

Lummi Island Ferry Advisory Committee (LIFAC)

March 7, 2017

Lummi Island Fire Hall

CALL TO ORDER - Chair Stu Clark called the meeting to order at 6:31 pm.

ROLL CALL - Present: Stu Clark, Rhayma Blake, Charles Bailey, Cris Colburn, Nancy Ging, Mike Skehan.

Also in Attendance: Bill Lee, Beth Louis, Roland Middleton, Rob Ney, Mike Kmiecik, Mary Ross, Jim Dickenson, and Joan Moye

FLAG SALUTE

OPEN SESSION

Ging welcomed Skehan as the new member to LIFAC.

Clark added the PLIC Dry Dock questionnaire to the Agenda.

Beth Louis, PLIC President read a prepared statement (Attached) on LOS, with three requests:

Task 3e, to identify where the ferry could go if Gooseberry is not available in emergencies.

Task 9; add at least 2 public meetings

Delay adoption of 'Scope of Work' until April to allow PLIC to have a public meeting on March 27th, with comments being submitted to LIFAC/PW on March 28th.

Also, Louis noted the Dry Dock questionnaire results have been submitted to LIFAC (received March 5th) for their review and discussion at a future meeting. Parking and Safety were the big issues noted in the 10 page cover letter and 25 page results document.

Mary Ross thanked PLIC for the Dry Dock questionnaire and summaries, asking for PW to read the numerous comments as valuable insight into Dry Dock issues. She suggested it be circulated widely, including Council members and Executive.

Bill Lee wanted to thank LIFAC for their comments before Council supporting the LOS ordinance as well as PLIC for their very well run survey and summaries of results. Many surveys have been conducted in the past with mixed reactions, noting it contains a great deal of good information, and supported its broad dissemination.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2/7/17 Meeting Minutes –Bailey moved and Colburn seconded a motion to approve, passing 6-0.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Clark opened nominations for the 3 positions available.

Ging nominated Clark for Chair, seconded by Blake, with closure after no more nominations.

Skehan nominated Ging for Vice-Chair, seconded by Colburn with closure.

Ging nominated Skehan for Secretary, seconded by Colburn with closure.

Skehan suggested voting on the slate of 3 positions, adopted by voice vote.

Colburn nominated the 'Slate', seconded by Bailey, and adopted by 6-0

Clark began a discussion on trying to fill the vacant LIFAC mainland seat, with the added burden of having to travel to the island on most occasions. He suggested we look into having more meetings on the mainland, which would allow for meetings lasting more than the current hourly session due to staff needing to catch a ferry. Middleton expressed concurrence with having longer work sessions due to the volume of work coming forth with the pending Feasibility Study going on. Colburn and Skehan supported the idea. Blake suggested April, Bailey suggested PW suggest some dates, and Ging reminded us we would look at Dry Dock results in April. No motions were made.

OLD BUSINESS

Update from Public Works - Rob Ney, Public Works Special Programs Manager, had four subject areas to discuss.

1. Thanked PLIC for the constructive Dry Dock Survey, and will be looking closely at the summaries and comments going forward.
2. Discussed the recent monthly inspection, finding a ram nearing failure, which was scheduled for replacement in the following days when weather permitted, noting this is why they inspect – to fix things before they break, which saves money in the long run.
3. Also at GB docks, a brake has been giving them lots of problems on the ramp cable system, which has been narrowed to an electrical problem. This will be repaired 'off-hours' during the evening of 3/7.
4. PW has taken one item off the Scope of Work DRAFT, after consulting with Pierce County on their newly installed ticketing kiosk. In all likelihood, he will have a ticket kiosk in place at GB prior to the Study being completed, so there isn't much point in studying it. Whatcom, Skagit and Pierce meet to discuss mutual ferry issues such as this, and the 'Ferry Consortium' is finding this relationship being beneficial to all three counties that operate ferries. There is no budget for this as yet, and he will bring this back to LIFAC for further discussion in future months. Rob is working with Skagit to draft an Interlocal Agreement to do some cost sharing of items of mutual benefit.

Council Meeting – Clark wanted to be sure everyone had a final version of the Ordinance that passed, asking if any other information needed to be added to the public record. Ging stated the only hint of opposition came from Councilman Mann, mostly having an issue with the entire county supporting the ferry operation. Colburn had a nice conversation with CM Mann after the Council meeting on some of his concerns. Clark asked about Council support for the new ferry, which seemed positive all around, thanking PW and LIFAC for getting to this point in replacement of the aging Chief. Blake noted Executive Louws was thankful for us getting to this point also.

Ferry Usage Data: Bailey said the data is input and he will try to have the analysis report ready for our April meeting.

Hybrid/Electric Ferries: Clark briefly discussed his making a contact back east with BAE Systems on vessel systems being developed. Ney said he has been asked to sit on the Panel for Skagit County when they start the RFP process for ferry replacement, learning from them while looking at all the alternatives going forward. Colburn discussed the recent Farmhouse Gang discussions (ref: Whatcom Council of Governments), and the recent discussion on Hybrid/Electric ferries. Ney noted there would be more meetings of that nature, and would get us on the mailing list.

NEW BUSINESS

Clark opened the discussion of selection of 1 or more members to be part of the RFP selection process going forward with the Feasibility Study, saying several members have expressed interest in being part of that. Bailey was interested in participating, as well as Blake. Colburn expressed interest, having talked with WTA to do that, and noted there was value to having a non-islander as part of that process going forward, as well as an alternate plan given the long duration of the involvement through next year. Ging was unable to commit to daytime meetings.

Middleton gave some additional details of the process and time commitment with PW expectations of LIFAC members selected to work with them to complete the Study. Initially, sets of questions would be developed prior to the interview process. After the Council approves the contract, the level of involvement would likely be to meet for specific issues that arise with the work. It's hoped the consultant selected doesn't need a lot of hand holding to develop the Study, PW would like to keep the number of LIFAC members to no more than a couple, with maybe an alternate, if needed. The lion share of the work would be in the next couple of months. After some discussion of those interested, Colburn and Blake were selected to represent LIFAC at the consultant selection meetings, and follow up as needed during the development of the Study. Louis was named as non-voting PLIC

alternate, as needed. Bailey moved and Ging so moved, motion being passed 6-0. Ging noted that representatives should keep the rest of the members of LIFAC informed in the process, with Clark saying it would be a recurring topic under Old Business.

Scope of Work: Middleton presented the latest DRAFT version after compiling items from the LOS resolution, Alternative Analysis and other ideas discussed, circulating that to staff and now LIFAC for comment. He assured us that no conclusions have been determined, that this is our shared study to determine the best course going forward for the next 60 years, and that more than one public meeting will be required to get this right. Using the Dry Dock Survey work as a foundation to start gives others the confidence we have looked in great detail moving towards a conclusion. When we start looking into population and travel demand as part of the alternatives considered, we'll have a good picture of what is needed in the future. Roland heard from WC Planning that they are seeing permit applications on Lummi Island like they haven't seen in years.

Moving through the ferry planning stages will consider things like propulsion, vessel size, landings and emergency landings. Climate change, alternate vehicle vessels, and cost sharing with Skagit County could all be part of the mix. Several months of mulling the options, along with cost projection analysis will start to boil this down to recommendations to PW and the Council, again keeping the community informed during the process.

Next, how we pay for all this over time will enter the discussion, looking at various ways to amortize this over time, using \$30m and 45 years as just an example, with the consultant working with us to determine the Level of Service provided in future years.

PW is hopeful this study will lead to a LIFAC recommendation to do X (vessel, docks, amenities), costing this much, and here's how you pay for it. PW would draft a resolution to the Council supporting our joint conclusions (PW & LIFAC) and present that to the Council with broad support from this Committee, Islanders, and other stakeholders to the process.

Middleton then laid out the timeline for RFP generation, PLIC involvement, and supplemental budget request for the study moving into the summer months.

Ging asked if the study would still come out of the Operations Account and Skehan asked if PW had a ballpark number for its cost. Middleton said yes and \$300,000 to both questions. Bailey asked about the number of firms that would be asked to bid – hopefully three, and Ging asked about advertising outside of Whatcom County – also yes. Blake asked Louis about expectations for another PLIC meeting focused on Scope, with the answer being given this would give the community more time to process where we are at, take additional comments before decisions are made, and document that public process. Clark expressed his support of transparency but experience shows people tend to wait until the end of the process to weigh in. Clark said we would set up a schedule for events so the public can get involved during this process. Ging, Baily, Clark, Louis and Blake all discussed how we have more meaningful public discussion. Clark suggested having an extra session for public involvement after we adjourn our regular monthly meeting. Skehan asked for inclusion of the WCOG Mobility 2040 Study is referenced to help keep costs down, suggesting \$600 per household for a study on the island could be a big issue going forward. Middleton walked us through how he arrived at the Study cost estimate, saying it's not an unreasonable number, and doesn't include other departmental costs they will likely use. Lee suggested PW look at the cost of other similar studies, Bailey asked about the Scope format – Middleton answered Outline form, then asked that Capacity Management be included in alternatives.

Ging moved and Blake seconded a motion to include Louis changes, add e3 emergency landing areas, change 9d to two public meetings and 3c (Bailey) Evaluate options for peak-load capacity management. Passed 6-0

ADJOURN - The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 pm.

Date: March 7, 2017

I would like to congratulate LIFAC on the approval of the Level of Service Resolution by County Council on February 22nd. This is the start of a ten year process to obtain a replacement ferry. Tonight you will be reviewing the scope of work for the approximately year long Alternatives Analysis. This study is very important and should be done right as it will be the foundation for defining the ferry and infrastructure needs for the next 60 years.

I have reviewed the scope of work and have three requests:

- 1) Under Task 3 e, Ferry Operations Alternatives/Landings, emergency landing locations should also be reviewed. I understand why Gooseberry Point is assumed to be the mainland landing both from practical and cost perspectives, but it would be prudent to at least begin to identify where the ferry would or could go in case of an emergency if Gooseberry Point were not available.
- 2) Under Task 9, Project Management and Outreach, it is requested that at least two Public Meetings be included to receive comments.
 - a. The first Public Meeting should be early in the process to receive a presentation on Tasks 1 and 2 Introduction and Purpose and Background and to take input on the Alternatives being defined under item 3 Ferry Operations Alternatives before they are defined.
 - b. The second Public Meeting would be to take input on the draft results as identified in the scope under Task 9.
 - c. It is important that adequate time for the public to review and provide meaningful comment is built into the study schedule and milestones.
- 3) I realize that it is important to get started on the study and keep momentum going, but it is also important that we continue to build on what we have accomplished so far and continue to bring the Lummi Island Community along in the process. With this in mind, I am suggesting that approval of the scope be done at your April meeting. PLIC would like the opportunity to have a member meeting to present the scope and take comments. This could be done by March 27 and comments submitted to you by the 28th. At this point, PLIC would like the opportunity to distribute the scope as broadly as possible to build support. This should not interfere with the budget request being considered by Council tonight and on March 21, but it would delay the consultant start date by a month. If this request is not able to be accommodated, then it is very important that two Public Meetings be held during the course of the study.

And finally, I want to bring your attention to the memo I submitted to you a couple of days ago that presents the results of the Dry Dock Questionnaire and identifies a number of short and long term suggestions for improving the Dry Dock experience. It is no surprise that parking and safety were the top issues, but there were a number of good suggestions from the Community that could be implemented immediately or over time to reduce the stress of Dry Dock. If you have any questions related to memo and questionnaire, I am happy to discuss them with you.

Thank you again for all the work you do. PLIC is committed to working with you to further this important process.