue the lifestyle they now enjoy. And, please remember, the ferry system is an extension of the Washington State Highway System
01/23/09	First, I would hope that islands like Vashon that have no other means of access beyond the ferries, are treated somewhat differently than those with land access. For those with bridges and roads, the ferries are a convenience for shorter commutes. For us without other options, the ferries are a vital and singular link to work, hospitals, airlines, family, and discount or specialty stores and services. We should not have our ferry access cut or restricted so severely that the remaining ferries are consistently overloaded beyond the current one-half hour to one hour waittimes. My daily commute to the University of Washington is already a minimum of two hours each way; I cannot imagine it becoming longer, and in this economy I cannot sell my house or buy a new one to compensate. Reconsider your plans for Vashon and other true islands. Secondly, while I understand that service reductions need to occur in this budget climate, the idea of introducing a reservation system at the same time is almost unthinkable and smacks of privitization and exclusion. If the rationale is to have a better way of estimating need and insuring priority loading for those who plan ahead, the details are unclear, and I fear the negative implications and impact of this plan far outweigh its benefit. How can you accommodate as many people as will need to reserve during weekday rush hours? How far ahead will a reservation have to occur? What are all the options for a reservation service (phone as well as email)? What happens when you can't get the reservation you need, for example, to the airport? Will you put on more boats for times the public is demanding service? Will you expect us to keep re-registering til we are able to get off the island sometime? Will all spots be reservable or will you leave some open? Will there be two

Date Received	Comment
	lines at the dock, one for preregistered and one for 'spontaneous' passengers? What about the hold lines in adjacent streets? What about when power goes out and computers go down? Though also flawed, the current system of showing up and waiting, first come/first served works pretty well, and is visibly fair. The reservation system will institutionalize a complex, have/have not system that will create problems, guaranteed. Don't do it. Thirdly and in summary, Plan A tries to maintain more service to Vashon by continuing the triangle, 3 boat route to Vashon/Southworth/Fauntleroy. I think it also maintains the passenger boat from Vashon. It costs more money -- but maybe more revenue could become available eventually. If I'm forced to choose, I vote for this plan, even if fees have to go up....again. I don't know why every road isn't a toll road; ferry users should not be the only ones expected to almost fully fund their transportation. Plan B eliminates our passenger boat and puts us on a two boat schedule. I think King County would try to run our passenger boat, but the reduced service plus possible elimination of passenger-only service would leave us with only minimal and unacceptable levels of service. NOTE: While I dislike the replacement of the Rhododendron with the Hiyu on the Pt.Defiance/Tahlequah run, I will not carp about it if we have adequate service to Southworth and Fauntleroy, from whence we can drive down to Tacoma if needed. The state legislature needs to get behind transportation infrastructure and revenue enhancement.
01/23/09	The government of Washington has a social contract with the users of the ferry system to provide adeqate ferry service. That contract was created when WSF formed a monopoly after taking over Black Ball. Over 10,000 people live full time on Vashon Island and thousands of those people would lose either their houses or their jobs if the ferry service were severely curtailed as proposed in the draft. The economic costs of that loss would extend far beyond King County. In 1980 there were 39 people working in non-operational jobs for WSF. Since that time the number has doubled every five years, and now there are approximately 600 non operational staff positions with WSF. That has happened even though there are less boats running now than 20 years ago and no boats are under construction. Instead of spending money on operating the boats, WSF has built a huge office building in downtown Seattle, the most expensive real estate in all of Washington, and pays almost $1,000,000/year just for free staff parking. The reason the system is low on money is because you WASTE it. You are not spending money to operate the boats, but to build an empire to aggrandize the careers of the system managers. Sell the building, cut the staff by 50%, move the office to Tacoma and stop paying for expensive perks. Then you will be able to continue to provide Vashon Island with adequate ferry service (that includes the Rhododendron.)
01/23/09	The Hiyu on Tahlequah/ Pt. Defiance ferry is totally inadequate to the needs of commuters! I know people who commute daily off island mwho have to wait in line for the 3rd ferry ie 2 plus hours morning and evening! On Thursday 1/22 I tried to leave the south end for Tacoma on the 10:35 ferry. We arrivd at the Tahlequah end at 10:15 and did not get on the ferry as it overloaded, making us catch the 11:25 ferry. On returning to catch the 8:10pm ferry from Pt. Defiance we arrived at 7: 50 and missed that ferry also due to overload and had to go on the 9:00pm boat. I have friends who are now renting studio apartments in Tacoma during the work week as they cannot afford to be late for work and do not want to sit for 3 hours in line. People are working in Gig Harbor and other distant points that preclude walking on. Regardless of your budget problems this is a totally unsatisfactory service. As a tax payer I demand that you review the problem and put a bigger ferry on the Tulequa/Pt. Defiance run. At the very least run the old Hiyu as fast as possible back and forth regardless of schedule to make a few extra trips each day. Obviously that would cost more in fuel and negate any cost saving you think you gain by using the lesser capacity ferry.
01/23/09	WSF continues to fail to understand the depth of public distrust that the ferry system will get it right. Recent episodes with the PT-Keystone vessels and the continued problems of the electronic ticketing system WSF chose to purchase merely reinforce the idea that WSF is a ship adrift at sea. The current long-range plan does nothing to alter this notion: it is short-sighted, short on imagination and lacks a comprehensive scope. WSF should realize that ferry-serve communities are its potential best allies in Olympia. But how can frequent users put their faith in a system whose management record is, at best, lackluster? Neither Plan A nor Plan B represent any vision for the future. Plan A fails to take into account the excellent analysis provided by the (assumed) consultants hired to investigate the issues facing the ferry system. By that, Plan A offers no recommendations on taking an innovative approach to structuring fares to address demand/capacity issues, even though the chart published in the report seemed to indicate that 10-15% increase from the current discounted multi-ride tickets for vehicles would yield a net increase in revenue. Nor does Plan A recommend the use of variable length-based fares for vehicles. There is passing comment made on creating

Date Received	Comment
	additional seasons and a peak-summer charge, which would seem to make sense. (This has the political advantage of soaking the occasional user – the tourist – over the regular user, much like the hotel/motel and car rental taxes currently do.) At a minimum, any plan emanating from WSF, given its financial plight, should be wholeheartedly endorsing any reasonable measure that increases income without affecting ridership. Instead, the system is falling on the mercy of legislators, many of whom represent inland constituencies with no natural affinity to ferries and the communities they serve, to reach into the state budget for more money. Or, failing that, handing off the problem to ferry dependent communities to create their own ferry services, even though one county, Kitsap, has twice lost ballot measures to do precisely that. The current long-range plan is in need of a major overhaul before it is again brought before the public. At a minimum, WSF needs to come back with 4-5 reasonable options – such options that the public can truly get behind, advocate for the ferry system and help win persuade the Legislature to meet its end of the bargain. A more imaginative long-range plan, will, at a minimum, examine how WSF can make cost-savings internally to: Reduce overhead managerial costs Reduce or eliminate in-house ferry maintenance costs and associated rules for tendering Reduce or eliminate in-house naval architecture costs Examine how technology already available can be better employed to reduce toll-booth costs (automated) Seek sponsors for printed timetables and reduce print-runs of entire system timetables Put smaller terminals out to tender as contracted services Lobby for repeal of the in-state building requirement for new vessels Put out to bid design/build contracts for new ferries (fits with greatly reduced in-house naval architecture office) It should be an abject lesson to WSF that when the heads of the Big Three Auto companies first appealed to Congress for financial help and had traveled to DC by private jet, to be excoriated for profligate waste, that on their second visit they all came by car – hybrid cars at that. The same maxim appeals here – convince the public and lawmakers that WSF is truly serious about reform its own internal systems, can think imaginatively and hearts and minds will open. Continue peddling Plans A and Plan B and other, more drastic actions will be taken beyond WSF's control.
01/23/09	Instead of turning the former Buzz Inn (Mukilteo) into more waiting lanes, why not make it monthly commuter parking. Revenue generated, less cars on the boat.
01/23/09	I have read the Executive Plan for WSF Long Range Plan. If one plan is to be adopted please make it PLAN A. Here are some of the things I have noticed since being transferred to the SanJuan Islands to work and to live: In this document, and in general the budget and the State seem to forget that on Vashon and the San Juans the ferries are our highways. We have no other choice for medical and personal needs. Why build a new Viaduct in Seattle, there are other routes to use there. Slower and more frustrating, but there are other routes. If you limit or decrease ferry service to the islands, it would be parrallel to closing the Viaduct and not reopening it. It would affect commerce, freight, quality of life, jobs, and medical emrgencies. It would decrease the ability to attract workers, businesses, and residents on the islands. The costs of goods are already high on the islands and it would only increase that problem. It would discourage mid and low income workers from living on the islands, because they would not be able to afford the increase in goods and the transportation costs. Most of the full time residents are not wealthy, but are like those that travel in Seattle and across the state daily. Would you close lanes or charge a toll for the use of mountain passes? I think not! Well, the ferries are OUR mountain passes. By eliminating routes you are eliminating, growth, commerce, and tourism. Closing the route to Sidney would be a mistake and a revenue lose both on the island and the mainland (America as we call it). Plan B does not allow for purdent replacemant of the old ferries. In 2030 our newest ferries will be close to 50 years old. Open the ferry building contracts to outside of the State of Washington. Let our boat builders compete with the others. The State highways on the mainland do not have to pay their way through tolls and fares, it is not clear to me why the marine highways must pay for themselves. Find a way to make it work without the big cuts. Billions are spent on highways and biways in America (the mainland), make deeper cuts there...Cancel a new "on ramp", charge a toll on the mountain passes, delay the new rail system to Rainier Valley. There are cuts that can be made and people will have other alternatives, we do not.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	I am a small business owner in Anacortes, and I would like add my two cents to the ferry debate. I own a busy restaurant in the historical Old Town neighborhood, and my business is supported by locals year round, for which I am extremely grateful. But the business thrives on the additional revenue and support that is brought to town by the State ferry system, and specifically the Sidney run. What we have in our ferry system is something totally unique, a tourist attraction in and of themselves, regardless of the destination. I want to see every effort made to not just keep the ferries going, but to improve the service and the system, so that it remains a viable transportation option. It is a terrific example of mass transit, and a truly beautiful way to travel. That said, please consider any alternate ways to fund the ferry system, and save our ferries. The state made every effort to pay for two sports stadiums in Seattle with taxpayers money, so maybe they can come up with some creative ways to pay for another important Washington program.
01/23/09	I would like to see the Sidney ferry run continued over the summer months, if the nice people in Sydney and Victoria agree to clean up their sewage problem.
01/23/09	I urge you to abolish the plan that proposes further cuts to an insufficient ferry system. I am a 13 year resident of Vashon and have experienced nothing but decreasing service and increased costs. It is time all government officials reaffirm that the ferries are our "Highways" as stated by law. The ferry is our only choice of getting off the island, to go to work, to get to schools, to shop, to do business, to get products delivered and so on. If you were to imagine every morning getting up and not knowing whether the highway, train, bus were going to be available to you to get to work, can you imagine the Stress. This is not just about "bottom line". The notion of the "HIYU" as a permanent replacement for the Rhododendron is a slap in the face. Not only are you replacing a 60-car ferry (not 48) with a 33 car ferry, a reduction of nearly 50%, but you are giving us a ferry that is not ADA compliant. I now have my father living with me. When I take him off Island he cannot use the bathroom facilities because there is no elevator. A person that boards on a wheel chair cannot get upstairs, has no place to safely sit on the car deck and is exposed to the elements. It came to my attention that the ferry system thinks this is ok because the Hiyu ferry predates ADA compliance. If there is a midnight emergency off the south end of the island the unmanned ferry is unavailable, because the crew is now sleeping 20 miles south in Lakewood. And WHY are we loaning (and considering Giving) our ferry (the Rhododendron) to Anderson Island whose population is a fraction of ours. And taking it out of the WSF fleet. You must change the "Made in Washington Mandate" to allow for the Federal dollars that will be available to the states to bring our Ferry system into the 21st Century with long range and equitable statewide funding that will provide efficient and effective service to all Island taxpayers.
01/23/09	Sidney needs the ferry and all the tourism it brings to our town. I know it would be sadly missed and in these tough economic times, we need all the support we can get.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	This e-mail is a plea that you do not allow our public ferry system to become a vacation reservation priority service highway. I live and work in Clinton, WA. 98236. The ferry is my highway to by business support systems in Everett, Lynnwood, Bellevue and beyond. The ferry is my access to I-5 to travel North, South and East and West. The ferry is my highway to my hospitals, doctors, dentists, shopping, and entertainments of choice. The ferry allows me to spend my money in a variety of counties. My ferries allow me to live a normal life accessible to everything mainlanders are accessible to, while still living and working on an island. Just as with your life, I never know when I must jump in my car and head on the ferry; parents or children ill, forgotten bill to pay, banking problem, need a new auto, grocery or cloths shopping, the same things everyone faces daily. Only I live on an island and must depend on my ferries. How can you expect someone like me to make a reservation. Impossible! Treat the ferries like a toll booth, a continuous toll booth that every 30 years needs upgrading. Ferry management is very top heavy, fire some of the talking heads and save money. Put a "gps" type tag on our local autos that lasts at least 6 months or can be renewed so we can bypass busy toll booths. Put less runs on during non-peak hours. Raise rates. But do not make a highway system become a burden due to a ridiculous reservation blanket policy for all. We islanders are not all vacationers and retirees. We are hard working tax payers. The ferries are our highways and should be treated with the respect of a highway(which also have had their share of abuse, shame on this state). For 30 years our ferries were ignored and monies were put elsewhere. Now that our ferries need help, you want to implement restrictions instead of repairing and boosting the system. Protect our ferries. Protect our islands. Our ridership is only going to increase as our counties grow. Yes, maybe some islands are more touristy then others, but a blanket policy will do more harm than good.
01/23/09	Personally…. I think you should scrap the whole project and discontinue the service. The revenues directly produced as a result of the Ferry are nowhere near the level to justify the hassles/cost and expenses to have and maintain the run. Additionally as a result of US Legislation as enacted piecemeal since 1996 and cumulating with the Patriot Act and formation of Homeland Security, makes the effective generation of revenue for BOTH the Washington State Ferries and the Town of Sidney such a hap-hazard endeavor that the potential pay-off is not at all justified by the level of FINANCIAL risk that would need to be undertaken by both parties over the term. On a “personal note”….. I am offended every time I drive by that berthing to see that medieval , chain linked, camera surveilled holding cell, abortion of an excuse for a Ferry Station there. I think that sort of mentality and state of being belongs and should stay on the side of the Border that I do not live on.
01/23/09	Our ferries move as many people as does SEATAC Airport. That's not inconsequential. Ferries are the Number 1 Tourist Attraction in the State of Washington the ferries themselves, not necessarily the destinations the ferries serve! Ferries are big ticket expenses, but also big ticket in terms of numbers of people served, and numbers of people attracted to ride the ferries for fun. Every ferry should have a tourist shop on-board -- much like the kiosks and shops at the airport. Q: Has this been given any thought? Certainly the shops would pay rent, and the ferry system should get a percentage of sales. Q: For the cost of building and running a ferry, per person/per mile -- how does that compare to the cost of building a land highway with a per person on the route travel cost? If ferries cost less than highways, then the State of Washington is not on par with providing fair transportation. We all understand that today we are in emergency times, and budgets are not normal. However, we must not plan a 30year plan based on emergency times -- and personally, I would feel 100% more comfortable with the State if we make the 30 year long-range plan a draft-only plan for at least 2 more years. I would prefer for the State to create a ferry system that people trust. People do not trust the State of Washington Ferry System to provide what we need - and that's not a 'problem', that is a crisis. Plan A vs Plan B are both insults, and should be dropped immediately. The draft should be revised to be a 2-year spending plan for the economic issues faced today, followed by a a 2-year study on creating a 30-year long range plan. Reservations: The taxpayers clearly do not want a 100% reservation system. The ferries really are a mix of a need for reservations, such as airlines require, and a need for spontaneous travel, such as highways allow. Personally, I think reservations should have 3 price points: a peak travel time price at a higher rate, and an off peak travel time rate at a very low price, and the 3rd, an expensive price that can be made for any ferry within 1 hour of departure, for a $25 - $30 cost. No more than 50% of any ferry should be reserved status. The bottom line is both that the current service is inadequate for every area served, and that the public does not trust the ferry system (ie, The State of Washington) itself. These are both critically important problems.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	I hope and pray that you will understand that thousands of good people are effected by your decisions. Please remember us and our healthy way of life. Ferries are our lifeline. Visitors and locals need to be able to have access to this transportation system. Our way of life is jeopardized when prices continue to rise and earning a living becomes more challenging. 'Plan B' would severely hamper our ferry route in the San Juans.
01/23/09	I have just received an urgent notice from our Chamber of Commerce to respond to what is happening or is projected to happen regarding the Clinton ferry run. We own a restaurant in Langley. Mike's Place Family Restaurant. We have owned this restaurant for over 23 years. Like everyone else in this nation, we are stumbling along through the gravest financial meltdown since the 1920ies. Our doors are still open. We have 27 employees on staff at all times. We are responsible for their lives, their families, their stability. We take this very seriously. Through the year we become a 54 employee staff, season permitting. It is our understanding DOT is planning to have a reservation only arrangement. Maybe I am confused. Isn't this particular ferry line a part of the 525/526 speedway and an extension of the I405 Federal Highway? This ferry system pays for itself. It is in the Black! And, it continues to be in the BLACK. This proposal will deter thousands of people from Boeing and everywhere from coming and going to this island, (which is one of the largest/longest in the United States and has a Naval Air Base)? There must be another way to increase State revenue. Who is responsible for determining our lives, lifestyle, ability to make money, secure our business, secure our families and go forward in these stressful times? To survive as a community we need an effortless access across the water. We are not just one business this reservation proposal will affect! If the Department of Highways is in charge of the I405 and 526/525, then it is logical to say that the ferry crossing is a part of the drive....to the next locale on the "highway." It will cost more money implementing your plan. And, if anything, for something this major, it should be presented to the voters on the ballot. Government is supposed to be for the people, of the people, and by the people, not by people in positions which determine, create programs, legislation or regulations which inhibit growth and the ability to sustain life. This will not help the State of Washington. This will not help, our community. This will not help our business. This will not help our families. This will not help the individual. Business is designed to expand and grow and build. This proposal will are cut tax dollars which help support this state? How is this logical? We are all reducing our budgets because of the piercing echo in our wallet. The "royal" WE need to find ways to create and stimulate business not restrict or stagnate it. The Founding Fathers called it "the law of supply and demand," and "laissez faire"....hands off.
01/23/09	In response to possible changes in the Clinton/Mukilteo Ferry schedules, fare increases and reservations, I have to say that it would an unfair burden not only on the residents of South Whidbey but also have an immense negative impact on visitor and tourists that South Whidbey and more specifically the businesses of Langley depend so heavily on. The state ferry system is an extension of the state highway system and to require island residents and visitors to book a reservation to travel to and from the island would not only deter travelers but greatly impede the easy access to the mainland that we residents rely on for business and family needs. This imposition would have the same impact on island residents as a comparable initiative would have on Seattleites if they had to book a reservation to use I-5. Island residents must have free access to the “highway” system without an impediment like booking a reservation to take care of business, family and medical needs. A large number of Whidbey Island residents rely on the Clinton ferry for their livelihoods as do many students who attend schools off-island and local small businesses rely on the free-flow of ferry service to sustain their local commerce. Installing a “reservation system” at any time would be a

Date Received	Comment
	death sentence to the hundreds of small retailers, inns, and support businesses on south Whidbey. Witness the economic impact Port Townsend businesses have experienced with the lack of adequate ferry service. The Clinton/Mukilteo ferry run is one of the two profitable runs in the whole Washington Ferry System. To unfairly restrict the free flow of traffic to and from the island with a "reservations system" at any time to shore up less profitable runs makes absolutely no sense and would negatively impact island residents' quality of life and decimate businesses. I strongly ask that you abandon any "reservation idea" or curtailment in ferry service on the Clinton/Mukilteo run and instead find ways to make other runs more "profitable" and efficient in their use of state resources.
01/23/09	I think the ferries should be self supporting or even make a profit. The highway money is needed more for roads than to satisfy a few people who decided to live on the Kitsap peninsula where property was less expensive.
01/23/09	I've been hearing that WSDOT plans to require reservations for using the ferries. As a residence of South Whidbey Island, I really DO NOT favor the proposal as I understand it. For these reasons: 1. I use the Clinton-Mukilteo route for commuting to and from work. Since I travel extensively by air, it would be very difficult and time consuming to always be making a reservation, which I may not be able to meet if my flight were late. 2. I believe that requiring reservations will lower the ridership. It would be a deterrent to the casual visitor to the island. The extra step of having to make a reservation will stop people from coming. This would heavily impact the economy on island. 3. Also, the sign on Mukilteo Speedway is often wrong. Many times I see it say 90 minutes to 2 hour wait and I've not had to wait nearly that length of time. If it can't be kept accurate, it should not be used, as guests to the island are discouraged by a long wait time that in fact does not exist. From talking to island residence, the general opinion is that a reservation system is not a good idea and that it would not bring more money into the ferry system or onto the island. In fact, it would probably be a loose for both groups.
01/23/09	Because we are an island only.....on Vashon, in addition to better service to and from Fauntleroy and also the south end to Tacoma (we need later boats than 10pm!!!), please give us more passenger only boats to and from Seattle. Now more than ever, with fuel costs so high....we could use middle of the day boats to and from. This is not only used by workers. We have other commitments in town, and need the use of the P. O. boats more often. The old schedule was far superior.
01/23/09	Are you serious???? Are you trying to cripple the businesses and ruin the real estate values of our entire island? We, who try to use mass transit instead of traffic-clogging automobiles, are being constantly subjected to threats of isolation from the mainland. Would you decrease the availability of highways to other communities?

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	WSF is currently considering schedule changes to meet a USCG mandate for compliance with the Federal Crew Endurance Management standard. This compliance must be completed by September 30, 2009. There are many crew scheduling scenarios on the table. Some of these may actually save the state some money. The following estimates are derived from the "Mark II Underway Basic Fuel and Emission Information" report that was put together to support running the ships on two engines vs. three. This data is available in great detail from the WSF Port Engineer's office. If you slow a Mark II down from 18.5kts to 16kts while running on two engines, the fuel savings can be in excess of two million dollars per year (per ship…). Slowing the boats down to 16kts adds about 3-4 minutes to a 30 minute crossing. I used the following formulas and assumptions to arrive at these figures. A Jumbo Mk II burns 389 gallons/hr at 18.5kts on two engines (165 shaft turns). This same ship burns 266 gallons/hr at 16kts on two engines (140 shaft turns). This is a fuel savings of 123 gallons per hour. Ships on the Bainbridge run operate an average of 19 hours per day, about 340 days per year. In order to be conservative with these estimated numbers, I used 16 hours per day running time to compensate for in-port pushing the dock, speeding up and slowing down. I realize that the data is available to be more accurate but I am using these estimates for demonstration purposes only. This is a rough analysis. A more comprehensive report can be requested from the WSF Port Engineer's Office. 123 gallons saved per hour X 16 hours/day X 340 days/year = 669,120 gallons/year. At $3.00 per gallon, fuel savings = $2,007,360 per ship, per year. At $3.25 per gallon, fuel savings = $2,174,640 per ship, per year. At $3.50 per gallon, fuel savings = $2,341,920 per ship, per year. Although we have no way to predict exactly where fuel prices will go this formula demonstrates that for every $0.25 bump in price, slowing these vessels down to 16kts creates an additional $167, 280 in fuel savings. A Jumbo Mk II produces 8,786lbs of greenhouse gasses and particulates per hour at 18.5kts. The same ship produces only 6000lbs at 16kts. Using the same formula and assumptions as above, this is a reduction of 2,786 lbs of greenhouse pollutants per hour or 17,997,560 lbs per ship, per year. To make this number easier to understand, 17,997,560 lbs/2000 lbs = 8999 MT (metric tons) of greenhouse gasses and airborne particulate pollutants not released into the atmosphere of Puget Sound. If we were to slow the ships down to 16kts, Have departures from Bainbridge and Seattle every hour on the hour, we would continue to provide the needed capacity,save the state millions of dollars per ship per year and reduce the level of pollutants pumped into the atmosphere of Puget Sound by tens of thousands of Metric tons per year. This savings estimate is just for the Jumbo Mk II class ships. There are three of them. Multiply the above savings by three then ask yourself, "what data readily is available for the other classes of ferries?" This is a no brainer... Why are we not already doing it? Any long range plan for WSF funding should include an analysis of potential fuel savings.
01/23/09	I am a resident of Orcas Island and use the WSF system as my highway to conduct business and visit friends and family on Lopez and San Juan. I am dismayed to hear there are proposals to eliminate the inter- island ferry runs. Those ferries are a lifeline to our neighboring islands. The crews are the most spectacular and caring workers I've encountered on any WSF run. There is a feeling of connection and real sense of community that exists on those runs. It is as intergral to our island culture as are the state parks, the orca whales, the local businesses, and all the other aspects of these islands that make us unique. Severing the San Juan inter-island runs is much more than a simple budget cut. Beyond the economic hardship, there is a clear severing of our connection as islanders.
01/23/09	It is crucial to the health and safety -- as well as to the economic viability -- of all those who depend on the WA State Ferry system that it be maintained to meet the needs of our population. The ferry system must be considered an integral part of the state's highway system -- a crucial part of our infrastructure. Obviously funds are tight in this time of economic downturn. That does not mean that a certain portion of the taxpaying public should be penalized disproportionately from the rest. If ferry-dependent people and businesses are to pay more to continue a level of service or face a diminishment in service, it is only fair that those of us who depend on the other segments of the transportation infrastructure -- highways, bridges, public transit, etc. should pay in kind. Where are the proposals to implement tolls on bridges and state highways throughout Washington? To raise license fees for trucks and longhaul buses? Equality of sacrifice is the issue here.

Date Received	Comment
01/23/09	Phase out all subsidies to ferries over the next 5 years. Force ridership to cover all costs of running and maintaining the ferry system thru ticket prices
01/23/09	As a frequent rider on this route, I think a reservation system is just not a good idea. It works ok on the Port Townsend run, but I can not imagine how it could possible work on this route. With a boat every 30 minutes people know the schedule, and long time riders are well aware of peak usage times. There are many considerations to take into acct for people who leave the island in the morning and return in the afternoon. Many things such as traffic and other delays would make it difficult to schedule a return trip accurately, and then what happens when you miss your reservation time and the next 6 boats are full with another hundred or so drive ups without reservations. Just won't work.
01/23/09	I urge you to maintain the current fee and schedule structures of the Mukilteo - Clinton Ferries. An increase in fees or a reduction in service will cause significant harm to the needs of working commuters and will have a negative impact on attracting potential visitors to visit and take an overnight vacation to South and Central Whidbey Island. I might agree with a reservation system if it permits commuting workers to be guaranteed ridership on the ferry they need in order to get to work. I would rather see a toll booth designated for prepaid customers as an alternative approach. My husband and I live in Clinton and he works for Boeing in Everett from 2:30pm to 12 midnight. He leaves on the 1pm ferry since long lines and delays due to riders without a prepaid ticket often force him to take the 1:30 ferry. When he returns, the only way for him to get home at a reasonable time is to take the 1am ferry. Any reduction in service for Boeing employees would impose a very serious impact on their ability to keep their jobs. I work for Island County as the Tourism Marketing Coordinator and due to the gas crisis, the unusual snows and flooding, I am witnessing significant economic losses by merchants already. PLEASE don't add to the hardship of our residents and tourism related business owners by disrupting the current status of the Mukilteo - Clinton Ferris.
01/24/09	I am a resident of Langley on South Whidbey. Efficient and reliable ferry service is critical to my ability to earn a living, support my family and pay my taxes. I made the decision - the investment - to live here based upon an expectation that you would maintain your service level. I have 2 comments: Plan B doesn't make sense. If the Ferries are a part of the Highway system, then they (and all their infrastructure) should be maintained and run by that entity. You don't expect Renton to assume responsibility for the S-Curves -- or Tacoma to take on the Narrows Bridge. The only way to wash your hands of the responsibility would be to privatize. The idea of passing the buck to a less capable government entity is a non-starter. Shame on you for even putting the idea forward. It goes to responsible management - Someone has messed up and needs to be held accountable. Someone has failed to do their job -- broken the faith. Is it WSF or is it the Legislature? Plan, budget, maintain -- and fund. If the first 3 items were done -- then the Legislature has the responsibility to fund the transportation system. If the planning / budgeting / maintenance were not done -- then shame on WSF - the legislature should clean house and start over. (Maybe the voters will clean house too!). The idea that the legislature can shift funds around based on the political whim-du-juor may be exactly what has happened. If that is the case -- then maybe your job is to tell the legislature that "The Emporer Has No Clothes." You shouldn't knuckle under and build a plan that enables the politicians to shirk responsibility. Ok times are tough. You need to ration service implicitly (reduced access), explicitly (increased fares) - or some combination. However, the transportation system exists to provide access to services and facilitate the economy. Recognize what you are doing and do it equitably -- ration transportation infrastructure state-wide. Don't single out and pick on one segment of the transportation network in a disproportionate fashion.

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	I have been a ferry rider for many years, commuting from Poulsbo to Seattle and then from Whidbey Island to Seattle. I now have the luxury of working and living on Whidbey, but understand how important a class A ferry system is to our region and our State. Please push your Plan A. The money is there, our legislators can find a way to fund it.
01/24/09	I would like to suggest that you come with a plan that addresses the growth we are going to see in the future, raise the fares on the ferries, replace $$ from the car tabs that was lost with another tax and start getting the ferry system back to its past days of glory. When the boats where newer and up keep of the boats was a top priority an dservies was respnsove and excellent. Let's get away from running and ruining the ferry system on a shoe string budget. Do it right and get some political will to do it right.
01/24/09	I live on Whidbey Island and I am concerned about the plans for the Clinton/Mukilteo ferry. I am especially concerned about plans to require reservations. It isn't all that unusual to have to make a spur of the moment trip to the mainland. Many South Whidbey residents rely on the Everett Medical Clinic for emergencies, especially on weekends. There's no way to know in advance that you are going to wake up sick and needing to see a doctor, and medical offices on the island are horrible about taking in last minute emergency patients - I speak from experience. My husband woke up with a bad sinus infection one day last May. We literally called every doctor in the phone book and no one would see him. So, we hopped onto the nice reliable ferry and he was seen and was given medicine at the clinic. What would have happened had we not been able to get on the ferry without having a reservation? The ferry isn't just a small convenience or a fun boat ride for us - it is can be a vital lifeline that needs to be available when it is needed, without the forethought of a reservation. No one has a crystal ball to tell them when there will be a medical, dental, or other emergency that requires access to something on the mainland. It is every bit as much of the highway system as is the pavement on I-5 and needs to be treated as such.
01/24/09	It has come to my attention that Washington State Ferries is planning to cancel its ferry service to and from Sidney, BC. As I'm sure you are aware, this ferry provides a vital lifeline for businesses in the San Juan Islands, western Washington State, Anacortes, Sidney, Victoria, and greater Vancouver Island. I am writing to you today as a local business owner who will be significantly impacted by this route cancellation. We have been operating the Humboldt House since 1992. Statistically, 15-20% of the tourists who stay at our Victoria, BC Bed & Breakfast use the services of the Washington State Ferry via Sidney, BC. In these times of economic uncertainty, we need to make the pathways for tourism and leisure spending easier, and not close cumbersome. Let's encourage the vibrant cross-border travel that has been beneficial to both sides of these waters for so many years. Please do not cancel ferry service between Sidney, BC, Anacortes, WA, and the San Juan Islands.
01/24/09	I am a local resident of the Saanich peninsula and regular user of the ferry. I remember my first trip as a kid with my mom and late father. The ferry trip was a great adventure and we got to enjoy staying in Anacortes and then traveling around eventually to Seattle and back. That was the first of many trips on the ferry. As a local businessman I understand the fiscal restraints that Washington State ferries is under. I do however know the multiplier effect in tax dollars that the ferry brings into both Washington state and Province of BC. The other thing is the human cost. This ferry has been going for generations. Many take their family's on outings using this trip. I would hate to see the budget cut so much that we lose our ferry. I believe that for many years the Anacortes to Sidney run has gotten the short end of the stick and there are ferries that are over 50+ years old with no modernization on the run. The run needs to be doubled or more. The selling point is its quicker for the 315,000 residents of southern Vancouver island to get to Seattle and other areas in Washington state via the Anacortes ferry than it is with the BC ferries and then getting stuck at the border. I would increase route and marketing and see how much it goes. And grows! I know you are receiving

Date Received	Comment
	many form letters but I wanted to write from a personal view. From someone who grew up with the ferry, uses the ferry and knows that the economic impact of keeping it far far outweighs the shorter gain in cutting it. I would hope you keep the ferry and look at ways to increase ridership through a more modern ferry, more trips and more marketing
01/24/09	Its time to admit that the San Juan ferries are a disaster. The ferries themselves are ancient. The BC Ferries are luxury liners in comparison. Not only are the ships falling apart, there aren't enough runs at present, and you're talking about cutting back. WSF "long range planning" is a joke. If you had a long range plan 10 years ago, we'd have new ferries by now. What we have is a yearly band-aid solution that inevitably is going to fall apart. Its time for new ferries, and you can pay for them by charging more money, charging to travel eastbound as well as westbound, and putting more services on board that will help pay the for the ferry system. Look to BC Ferries for your example.
01/24/09	I am not for the reservation system at all. Example. If we who live here have a Dr's appointment on the mainland, yes we can get a reservation going...and back, BUT too often the Dr. is late 1-2 hrs late with an emergency..How do WE get back home? You no longer allow priority loading for people who have just had operations on their faces with pressure bandages on..Or after cataract surgery! I know as this has happened to me. I am a senior citizen, lived on Lopez for 30 years, and each year the ferry system pays much more attention to the tourists than to the people who live here..This should be your primaryconsideration..Obligation. Since you are our only highway.. It is always money, money when it should be people, people. As far as money goes, there are ways to cut back. We always, each year, have gone to Sidney in December on your practically empty ferry. I also hear that Canada has greatly raised the rates for the WSF ferries to land there..These are two valid reasons to stop this run.. Empty ferries and epensive rates to maintain their dock. Yes, we would miss it, However, we understand the economics of the problem. Secondly why not cut the late boat from Anacortes to the islands? From a good source we are told that it runs practically empty as well. It is true you need an early boat from San Juan to Anacortes, but could that not be dealt with an earlier sailing? Please start to pay attention to your obligations before the tourists! We will understand cutbacks if they are reasonable and Please do not give us these reservations you say work so well in Port Townsend. I have been told that people make up to 3 reservations at one time for the same day to make sure they can get on..Is this what you call successful?
01/24/09	In a time where public transportation is being called to leap forward and offer an essential and efficient service to all citizens, your decisions to require reservations and increase rates on the Clinton/Mukelteo Ferry Service are unfounded and antiquated. Already, the schedule lacks runs late into the night, which makes life stressful for making it home sometimes. Scheduling less runs will make it even more difficult. Making these decisions would impact my family a great deal and we are some of the lucky ones who have only a small amount of debt, but need to stay that way in these uncertain times to keep our family safe and healthy. My husband has health requirements that force us to depend on the Clinton/Mukelteo daily and at a moment's notice. This proposal is very threatening to our well-being and economic stability. Also, In my brief reading of your plans for future ferry boats, I do not see an emphasis on developing boats which make use of state of the art fuel sources and efficiency or green manufacturing. Peak Oil requires these goals to be in the forefront of every long range plan. Please make your effort count while you hold your position.

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	Regarding the proposed changes to our marine highway....would a reservation system work on the Narrows Bridge? How about 520 or I90? Or Hwy 2? Would raising prices on the Narrows be swallowed whole without an outcry? We have payed high prices for years with our ferry system. There was money in the kitty for a long time for new ferries...where are they? Why should WE, the PEOPLE, have to swallow the mismanagement of a system by elected officials in the form of low or no or super expensive service? Isn't the ferry system part of the state infrastructure? Instead of giving us a hard luck story about why we can't even have the service we have been having, please, show us what happened! We want the transparancy of government that President Obama has said would be there! My husband went to a forum on the two plans that you put forth and neither one of them is acceptable. Where is the money? Why should we have to pay for snow removal on the passes? I don't go across the passes every day...where is the attention that was supposed to be on our ferry system?..Again, where is the money and why wasn't it spent to take care of the problem when it should've been? What are the two most recognized symbols of Washington State? Number 1: Space Needle Number 2: Ferry System Do you have any idea what this will do to the tourism infrastructure that so many businesses here on the island are dependant on? You should know, you screwed up Port Townsend with your mismanagement. You want to do that to Whidbey now? What other islands are you messing with because of your lack of handling our tax dollars properly? The idea of having to make a reservation is absurd. In our Health Insurance Network system we don't even have a doctor on the island. We have to go off island. If I develop a kidney stone and need to go see the doctor TODAY...and can't get on the ferry because I have no reservation...that is going to be a BIG problem! Or if someone from out of state makes a reservation and gets on instead of someone living here and paying for the system TWICE.....daily when using it and through taxes! My mother is 93 and lives in Everett. If she has a problem I need access to get to her NOW..... A possible acceptable solution for this problem the state has created for us could be found if you had people who LIVE on the island form a board and bring ideas to you and the solutions would be from the perspective of people who live with the ferry system on a daily basis. Please do not change this system without the input from the people who know it and LIVE it daily.
01/24/09	Before you decide to battle the WSF to retain the Sydney run, check the statistics of how many cars and people actually use that run. Those numbers are available from the WSF. It is a huge money losing run. If the Gov. needs to cut certain things the Sydney run will probably save alot of $$. Lets face it, in these difficult economic times, budget cuts wil have to be necessary and we have to learn to live with less. If the Sydney ferry is essential to Anancortes, my guess, it is only during July and Aug. Before the run was cut with the new schedule the Sydney boat would depart FH with as little as 3 cars, hardly worth the cost. Also everytime the ferry docks in Sydney the WSF pays a very large fee, I think it is over $1,000. Check the facts and look at the financial realities before jumping into this battle, I think you will find it is a sound financial decision to eliminate the Sydney run. By the way I was in the tourist biz for 6 years (founder of San Juan Excursions) and the Sydney run was inconsequential to me. Get the facts, look at the actual numbers.....Please share with all.
01/24/09	I am writing to share my opinion as a Skagit County voter/taxpayer. 1. No service reductions 2. Build new classes of boats ASAP.
01/24/09	I am greatly concerned about the proposal to close the Anacortes/Sidney ferry run. Please refer to the Hovee Report regarding the $9.2 million tax Revenue and the $7 million Farebox Revenue compared to the $9,177,300 Operating Expense (as reported in Governor's Budget)..and one can readily see that this run makes a net gain of some $7 Million. Add to that, the 2010 Olympics are going to be held in Vancouver, BC....and will require transportation from the State of WA. What better way than the Sidney/Anacortes ferry for out of state people to ride. Those facts, together with the dreadful impact on the economy of Anacortes, Skagit County, San Juan County, Whatcom County, Island County Snohomish County, and Sidney, BC. Please do what is necessary to KEEP THIS FERRY

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	I am a resident of Whidbey Island and ride the ferries for medical, business trips or pleasure, both to Mulkilteo and Port Townsend. I am opposed to Plan B which would cut ferry access to both mainlands from Whidbey and not provide enough boats. The reduction in service to Port Townsend has been devastating to the economy of Coupeville and Port Townsend as well as other towns on the island. The reduction in amount of service in the summer would also be devastating to the summer tourism economy of the island. The state ferry system should be viewed as an extension of the highway system. It should only vie for funds as much as road repairs. The state has long ignored the aging ferries and failed the people of the state in providing adequate maintenance of the boats. It is not the problem of the counties to provide service but the State Highways budget to do so. It is unfortunate that this has occurred during a shortfall budget year but we should plan for the future, even if it means raising ferry fees a little to pay for the service. I urge you not to support Plan B!
01/24/09	Ferries are part of the state highway system. If that system's budget does not have sufficient funding to maintain and improve it, then raise the cost of using that highway system on all of it, not just the ferry segment. Institute tolls on those portions of the highway system that are used primarily for the convenience and benefit of the residents they serve, such as the 520 bridge, or the West Seattle Bridge, or I-405. Do not even consider reducing service on the ferry system; the transportation authorities do not, for a minute, contemplate closing lanes on major highways because funds are not available for maintenance. Why, then, do they investigate such actions for the ferry system? Until the ferry system is considered an integral and equal part of the highway system, it will always take short shrift
01/24/09	1. I think WSF missed the ball completely on this "plan". I think they should have: 1. Provided an analysis of future needs for car and passenger capacity. The PSRC Passenger Ferry Study provides a good analysis of the passenger ferry demand. 2. Provided a short term and long term schedule for integrated car and passenger ferry service to meet the demand. 3. Propose options for funding the operation and maintenance of the system, both the car ferries and passenger ferries. One difficult part of the equation is that we have not been able to agree on is how the passenger ferries should be funded. Some argue that they are also part of the highway system, some say they are not. Through legislation and actions, the State has gotten out of the passenger-only ferry business but they have not made a clear policy decision on whether or not passenger ferries are a part of the highway system and therefore can be funded by the State. I personally think that there should be a clear distinction between the highway system (car ferries) and a transit system (passenger ferries). However; I also think there is a good argument that the state should help fund passenger ferries to run during periods of low demand because they are so much cheaper than the big ferries. Here is what I think the State should do: Develop a plan to have an integrated car and passenger ferry system. The passenger ferries would be owned and operated by a transit organization. Propose a funding scheme that would fully fund the car ferries and fund some passenger ferry runs where it will allow the State to eliminate car ferry runs. Urge King County, Kitsap County, Kingston and Kitsap Transit to work together to fund additional passenger ferry runs (supplemental commuter runs, evenings and weekends). Additional public funding will be required for a complete system.

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	We fail to see how a reservation system will save money on the Clinton-Mukilteo run. I like the reservation system on the Keystone run. It works there because there are no worries about traffic and you can pretty much figure out which ferry you will get.(I also think the sign approaching the Keystone ferry is misleading when it says you must have reservations--because if there's room you can or course get on.) For Mukilteo--one never knows coming back from Seattle it you'll get stuck in traffic--and then if you do you would have to call on your cellphone(if you had one), and besides--now it is unlawful to use one as the driver! Aren't they going to make a bigger holder area at Mukilteo anyway? That should alleviate the traffic backing up problem. Let's just see how it works on the Mukilteo run w/o reservations for awhile. Many of us have fears that a new reservation system would discourage tourists--and already many Whidbey businesses have shut down or are hurting. Maybe instead some highway message indicating how long the backup is, or something on the website that indicates which ferry runs typically have the longest backup so people could plan, or an updated phone message folks could access. On the South Whidbey side we can look at the ferry cam on the Whidbeytel site and see if there's a backup which is helpful.
01/24/09	I know you've already heard from many Tacoma-bound passengers, but I'd encourage you to try getting on the Vashon-bound boat from Pt. Defiance anytime after 2PM. We cannot work with the Hiyu.
01/24/09	As a homeowner and small business owner I want to voice our plea NOT TO IMPLEMENT your proposed changes to the ferry run. This is our highway, we not only pay the taxes for the highway system, we also pay an increasing fare to ride the ferry. All of our medical care is on the mainland and we also depend upon the ferries for business and recreational purposes. This plan will decrease ridership since it will discourage people from either leaving or coming to the island. Last minute trips are out and this will impact the revenue for the ferry system. I feel that this is NOT a wise idea and remember that the ferries ARE OUR HIGHWAY, and feel that you should not change the accessibility to the ferries. There are no reservations on bridges, and this is basically a moving bridge.
01/24/09	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Please listen to what citizens and local leaders are saying. Make wise, enlightened, fair decisions on the ferry system. Don't continue dismantling one of Washington's most iconic, valuable and charming assets. Community Goals A sustainable ferry system that provides affordable, accessible, and reliable basic transportation as follows: Sustainable: The ferry system must have long-term, reliable funding. Affordable: Total transportation costs, including fares, should be affordable to our communities' median income rider. Fares should not exclude ferry use by the greater part of the community. Accessible: Ferries should be available to regular riders and those who are dependent on ferries. Reliable: Ferries must meet the scheduled arrival times. Basic: Priorities for Kingston-Edmonds must be focused on transporting the large numbers of vehicles and people this route serves and connecting with transit. Business Model • We strongly support legislation directing and funding a study of alternative business models and governance for WSF that would result in sustainable maintenance, operations and capital repair and replacement practices. We consider this critical to the system's long-term success. Reservations: • We conditionally support a reservation system to reduce congestion, reduce terminal costs and make better use of existing ferry capacity. Rider concerns must be thoroughly addressed in the implementation of reservations. These concerns include convenience for frequent travelers, a priority for those who must depend on ferries and for commercial traffic, and the ability to accommodate short-notice travel needs. Successful implementation will require an effective working relationship between WSF, the FAC and our local governments. • We oppose reservation fees. Reservation costs should be recovered through savings and cost avoidance. • We support a no-show penalty from the reservation of a pre-paid ticket. Fares • We oppose fare increases beyond those equal to the rate of inflation for operating

Date Received	Comment
	costs. The large fare increases over the last 7 years have eliminated use by many riders and have had an adverse effect on our community and the region. • We oppose system recovery rates beyond the current 70% of operating. • We strongly oppose any reduction of, or new limitation on frequent user discounts. • We support the Tariff Route Equity fare policy. • We support legislation for a mandatory public process before any fare change decision is made to minimize the negative impacts to the system. This includes: One month of public outreach to inform riders of proposed fare increases Public hearings after the public outreach program Formal review and official comment by official rider representatives, now the FACs An avenue of appeal beyond the WSTC Strategies • We strongly support incentive strategies that will improve ferry utilization such as full car discounts, car pools, small vehicle discounts, incentives to foot passengers and reducing the gaps between ferry and transit service. • We support strategy implementation only when the implementation costs will be recovered through savings or cost avoidance. • We strongly oppose peak pricing. Peak pricing would impose significant costs on riders and our community without benefit. We support reservations instead of peak pricing as a constructive means to address congestion concerns. • We oppose any strategy that has not had a formal assessment of the impact on riders and communities. Local FACs and/or local governments should provide this assessment. Level of Service Standards • We strongly support the direct participation of local governments in developing and assigning Level of Service standards. • We oppose new LOS standards that would prematurely trigger strategies to increase rider costs. Capacity Adding Capacity • We support building new ferries to sustain the current fleet. New ferries should be sized to optimize their net revenue for the routes on which they will operate, and capacity should be added where that will be cost effective to do. • We do not support building additional Island Home ferries beyond the two currently planned. • We give our strongest possible support to proceeding with current plans to build up to three 144-car ferries and two Island Home ferries in the upcoming biennium. Any decision to change ferry acquisition plans should be deferred until the next round of ferry construction. • We support extending the planned service life of our current ferries. • We strongly support adding a third, unscheduled ferry to the Kingston-Edmonds run to absorb summer traffic overflow when a boat available. This arrangement has worked successfully in the past and will both add capacity and provide a positive revenue stream in the future. Traffic • We strongly support taking near-term action to reduce ferry traffic congestion in Kingston. This includes reservations and the interim use of an existing parking lot as an auxiliary holding area. • We support the Kingston Circulation Study Plan as the long range SR 104 plan of record. • We strongly support improving the staffing, traffic controls and procedures of current holding lots to maximize their utilization. • We support transponder and pre-ticked traffic lanes to improve traffic flow and taking measures to reduce ferry turn-around times. Multimodal Transportation • We strongly support the Governor and the Legislature in taking measures to improve the collaboration between WSF, WSDOT and transportation agencies in the Puget Sound area in providing an effective transportation network. Financing • We support a state-wide solution to fund ferries. If WSF is not sustainable then it is WSDOT that is not sustainable and remedies should address this as their first priority. • We support cost reduction actions and the inclusion of local FACs and governments in that process. This includes action on previous study and audit recommendations, involving workers in process improvement, using business performance benchmarks, and action by the legislature to reduce restrictions that increase costs. Policy • We support legislation to define the role of rider representatives and local communities in ferry decisions. Riders should have a voice that is commensurate with their contribution to ferry operating revenue. • We strongly support formation of Ferry Commission or Board as the single point for oversight of ferries. This should include state, legislative, local government and rider representatives. We believe this will both improve WSF efficiency as well as oversight effectiveness. • We support coordination and cooperation between WSF and passenger only ferry service providers, including coordinating fares.
01/24/09	I am a ferry commuter, riding from Anacortes to Lopez Island and back daily, to teach at Lopez Island School. At $7 a day, this costs me about $150 a month to commute, plus the occasional $22+ for the times I need to bring my car home from Lopez Island. While the results of your survey indicate that commuters would continue to use the ferry regardless of fare increases, please recognize that this is out of necessity, rather than because the fare is insignificant. One hundred fifty dollars a month, plus keeping one of our family vehicles parked on another island, is significant. The commuters with whom I ride do not appear to be affluent. For the most part I see teachers, construction workers, and people in service industries. I would like to see some sort of fare package that would offer a greater benefit to the commuter, particularly during the winter months, when $7 a day is not much of a discount. I recognize that operating the WSF system is expensive, and that both plans already contain shortfalls. Perhaps our state legislators can petition the federal government to

Date Received	Comment
	include WSF in its stimulus package, which is supposed to contain funds to improve our infrastructure.
01/24/09	A reservation system for the Clinton ferry run is just dumb. It WILL reduce traffic on the ferry IF THAT IS YOUR GOAL??? IT WILL have administration costs, do you think for one second that it will be an efficient system? NOT Will it confuse the tourist? Yup Do the folks on Whidbey Island want it? NOPE! Will it have ANY POSITIVE outcome towards somehow improving the ferry system or reducing costs? NOPE SO WHY ARE YOU EVEN THINKING ABOUT IT? I have to say it is ONLY DOING ONE THING! IT MAKES THE FERRY SYSTEM MANAGEMENT LOOK BAD! I GUARANTEE IT! SO, if you want of look bad and then in a year or two shut it down, go ahead! We can ALWAYS find new management and maybe, just maybe that is what is needed. Some new ideas would be good
01/24/09	Please do not increase the cost of ferry fares. Do increase, however, their efficiency and number of trips. The state should carefully study an increased number of ferry slips and an increased number of smaller ferries Vs larger ferries that will, in the future, handle an even a greater volume of passengers and vehicles. The ferry system is a part of Washington's transportation system and should be maintained as such. It should not be turned over to private enterprise. The Black Ball line was an example of poor, inefficient service.
01/24/09	Proposed Reservation System 1) This adds another layer of administrative cost and infrastructure for the state. How does this save $ in the long-run? 2) It penalizes people who are not able to live life by a schedule, with erratic work hours and those who do not have cell phones or Blackberries. 3) With traffic on the "mainland" so congested and unpredictable, it makes a commuter's travel time unpredictable in catching a Kingston, Mukilteo or Seattle ferry. Is life to be for daily commuters, a series of calls to make, change, cancel reservations? 4) Reservation requirements will exacerbate the already floundering day-trip visitors for Port Townsend and Whidbey Island businesses, eliminating spur of the moment visits on sunny days by families out for a Sunday drive. 4) AND...Will the reservation system be another investment folly like the automated ticket reader system, that is rendered unusable and has never been deployed (as in Mukilteo)--an expensive waste of resources for nothing!? Walk-on Passenger Only Traffic Your plan indicates walk-on traffic should be encouraged. Great! We encourage visitors from the Mainland to park in Mukilteo and walk on so we can pick them up. Only thing is....they drive around and around looking for parking in Mukilteo! There is also inadequate parking at Keystone, Port Townsend, Clinton, Edmonds, and Kingston, and Seattle and Winslow. Not all of the walk-on traffic can travel by transit. We would welcome increased parking, for extended periods of time such as at the airport (e.g. for weekend visitors), at these ports of call. Eliminate Mukilteo Extra Summer Weekend Service??? It is hard to believe this is really a proposal under consideration!!! Have any of the drafters of this proposal tried to catch a ferry on this route during a summer weekend? The rates are increased in summer and the lines back up the hill in both directions. This stretch of "highway" already fails to serve the ridership, and you are considering cutting service? This will seriously affect the economy of the Island and Port Townsend, when people considering renting a house or staying in a B&B, or attending the Island County Fair, decide it isn't worth the hassle....Truly, what is the panel thinking? Questions: 1) Is there any money to be had in the new Obama infrastructure initiative that is to build jobs and address transportation issues? Is anybody checking on this? 2) If I read correctly, it is possible the Mukilteo/Clinton run may be privatized? I hope this is incorrect information. Since Gov. Gregoire has referred correctly to our ferry system as part of the WA State highway system, a private entity controlling our transportation system holds us hostage on the island to whims of greed and enterprise. The ferry system should be treated no differently than a stretch of road or a bridge. Comments: We realize the State is urgently trying to address transportation challenges neglected for decades, but in the haste to make changes that save $, please consider the lives and businesses and economies that your decisions impact. Is it a good decision for the

Date Received	Comment
	state if they create financial or physical hardship for those who depend upon the ferry highway system? If the ridership goes down and the Island and Peninsula economy goes south? And please make sure that, in a time when the general populace is already economically challenged through unemployment, failing and closed businesses, and the tightening belts of each household in this time of depression, that each $ collected and spent by the WSF is wisely determined and allocated. So many times, it seems like money has been thrown at a solution that was ill advised and useless (e.g. $ for celebrity voices on the WSF announcements, and again I site the useless ticket scanners). If it's true that WSF is the largest and most effecient ferry system in the world, why is it looking to other models (i.e. Woods Hole) for their models and inspiration? I've ridden the east coast ferries and found the reservation, loading and unloading process slow, cumbersome and frustrating. WSF is the model others look to...in the mode of our new leadership in Washington, DC, we are counting on smart and effective leadership to make life better for the citizenry.
01/24/09	With sales tax down because of the poor business climate, does it make any sense to reduce it further by eliminating the Anacortes-Sidney ferry? It's like shooting yourself in the foot.
01/24/09	I have lived on Whidbey Island for the last 10 years and run a business in Langley on the south end of Whidbey Island. I think it is time this state started looking at our ferry system as a part of our public transit system, not as an extra frill. While vacationing in Finland this past year we went by ferry to a remote island. The ferry ran 24 hours a day and was free...just like all of the highways in the country. I'm not suggesting that the ferries should run that often, but they are part of our road system and as such should be treated accordingly. A road is a road, whether it is part of the marine highway, in a remote area of NE Washington or in Seattle. It's time that a progressive state like Washington start acting like it.
01/24/09	I am writing to comment on the draft long-range plan as it pertains to the Bremerton ferry route; I have been a regular commuter on this route for 15+ years. Please give consideration to the following comments. $50,000,000 has just been invested to construct a tunnel to route ferry vehicle traffic in Bremerton. It would be the epitomy of poor planning to severely reduce auto ferry service to Bremerton considering this major investment of tax dollars. Small passenger-only ferries, i.e, those that hold 149 passengers, are not a viable alternative to the larger auto-passenger ferries. Commuters would constantly run the risk of being left behind when the ferries reached capacity; operating costs per passenger are significantly higher on the smaller boats; and the wake problems of the past would likely be repeated. Thousands of commuters rely on reliable ferry service from this area of Kitsap. Further cuts in service would place more SOVs on the road, increasing traffic congestion and pollution. As long as the WSF system is considered a part of the state highway system it should to funded as such. Would the DOT seriously consider cutting capacity of the I-90 or 520 bridges by 50%?
01/24/09	Scrap both Plan A and B. As the term implies " Marine Highway System" it is a highway system for those of use who live on the islands [Whidbey for me] and those who visit [tourists]. And like highways, we use it to go to work, go shopping, and to get medical attention if needed. Yes, in an emergency we depend on the ferries to be running and available, just like the roadways. Charging a fare for the ferries is unfair. You don't charge for roadways and most bridges. What's the difference? Increasing the fares would be totally outrageous. If anything, eliminate the fares for island residents and apply a fare to non residents [tourists]. Scrap both Plan A and B. Would you reduce the lanes on roadways? Would you force reservations to those using the roads and bridges? Would you "farm" out the roadways to local towns or counties? Would let other entities manage or operate the roadways or bridges? Of course not! It would be stupid to do so!

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan, versions A and B. The Draft Long-Range Plan states that it is to assess the needs of ferry customers and develop a service and capital program that is responsive to those needs, while providing policy makers with the right information to develop a long-term solution that addresses WSF's financial sustainability. It also states it is to take a fresh look at how ferry services may be delivered in order to support current and future customers, while recognizing the significant financial challenges facing the ferry system. Neither Plan A nor Plan B appears to do any of these stated things. In fact Plan B says we have failed at our mission, we cannot meet the needs so lets dump our responsibilities onto someone else. I am most often a user of the Southworth-Fauntleroy run, but also occasionally use the Bremerton, Bainbridge, Kingston, and Port Townsend runs. I am not usually a commuter but use the ferry frequently for discretionary travel. I travel by car, motorcycle and on foot. My ultimate destination is not always Seattle. I enjoy the ferry and feel it is money well spent. It is usually convenient, saves on gas and cuts down my travel time. It is my preferred choice in bad weather and late at night. It is a "civilized" way to travel. My main frustrations with the system have been: - Traveling from Fauntleroy to Southworth in the late afternoon and having to wait through several sailings to get on a ferry when in a car. - Traveling from Southworth to Fauntleroy in the early morning and having to wait through several sailings to get on a ferry when in a car. - The "gap" that there is in the evening schedule. If you go over to Seattle for an evening event, about the time you want to come home there is a several hour gap in the schedule and it is faster to drive around. - Transit connections from Fauntleroy to the airport. I have never tried the passenger only service from Vashon to Seattle as it does not run at a time when I would choose to travel to Seattle. If there were a direct passenger only run from Southworth to Seattle I would use it, but likely more on weekends. I would appreciate improved transit connections to the airport and Seattle. I have used the reservation system for the Port Townsend system, it was easy to use, but also frustrating when all sailings for times I wanted to travel were sold out. I do understand that this summer that was due to the smaller boat that was being used. But on a regular run it would indicate that the system is not meeting the demand. From my riders point of view it seems that there are some runs that are under used (late evening and early afternoons) and then other runs (rush hour) that do not meet the demand. I have many friends and neighbors that commute via the ferry and from their comments it seems that there is more demand than ever for the commuting runs. As a taxpayer I would much prefer to have my tax dollars spent on the ferry system, a system that promotes and supports carpooling, biking and walking, than on the highway system creating more and larger highways. I do not understand how you can invest so much time and effort into developing plans that do not meet the goals that were set out for them. You went to the effort of collecting information via surveys so you can see what the needs are and then do not seem to use this information. If current routes and service are not working or meeting demands then why not do things differently? For instance on the Southworth/Vashon run – having some straight runs to Fauntleroy. It seems there are some runs that would be filled up by Southworth riders and Vashon never seems to have enough runs. I have no expertise in transportation planning so I do not have any specific solutions. But it is very obvious from looking at the plans, the outlook for the future and the comments from riders that neither of these plans is acceptable. Find yourselves some better planners and go back to the drawing board to create a long term vision for a successful ferry system that meets the needs of the communities it serves.

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	I am writing to request that you consider a Plan C regarding ferry service. The current plans do not meet the current needs of the people who live in South Kitsap County, much less the future needs. My husband and I both take the ferry to work 5 days a week and often on weekends. I ride in a vanpool while he must drive for his work. When we bought our home in 2000 we understood the ferry system to be part of the highway system. Since you would never close lanes on 520 or I-90 we were assured that the ferries service we need for our lively hood would always be there. Part of the problem is the disparagy of service between Southworth and Vashon. Southworth, by WSF's own estimates, is projected to grow by 70%. For the last 20 years, we have been allotted only 30% of the capacity, while Vashon, with 10% of the population, on the triangle, is allotted 70% of the service. Plan A is woefully inadequate. Plan B is a joke. With the 70/30 service split, Southworth would be allotted one half of one boat. Vashon has only 4,400 households paying state taxes. South Kitsap, by contrast, has 58,000, yet our people are not allowed equal access to the ferries. The people of South Kitsap knowing that space is limited has reacted by creating a large contingent of vanpools while Vashon has not. Please make sure we have the adequate and affordable service we need in South Kitsap and throughout the ferry system. Thank you.
01/24/09	I live on Whidbey Island in Coupeville. We are very concerned about the ferry situation at both Keystone and Clinton. The Washington State Ferry system is part of the state highway system and should be considered part of the Federal Highway system. There is no way that regular roads in this state would be subject to the same haphazard management as our ferries. My partner, a shipbuilder, works in Port Townsend and has had trouble with both legs of the journey when the weather is too rough. He is often either unable to get to work or return home. He is primarily a walk on passenger and does not have access to a vehicle to return home if he gets stuck in Port Townsend. He works with other Whidbey Islanders who have children they need to get home to after work- and these people are in the same predicament when the ferry is seriously delayed or cancelled. There have been times someone with a sailboat has offered to take stranded passengers over to Whidbey Island. This is hardly consistent nor an acceptable solution to the ferry problem at Keystone/Port Townsend. Business also suffers on both sides. For example, Penn Cove Mussels must rely on alternate routes for their business now. Many of the logging companies and construction companies that carry trusses need reliable routes to move their products. All of these companies now must drive miles and miles out of their way to reach their destinations or find other suppliers, thus losing business for Whidbey Island. As for small businesses, it is much easier to walk once you land on the Port Townsend side, but that is not the case for those coming to Whidbey Island. I would like you to advocate for public safety and reliability for the Keystone Route- we need two vessels at all times- one as a backup at a minimum. Additionally, I know there is a state law about ferries being built in Washington State. Given the current economic downturn, I would suggest that this law be put aside so that our needs can be met. Todd Shipyard is the only facility that put in a bid. All of the other shipbuilders are at capacity and are unable to take on additional work. It seems that we could waive the state law and open up bids to other US shipbuilders who are able to do the work now. There was a State Transportation meeting at the Useless Bay Country Club for public input recently. (The meeting on the Port Townsend side was not attended by many due to the weather and worries that we would not make it back that night.) Many riders and businesspeople spoke about the problems on the Clinton/Mukilteo route and the issues related to reservations on that end. You know that when you are suddenly stuck in traffic on I5 or 405 you are not going to make your reservation. Those who miss their reservation will then have to call in for another and keep their fingers crossed that they will make the line in time. This seems untenable and completely unworkable. It seems that the State Transportation folks did not listen to the public comments and only offer two very poor solutions. Many experts spoke from the public about possible solutions, however, they told us to "write our comments and they'd look at them". The unresponsiveness to the public need and safety by our State's transportation department is appalling. In closing, I would again ask you to advocate for Whidbey Island in regard to the ferry situation and treat these routes as part of the Highway system. We are looking to you for strong leadership. If there is a way to replace people who are not doing their jobs, do it. If there is a way to waive the state law for where ferries are built so that Keystone can have 2 safe and reliable ferries, do it. We are relying on you. Whidbey Island's economic future and safety, through business, workers and tourists is dependent on the ferry system.

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	I live on Whidbey Island and use the Clinton-Mukilteo ferry frequently. I do not want to make a reservation when I decide to go to town, I do not want to pay a higher fee. The ferries have ALWAYS been a part of the highway system in WA State and they have always had a fee to ride them. I believe that the State budget should support the ferries like they support the Viaduct in Seattle, Highway 2, Highway 99 and every other State highway. The money could come from tolling all the major thorough ways - user fees just like the ferries. Your idea that the local cities could take over the land based part of the ferry is ridiculous! What if there is no city/town there - such as Shaw Island? It would create just another layer of bureaucrats for we the taxpayers and fee payers to pay. Let's try cutting the size of government, and the expenses of government.
01/24/09	It is my opinion that people will avoid using the ferry system if the reservation system is activated as reflected by the Port Townsend/Keystone run which we and many others now avoid. Unintended consequences should be a topic at your next meeting and maybe it is time to start looking to private enterprise to take over the ferry runs as the state sure hasn't shown they can run it effectively. I might add that the kiosk and internet ticket purchases doesn't appear to be working out very well either.
01/24/09	By way of this letter, I wish to encourage you to do everything possible to maintain and improve the Anacortes/Sidney Ferry service. I am a small business owner and operator who offers boat tours and harbour cruises along the Sidney waterfront. Visitors and tourists who arrive by the Ferry are an important component of our summer trade.
01/24/09	Request: do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney run.... As a motorcycle enthusiast and avid off-island traveller, I am very disappointed to hear that the Anacortes/Sidney run is in jeopardy. The annual Anacortes Oyster Run (largest motorcycle run in the Pacific Northwest) attracts many tourists from Vancouver Island in the month of September. This is only ONE event that will be greatly impacted by closure of this ferry route--ultimately contributing to Washington State's regional economic loss of an estimated $126 million in annual spending throughout the Skagit Valley, loss of 1470 jobs with a $30 million annual payroll. The following list represents just the restaurants that typically benefit from the Oyster Run event (there are 52 of them) and who will be negatively impacted by the drop in attendance due to the Ferry closure: [See email for list] This Ferry service is a gateway for tourists visiting and living on Vanouver Island. The example noted above is only one representing and contributing to the negative impact of ceasing the Ferry service. I have not touched upon the many, many others. You must also consider the international aspect of our two countries maintaining an important economic/cultural link and the prospect of eliminating the ferry as counterproductive to both countries. Keep the Anacortes/Sidney run active!
01/24/09	These ferries are a vital part of the state highway system, and we are disappointed that the plan seems to place so much responsibility on customers to maintain the operational and capital budgets. The ferries are also a state icon - a symbol of our state and its maritime heritage; it is a shame that the system has not been maintained in a manner that respects and preserves this heritage. The state as a whole should subsidize a greater portion of the ferry budget; and a greater amount should be spent on maintenance of the fleet. Both Option A and Option B have deficiencies, although Option B is worse. The plan does not seem to explain what is meant by eliminating or reducing "night time" service on the cross -sound routes. We object to any further reduction in night service, and cannot imagine that east-sounders would favor such reductions either. Many Olympic Peninsula residents travel to the I-5 corridor to shop or attend baseball or football games and cultural events. Eliminating night-time ferries means fewer fans, or attendees at I-5 corridor functions, and fewer customers for I-5 corridor businesses. We object to a pricing structure that would provide for lower fares for "smaller" cars. Please keep the same structure as currently. Better driver education or

Date Received	Comment
	more stringent crew enforcement re; minimizing space between vehicles should be emphasized instead. We strongly object to any form of ferry reservation system. We support adding surcharges for travel during peak daily travel times, to encourage riders who have flexibility to travel at more off-peak times of the day. We support placing an extra "super surcharge" for travel during July and August, so long as holders of frequent user books pay the same rate for the books year-round.
01/24/09	My wife, child and I currently spend over $5000.00 annually on ferry passes as regular commuters using the ferry system. This represents real, after-tax dollars that are not subsidized by our employers in any way. Maybe five grand isn't much to some folks, but it's huge expense to us. We chose to live in Kingston, because a modest home is affordable here, crime is all but non-existent and the quality of life is very high. The reality is that the Puget Sound civilian employment base extends to the north and south of Seattle, which means more and more of us will live over here and work over there. Economics will require it. Why do ferry system future plans intend to impose on their biggest source of income, the regular commuters, when it comes to improving the system? Any plan that calls for raising fares in any amount should be THROWN OUT. If you want to start charging folks for using the highways, then we must look at making all major highways into toll roads and distribute the costs fairly to everyone. I suspect that about 400 positions could be eliminated at WSF HQ and the remaining 50 or so folks could run the system just fine. If you want to save money, head count is the first best place to start. The ferry system employees on the boats are lazy, rude, apathetic, unprofessional, and generally missing once the boats are underway. I don't know how much you're paying these folks, but working for 20 minutes each hour seems like a good deal to me. I hope their salaries reflect the relatively low-skill and energy levels required to load a boat. I haven't seen a boat loaded consistently in over three years. Maybe some of the money you save could be spent on development of a meaningful training program. To you and our legislators I say: The Washington State Ferry system should be receiving the same care and funding that other Washington State mass-transit systems are receiving. The Washington State Ferry system should be receiving the same care and funding that other Washington State highway systems are receiving. Look for solutions in alternative energy – hybrid diesel electric, even nuclear should be on the table. Look for solutions that don't involve implementing expensive programs that will be extremely difficult to enforce (reservations, peak surcharges – what a management nightmare!). Leave the commuter runs alone. Perform preventive maintenance while underway (I'm sure a little Navy training would get that straightened out fast), train to a standardized loading/unloading format – provides better on time performance. Provide passenger only service for commuter runs to downtown Seattle – we can catch express busses and van pools from there (oops, already sold those boats at a huge discount didn't we?). Open the boat building bidding process to out of state contractors. Federal funding opportunities must be given a closer look – even at the expense of a few well protected local jobs. Do we really need to pay double for our new ferries because no competitors exist and we must build them using local businesses? That may have been a great idea when we had a dozen shipyards in operation, but since this is no longer the case, isn't it time to revisit this outdated policy? In closing I must say how really completely disappointed I am that good taxpayer money and time was wasted to conduct meetings, perform analysis and weigh the feedback and results – only to come up with same old rehashed 'solution' that has been the answer for decades. We didn't need to spend a dime to regurgitate the same old data. I guess it was all for appearance sake, and to appease our government sponsors. I attended the meetings and was astonished at the absolute lack of any creative solutions being discussed, in fact I was criticized for proposing the wildly out-of-box notion that alternative energy be considered for powering the ferries. I was laughed at. Really? Because if we aren't looking at a way to cut the cost of energy to operate the boats, then I have news for you – the ferry system WILL FAIL. You can't possible believe that people will continue to pay whatever you ask in order to subsidize a fundamentally broken system. Bring on the creative problem solvers and committed people who are not afraid to roll up their sleeves and fight for a real solution! The rest of the WSF team should be reassigned immediately. I choose neither plan A nor B. ALL of the folks I ride the ferry with every day agree - every single one of them – that WSF has failed miserably to provide a viable plan. So who've ya been talking to that thinks this any of these plans are such a great idea? If you look outside of your own team, you'll see that nobody is impressed at all. We deserved better.

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	Please do not eliminate the ferry run between our 2 great countries.
01/24/09	I think it would be a real shame to eliminate the Anacortes Ferry Service. It provides a great alternative to people who do not want to take the Tswassen Ferry or the Victoria Clipper. As a business person in Sidney, BC with a travel agency, we recommend our clients use the Anacortes Ferry when they want to go to Seattle.
01/24/09	I urge the State of Washington to accept Plan A which keeps the level of service as it is now including the Anacortes to Sidney, B.C. run. It is vital to the Skagit County economy to keep the Anacortes to Sidney service. Speaking personally, I am a resident of Mount Vernon but have family in Victoria, B.C. so I use the ferry service on a regular basis and so does my family. I am a senior and it is really a hardship to have to cross the border and catch a Canadian ferry.
01/25/09	Please do not eliminate the Anacortes Sidney Ferry. The business I work in would take a serious hit, along with all the other wonderful establishments in Sidney.
01/25/09	What I havent seen mentioned is the subsidizing of the construction of the ferry boats. If the state isnt going to invite bids from "all qualified bidders" whether puget sound, nationally or internationally, then the cost overrun should be born by state taxpayers and not just the ferry users.This practice is buying votes by the democrats. I am in favor of shutting down the Sidney ferry.
01/25/09	I am writing in support of the importance of continuing the Anacortes- Sidney Ferry run. Skagit County and Anacortes are healthy, growing parts of WAshington State that provide valuable tax dollars as result of their abundant natural, human, and economic resources. The Anacortes-Sidney ferry (as well as all the San Juan Island ferries) are a unique magnet, drawing important traffic through the region, traffic that spends dollars to support local businesses (and state tax coffers). Travelers to the ferry gain a familiarity with this special part of the state they otherwise might not experience--and which may contribute to drawing them back for future visits, perhaps even to relocate their residence or business to the region. While I certainly don't want to see irresponsible area growth, I do value addition of new energies, new ideas, and economic contributions. The ferry run is an important part of this. Secondly, the ferry provides a meaningful connection between Anacortes (and the U.S.) and Sidney/Victoria/British Columbia. Who can deny that this world would benefit from the kind of

Date Received	Comment
	international cooperation that has developed on multiple levels because of the water highway that connects us? Facilitating visits and commerce between Vancouver Is. and the U.S. enhances the ongoing health of each of us. Should one of us decline, the other will suffer. The benefits of this connection are economic as well as personal. Thirdly, the ripple effect of direct ferry spending, as well as by those traveling to and from terminals, has huge repercussions well beyond fares collected. One has only to read the study conducted by the Economic Development Assn of Skagit County to recognize the multi- million-dollar financial contributions of this interconnected economic web of which we are a part. Finally, ferry travelers contribute directly to many local Anacortes and area businesses. Without the additional support of these visitors, many of our services and merchants may not survive. Without them, the town loses much of its quality of life for current residents and appeal as a destination for local tourism, retirees, and new businesses, which, in turn, support out top-flight hospital, schools, and local government services--all valuable economic contributors to both local and state budgets. Let's not sacrifice long-term prosperity for short-sighted, short-term, paper gains.
01/25/09	I have owned and operated a small business in Port Townsend for twenty years. I have been able to successfully employ a minimum of 7 people year round, but my business is completely dependent upon tourism for revenue. In the 14 months that we have had reduced or passenger only ferry service, my revenue has decreased 15%, a number which is tracked by geographic data of where visitors come from. On top of that you add the actual decrease of revenue from the general downtown in the economy, my business has suffered a 35% decrease in revenue. This year we will be isolated for 6 weeks due to the closure of the Hood Canal Bridge and it paints a very bleak picture. My business is only one of hundreds of small businesses which are affected by the decisions which you make in the long term planning of the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry. Your decisions will impact the economic well being of small communities on the Olympic Peninsula and San Juan islands not only for us, but for generations to come. The Port Townsend-Keystone route is an extension of Highway 20, and a major connector route for not only tourism but for small and large businesses. For us, it is the equivalent of choosing to shut down Interstate 5 for Pierce and King counties. I beg you not to be shortsighted in the long range plan for the Port Townsend-Keystone ferry, as your decisions will affect us for years to come and have a major impact on the economic vitality of our communities. The savings you are budgeting for now will have a devastating impact on future revenues of this entire region and that just doesn't seem to make good economic sense. Please adopt Plan A in the Long Range Plan. I support looking at private options to supplement Plan A, but not as a substitute for it.
01/25/09	I live in western Skagit County, but have property and relatives on the Olympic Peninsula. I have been using the ferry system for the past 40 years, primarily Edmonds-Kingston, Keystone-Port Townsend, and the San Juans. Plan B is totally insufficient and must not be adopted. Plan A is much better, but still does not face up to providing better, more reliable service. The Edmonds-Kingston route service has improved tremendously over what it was in the early 1990's. This is due primarily to the larger vessels and the state patrol intervention during busy periods. Keep up the good work! Please do not put any smaller vessels on this route. If the reservation system can handle the volume served here, please add it. The Keystone-Port Townsend service in the past has been horribly frustrating, to the point where prior to the reservations I gave up on using it, even though it should be a much better chose for me over Edmonds. Two reliable vessels and the reservation system will improve this tremendously. The reservation system is a huge success for this run. Please do not end the Anacortes to Sidney run. This really provides an important link from Washington to the Victoria area. In summary, maintain or increase the size of the vessels; do not reduce service; institute the reservation system where-ever practical. The State should not use the excuse of lack of funds to reduce service. Funding is simply a chose of how to raise revenue and where to spend it.

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	I am a frequent user of the Clinton/Mukilteo ferry and must protest any plan to cut back service. I take all my Out-of-Town visitors on a visit to Whibey Island. I pay property taxes and utilities on a cabin near Langley. I would be happy with INCREASED summer sailings. I would be happy with no terminal improvements except those needed for safety. I would accept a 5% increase in both Winter and Summer fares on that run Out-of-state, lower-cost shipyards should be encouraged to bid on new ferry construction. "Design-build" construction contracts might reduce system overhead by having private contractors design the vessels as well as build them, eliminating the state's vessel engineering staff. Not allowing workers to gain overtime by working more distant runs should save on operating costs. The ferry system is an integral part of the state's highway system -- a crucial part of our infrastructure. It must be maintained for all those who depend upon it. It needs a regular, assured frequency as we plan for our jobs and schools. If a Reservation System can be shown to help more than just the wealthy or the truckers, then at least half of the spaces for each run should to left open for the rest of us taxpayers
01/25/09	Anacortes terminal needs basic maintenance not megamillion remodel.Repave the loading lot before it becomes unusable.The tourist rate is dropping so ridership is not increasing; the economy is not recovering any time soon. Sydney run could be shortened to weekends only during the off season and restored as traffic demand increases. Everytime I travel in Eastern Washington I am amazed how nice the roads are and how constantly maintained the road surfaces are.. .We are part of the road system, however shortchanged the Legislature deems us..Taxes in The San Juans have steadily increased since I moved here in 1973, ferry service has not been on par to those increases.We are an agrieved contigency who will not take much more neglect and abuse!
01/25/09	Please don't cut the ferry schedule - I have a hard time as it is to get to work from Southworth. I have a 5 hr daily commute because the Ferry and Bus routes are not synched. If the Ferry schedule is reduced it could take even longer for me to get to work and to home at night. I currently work 1:30pm to 10:00pm. Because of the mad crush in the morning of people trampling each other to get a seat on the bus, literally running off the boat, I must commute later in the day. I am 60 years old with degenerative arthiritis in both knees and am unable to run to get a seat. There are a great number of commuters in pretty much the same circumstances (concerning various physical issues) challenging their commute. I cannot stand all they way to Seattle . I leave my house at 11:00am for a fifteen minute trip to the ferry terminal in Southworth and fifteen minute are then available to make it down the Dock to the Ferry - (including a little rest time for aching knees). Then at Fauntleroy I catch a Bus across the street from the Toll booth at aprox 12:30pm. I get to the Fauntleroy Ferry Terminal around 11:00pm and the Ferry arrives at 11:40pm. I finally get home at about 12:30am. SO to the reduce the Ferry runs would most likely severely impact my commute and my Job and my House value. I live across the water because I cannot afford a house inSeattle or the surrounding area. My Daughter and Son-in-law and Granddaughter also live with me. The schools are excellent and it is a good place to raise a family
01/25/09	We personally ride the ferry from time to time, and would hate to see it discontinued, but more than that would be the impact it would have on the communities it serves. PLEASE give favorable consideration, and keep the Anacortes to Sidney operating into next year and beyond

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	Attending the meeting in the inter-island boat was interesting but leaves much unconvincing. It is hard to consider how realistically the system's proposals should be considered when the past performance has been such a steady deterioration; not all due to money problems. Therefore the following are a short collection of comments related to various aspects of the proposals and ended with what seems like the only solution. Allocation of resources. The past record doesn't look too good. Consider the millions spent a few years ago on the Shaw terminal, restrooms etc I also note that the ferries call at Shaw 18 times/day [after subtracting Fri only] on the current winter schedule compared, say, with Orcas 22. On a traffic basis this is ridiculous. Even in the face of critical financial shortages pushing for big facilities improvements is fallacious. The primary aim is to provide transportation and upgraded facilities are secondary, or less. The Sidney run is very nice and we go on it about once/year, in Dec. There are, perhaps, 30 passengers & 5-10 cars. Is this an intelligent use of resources? I've been told the rent on the Sidney facility alone is of the order of $\$10^6$ /year; so it doesn't look like it makes any sense. Alternatively, the inter-island ferry is an absolutely essential part of the ferry system and the functioning of San Juan County businesses. That must be continued under any plan. Reservations: All the propaganda & justifications cannot alter the fact that tourists know way in advance when they need to go; but local people, the ones who use the system consistently & upon whom it's success actually depends, do NOT know far in advance. For them to be blocked out by visitor's reservations is simply unreasonable and, of course, the reservation system will cost plenty before you are done with it, no matter what the present claims are. Look at the record. The reservation proposal is, of course, subject to the observation that all previous "improvements", making things more convenient for the ferry system, have led to poorer conditions for customers. Reservations promise to be an extreme case. The Anacortes terminal can't even sustain a ticket holder only lane; so that those who can get through fairly efficiently can do so. And, when there was one, it was inaccessible until one was within 6 or 7 cars of the toll booth anyway; so it was of very limited use. Poor design and uselessness is a characteristic of the implementation of almost all "improvements" the management has made over a long period of time. In access to the toll booths the ferry system has failed to learn from the banks how to set up lines and loading of the San Juan Islands ferries has become very poor over the past years, the latter due entirely to the personnel and their lack of direction. Walk-on; On the San Juan routes a major impediment to increasing the fraction of walk on traffic are the outrageous charges for parking at that terminal. Use of SKAT is limited by the areas they serve and eliminates those who need to transport bulky items. Taxi service in Anacortes is, based on very recent as well as long standing experience , very unreliable & often unavailable; so leaving a car at the terminal would, in most cases, be the only feasible way to use walk-on service. But the fees prevent that ********** Role of ferries as highways: As long as no one is charged to drive on the state's highways, it is absurd to discuss the concept that ferry riders should pay a large fraction of the cost of service. There are huge expenses involved in keeping roads open and maintaining them; so providing and maintaining the ferry fleet should be on an equal basis. Logic says that, in view of these facts, riding the ferry should be free, as is the case of at least one eastern WA ferry. There is little hope for the system until its status as part of the highway system is implemented. Bottom Line: Detailed comments, suggestions & criticisms are useless unless the system is actually on an equal basis with highways, financially. Without that, nothing effective can be done.
01/25/09	I urge WSF to adopt Plan A. As a resident of San Juan Island, I am greatly concerned that reductions in ferry service will limit the ability of ordinary working people to continue to live on these islands. The ferries represent our "highways" to the rest of the world, and it is very frustrating that the state has not devoted equal attention and funding to the ferry system as it has to other road systems and construction projects. We have no alternatives on the islands--the ferries are our only link to food, medical services and other commerce. Existing service is barely adequate, and we face horrible problems every time that one of our aging ferries experiences maintenance problems.

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	I am a retired City of Seattle auditor living full-time on San Juan Island. Prior to my retirement in 2006, I lived in Kirkland and spend weekends and vacations on San Juan. Thus, based on my experiences, I have several comments/suggestions. 1. The easiest improvement in ferry service to the Islands, in my opinion, would be a better and faster program for loading ferries to and from Friday Harbor. I have personnally observed on numerous times that the WSF staff loads ferries to Whidby much more efficiently, consistently, and quickly. Loading at the Anacortes terminal is very inconsistent and slow. I realize the San Juan routes are much longer and the boats differ. However, this process needs much improvement, and thus the staff needs better training and supervision. I also don't understand why walk-ons in Friday Harbor can't be loaded while the decks are being checked (or the crew is taking a break). 2. One booth in Anacortes should be permanently designated for Wave-To-Go tickets only (with the possible addition of "cash" only payers). This would be another benefit of getting the Wave-To-Go Tickets. 3. Walk-offs into Friday Harbor should be delayed until the vehicles have unloaded. Many walk-offs are elderly or with heavy loads and thus do not get off and out of the way in a timely manner. The current process is also inefficient due to the fact that too often, unloading of vehicles is interrupted by walk-offs who did not get down to the car deck. 4. The most effective improvement (although admittedly costly) in off-loading walk-ons in Friday Harbor would be a walkway bridge. 5. Another definite improvement would be close East Street where it meets with Front Street. Alternatively, some of the unloading cars could be directed up East Street and A Street to either Nichols or Web Streets. 6. Prior to living in Kirkland, I lived in Chelan and Wentachee. The WSF service to the public, in my opinion, should be treated no differently than our mountain pass highways (ferry routes function the same as highways, both are transportation options for the public). 7. My son works for the U.S. Chamber in WDC. Whenever I visit him, I travel around the area, and often have to pay for going through several tolls. It is time for our State to implement toll charges on its most heavily used roads. Toll charges would only be fair, and comparable to the charges to go onto a ferry to get where you want to go. When I first moved to and lived in Kirkland, I had to pay a toll to cross the Evergreen Bridge. I have not understood why that toll was not continued. 8. The San Juan Islands are a major tourist attraction for visitors thinking of coming to Washington. I have not heard of any recent studies identifying the dollars spent by tourists coming to the Islands. I am sure it is much larger than that for tourists coming to Washington to also visit Victoria. The State shoudl conduct a study or an analysis projecting the dollars coming into the State from tourism to the San Juan Islands. I also suggest that the State recognize the number of lower-class residents that live on the Islands and enable the San Juans to be viable destinations. If the State keeps raising prices to ride the ferries, not only will tourism be affected, but the daily costs of living for our Island's lower-class residents will drive them off the Islands. We can already see the beginning of this by the decline in school attendance and its resultant increasing school budget shortfall.
01/25/09	Instead of running the expense and complication of a reservation system. A way to generate revenue would be a “next boat” fee, similar to the 167 toll for hov lanes. You could charge money to get on the next boat based on wait times. Example if you want to get on a boat to Whidbey on a Friday evening on a holiday weekend when there is a 2.5 hour wait. You could charge a $100 dollar fee to get on the next boat. On other days when there is only a one boat delay you could charge $20 to get on next boat. Sometimes people need to get to where they need to go or they feel their time is more valuable spent elsewhere. The system could be implemented at the local terminals without the need for an expensive integrated system.
01/25/09	I am writing to express my favor for the proposed Option A contained in December 2008 Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division Draft Long-Range Plan. State funding must continue to be appropriated to the marine transportation system or "ferry highway" just as state system's tax dollars fund the highways and roads that mainland commuters are able to travel on. Obviously, voter approval of I-695 which cut state budgets and substantially reduced the dedicated funding for the ferry system. The passing of I-695 was an approval of a majority of voters who clearly don't rely on the Washington State Ferry system! That majority was mainlanders, not islanders. The state must create new necessary funds or divert currently available funds from the state budget to create a sustainable marine transportation system. This is not an optional responsibility of the state. In view of the fact that the ferry fares provides 70% of the WSF's operations (2007) up from 60% in 2006, continuing to increase fares is not a viable way to fund the currently, dollar-challenged system. Citing WSF operations: "Fares have increased between 37% and 122% . . . " This is a serious financial hardship to those, including myself, who must commute to the mainland, on average 2-3 times round-trip on a weekly basis from Orcas to Anacortes. Further, large capital investments must be made by the state to insure continuing, safe transport on the waters. The state

Date Received	Comment
	cannot expect the ferry system to become self-sustaining by continuing to raise ferry fares! Contrary to the WSF study finding that fares are a "small factor" in ridership on the ferries is grossly understated! If fares continue to rise many, including myself, will be out of a job. Further, on Orcas where I maintain full-time residency, and all other San Juan Island destinations will suffer from the loss of tourism--the mainstay of our local economy. A depressed economy on the islands is already forcing and exodus of locals to the mainland resulting from lack of work and businesses closing. The WA state ferry system--a public system of transportation--cannot become an "elitist" form of transportation only available to those few who can continue to afford rising fares. I personally travel for business to and from the mainland 2-3 times weekly in conjunction with some inter-island travel. I currently spend over $2000. per year on ferry passes. This travel supports my income and my way of life living in the islands. Continually rising fares will at some point force me from being able to live on Orcas Island. I would suggest that the state legislature remove the edict, to my knowledge, that new ferries must be built in the state of Washington. Perhaps in the interim period while ferries are being built in this state, for which I have heard can take two years to build a vessel, the state must consider buying existing vessels from other countries (e.g. Canada). These options may very well be a less expensive, more efficient way to begin to replace our ancient vessels. Ecologically speaking, innovative types of vessels in terms of design and the fuel used to run them must also be sought out if, in fact, this is a long-range plan--ecological impact will play an important factor in the future of ferry travel, period. Clean energy use has become a "hot-button" topic concerning the environment and global warming. The Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division Long-Range Plan seemingly has no mention of providing an "earth-sustainable" marine transportation system. I find this to be short-sighted in view of the global concern over the future of our planet. The state must think globally while making any long-term plan. I hope that my appeal will be heard by the powers that be in the Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division. I will restate that I am in favor of Option A of the long-range plan for all the aforementioned reasons that I have stated in the text of this letter.
01/25/09	It is important that the State Ferry system administrators understand the bulk of San Juan county residents respect and appreciate their efforts in providing reliable transportation service to and from the islands. I believe many San Juan County residents would like to see a cost per run breakdown. ie. what does it cost the State tax payers per hour to operate the various routes in the islands. I believe that this actually might help people come to realize the enormous costs associated with ferry operations here in the San Juan Islands. Further more it could promote a positive dialog regarding the possible paring down of current ferry routes. Understanding the hourly economics of the States transportation responsibilities may help islanders consider off season "Flex Schedule" ferry routes, ferry routes that do not run on hourly basis as much as capacity minimums instead. However you as administrators design future routes here in the San Juans remember the ideas that did not work and move forward in providing us with a new transportation vision for our tiny Island group. Maybe most important do not hesitate to keep challenging us as residents and users of the ferry system for our input and future correspondence.
01/25/09	My vote is for Plan A of the draft Long Range Plan for the WSDOT Ferries Division. Plan B is a joke. Plan B is the classic putting your head into the sand because you don't want to deal with hard problems. All it does it reduce service; keep maintenance on 80 year old vehicles that need to be retired and shifts the burden of the Passenger Only Ferries (POFs) to King and Kitsap County. It doesn't save money on the POFs, it just moves the money off of the State coffers and on to Kitsap and King County. Money is money; please do not insult my intelligence. I know funding for Plan A is an issue but these are some ideas: 1. I would not be apposed to raising the gas tax in this state to fund major projects. Gas was selling for $4.80 a gallon not too long ago. Imagine if we added another 50 cents to the gasoline tax for two years AND ONLY FOR TWO YEARS. Gasoline would only be $2.60 a gallon and you would raise more than enough to fund the WSF system, 520 floating bridge and the Alaskan Way Viaduct. The 2005 9.5 cent increase was projected to raise 5.5 billion in 4 years. Hence a 50 cent tax would raise 14.5 billion. People were already used to paying $2.80 a gallon prior to the gas hike. With good marketing, $2.60 a gallon can be marketed as "still cheap gas" while vastly improving the state transportation system. 2. Get some of the Obama stimulus package money by GETTING RID OF THE MADE IN WASHINGTON MANDATE. Are you willing to give up on getting federal money by sticking to a principle that does nothing for anyone in the State of Washington? Union workers can't work if there is no money to build ships! At least if we get some stimulus money they have a chance for work. I think Plan A is a well thought out plan. I am 100% behind this plan. Increasing POF prices should have been done along time ago. This plan addresses the long term needs of the WSDOT Ferry System. This is the RIGHT PLAN. Please endorse this plan as the

Date Received	Comment
	RIGHT PLAN!
01/25/09	I am writing to state my opposition to the WSF draft long-range ferry plan (both A and B.) And I have a very innovative idea that may keep all of our runs, avoid ferry back up, reward ride-sharing, save the environment - all at once. On the San Francisco Bay Bridge (and a ferry IS a bridge) there is a lane for carpools that during rush hour goes waaaaaay faster than the SOV lanes. Why not have a carpool lane for the ferries? People with a full vehicle (2 people for 2-seater cars, 3 people for sedans, 4 people for vans) have priority boarding for the ferry up to 5 minutes before sailing and ride at current rates. Single occupancy vehicles board on first come first served basis and pay a small surcharge per car (25-50 cents a ride). What difference will this make? It will encourage ride sharing (global warming), it will reduce ferry back up (more predictability for all drivers), it will encourage neighborliness (more community) and possibly "casual carpooling" at the park and rides (fewer vehicle miles). Even if you had 3 ferries per 2 hours rather than 4, people would accept the change because they know that they will likely get on the ferry of their choice. If you partnered with Island Transit and created an online ride sharing board so people could find others going to their part of town on the other side, there would be both a mechanism for sharing through IT and a reward for sharing through WSF. Once on the boat, you could also have meeting points (announced by those lovely sportscasters) on the boat for people to find rides to their destination (more walk ons!). For example, you could have a place for Bellingham, for Everett, for North Seattle, for the Eastside, for the U District, for downtown and for South Seattle. People could work out their rides and perhaps a few more folks would be willing to walk on without a car, or hop a ride with a neighbor knowing they could swap cars on the ferry. Can you imagine it: saving money, saving stress, saving the environment while knitting our wonderful whidbey community together. I agree with Rep. Larry Seaquist that you must throw out your draft plan; continue to build the maximum number of boats, forget dropping evening ferry runs, and come up with a new plan that will first preserve, then enhance the ferry system. Yes, we are in tough financial times, but that doesn't mean you need to hold a fire sale. Please do not make short-sighted decisions that will hurt our state for decades to come. This is a time for creativity. Consider using classic marketing principles to encourage ridership. Have you considered that oppressive pricing structures and poor schedules may be the cause of very trends you claim to so closely watch? The ferries are a Washington state treasure. It is time to get creative.
01/25/09	Hello, I am writing to request that they do not eliminate the Anacortes/Sidney Ferry run. The impact would have a disastrous effect on the two cities-Sidney and Anacortes. It would also curtail the cultural alliance between the two sister cities. Not only this, it will all lead to a Washington state regional economic loss of 1,470 jobs with a 30 million dollar annual payroll along with 126 million in annual spending throughout the Skagit valley. It would seem as though the savings on operating the ferry would be seriously offset by the direct and indirect economic loss of sales and services in the Skagit valley, Sidney and the Saanich Peninsula. The loss of this service undermines the international aspect of the two countries maintaining an important economic/cultural link and the prospect of eliminating the ferry will be counterproductive to both countries.
01/25/09	Retain the ferry service between Anacortes and Sidney. Tourism is the heart of our business and includes many Canadians. Without tourism business, my store and many others will not survive through 2009 in Friday Harbor. Can the state afford to be deprived of sales tax the San Juan Islands contribute each year to the budget? Most of our business must be earned from May to October from tourists.

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	I understood the ferry system was a part of the Washington State Highway System. I understood the need to supplement the public funding of the ferry service with fares, as it is a more costly method of travel per mile on an ongoing basis than a freeway or highway. However, the initial infrastructure costs may be more costly for the freeway and highway systems (i.e. with related overpasses, bridges, tunnels, walls, and the need to acquire right of way in order to build such roadways). The ferry maintenance (not maintenance of in service vehicles, but the replacement of aging equipment) has not been considered in the annual budgets for the State Highway System as evidenced by its inability to acquire replacement ferries when necessary. The ferry systems are a life link for many of the islands and to cut service would be like closing the only roadway into a community for portions of every day. It is a discriminatory budgeting practice and is patently unfair to the residents of those islands. Let's look at the service to and from Whidbey Island, the Mukilteo – Clinton route in particular. While Whidbey Island is a popular vacation spot for many, it is home to many as well. Whidbey Island is inhabited by people who work as well as live there, but many of the residents also need to commute off island for work or for healthcare and other services unavailable on the island. When many of these residents moved to Whidbey, they did so with the knowledge that the ferries were a part of the State Highway System and were a reliable transportation option. In the off season, the vast majority of the travelers using the ferry are the residents of the island or delivery vehicles and workers coming on island to provide goods and services to those businesses and individuals on the island. The ridership swells significantly during the peak season because in addition to the year round usage, you now must add in the daily tourists, the vacationers and the summer commuters (those with a vacation home on the island, where the family stays on island for the summer, and the breadwinner commutes to work). To cut service to Whidbey Island would mean a reduction in tourist travel and a reduction in the ability of residents to get to work or the services they need. So what do I suggest as a means of curing the budgetary problems facing the ferries? First, I would like to see a fair allocation of funding for the ferry system. That being said, I think the following are viable options as well: No cuts in ferry service should be considered unless there is a reduction in ridership! To do so would be saying that Washington doesn't want its communities to grow and prosper, and actually wants such communities to decline. Install a reservation system for automobiles, but no ferry run should have more than 30 - 50% of capacity booked with reservations (this would be determined on a route by route basis and may be seasonal). And a no show should have a penalty of perhaps 25% of the fare paid (a call or email to reschedule or cancel the reservation can avoid the penalty if done timely). Island residents, especially daily commuters, should be allowed a fare discount if they make reservations, with no bump in fare during peak season. Proof of permanent island residency should be required. Reasonable increases in fares from time to time should be made consistent with a verifiable index, such as the cost of living index or a similar independent publicly available measurement. Passengers should experience a lesser increase than automobiles. This would encourage carpooling and passenger ridership as opposed to automobiles. There needs to be better coordination of the various forms of public transportation to encourage passenger usage instead of so much auto usage. Currently, trains do not coordinate enough with ferry schedules in order to promote this. New ferries should be acquired on a rotational basis (there is no excuse for waiting until nearly all the ferries need replacement to plan for such replacement). Also, any new ferries should be made to utilize alternative fuel. This should help control fuel costs into the future. No private companies should run the ferry system. To allow a private enterprise to step in would mean that we now not only have the costs of operations to consider, but the private company's profit as well. If the ferry system wanted to consider private contracts to provide for certain portions of operations, say for the maintenance of the ferries themselves, then if it is a cost effective alternative, it should be considered. But in no way, should the system or any run of the system be outsourced in its entirety. Where is the accountability?
01/25/09	As a commuter whose job moved from Vashon to Seattle recently (K2 Sports), I am shocked at the proposed cuts in service to Vashon... Both on the Fauntleroy and Pt. Defiance runs. The smaller boat that we have now is causing immense back ups and wait times. It's not working. The lines at Fauntleroy for commuters are somewhat manageable now, but a added burden of reservation system will not work. It's extremely unfair and would just take more WSF workers to administer.

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	I understand that implementing a reservation system is a strong component of the long-range draft plan. As a 26 year resident of Lopez Island, as well as privately contracted employee of the Lopez Ferry Terminal for ten years, I can assure you that such a system in the San Juans would be a disaster. WSF has included the San Juan Islands in every blanket change it has implemented over the years, without seeming regard to the fact that we operate under an entirely different set of circumstances than down sound. We do not have boats that run back and forth on the 1/2 hour where the primary goal is on-time performance. Our runs are longer, more complicated, and we deal with a quota system to attempt some sort of fairness between the major islands. The paperwork alone in a reservation system would be a bureaucratic nightmare. The primary purpose of a reservation system is to: 1. Use up space on boats that have less traffic, and 2. Guarantee passage for those who plan ahead. Why I believe this will be an abject failure in the San Juans: 1. We need to eliminate the boats that have hardly any traffic instead of trying to force people on to them because the other boats have all the space reserved!! There's a reason why nobody travels at 10 p.m or worse, 1:30 a.m. Why does the system keep running fully crewed boats at times when no one uses them? 2. Even Anacortes would have terrible difficulty having special reservation lanes--I have been there in summer when they had to close down the lot because it was completely full. Where will the reservation traffic be held? On the islands, the situation is even worse. Orcas is already a disaster in summer--they have no room at all in their holding lanes. Lopez's Anacortes traffic parks on the side of the road all the way up Ferry Road. How do you imagine we are going to separate out reservation traffic from the "spontaneous" travelers? Are we going to be expected to print out reams of paperwork and then somehow, between making announcements, selling tickets, loading and off-loading boats, run a mile up the road and consult with every single car/driver? I can assure you that the system would have to build in an extra 1/2 hour on each island for every Anacortes run to accommodate this system. Secondly, what's to prevent tourists from booking up reservations months in advance "just in case?" Or islanders, for that matter. What if I might want to go off-island next week but don't know which boat and I book a reservation for every single boat, "just in case?" If you impose a penalty to break a reservation, there will be thousands of exceptions--which there indeed have to be, thus producing a nightmare of paperwork. In conclusion, unless you plan to expand and redesign every terminal (and wouldn't it sort of defeat the purpose of saving money if you do this?), a reservation system in the San Juans will make the lives of everyone, islanders, ferry workers, tourists, a gigantic headache. Ironically, many islanders have wanted a reservation system for years: but only for us! If you include the general public, then those who live here will inevitably get the short end of the stick: longer lines, more paperwork, and competing with tourists just so we can go to the doctor or come home. Please do not include the San Juan's in every new WSF scheme. We are in an entirely different boat; literally and figuratively.
01/25/09	Reduced service is a bad idea on any of the ferry routes and I am especially concerned with the Southworth/Fauntleroy route. The ferries are part of the state highway system and it's time they were treated that way. Would you neglect our highways for decades and then suddenly say "we don't have enough money, we're going to close I-5". This is what has happened to the ferry system. The steel electric ferries were very old and then suddenly all four are taken out of service. Didn't anybody see this coming? The ridership was higher in 1999 because the SERVICE was better in 1999. When you cut service you cut ridership. Remember? You bought the Snohomish and the Chinook - they were SUPPOSED to have an acceptable wake for Rich Passage - they were slowed down, put out of service, and eventually sold for a bargain to the Bay area. The auto ferry runs had been reduced because of the passenger ferries. They were never increased again. The money that could have extended the service for a year apparently was put into the Bremerton tunnel project - you're not going to need a tunnel when you have one boat!!! Cuts were also made on other routes, not to mention that food service was halted for a year because contract negotiations were bungled. We need to have smart, effective people working at WSF - not people who give ferries away to California or lose money on food service. In the Gig Harbor - South Kitsap area you either pay a bridge toll or a ferry fare to get to Seattle and back. We seem to be the only people in the state paying user fees. Mountain passes are expensive to maintain, why not charge a toll and free up some money for ferry service? The bidding process for building ferries should not be limited to Washington State. This needs to change immediately so ferries are eligible for Federal funding and so Todd Shipyards has some competition. I think the reservation system is a bad idea - spend money on running ferries not making it harder to ride them.

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	As a San Juan Islands resident, I wish to register my emphatic support for Plan A and concur with the opinions expressed in a message to you today by Ms. Bernadette Vinson, 61 Myth Road, Eastsound. I sincerely hope you will be guided by the opinions of the residents of San Juan County as expressed in public meetings and in individual messages to you.
01/25/09	It would be disasterous for residents of Whibey Island to be required be make reservations for Mukilteo/Clinton ferry. There is no way to guarantee arrival time when commuters need to deal with traffic conditions. While we can appreciate the need to have the ferry system operate as efficiently as possible, the impact on Island residents must have a high priority in the process.
01/25/09	I am a resident of Anacortes. I am astounded you would consider shutting down the Sidney ferry. Are you trying to kill Anacortes's economy. It is very fragile up here. I am totally opposed. I think your two choices are rather stupid in that it is either the frying pan or the fire. I find it difficult to believe those are the only choices -- albeit not logical. However, I am forced to say I support Plan A.
01/25/09	We would like to express our support in favour of keeping the Anacortes/Sidney run in place. Over the many years this service has been in place, both the Skagit Valley in Washington State, and the Saanich Peninsula, especially Sidney have enjoyed a unique and beautiful union, made possible by the joining of the two with the ferry crossing service between Sidney and Anacortes. The cultural alliance between the two sister cities of Sidney and Anacortes has enhanced this partnership along the way. Sidney in particular has considered the service as part of their history in promoting their community and surrounding areas, as has the community of Anacortes and neighbouring areas. Together, both areas have enjoyed the improvement to the economic base , and having a most important link between countries. It is particularly important now, with the economic struggles we have facing us, that jobs are not lost and that annual spending in both areas, will not be negatively affected. Perhaps it is even more important now than ever before, that both governments and both communities, incourage and perhaps even enhance this service between the two, so that people can still travel and have the opportunity to get away without spending too much. This service is the perfect "getaway" tool for this immediate area, and it is still affordable for the public to use. It will be an important part of keeping the tourisim industry moving in the next few years.
01/25/09	Clearly, our marine highways are not thought of as equal to our land highways. What this means is that the people who drive our road highways are winning out against the people who depend on our marine highways. This is unfair, and unsound, especially since ferry riders not only pay road taxes, but also pay rider fares, both as passengers and for vehicles. There can be no discussion of lowering services from WSF; the discussion needs to be how to immediately correcting the Department of Transportation's attitude that our marine highway is separated from our land highways in terms of monies, analysis, maintenance, growth and planning. Certainly, boats have different maintenance requirements than roads, but all of the ferry routes are highways, they are marine highways. Someone connected that thought rather well when they pointed out that Hwy 525 from Mukilteo connects to Hwy 525 on Whidbey Island via Marine Hwy 525 Ferries. One main, and positive, difference is that ferries already have a toll in place, unlike the majority of our land highways. We might also increase revenue with an implementation of a fee-based reservation system, which might reduce the need for more boats. I believe a reservation system of some sort is a smart idea. From the Department of Transportation website is this article, "Moving Washington, A Program to Fight Congestion". http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/movingwashington/ This paragraph below from

Date Received	Comment
	the article suggests that the DOT is supporting alternatives to driving or driving alone, instead of managing what people want, which is the ability to get where they need to go, when they need to go. Yet rural areas are the least able areas to effectively utilize alternatives to driving or driving alone (especially when our own Island Transit cannot find funding to operate on Sundays). From the DOT article: Managing demand means promoting and sponsoring travel options for commuters that result in greater efficiency for the transportation system. For example, convenient bus service, incentives to carpool or vanpool, promoting workplaces conducive to telecommuting. WSDOT partners with many organizations, including: • Community Transit in Snohomish County • Everett Transit • Intercity Transit in Olympia • C-Tran in Vancouver • King County Metro • Employers in the Commute Trip Reduction program • State-run and private ferries • Spokane Transit • Amtrak Cascades • Sound Transit • Pierce Transit Excuse me! WSDOT doesn't "partner" with State-run ferries, they are responsible for them, ie, they OWN the ferry system. Effectively, this tells us that the DOT supports crushing rural areas economic growth by not supplying them with ample marine transportation methods. For the cost of building and running a ferry, per person/per mile -- how does that compare to the cost of building a land highway with a per person on the route travel cost? If ferries cost less than highways, then we are not on par with providing fair transportation. It is ludicrous for our ferries to be required to be built here in Washington - yet when WSF requests bids, only 1 company is interested in bidding. Clearly, that tells all of us that the boat builders in Washington really don't WANT the work, (which likely means they don't want to put up with WSF and State issues ...) so why should we not try for repealing the legislation that forces boats to be built here? Most certainly boat builders in WA could still bid if the process were opened up nationally. To get bids from international boat builders, I believe we also have to deal with the Jones Act. Probably not worth it to fight three major battles at once. We need new ferries and ample service -- now. What's worse is the fact that we were all riding 4 boats with 80-yr old hulls, because WSF didn't save or allocate funds to build new boats. The State can't have it both ways -- require boats to be built here, yet not save or allocate funds to build boats in a responsible time frame.
01/25/09	We have lived on San Juan Island for many years. Our son is 14 years old and has grown up here. We chose to move here from the Seattle area because of the lifestyle, strong sense of community, and natural environment. At that time, we realized that it would be a trade off and that we would have to deal with taking ferries to and from the mainland, especially for my husband's work which requires him to travel. This is a very special community and we feel blessed to live here. However, we have observed the hardship that some individuals and families experience with rising ferry costs and with limited service. Our son participates in sports, and we find ourselves traveling off island every weekend for sports events to support him and his team. It is expensive to do so and many families try to carpool as much as possible. Still, it is a huge expense, especially for the non-school related sports activities. Also, traveling to and from medical services on the mainland are much more difficult and costly while living here. Last week I took my husband for a colonoscopy, and we left on the 8:00 a.m. ferry and returned on the 8:25 p.m. ferry, arriving home at 11:00 p.m. We accept this as part of living on this island, but simply cannot imagine the additional difficulties if ferry service is reduced. Can you imagine the life of a cancer patient living here who has to travel off island for regular chemotherapy treatment? It is imperative that Governor Gregoire and the legislature recognize the needs of our island communities. Plan B will devastate these communities, as many tourists travel to our islands and many continue on to Vancouver Island. The citizens of San Juan County pay taxes and contribute to funding for transportation services, which includes our state ferries. The ferries are our link to the mainland and our highways. As we all recognize that the current economic climate has become extremely challenging in all areas, our ferries are a vital service that can either make or break us. If Plan B is implemented, many businesses will suffer from the reduced tourism and will close. Families will be forced to move from the islands, which will further devastate our schools with reduced enrollment which is already declining. So, for us to have a ferry crisis on top of our education crisis is extremely upsetting. Please pass this message on with all the others you have received to try and persuade the Governor and the legislature to realize the extreme economic, personal, financial and far reaching hardship that our island communities will suffer if our already challenging ferry service is reduced and the Sidney ferry is eliminated.

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	Earlier this year when the Bremerton WSF unexpectedly went out of service the Victoria passenger ferries were placed into service. For the time they ran I typically took the 6:05 a.m. ferry from Bremerton to Pier 50. There was a second foot ferry leaving at 6:20. In the evening I took the 6:45 ferry back from Pier 50 to Bremerton. If you are considering a passenger only ferry from Bremerton to Seattle for the morning run, returning in the late afternoon, I found that schedule to be ideal for my work hours. I got to work about 7:05 – 7:10 a.m., as opposed to my current arrival in the office around 7:23 – 7:30 a.m. When the Victoria passenger ferry was running I could leave the office around 4:05 and walk to Pier 50 and catch the 4:45. However, if I delayed much longer I would miss the 4:45, because of the number of people wishing to catch that ferry. My only concern with a shift to passenger only ferries would be adequate seating for my return trip to Bremerton. As it is presently, I am up every morning at 3:30 in order to make my connections and return home at 6:30 p.m. It does make for a long day, but could be even longer if I miss my ferry from Seattle. That has happened before. On those occasions I typically roll into the garage around 7:30 – 7:45 p.m.
01/25/09	To the Washington State Ferry Board, I am a widow, 78 years old, who is a constant rider of the Clinton-Mukilteo Ferries. I am dismayed at the proposed reservation system, and wonder if you have any idea of the problems it will create. Yes, I do agree that in times of an emergency, it might be necessary, but this should be considered only in an emergency situation -- not for a regular schedule! My objections are as follows: I frequently must go to the mainland at the UW for medical care and follow-ups. I could imagine making a reservation for my outbound trip, since I know the time I need to be there for my appointments, but coming home is a different matter. I have no idea how long I will have to wait to see the doctor, whether he will require any other time consuming procedures (blood tests, etc.) so my return trip, out of necessity, must be left open, since I have absolutely no idea when I would be finished. A reservation system for this return trip would be hopeless, and probably mean I would have to waste the rest of the day sitting at the ferry dock hoping for a space to get on board. I have had no problem learning to be patient when there is a long line of cars up the hill, since in good weather and especially, in the summer time with so many tourists, that is to be expected. A reservation system would certainly affect the economy of our Island businesses, and many of them, in our present economy, would be forced into bankruptcy since they rely on those summer tourists for their peak profit periods. I have learned to plan around ferry lines, but to have to prepay for a ticket and space for an unknown time of my getting to the ferry dock is ridiculous. Where do you plan to put all the extra cars who were not able to tie down a reservation? Will there be an extra holding pen provided for all of us who live on the Island and cannot make a return reservation? My next concern is my family coming to visit me on the Island. They fly in from Virginia and Utah, and rent a car to drive to the Island. How on earth can they make a reservation, when their flight could be delayed, and upon arrival they would need to pick up their luggage, and get their rental car? Let alone possible rush hour traffic on I-5 that may delay their even getting to the ferry terminal? It seems that this is being rammed through without even a consideration to those of us who chose to live on an island. I understand our Mukilteo-Clinton route almost breaks even, and since our ridership is high we help the DOT pay for those routes who have limited usage. I have no problem with accepting this, but you have gone too far in even entertaining thoughts that a required reservation on this heavily used route might work. Our ferry employees do a great job daily of getting us on and off, and we need a continuance of the present "no reservation, but first come, first serve" policy. I beg you to reconsider this foolish reservation idea, which will affect not only me and my family, but hundreds of people just like me, who depend on the ferry and its schedules. For us, it is as important as I-5 is to the multitudes who travel on it, and the ferry system is an important part of our transportation system. I plead with you that you rescind any fantasies that this reservation system "might work, since it works elsewhere." I am not adverse to change, if it causes an improvement in service. Your Wave to Go tickets are a good example of a change that works. If this required reservation is implemented, it will make my life on the Island much more difficult, and I ask that you drop such a poor idea.
01/25/09	I understand that our ferry system is old, and the cost for new ferries is extremely expensive. I would hope that before any changes are made to the system, everyone keeps in mind that the ferries are a part of Washington State's highway system. They need to be maintained and remain accessible for all during good times and bad. Not only is the ferry system part of our state's charm and history, it is vital transportation for many citizens to use for work, medical care, shopping, entertainment, etc. Continual increases in the fares are hurting the local economy. If more money is needed, the increases should be on the fares of the tourists, not the local residents who use the ferry on a regular basis.

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	The proposed plan to increase fares and decrease runs on the state's water highways are not acceptable. Users fees on the water highway segment of the state highways is not in keeping with the maintenance of a efficient and affordable system. Raising fares will reduce ridership and provides a regressive tax for our fellow citizens. State ferries need the same consideration as the bridges, highways and other public conveyances. Long term planning should include the replacement of ferries and terminals. Although the ferry system is very expensive, it is the #1 tourist attraction in the state and carries tourists to many parts of the state that are not very accessible by roads. I have chosen to live on an island for the past thirty years. At times I have worked off the island but at all times I have needed to leave the island for medical reasons or to travel beyond the state or country. Ferries are only one part of the transportation system, but it is a necessary part of our state economy and aesthetics.
01/25/09	I'm not sure why there is no proposal to buy 5 vessels and keep the service level at the same level. It would seem that would be another alternative. Living in Anacortes and using the ferry to get to Vancouver Island and into the San Juan Islands on a regular basis over the past 30 years, I believe halting the Sidney connection would be a mistake. This Sidney run not only provides transportation, but it also helps maintain a close relationship with our neighbors to the North. It's important to maintain our Canadian relationship. It would also be a significant hardship on Anacortes and Skagit County financially. Please reconsider the options and don't cancel the Sidney run.
01/25/09	My name is Alan Cohen and I live on Whidbey Island. I work as a consultant for the Intercontinental Hotels Group. I commute on the Clinton-Mukilteo ferry for work. I depart on Sunday or Monday onto the mainland and return on Thursday or Friday to Whidbey. My job takes me all over Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia. When I return home, I might have a remote idea about which Mukilteo Ferry I might be able to catch. If I had to reserve a ferry on this route, I would either miss my ferry on a regular basis or be forced to schedule a much later ferry which might have me waiting 2-3 hours on the mainland until by reservation comes up. For this specific route with ferries every 30 minutes and a difficult access and parking issue, a reservation system that works efficiently would be impossible to implement.
01/25/09	After reviewing the Draft Long-Range Plan and attending the meeting held in West Seattle on January 21, 2009, we have serious concerns concerning the current Long-Range Plan pertaining to routes using the Fauntleroy Ferry Dock: Little to no information has been disseminated to the West Seattle community regarding the major revision to the Long-Range Plan, specifically the recommendation to continue sending Southworth ferries to Fauntleroy instead of sending them downtown. We have attended past WSDOT Ferry Meetings in West Seattle and signed up for the State Ferries email notifications about the long-range plan and in the past received notification of community meetings to discuss ferry issues. We received nothing from the Ferries Division about this major change to the long-range plan nor did we receive notification from you about the meeting which occurred on Jan. 21, 2009. We did receive notification from our local community association one week prior to the meeting. There certainly was not enough advance notification of the meeting to reach most West Seattle residents or to give people an opportunity to attend. Our community deserves an opportunity for more input and more discussion before you make a change to the Long-Range Plan that will have such a lasting impact on West Seattle. We ask you to reconsider the change that you are proposing. Do not make a long-range plan based on today's economic climate. Make a plan that best serves the needs, the safety and quality of life of the residents of Washington State. If some parts of the implementation must be delayed by economic necessity, then do that. Do not recommend an unsafe plan due to a concern about funding. The current level of Ferry traffic has a serious impact on the health, safety and quality of life of the residents of West Seattle. Over the years, this situation has continually worsened. The majority of ferry riders do not have West Seattle as their destination, they are just driving through it to go elsewhere. This traffic creates safety, pollution and congestion problems at the Fauntleroy Dock, Lincoln Park and through West Seattle and the West Seattle Bridge. To consider increasing the number of cars passing through West Seattle does not make sense. We walk to Lincoln Park. When the Ferry traffic lets out, it is not possible to safely cross the road, whether you are crossing at an intersection, a marked cross-walk or even a cross-walk with a pedestrian-activated light. It is easy to blame the ferry commuters for not obeying traffic laws. However, the truth is that the system itself has created an unsafe situation. In manufacturing, the best method for a safe work environment is to remove the unsafe

Date Received	Comment
	condition or to engineer a safe solution. It is never acceptable to pretend to have solved a safety issue by telling people to "be careful". Yet, this is exactly what the Ferry Division has done to pedestrians attempting to legally cross Fauntleroy Way anytime there is ferry traffic. The drivers are thinking about getting out of West Seattle, not about the possibility that there may be pedestrians crossing the road. You must come up with a solution which takes responsibility for the unsafe conditions you create by unloading ferry traffic in a residential neighborhood next to a park. To consider increasing the number of cars off-loading at Fauntleroy Dock is irresponsible. You are considering continuing the Southworth to Faunteroy run despite the challenges that West Seattle will be facing in the near future. The City has decided to reduce the number of lanes on Fauntleroy, yet your decision will increase the number of cars on that very road. And, West Seattle will be impacted no matter which option is chosen for replacing the viaduct. Continuing to send Southworth ferry commuters through West Seattle is a plan steeped in 20th century thinking. In the 20th century, we built suburb after suburb to handle our growth. These suburbs were built without mass transit plans, with the thinking that single occupancy vehicles cars fueled by gas could continue forever. In the 21st century, we've learned quickly that this is not a viable direction for our future. We understand from past meetings that future growth will occur largely in the Kitsap Peninsula. If this is true, growth should incorporate the true cost of commuting and reduce the impact by taking riders closest to their destination. The long-range plan must recognize the needs and challenges of the 21st century, and not continue the mistakes of the 20th. The plan must improve safety and decrease pollution by reducing car commuting miles – that means keeping the plan you already had, and sending Southworth Ferries downtown.
01/25/09	Plan A with looking at less costly terminal rebuilding is the best choice. It maintains the state constitutional requirement that the ferry system is part of the state highway system. Also encourages us to drive less and use mass transit. Less traffic on state roads and miles driven by automobiles. Also should consider out of state builders to bid on new state ferries. Plan B is unacceptable. If this is the choice then new bridges need to be built(i.e. Bremerton to Bainbridge Island, Southworth to Vashon Island and even a new cross Puget Sound bridge).
01/25/09	Go with Plan A. Please. Even if it means running a deficit for a few years (things're bound to get better economically) or raising taxes. Riders can handle a 2 percent/year fare raise, probably, but if service is cut we'll end up with more cars on the road, more pollution, and a diminution of the quality of life in the Puget Sound area. I've been commuting from Bremerton to Seattle on the 7:20 run for five years, after having moved out of Seattle back to Bremerton, my hometown. I and many others on the commuter runs rely on the ferries to get us to and from work each day. I'm a Washington native and the ferries have been a part of my life for 54 years. To cut runs and decrease the level of service we have now would be a big mistake, in my opinion.
01/25/09	As one who has travelled the stunning marine highway between Sidney and Friday Harbor countless times throughout the past thirty years, I am particularly bothered by the alarming lack of long-range planning in the Washington State Department of Transportation's so-called "Long Range Plan" draft. "Plan B" is such absolute nonsense that it clearly illustrates just how out of touch Governor Gregoire truly is. (In future I will be actively backing her gubernatorial opponents, as well as supporting term limits for governors.) In 2007 the Municipality of Sidney, B.C. invested $4 million in renovating the dock and surrounding facility after a three-year lease was signed by B.C. Ferries and WSF. Cancelling the sailings so soon after this commitment has been made (by a community of just over 11,000 people) adds to the absurdity of the situation. A more sane approach would be to re-negotiate this agreement; it was likely made under duress due to the impending start of the spring schedule. Perhaps the greatest concern should be that neither plan provides any ferry service between Anacortes/Friday Harbor and Sidney, B.C. during the 2010 Winter Olympics and Paralympic Winter Games in nearby Vancouver B.C. This effectively eliminates an otherwise-convenient conduit of regional travel for tens of thousands of Games attendees and media crews during nearly a month of activities. This is sure to result in inestimable revenue losses to businesses in the San Juans, Anacortes, and Sidney. One only has to look at the obvious swell in tourism that occurred during (and after) Expo '86 and the Commonwealth Games in 1994 to realize what there is to be gained. Give your heads a shake! "Plan B" will save an estimated $9.2 million, but that fails to take into account the direct losses to tourism, jobs, and

Date Received	Comment
	commerce affecting both sides of the route. For me, it will result in a full day's drive in order to reach Friday Harbor from Sidney – the trip now requires nothing more than a scenic 90-minute ferry ride that allows me to leave my car at home. Instead of wisely investing in the promotion of cross-border visits between these neighboring communities, the DOT is wanting to sever the connection-- thereby sending potential visitors around to the remote Olympic peninsula or the already-choked Blaine crossing. This not only decreases tourism through the San Juans, but it also forces more vehicles to take a much longer route – hardly an ecologically responsible choice. While "Plan A" misses the mark in many ways, my family gives it a tentative thumbs-up. Please find the necessary funds needed in order to preserve this very important marine route (others have done so since 1920). To fail us now is nothing short of financial negligence.
01/25/09	Main Comment: Eliminating ferry service in the evening is not an acceptable solution. Many of us work non-standard hours that at times extend late into the evening. It is possible to adjust travel times if the routes are reduced, but impossible if the routes are eliminated.
01/25/09	We live full-time in the San Juan Islands and strongly favor the elimination of the Sidney Ferry run.
01/25/09	We have lived in WA State for 40 years and on Whidbey Island for 3 years.I have never tired of riding the ferries. Whether catching a Southworth or Winslow ferry to go to Sequim to visit my parents, or to the San Juans for a vacation, there has always been a ferry mentality expected of anyone who rides the ferries. It is one of patience. Lines are expected – you bring a book, listen to music, take a nap. When the Port Townsend ferry was pulled, replaced with a smaller boat and the reservation system implemented, we began to hear the stories from retailers about the drop in tourism, about people feeling discouraged about making a short notice trip etc. It was certainly the case for us. We loved traveling to Port Townsend to the delightful shops and restaurants. The reservation system seemed like a hassle to have to call ahead first, so we stopped going. We thought the reservation system to PT was due to the boat size, so we were very surprised to hear the proposal that it be extended to other crossings. I can't think of anything positive that the proposed system might accomplish. It seems like a new layer of bureaucracy to me – more staff to take phone reservations, new machines/computers to log and print them. How do you separate the cars with reservations from those without, in the lanes leading to the ferry. Or will they be 100% reserved. What if I have reservations, become sick, and decide not to go. What if I decide to take someone with me on a trip to the mainland, or someone decides not to go, does this require another phone call, a refund, an additional transaction? I thought the ferry system was part of the highway system. If I lived in West Seattle and decided to go to Bellevue, it would be like needing a reservation to use I-90! Please, please, please, don't implement this system!
01/25/09	We write because of our concern regarding future plans for ferry service to Vashon Island. Neither Plan A or B, currently being considered by the Governor, the DOT, and the State Legislature seem adequate. Option B, would seriously jeopardize the very economic sustainability of the Vashon Business community and those dependent upon it. At a recent public hearing regarding these issues, it was suggested that the high capital costs of necessary ferry boat replacements could be significantly reduced if a regulation were modified, that requires all boats purchased by the Washington State Ferry System be "made in Washington State". Evidently, such law or regulation precludes Federal funding assistance for ferry boat construction. If this situation is indeed the case, we want to urge the repeal of any such regulation or law. While we sympathize with the marine construction industry in their struggle to preserve business, we strongly feel that the economic hardship for at risk ferry dependent island communities far outweighs the economic loss for one or two Washington

Date Received	Comment
	State shipyards. Certainly the Washington State shipyards need to be competitive in construction costs with others in the U.S. Please do all that you can to repeal any such law in order that the Washington State Ferry system might qualify for federal assistance, thereby preserving the economic viability of our island communities.
01/25/09	I am an Upper Fauntleroy resident who fully supports the existence of the Fauntleroy-Southworth route and the expansion of the ferry dock. I think West Seattle benefits greatly from the existence of the ferry. -I commute daily to Southworth. Re-routing the Fauntleroy-Southworth route to downtown would severely complicate my life as well as the lives of the significant number of other West Seattle residents who do the reverse-commute along with me. The Fauntleroy ferry has been a part of West Seattle for many years, and many people have built their lives around its existence (for example: house purchases and job choices). The Fauntleroy ferry allows West Seattle residents to work on the Kitsap Peninsula. -My wife, friends, neighbors, and I enjoy having the ferry in our neighborhood for recreational trips to the coast and Olympic National Park. The quality of life in West Seattle is higher because of this convenient gateway to the Olympic Peninsula. -I know that many commuters from the Kitsap Peninsula spend money at West Seattle businesses. The same is true for many of the tourists who pass through West Seattle during the summer. Removing the ferry from West Seattle would remove many customers and hurt West Seattle businesses, especially in these tough economic times. -Opponents of the Fauntleroy ferry have cited traffic as a reason to reroute the ferry to downtown. However, Fauntleroy is and has long been a major West Seattle arterial. People who live along Fauntleroy bought their homes knowing that the Fauntleroy ferry exists and that the road is a major arterial. -Loss of views has been cited by opponents of the Fauntleroy ferry, but a quick look at a map or at the houses surrounding the terminal makes it very clear that the views of very few homes will be affected by the expansion of the Fauntleroy ferry terminal. Please do not let the wishes of a few people who own waterfront property take away the benefits of the Fauntleroy ferry from West Seattle.
01/25/09	I am writing to you to give my personal comments on the draft Long Range Plan. Draft Plan B will result in a substantial decrease in both frequency of service to the San Juan Islands and available capacity. Plan B does not meet the minimum needs of the Islands' economy and its citizens. While I have not yet seen a schedule showing the implementation of Plan B, it is reasonably clear that Plan B will disrupt severely truck and other commercial traffic to the Islands and will severely restrict our residents' ability to leave the Islands for business, medical appointments, education classes and vacation. Plan B is often referred to as eliminating the "Sidney" boat. This is thoroughly misleading. In the Fall and Spring Schedules, the "Sidney" boat primarily serves the Islands; and in the Winter Schedule, it is wholly devoted to the Islands. The following tabulates the percent capacity of the third mainland boat (the "Sidney" boat) that is currently devoted to the San Juan Islands: Fall and Spring - over 80% Winter - 100% Summer - 25% The following tabulates the percent reduction in total capacity available to the San Juan Islands (Monday thru Thursday) if the third mainland boat is removed: Fall and Spring - 20% Winter - 30% to 40% depending on the boat removed from service Summer - 6% The loss of the third boat (the so-called Sidney boat) will result in an economically damaging reduction in domestic ferry service to the San Juan Islands. In the Fall 2009, Washington State Ferries will have to comply with the US Coast Guard's ban on touring watches. I understand that complying with this ban will result in fewer trips from Anacortes to the San Juan Islands each day and thus will reduce capacity. When Plan B is married to the implementation of the Coast Guard's ban on touring watches, the aggregate effect on ferry service to the Islands will be disastrous. The Islands will lose very roughly 33% of its ferry capacity in the Fall and Spring, a greater amount in the Winter and a lesser amount in the Summer. I urge the focus should be, not on slashing ferry service, but on finding funding sources to sustain a ferry system that can serve the community of the San Juan Islands and other communities in Puget Sound. Potential funding sources are: acquisition of lower cost ferries via soliciting bids for boats outside Washington State, Federal funding for ferry construction, and a reinstitution of a fair Motor Vehicle Excise Tax.

Date Received	Comment
01/25/09	I would like to add my opinion to the subject of the ferry system in regard to the route between Bremerton and Seattle. I believe that the ferry system is part of the state highway system, and should be maintained as such. Many citizens use the system to travel to jobs both in Bremerton and in Seattle. There are goods transported via truckers using the ferry system. Not having the ferry system would impact Kitsap county negatively by slowing down growth in industry locating to Kitsap county. I believe that all the counties in the state provide benefit to the government in the form of business revenue and employment which in turn, gives more tax revenue to the state since people will be able to purchase goods and homes. Do not break this important cycle. Kitsap is a growing county with more affordable housing than King county and needs more businesses to locate here, which will need good highways/ferries systems to keep progress moving forward. Since one of the goals of this state is to get people out of their automobiles, off of our highways, and into mass transit systems in order to reduce pollution, I do not understand why the state is considering not funding the ferry system. We citizens of Kitsap county pay a gasoline tax (that is very high), and our taxes should by used to maintain all aspects of the highway system. The governor is willing to waste big money on a tunnel in Seattle to replace the Alaskan Way viva dock, which is the most costly solution. Both of these situations do need to be resolved so that all in the state are fairly treated. Seattle does benefit from the all the business and employers and employees from the whole state. And lastly, many citizens and tourists use the ferries to travel to Seattle to attend many of the cultural activities that are available. These people spend money at restaurants, retail stores, Pike Place Market, and theaters to name a few. This is helpful to Seattle and the state. That will become less if the ferry system is not kept because some people will make fewer trips to Seattle if they have to drive around, especially older persons that don't drive or do not feel comfortable driving in Seattle. Please maintain the ferry system. It is a positive for Washington. The ferry system is mass transit!
01/25/09	The ferry system of Washington State has been a jewel of the state. They have been safe, inexpensive for passengers, and have covered many routes. The system is an essential part of the transportation infrastructure, vital for commuters, commerce, tourism, and the quality of life of the region's residents. Until the steel electrics were removed from the Port Townsend/Keystone route, the ferries were extremely reliable. Privatizing the system makes no sense. It would be wasteful, would be unlikely to provide the same level of service, would be inconsistent in fares and policies, and would also be unlikely to follow the same standard of labor practices (fairness and benefits) required of a public agency. Therefore I argue for Plan A, with the addition of year-round two boat service between Keystone and Port Townsend. As for the money? Ask the federal government, since they collect an income tax. We need a peace dividend, so let's get rid of the Department of Homeland Security, stop the wars, and use the money for our people, here. It's time to reassess our priorities and values.
01/26/09	I watch that ferry go by my house all the time. I notice it really isn't full at all most of the time. What a stupid waste of my taxpayer dollars. Eliminate this wasteful spending. I can access Canada through the border crossing. We need good service to San Juan island so I can get to the mainland for doctor appointments and supplies.
01/26/09	Do not replace the Rhodie with the Hiyu. Folks on the south end have suffered for years with the already reduced runs. We pay more and we continue to get less. If the ferries are a part of the Marine Highway and therefore Washington state highway system we should apply the same strategy to paving roads in eastern Washington. Small communities are subsidized by larger communities where population density makes up the shortfall. Don't treat the ferry constituency differently than the rest of the state.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	We are long time residents of Orcas Island and Washington State. It is clear that our commerce and life on Orcas Island is highly dependant upon the Washington State Ferry system. We are very pleased that you welcome our ideas and expectations about how to improve basic transportation service to those areas served by the ferry system. Here are some important facts that we urge you to apply to all future decisions about transportation to the San Juan Islands. [] Access to these island is only available by {} small aircraft that can carry a few hundred pounds of cargo and a maximum of six passengers {} charter barge service that very difficult to schedule {} private boat service that is very expensive and has limited capability {} scheduled ferry service provided by the Washington State Ferry [WSF] system This means that we are highly dependant upon the WSF system. This also means that the Governor and all elected officials must develop an official position and attitude that service by WSF system be provided that is equal in cost and reliability to transportation service to any other part of Washington State. This position must include provisions that the fiscal programs of WSF receive funds from the federal and state governments that treat marine highways as equal to land highways. The WSF system can not depend upon toll revenue to sustain the cost of general operations and the expenses of capital development. The simple laws of economics clearly state that when you increase the tolls (taxes) that use of the WSF system will decline. Simple logic and basic lessons of economics verify that if you reduce..yes reduce the tolls, then customer use of the WSF will increase. There are many people who think that a simple solution of the WSF funding deficit is to resurrect a program of huge fees on vehicle license taxes. It is not possible to explain the logical relationship between extreme vehicle license taxes and funding of the marine highway system. With these fundaments in place, we present the following requests to you, to the Governor and to the Legislature. [] Please provide for public analysis the total costs for all salary-benefits-overtime pay-retirement benefits of employees of the WSF system: {} all officers and management employees of the WSF system {} all employees of WSF system on the vessels and terminals {} all contract employees who serve the WSF system [] Please provide information if all current employees and retired employees are entitled to use of WSF without any cost We believe that you are in a stage of denial about the current condition of the WSF system. Think about these basic facts: [] The Anacortes Terminal is a major disgrace to Washington State to America The asphalt paving..most signs..fences..guard rails..rest rooms are in terrible condition What is the cost of basic cleaning and painting and fundamental maintenance. This facility is a powerful example of poor management and failed maintenance. [] The Anacortes Terminal is only an example of your failure to maintain and manage facilities at all ferry terminals. [] The contracts with the unions have damaged and limited your ability for manage based upon a long-range plan Excessive salaries and benefits erode your ability to be competitive and to be cost effective [] The legislative requirement that all new ferry vessels must be built by a company located within Washington State prevents competition. This requirement is not reasonable nor logical This requirement does not allow wise investment of taxpayer revenue [] The physical condition of most vessels of the WSF system is a disgrace. A simple inspection of most vessels will verify the following deficiencies: Most vessels need basic maintenance and repairs The rest rooms are dirty..Most need a major cleaning The seats-windows-walls and floors need major cleaning We can imagine the condition of the engine rooms The employee lounges are cluttered and full of garbage. [] If the WSF system were a private operation and subject to market competition, you would be bankrupt and closed for operation. {} The WSF system does not have a strategic plan based on a reliable funding program to replace existing vessels and repair terminal facilities. [] Most of your programs are founded on "emergency" reaction to problems and crisis conditions. You must develop methods to identify potential problems. You must gain support for reliable funding to resolve these problems. This funding strategy must not and can not be additional tolls or user fees. Conclusion: You must conduct a comprehensive and honest-objective analysis of you operations and make some major changes. There is only one acceptable option. You must manage and operate the WSF system as a business serving the public. If you continue to function as an agency that requires constant subsidy and life-support, then you will fail and cease to exist.
01/26/09	The Department of Transportation has misused ferry money for several years and nothing to show for it! Why is it the ferries are singled out? They are, whether our leaders realize it or not, part of the highway system. Closing down routes or scaling them back, is like closing lanes on I-5 or closing down bridges so they won't need resurfacing or repairing. The whole situation is rediculous to say the least. NO reservation system for the ferries; just more money needed for software and management not to mention the changes in the ferry traffic at the toll booths. The rich get the advantage; those who work or in retirement are penalized if they can't come up with the extra fee!!! Also those without cell phones or computers will be discriminated against. This is just another poorly thought out process by our leaders in hopes of adding more money to their coffers. Ferry people, get real!!! Put the ferries in a higher

Date Received	Comment
	priority than a Seattle tunnel or a floating bridge. This is a huge tourist attraction as well as a highway system for all on islands. Don't cry "no money" now when you have wasted too much already in the past few years with nothing to show for it.
01/26/09	I am against Plans A (as bad as usual) and B (untenable), because the ferries need to be acknowledged as part of a visionary transportation system with robust schedules on all runs, and integrated with other systems (e.g. buses), making a complete system that encourages people to get out of their cars and supports projected growth in the West Sound. I support a citizen's initiative to come up with a Plan C that meets these needs. The ferries are an integral part of the Washington State transportation system that includes highways (marine and road), bridges, buses, bike lanes, trains, planes, vanpools, park and rides, and light rail; all those ways that the state plays a role in moving people efficiently from one place to another. The ferries in particular provide the critical transportation to: Alleviate highway congestion On I-5 between Tacoma and Seattle and Hwy 16 between Tacoma and Kitsap County Potentially alleviate traffic congestion on Bainbridge Island's Hwy 305 by adding service to Bremerton, giving Central Kitsap residents a better option. Provide commuter access from the Kitsap and Olympic Peninsulas to the Greater Seattle area Provide coordinated transportation plan with other systems to get people out of their cars Provide access to affordable housing to the Greater Seattle area Support economic vitality in the West Sound through robust transportation links to the greater Seattle areas. With 1.7 million more people predicted to come to this area, we must be prepared by developing the transportation infrastructure in those areas in the West Sound area that have the most capacity to support increased growth. Provide non-military services to the military bases in the West Sound Support the resource needs of PSNS Shuttling between the Everett base and PSNS Bringing skilled workers from the east-side to PSNS Access to cultural and sporting events from the West-side, e.g., the ferries are filled with Mariner and Seahawk fans on games days. As we enter the 21st century, we need our leaders to envision a Washington that provides a system that gets people out of cars and moving efficiently. According to the WA DOT website, "Public transportation improves the efficiency of our road system." And yet, instead of envisioning our marine highway system as a way to support growth and alleviate existing highway and interstate congestion, a vital cog in the system, our leaders seem to be using marine highways as a standalone operation from which they can whittle away service without ramifications. It certainly doesn't go without notice that when the DOT recognizes a problem, such as the viaduct, they can find the means to tackle a problem. Somehow, our leaders seem to have a blind spot when it comes to ferries as being a vital link in the transportation system. Additionally, we need to recognize the growing need for swifter, more fuel-efficient, passenger-only boats that support the growing need of citizens who are increasingly demanding to get our of their cars, the waste of the off-peak car ferries that have few cars on them, and the growing need to 'green' our impact on the planet. We face challenging times. And challenging times call for exceptional leaders; leaders that can see that those on either side of Puget Sound benefit from a robust transportation system along our marine highways. Plans A and B tell me that those leaders currently don't understand our state's long-term needs, nor the fact that we seek a vision that will get people out of their cars and decrease our carbon footprints
01/26/09	I had planned on attending the public hearing pertaining for the new ferry plan that your office had sponsored on Tuesday, January 6, 2009. I had left my office in Everett at 4:40 p.m. to make the 5:30 p.m. ferry und it takes me only 10 minutes to drive to Mukilteo, I did not get onto a ferry until 6 p.m. That's how my life has been lately, waiting in the ferry line forever. When you access the State of Washington official web site for the Department of Transportation it touts that Washington State has the largest ferry system in the nation. However, it neglects to mention that it does not fund the ferry system properly. If you are that proud of your ferry system, wouldn't you make sure that the ferries are maintained properly and replaced in a timely manner? We have now reached a point where the economy is suffering and ferries need to be replaced urgently. I participated on various occasion with the surveys that were being conducted last year. We had only moved to the island last year and the only reason I considered moving here was because I thought that the ferry system was a safe and reliable way for me to commute daily to my place of work in Everett; now I am not so sure whether moving here was the right choice. The ferries are our highways to our places of work whether it is on the mainland or on the island. The ferries transport tourists to Whidbey; tourists that leave their hard-earned money at the local restaurants, farmers' markets,

Date Received	Comment
	galleries, etc. The talk is about a reservation system. Do I think it would work? No. Would people that intend to visit the island take advantage of a reservation system? Only if the trip was already planned. Spontaneous trips probably would decrease. And what about the commuters? Would we able to get on the ferries in a timely manner? Especially in the evenings? As an example, my workdays including commute are already 12-1/2 hours long – and only if I am lucky enough to get onto the 5:30 p.m. ferry. The ferry traffic has increased tremendously with commuters and commercial vehicles. It is not going to decrease and the state of Washington should consider increasing the ferry runs and not decreasing them. And please don't push that responsibility to local communities. It would not work. I would also like to recommend that building ferries be opened up to full competition, not just to Washington State shipyards, so federal funds could be used to build the ferries. I am all for protecting local jobs but if the budget situation is so dire, we have to look at other opportunities. I would like to reiterate again, the ferry system is no different than the highway system. You authorize funds for building highways and you are not charging tolls yet for everybody who uses them. Residents living on Whidbey Island are already supporting the ferry system with our fares and taxes. Keep the ferry system affordable for everybody.
01/26/09	We moved to Anacortes four years ago. Our decision to locate here was based on the availability of the ferry from Anacortes to Sidney. If you love Vancouver Island, Anacortes is the best place to live and still be an American living in America. We use the ferry at least 5 times a year, at least once with a 30' motor home. Loss of the international ferry could greatly affect the value of property in Anacortes, both residential and business. This could very well extend the present temporary slump in home sales to a permanent situation. Loss of the ferry would be devastating to our community. If changes must be made the future they should involve some type of alternative. That could include higher fares if necessary, a smaller ferry, or a passenger only ferry. In that case, assurance should be made that there is public transportation and auto rental services available at both ends of the run.
01/26/09	Ferries are transportation to assist us to get from point A to point B. Roads and bridges are for the same purpose. My strong feelings are that ferries should be considered part of the department of transportation and funded as the roads are; i.e. part of the budget that funds road projects and maintenance. I do believe that we should pay tolls for them as we do now and as we do for some bridges, however to expect them to be self sufficient and break even in the budget is wrong. The geography of our state is such that even for those of us that live on the peninsula it is not practical to "drive around". Adding more than 50 miles to a trip that will add 10 miles on our vehicle (by ferry), is not environmentally responsible for me and I wonder how the state can justify this in the increasingly "green" expectations we must place on ourselves as well as the decisions our leaders make. I work in Seattle and walk on the ferry and take the bus about 99% of the time. I spend 2 hours each way in this commute pattern. Yes, I have lived in south Kitsap for over 30 years and I chose to work in Seattle, however I made this choice expecting a 4 hour commute each day. By cutting the Southworh-Vashon-Fauntleroy run to two boats will make my commute very unreasonable and I will make other decisions about my career choices. Others will do the same further affecting our economy particularly on the peninsula.
01/26/09	I am concerned that Plan B, if implemented, will cause great hardship to the residents and visitors of the San Juan Islands. It does not meet the minimum needs of the islands' economy, it will severely limit our residents' ability to leave and return to the islands, and it will limit the ability of non-residents to visit the islands. The problem is that Plan B eliminates "the Sidney boat." It is one thing to eliminate service to Sidney, but, unfortunately, the "Sidney Boat" is a major component in the fleet of boats that service the San Juan Islands. For example, in the Fall and Spring, over 80% of the capacity of the "Sidney Boat" is dedicated to the San Juan Islands. In the Winter, when Sidney service is suspended, 100% of the "Sidney Boat" is dedicated to the San Juan Islands. Thus, it seems reasonably clear that implementation of Plan B will disrupt commercial, residential, and visitor traffic too the San Juan Islands, and cause multiple hardships. I urge that the emphasis in the current planning effort not be on cutting service, but in finding ways to sustain a ferry fleet that can serve the San Juan Islands and other Puget Sound communities. Lower cost ferries, constructed outside of the State of Washington using Federal funds, and some restitution of the Motor Vehicle Excise Tax could help.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	I support Jaime Forsyth's letter, particularly her comment about the need for passenger-only ferries. I use the ferries for both business and pleasure, and without the ferry system I would probably stop visiting Seattle. I rarely take a vehicle on the ferry, since I walk or use public transport at the other end. It seems improbable that substituting a few smaller fuel-efficient passenger ferries would not provide more regular service to foot passengers, promote public transport use in Seattle, and be less expensive to run. Like the train system in California, the ferry system will be much harder and more expensive to rebuild than it will be to maintain. Please consider a Plan C--more, smaller fuel-efficient foot ferries with a reservation system for the car ferries. With the recent declines in fuel costs, it would be a great time to lobby for a small gas tax to support the entire Washington State public transport system, including the ferries.
01/26/09	Although I know this was clearly expressed by a number of citizens at the Vashon Island public hearing, it cannot be overemphasized that Vashon Island is a ferry-dependent community. Recent reductions leading to an inadequate existing level of service is already putting pressure on that community. For decades people have moved to Vashon Island, many of us started businesses and families on Vashon Island, in reliance on a functional and reasonably priced public transportation system. Plan B, including the reduction in the number or size of the state ferries serving Vashon Island, will be lethal. The reservation system would be unworkable for us. Please treat and fund the marine highway system with equal respect as the remainder of Washington's transportation system. I support at least the approach set forth in Plan A, though we urge you to draft a Plan A+. Washington's ferry system should not be permitted to wither and eventually die.
01/26/09	As a Monday through Friday rider of the 6:25 ferry out of Edmonds to Kingston fun to go to my job in Poulsbo, coming back daily on the 5:10 out of Kingston, I would hope that you seriously consider another way to cut costs. Perhaps you could cut out some office jobs. Or show us how many assistants are really needed to assist. I frequently use this run at differing times on the weekends also. My daughter and her family live near Southworth and we frequently use that run also. The state needs to look at the ferry system as a water highway and fund it like any other highway. You wouldn't close down I-5 for an hour at a time, to save wear and tear on the highway itself, to be able to cut back on State Patrol time and gas, etc. Please don't assume it is alright to close down any ferry runs. Those on the peninsula need access and really don't want to be inconvenienced by having to wait for boats to appear. Neither Plan A or Plan B is an option.
01/26/09	I am a professional who lives on Whidbey and commutes to Everett 3 days per week. In the 6 years I have been commuting I have experienced multiple ferry rate increases with no corresponding increase in service. I am not happy about the proposed changes in the ferry service to Whidbey, most importantly the Clinton-Mukilteo run, but the Keystone, Port Townsend run as well. Whidbey needs more service, not less. Ferry lines are longer (all year round), I am strongly OPPOSED to a reservation system. I AM STRONGLY OPPOSED TO CUTTING RUNS OR FERRIES SERVING THAT RUN. The terminal at Mukilteo needs a real fix, not just plowing down the Buzz Inn for more parking lot space. Ferry Service, including auto transport, needs to be increased to Port Townsend as well, especially in the summer and around holidays. All of the above is in the best interets of the residents and business owners of Whidbey Island, the citizens of the state that travel to the island or the northern peninsula (and who doesn't?), and the overall economic health of the state depends on a healthy, not atrophied, state highway infrastructure. The Ferry system is part of the highway system and needs to be treated as such. It is vital infrastructure. Monies being discussed for expensive tunnels through Seattle to replace the Alaskan Way viaduct could be spent on new boats, new docks and improved service (think "more boats and more runs").

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	We are in favour of the continued operation of the Washington State Ferry route between Anacortes, WA and Sidney, BC. Our floatplane charter airline has received business from passengers travelling to our area via the Anacortes to Sidney ferry, using Sidney as a gateway to other parts of Vancouver Island. It seems logical that reciprocal business is also travelling to Anacortes or Friday Harbor from the Sidney and Peninsula area.
01/26/09	The decision by the Legislature in regard to the ferry system is exceedingly important. Cutting ferry service from Anacortes to Sydney and not ordering the construction of new ferries is damaging to our state economy. The expenditure of tax money by the Legislature to provide new infrastructure for the state is a way to keep people employed, either in the construction of the ferries or as employees of the ferry system. To cut capital spending at this time is not in the best interests of state residents who are looking for employment. At this time of economic downturn, recession or depression the Legislature should be looking toward the future and using tax dollars for the improvement and maintenance of the infrastructure . That is the best use of our tax money.
01/26/09	I am concerned that low priority is being given to the ferry between Port Townsend and Keystone. The ferries are critical to North Whidbey, but aren't being treated that way. For over a year we haven't been able to visit with family without encountering problems. The ferry can't be depended upon. My sister-in-law who has a very sick sister in Port Townsend is constantly getting stuck when she visits her, or tries to visit her. My family has only gotten together once during the past year. Before the ferries went out, we'd get together once or twice a month. We miss those get togethers badly, but the current ferry is just too undependable. Families with children can't take a chance on getting stranded on one side or the other, due to the ferry not operating. I also worry that we need more than one exit from the north end of this island. Our bridge is beautiful, but old. What happens if it goes out, due to deterioration or terrorist attack? We won't have another option for exit. Kenmore Air just closed it's operations on Whidbey Island as well. The builders keep cutting down trees to make more homes for more people to live here, but what happens if we do have a terrorist attack? Whidbey Island is a likely target with the US Navy here, but the non-Navy residents don't have alternative ways to get off the island, unless they have boats, which most of us don't. Please reconsider your plan to treat the residents of north Whidbey as second-class and expendable.
01/25/09	It is my understanding that WSDOT is planning to reduce ferry service to Vashon Island as a cost saving measure which is needed because of lower than expected revenues form several tax sources. It is my opinion that the state will realize a significant impact in tax revenue from this short sighted tactic. A careful look at demographic population growth charts will show the there is a strong correlation between population growth and commute time to urban centers. Property values on Mercer Island for instance are much higher than on Vashon because of the more convenient commute between Mer cer Island and Seattle. If you look at the population growth on the Eastside of Lake Washington on a population growth timing curve you will notice a explosion in population growth immediately after the original floating bridge was built than another huge spike in population growth when the second bridge (SR 520) was built. You will also notice that property values spiked with direct proportion to the population growth. It is obvious and well documented that property values are directly proportional to demand, and the demand for quality developable real estate is a function of its location. It should seem clear that reducing the value of a location by making it more difficult to commute and travel to and from would have a significant impact on the property values then it seems clear that reducing ferry service to Vashon would place significant downward pressure on property values, and downward pressure on recoverable property tax revenues. The short story is that by the WSDOT cutting of service to Vashon will likely have the opposite impact than that expected by WSDO T, and an overall reduction in revenue to the state. Very simply if you reduce service to Vashon you will save a little money on the cost of ferry service and experience a significant loss of money from reduced property tax revenue. I actually learned about this demographic mombojumbo in an urban planning class at the University of Washington while attending the college of civil engineering back in the 1970's. What I am trying to say is the above analysis isn't speculation but rather it is

Date Received	Comment
	just the way things work and it's really surprising the nice folks at WSDOT didn't figure this out themselves, or perhaps transportation engineers aren't required to take urban planning classes anymore.
01/26/09	Recently I read in our local paper that WSF was considering eliminating ferry runs at night. My wife and I live in Kingston and work in Kirkland and rely on the ferry daily to get to and from work. Many evenings we stay late at work or at events. Using the Seattle to Bainbridge run would make out commute very difficult. I have always viewed the ferry system as being an extension of the highway system. To eliminate runs at night would be like closing Interstate 5 at night to save money. People on the peninsula need the ferry system for our daily operations. Please reconsider limiting our ferry schedules.
01/26/09	The routes I catch are very popular, and ridership has really grown over the years, as I'm sure you know. I suspect you have more potential fare-paying car traffic than statistics bear out because many cars are turned away from Southworth in the morning by the load limits and forced to drive around. The proposed plans cutting service to Southworth are, as I know you've heard, completely unacceptable. We realize the budget constrants you are up against, the poor economy, etc., have taken a toll. However, there must be some way to avoid the devastating impact your cuts in service would make on your riders, their families and employers. I really believe if you explore funding options, grants, and get creative (encouraging more paid advertisements on your ferries for example), you can do better than this. Please keep trying to come up with a plan that respects and provides decent service for the Southworth commuters.
01/26/09	I am saddened and alarmed to hear that the Washington State has plans to eliminate the Anacortes and Sidney run ferry. I feel this would not only have a serious economic impact for both the cities of Anacortes and Sidney but would also diminish the close relationship we have had over many years. I have reviewed the latest research that shows the Washington State region would be at an economic loss if the ferry closes. An estimated loss of 1,470 jobs that generates a 30 million dollar payroll would dry up, reducing the spending dollars that would normally go back into the local economy. There is also an estimated 126 million annual spending throughout the Skagit valley that would disappear since the inbound tourism and business traffic to would be greatly reduced. At a time when job creation and stimulating the economy is a high priority for the both our countries I feel closing the Anacortes ferry would be counterproductive and have a very serious impact on both the Sidney and Anacortes economies.
01/26/09	Plan A and Plan B simply do not address the critical problems facing those of us who use the ferries as part of our highway system. And they are part of the highway system. Please consider a blue ribbon panel to address the ferry system as a whole with a focus on why we only buy ferries every 40 or so years and why the legislature should address the restriction of WSF purchasing only ferries made in Washington State. The latter restriction is clearly part of the molasses and inordinant purchashing cost of new ferries. It needs to stop. Miles of highways in eastern WA and other parts of the state are supported and maintained. The same needs to be true of the ferry system

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	1. The aim should not be to have fares make the system close to self-supporting. It is a marine highway and deserves tax support as does any other highway. 2. Whidbey's run tends closer to paying its own way; it is not fair to have it go through service shrinkage and fare raises to unduly support the rest of the system, though the whole system has some internal obligations to each route. 3. A partial reservation system might be fine--just not a total one. Whatever system must favor residents who commute over tourists, etc.
01/26/09	My comments on the long range plan are brief. Plan B SUCKS! Beyond that, I think it's crucial to the communities (especially the island communities - I live on Whidbey Island) served by the ferry system that service not be curtailed. If that means ferry fare increases, so be it. I've travelled enough to know that our ferries are among the least expensive anywhere. If a reservation system is necessary, it needs to be fairly simple, and there needs to be a mechanism so that last minute trips (not just emergencies) to the mainland (or return) can be accommodated. There are times something comes up and it's necessary to head accross the water so some spaces need to be reserved for these instances (perhaps half the spaces). Last, as I recall from past fare hearings, Whidbey Island is one of the most used routes and provides the highest return to the system from fares - 90% if I recall. In any case, it seems ludicrous silly to reduce service on routes that nearly pay for themselves. An equitable fare structure that requires that xx% of costs be covered by fares on any and each individual route should be implemented. The state needs to determine what portion of the costs should be borne by general transportation funds - as taxpayers we deserve some level of support from the state. I do think it's fair to share (not unload) the costs of terminal/loading facilities with the communities served by ferries. The formula, however, could be very sticky to develop. I guess the comments weren't so short after all. The ferry system has provided exellent service over the years and any form of privatization is absolutely out of the question. Seems to me the only problem is that we've deferred maintenance and upgrades because we didn't want to pay higher taxes or fares. It's time to bite the bullet and pay up.
01/26/09	If you cut our ferry service (to the mainland and Sydney BC), we stand to lose more than 50% of our potential visitors (and more importantly, their money/our island jobs). That's a pretty big hit for our specialized island economy (not to mention the loss for Anacortes - the gateway to the San Juans). We'd be back to the 1960's & 70's, when much of the traditional economy of farming, fishing and seafaring had dwindled to almost nothing (ah, those were the days). From the San Juan County Economic Development Council's 2007 Economic Almanac (http://www.islandway.org/almanac.htm)... "Tourism also drives other economic elements: real estate sales and investment, home construction, and retail sales and services for outdoor activity in the county's natural environment (eco-tourism before it was popularly named as such)." Of all the times to make a decision to cut service to small communities, this is not it. Please implement Plan B
01/26/09	For many years I have felt that Wash State Ferry System has ignored many good ideas that would help the system. The concept of using a 3,000 lb token (car) to reserve a place in line to catch the next ferry has been a big disadvantage to the traveler. The time of the traveler would be better spent arriving in time for the ferry with a place assured on the boat that fits your travel plans. Airlines, hotels, and other services accommodating travelers have all figured out how to implement a reservation system. Your parking lots for the (vehicle tokens) or having people leave and come back when the parking lot is not full is a waste of travelers time, as well as, your capital facilities construction and maintenance dollars. The implementation plan in the proposal should be shortened to one year for all facilities. Borrow from lessons learned from other ferry and airline reservation systems. Lease or purchase a system, with a guarantee of performance, and get a good team together to implement it. The lead times for advance reservations listed in the report appendix look like a good starting point. However, I feel that 25% of the sailings to the San Juan Islands should not be reserved more than two hours in advance of the scheduled departure time to allow for travelers who arrive at the terminal and do not know about the need for a reservation. You can also have a standby line for some and those that missed their sailing reservation. Also, the frequent traveler ticket fare price should be available for payment of the fare plus a small surcharge to get a reservation, and not just the full fare (especially summer rates).

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	I am writing to urge the review panel to reject plans A and B. I read an article from 9 years ago last night in the Seattle times reporting all the same ferry problems we have now. No progress seems to have been made if we take that as a loose litmus test. Some observations as a PhD in business and with international developmental economics training (free--don't need to pay me millions like those consultants): 1- Increasing population and ridership does not logically lend itself to cessation in service or boat reductions. 2- Regional waterway interdependency creates entwined economies. Necessarily then, directly tying ridership/floatership sustainability to increased not decreased service. (It's called priming the pump economically speaking). 3- Legal mandate and equitable treatment of taxpayers probably compels continuation if not expansion. WSF historically chronically over serves Bainbridge Island at the expense of other riders' experience, other areas' economic growth and ironically ultimately, WSF's own prosperity. 4- WSF designs almost exclusively around a driving ridership, with singular focus on dual purpose boats. Sadly, if WSF had pursued its plans mentioned in this article 9 years ago--build electric class replacements, add passenger only more logically timed departures, pursue cat or foil service from Bremerton through the passage--this situation would not persist. Tantamount to the monorail fiasco in Seattle of a decade of knowing and voting on an issue but doing nothing, WSF now faces the same challenges with same boats, same routes and larges same people it faced in 2000. Perhaps this is due to a staffing system built upon patronage and union entitlement versus skill and urgency--perhaps this is because Olympians do not ride the ferries. Irrespective of cause here we are. It makes little if any sense from the aforementioned economic stimulus, principle and mandate of service, WSF mission, or actual ridership needs to pursue plans A or B. Build boats replacement boats but of varied body types Increase mono-use vessels Intersperse BI and Bremerton with foot only Invest in cat service/foil service Treat all tax paying riders equally--A $600k house in Silverdale or Gig Harbor or Port Orchard, is the same tax provision to WSF as a $600k home on Bainbridge Island.
01/26/09	I live in the San Juan islands and have been reading about Plan A and Plan B and would encourage you to pursue Plan A but with some modifications. Reducing the number of new boat purchases would, in my opinion, be very short sighted. It would be far better to divert funds from terminal improvements and purchase the higher number of boats sooner rather than later. We can live with antiquated terminals, but can not live with antiquated, unreliable boats. The majority of people going through the Anacortes terminal remain in their cars while waiting, and even though the terminal is old and not in very good shape - I would venture to guess that almost everybody taking the boat would prefer a newer, faster boat than a newer terminal. If 10 boats are needed, then 10 boats are needed. Delaying or stretching out procurement times would only delay the inevitable - and would probably result in higher costs in the future and higher operating expenses while running the older boats. Why not replace all of the boats as soon as possible (say in 5 years) and worry about the terminals later? If one or more of the current fleet were taken out of service like the old steel ferries last year - the impact could be significant. It seems like we are just "playing with fire" by continuing to operate such an old fleet. Also, replacing the Elwah with a smaller boat would severely impact the San Juans and should not be considered. One additional point regarding the funding has to do with the requirement that any new ferries be made in WA. From what I understand, this is preventing us from obtaining Federal funds and if so, this requirement should be changed. Granted it is a good thing to try and keep jobs in WA, but to do so at the risk of having the fleet further deteriorate - impacting all of the passengers using the boats does not make much sense.
01/26/09	After visiting the San Juans for several years, my husband and I very happily became permanent residents on Lopez in June of 2008. Though we don't have years of experience here, we have quickly realized to what extent the ferry service governs the culture and economy of the Islands. We're very concerned that if a reliable stream of capital funding is not found in the near future to maintain and replace the aging ferries in the system, the result will be the beginning of a downhill slide that will negatively impact every aspect of island life. I think all SJC residents realize that living on an island involves some tradeoffs. We enjoy the natural beauty, outdoor opportunities, and friendly communities, but know that in return we are agreeing to spend some time in the ferry lines, plan our shopping needs carefully, and pay often significantly higher prices for goods and services. If these pluses and minuses stay in balance, living in the islands is a viable option. If the number of ferries decreases and the cost of fares continues to rise substantially, that may no longer be the case. These are some of our concerns: 1. Local businesses, especially those who do business on more than one island, have eloquently expressed their fears that if the inter-island ferries disappear, they may no longer be able to afford the time or fares to travel between the islands. If they have to cut back to just their home island, their businesses may not continue to be self-sustaining.

Date Received	Comment
	2. If the delivery trucks that come from the mainland face longer wait times and higher fares, the price of every item sold in the islands will increase, to the point where some will not be able to afford to continue living here. 3. A reservation system may indeed be needed, and can help with wait times for the above businesses, especially those who have more regular schedules and routes, but it will likely make it even harder for those who cannot always plan their trips in advance. The fares for vehicles longer than 20' feet are already extremely high; how much more will the owners of the big semis be able to afford before they say, "It's not worth it?" 4. We have excellent schools in the islands. In order to maintain them, we need to attract more families. This requires affordable housing (already a problem,) but also employment and business opportunities. Reliable and affordable ferry service is a vital factor in people's decisions to move and start a job or business here. Families also need to feel they can afford to leave the islands during vacations to provide additional educational and recreational opportunities for their children. 5. A career as a ferry Seaman is an excellent opportunity for Washingtonians. I am aware that people have varying views of the role of the unions, but I think it is important that a good number of young men and women continue to have access to the training and career advancement opportunities the ferry system offers. If ferries aren't replaced, there will be less incentive for people to enter the ferry service. These jobs are important. 6. Tourists will continue to come to the islands – as long as they can afford the trip, as long as the ferry leg of the journey is a reasonable and pleasant process, and as long as there are enough activities and services on the islands to make the trip enjoyable. It's all tied together: if the ferries are fewer, if the prices are higher, if fewer people can afford to maintain restaurants and shops on the islands for the tourists' enjoyment, the downward spiral will begin. These are difficult economic times. The money just isn't there, and painful choices have to be made. There are agricultural, fishing, logging, big city and tourist-related interests all vieing for the same diminishing revenue sources. I think we all realize that for the short term there will have to be some sacrifices. But for the long-term, an economical and viable ferry system for the State is vital to it's continued economic prosperity. We must find a way to build the new ferries. If the timetable has to be moved back a little, that's one thing. To permanently decrease the number of ferries and make permanent cutbacks to the service, is a self-defeating proposition for the whole State. To help come closer to Plan A, I believe we should: A. By act of the Legislature, remove the requirement that ferries only be built in WA, thus opening up more possibility of federal funding B. Aim for sustainability in the ferries' operating costs, but admit that fares and the current dedicated funding will never be able to provide the capital stream needed to build new ferries C. Work to convince the Legislature that ongoing capital funding for new ferries must be found in some way – whether it is by diverting funds from other sources, finding a way to replace the funds that used to be provided by the car tax, or finding more creative and efficient ways to manage current resources. A few ideas I have heard expressed as ways of utilizing the existing ferries more fully would be: 1. Letting environmental or educational groups rent portions of the passenger lounges (esp. in the off season,) for floating classrooms. I'm sure both island and mainland residents would be willing to pay something for this type of activity. Power Squadron or Coast Guard Auxilliary classes could also be offerred on the ferries instead of limiting their activities to one island. Often classes offerred on one island can't be taken by those on the other islands because there is no ferry that can bring them home in the evening. A ferry class would solve this problem. 2. The past several weekends the Evergreen State has sat in Fri. Harbor for the whole weekend. I don't know the reason why, but if this is a planned and normal event, couldn't the ferry be made available during that time for weddings or other group events? (Obviously there would need to be the appropriate management and controls of these kinds of activities.) 3. What about an occasional "craft fair" on a ferry? Vendors would pay for space, and walk-on passengers from Anacortes and the islands could enjoy the ride and visiting the booths. Other fund-raising activities could also lend themselves to ferry use. The larger ferries with the upper passenger lounge seem like a good venue for this sort of thing. And there are surely other ideas of this nature that would also work. The funds generated wouldn't build new ferries, but they could help with operating costs, as well as enhancing the image of ferries as fun places to be.
01/26/09	I am a regular "walk on" commuter on the Edmonds - Kingston run. I ride the first boat in the morning and the 4:30 or 5:15 boat in the afternoon. I recognize that the system needs to economize. I am not opposed to reducing late night service on this route and am also not opposed to the reduction of service on other routes where ridership does not support the level of service. I believe strongly that for the economic well being of the region, commuter hours of service should be maintained. A decrease in car ferries with the difference made up in passanger service, with a corresponding linkage to public transit is an option that I encourage you to consider.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	The ferries are an extension of the highways. They are not a separate entity. Highway money should be used to fix the ferry problems as highway money does to fix and replace flooded roads etc. When the roads washed away just recently, our portion of our tax dollars was used to help fix the problem. This problem is not ours. It is a problem for the highway and the responsibility should be shared equally. This proposal will hurt the Whidbey economy by hurting Whidbey business of which we are one. We operate the Uhaul. You will see more businesses closing their doors with the added reduction of customers coupled with the already sagging economy.
01/26/09	I am writing to express my thoughts AGAINST the proposed closing of the Anacortes-Sidney Ferry, as a Canadian resident and business owner in Sidney, BC. I would like to see the ferry saved and Plan B scrapped, i.e. retaining the route in its present form, though compromises would be an acceptable option failing this (see B). This past year has seemed like the "perfect storm": high gas prices, a poor exchange rate (for Americans), fuel surcharges on the ferry and many consumer/trade items, and now the economic and banking crisis in both countries - and should be considered a poor basis for closing the service. As an owner of a Bed and Breakfast, it was quite evident that Americans were not traveling as much last year as in the past. For my part, I did travel to Washington State on several occasions to price sailboats, to go shopping, to visit family in Seattle, and to take 2 vacations departing from SEA-TAC airport. {A} Reasons for saving the route: 1. The economic impact on Anacortes/Skagit area, such as outlined in the Hovey Report, etc. 2. Better economics in 2009: lower gas prices, more favorable exchange rate (for Americans), alleviation of the financial crisis as a result of the US Gov't spending packages. 3. Infrastructure spending proposed by President Obama and Prime Minister Harper 4. The Olympic Games in BC in Winter 2010 5. To act as a stimulus to the economics of Sidney and Vancouver Island,BC (in a reciprocal fashion). The Ferry route is critical to my small business and to a myriad of other small business here. 6. To facilitate future development of the Sidney/Gulf Islands waterfront by American interests here, such as the New Marine Centre, Sidney Pier Hotel and proposed Sidney marina development - which would have considerable appeal to US citizens. e.g. See http://www.newmarinecentre.ca/contact.htm 7. As a service to the marine and recreational boating community. Many US citizens moor their boats in the vicinity of Sidney. 8. To facilitate transportation of goods to the Island and trade with the West Coast of the USA. For instance, something like 95% of our food comes from the mainland and I would assume that in the winter much of that travels from South to North including many food/consumer items: (tomatoes, oranges, wine etc). Also with Seattle having a major container port, it would make sense to me that some of that freight should move on the Anacortes ferry, which could be promoted by WSF. 9. Greenhouse gas reduction: The use of aircraft to move people and goods produces many times the amount of CO2 as a ferry and vehicular traffic for a given weight. 10. Faster access to Washington state and Seattle for Vancouver Island residents and vica versa, bypassing the abominable line-ups at the Blaine-Vancouver border crossing & BC Ferries. {B} Compromises To Explore: 1. Running the Anacortes Ferry in the summer months only, if not feasible to run year round. Most of our B&B business is in the summer months. 2. Explore more convenient departure times for the existing WSF ferry: start from Sidney (7:30 am) arriving at Anacortes at a time more convenient for Seattle residents (say ~9:30am) for a return trip to all islands and Sidney around ~12 noon). Second trip in late afternoon/evening (assuming 2-3 hr crossing time). 3. Explore a routing via Port Townsend, as I understand this route is also in jeopardy. Or share the boat between the two routes. 4. Explore code-sharing routes with BC Ferries. For instance, it might make sense for BCF to run their Pender, Saturna Island ferry out of Sidney to connect with the WSF Ferry at San Juan/Orcas Island, or for WSF to connect with BC Ferries at Saturna. This would preserve the existing Customs infrastructure etc. 5. Consider asking BC Ferries to run a ferry from Sidney to the US (Anacortes, Bellingham or Blaine) using their existing Pender, Saturna Islands ferry.
01/26/09	Please don t eliminate the Sidney-Anacortes ferry run. I live in Friday Harbor and have been taking this ferry for 22 years. All of my family lives in Victoria and I go over there often. If the ferry was cancelled, my only option would be to drive up through Blaine, cross the border there and drive to the BC Ferry terminal. I have done this trip before (in January because the ferry wasn t running) and it takes about 6 hours-provided there are no waits at the border and both ferries-plus the cost of gas. In total about $250.00. I can walk on to the International boat and buy a round trip ticket for less than $20.00. Usually, I take my car, which is only a third of the cost of doing the wsf-bcf trip. Please, please, please continue the Sidney-Anacortes ferry run.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	I tried to read your plan online, but the format was unreadable. From what I have read in the paper, you basically want to destroy the ferry system so that more money can be spent to turn the Alaska Way Viaduct into a tunnel, thereby rewarding Seattle developers at the expense of, basically, everyone else but especially ferry riders. Perhaps if you hadn't wasted millions on that idiotic pass card system, you would have more for actual ferry expenses. From what I read, the worst proposal is to get rid of night service at Kingston. I live equidistant from the Bainbridge and Kingston ferries, but always take the latter. The approach to Colman dock is almost impossible if you are coming from the north. I doubt things are going to be any better when they start work on the Viaduct, and probably a whole lot worse. It makes sense to me to have the downtown terminal handle more foot traffic and shift car traffic to Edmonds and Fauntleroy. I did not see anyone who represents the Kingston users (Christine Rolfes is a Bainbridge person even though she technically is the representative for North Kitsap). Since Kingston and Bainbridge pay more of their share than any other run, they should suffer the least in service cuts. Ferries may be subsidized, but probably a lot less than other mass transit or little-used roads in Eastern Washington, so lets treat them fairly.
01/26/09	Please do not cancel the Sidney/Anacortes Ferry. It provides an important economic and cultural link between our two countries. This ferry service has always represented the best of our two countries' commitment to remaining close neighbors and friends. In these difficult economic times we must keep the pathway for business and cultural exchange open and encourage our countries to continue to build good relations. This key transportation route provides a convenient and vital linkage between Vancouver island and Washington state. It is a important part of the tourism linkage and will be very important to both our countries during the 2010 Olympics which while being held in Vancouver, are certainly more regional in scope and will benefit greatly our friends and neighbors in Washington State.
01/26/09	Eliminate all consideration of a reservation system. It's not worth the trouble. It will engender no end of complaints. It discriminates against ferry users who have no cell telephones, no internet service, and no credit cards. It is inappropriate at a time when public telephones are hard to find. It will add an expensive extra layer in the WSF bureaucracy. It probably will not significantly reduce the number of cars in holding lanes. Forget reservations! Before implementing any changes in WSF operations or capital projects, let's wait to see how much federal funding we may expect under the Obama Administration. Our representatives in Congress may be able to persuade the Administration to look kindly upon us, perhaps in the context of an infrastructure renovation program and/or a program to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. In the minds of many who live on the mainland, Whidbey Island is viewed as a shabby-chic, cutesy sort of place inhabited mainly by rich people. They view us as some sort of lapdog, not to be taken seriously. The truth is, we're an enormously diverse group of tax-paying, working people just trying to scratch out a living in difficult times. WSDOT's prioritization of ferries substantially lower on the funding list than the highway system reflects that unfair perception. If cutbacks and increased user fees on ferry service are necessary, then let such measures be imposed equally on the rest of the state transportation system! Treat us equitably. Consider wider application of tolls on highways and bridges. Consider making RFID systems available statewide. While gasoline prices are low, edge gas taxes a tick or two upward.
01/26/09	Voicing an opposition of 3 family members to changes to Mukilteo-Clinton run: no reservations, no service cutbacks, this is a commuter run, not a tourist run.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	As part of PSE's service obligation, we are required to maintain and reinforce our electric and natural gas systems as the need arises. New growth increases demand for energy and natural gas services and associated infrastructure. All of this requires PSE to be particularly responsive to all service needs. PSE must have the ability to access and maintain safe, immediate and reliable service to our customers. This work requires us to utilize Washington's transportation infrastructure, including the Ferry system, to reach our customers throughout the Puget Sound region. The Ferry system is considered a major regional transportation thoroughfare and any reduction in service would have a negative impact on PSE's ability to quickly respond to our customer's needs. PSE respectfully requests that you do not approve a Long-Range Plan that eliminates, downsizes, reduces, or closes any Ferry service, as your Plan B Option describes as an alternative to reduced funding. PSE is particularly opposed to reduced service to Whidbey Island, as these eliminations would, without doubt, cause delayed response times in the event of an outage, taking our crews longer to mobilize to the site in need of service. In regards to your plan of installing a reservation system PSE also requests that you add an alternative to your plan by, at a minimum, providing preferential treatment to critical infrastructure emergency response crews, such as our electric and natural gas crews, so they will be able to board a ferry without a reservation. Not having the ability to allow our emergency response crews to board a ferry would cause delayed response times in the event of an outage, taking our crews longer to mobilize to the site in need of service. As you continue to develop a Long-Range plan, we strongly urge you to carefully consider the complexities associated with the significant use of the Ferry system by PSE. The Ferry Division should place a high priority on assisting PSE to provide continuity and uninterrupted service to our customers in western Washington.
01/26/09	I am urging you to reconsider the WSF draft long-range ferry plans (both A and B). I realize that tough economic times demand tough choices, but these plans are punitive and ill-conceived, limiting a community's lifeline to jobs, medical care, etc. As a Vashon resident, I strongly urge you to keep the ferry system equitable and affordable for all, and to search for further options.
01/26/09	The ferry system is part of the highway system just as bridges are part of the highway system. I found it odd to read that the proposed plan evaluates the number of riders who were using the ferry system on "discretionary trips". Has that assessment been applied to the people who drive along I-5? The number of people who travel over the Snoqualmie Pass? How about Stevens Pass? How much money is spent keeping those passes open? Do the "discretionary trips" that people make over the bridges and passes diminish the State's desire to maintain the bridges and passes? What percentage of trips on any of our roads or highways are "discretionary"? And what qualifies as a "discretionary trip"? Apparently anything that doesn't involve work or school. So, going to help out a disabled friend who is in desperate need? Discretionary. Seeing a medical specialist who practices only on one side of the Sound? Discretionary. How about maintaining family connections? Of course, that's "discretionary". Its certainly not important to The State. Pretty much anything that is human is "discretionary." Sadly that says a lot about our current government planners. They have come up with a plan that would make a room full of robots very pleased with themselves. When the government decided to spend four billion dollars to replace Seattle's Alaskan Way Viaduct did they poll the drivers to see what percentage of the current Viaduct drivers were making "discretionary trips"? How about the users of the new proposed tunnel? What percentage of traffic through the tunnel is projected to be "discretionary trips"? It is ludicrous to ask how the ferrys should be funded. They are part of the highway system and should be funded from the highway funds. If highway funds are short then raise the revenues. That's part of the responsibility of the government. Do your job. Eyman's I-695 initiative won the popular vote mainly because of the heinous car tab tax. And even that wouldn't have been so unpalatable if the payments would have been stretched out over the year. But to be hit once a year with that huge payment was just too much of a shock to people's budgets. Smaller, incremental taxes work better. Raising the gas tax a few pennies is one of the best bets. It discourages waste and rightfully penalizes people who buy gas hogs. It is a win-win tax. The state government took over running the ferry system because it recognized the economic importance to the State of developing the peninsula. It wasn't a theoretical exercise. The ferry needs many years ago were being met by a hodgepodge of boats we all know as the "Mosquito Fleet". Recognizing the importance of having an organized, reliable ferry system the state wisely took over the enterprise. With that takeover comes the responsibility of fully maintaining the routes. We ask that you honor that responsibility.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	I have lived on Whidbey Island for over 17 years and while population has grown so have the lines to the ferry. I have also seen what appears to be an exodus from Whidbey Island which I attribute to the poor ferry service. There was a point in time that people could easily work off island and live on island. This is not the case anymore. This is time to increase service and not decrease service. I see new bridges and bridges expanded and the ferry system is like our bridge. It is WSF's responsibility to improve our transportation service not make it worse.
01/26/09	This letter will confirm that I am definiotely against either one of these palns as they do not sincerely address the needs of the SW community in any way, shape or form. Firstly, there should not be a "reservation" system for all those daily commuters who go across twice daily. rather, there should be a "pass" to be shown to the collectors which allows passengers to move freely from time to time plus allow vehicles priority boarding as they are daily commuters. making those people make reservations is ludicrous. Should you be asking all the car commuters on the 520 bridge to make reservations? What about all the trucks lumbering up the I-5 corridor? Should they have to makr reservations to use the highway. The ferries are a huge part of our transpotation infrastucture and thus should have the same kind of funding and advance planning as the asphalt highways. Why is there such a distinction being made between the 2. It also happens to be the largest system in the US so why has there been such a lag about getting new ferries built? Oh yes, some legisltaors made it mandatory that all ferry vessels be built here in Washington State. What kind of stupidity is that. That is counter-productive when all sorts of shipyards across the nation could be competing for those contracts???? I simply do not understand this mentality. Washington State should be studying how other states operate thir ferry systems, even looking into the BC, Canada system. The Department of Transportation is remiss in its fiduciary responsibilities for not having a contingency fund allowance for purchasing new vessels and the fact that the Keystone-Port Townsend route is in jeopardy is all due to this lack of due diligence. We need to reverse and repeal whatever legislation was passed concerning the production & purchase of new ferries being limited to Wa State boatyards alone. No resrvations Repeal legislation and open bids to the entire national chain of boatyards Review ridership & consider passes for daily commuters Find funds for new ferries immediately.
01/26/09	As someone from another state agency that works with many committees and citizens locally to sustain economic development in the San Juan Islands, I can't stress how important it is to maintain the existing level of service for transportation to the mainland (Anacortes). There could be efficiencies gained with a reservation system, using all higher capacity boats (140-160 cars) year-round. This will both fill the need to take products to the mainland (Ag products) and get people to much needed medical appointments, drivers license exams and other special services that do not exist here. A reservation would help those of us that live and have businesses here a lot. One Sydney ferry in the summer (not two half-full ones) should handle most of the international traffic. Thanks for the opportunity for input.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	First I would like to encourage WSDOT to request that the vehicle registration fee legislation that Tim Eiman put forward and Washington State voters passed be re-evaluated and whatever measures need to be taken to reverse the measure by the Senate Transportation Committee as this seems to be the number one problem with finding adequate funding for transportation needs across the state. I would happily pay higher vehicle registration fees to help pay for the services that we need across the state. Washington State Ferries are not a luxury, they are an integral part Washington transportation systems just like other road ways, bridges, tunnels etc. The costs of maintaining the ferries and needed infrastructure should not be the burden of ferry riders alone. Secondly I would like to state that I am against the Option B Plan as it takes out a ferry that is critical for the existing inter island and Anacortes run but also eliminates the international run to Sidney, B.C. The economic impacts to all of the communities by elimating this run appear to outweigh any potential savings. Also, I think we are forgetting that key to our sense of place as a regional community defined by water-the Salish Sea- is the strong international relationship we have with our close neighbors in Canada. This relationship is both key to our economic and cultural integrity. Eliminating the ability for the public to easily cross the border to our friends in Canada changes the flavor of who we are as a people and creates hostility and barriers. We need to be working with Canada to solve critical economic and environmental problems that we both share being dependent of the health of our marine ecosystems. We need to be able to work together and do not need the barrier of transportation to be yet a further obstacle.
01/26/09	It is extremely disturbing to us as a family that the planned fees for the ferry are so extremely high. My husband, Paul Wasell is a Superintendent for a Commercial Construction Company based out of Bellevue and has been commuting on the ferry for 10 years. He has been with the same company for more than 20 years. When we first moved here 10 years ago, our ferry costs every 2 weeks were $95.00. He uses the frequent user pass which has now gone up to $184.80 every 2 weeks. That is $369.60 per month. That's a few dollars short of double our original costs. We are a family of four on one income and these costs have already been a terrible strain on our family and we just can't see how we could afford anything any higher. Being a construction Superintendant ~ getting to the job isn't as easy as "just use public transportation" "or you've just got to get people out of their cars" like use a bus or van pool, etc.... He is expected to have a large tool box for the job on his truck and has to commute to different job sites. He does not have just one particular transportation route daily. There is no possible way to carry this truck tool box onto a bus or in a van-pool and traveling between jobs, the head office and suppliers and sub-contractors offices would be impossible without his own vehicle. I would like to also point out that we did not vote yes for Tim Eyemans initiative on reducing vehicle license tabs that took away some ferry funding and helped cause our costs to sky-rocket. We voted no and think his initiative was and still is ridiculous. We would also like to point out thate we cannot deduct these expenses as job costs on our taxes. I don't know where the commission thinks that any family can afford almost $400.00 a month for ferry costs and then ask us for more. Who can afford this? Driving around the Peninsula and going over the Tacoma Narrows from Poulsbo when the ferry is 5 miles from our house would make things an extra long day so we have continued to pay the high cost. My husband and I are up at 3:30 a.m. every morning. I run our family farm here in Poulsbo. He leaves by 4:45 a.m. to catch the first Kingston ferry across to Edmonds and drives to the job site from Edmonds. He's usually not home until 6:00 p.m. every evening sometimes later, depending on ferry traffic. None of his fellow employees live here in Kitsap County so commuting and sharing costs is also not an option. As you can see there are many important reasons why my husband commutes on the ferry and many reasons as to why public transportation is impossible in his job that he's had for 20 years. We find this situation with the Washington State Ferries to be more than apalling and would like to see the State and the Commission come up with solutions that don't bludgeon family budgets in Kitsap County. This is wrong and we are tired of taking the whole brunt of this problem on our shoulders. These are not Kitsap County ferries ~ these are Washington State Ferries and the citizens of Kitsap can't pay by themselves to prop up the State Ferry System. They are not Bainbridge or Vashon or Whidbey/Clinton ferries they are Washington State Ferries. Something else must be done to help our hard working citizens overcome the challenges. We can't do this alone and it's wrong for the State and The Commission to keep asking for more.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	I work in Bremerton three to four days a week, taking the ferry from Seattle to there. Now, I took my position based on, in part, ferry access. I hope that if there are any changes to the route that you ensure that those who depend on the ferry have access to a private ferry, etc. to close whatever gaps you create by limiting service. In other words, as a state-run/financed (in part) agency, you need to consider the needs of people you currently serve. If you cut off the 7:35 a.m. ferry from Seattle to Bremerton, you must make sure (however you decide to do this) that the private ferry picks up that slack.
01/26/09	Please remember that the ferries are part of the state highway system and treat them accordingly. If major highways like I-5 or 405 were falling apart and could no longer accommodate traffic they would be fixed ASAP. I am tired of driving on these freeways and seeing constant improvements with signs saying "your nickel at work". Where's the nickel for the ferries? We live on Whidbey Island and rely on the ferry every day for commuting. I don't want to be forced to make reservations because my commute time can vary depending on how late I work. It should come as no surprise to the DOT that ferries and their terminals must be maintained and replaced. Stop treating the ferries and their users like second class citizens with deep pockets. Take care of the ferries like the rest of the highway system.
01/26/09	My husband and I are retired, but often go to Tacoma for medical appointments, visits to take care of my husband's 90 yr. old mother and most recently, for visits to my dying sister-in-law. The idea that you would even consider putting the Hiyu on that route permanently is gross negligence! I would suggest you subscribe to the WSF alerts since the Hiyu is currently on the Pt. Defiance/Tahlequah route. From late afternoon (around 3:30pm) on, we receive notices for a need to arrive anywhere from 45 minutes to 1 1/2 hours prior to a given sailing on the Pt. Defiance side. At least WSF have dropped the "due to heavy traffic" in their alert - we all know it is just the usual traffic, but due to the small boat, the ferry system cannot accommodate the cars. Twice in the last week, my husband and I went to catch the Tahlequah ferry 1/2 hour to 45 minutes prior to the sailing and each time had to wait for another boat. I am currently undergoing medical treatment in Tacoma and must consistently go wait for an ealier ferry in hopes that I will catch the one I actually want to take. Even when the Rhododendron is on the route, if you want to come back to the Island on the 2:40pm ferry, you must arrive at Pt. Definance no later then 2:20pm. People are always left behind on that boat. And with the Hiyu being even smaller, over 1/3rd of the people waiting don't get on. We very seldom use I-90 or 520, hardly ever drive I-5 and have NEVER driven the farm roads in Eastern Washington. Since they do not want to pay for MY highway system, does that mean that I no longer have to pay for THEIR highway system? I will be happy to pay for THEIR highway system when I use it! If you cut my highway ferry system by 1/3, does that mean I will get reimbursed through my taxes? If you do not know or can't imagine the impact to this Island if you cut services and put the Hiyu on the Pt. Definance/Tahlequah route, please, please subscribe to the WSF alerts - that will give you a clear picture of the problems this will create. And I haven't even touched on the medical problems cuts in service on both ends would create, nor have I touched on how idiotic the reservation system idea is!
01/26/09	Restore the vehicle tax. Its simple and can be made more market sensitive to used car value vs tax amounts. It would generate almost twice what it used to based on the number of vehicles. Certain vehicles could be mileage only tax basis. I think it s the best solution to all your problems.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	i live here in anacortes, and i didn't believe all the hype about how much money the area would lose a few years ago when there was a big push to save the sidney run and i sure don't believe it now.....i'm in favor of plan B..... plan B for the whole area.....it makes the most sense!
01/26/09	If the ferry is truly part of the state high way system, then ferry fares can be likened to road tolls. If that's the case, then ferry fares should—to be fair—be a reasonable, flat fee, per car. As a family living in the San Juan Islands, we have to pay extra for each additional family member in the car, which is in itself an astronomical $28 per trip. That means that I cannot afford to take my children with me (even at a reduced rate) to visit the mainland for errands. Since my island does not have a doctor, mechanic, hardware store, or even a gas station, that is a lot of trips off island for which I have to either find a babysitter or bring my children along and pay for their presence in their car. It isn't fair. I pay taxes to support the state highway system but am charged disproportionately to use my portion of them—in other words, the ferry.
01/26/09	We are very concerned to hear that plans have been made to implement the reservation system on the Clinton/Mukleteo run. We have taken the Keystone ferry & the reservation system may be working there only because of the long interim between crossings. On the C/M run with the high volume of cars and the frequency of crossing you would not only be adding the burden of making reservations for each crossing, you'd be adding to the processing time at the ticket booth thus compounding the problem, esp. at peak times. Many of us cannot take a bus because our trips involve multiple stops and appointments. By fining people who are unable to keep their reservation, you are creating a situation whereby drivers will feel the need to increase their speed in an attempt to meet their reserved time. Our son who lives in OR would find it difficult to visit us at our home because of the difficulty in trying to estimate the time he'd be arriving. At present, he arrives between 30 - 120 minutes later than expected due to traffic. He'd prefer to take the Keystone ferry, but hasn't been able to because of the inability to estimate his arrival time at the ferry. Please, please do not adopt the reservation system.
01/26/09	When we consider that the Ferry from Anacortes to Friday Harbor and Sidney as a State Water Highway to Canada, I believe it should receive the same considerations as keeping SR 543 open into Canada. Since the demand for travel between the U.S. and Canada will continue to increase over the next 21 years, we should be willing to continue the investment in both our water highway into Canada, as well as the Blaine Truck Crossing on SR 543 into Canada. In reviewing the 2006 Skagit County Economic Development Association Study it is also documented that the related economic benefits from this ferry run also produces a good return on our investment, when related to the cost of operations. I believe that if we wish to remain a viable economic neighbor to Canada, and an International draw for tourism we must continue to finance this ferry with convenient and affordable passage into Canada.
01/26/09	First, I am rather tired of hearing about how voter approval of I-695 is the cause of our current mess. That is water under the bridge. It is the job of the state legislature to find the funds needed to run the ferry system, a responsibility that they have found easier to blame on the voters. I-695 was rightly passed by the citizens of Washington to eliminate a bizarre way of funding important state services, where the value of your car was somehow tied to funding things like education. A more appropriate way to fund transportation services, would be to raise the gas tax. This is fair and appropriate and also spreads the cost to those who do not live in the state but use state transportation resources. This is an issue I will also raise with my district representatives. Second, as a semi-regular ferry user, I fully expect my fare price to cover the operating costs of the ferry system. I believe that a more equitable way to charge fares is based on size/length of vehicle, since it seems pretty strange for someone driving a small car to pay the same as someone driving a full-size truck that takes up two spaces. I do not however, expect my fares to cover the cost of new terminals, new boats or other capital expenses. Those are part of the highway system and should be funded like any other major transportation project. I also do not support a reservation system. We need less bureaucracy, not more. Lastly, I cannot imagine why with projections for ridership to

Date Received	Comment
	increase, you would be planning on reductions in service. Perhaps we should also consider shutting down I-5 at night, or the floating bridges on the weekends to save on wear and tear of those surfaces and structures. Certainly usage of those state resources are expected to rise as well?
01/26/09	I still don't understand how the idea of a reservation system even makes sense on a island in which so many residents commute off island daily to work. A person such as myself, who's departure time is usually the same, but who's return boat is not might suffer in such a system. True, I have decided to purchase a home on an island, and I am therefore subject to the ferry schedule. However, I always knew that I had the same chance for a boat as anyone else that took the Fauntleroy-Vashon run. With a reservation system, I'm concerned that my varied return time to Vashon would increase my commute time even more. I work in Bellevue. I'm subject to whatever traffic is on the interstate as well as the West Seattle Bridge, on to the ferry terminal. I don't see how a reservation system is going to help a commuter like me, who works late some days and not the next, who has appointments off-island that don't allow me to schedule my return home. I feel I will be penalized by your proposed system. It seems for the reservation system to work, you will have to change the behavior of those served, regularly, by the ferry system. How are you planning on doing that? Won't customers continue to queue up regardless of their reservation time? What else will we do with that time if we have already arrived at the ferry terminal? I'm not going to go to Starbucks or Tulley's for a coffee just because my reservation is not a boat 45-60 minutes later. I'm going to get in line. That's what we do. I don't see how the reservation system would actually reduce the queues. I've read through some of the posted documents, and I just don't get it. I'm not sold on the reservation system. I'm also not sold on traffic from Southworth being completed diverted to downtown Seattle. Unless you increase the runs on the south-end run for Vashon, I don't see how redirecting ALL Southworth runs to Seattle will be beneficial. Sometime I actually drive all the way from Tacoma to Southworth (when traveling from that area) to get on Vashon (due to the schedule at Pont Defiance, and the small boat on the run). What about the people that work in Kitsap Peninsula? What if someone wants to work on the Kitsap Peninsula and lives on Vashon? This would restrict island residents such that they could not work in the Kitsap Peninsula without having a hefty commute. If I were teaching at the Junior High School one mile from the Southworth ferry terminal, I would have to leave my job. It is unacceptable to reduce access for residents of Vashon to areas to which they have traditionally had access. Peoples jobs could be at stake, and their choices in employment. The "Strategies and Server Level II" plan makes no sense.
01/26/09	The "Plan B" that was presented on Vashon Island on 2009 January 7 is simply unacceptable. It would adversely affect the lives of those living on the island, and the economy of Puget Sound as a whole. Groceries and other goods that are trucked onto the island will go up substantially in cost as the vendors will factor in their wait times. Many suppliers may choose to not deliver goods to the island altogether. The wait times that reduced service would impose would force many who commute to mainland jobs to move off the island. As the ferries were in the WSF's care when the Coast Guard inspected them and found several to be improperly maintained, why is it that Plan B imposes cuts on service to those people who kept up their end of the bargain? Islanders and other Puget Sound residents have paid their required fees with the understanding that WSF would maintain the fleet and provide at least the level of service it had the previous years. While I-695 had a significant impact on the ferry system's funding, it's evident that the ferry boats identified by the Coast Guard should have been better maintained or even replaced before the passage of I-695. Where is the streamlining of the WSF management? If removing the restriction that new ferry boats must be made in Washington will lower the cost of acquiring those ferries, please remove the restriction. Last year, when the Rhododendron was out of service at the South End of the Vashon Island, there was a substitute boat provided for the weekend and NO BOAT for most of the following week. I had heard that the WSF had provided the substitute boat on the weekend because of its higher profitability for WSF since there would be more travellers paying full fare rather than the discounted frequent user rate. I hope that this was just a rumor. I'd like to remind WSF and the Washington State Dept. of Transportation that regulated monopolies are held to a higher standard of providing service, that while operating efficiently and economically are key goals, all routes must be provided adequate transportation and not just the most profitable. Phone companies are not allowed to forego providing phone service to those who live outside the metropolis because the cost of running phone lines to them is more expensive. The ferry system is part of the highway system of Puget Sound and of Washington State. It must be maintained and brought up to 21st century standards, not allowed to degrade into a totally inadequate system. Plan B is not acceptable.

Date Received	Comment
01/26/09	It makes no sense to cut back service on the Mukilteo-Clinton run, one of the few that is profitable. Reducing the number of runs during the summer would be devastating to the Whidbey Island economy, which is largely dependent on tourism. Summer brings long wait lines as it is. Whose bright idea was this?
01/26/09	First, I'd like to say that I generally support WSF and its employees, and I believe that overall they are good people trying to do a difficult job. I've grown up on ferries, I enjoy conversing with WSF staff, and I try to give the organization the benefit of the doubt whenever I can. I want WSF to succeed in their mission to provide high-quality ferry service as part of this State's highway system. Given this, I am disappointed with a number of things in the current plan. Most of all, I'm disappointed that the plan presents a "Plan A" which provides unacceptable levels of service, and a "Plan B" which is worse. The legislature directed that WSF's plan provide the highest level of service at the lowest possible price. Neither Plan A, nor Plan B, addresses the demand increase over 22 years, predicted to be as much as 40%. The two plans seem to compete to find the best way to provide the lowest level of service, given the forecasts in front of us. In this way, these options fail to complete the task given by the legislature. I have a Bachelor's degree in Economics, and a Master's Degree in Business Administration. I understand all to well the economic conditions we are currently living in. But this plan addresses the ferry system over 22 years. We will almost certainly have 2-3 economic growth cycles over the length of this plan. Therefore, we should not be presenting options that assume the next 22 years will be a snapshot of the problems facing the 09-10 biennium budget cycle. Therefore, WSF should provide a third plan, which would adequately address forecasted increases in demand, and assume that funding constraints will not always be this severe. Plan A should represent a modest midpoint between the two alternatives. There should also be key milestones identified, where the legislature may have another opportunity to better fund WSF. For example, Plan B calls for "Small Vessel #1" to enter service in 2021. The plan should identify the last reasonable date the legislature could decide to purchase larger vessels instead. This approach should also be considered with regard to terminals. I've reviewed the proposed terminals in Edmonds, and Mukilteo quite closely, and I don't understand why these plans couldn't be broken into phases, with funding for some components coming in later years. Parking garages, extra vehicle holding areas, and elaborate transit connections could be packaged as "Phase 2" and funded in a few years, when the state has a surplus. In the interim, we could build bare-bones terminals which would accomplish the goal of having multiple vehicle docks and overhead loading for Mukilteo. The fundamental problem with WSF is that it is a 50-year proposition with a 2-year master. There is no political incentive to fund WSF long-term, but the procurement and replacement of boats and terminals requires long-term commitments. Millions of dollars are wasted planning and re-planning, designing and re-designing, all on the changing whims of the legislature. Meanwhile, the rest of our highways are adding capacity. There are no proposals to close the south span of the I-90 floating bridge because the state is short on cash. Snoqualmie Pass doesn't crawl to the legislature to request replacement snowplows every 2 years. There are no proposals that people in Chelan be charged for peak-period driving. Garfield County isn't being asked to take over the maintenance of Highway 12 from the State. There are no other highways in our state with signs saying, "Reservations Required, 3-7pm." As citizens of the State of Washington, we pay taxes to ensure that any one of us could drive from Metaline to Neah Bay, if we so choose. Following highways built and maintained by WSDOT, this trip is 508 miles and takes us between the Northeast Northwest corners of our state. On this trip, the only place we would pay a toll is on the ferry from Port Townsend to Keystone. This ferry is part of the state's system of highways, and saves us 100 miles of driving on this particular trip. The operation of the ferry isn't cheap. The North Cascades Highway isn't either. Nor are the deserted roads along the northern border, which

Date Received	Comment
	only see a handful of drivers on a typical day. But these all make up a system, which will transport us throughout the state if we ask it to. Like bridges and mountain passes, they are vital links that connect our lives. Unfortunately, you don't have to rip up concrete to take this system away from us. Regular ferry users know this better than anyone. Highways are repaved or expanded every 5-20 years, but ferries and terminals last 50 years or more. This has made it easier for the legislature to procrastinate on the commitments WSF requires, and now it is distorting the facts around the big decisions that must be made. I urge legislators throughout the state to recognize that WSF is an important component within a system we all use. In some ways it is unique, but its purpose is common. It is a highway, a tourist attraction, and the most efficient mass transit system in our state. It deserves and requires a dedicated, reliable, and adequate funding source adequate to meet the needs of its users.
01/26/09	We purchased our home more than six years ago with the intention of moving to Vashon to raise our young family. Thanks to the failures of the Washington State Legislature, we are now struggling to keep this dream a reality. We have three young children and one parent commutes off-island to work. The skyrocketing costs of the ferry system that have all been passed on to the consumer have made Vashon a very expensive place to live. There was no logical reason to repeal the car tax. The rest of the State's transportation infrastructure benefits from taxation, why shouldn't the ferry system? Changes need to be made in the legislature to reflect that the ferry system is indeed equal in importance to our State's highways and should have a permanent funding base other than ticket sales. The other issue I have with the ferry system is lack of service. Plan B, as many have already so eloquently put, should be destroyed immediately. It will not work for Vashon and should never have been offered as a legitimate choice for the legislature. I am also concerned that even if Plan A is adopted, the Governor has called for the Hiyu to become permanent on the southern route due to budget constraints. My husband commutes daily on this route to Ft. Lewis and has already had to deal with the Hiyu whenever the Rhody is out for maintenance or repairs. This is not acceptable. The waits each evening to return home are between one and two hours. In my mind this is equivalent to shutting down the 520 bridge for an hour or two each night and we all know this would never happen. Why is Vashon so frequently treated as the "poorer" stepchild of the ferry system? Lastly, as I mentioned we have three young children. The oldest just turned six last year. I have tried to calculate what the cost of returning to the island will be for our family when all of our children are over age six and it is not a pleasant thought. I have never understood how the ferry system can on the one hand equate our fares to a "toll" on a highway, and on the other hand charge for each passenger in the car. I have yet to go through a highway or bridge toll system that charges for each person in the vehicle. I do realize that our family chose to live on Vashon, but we made this choice with the assumption that the State was going to keep its side of the bargain and not force the system to be completely dependent on fare collection. The State must come up with a permanent source of funding to subsidize the ferry system
01/26/09	Parking at the Anacortes terminal: Why should we pay the high fees when we are commuting with several different people? Metro transit commuter lots are free. Why should we have to pay these high prices to use these lots when we are walking on the ferry and leaving our car behind. The food service is horrible. Can't you find someone who can make a go of it? What have you learned from the British Columbia Ferry Corporation? It always balances its budget - and its ferries are newer and in better overall shape. The ferries (e.g., M/V Queen of New Westminster) built in the early sixties are now being retired and sold. That would be like selling the M/V Elwha and the M/V Kaleetan. Passenger decks. Have you ever been on a BC ferry? Even the smaller vessels have a minimum of two outdoor passenger decks. It's a great warm weather experience. The passenger decks on the Issaquah and Evergreen class vessels are a joke. It makes for a lousy riding experience. Who was the Einstein who designed the decks on these vessels? Obviously, he or she had never traveled on a ferry. Let's not make the same mistake again. Alcohol prices should be reduced and allowed to be consumed anywhere on the passenger decks. You would sell more beer and wine and make money. Sell advertising in the ferry schedules! This is a no-brainer! BC Ferry Corporation does it. Why don't you contact them. Have you purchased a ticket at the Tswwassen terminal? Those people and that system are super fast. How come you have not researched the benefits of that system? Better load balancing. How can BC Ferries communicate on its web-site the minute by minute percentage capacity for its next sailing? This information impacts how people use the vessels efficiently. We are fortunate that one of the world's largest ferry systems is located just two hours north. You need to camp-out in its office. It It is doing a relatively good job. Finally, it is unrealistic that Frank Chopp, a Seattle resident, is going to be open-minded about the necessity for clean, improved facilities and newer vessels and sufficient service in the Islands. This is our highway. Seattle gets 520 and we get the ferries. Thanks to state law, private enterprise cannot provide service. So the state has to step-up. Frank needs to take it out of the Seattle or Tacoma area DOT budget. Traffic may

Date Received	Comment
	be bad in Seattle but it pales in comparison to the traffic at the Anacortes terminal on a summer Friday afternoon and in the Islands on Sunday.
01/26/09	The situation that WSF is now in is regrettable. What can be done to fix this and not only maintain but improve a valuable part of Washington State's transportation infrastructure? The answer should be simple--approve Draft Plan A as soon as possible. Draft Plan B is plainly not acceptable. Are we closing down highways or reducing interstates in the name of mass transit? Public mass transit is a wonderful thing and should remain a viable option for anyone residing in a metropolitan area. But the automobile will continue to be the mainstay of transportation in the 21st century. Plan B is either the result of poor management or an underhanded attempt to hobble WSF. Whatever the reason for Plan B--it likely will continue the decline of WSF. A diminished ferry system can only diminish our state. Give the people what they want and what they've paid for--a marine highway system. Yes it's expensive but it's an investment in valuable infrastructure. New ferries and new terminals will serve the transportation needs of Washington residents and visitors for generations. It will create jobs. What's wrong with ushering in a new era of Washington State shipyard work? Look at another iconic PNW experience--the Seattle Viaduct. Is it a great experience to drive north-bound on that elevated highway? Yes. But does the function of the Viaduct serve Washington residents and their transportation needs? Not any more. That's why the tunnel pick is sound. Even though we will lose that drive and pay an arm and a leg it's the right choice. The guts it took to make that very informed decision gives me some hope that Plan A is the future for Washington State Ferries
01/26/09	I live on San Juan Island and am dependent on the ferries much as the rest of the state is dependent on the highway system. Our ferries are part of our unique cultural and an icon of the state. I do not support Plan B as outlined in the draft long range plan. I believe a true long term view should seek to improve the operating efficiency of the program as a whole. In a time when we are working so hard regionally to improve relations and on transboundary issues with our Canadian partners, the end of the Sydney ferry run would be a mistake. If anything, we should be seeking to find ways of facilitiating communication and partnerships across the boundary, particularly with Victoria as the political seat. As a citizen of Washington State and San Juan County, I also support my county council and ferry advisory committee's recommendations listed in their comments and letter to you dated January 13th. Please do not proceed with "Plan B." Between the two options I support "Plan A," but would strongly prefer to see a renewed effort at planning and streamlining the existing program.
01/24/09	While I am in favor of the CONCEPT of reservations, I am concerned as to how it will affect van pools. I have attended a couple meetings and NO ONE can give me an answer. I have been a manager of an Island Transit Van pool for 9 years commuting to & from Seattle. We are scheduled to be on the 4 pm sailing from Mukilteo to Clinton every afternoon. Due to the varaible of traffic conditions(our van starts from south Ursula St, stops at 1st & Marion in downtown Seattle, makes a stop at the Lynnwood P & R, and then arrives at the Mukilteo terminal between 3:50 & 4 pm. I am concerned that if we are running closer to 4 than 3:50 what happens to our reservation? At what point is it voided? (for the Keystone Pt Townsesnd you have to arrive 45 minutes early to insure your reservation). Does it carry over to the next ferry? Or do we have to take a "stand by" at the end of the line? There are several van pools that go to & from Seattle from Whidbey and we would like answers.

Date Received	Comment
01/24/09	Here is a quote from a Jan. 22. 2009 Seattle Times article in their Travel / Outdoor section. How very sad that the information about ferries in this article is so negative -- not only does it cost Whidbey Island visitors who choose non-ferry destinations, but it costs the State of Washington when tourists choose other desintationst they can drive too instead of paying a ferry fee (leaving empty winter boats) because they are told publicly that "avoid a long wait". Shame on the State of Washington for not fixing this problem years ago. http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/outdoors/2008654756_nwwfreeland220.html Catch an early boat Whidbey is a popular tourist destination. Ferry lines can be long, especially on spring and summer weekends. Catch one of the early Mukilteo-Clinton ferries to avoid a long wait. Crossing time is about 20 minutes. Follow two-lane Highway 525 north past Langley, and turn right at a large sign that says "Freeland."
01/26/09	I originally wrote this fuel analysis last September to illustrate the possibilities that are out there to amend WSF schedules to address the USCG mandate for "Crew Endurance Management" which is the current catch phrase for the crew fatigue standards instituted after the Exxon Valdez incident. At a fundraiser before the election, I hand delivered this analysis to the Chairs of the Transportation Committees and explained our situation in regards to this federal scheduling mandate. After looking at the numbers it was Judy Clibborn who asked, "Why aren't we already doing this?" Copies of this letter have been sent to WSF management and I handed a copy to a Governor's aid after a very brief explanation of the scheduling issue while she was riding across the sound on the Wenatchee shortly before the election. I have attached the original letter above. As for the accuracy of my numbers, they were derived from a report written by the WSF Port Engineer's office and I have heard that my rough analysis has been passed around that office without negative comment. My rough fuel savings numbers were designed to be conservative on purpose. I am not an engineer and do not have the nuanced statistical mind to verbalize fuel consumption curves while accelerating and decelerating. A more accurate report containing charts and graphs "with circles and arrows on the back of each one" is probably available from WSF but it might not be easily grokked by the layman. The bottom line is that those last two "top-end" knots of speed are very expensive. As state employees we are all stewards of the taxpayer's dollars and we may be able to do better serving the public interest by slowing down a little thus saving a substantial amount of money and pumping considerably less pollution into the atmosphere. Scheduling the Seattle/Bainbridge boats to leave the dock on the hour would be less confusing for our customers and the additional few minutes in port would not only allow us to conduct more meaningful crew training, but also allow the cabin crews to keep the boats a little cleaner which is the ferry system's biggest source of complaints... a win/win for everybody. It is my understanding that WSF Management is held in a tight box regarding what they can and cannot do without direction from the Transportation Commission and the Legislature. Unfortunately this is a handicap when trying to be flexible in meeting the needs of the system. This is partially why we were granted an extension on the USCG scheduling mandate until September of 2009 and it probably is also why we are now looking at Plan A, Plan B and hopefully Plan C as regard to the long range funding. Slowing the boats down and adjusting the schedules a bit is just one possible tool in the box to meet our goals. I have only worked for WSF for 3 years. However, I am learning that due to continual funding shortfalls, we have been robbing Peter to pay Paul for quite a while now and it is imperative that we fix the money issue. The situation is indeed dire however I believe cutting service will not be a viable long range answer when our own studies tell us that ridership demand will rise as the Peninsula develops. The notion of cutting jobs on the vessels is ridiculous because the manning levels are mandated by the Coast Guard and the Code of Federal Regulations. To keep vessel labor costs as low as possible WSF already mans its vessels at the absolutely lowest possible number based on the USCG safety requirements and personnel contracts. The USCG piles addition regulatory requirements on our crews every year and it is extremely expensive to train and certify all these people. We also have an aging workforce. I was told yesterday that the median age of the workers on the ferries is 56.7 years! How long can we sustain that? I don't know... Our job at WSF is to move people and commerce across the Sound in a safe, efficient and reliable manner. In my maritime career I have sailed all over the world and been part of many complicated marine operations. WSF is without a doubt the most complex (non-military) operation I have ever had the honor to be associated with. All the bad press surrounding the occasional snafu not withstanding, the people of WSF both in the office and on the vessels do an amazing job keeping all the balls in the air while moving all those millions of people and those billions of dollars of commerce around the Sound. Washington State Ferries is not just an iconic tourist symbol for our state; but a lifeline for commerce in the Puget Sound region. I honestly don't know what the final answer will be for the Long Range Plan but we really do need one. It must be multifaceted and include funding for operations, capital projects both ashore and afloat, address unplanned contingencies and maintain our aging workforce. I am hopeful we will see a viable

Date Received	Comment
	answer soon and it is my belief that people smarter then me are working on it... If you have any questions please free to contact me. If I don't have the answer, I am pretty sure I can point you in the right direction. Saving Fuel Dollars and Reducing Greenhouse Emissions WSF is currently considering schedule changes to meet a USCG mandate for compliance with the Federal Crew Endurance Management standard. This compliance must be completed by September 30, 2009. There are many crew scheduling scenarios on the table. Some of these may actually save the state some money. Of particular note, is the concept of reducing vessel speeds to conserve fuel. The following estimates are derived from the "Jumbo Mark II Underway Basic Fuel and Emission Information" report that was put together to support running the ships on two engines vs. three. This data is available in amazingly great detail from the WSF Port Engineer's office. If you slow a Mark II down from 18.5kts to 16kts while running on two engines, the fuel savings can be in excess of two million dollars per year (per ship.). Slowing the boats down to 16kts adds about 3-4 minutes to a 30 minute crossing. I used the following formulas and assumptions to arrive at these figures. A Jumbo Mk II burns 389 gallons/hr at 18.5kts on two engines (165 shaft RPM). This same ship burns 266 gallons/hr at 16kts on two engines (140 shaft RPM). This is a fuel savings of 123 gallons per hour. Ships on the Bainbridge run operate an average of 19 hours per day, about 340 days per year. In order to be conservative with these estimated numbers, I used 16 hours per day running time to compensate for in-port pushing the dock, speeding up and slowing down. I realize that the data is available to be more accurate but I am using these estimates for demonstration purposes only. This is a rough analysis. A more comprehensive report can be requested from the WSF Port Engineer's Office. 123 gallons saved per hour X 16 hours/day X 340 days/year = 669,120 gallons/year. At $3.00 per gallon, fuel savings = $2,007,360 per ship, per year. At $3.25 per gallon, fuel savings = $2,174,640 per ship, per year. At $3.50 per gallon, fuel savings = $2,341,920 per ship, per year. Although we have no way to predict exactly where fuel prices will go this formula demonstrates that for every $0.25 bump in price, slowing these vessels down to 16kts creates an additional $167, 280 in fuel savings. A Jumbo Mk II produces 8,786lbs of greenhouse gasses and particulates per hour at 18.5kts. The same ship produces only 6000lbs at 16kts. Using the same formula and assumptions as above, this is a reduction of 2,786 lbs of greenhouse pollutants per hour or 17,997,560 lbs per ship, per year. To make this number easier to understand, 17,997,560 lbs/2000 lbs = 8999 MT (metric tons) of greenhouse gasses and airborne particulate pollutants not released into the atmosphere of Puget Sound. If we were to slow the ships down to 16kts, Have departures from Bainbridge and Seattle every hour on the hour, we would continue to provide the needed capacity, make better use of the capacity that we have, save the state millions of dollars per ship per year and reduce the level of pollutants pumped into the atmosphere of Puget Sound by tens of thousands of Metric tons per year. This savings estimate is just for the Jumbo Mk II class ships. There are three of them. Multiply the above savings by three then ask yourself, "what data is readily available for the other classes of ferries?" This is a no brainer... Why are we not already doing it? Any long fundraiser letter.doc range plan for WSF funding should include an analysis of potential fuel savings.
01/26/09	Please remove the proposed cuts in ferry service to Vashon Island from further consideration. My husband is a public school teacher. He currrently gets up at 4:25am to catch the only ferry that can get him to work on time. He spends at least 3 hours a day commuting. We have a two-year-old son and another baby boy on the way. We cannot possibly afford to sell our house and move off-island right now, so we are at the mercy of the ferry system. Please help us.

Date Received	Comment
01/16/09	It is with profound regret and frustration that we are writing still another letter to WSF. We have written many in the past to WSF, to State Representatives and to the Governor. We have gone to meetings held here on Orcas Island and been in contact with our County Commissioners, Council and the Ferry Advisory Committee. We just can not seem to get our plight of being a ferry dependent community understood or taken seriously by the Legislature or WSF. We have read the letter that our present County Council and FAC has written to you and agree with their assessment and endorse their letter. Once more we are faced with the real threat to our access of the state's highway system and the mis-management within the WSF. While we know that precious revenue was taken away from the Wa. State Transportation System and WSF by I-165 (which we did NOT vote for) we also can see how it seems to have affected WSF more so than public works projects within the state as a whole. The WSF responded by having ridership pay for operational costs through increased fares and decreasing service. We agree with all the concerns expressed in the letter sent to you by our Council and the FAC and reject Plan B. We are operating on a less than acceptable way at the present time but we are at least coping with it. To take another ferry from the present run would be a terrific hardship. It would reduce us to just 3 ferries in fall, winter and spring and 4 ferries in the summer. Eliminating the Anacortes/San Juan Island/Sydney run would have a very real impact on the mainland capacity of island traffic. The Council states that 80% of the capacity in the off-season is assigned to domestic service. Plan B does not provide an emergency backup vessel for more than 5 years which is unacceptable nor does it address increased capacity in relation to vessel replacement. We still find it incredible that the WSF decided to scrap the 3 Electric Steel Ferries without public comment and for the ridiculous sum of 500K. We feel that the cost of building one new ferry would have most likely paid for all three of the ES ferries hulls to be replaced or re-enforced. To scrap those ferries seems like a terrible mistake and waste of tax payer monies. To make a decision of this magnitude also seems like a dis-service to the islands and runs dependent on those ferries. Plan B will further economic hardship for the San Juan Islands. We already are feeling the impacts of the financial crisis. It will create major hardship for islanders who must rely on the ferries. Plan B does not seem to take into consideration that we are totally ferry dependent. There is not even an Economic Analysis in Plan B! We rely on goods and services being delivered to the islands. We rely on the tourist industry to provide much of our economic needs. There is also not a transit system in place that adequately serves the islanders or tourist nor is there adequate parking solutions for walk-ons or for leaving cars on the mainland. Plan B assumes that some reduction in ferry capacity would be absorbed by passenger ferries operated by local entities rather than by the state. That is something our small economically strapped county could not possibly provide. We would also like to go on record as being against a reservation system that would impose a fee. We would love to have a reservation system NON CHARGE for islanders but we don't see how that could be implemented. When we go off for a doctor's appointment we usually try and cram in visits to friends and shopping. To try and figure out which ferry we might make on the return would be very difficult to figure. It is a 5 to 6 hour ordeal or more to just get off Orcas Island and back when you take into consideration the time you must wait to make sure you make the ferry you need to leave on, the travel time and the wait to return. We are tired of hearing "that's the price you pay for living in paradise". We are a retired couple living on a fixed income. Jim bought this property in the early 80's and retired here in 1987. We started building our log house out of 200 trees that blew down in the 90/91 wind storm by HAND. It is a hardship to live here especially with health problems arising and surgeries needed. Is it simply WSF stance that we should just sell our property we have worked so hard to develop and move to the mainland because of the increased cost and hardship of getting to and from the mainland? The passengers using the ferries pay for 70% of the operating costs. This is not a viable or workable situation. It is our State Highway. It is up to the state to provide us transportation instead of penalizing us and transferring the cost to run the system on those who live here or visit here. We also urge the WSF to continue to provide inter-island travel free of charge. There are many residents who do not work on the island they live on or must travel to Friday Harbor for other needs. In closing we hope you will reject Plan B and take our County Council and FAC letter to heart. Please realize that we are a ferry dependent community and county and are subject to different needs. It is time that the WSF and the State Legislature take this into consideration. Please have some realization of the economic hardships that Plan B would create. Please do not take yet another ferry from our route. Please consider our plight!

Date Received	Comment
01/21/09	I support eliminating the Edmonds/Kingston "multi-modal" project. I support keeping the ferry terminal in Edmonds in its present location and having the ferry system work closely with the City of Edmonds to adequately re-design the current holding facilities to a) improve traffic circulation, b) reconfigure parking facilities to allow cars to park in line without idling or moving on crowded days while waiting for multiple ferries, c) improve access for pedestrians to the west side of the railroad tracks, and d) centralize and coordinate bus/ferry/train facilities, which are already only within a few steps of each other. Please do not spend more millions to move the ferry. It's fine where it is: we only need to adjust better to it.
01/25/09	You just have to know that a "Reservation system" on the Clinton Mukilteo run is fraught with problems. Will it make any real difference if you know how many riders or cars are expected for any particular run? Would you cancel the boat if it was not full?, and still pay the crew for stand-by time?. Doesn't the revenue at least equal the diesel costs? Keystone-Port Townsend does make some sense to have a "Reservation", but even it can not have a 100% reservation, there has to be some room for drive-ups.
01/26/09	I encourage your support for Plan A. Ferries are part of the state highway system and should receive the same type of state funding as other highways and not considered as something that is only used by small communities. As a state we fund highways and state roads in Eastern Washington which are not used by me but are funded by my taxes as they are part of the larger state system. The ferry system is the same. The growth of the peninsula area is dependent upon a well functioning highway system which includes the ferry system.
01/26/09	Many say there is no Ferry Godmother. We who must rely on the ferry service for getting to work, for visiting family, for medical appointments or for shopping and recreation (days and evenings) are painfully aware that we are trapped in an entirely different “ferry” tale, reminiscent of the ones with the huge, slavering wolf scratching and snuffling around the house, while we stand braced against the flimsy door, shivering in the knowledge that we have no wolf repellant. How can anyone be surprised that the Ferry Systems Plans A and B were greeted with consternation and anger? The plans do not even address the systems’ own estimates of growth in ridership. Where will they put those extra people? Pack them like sardines on the outside decks? We are the heirs of a pattern of procrastination and lack of planning going back even before the loss of car tab revenue. That the steel-electrics were allowed to degenerate to the point that one could poke one’s hand through the hull is incredibly negligent. Where are the studies of economic impacts? The Ferry System’s own analysis fails to link the economic and social impact of these policies on the affected communities. Tax collections from affected areas would surely drop under either plan, both in capital spending and in business revenues generated from ferry users visiting local stores, hotels, restaurants, etc. It goes without saying that employment would also drop, adding to the state’s financial burden. Let’s look at it from a wider perspective: housing costs in King county are no longer affordable to blue collar workers, teachers, service workers, etc. The median price for a single family home is now $429,950.00. Taxes, insurance, mortgage and maintenance costs put it out of reach for many. Snohomish county has a median price of $299,900.00; Pierce county is $240,000.00. Rentals follow a similar trend. Meanwhile, the median in Kitsap County is $209,250.00, with even lower medians in various areas of the county. Does it not make sense to encourage people to live in affordable Kitsap and cut down on the pollution and traffic congestion on the highways created by commuting an hour or more by car in order to live in a home one can afford? In 2007, Seattle Magazine chose Manette as the most affordable, livable neighborhood in the Seattle area. Manette is a charming waterfront area in Bremerton. The article cited the appeal of the peaceful one hour ferry crossing to downtown contrasted with the stressful, tortuous commutes endured daily by so many. If we can keep the commuter fares at reasonable levels, we will enhance the quality of life for so many working families, while increasing home ownership and generating increased revenues for all levels of government. We need to change the law that requires the ferries be built in-state. Good intentions, but the result is that only one bid was tendered, and at a much higher cost than expected. Let’s open up the process to the country and the world, and see how much we can acquire for far less cost. There are some exciting

Date Received	Comment
	possibilities for alternative fuels and energy efficient propulsion systems that could be explored to save on operational costs. Even if we were to purchase the existing "Island Home" designed boats, we would save a substantial amount over the Todd Shipyard bid. If the law were to be changed, we would also be eligible for federal funds. It would be a piteous thing to lose so much on the backs of so many as the consequence of Plan A or Plan B, while "protecting" jobs at shipyards that have neither the interest nor the time to build the boats here in Washington. Why are we not going for economies of scale in building the new boats? One at a time is not the way to negotiate the best price. If we can afford the billions of dollars for the Alaska Way tunnel and the 520 bridge, why can we not fund our bridges? Is this not "infrastructure" that President Obama is so eager for us to invest in? Would not the lasting benefit to future generations be many times the investment cost, particularly if we maintain the boats properly over their long lives? In this land of many peninsulas and shimmering islands afloat on blue waters, how can it be denied that our lifelines, our arteries, our "floating bridges" are any less a part of our state's highway transportation system than I-5, I-90, I-405 or the bridges over the Columbia River?