



P.O. Box 266
Lummi Island, WA 98262
February 2, 2015

Dear Lummi Island Ferry Advisory Committee,

The Board of Protect Lummi Island Community (PLIC), representing a community alliance of Lummi Island residents and property owners, has followed the work of the LIFAC Ferry Replacement Subcommittee with great interest. Based on a review of a first draft of their report and its presentation to LIFAC at its meeting on January 6th, the PLIC Board of Directors has attempted to provide a forum to share information about and invite feedback on the draft. The subcommittee was invited to present their findings to the approximately 50 islanders at the PLIC Annual Meeting on January 27, 2015. Attendees were able to comment and ask questions. Many of you were present to share that experience.

In addition, PLIC developed a survey to capture the comments of a wider island population. Nearly 150 surveys were returned. Those with names and addresses have been compiled into the attached report representing opinions of 127 respondents. Based on over 60% of the respondents indicating that they either somewhat or strongly agree that the report should be moved forward, along with islanders' individual comments, the PLIC Board encourages LIFAC to forward the report to the Whatcom County Public Works for their review. It is understood that there is possibly a short period of time that the M/V Hiyu will be available on the market, and it is one of the few possible ferries available to service Lummi Island. A conscious, well-informed decision on whether to seriously consider its purchase should be made as soon as possible, and such a decision can only be made with further input from Public Works.

PLIC board members have received a wide variety of questions and concerns from islanders as part of the process of making the survey available. Some islanders voiced concern about how their answers might be construed. The most widely voiced concern is that of cost. A full 73% indicated that they would pay no more for ferry service. Twenty-three (23)% indicate they would pay from 1-25% more to have a second vehicle ferry available.

We thank you for your work on behalf of the island and your consideration of these findings.

Respectfully,

The PLIC Board of Directors

Rhayma Blake, Mike Kmiecik, Beth Louis, Jansen Pierce, Janet Lutz-Smith, Mary Ross, Dave Wing

PLIC ANNUAL MEETING SURVEY

Prepared for presentation at the
Lummi Island Ferry Advisory Committee Meeting
February 3, 2015

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

- One of the primary purposes of Protect Lummi Island Community (PLIC) is to foster respectful and informed discussions within the community when issues arise regarding the ferry service.
- The purpose of this study is to determine Lummi Islanders' current attitudes concerning the ferry and the draft of the Lummi Island Ferry Replacement and Options Report which the Lummi Island Ferry Advisory Committee (LIFAC) Ferry Replacement Subcommittee presented to LIFAC at its meeting on January 6, 2015.
- A total of 127 surveys were completed between January 25 – 31, 2015 using a hybrid methodology:
 - 110 online
 - 17 paper at the PLIC Annual Meeting or The Islander
- Islanders were made aware of the survey via the PLIC Annual Meeting on January 27th, Nextdoor, Brown Betty, PLIC eblast, Facebook, and notices at the Lummi Island Post Office, and The Islander.

ISSUES PROBED

- Preference on ferry size
- Importance of frequency of service
- Preference on the amount of fuel usage
- Importance of air and water pollution emissions
- Need for more deck space between cars for ease of exiting
- Need for second vehicle ferry
- Willingness to pay more for an additional ferry
- Interest in having the report examined further by Public Works

KEY FINDINGS

- Over 60% of the respondents indicate that the report should be forwarded to Whatcom County Public Works, along with islanders' comments articulated in the survey. In fact, 41% strongly agree that the report should be forwarded for further examination. Eighteen (18%) strongly disagree, however.
- Respondents are sensitive to the financial implications of the report. Seventy-three (73%) indicate they would pay no more for a larger or second ferry. And many of the written comments express concern about potential financial impacts.
- Approximately one-third of respondents agree that a larger ferry is needed.
- Also one out of three indicate the island should have a second vehicular ferry available when needed.
- Three-fourths of the respondents indicate that two runs per hour could meet their service needs.
- Forty-three (43%) of respondents agree that more deck space for ease of exiting the car on the ferry is preferred. Just under one out of four feel strongly.
- Three of the 127 respondents are ferry crewmembers. Two strongly disagreed with moving the report forward. The third strongly agreed with moving it forward, primarily for a more thorough estimate of costs.
- Approximately half of the respondents included comments with their survey, and LIFAC is encouraged to review these comments at the back of this report before acting. Predominant themes in the comments include:
 - A larger or second ferry might benefit the island.
 - The Whatcom Chief serves the island well.
 - Costs and issues with the Hiyu could be underestimated.
 - Sending forward a report that could increase expenses might jeopardize islanders' hard-won credibility with county government.

DETAILED FINDINGS

Q. 1 A larger ferry is needed.

Approximately one-third of respondents agree that a larger ferry is needed.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	37.60% 47	12.80% 16	11.20% 14	20.00% 25	14.40% 18	4.00% 5	125	2.49

Q. 2 While the most frequent ferry service is ideal, two ferry runs in a typical hour are sufficient to meet my transportation needs.

Three-fourths of the respondents are either neutral or agree that two runs per hour could meet their service needs.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	9.84% 12	15.57% 19	12.30% 15	17.21% 21	44.26% 54	0.82% 1	122	3.68

Q. 3 A ferry with the lowest fuel consumption is preferred.

Economical fuel consumption is preferred by most respondents.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	4.00% 5	4.00% 5	21.60% 27	27.20% 34	39.20% 49	4.00% 5	125	3.82

Q. 4 A ferry with the lowest water and air pollution emissions is preferred.

Air and water pollution are also a concern of most respondents.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	3.23% 4	3.23% 4	20.97% 26	31.45% 39	37.90% 47	3.23% 4	124	3.88

Q. 5 The ferry should have more deck space than we currently have between cars for ease of exiting.

Forty-three (43%) of respondents agree that more deck space for ease of exiting the car on the ferry is preferred. Just under one out of four feel strongly.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	16.00% 20	16.00% 20	24.00% 30	20.80% 26	22.40% 28	0.80% 1	125	3.15

Q. 6 Lummi Island should have a second vehicle ferry available when needed.

Nearly one out of three respondents indicate the island should have a second vehicular ferry available when needed.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	32.00% 40	21.60% 27	13.60% 17	20.80% 26	9.60% 12	2.40% 3	125	2.47

Q.7 Would you be willing to pay more to have a second ferry available when needed, if so how much more?

Nearly three out of four respondents would pay no more to have a second ferry.

Answer Choices	Responses
I would pay no more. A passenger-only ferry is sufficient back up.	73.17% 90
1-25%	22.76% 28
26-50%	4.07% 5
51-75%	0.81% 1
75-100%	0.00% 0
More than 100%	0.00% 0
Total Respondents: 123	

Q.8 The report developed by the LIFAC Ferry Replacement Subcommittee along with this summary of public comments should be forwarded to Whatcom County Public Works for their review.

Despite many reservations expressed in the comments at the end of this report, a majority of respondents indicate that the subcommittee’s information should be forwarded to Whatcom Public Works for their review. In fact, 41% strongly agree that it should be forwarded for further examination. Eighteen (18%) strongly disagree, however.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	18.03% 22	4.92% 6	11.48% 14	19.67% 24	40.98% 50	4.92% 6	122	3.46

Q. 10 Which statement most accurately characterizes your usage of the ferry?

Nearly all of the respondents answered survey questions as drivers of a personal vehicle, not walk-on passengers.

Answer Choices	Responses
Driver of a personal vehicle	97.44% 114
Passenger of a personal vehicle	7.69% 9
Walk-on passenger	4.27% 5
Driver of a commercial vehicle	1.71% 2
Total Respondents: 117	

Other:

- 1 Sometimes I am a passenger in car.
- 2 half the time i drive, the other half i drive.
- 3 Whatcom Chief crew member, 23 years. Master, 100 gwt, inland waters, 20 years
- 4 The majority of my trips are business related.
- 5 1/3 driver, 1/3 passenger of veh. 1/3 walkon. false forced choice
- 6 1-3 times a week, I am sometimes a passenger in a car or a walk-on.
- 7 All of the above
- 8 IF THE WALKON FARE WAS REASONABLE I WOULD WALK
- 9 employee/operator of Whatcom Chief
- 10 Both an occasional driver but mostly walk-on
- 11 Often I am the driver, often I am the passenger, on occasion I am a walk on (Karen walks on 5 days/wk--sometimes more)
- 12 I commute. One car R/T per week, and the other four days I'm a walk-on.
- 13 Pedestrian - we often park & walk across

(Q. 9): **Other comments, questions, or concerns about the report that have not been addressed in this survey. (Optional)**

The report should be sent forward...

Time to process request thru county.

Comments should be submitted with the report with a request to conduct an objective assessment comparing all options.

Actual costs overall need to be stated. No question about needing a newer (as opposed to a larger) ferry.

You need a realistic timeframe to be developed for all components.

overall fuel will be less used with hiyu

The Hiyu report should be sent to the County for their review with the understanding that the report doesn't speak for everyone on the island. In my view there are many good points and suggestions in the document but other issues were missed and I don't agree with all the conclusions. The County needs to hear our voices and their leadership will review whatever input they're given critically, as they should

The report by the ferry committee is a very well done and complete preliminary evaluation of a ferry replacement opportunity. I strongly support the passing this report to the county council, with the recommendation that money be committed to obtain an option of first refusal to obtain the Hiyu from WSF (protection against the loss of the Hiyu) and funding for the resolution of a number of outstanding questions and issues. For example, crew reduction for the Hiyu must be resolved, increasing the crew size is a deal breaker, what are the real terms (\$) between WSF and Whatcom Co. for transfer of the ferry, the engineering for modifications to the landings (not lost dollars, would also be done for new boat design), any required modifications to the boat itself, etc. The total of all capital costs and projected operating expenses should be rolled up into a 10 year pro forma operating statement for ferry operations with projected ferry fares for the three potential options, ie. maintaining the Chief, the Hiyu, or a new design. Probability and sensitivity analysis of the various cost items should be considered for the final forecasted operating statements. If there is a significantly lowest, most probable, cost option, the final decision becomes easy. As I believe, most people on the Island and those in county management will set aside the "side issues" and the "nice to haves, etc." for the most probable lowest cost option. The question concerning retention of the Chief for a three county backup is a totally separate project with no bearing on the above decision. The base case is continuation of passenger ferry service during outages. If the Chief should become surplus, a potential opportunity can be formally evaluated of the cost

benefit analysis for it's use as a backup boat verses sale or scraping. Don Wines
2219 N Nugent.

In fact, a larger ferry or second ferry might benefit the island...

A larger boat could facilitate construction and development.

Ferry to Fairhaven to get away from the Lummis. Get us to town, buses, civilization.

I find the report very comprehensive and well researched. I think the notion of a standby could be acceptable if the cost is shared with other ferry using groups. I doubt there is an ideal ferry for lummi island that wold completely satisfy everyone, but the Hiyu seems very close.

Decreased frequency to twice an hour might be OK with increased capacity so getting on would not be more difficult

When we first bought our property on Lummi there was a state grant in play for a larger ferry. As I remember, the county council vetoed the purchase of a larger ferry. I understand this was mostly because they didn't want growth on the island. This was irresponsible in my option. The ferry needs to be larger and I don't believe there needs to be a second ferry. Just one larger one.

I feel that something has happened- I have my theory as Frank Abart has resigned but the Coast Guard is not happy with us. Therefore, the Whatcome Chief may be reduced to 14 cars max. The Coast Guard is pushing this Hiyu. If we do not get it, they will take action is the rumblings by them. Are islanders willing to take a 50% reduction in ferry service at a greater cost? That was never put on this questionnaire.

The Island needs have change a lot in the 52 years this ferry has been in service. Also a second ferry is needed for dry dock due to the lack of mainland parking.

It seems it's time to think outside the box. A ferry going into Fairhaven is a viable option. Think about moving people - not cars with single passengers in each. Lummi Nation does NOT benefit from cars using fossil fuels with one person in each car zipping through their community. The ferry to Fairhaven could be a several-times/day vehicle ferry but mostly a passenger ferry. Excellent pedestrian connections from Fairhaven. Would also lead to reduced driving on the Island. We could establish solar-powered car re-charging stations on the island. It's time to research this more thoroughly.

Others feel the Whatcom Chief serves the island well and are wary of something bigger...

The Whatcom Chief should be adequate for the next twenty years.

Whatcom Chief is a very good vessel for this application. With proper care it will last many years to come. We don't need a 50 yr. old piece of garbage.

THE FERRY IS FINE AS IT IS BUT THE FARES ARE TOO HIGH. THIS SIMPLE ROBUST FERRY IS GOOD FOR YEARS ACCORDING TO THE SURVEYOR/EXPERT

I'm concerned about raising fares. Also, ferrying to Fairhaven would be a hardship due to work commute and time. If I was wealthy or didn't work FT I wouldn't care. I think Gooseberry will be nicer when the Tribe completes a new Marina.

From my knowledge, the Whatcom Chief should be able to meet our needs for a while longer, without the help of a second ferry. But 1) I would like to see us move towards having a vehicular ferry during dry dock to serve our aging island population. And 2) I would appreciate seeing Public Work's analysis of how the Hiyu might be bigger, "badder", and faster in taking Lummi Islanders to alternative locations (Cherry Point or Fairhaven). That financial analysis might include a savings of \$4 million in future uplands lease payments and \$6.2 million in tidelands payments over the next 31 years.

If the Chief is not big enough with additional runs made, then we should look to building a better Chief design since the 'cork' design is a useful one in this extremely treacherous but short distance. We do not need a huge ferry, we need a ferry that can handle both the needs of night workers coming home on the late ferry and the large commuter crush that occurs predictably both morning and early evening. Buying an older ferry with outdated technology not easily converted does not solve our concerns. We are entering an era where transportation will need to be efficient as well as convenient. If a new ferry is needed, if the Chief cannot be retrofitted and ran efficiently-if it does not have the possibility to run on renewable fuel such as biofuel--if these measures cannot be met, then it would be better to look at pursuing a new ferry, one that will meet all requirements, not just a bigger lane for one's car. To continue this discussion, we also need serious negotiation done for a direct smaller bus for those who work in town, so we can expand our abilities to provide better transportation for those who do commute to a main hub like Bellingham.

Yes, we agree that the summary of comments (or the actual comments) should be forwarded for review by Whatcom County Public Works. After living on Whidbey Island for 20+ years, I can personally tell you how switching to larger ferries have negatively impacted the island. It has brought "more" congestion

because there are "more" cars able to come to the island each crossing, creating heavily traveled roads; it has brought "more" of an increase in ambient noise for islanders because more people are traveling on the roads; it has brought an increased level of "crime" and changes to "safety" of residents on the island as well. It has even increased the use of the "free bus" that locals rely upon to get to and from appointments and the like. It allows those with "resources" to use the "resources" that were truly created for those that really needed and relied upon said "free transit." There has also been an increased demand for people to live and play on Whidbey Island, meaning that for locals, the housing and rent increases substantially. This is great for those in real estate, but not so great for people that chose the island as a SAFE place to raise a family and have children that are allowed to enjoy the beauty of unspoiled outdoors. Don't let this happen to Lummi Island! With growth, comes a lot of undesirable factors people underestimate or don't even consider. We use the Whatcom Chief each and every day. We rely on it for transportation. My husband and I rarely see a long line; in fact, we are often surprised that there is NOT a backup when we anticipate there might be. It is our understanding that the Whatcom Chief has been an invaluable resource for islanders, it has weathered many storms, seems to be indistructible, and frankly, we hold her dear to our hearts. Sincerely, Connie and Craig Miller

Need to look at making the Chief longer. It's a great boat and well maintained.

There is an important distinction missing between "larger ferry" and "better ferry service." It is possible that some people may want a ferry that will carry log trucks, for example, hence "larger ferry." For everyday operations, however, optimal capacity (cars and passengers per hour) is about ability to handle peak demand periods. A smaller vessel has more flexibility to to meet peak demand by making more runs, and a larger vessel does not.

For Q 7 no more than 10% increase AFTER the current surcharge is cancelled. The current demand and income does not warrant a larger ferry. Beware this debate is more an issue of pro-growth vs stainable island living than the particulars of a new/larger ferry. Does LI want to be a bedroom community of Ferndale/B'ham or maintain its own unique rural community character?

Without general agreement that a new Ferry is needed this seems like a waste of time.

The question at hand is , should we be replacing The Whatcm Chief, not whether the possible replacement is larger

Some are concerned that the report underestimates the costs and issues involved with purchase of the Hiyu...

I have a major concern with increase costs. Not only is there storage and maintenance costs, but insurance to consider. Renting the second ferry to another party is costly too. It makes more sense to rent someone else's car ferry as a backup when needed..

Questions #3 & #4 are trick questions - let's face it - who won't want a ferry with lower fuel consumption and better water and air pollution - we all care about the planet - but a bigger ferry is not the answer. A larger ferry only brings larger problems: retrofit existing docks - more deckhands,etc. We all just saw many weeks of ferry-dock repairs and upgrades...(for what then...) Now to some bigger questions: this whole larger ferry situation is really brought about by one person (with I'm sure a cadre of others - who are unaware) Jimmy Dickinson who is pushing this whole thing through because he & his family want to haul longer - heavier loads of logs off Lummi Mountain - and a bigger ferry would work within their plans. Is this the best for all? Unfortunately PLIC & LIFAC do not represent the whole Island by any means. There are SO many residents who are just trying to get by in life and have no idea that something like a "bigger ferry" is even on the drawing board. And others - just don't care - or don't want to get involved...It's the same old story everywhere - every day. And now let's get down to the nitty-gritty! Who has the money? I don't, do you? As tax-payers - we are ALL maxed out. The county sure doesn't want to buy Lummi Island a bigger - expensive ferry. Lummi Islanders don't want to pay more for a ferry. Where is the money coming from? This is the most important question. Please, use common sense - the Whatcom Chief satisfies our everyday needs. Yes, it's a boat. Yes, it breaks down ONCE in a while. You choose to live on an Island - that means you take situations as they come. If you want everyday conveniences - maybe an island is not for you. If the Coast Guard continues to inspect and pass the Whatcom Chief with certification - which MUST happen every year - what then is the problem. And for the record - I have lived on the Island 40 years - the Whatcom Chief has served me well! Thank you - Buff Lapof

Anyone who preaches that a larger ferry will be more economical is not telling the truth. It takes MORE power to move more tonnage through the water not less. See high school physics. A larger ferry will cost more to run - more to maintain - more to haul out - on and on - could we get objective about this? It is a bad joke that the prime proponents of a large ferry is an island family who want to use it for their logging business. And who the hell has the money for this day dream? Certainly not the county. The Whatcom Chief is well maintained - as efficient as can be for its size - and easily repairable, hull and systems, on into the future. It it does not meet your needs, please move somewhere where you won't have to rely on it. Thank you.

No discussion about the ferry size, schedule and other matters is complete without careful analysis of capital and operating costs. Its difficult to respond to this survey because there is no consideration of costs and who pays what.

The report as written glosses over some of the most significant costs. It also comes across as a shopping channel sales pitch. Conclusions are drawn in the report which the subcommittee and LIFAC are not qualified to make, as it requires an engineer. Supporting data is absent on crucial issues (such as condition of the Chief), and other alternatives have not been explored (such as lengthening the Chief itself).

Maintenance and operational costs of the Hihu are way underestimated in the report.

We need to learn to live within our means. Maintaining and updating the current ferry is best.

All the potential costs of the larger ferry, eg, acquisition, dock upgrades, staff cost increases, plus any other costs, really need to be nailed down and assessed before we send a 'recommendation' to the county. I'm basically happy with the Chief. It can be tough in the summer, but usually the ferry comes right back if there's a line waiting at either side, so the wait isn't too long. The Hiyu could be good but only if all the future costs are considered. We've recently had such huge fare increases, we would not be in favor of a change if any significant fare increases were required.

We don't need a "new" old ferry to replace the Chief. I don't see sailing to Fairhaven as an ideal option. Is there a lot of free parking in Fairhaven if the ferry moored there? No. Replacing the Chief with the Hiyu sounds like a terrible waste of money. The ferry rates and waits are reasonable. Anytime I use one of the State Ferries I am grateful for our small, frequent runs. I commute every day and many times the Chief is not full. For busy runs, if I HAVE to get to town, I know to get in line early. I see no advantage in buying a "temporary" replacement that requires 2 more crew persons, makes fewer runs and requires expensive dock changes when nothing is wrong with the ferry we have.

The Hiyu has too many negatives : size ,draft ,crew ,docks, deferred main trance to mention a few, to fit our needs!

Given differences in consumption between Chief and Hiyu are neglible, unknown re: pollution. These questions force inappropriate choices. "Should have more space for exit' is another question with leading wording. Chief has enough if we agree to change loading and charge people 2X fare for owners w/vehicles that take up 2 spaces. Appreciate PLIC's effort to learn 'what islanders want' but survey would be more meaningful with without leading questions. Also better with

query re specific source of knowledge (from 'none, really' to 'friends told me their opinions to have read report and all comments on nextdoor and FF& attended meetings to nada). Then could summarize results by (self-claimed) knowledge of issues, which could influence answers a great deal. For example, I thought the proposals were intriguing & likely viable at first, but as I learned, thought & listened more I've changed my mind. I'd still entertain replacing the Chief w/Hiyu IF the total time & costs (short & long term) and feasibility (will LN allow dock modifications etc) weren't prohibitive. A 2nd vessel is appealing but would necessitate higher fares even if 2 other counties agreed to pay 1/3 each. I think we keep the Chief (and yes, there are risks with this option too) and meanwhile lobbying to start designing with new ferry system (docks, location, appropriately designed vessel). Of course, I've detailed all my concerns elsewhere. Don't know why I repeat them here.

More time is needed for projections and opportunities for collaboration with the county and Tribe. Two ferries seems to take some primary concerns off track.

This report lacks technical details and citations and was prepared without knowledge of engineering principles and knowledge of metalurgy. Much of the document is written in a manner designed to appeal to emotion and fear. The report lacks an understanding of permitting details, such as timelines necessary for dredging, environmental mitigation issues and an understanding of the needs and desires of the Lummi Nation, into which the County recently entered a lease agreement. Finally, the report lacks economic details that affect not only island residents but other county residents who pay into the road fund that contribute to the ferry's costs.

This poll is biased towards 'pushing' an agenda of change without clearly addressing the trade-offs required, until question 7, then only if a 2nd ferry is kept. If you ask someone if they prefer candy to no candy, then the answer is pretty obvious. Asking about fuel consumption, bigger boats, more service or other 'wants' will bias the results. towards the 'greed' reaction in all of us.

I believe the cost of operating and maintaining a larger ferry would be prohibitive, and that, while the substitute passenger ferry can be inconvenient, I've gotten by with it for 37 years of residence on LI. Hence do not think the cost of keeping a second ferry on tap would be justified. Someone suggested that the backup ferry could be shared amongst several users, in which case it might be a better option. In the future, current low oil costs notwithstanding, I believe that fuel cost and availability will very likely become a serious problem within a few years and a larger ferry would only exacerbate the challenges that would present. In an era when CO2 and climate change have become an issue, it's up to us to rein back our fuel usage and pollution emission, not increase it, even at the expense of inconvenience. Note that there's a typo in question 2. My answer should be "Somewhat Disagree"

I believe the Lummi Nation will not allow the ferry Hiyu to operate in their traditional fishing grounds in Hale Pass.

I have read the LIFAC report regarding the acquisition of the M/V Hiyu, and have a few questions that I am hoping that those of you more familiar can answer for me. 1. The report mentions that the Hiyu is licensed for a crew of five. The Whatcom Chief currently operates with a crew of three. Annual salary costs would therefore increase by 60%. It also mentions that our crew is not certified to operate the Hiyu, being over 100 tonnes. \$250,000 in modifications would need to be spent to classify her as a 100 tonne vessel, OR we could try to get legislation changed. This seems to be a substantial expenditure just to acquire a “free” replacement ferry. 2. The report mentions that 78 tides a year would be too severe for Hiyu to run. The handling of this would include canceling runs, bringing in the Chief, or jumping through federal hoops to get the landings dredged. We are then faced with the expense of dredging, the expense in maintaining and operating an additional vessel, or limiting accessibility to the island. So, more expense and less accessibility. 3. Annual maintenance – the report mentions that in the past 6 years, repairs to Hiyu have only totaled \$610,000, while the Chief has spent \$1.7 million in that time. Seeing that Hiyu was in service for the grand total of 8 days in 2013, of course maintenance costs were are lower. She has been a back up ferry since 2007. 4. The report recommends that the dock facilities on both sides be repositioned and rebuilt to berth a reserve ferry and to accommodate available ferries that might dock there. What is the estimated cost of such an expense? 5. It is estimated that the Whatcom Chief can last another 20 years. The Hiyu can last 25. A new ferry will cost \$10 million. It seems to me that we can keep the Whatcom Chief for 20 years, with no additional modifications or expense, or we can get the “free” Hiyu, spend a couple hundred thousand modifying her to avoid certifying the crew, rebuild the docks on both sides to allow the Whatcom Chief to moor there, then pay the expense in maintaining the Whatcom Chief as a “spare”, and then, with only a five year difference in time, replace both ferries with a new one, because they have both exceeded their rated lifespan. Do we really even want to consider the effort and expense, only to gain 5 years of operational life, just so someone doesn't have to wait for the next ferry?

And some suggest that by sending forward a report that could increase expenses, islanders might lose hard-won credibility with county government...

I have grave concerns about eroding Lummi Islands hard won credibility with county government especially in light of the fact that LIFAC currently is requesting PW and County to consider fare structure measures that would be giving those buying multi ride passes significant rate relief. Following that up with request to consider a proposal that has so much truly unknowns as far as actual operating costs seems very unwise to me. I know that "time of opportunity" is according to the report, very limited but I am of the feeling that the actual costs and benefits, consequences of actually acquiring the HIYU have not even begun to be addressed. Thinking that it will cost less to haul out, paint, maintain mechanical systems on a larger vessel is wishful thinking. Plain and simply stated, painting a 1000 square foot house will cost more than painting a 5,000 square foot house. It will cost more in materials, It will cost more in labor, and it will take more time to do it. When this is not a house but a boat, there is an additional factor of cost to haul out and store the boat while work is being done. A larger boat may require a larger dry dock facility which I would imagine would be more expensive. When this boat is a ferry that people rely on for daily transportation the additional factor that must be considered when looking at costs is time. The ferry's purpose is twofold, move people and goods back and forth between mainland and island, and also to generate revenue to pay for a large portion of its operating costs via fares. When ferry cannot operate due to "dry dock" it is not able to generate revenue. Therefore it is desirable to minimize length of time a ferry is in "dry dock". The only way to do this is to hire more workers to get the job done quicker which is more \$. I am sorry but I do not find speculations put forth in this section of report based upon any cold hard facts despite what committee says it has found. Other gloss overs are environmental concerns...The "scouring of silt" idea put forth in the report simply defies what little I know about the marine environmental protection laws. Saying that getting permission to dredge will be simple is counter to everything I have ever heard or seen. I have watched and participated via public comment in the process that both the Port of Everett and the Port of Bellingham had to go through just to get a permit for maintenance dredging within their marinas. It is NOT an insignificant process. In the meantime the fact remains that the HIYU would be sitting on the bottom in Lummi Island side berth at any -1 tide or below. (How much will it cost to keep the HIYU sitting out in deep water until the tide comes back in, and how much revenue lost does that translate into) or how much overtime, fuel cost etc. will it cost to have the crew onboard sitting out in the middle of Hales passage for 3 hours from 2 to 5 AM as the tide falls below and then rises above -1 foot in the middle of a stormy December night. How much inconvenience will it be to islanders if the ferry can't get into the island slip during low tides during a morning commute. (This does affect ferry operations on WSF ferry route between Port Townsend and Keystone Whidbey Island but Whidbey residents do have an

alternative in the form of a bridge). Also just letting the ferry sit on the bottom during low tide does not seem like a practical one either. Ships not specifically designed to do this risk structural damage to hull. The reports way of negating the draft issue suggesting dredging (long permit process and costly) scouring (in today's times of increased awareness of environmental costs of stirring up hundreds of yards of marine sediment on nearby eel grass beds or crabbing grounds shows much naiveté on the part of those proposing this idea) and bringing in a second ferry (the Whatcom Chief) whenever the tide will be too low forces the county into a two ferry ownership situation which in spite of what the proponents of acquiring the HIYU say in the report recommending keeping the Chief and sharing it's costs between two other counties state, Whatcom county would still be incurring additional unnecessary costs. I have read all of the report that has been published. Read all of the posts on Next Door I also went through the documentation provided by the committee via Bill Fox's link on Next Door, I have attended some but in no way all of the meetings discussing this issue, I took up the invitation Jim Dickinson posted on Next Door and went down and looked at the HIYU myself last spring along with members of the technical committee, and members of the long range planning committee of LIFAC. I have been a concerned citizen involved with ferry issues on the island and have attended many county council meetings on ferry issues. I also have been a member of PLIC since shortly after it formed and have been a board member for several years as well. (I am in no way speaking on behalf of the PLIC board at this time, these observations and opinions are strictly my own) I also held a 100 ton USCG Masters License for 20 years (which is same license held by the ferry masters) but used it only for running smaller vessels for hire so I make no claim to knowing anything about skippering a ferry but I took the same exams, and went through the same documentation process as the captains of the Chief to initially obtain and renew my license every 5 years. Based upon all that I have read, and my own experience, I am of the OPINION that neither LIFAC's or the island's best interests would be represented by forwarding this report on to the council at this time. I know that many folks have put many hours into developing this and many good points have been raised. I also know that delay may put Whatcom County out of the running when the Hiyu is declared surplus by the state. Given all this I still have too many unanswered concerns about realities and costs to support this going forward. – Mary Ross

The Hiyu is a bad solution to a problem that doesn't exist. Lifac should strongly consider their own credibility standing with the county before forwarding this report regarding such a hare-brained scheme.

If all the islanders voted yes for this replacement ferry I think the county would still shut it down because its such a bad idea.

In my opinion.... Purported fuel savings are soley due to reduced runs. The report is biased. It was written with an outcome in mind and includes only data to support said outcome. Forwarding the report as is, will result in a loss of

credibility with the county. I'm not necessarily opposed to the Hiyu. I am opposed to the report as written. Question 2 is missing the somewhat disagree selection. Convenience surveys are NOT scientific and should NOT be construed as an accurate profile of the population surveyed.

Hiyu proposal is not a viable, responsible option. Fiscal analysis of options has not been performed, ie, cost/benefit & lifecycle costs. Please don't embarrass the LI community by forwarding to the WCPW or the County Council. However, a replacement ferry should be incorporated into the county's annual TIP (Transportation Improvement Plan).

Other...

There should be a budget to replace the current ferry with a Used ferry that should not be paid out of fares. As a capital expenditure, the County should have budgeted for this over the last 25 years..

This survey submission should represent my viewpoint, not the one I submitted in haste earlier this week. After reading and commenting on the subject, I have a clearer picture of the situation. Please make note.

Pay cut and hours for ferry crew.

Build a bridge, eliminate the ferry.

The \$3 surcharge for all (passengers to cement trucks) is extremely unfair. A surcharge should be based on deck space required and/or weight. This should be addressed, if not in this report, then in another appropriate document/meeting.

I hope that islanders read the report, and face facts over fears.

I think LIFAC should decide how to handle the subcommittee's report and public comments in terms of context, cost, content and factual reliability.

I would prefer a passenger only ferry on a regular basis, with occasional, scheduled, vehicle ferry runs.

Ferry fares too high

Questions # 3 & 4 of this survey should be normalized to per car/passenger carried. Other questions that should be addressed to reduce cost, are: does it make sense to give free service to past/present employees & their families.