

Fauntleroy Terminal Trestle & Transfer Span Replacement Project

Public Comment Log

Last updated: 10/27/2021

Purpose: This document provides an ongoing log of all comments about the project, organized into themes. Public comments provided during community meetings are detailed in separate meeting summaries. WSF began tracking comments in this log in December 2020, when community engagement planning began, and this document is updated monthly.

Key:

MoP | Member of the public

WSF | Washington State

Ferries

Terminal design/size/location

10/25/21 – MoP writes WSF, members of city council and the legislature about their opposition to expansion of the Fauntleroy terminal:

“The existing ferry traffic coming out of Fauntleroy exceeds the tolerable level any community should have to deal with. The impacts on communities such as South Park, Westwood, Morgan Junction, Gatewood, Arbor Heights, Fauntleroy, Highland Park, Delridge are unhealthy and reduce the quality of life in these communities. I am firmly opposed to any expansion of the Fauntleroy ferry dock. “

10/21/21- MoP writes WSF and members of the legislature about her opposition to expansion or enlargement of the ferry dock and instead urges some direct ferry service to downtown Seattle, and adoption of the “Good To Go” system for the ferries.

10/21/21- MoP writes WSF to express concern and opposition towards the potential expansion of the Fauntleroy ferry dock:

“This issue of attempting to expand the Fauntleroy ferry dock has been going on for over four decades and has been repeatedly rejected by the residents of West Seattle, the Seattle City Council, King County Council member Greg Nickels, Seattle Mayor Royer, and Washington State Senator Phil Talmadge and others. And for good reason.

Instead of eliminating single destination ferries to Vashon and Southworth, which exacerbates vehicle congestion in the immediate Fauntleroy, Gatewood neighborhoods, or implementing more passenger only ferries from Vashon and Southworth that take riders directly downtown, or making a concerted effort to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles (SOVs), the ferry system has greatly added to the pollution, congestion, and road-rage incidents being forced on tax paying, voting citizens of the Fauntleroy, Gatewood and Morgan Junction communities.

During the past forty-plus years, there has been no reduction in the 80% of single occupancy vehicles that use these routes. And while it has been shown that auto emissions are the highest source of green-

house gasses, in a time where we suffer as a City, State and nation over global warming, further enabling an increase in an ever-growing number of vehicles from outside King County into these residential neighborhoods is totally unacceptable. While the City of Seattle makes more and more efforts to reduce residents use of personal vehicles, by among other things encouraging the use of public transportation, it is ludicrous to enable more cars and SOVs from outside King County to wreak environmental havoc, while increasing the already in-tolerable congestion into West Seattle.

Instead of increasing the size of the Fauntleroy dock, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and Washington State Ferries (WSF) should concentrate on working with King County Metro to coordinate getting ferry riders to their destination, and adding passenger only boats that take riders directly downtown - where it's been documented that over 78% of the riders coming into Fauntleroy go."

10/17/21 – MoP emails project inbox to advocate that the new ferry terminal be able to accommodate a 144-Car Class ferry when it is fixed; MoP shares:

"This will make commutes much shorter, increasing ridership and tourism onboard. They will even rival the Jumbo Mark II class in daily ridership, allowing them to fill in for and eventually replace it. Its shallow draft could even allow the 144-Car Class to even fill in for the Kwa-di-Tabil Class ferries. This ferry could maybe service any route with the fewest carbon emissions. As such it will likely become the pride of the fleet; also likely to increase tourism onboard especially at first. Having more of the 144-Car Class will be a greater pride boost to the pride of the fleet. If a vessel gets more sister ships, it is a tribute to the value of the vessel. It leaves a bigger mark on history. The 144-Car Class ferry will be no different.

The 2040 Plan however is currently based on a worst-case scenario of the Fauntleroy Terminal remaining a problem twenty years from now. Washington State Ferries wants to condense the fleet to more efficiently use their funding (a lot of which is your tax money). But the Fauntleroy terminal prevents them from doing so completely. Probably following the production of the 5 additional Olympic-class ferries currently on order, a whole additional class of ferries will be built just for Fauntleroy triangular route; the 124-Car Class. The fleet doesn't want the 124-Car Class, but they have to have it because of Fauntleroy Terminal. It's a necessary evil! Having these ferries will be a 50-year reminder of our inability to solve this problem. It will cost us extra tax dollars not only to have purchased this extra ferry class but also to maintain it. The fleet also likes ferries that can service different routes in a pinch. I don't trust a ferry class built especially for one route to do this.

Making the transition from Olympic Class to 144-Car Class production as seamless as possible will reduce costs further if they share similar manufacturing processes. This transition could also allow the fleet to cancel some to all of the upcoming 5 Olympic Class ferries in favor of 144-Car Class ferries. Construction of the 124-Car Class will disrupt this transition."

9/29/2021 – CAG member shares a vision for the project and suggests solutions to several challenges:

First, The Vision

Envision a modern efficient dock built on time and on budget. A dock built to withstand seismic and climate challenges that will enhance the natural and human environment. Designed to be as appealing

to view as the ferry boats. A dock moving transportation into the future with rapid processing, loading vehicles at 6-10 per minute. A sleek terminal with amenities. An improved near shore environment with decreased creosote, more over water natural light from the raised dock height, improved warm lowered directional lighting, and decreased noise. A dock with a system that collects and treats runoff to prevent polluted water from entering Fauntleroy Creek and Fauntleroy Cove. All this accomplished with no or minimal expansion.

Replacement, not Expansion

The title of the project is Terminal Trestle and Transfer Span Replacement. There is no funding currently approved by WA State legislature for expansion. The site is extremely constrained, with a pump facility bordering one side and a viable salmon stream on the other. For 42 years Fauntleroy, the surrounding communities, their state representatives, City Council members, Mayors, King County executives and others have opposed expansion. Increasing vehicle volumes makes even less sense now on this now downsized 2 lane, 25mph residential street with Rapid Ride services to Light Rail Stations. This was the only dock in the system to improve its on time performance in 2019, due to schedule and operating changes developed in cooperation with WSF and representatives from all three communities served. Subsequent to these changes, on-time performance averaged at 90%, among the best in the system. Boats left full, Vashon complaints plummeted. Problems can be solved without building overwater.

Spread the Peak, Speed the Board

There are 4-5 hours a day of rush hour. Rush hour delays occur at every vehicle transportation corridor, all freeways, all ferry routes. All other times load here without backups or delays related to the dock even with this size dock and with the antiquated tolling. All sailings possible should be dual destination, especially when 2 boat schedules or during weekday or weekends rush hours. WSF should follow the 2040 Plan and the three recent legislated studies recommendations to reduce and spread the peak and speed ticketing and boarding.

- Maximize utilization of system capacity through adaptive management strategies to spread out peak demand such as an expanded reservation system, improved fare collection methods and fare structure.
- Promote mode shift through investments in technology and infrastructure that promote and prioritize HOV, pre-ticketing, walk-on and bike-on passengers and improved multimodal connections.

Ticket Holders Lane, not Ticket buyers Lane

Backups can and do occur at any hour due to unavailable boats, crews, marine conditions, Vashon medical emergencies, large events and other non-dock related problems. A larger dock will not solve this. A two-boat backup now during Covid occurs regularly and at peak times means 250+ cars must be accommodated, way beyond the scope of any imagined expansion. There is space for more than 180 cars in the ferry holding lane from the dock to the gas station at the north end of Lincoln Park. The ferry holding lane will always be necessary on Fauntleroy. It should be used and turned into a Ticket Holders lane, not a Ticket Buyers lane. Vehicles could then load at pre-ticketed speeds well within current dwell times. This is accomplished first by requiring all vehicles to have a ticket before entering or queuing for the dock. WSF purchases the gas station, moving ticketing booths there and leaving the scanning at the dock choke point. Online tickets continue to be promoted; these pre-ticketed vehicles directly access the queue. Improperly ticketed or non-ticketed vehicles are sent 1 mile north. This is very cost effective. There are no added personnel, no immediate fare changes needed for implementation, it has reduced construction costs, it utilizes existing pavement already signed for peak rush hour use, already SDOT approved for this use. Good-To-Go type ticketing or a hybrid with the toll booth operator clicking a

button to add passengers could be incorporated at a later date if technology is satisfactory to WSF needs. It does not require residential home purchases, reduces overwater construction, allows more time for the ticket transactions.

Overhead Loading increases Overhead costs

Overhead loading is a large capital expense and adds a long-term increase in staffing. It increases ferry operational costs, maintenance costs and requires boat modifications and backup systems. It decreases the chances that WSF will meet its mandated operational costs coverage. Gains in operational efficiencies opportunities are minimal for simultaneous loading. These opportunities can also be gained by changing the timing of the loading of pedestrians, motorcycles and bicycles. Cost savings is tens of millions. Safety data for multimodal loading is good system wide. The two other docks on this route do not have it. It could be funded as a separate project for all three docks at the same time if studies warrant it, at a later date. Safety measures currently in place including the traffic police are more essential. Road rage has led to guns pulled here.

Build Boats and Bridges

Cost overruns are a given in Ferry projects. Mukilteo cost about \$187 million so far, still not fully completed. Colman was funded in stages, construction started at \$350 million, and is now \$490 million with mission creep and corrosion problems continuing increased funding needs. The Marine Highway is our most expensive highway system. Since 1951 it has been “temporary” until bridges could be built. Inadequate vessels are a long-term unresolved problem. The system needs 21 boats to fully operate, currently has 17, with a significant number aging out. WSF must prioritize cost savings in terminal replacement and ask for boats. Where possible bridges should be built.

9/15/2021 – CAG member writes WSF stating:

I read through the 2040 Plan and the referenced 2018 UW study. Neither appeared to address the 1981 study that the Fauntleroy dock being suitable unless annual traffic exceeds 1.25 M cars per year. (We are well over that number). Nor the City of Seattle’s 1997 resolution 29566 that there should be no expansion of the dock and efforts should be made to reduce the amount of traffic. Could you please comment on these two issues at our next meeting? I am having trouble reconciling the current plan with the prior analysis.

9/7/2021 – MoP writes WSF Assistant Secretary Patty Rubstello inquiring if a decision has been made to expand the Fauntleroy Ferry Terminal dock in light of conflicting and confusing statements contained in funding authorization language on the WSDOT website.

8/18/2021 – MoP couple writes the project inbox with suggestions to the P&N statement suggesting: “Location: There is an assumption that service from Southworth/Vashon will not be relocated. If the criteria/justification for maintaining the existing location exists, this must be clearly stated in the Purpose and Needs as background information along with a link to the supporting data. “

8/2/2021 – MoP suggests a new location for the terminal be considered -one that has capacity for a large agency facility, and that space for microenterprise might be a good idea to consider if within WSF purview to include in terminal design.

7/29/2021 – MoP forwards an idea from the Vashon Ferry Riders Facebook page about a ticket holders line.

7/14/2021 - MoP suggests the best way to achieve various goals for the project could be by constructing a floating dock, additionally providing a pdf document of a self-drawn overview diagram of their proposal.

| |
|---|
| <p>5/28/2021 - 6/10/21 – MoP inquires with King County Wastewater Treatment Division about the Barton Street Pump Station’s access needs for inspection and maintenance, whether WSF will have the option to purchase adjacent property, and whether KCWWD and WSF will be working on restoration together. King County shares the comment with WSF for tracking.</p> |
| <p>5/24/2021 – Fauntleroy Community Association (FCA) president writes WSF Assistant Secretary that FCA supports the project, but does not approve of increasing the footprint of the structure over water, the purchasing of resident homes, or the alteration of Cove Park for the project.</p> |
| <p>5/3/2021 - MoP asks how the future design of the terminal will affect a property they are thinking about buying.</p> |
| <p>4/22/2021 - MoP would like to see refitting of the future dock within its current parameters since they just remodeled their home to fit the views of the current dock structure and mentions it would maintain the neighborhood feel.</p> |
| <p>4/20/2021 - MoP states they have seen the ferry traffic increase to the point where it is having a negative impact on the community. “I believe the only solution is to move the ferry dock out of our beautiful neighborhood.”</p> |
| <p>4/9/2021 - MoP writes that WSDOT needs to stop relying on assumption that West Seattle is opposed to a second slip at Fauntleroy and suggests WSDOT provide the Fauntleroy community with a better explanation of second slip benefits such as reducing backups of cars.</p> |
| <p>3/26/2021 - MoP shares that the “...terminal presents challenges with vehicle queuing on Fauntleroy Way, with only one shoulder holding lane to serve two destinations and a small terminal, with only enough dock space for approximately 80 cars (that is served by three 124-car Issaquah class ferries) using a single slip. Only if enough dock space is provided to allow at least one-ferry’s capacity on the dock will the current difficulties with loading, on-time sailing, and rider dissatisfaction be removed. In short, by the time of the completion of the Fauntleroy terminal project, the dock must be able to hold at least 124 cars.”</p> |
| <p>2/12/2021 - MoP requests WSF move the dock .5 miles south of Salty’s restaurant, adjacent to but not part of Terminal 5. Mentions minimal view impacts, large holding lanes, and vanpool lots. Involves purchase/long-term lease of land from the Port of Seattle.</p> |
| <p>1/12/2021 - MoP writes that the Fauntleroy dock needs to be large enough to accommodate a full load for whichever vessels will serve the route and must include a way to load passengers and cars simultaneously.</p> |
| <p>12/15/2020 - MoP requests WSF determine if the current site (at Fauntleroy) is the best location, stating: “The site has very difficult constrictions for rebuilding. There are environmental concerns regarding the stream, eel grass beds. There is a pump station permanently restricting the choke point entry. Continuing operations during construction is a tough problem. The terminal is in a residential zone. Can it be moved? “Seattle has refused access at Colman Dock, use of Terminal 46, or Terminal 5. Fauntleroy is Seattle, with difficult and currently absent bridge connections and projected increases in traffic problems with urban up zoning expected. Fauntleroy Way is a two lane road with 25mph speed limits. WSF claims to have statistics that vehicles travel equally to destinations north and south of Fauntleroy. What about locations in Burien, such as the extension of route 518 connecting to Sea- Tac? Seattle Parks has codes against use of park space such as Lincoln Park. Multiple houses would need to be demolished to place the dock on the south border of the park (if park land itself was not to be used), or to expand the footprint at the current site. Either plan would invoke community wrath.”</p> |

Ticketing/fare rates

3/18/2021 – MoP writes asking if there is a law precluding WSF from implementing a passenger-rides-free policy and why WSF hasn't experimenting with a Good-to-Go scanner in at least one of the toll booths, even if for only no-passenger vehicles?

1/12/2021 – MoP writes about streamlining ticketing processes.

12/15/2020 – MoP writes WSF stating:

Determine how best to process and hold vehicles. Good to Go? Mandatory pre-ticketed? Toll one way east bound? Toll booths with prolonged transactions must be a thing of the past. Choose how to automate processing. Must street lanes be "holding" lanes?

12/8/2020 – MoP asks if WSDOT/WSF are still considering "Good2Go" passes.

12/6/2020 – MoP writes after 12/3 stakeholder webinar saying the meeting went well and the new terminal design must focus on the choke point. Serious planning and directional tolling should proceed, tech engineers recommended fare structure change at the Triangle route and the Fauntleroy rebuild is the perfect opportunity to implement those changes. License plates can be utilized to measure over height/length of vehicles for fares and passengers can be quantified if desired in several ways. If cars proceed at 5mph via "Good to Go" passes, a 124-car dual destination vessel could be loaded on time with this size dock, allowing any new additional lanes to be utilized flexibly for carpools, buses, bikes/motorcycles, turnarounds.

Environmental impacts

10/18/21 – Fauntleroy Watershed Council writes with Fauntleroy Creek considerations:

Fauntleroy Creek is an anadromous stream discharging into central Puget Sound a few yards south of the Fauntleroy Ferry Terminal. It typically flows north of its mouth through a tangle of driftwood to exit on the north side of the trestle. Releases by school children are the major source of coho juveniles in the creek. Smolts migrate to saltwater mid March-May and spawners come into the cove in September to prepare to enter the lower creek mid October-mid November.

Washington State Ferries has a checkered history regarding stewardship of the creek. The most notable lapse occurred in 2001 when WSF scheduled pile driving during spawning season and promised to have a fish biologist monitor whether or not noise and vibration disrupted spawner behavior in the cove. WSF dismissed the biologist after one visit without notifying us.

After this incident, WSF stewardship of the creek improved. Project leads now preview work timing with us to be sure it does not impact the creek. When the current project initially started, WSF's environmental-compliance team met with me for a lengthy and productive discussion about possible implications for the creek and I offered to share whatever documents and data I could. Now that WSF has fully launched the project, I ask that project management take the following creek-related considerations into account:

1. TRESTLE DESIGN

Updating the trestle to current standards should keep polluted runoff from entering Fauntleroy Cove and improve spawner access to the mouth of the creek.

I understand that a state-of-the-art system will be installed to collect vehicular fluids and other pollutants in trestle runoff so that it can be disposed of responsibly off site. Eliminating this source of pollution will be a step in the right direction to improve nearshore conditions for coho juveniles. I further understand that WSF's current design standards will significantly reduce the number of piles. Given the orientation of the cove, drift logs naturally come in and get trapped by the piles, resulting in a thicket of piles in the creek channel, which often required dispersal by volunteers to ensure spawner access to the mouth of the creek. With fewer piles, drift logs may disperse naturally with tidal action.

2. OVERWATER COVERAGE

Although increasing overwater coverage is not explicitly in the project workplan, it has come up as a possibility. These study findings speak to likely environmental implications:

Conclusions from 1999 and 2001 reports:

(1) Overwater structures create sharp, underwater light contrasts by casting shade over an area during the day. Light contrasts can also occur at night from artificial lighting surrounding a structure.

(2) Fish exposed to such underwater contrasts may have increased risk of mortality as a consequence of delays in migration, loss of schooling protection, and change in migratory routes to deeper waters.

(3) Despite considerable speculation that overwater structures increase the numbers and success of predatory fish, evidence supporting this contention is inconclusive.

(4) Overwater structures can reduce light levels 90 - 100 percent below ambient, which can significantly affect marine plant distribution and abundance, posing risks to estuarine ecosystems,

especially where habitat is extremely limited and the shoreline is highly modified with piers and bulkheads.

fws.gov/wafwo/Documents/EffectsofAction/Effects%20of%20Shade%20on%20Salmonids.pdf

WSDOT's 2002 study (*Effects of Large Overwater Structures on Epibenthic Juvenile Salmon Prey Assemblages in Puget Sound, Washington*) examined the effects of large overwater structures on juvenile salmon and their prey at three terminals. By extension, these effects would increase if the size of overwater structures increases. Researchers concluded that four interacting factors affected decreases or changes in epibenthos density, diversity, and assemblage composition:

- (1) direct disturbance and/or removal by regular vessel disturbance,
- (2) reduced benthic vegetation or compromised benthic vegetation function caused by shading and physical disturbance,
- (3) physical habitat alterations (altered grain-size distribution from propeller wash or piling effects), and
- (4) biological habitat alterations (increased shell hash from sea star foraging and reduced eelgrass density because benthic macrofauna disturbance).

wsdot.wa.gov/research/reports/fullreports/550.1.pdf

WSDOT's 2010 study (*Assessing and Mitigating Dock Shading Impacts on the Behavior of Juvenile Pacific Salmon: Can Artificial Light Mitigate the Effects?*) examined if a fiber-optic lighting system might reduce the effects of ferry terminals on juvenile salmon (tested at the Port Townsend terminal). Researchers found that using artificial light had promise as a mitigation method but could not determine if it could completely mitigate effects of the dock.

wsdot.wa.gov/research/reports/fullreports/755.1.pdf

3. PROP WASH IN NEARSHORE HABITAT

As noted in the 2002 study, the continual churning of sediment in the cove by ferry arrivals and departures is worth examining as it impacts the habitat that coho juveniles find when they reach the nearshore.

As documented in WSDOT's 2019 report (*Ferry Vessel Propeller Wash Effects on Scour at the Kingston Ferry Terminal*), the magnitude of bed stress varies by propeller action (arrival or departure), vessel size, frequency, and natural topography. At the low end, scour from ferry wash is sufficient to disturb fine to medium gravel; at the high end, it is sufficient to disturb cobble. Such disruption of natural sediment processes has implications for seabed composition and water turbidity, which directly affect the abundance and diversity of flora and fauna in the nearshore.

4. CHEMICALS FROM VEHICLES

I call to your attention (and that of WSF's environmental-compliance team) to the innovative work under way to understand the relationship of tire-related chemicals to salmon pre-spawn mortality in urban streams. Paul Levin, PhD, lead scientist with the University of Washington/Nature Conservancy Conservation Science Lab, has found that these chemicals are most concentrated in stormwater runoff from streets where speeding and braking are prevalent. On Sept. 27, 2021, he responded as follows to my query about any data from moss-monitoring research near ferry terminals. As a user of the Fauntleroy Terminal, he is well acquainted with this area. While no hard data exist about the Fauntleroy Terminal, he suggests a possible correlation:

Our approach to identifying pollution hotspots was 2-fold: 1) Knowing that we could never monitor all places, we wanted to come up with a statistical technique to predict pollution based on traffic volume, traffic behavior (speed, braking, etc.), land cover (how much pavement, etc.) and land use (industry, residential, farming, agriculture, etc.). Then 2), we ground-truthed our predictions. This showed that our statistical predictions of where pollution hot spots are was very good.

We do not have on-the-ground measurements from around the ferry but we do have estimates from our statistical model. It doesn't really highlight the ferry dock as particularly high, but it is clear that the roads leading to the ferry (Fautleroy Way, Barton St.) are higher than surrounding areas in that part of West Seattle (but less than the roads leading towards Harbor Island, and certainly less than areas around South Park and the Duwamish River.

We are fortunate that pre-spawn mortality has not been the issue with spawners here that it has been in other Seattle creeks. Having spawning habitat close to the mouth is a likely factor as their time in creek water is no more than 24 hours. However, were the volume of ferry traffic to increase, more speeding and braking would release more of these chemicals, resulting in increased risk of pre-spawn mortality.

8/2/2021 – MoP asks for a timelapse video camera to be installed so as to record Fautleroy Creek and Cove to better understand wildlife use of the transition zone.

7/22/2021 - MoP asks what efforts WSF has made to reduce single-occupancy vehicles and promote multi-modal transportation and integration with other transit agencies and routes.

6/3/2021 – MoP writes asking to install a camera on the ferry dock to capture tide time lapse of Fautleroy Creek log jam regarding Coho salmon passage.

3/3/2021 - MoP writes hoping upgraded facility is safe, balances nearshore infrastructure with salmon habitat enhancements, and features art/culture of Duwamish Tribe (if willing).

12/15/2020 - MoP requests WSF determine how best to improve conditions, specifically related to removing creosote, containing and cleaning runoff from the dock, installing non glare warm lights (“the current ones are abominable”), control noise pollution caused by the megaphone announcements, and finally through reducing the noise of loading.

Funding

3/30/2021 - MoP writes asking for information on what the legislature approved for funding for improving efficiency at the Fauntleroy Terminal.

3/30/2021 – MoP suggests WSDOT reallocate money for a second slip at Southworth to fund a second slip at Fauntleroy.

3/10/2021 – MoP writes WSF asking for the request before the state legislature, the repair and replace funding proposal, and the basis for design document.

Fauntleroy/Vashon/Southworth route operations

9/29/2021 – CAG members writes:

My comments to the CAG span from the early days when there was some belief that WSF was somewhat sincere in saying they were considering moving the dock. Mr. Sowers' comment last night leads me to believe that will be cost prohibitive, and this issue is a moot point despite him continuing to lead us all astray with the line "We are still looking at everything."

My comments include a period where I thought after 3 studies recommending that a pilot Good-To-Go project be started here, it actually might. The continued argument that there are revenue problems and coast guard problems lead me to propose a hybrid system where the tech captures a license plate and the booth operator clicks a button to add the passengers. I am sure that never saw the light of day. It needs to be system wide is always argued. There are many examples of WSF solutions that are not system wide, including reservations, overhead loading, dock size relative to vessel capacity to name a few.

I also revived a proposal that originated on Vashon. This moved the ticket booths 1 mile away up to the gas station and required a user have a ticket before getting to the choke point. I was looking for anything that would make the line a Ticket Holders line. Preticketing in any form solves the dwell time load. WSF online ticket sales have done some real good, but progress is too slow.

Over the many many times I have seen the typical slide presentation over these years processing has never been included. It is always raise the dock, fix the seismic problem, and increase the size.

I now doubt processing improvements ever really played a part in the planning.

7/27/2021 – MoP writes suggesting adding King County Water Taxi services to the terminal, with regular service between Vashon and Fauntleroy, and Fauntleroy and Downtown Seattle to reduce environmental impact transporting vehicles and encouraging multi-modal transit.

4/26/2021 - MoP sends letter with comments and questions regarding the WSF 2013 Origin-Destination Travel Survey and travel patterns for the Fauntleroy/Vashon/Southworth route.

3/30/2021 - MoP writes with four alternatives for WSDOT to consider:

"A. Add second slip at Fauntleroy then rebuild old slip. AND increase net capacity on dock to meet max boat capacity. Initiate auto ticketing including passengers, and all passenger loading AFTER cars, combined these minimizes load times. All Boats stop at all triangle docks for every run results in best economy, lesswait times. Combining these REDUCE long ferry lines in West Seattle (makes neighbors happy). B. Keep Fauntleroy at one slip and add NEW Burien ferry at Seahurst Park via 12th Ave and 148th to Freeway, C. REPLACE on time performance metric with maximum vehicle movement metric. Having boats leaving partially full drastically increases wait times and back ups into W Seattle, and D. planned additional slip at Southworth is not worthwhile UNLESS there will be direct car ferries to Colman, which is very doubtful as no new slips will be added at Colman."

3/3/2021 - MoP advocates for signage around the Fauntleroy terminal to reduce confusion.

12/15/2020 - MoP requests WSF determine how best to load passengers/bikes/vanpools: "Overhead passenger loading requires elevators and bulky view obstructing structures to the far end of the dock for each slip. Thick short docks into deep water with large land side vehicle holding lanes makes this ideal. Very difficult to apply this to the exceptionally long dock needed here given the accumulation of sediments. Consider last on, first offloading for pedestrians. Consider first on, first offloading for Van Pools. Consider last on, last offloading for motorcycles and bikes. Motorcycles need to be last off so a column of cars in front of them will keep them from violating speed limits."

12/15/2020 - MoP requests WSF determine how best to decrease single occupancy vehicles: "Incentives? Fares? Vanpool lots? Where? Transit partners increased all locations? With what money? Just make Rules? Limited SOV slots? Parking lots on the Island or the east side? If you build it they will come and use good transit. A dock capable of holding 124 vehicles would still have lines way up the street if it stays this cheap and WSF keeps making it easier to drive on."

Purpose and Need

9/14/2021 – MoP writes WSF with suggestions for the P&N:

“The purpose of the Project is to maintain safe, reliable, and efficient service on SR 160 between West Seattle and Vashon Island, Southworth, and communities on the Kitsap Peninsula and beyond, consistent with travel and ridership needs.

WSF intends to support the 2040 LRP recommendations and achieve the purpose of the Project by accomplishing the following objectives:

- Replace aging terminal structures to meet current seismic, storm, and tsunami design standards.
- Raise the elevation of the terminal to accommodate future sea level rise.
- Pursuant to the 2040 Plan, provide operational efficiencies by:

maximizing utilization of system capacity through adaptive management strategies such as an expanded reservation system, an improved fare structure and fare collection methods, and others that increase efficiency, spread out demand, and prioritize walk-on and bicycle customers.

(WSF must identify specific technology improvements that it will make to speed boarding at Fauntleroy - this technology is already in use by WSDOT for the Highway 99 tunnel, the Tacoma Narrows bridge and by highway agencies throughout the county.)

promoting mode shift through investments in technology and infrastructure that promote walk-on and bike-on passengers and improve multimodal connections.

(WSF must propose specific changes to fares to eliminate SOV discounts and integrate passenger fares into the regional transit pass and E-Purse system established by ORCA transit agencies.)

- Improve safety and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility for pedestrians, vehicles, and bicycles.
- Use the 2040 Plan strategies and recommendations to Manage Growth and promote Sustainability to reduce the projected increase of an additional 255,000 vehicle trips per year through West Seattle, and minimize the impacts of those trips.

Project Goals

The 2040 LRP provides a vision intended to guide the future service and capital investment decisions for this critical part of the state highway system. The following Project goals are guided by transportation system goals and fiscal and asset management constraints established by the legislature and the 2040 LRP:

Meet percent on-time performance goal for the route that are consistent with the rest of the system.

Accommodate future electrification at the terminal to charge hybrid electric ferries.

Promote sustainable modes of travel, such as walk-on and bike-on passengers, and enhance multimodal connections at the terminal.

Foster social equity and community values.

Maintain and improve the quality of the natural environment

Minimize impacts to the human environment in Fauntleroy and throughout West Seattle.

Be technically and economically feasible for WSF to construct, operate, and maintain.”



8/27/2021 – SDOT writes the project inbox with suggestions for the P&N:

Following up on that discussion, SDOT has a few suggestions for changes to this if it's not too late:

Project Need:

(Either in operational efficiency or growth management sections) The project should also prepare for future operational practices and policies, including reservations, mobile ticketing, pricing incentives by sailing time and vehicle type, and the technologies necessary to implement these changes.

Project Goals:

- Promote sustainable modes of travel, such as walk-on and bike-on passengers, and enhance multimodal connections at the terminal. Should also advance federal, state, and local climate goals and reducing drive-alone trips and drive-on passenger traffic.
- Minimize impacts to the built and natural environment and balancing between the two.

8/23/2021 – The Dept. of Ecology writes the project inbox with suggestions for the P&N stating:

“As requested, I am providing some feedback on the purpose and need statement. I mostly focused on the goals as a couple things stood out and prompted questions on my part. Please note I am not familiar with this terminal so I took a look at the surrounding area on Google maps – it largely looks to be residential West Seattle neighborhood that I assume has businesses mixed in (grocery stores, gas stations, restaurants, dry cleaners, etc.). If I am incorrect, then some of my feedback may not be as relevant.

Goal Statement: Foster Social Equity and Community Values

I think the crux of conflict often centers around access and how that access either isolates or integrates something like a ferry terminal with the surrounding landscape and whatever is in it. To that end, I think it is important to define or understand who constitutes your community and what you mean by values. The terminal looks to be surrounded by private homes or neighborhood and sometimes the concept of community values get lost in the concerns of individual home owners. I also found myself wondering if the users were the local neighborhood or do we have more folks coming from further afield as well as thinking about users being people on the other end of the route. Maybe a clearer way to approach this goal is to understand if the terminal as public space will have a design that protects people's privacy (as home owners) or integrates with the neighborhood (shoreline access, trails, where do cyclists and pedestrians go when waiting for their ferry, what kind of space do you create for the public to access and who is accessing it).

I also would like to know if there should be a separate goal for tribal interests or if they are included in the societal equity and community values goal. I am thinking of how Mukilteo Multimodal addressed this topic. Even though the tribes are sovereign nations, they are also a community and part of society and have their own spaces too. Do they have more than just aquatic/fish concerns? What about historical/cultural considerations?

I also wondered if WSF had even defined a geographical area for the concept of community – are you targeting both ends of the route since that will constitute users and locals on the Fauntleroy end where this terminal sits? This ties in with what I was saying above.

Goal Statement: Minimize Impacts to the built and natural environment

For this goal, would WSF just be focused on minimizing impacts or also looking at ways to restore areas and would that action tie in with equity and values for the community? I also recommend really understanding local shoreline regulations. That is where I see the most conflict between communities and regulations. I assume the shoreline there is private property, but I recall a project where a fish barrier culvert as well as view from a public trail in the area caused consternation from the private home owners that were adjacent to the stream and trail where these two things were being addressed. It did result in delays to the shoreline permits. I understand that might be wading into the weeds to early but worth thinking about what you mean by this goal. Also, should restoration be a separate goal, if one at all?

That about covers it. I think the purpose and need was pretty straightforward. I also think some of the goals like improving on-time performance are pretty straightforward. If I missed using some kind of form to submit these comments, please let me know. Anyone can call me if they have questions about these comments.”

8/23/2021 – King County Metro writes the project inbox with suggestions for the P&N stating:

“Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preliminary Purpose and Need Statement for the Fauntleroy Terminal project. Under the Project Goals, bullet three (“Promote sustainable modes of travel, such as walk-on and bike-on passengers, and enhance multimodal connections at the terminal.”), transit integration should specifically be mentioned as part of multimodal connections. Metro has four routes that serve the Fauntleroy Ferry Terminal, including routes 116X, 118X, 119X, and RapidRide C Line. Currently, routes 116X, 118X, and 119X are suspended due to COVID-19 impacts. However, prior to the pandemic, Fall 2019 ridership shows over 300 daily boardings on weekdays at the stops at and adjacent to the terminal. Intentionally incorporating transit integration into the project’s goals will ensure that ferry users who ride transit will have safe, convenient, and cohesive transportation options.

Please let me know if you have any questions.”

8/19/2021 – MoP writes WSF with comments on the purpose and need stating:

“Following up on my Aug 17, 2021 comments on public access to all Advisory Group meetings for the Fauntleroy Terminal Trestle and Transfer Span Replacement Project, I want to comment on the Draft Preliminary Purpose and Need Statement dated July 19, 2021 provided to CAG members for discussion. The draft document proposes both a "Project Purpose" and "Project Need". Both the "Project Purpose" and "Project Need" expand the original stated intent of the project, which is to replace the existing dock structure.

While both the "Project Purpose" and "Project Need" list the physical and structural deterioration and seismic instability of the existing dock, they both include Operational efficiencies, Ridership forecasts and Passenger accessibilities. Specifically, the "Project Need" includes: Structural Reliability, Resilience, Operational Efficiency, Safety and Growth Management. Given the implications of something being listed as a "Project Need," I have serious concerns about this being an example of project creep.

The only "Need" around this project relates to the physical structure of the dock. The pilings and other support structure are failing and are seismically unstable. The dock is also too low to deal with the projected rising tides due to global warming. These have serious implications to the safety of passengers and crew who use the WSF system here in Fauntleroy. If not for these structural issues of the dock, this project would not be undertaken.

This project would not exist because of an issue with "Operational Efficiency." Nor would it exist because of a need for "Growth Management." Further, even the "Safety" issue has been expanded to

include concerns that are unrelated to the true "Need" of replacing an unsafe structure. Expansion of "Safety (need)" to suddenly include (a) all modes of traffic using the same transfer span to load and unload and (b) managing traffic at the intersection of the ferry dock and Fauntleroy Way SW, is clearly an example of project creep and outside the definition of a true "Need". If for example, concerns about all modes of traffic using the same transfer span to load and unload were a true "Need," WSF certainly would have addressed these same concerns on the recent major repairs/replacement of the dock at Vashon as well as other terminals at Southworth and the San Juan Islands. Similarly, to include relief of congestion on roads outside of WSF-leased property in Fauntleroy cannot be claimed as a "Need." In reality, this project is being undertaken to replace the existing physical structure for seismic and decay concerns and increase the height of the dock for tidal concerns. All other items listed are "Desires" or to use the document's terminology "Goals" and should be listed as nice-to-have, but-not-necessary true "Needs."

I would suggest that the stated "Purpose" be the replacement of the existing dock and transfer span while taking in to account an opportunity to consider Operational Efficiencies, Future Ridership and Passenger Accessibilities. The "Needs" statement should only include the replacement of the existing dock and Transfer span while "Project Goals" can include the Operational Efficiencies, Passenger Accessibility and Future Ridership."

8/18/2021 – MoP writes the project inbox with suggestions to the P&N statement suggesting:

“Location: There is an assumption that service from Southworth/Vashon will not be relocated. If the criteria/justification for maintaining the existing location exists, this must be clearly stated in the Purpose and Needs as background information along with a link to the supporting data.

Safety: Improving the safety of residents and passengers outside the terminal must be included and resolved. Specific areas of concern are the excessive speed of vehicles traveling to/from the ferry, vehicles making illegal turns to queue, and the potential for injury or harm to pedestrians trying to cross Fauntleroy and residents who must negotiate queued vehicles illegally blocking their driveways.

Growth management and environmental impact: Must include the impacts on the residential neighborhood. Exhaust from idling vehicles, light pollution and noise pollution will all increase with the anticipated growth noted in the background materials so we request that mitigation to these impacts be included and addressed as part of the project. Further erosion to the shoreline and Fauntleroy Creek, already adversely impacted by the current situation, must also be studied and mitigated.

Operational Efficiency: This must include automatic tolling and mitigation for traffic congestion in the neighborhood. In addition, managing ferry delays and boat/crew shortages must be addressed first because these factors currently contribute to significant backups and congestion. Just expanding the dock without solving for the problems that contribute to inefficiencies is pointless.

We are also requesting:

A commitment to interagency communication and coordination with King County Metro and Seattle Department of Transportation be identified and called out in your document. This is a small neighborhood and the growth projections for ferry ridership will need to have all three governmental agencies working together to ease impacts for ferry riders and residents.

The recordings of the other two advisory groups (TAG and EAG) which are currently not available on the website but, given that this is a public process, a link should be available on the website so that the public can review the content and provide additional comments.”

8/16/2021 – The Washington State Transportation Commission writes WSF with suggestions for the purpose and need stating:

“Reading through the statement document, there are not many comments I have. Overall, it seems really well thought out, however below are some thoughts on behalf of the WSTC staff:

The plan seeks to accommodate ridership forecasts from the WSF 2040 LRP. Since the LRP was published in January 2019, it does not take into account any forecast changes since COVID. (Though, perhaps the LRP is a living document, and therefore this would be addressed with an updated version) Along this same line, I was surprised to see no discussion regarding improved sanitization-related safety measures. "Safety" is listed as one of the project needs, however this is focused on collision prevention. Finally, some of the project goals seem a bit broad, and don't necessarily tie to any of the project objectives or needs. For example, one project goal is to "promote sustainable modes of travel, such as walk-on and bike-on passengers, and enhance multimodal connections at the terminal." This is a great goal to have, however without a corresponding objective or need identified, I don't see how this gets accomplished within the project."

8/16/2021 – MoP writes the project inbox:

"The Purpose and Need Statement clearly identifies the issues in-play and provides the limitations DOT has when addressing these issues. I look forward to considering the alternative solutions for this challenge and working with the other stakeholders to come to a win-win solution."

8/7/2021 – MoP writes WSF suggesting the purpose and need statement include addressing environmental issues, including a need for a stormwater retention system to treat water from the dock before entering Fauntleroy Cove, similar to the Coleman Dock water retention system. MoP similarly inquires when the meeting notes will be online.

8/3/2021 – MoP writes asking how to best suggest edits to the purpose and need statement.

- WSF replies stating the best way would be through the project inbox so comments can be shared widely with the project team for review and to the facilitator to log.

7/29/2021 – MoP suggests edits to the purpose and need statement to include the intended possible changes to the intersection, the loading, and safety needs as previously written stating:

"The simplified sentences would also allow consideration and discussions on alternatives that would otherwise be automatically excluded. Operational efficiency---The terminal needs improved cost efficient safe processing of vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Safety—The terminal needs improved safe loading and unloading of all modes of traffic at the transfer span and the residential street."

Neighborhood Traffic

10/12/2021 – Project team members share notes about community association meeting on 10/12/21 related to traffic concerns.

9/16/2021 – CAG member writes WSF stating:

“Any processing solution that allows WSF to take advantage of the 180 car capacity of the dedicated ferry lane for rush hour on Fauntleroy would have significant economical, efficiency and environmental impacts. Vashon’s dock is smaller than Fauntleroy’s and backs up on the residential street during high volume commutes. It loads boats on time mainly because there is no toll booth or processing. Suggestions to improve Fauntleroy processing have included required preticketing online, Good to Go, a ticket booth facility north of dock entry, hybrid digital and manual ticketing and one way east bound tolling. Dual destination sailings whenever possible but especially during rush hours on weekdays and weekends and during two boat schedules would also solve some capacity and efficiency problems. Increase processing, not pavement.”

8/16/2021 – CAG member writes WSF stating:

“June 30 2009 Final & Long Range Plan pg. 6

Growth, Ridership Demand, and Service Needs. Although WSF serves nearly 23 million riders annually, ridership is down over 13% since its peak in 1999. While there is population growth expected in many of the communities served by WSF, it is not clear how this will translate into increased demand for ferry service. Ridership has declined from 2000 to 2006 throughout the system, despite population growth in counties serviced by WSF ranging from 4% growth in Kitsap County to 14% in Island County during the same period of time.

WSF, I recognize that COVID has played havoc with projections, but it appears that there may be a trend that ridership may not increase as much as expected due to the “work from home” trending today. Could you provide updated ridership projections for the triangle?”

“June 30 2009 Final & Long Range Plan pg. 26

Based on comments heard at the Fauntleroy public hearing and comments received by the City of Seattle, the concept of expanding the Fauntleroy dock (as proposed in the Draft Scenario A) was not viewed as feasible. As a result, the project was removed from the Revised Draft Plan, and WSF will investigate all possible roadway and right-of-way options, if expanded vehicle holding is needed.

WSF, After reviewing the 2009 document, I noted the above statement. In our next meeting, could you comment on how this changed to Fauntleroy dock replacement? I suspect I do not fully understand this process.”

6/3/2021 – CAG member shared article on uniformed police officer traffic control at the Kingston ferry terminal with WSF.

12/15/2020 - MoP writes WSF stating:

“Determine how best to load passengers/bikes/Van pools. Overhead passenger loading requires elevators and bulky view obstructing structures to the far end of the dock for each slip. Thick short docks into deep water with large land side vehicle holding lanes makes this ideal. Very difficult to apply this to the exceptionally long dock needed here given the accumulation of sediments. Consider last on, first offloading for pedestrians. Consider first on, first offloading for Van Pools. Consider last on, last offloading for motorcycles and bikes. Motorcycles need to be last off so a column of cars in front of

them will keep them from violating speed limits”

11/8/2020 – MoP writes expressing concern about vehicle traffic patterns, specifically turning left, after landing in Fauntleroy, overall traffic concerns in West Seattle and suggestion for traffic signals or roundabouts.

10/1/2020 – MoP expresses concern over how an inadequate plan will leave the Fauntleroy community clogged with traffic.

Community Advisory Group format or role

9/29/2021 – CAG member writes project inbox asking for the recordings of the TAG & EAG meetings as well as asking how public comments are shared.

9/29/2021 – CAG member writes WSF suggesting increased processing and presenting previously submitted comments.

9/23/2021 - TAG member writes WSF to inform of new TAG representatives.

9/15/2021 – CAG member writes WSF stating:

“In person meetings do lend themselves to more collaboration. It is difficult to have a true back and forth conversation on zoom. Is it possible to ask CAG members if we could share our contact emails? Several of us already know each other, and have been able to share ideas and concerns. On the Task force we regularly asked members from Southworth or Vashon to clarify or expand on their solutions or concerns by email. This allowed us to “get on the same page” or realize addition roadblocks our own biases had failed to understand. Members of CAG who do wish to communicate this way could opt in.

I appreciate getting the public comments days before the next CAG, allowing time to read and understand the suggestions.

8/30/2021 – CAG member writes WSF asking how best to comment and when the next CAG meeting is.

8/16/2021 – CAG member writes the project inbox stating they’d be interested in the TAG and EAG meeting recordings or summaries when they’re available. MoP additionally asks how to access the most recent public comments inquiring: “Are they batched and released later or continuously being added? Somewhere on the project website?”

8/16/2021 – MoP writes WSF stating:

June 30 2009 Final & Long Range Plan pg. 26

Based on comments heard at the Fauntleroy public hearing and comments received by the City of Seattle, the concept of expanding the Fauntleroy dock (as proposed in the Draft Scenario A) was not viewed as feasible. As a result, the project was removed from the Revised Draft Plan, and WSF will investigate all possible roadway and right-of-way options, if expanded vehicle holding is needed.

WSF – I reviewing the 2009 document, I noted the above statement. In our next meeting, could you comment on how this changed to Fauntleroy dock replacement? I suspect I do not fully understand this process.

June 30 2009 Final & Long Range Plan pg. 6

Growth, Ridership Demand, and Service Needs. Although WSF serves nearly 23 million riders annually, ridership is down over 13% since its peak in 1999. While there is population growth expected in many of the communities served by WSF, it is not clear how this will translate into increased demand for ferry service. Ridership has declined from 2000 to 2006 throughout the system, despite population growth in counties serviced by WSF ranging from 4% growth in Kitsap County to 14% in Island County during the same period of time.

WSF – I recognize that COVID has played havoc with projections, but it appears that there may be a trend that ridership may not increase as much as expected due to the “work from home” trending today. Could you provide updated ridership projections for the triangle?

7/30/2021 – CAG member writes the project inbox asking about a ridership table in CAG slide deck.

7/29/2021 – CAG member writes WSF stating she never received the comment log.

7/6/2021 – CAG member asks WSF about CAG roster and recordings being made public.

7/14/2021 – CAG member responds stating they shared comments from the CAG with the FCA meeting (7/13); they ask if they can share CAG information and how the public can provide input.

7/14/2021 – CAG member asks if comments made to the inbox would be shared with other CAG members.

7/19/2021 – CAG member inquires if ALL comments are shared or only the ones that WSF “wants to send out”.

7/20/2021 – CAG member concurs but reiterates the worry that WSF might just be “checking the box” without a “formal recommendation” as an advisory body.

6/23/2021 – CAG member writes WSF and the project inbox expressing concerns about the lack of CAG member socioeconomic and racial diversity, the commitment to group process when some CAG members noted access and relationship to elected officials and discouragement about whether members of the group are open to new perspectives in this process.

5/12/2021 – MoP writes asking if there are committee members representing students commuting to Vashon Island.

5/11/2021 – MoP writes asking if he can make a 20-minute presentation to the CAG or TAG about “established engineering designs” that’ll mitigate construction, service, and neighborhood dock replacement interruptions.

7/14/2021 – MoP follows up suggesting the best way to achieve various goals for the project could be done by constructing a floating dock, additionally sending in a pdf document of a self-drawn overview diagram of their proposal.

Community involvement

8/17/2021 – MoP writes WSF asking for TAG & EAG recordings and opportunities to provide comment.

7/19/21 – FAC member, writes WSF asking if there're any updates for report to the Vashon-Maury Island Community Council.

3/20/2021 – MoP writes advocating for high school students' involvement in the project and expressing interest in being a more involved individual on the project.

3/19/2021 -- MoP wrote expressing interest in being involved on the project.

3/18/2021 – MoP wrote expressing interest in being involved on the project specifically to help quicker construction, less community disruption, reducing local changes, easier berthing, and less damage from berthing errors.