CALL TO ORDER
ROLL CALL
FLAG SALUTE

MINUTES CONSENT
1. Advisory Committee for May 21, 2012
2. Advisory Committee for June 4, 2012

ANNOUNCEMENTS / SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS
1. Traffic queuing alternatives at Gooseberry Point, and other priorities w/ Ferry Captain Mark Richardson and other ferry crew members

OPEN DISCUSSION
During open session audience members can speak on any issue. Each speaker should give his or her name for the record and will be given three (3) minutes to address the committee. The committee requests that individuals intending to speak during public comments please submit the comments in writing for a compilation of public records.

OLD BUSINESS
1. 2013 Proposed Public Works Budget
   A. Electronic Ticketing RFI & Ticket Elasticity Research (Zender)
   B. Security at Gooseberry Point (McKenzie)

NEW BUSINESS
1. Traffic Queuing Recommendations requested by County Council PW Committee 6/5 for presentation by Chair on 6/19 @ 1:30 p.m. in Council Chambers

OTHER
1. Set next meeting and agenda

ADJOURN
LUMMI ISLAND FERRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (LIFAC)
Third Meeting
June 18, 2012

CALL TO ORDER
Committee Chair Mike McKenzie called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Lummi Island Fire Hall, Bellingham, Washington.

ROLL CALL
Late: Crispin Colburn, Josh Zender

FLAG SALUTE

MINUTES CONSENT
1. Approved minutes for May 21, 2012 Meeting
2. Approved minutes for June 4, 2012 Meeting

ANNOUNCEMENTS / SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS
Traffic queuing alternatives at Gooseberry Point, and other priorities w / Ferry Captain Mark Richardson:
McKenzie introduced the topic with a quick review of the presentation made by the Transpo Group at the June 5, Whatcom County Council (WCC) Meeting. McKenzie introduced the Whatcom Chief Ferry Captain Mark Richardson to express what he felt the best option would be for the ferry traffic queuing. Richardson presented a "funneling" type of option that had not been considered by the Transpo Group that appears to have a simpler control strategy and would allow for a few more vehicles on the approach. (see attached sketch). The LIFAC agreed that this may be a viable option.

The following are responses from Richardson to various questions from the LIFAC:
- Two lanes would be enough most of the year w/4 lanes only at big events and other
- 10:00 pm busy. 11:00 to Midnight Light, and 12:20 am mostly empty
- Of importance to crew:
  ✓ Raise
  ✓ Ferry passes for crew and retirees
  ✓ Running reliable - 2 ea. new rebuilt engines at dry dock
  ✓ Continued very good response and knowledge from PW
  ✓ Having a lot of backup
  ✓ Some resistance to electronic ticketing:
    ◆ 95% wo/cash mostly pay when leaving island,
    ◆ Current method works and is not broken,
    ◆ How to do a receipt?
    ◆ Barely have time to do 20 vehicles & passengers now,
    ◆ Maybe pilot a system

McKenzie allowed the 13-15 audience members to ask questions of Richardson as follow:
Mike Skehan - Asked if there were plans for a new boat capacity chart? The current study is old.
Bud Jewell - Asked about how the electronic ticketing would handle cash transaction? Zender answered that it would depend on the technology available.
Others asked to save question on ticketing until later discussion
Mike Skehan - Asked if the schedule could be changed to the "clock face", i.e. leave the island on the hour and return on the half hour.
Rhayma Blake - Does the hour schedule give the crew break time? It gets intensive around 5:00 pm maybe there should be a 5/1 system where there are 5 runs and one break.
Bud Jewell - Submitted a written letter (attached) to the L1FAC:

1. The traffic volumes shown are from 2009 prior to the high ferry fares now in effect. Also the December traffic is not representative of the overflow traffic causing the Tribe concern.
2. Of the three alternatives presented the first is the best because it caused the least disruption of parking, is the least expensive, and could be best understood by drivers waiting to board the ferry.
3. On the recommended signage reading "Alternate, 1 Vehicle Per Lane", I would suggest a 4th line reading "Left to Right." The draft calls this the "Honor System", but is no different than any 4-way stop on any intersection in the county.
4. This alternative will only work if the current Ferry Lane marked on Lummi Shore Road remains to handle the occasional times when traffic exceeds the capacity of the Queuing area. This property still belongs to the County as road right of way.
5. The proposed pedestrian waiting area will slow down loading procedures unless pedestrians are allowed to walk up the dock while cars are loading. Are they going to tear down the current shelter at the end of the dock?

OPEN SESSION (There were 13-15 citizen's in attendance)
Due to the allowed comment during the other portions of the meeting, there were no comments from the audience for open session.

OLD BUSINESS
1. 2013 Proposed Public Works Budget - Zender explained that the Budgets on the website for 2012 had not been updated so he was unsure what might be asked of the for a reduction of the ferry budget. There is still a belief that it will be less than the original $250K suggested. The LIFAC will need to be more interested in helping to set and make suggestions for the 2013 budget.

2. Electronic Ticketing RFI & Ticket Elasticity Research (Zender)
LIFAC thanked Zender for his work to get out the 20+ "Requests for Information" (RFI) for electronic ticketing options. Zender sent out copies of the RFI and explained that it explains the ferry ticketing issues and visions and asks the various vendors for information in response. He expects that only 4 or 5 will respond as we are not actually asking for a formal proposal at this point. He hopes to get several differing options and some estimated costs. This RFI will direct the "Request for Proposal" (RFP):
   • Possible ability to issues tickets on-line rather than just at the ferry
   • Creating new levels of customer service and better accountability
   • Devices that will be of heavy duty material that can stand the use and weather
DISCLAIMER: This document is a draft and is provided as a courtesy. This document is not to be considered as the final minutes. All information contained herein is subject to change upon further review and approval by the Lummi Ferry Island Advisory Committee.

- Cash tracking
- Real-time accountability

McKenzie allowed the audience members to ask questions of Zender as follow:

Mike Skehan - Asked why receipts are required? Zender says that they may be able to electronic receipts rather paper and this would surely work if there was on-line ticketing.

Mike Skehan asked if in the RFI, did you ask for a data stream, i.e., number of vehicles, number of passengers, times, etc. Colburn responded that back-up data was asked for.

Mary Ross - Asked about multi-ride tickets and Zender responded that the RFI asked for solutions from the vendors.

Steve Thomas - Asked if debit cards could be used and again that would hopefully be answered with the RFI.

Bill Lee - Explained that this option in the past proved to be very expensive, but that the systems then were mechanical hard paper ticket issue machines.

Rhayma Blake - Asked how the system would interface with the PW accounting system?

Zender explained that he currently works is the City budget system and would be able to work with the PW to assure the system would interface.

McKenzie - Asked what would happen if there was a signal loss to the entry devices? Zender responded that most of this type of equipment would have a back-up storage, so that the system would update when the signal returned.

Richardson - Asked what if the signal loss happened all of the time when the ferry crossed a certain point. Zender responded that the selected vendors would have to provide a guarantee.

Colburn - (comment) The system should be of the benefit to the crew. He says the system should be important them as well as to others. He related a similar effort at the Whatcom Transit Authority (WTA) where special effort was make to assure the new system would work for the drivers.

McKenzie invited the ferry captain and the crew to attend any future meeting as they were always welcome and their input would be valued.

3. Security at Gooseberry Point (McKenzie)

McKenzie explained that PW does not expect to renew the contract for the private security company for the mainland landing. He indicated that they may be making some provision for the 2012 and 2013 dry dock periods. This issue needs to be decided by July 15th.

Antholt commented that in the 70's this was a real issue and thought it may still be an issue without security. He thought the current issue may with public safety and not for private property.

McKenzie allowed the audience members participate in the discussion as follows:

Jim Dickenson had issues with PW not renewing the security. He has history of damage to his vehicles and of others.

Antholt agreed with Dickenson.

Zender suggested using a camera system.

Mary Ross says the only reason PW wants to cut security is to save ~$80K.

Jim Dickenson commented that if more people drive their cars thru fare reductions there would be no need for security.
DISCLAIMER: This document is a draft and is provided as a courtesy. This document is not to be considered as the final minutes. All information contained herein is subject to change upon further review and approval by the Lummi Ferry Island Advisory Committee.

1. Eileen Martin commented that she felt strongly that there was a need for security in the dark hours for personal protection. She had issues with children walking alone especially at dry dock times.

2. Antholt asked if the LIFAC should make a recommendation before June 29th for PW to address these security concerns for 2013?

3. Clark made the following motion and was seconded by Antholt:
   LIFAC requests Public Works to include funds in the 2013 budget to cover the costs of providing personal safety security at Gooseberry Point during nighttime hours until the last ferry departs.

4. The motion passed on a voice vote 6=yes and 1=no

5. Antholt made the following motion and was seconded by McKenzie:
   Public Works need to include security for the 2012 dry dock period on the mainland side for 10 hrs at night time until the last ferry.

6. The motion passed on a voice vote 7=yes and 0=no

NEW BUSINESS

1. Traffic queuing alternatives at Gooseberry Point requested by County Council PW Committee 6/5 for presentation by Chair on 6/19 @ 1:30 pm in Council Chambers.

2. McKenzie stated that this item was no longer on the Whatcom County Council Committee agenda for 6/19. He pointed out that the general feeling from the WCC had been for the Site Layout - Option 1: Three inbound Lanes, that is recent conversation with Roland Middleton (sp) (Project Manager for the traffic queuing) that the new direction was for two lanes using the existing geography and letting overflow back-up onto Lummi Shore Drive. It was pointed out by various L1FAC members that the same funneling plan as proposed by Richardson could be used along with some simple signage.

3. LIFAC recommended that the two lane queue with the funnel option and back up onto Lummi Shore Dr would be acceptable.

4. The option for paid parking was brought up by ???

5. Dickenson commented that the cost to do paid parking had been explored and was too expensive (recalls about $100K). He still recommends lowering the ferry rate for vehicles so that there is no daily need for parking facilities.

6. Bill Lee commented that there is not real available land for secure parking. People do not park properly where the spaces are available along the road. He does not believe that there is any more room along the road, but proper parking may improve this area.


8. Mike Skehan asked about the road right-of-way, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, etc. proposed for the Lummi Shore Dr as proposed by the Tribe? How will this impact ferry parking?

9. Dickenson commented the Bill Fox had all of the correct information regarding the rights-of-way.
OTHER BUSINESS

Bush commented that at this time the Fire Hall was the only place on the island that was currently available for the LIFAC meeting. He also explained that due to other needs for the meeting room the LIFAC would need to provide a schedule for their meeting. Zender recommended that we schedule regular monthly meetings. This was discussed and it was recommended that rather than monthly the meetings should be on a 4-week basis.

The next meetings of the Lummi Island Ferry Advisory Committee will be on:

- Monday, July 16, 2012 @ 6:30 p.m.
- Monday, August 13, 2012 @ 6:30

Location will be the Lummi Island Fire Hall

Antholt asked if there was any Liability Insurance for Committee and McKenzie said he would ask at PW.

Zender asked about a domain name for the LIFAC at the County and McKenzie said he would ask at PW.

Bill Lee commented that just because the traffic queuing was not on the WCC agenda for tomorrow, the LIFAC should respond as was originally requested.

TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR THE NEXT MEETING

CALL TO ORDER
ROLL CALL
FLAG SALUTE
MINUTES CONSENT
ANNOUNCEMENTS/PRESENTATIONS
1. McKenzie will be reaching out to PW Engineering, i.e., Roland Middleton, and offer him some alternatives for a short evening meeting with him in the city after business hours. That meeting should be brief, addressing his request for input from us on signage and "education" of the public on the new method of forming the queue at Gooseberry. We also will give him our recommendation of the staggered lanes, as discussed with the ferry captain and among ourselves

OPEN SESSION

OLD BUSINESS
1. The queue recommendations, as discussed at their June 5 PW Committee session
2. Discuss Josh’s finding on the RFI for electronic ticketing, and formulate a recommendation to Council for consideration in the 2013 budget and/or beyond

NEW BUSINESS
1. The 45/55 split on the Road Fund/Ferry Box, as discussed at their June 19 PW Committee session. OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.
TRAFFIC QUEUING: FOUR LANE FUNNEL OPTION

EXIT —————— Offloading

Lane 4 ———— ♀
Lane 3 ——— Lane B ——— ♀
Lane 2 ——— Lane A ———
Lane 1 ———

Loading

Pedestrian Shelter
I understand that you will be taking comments tonight on the Ferry Queuing alternatives.

I have studied the 3 alternatives presented by the Transpo Group and would like to make the following comments:

1. The traffic volumes shown are from 2009 prior to the high ferry fares now in effect. Also the December traffic is not representative of the overflow traffic causing the Tribe concern.
2. Of the three alternatives presented the first is the best because it causes the least disruption of parking, is the least expensive, and could be best understood by drivers waiting to board the ferry.
3. On the recommended signage reading “Alternate, 1 Vehicle Per Lane” I would suggest a 4th line reading “Left to Right”. The draft calls this the “Honor System”, but is no different than any 4-way stop on any intersection in the county.
4. This alternative will only work if the current Ferry Lane marked on Lummi Shore Road remains to handle the occasional times when traffic exceeds the capacity of the Queuing area. This property still belongs to the County as road right of way.
5. The proposed Pedestrian waiting area will slow loading procedures unless pedestrians are allowed to walk up the dock while cars are loading. Are they going to tear down the current shelter at the end of the dock?

Hopefully these comments will help you make a decision that will improve the loading process without confusing everyone, and leaving bad feelings against the County and the Lummi Tribe.

Earle "Bud" Jewell