LUMMI ISLAND FERRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (LIFAC)
Sixteenth Meeting

May 27, 2014

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

ROLL CALL
Absent: Stu Clark and Byron Moye.

FLAG SALUTE

MINUTES CONSENT
1. Approve minutes of April 29, 2014 LIFAC Meeting was not completed (lack of review)

ANNOUNCEMENTS / SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

Mike McKenzie, Chair –
• Commented that Brown spoke at the Tuesday May 20th WC Finance Com Mtg. regarding the Dolphin Replacement Project CRP No. 914004. McKenzie said that it was pointed out to him clearly in a subsequent e-mail from Executive Louws that Executive Louws wants a direct recommendation regarding the Dolphin Project from LIFAC to come out of this meeting tonight. The Executive’s second sentence in the message was that to keep in mind that the project is already permitted and scheduled. McKenzie then commented that James Lee made a presentation to the Finance Committee and answered their questions. James added a little bit that he had shared with McKenzie in a private conversation prior to the Finance meeting. McKenzie said that the reason he got the e-mail from Executive Louws because Councilmember Mann question why this discussion had not come through LIFAC in the first place. The overall message from this is that the Council wants all issues dealing with the Lummi Island Ferry to come through LIFAC.

James Lee – Public Works Bridges and Ferries
• Clarification on issues for the dolphin project were given to the Council Finance Committee meeting last week.
  o The design and permits are complete and PW has already opened construction bids. What was the point of Council last week was the supplemental budget request because although this was in the 5-year plan it was not in this year’s plan because initially PW did not think that they could get it done this summer. The request was for $850,000 the construction planning. PW received a bit from “Orion Marine Group” of about $700,000 and much lower that estimated ($940,000). The remaining bids were closer and around the estimated engineering number. PW contacted Orion and reviewed their estimate. James point out that Orion is a very large marine contractor with recent work experience in the ports of Tacoma and Anacortes. PW also review work by Orion with the Lummi Island Ferry Advisory Committee
State Ferry System. Award of this construction contract will be before the Council next Tuesday June 3rd.

- Specific to the design there was discussion on if the piles could be moved for a larger ferry. James confirmed that the pilings on the Gooseberry side can be vibrated out (extracted).
- The reason for fast tracking the project is much like the wing wall repairs last year. The piles on Gooseberry have exceeded their design life. PW is fearful, particularly during a large storm, that the ferry could come in and the dolphins would be unable to do their full job. Getting the dolphins done gives a safe and reliable protection for the future.
- Someone had asked about the level of design and James commented that the design had been completed by a professional marine engineer. It is designed to provide the best positioning for the Chief, looking at the design and weight of the boat, i.e. the energy of the boat.
- James pointed out that PW had a meeting on the Chief with all of the Captains. There was good interaction between staff, the design consultant and the Captains to provide added value in James’s opinion.
- In regard to the existing timber dolphins there has been a lot of discussion regarding the inside dolphins at Gooseberry. In their current location they are out wide enough practically speaking that the boat never engages them. So, they are really not a part of the functional existing system that we have out there today. Part of the concept was to bring these in to make them a part of the functional part of the berthing system.
- Commented that they are having a feasibility study (in conjunction with Skagit County) done for the Ferry Trek which has same basic length and width as the Chief. It would fit at the docks without issue. (about 63 feet apart)
- The outside dolphins are being slightly widened from the existing dolphins in order to give the Captains a little bit wider “target”. The inside dolphins with their proposed locations will provide a little than 8 feet of room beyond the beam of the Chief. (44 feet vs. 52.3 feet)
- McKenzie commented that he understood that if we delayed the project to accommodate a larger ferry it would delay the project one year. This would mean the Chief would be using the bad timber through the worst part of the year. James confirmed that as stated part of the rush for this year is the “fish” window from July 15 to October 30. This is the period that PW can work in the water. James commented that materials would have to be cancelled and re-ordered and design would have to be redone.
- Brown commented first that he would like to apologize to James for being caught in the middle of the question of why LiFAC had not been included in this PW planning issue. He also commented that he did not believe merely moving the piling a few feet would cause any major delay to this project. Materials would be the same in reality and re-design would be simplistic.
- Antholt commented that although this may appear simple on the surface, that there must be some issue with calculations. James responded that Brown could be right, but then there may have to be more or different permits for the project.
that could delay it and one thing kinds of feeds into the other in developing the project.
  o **Busch** asked if they were replacing with wooden piling and James responded, no, steel piling. He commented that the current design is for the Chief and he asked what flexibility that gives us. James responded that he was correct about the design and that “we” don’t know what the future may hold for a larger ferry or other modification down the road. He felt the additional 8” of clearance in the berthing facility might accommodate some larger boats. This is only one piece of the plan, because you would also have to look at the additional energy of a larger ferry. James acknowledged that if in fact a larger ferry was used there would be “tweaks” required to include the wing walls modified last year.
  o **Colburn** asked if James could provide a general sense of expected useful life out of the steel piling to be used. Can they be expected to last longer than wooden timbers? James responded that depending on the maintenance program and watching for corrosion that the steel pilings would be from 30 to 50 years.

- James provided a quick update on dry dock saying that it is now scheduled for September 3rd to the 17th. Issues with moving the date can’t be done at this time as the contract is already out. If this is something we want to talk about for following years it needs to be on the radar early. The time would be when PW is actually putting the bid documents together when there would be some latitude to modify the dates.
  o Someone from the audience asked when the bid documents are put together and James responded “late” winter.
  o **McKenzie** commented that one of the ferry task force recommendations was to move the dry dock to April or October. The response was no, but PW would move it “back” a little. This has been a question that comes up every year with the same response. McKenzie told James to look forward to this again in the late winter.
  o **Brown** responded asking why LIFAC has to wait until winter. Why couldn’t LIFAC write the recommendation now so they forget? Every year this happens so why not address it now. There was general approval, but no action.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- **Jim Dickenson** provided a list of small Ferries that exist in Washington State (attached). He pointed out that there were only three that would work with the revised dock, the Whatcom Chief, Skagit County’s Guemes and the Charlie Wells (private Heron Island Ferry). The Guemes and Charlie Well will not be available. The Trek is privately owned and he fells if someone offers the right amount of money to the owner, it will be gone. There is still come chance that the Trek will be available of dry dock rental, but this is still in question. That leaves us with the somewhat larger small ferries. The H11, which will be with the State until next year; the Pierce County Ferry’s Christine Anderson; and, the Steilacoom II. The Christine Anderson would be the more likely of the two because it is slightly smaller. And so if we do this (don’t look at these options) we are in trouble. We have no reserve, period. If something happens to the Trek or the County decides not to get it, or commission it, we are out of luck here. The Ferry Task Force had recommended to the County consider some of the larger ferries when they work on the dock. AS he looks at this plan he can see about three different ways we can accommodate (larger ferries)
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.

and really not change it much. It appears that nobody is talking to each other. It’s like nobody bothered to ask the community, like could you move it back a couple of weeks on the dry dock. It is very frustrating in his opinion.

- Rhayma Blake on behalf of PLIC commended James for helping them draft the letter (attached) and to you all for listening to the letter and even if it created somewhat of an uproar, I think a lot of good things came out of it. She wanted to thank LIFAC for the dialog and to thank Jack Louws for taking a second look at it. She was happy to hear that we are including the crew in this discussion that in general the whole discussion was professionally handled. She also wanted to say that one of the reasons that they drafted the letter is that there is such a good body of work in the 2011 Task Force Report that she really wants to keep offering it up as some guidance for how LIFAC can move forward. She hopes to keep PW aware of the body of work that is in there and because it really did, since there was a lot of public discussion, represent where the Island stands on a lot of these issues and recommendations. She felt that it is PLICS job to continue to raise this up, so thank you James and thank you LIFAC.

- Rodger Prestiy (see attached) wanted to toss out the idea of a bridge which he is aware is not new to LIFAC. He noted that there would be no expense for annual dry dock, no parking expenses, no personnel expenses, no insurance, no ferry, and no complications like that. It could possibly be a toll bridge to collect a chunk of funds one way on the trip. As well, WTA could provide service that might give a lot more options to people on the Island 24/7. He keeps thinking about the bridges in Florida and in the Keys and the challenges that must have been overcome. If he can get some kind of discussion on points that may have not been brought up before, then great. There was general discussion from all on memories of options to build this bridge, but there was no action discussed. It could become part of long term planning. Jim Dickenson had some detail about actual ground sampling that has been done (’59) over the years at various possible bridge locations.

- McKenzie recognized Councilmember Brenner for attending this meeting and the previous two. He also recognized her interns, Oscar and Kaylee.

OLD BUSINESS

- Update on Ferry Fares Model (Antholt & Colburn)
  
  (Antholt – see attachment “Draft Contingency option for Temporary...”) At first just ran through and quickly showed a part time solution to an interruption of ferry service. This is not a long time solution. The foot/passenger traffic will be taken care of with the walk on ferry as is normally done. But, what happens with Propane, garbage and other large vehicle issues. Many of the options presented were initially identified and researched by Mike Shehan in 2011/12 and he deserves a thank you. The draft mainly addresses the use of landing craft vessels and some that may be used for oil spill cleanup. They are usable boats and are the San Juan Enterprise, the Henry Island, the Island Transporter, the Pintail and the Tin Boot II. Brown asked where these would land and offload/load. James thought it might be possible to use the ferry landing gangway. Antholt did not know. Someone from the Audience asked if anyone had checked to see if the Military (i.e. Reserves) would have some boats. No one could respond but it is a thought for long range planning.
DISCLAIMER: This document is a draft and is provided as a courtesy. This
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- **McKenzie** opened the discussion about fares saying that recent Whatcom County
  Committee Meetings on Public Works Public Health and Safety Meetings, at least three
  that he could recall, suggested that it’s time to look at this because of the perception that
  the ferry rate hike in 2011 was a temporary measure. So LIFAC has set out to look at these
  fares now in anticipation of 2015 on a basis to see if we can find a way to support a
  reduction in fares for at least the main fare categories.

- **Antholt and Colburn** are a little bit hesitant and don’t feel they have gone as far as they
  should, but here goes. Assumptions to keep in mind: (1) an assumption that the county
does a reasonably good job with estimation of ridership projections, and (2) most of the
revenue taken in by the Chief to meet our 55% obligation comes from about 5 fare
categories out of about 20. One of the several questions that surfaced was should we use
a base fare and $8000# vehicle with driver. This is probably the best fare category as it
generates the most revenue. Then you ask, what is the relationship between the base
fare and walk-on or a cement truck? What about summer fares? Antholt and Colburn
could not answer these themselves and for a longer term if we really want to measure
this we should have a count done in both directions and can we do this. What would it
take? Again, these are issues we need to talk about in the future. When we choose a
ticket fare schedule, what do we have to do to be prudent with respect to meeting our
55% obligation? These relate to projected budget costs and as budgeting is a bit of an
art, we need to have the Kentucky windage, what is it 5%, 10% what is it. The ferry
delivers a lot of services. People ride the ferry that don’t always pay cash, but are
delivering a service. Lastly, given deck space, should we be looking at a fare schedule that
rewards smaller cars. We can step back and ask how we are approaching fare structure
and what kind of underlying philosophy do we have about the fare structure. Mike and
Diane Harper built this fare model for the Ferry Task Force. This is the model (not
attached) used tonight and the basic underlying structure is the same. The Committee
spent about 30 minutes reviewing this model. The fares percentages we have right now
are pedestrian is 54% of $13.00 = $7.00 and so on. The model allow the user to adjust
these percentages to answer various what if questions, i.e., what it percentage was 50%
rather that 54%. By making these changes you can see how this effects the overall budget.
You can add items i.e. a summer surcharge and see how that affects the budget. Is 1000%
for a dump truck valid? Look at how many vehicles are displaced by a large truck and is
the 1000% enough or too much to cover this? **Colburn** commented that we should just
concentrate on the 5 or 6 main revenue categories and not try to chase every conceivable
option. **Brown** suggested that we make this simple and do 5 variations of the 5 major
cost revenues. **Colburn** suggested maybe High, Medium and Low as a good approach.
**Antholt** asked if we had enough time to look at these options before it should go to the
Council. There was some discussion about an additional meeting in early of mid-June,
and this was taken under advisement of the Chair. **Colburn** comments that due to the
time issue it will force them to work on the smaller set of options. **Brown** brought up the
question as to when the Council needs this information. If LIFAC tells then that the fares
will match the 55% obligation and that we really don’t have to change the fares at this
time to do this, then can we wait and ask for a fare change in January ’15 for example.
**McKenzie** offered to ask the Council-PW what they need in July of ‘14 from LIFAC.
**Colburn** suggested that we provide some examples for the council showing that we can
meet the obligation (with a cushion) in various way and LIFAC is not yet ready to identify
the final structure. Maybe we would provide them with a range of schedules. It was
generally agreed that LIFAC looks at the 5 primary revenue categories and then look at
about three options for each. Colburn closed with the questions, will a change in fares
increase ridership and is there a desire on some part (i.e. Public Works, Islanders, Council)
to shift from more walk on riders instead of cars or smaller cars instead of larger cars.
Brown suggests that these kinds of questions are for down the road when the initial re0-
structure has been completed. Colburn restates that it is important to address what the
interest is behind the fare adjustments. McKenzie again comments that he plans to have
some kind of interim meeting to further address this. He also addressed the need to
answer what kind of surplus we plan to have as this is important to pay off various lease
agreements and such.

- LIFAC Recommendations (Brown) (see attached recommendations)
  - McKenzie asks if these recommendation are submitted as proposals and Brown answered
    by asking to put a little history behind this effort. He goes on to say that these
    recommendations came out of maybe the last 32 LIFAC meeting. Although LIFAC was
    very opposed to a “referendum” it is still a fact that there is very little that comes from
    LIFAC to the Council. In an effort to try and make things simple he felt that there were 3
    things and maybe 4 that LIFAC should be recommending the WC Council. He did not
    suggest that they had to be as he wrote, but he had make an effort. What also prompted
    this effort was the PLIC effort on the Dolphins to Executive Louws and his response
    (attached) which was, after reading the response to LIFAC, that there has been no
    response from LIFAC. Brown understands this to say that unless LIFAC says something he
    will not address the PLIC concerns. He does not care if the recommendations are changed
    or re-written, put them all in one recommendation, or individually or...
  - The Dolphin Replacement - LIFAC needs to tell the Council (Executive Louws?) yea, or nay
    on moving ahead as planned or making modification for a larger ferry. McKenzie says that
    he has been asked by Executive Louws to make a recommendation to the County Council
    through LIFAC. Last Tuesday the PW Committee voted to move ahead with the funding
    and the vote would be at the next Regular Council Meeting. McKenzie states the question
    as is this Committee wanting to go ahead with the project and the PW Committee has
    voted. Brown believes that is not the question as we all want to move ahead with the
dolphin replacement. The actual question is do we want to move a couple of the piling
    to accommodate a somewhat larger ferry. McKenzie restates his question as to whether
    or not we should recommend that they move ahead with the project as it is permitted
    and drawn up by the engineers at this time as presented by James to LIFAC and to the PW
    Committee before they approved the funding. Antholt comments that he feels we should
    move ahead and that LIFAC is in no position to second guess what obviously took a lot of
    preparation work, a lot of engineering and thought and consideration. Antholt agrees
    with the question but does not know what a future cost would be to move the dolphins,
    but we should give the POQW the benefit of the doubt. McKenzie comments that as a non-
    engineer he took the phrasing about the engineering being done strictly on the geometry
    and energy of the existing ferry, and so to him after hearing the engineers and the ferry
    captain speak about this that it would be diminishing to the project if you make any
    adjustment to it. Brown commented that he would vote against the question as stated
    because he does not believe that the adjustment would be a large effort. He also doesn’t
    believe when you are talking about moving 3’ diameter piling, which is different than an
old stick in the ground, is any easy or inexpensive task. **McKenzie** comments again that he will support the question as the effort and costs are too high to make a change. **Busch** asks what the cost is if we do this wrong. **McKenzie** comments that we can’t predict what the cost will be 10 to 15 years down the road. **Brown** replies that he heard a statement earlier that when you build a bridge or highway, you build it for the future and all he can do is support this no matter what the others do. **Busch** commented that felt that the project was for the Chief and he was not sure that was the right idea. **Antholt** brings up the issues of the bottom soil and if it will support the pilings being moved, so widening them out 8’, we just don’t know. **Brown** comments that they are going to move them out 8’. **Antholt** then comments that he does not feel we are in a position to second guess the County. **Brown** responds that if we don’t second guess them who will. Is that not what LIFAC is for? The unofficial count was as follows and the Chair will suggest that the WC Council move forward with the plan.

- Approve – 3
- Reject – 1
- Abstain – 1

Many feel that they would like to have the vehicle-passenger Ferry Trek being used during the ’14 dry dock. **Brown** feels that the argument from the County is that they don’t have time to rebid and there is an existing contract that can be extended with the walk-on passenger only ferry and he suggest that this is BS. This could be a sole source bid as there is no other vehicle-passenger ferry available. He suggests that LIFAC recommend that the County does what he feels the Islanders are asking for and have the Ferry Trek available for this year’s dry dock period, whether or not you think it can be done. **McKenzie** and **Antholt** comment that we all hear different things and **McKenzie** mumbles that he heard a few voices. **Antholt** says he has dealt with a lot of contracts and he is very suspicious about sole source contracts and next year it will be on the menu. **McKenzie** says that lets just deal with the facts; (1) a firm has been hired to determine if the Trek will work for us at all; (2) if they deem that it will work there are modifications for the Guemes Island dock, and, (3) if all goes well and it is financially feasible (which nobody knows yet) it will not only be for dry dock buy as a general back-up ferry. **Antholt** comments that he believes that is prudent for LIFAC to wait and see, why jump the gun. Jim Dickenson wants to respond, but is informed that this is not a public discussion. **McKenzie** concludes the discussion by saying that LIFAC does not need to make a recommendation unless it is this one and if we don’t make a recommendation the process will continue to play out its thing and if there are enough citizens who feel strongly enough about this, then make it a citizen issue. From his view point it is not an issue for LIFAC unless we want to recommend this. **Antholt** say that it appears to him that this might be a useful option, but we don’t know that today. There is no basis to make any recommendation today. **Colburn** comments that once we have results we may want to make a recommendation. **McKenzie** asks **Brown** if he know of any professional study going on about this right know and Brown responds “no”. **McKenzie** ask **Brown** if there is a downside to wanting a professional study and Brown response that it would be spending a lot of money that is probably not necessary. You could drive the Ferry Trek up to the docks and determine if it fits. **Antholt** comments that there is the study going on by Elliot Bay. There was no official vote and the committee moved on understanding that there would be no further action.
Brown commented that the third recommendation was to have the County actually look into the Ferry HIYU rather than waiting for it to be labeled “Surplus”. McKenzie asked how much this cost would be and Brown responded that he did not know and what difference does it make, we are just asking them. McKenzie comments that it makes a huge difference. Brown responds that the Council should decide the cost, not us. He does not understand why LIFAC just keep stopping everything. McKenzie comments the LIFAC’s role is not to “tell” the Council to go spend a lot of taxpayer money. Brown responds that “requesting” is not “telling. How is LIFAC going to communicate with the Council unless you request something? Antholt comments that there is no drop dead urgency about the HIYU, the Chief is not going to sink tomorrow. He sent around to all of us the findings of the naval architect (years ago) and all of the crew information about the new engines and all of that stuff so we have time. What we don’t have time for is to get ready when the HIYU becomes available. So we should have a fix on this, but you can’t look at the HIYU in isolation. You have to look at keeping the Chief running, the HIYU and the new ferry option. This is pretty easy to do if you get the right numbers because whatever we decide to do its 50-60 years implication. The urgency to look at the three options is because of the timing of the HIYU. That may be a very suitable ferry, but right now we don’t know. WE can’t be ready to jump until we look at the other two options. Brown responds by reading the first line of the recommendation, “...(LIFAC) recommends that Public Works consider investigation of the Washington State Ferry HIYU...”. That is all the recommendation is asking. McKenzie comments that (a), it is soft, and (b) the County has addressed this and rejected it. Brown said this was not so and McKenzie said they did, they took action, they took the only action. Brown excused himself and interrupted saying they could not have taken action as we have not even asked them to look at it. He asked them and got a letter (attached) back from James Lee saying that a recommendation has to come through LIFAC. So he has brought it to LIFAC and if LIFAC does not want make a recommendation, just say no. Antholt continues and says it is insufficient to just deal with the HIYU. Brown asks why? Antholt restate that there are 3 choices. Brown responds that he is tired of that argument as we have heard this ever since LIFAC was formed. We reviewed this for over 9 months when we were working on the Ferry Plattsburgh and we had agreed as a Committee that we had all of the answers possible to us and the rest were to be made by others. After Antholt again explains how important this is Brown comments that this is why LIFAC will never make a choice. McKenzie comments that what he was trying to explain is that the county had 2 actions. One is to spend whatever money it takes to do whatever it to figure out if the HIYU is a viable option and the second was get on the wait list of interested parties and that is what they have done. The HIYU is not available until at least June 2015 and PW said it could be even longer than that. McKenzie said that he asked the question if the state would allow ample time for any interested parties to decide if the HIYU is a viable option before it goes on the market and the answer came back, yes. So his point here is, his only point is it is one thing to say “would you consider” this and they already have and they took the action rather than undertaking a study of the HIYU to took the interested parties list option. There is nothing objectionable in the working of the recommendation, but it doesn’t carry any weight. This committee could make 50 suggestions to consider something, but part is to make the consideration in the cost to the County and the taxpayers. That is what our charge is and that is the way it is written. Because some people think that the HIYU
is some great alternative, it is not enough. Antholt says we it might be a great option but
you can’t make that decision until the other two options are included. He states that it
bothers him that if we don’t get going we could get caught with our pants down when the
HIYU becomes available and we ought to be read for that. He thinks the County should
be ready to move before the HIYU option is available. Colburn suggest different language
that isn’t related to a specific vessel, but recommends that Public Works set out a capital
replacement plan for the existing vessel. He has not seen a plan to replace it based on
engineering standards. This is urgent because the HIYU is available is incorrect as the
urgency should be driven by the state of the Chief. Antholt adds that we need to look at
what things like the population will be in the future. He is worried that if the HTYU is a
good deal, we want to be ready to say so. He is a little concerned that if we don’t get
started we won’t be ready. The County may not start soon enough to take advantage of
the option. Councilmember Brenner suggests that LIFAC put together what both are
saying and request PW to move ahead expeditiously on this so that well before the HIYU
becomes available that we have an understanding if it is a viable option enough that we
can bid on it. She believes that LIFAC does need to say something because she feels that
it is moving slow. McKenzie suggest that Antholt and Colburn work on rephrasing the
recommendation per the Councilmember’s suggestion.

- Extra Ferry Run During Dry Dock
  - John Gibbs had asked for an extra run during dry dock that he was willing to pay for. Most
    felt Mr. Gibbs should address this with PW on his own and McKenzie took this under his
    advisement. McKenzie will contact the party and tell them to put it in writing. This item
    is closed.

- Sidewalk Recommendation 9/19/12 (attached)
  - LIFAC recommended to Council the parking issues per Mike Shehan and have had no
    response back. This item is closed.

- Formation of Subcommittees
  - McKenzie commented that Rhayma Blake has a desire to head up a subcommittee for LIFAC
    undertake the subject of long term planning. He suggests that this may actually be just one
    subcommittee, but LIFAC needs to set a direction for them. Jim Dickenson has also requested
    to head up a subcommittee to investigate alternative vessels. He asks Antholt and Moye to
    head up this subcommittee. Jim Dickenson comments that he would prefer to work with
    Brown but was told the heads of the subcommittees were as appointed. A structure needed
    to be developed first and then any of the members could participate.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Demography for a New Ferry (Antholt)
   - 30 pages of information was passed out for review and/or comment by the members. These
     are items that should be considered in the planning for a new ferry.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business
TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR THE NEXT WORK SESSION

The date for the next meeting is Tuesday July 1st

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

FLAG SALUTE

MINUTES CONSENT

PRESENTATION

Mike McKenzie – General Update
Intro of PW Operations Ferry Manager, Rob Nye

OLD BUSINESS

Update on Fare Analysis Study
Presentation on historical fares
Recommendation for HIYU Investigation
Recommendation for Future Dry Dock Dates
Scope for Long-range Planning Subcommittee
Scope for Ferry Replacement Subcommittee

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURN

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

The Committee approved these minutes on 9/2, 2014

ATTEST: ____________________________

Michael McKenzie, Committee Chair