DRAFT Agenda

Ferry Technical Issues Sub-Committee

Organizational Meeting

1. Introductions

2. Purpose of Subcommittee, Greg Brown, Jim Dickinson

   A. Draft Statement:

Meeting Started around 6:30pm and finished at about 7:50pm.

To investigate, examine and recommend various Ferry Vessels and their related Infrastructure, using known Marine Engineering Criteria, for the Lummi Island Ferry Advisory Committee.

3. Format of Meetings

4. Known Written Resources;

   A. Geo-Technical Report of 2006 regarding our Ferry Docks;
   http://savetheferry.com/Geotech%20bottom%20study%20smaller.pdf

   B. Skagit County Ferry Reports;
   http://www.skagitcounty.net/departments/publicworksferry

   C. Passenger Vessel Association Report on Washington State Ferries

   D. John Waterhouse’s 50 Years of Double Ended Ferry Design
   http://savetheferry.com/50_years_double Ended_ferry_design.pdf

   E. Whatcom County Reports, including current Dock Renovation Plans;
   Available from various County Sources usually on paper.

   F. Elliot Bay Design Group report on Ferry Trek.

4. Topics:

   A. Evaluation of WSF Ferry HIYU
B. Evaluation of remaining life of Whatcom Chief
C. Evaluation Of “New Unbuilt” 2004-2008 Ferry
D. Evaluation of possible use of rental ferry Trek
E. Evaluate issues concerning a Spare Ferry
F. Conceptual Designs of New Ferry Boats
G. Docks and Structures to accommodate different Ferries
Jim - Run like Task Force Meeting – too about 90 min

- Much Less Formal
- Start w/Pledge
- Anybody got any concerns
- Start the Meeting
- Anybody got any concerns
- People would talk
- Anybody got any concerns
- Close the meeting
- Anyone is welcome

**Revised Mission Statement:** We are going to investigate the value and life of the Whatcom Chief and look at options for a new and/or a used replacement ferry.

Members want to see the boats in person if possible. Visit Dry Dock. Check out the Guemes Ferry, etc. to put things into perspective.

Good idea - What if each one of us took one of the reports below, read it and report back to the others like a cliff notes type of thing. Jim says that from the Passenger Vehicle Association you are going to get how you age ferries, how you crew them and how you maintain them. The Skagit Report should be looked at by everybody. What you take out of the 50 Years of Ferries you take out things like how wide are passenger ways and general nuts and bolts stuff. The geotechnical report tells you how deep the mud is. Jim has requested a copy of the Trek Report by Elliot Bay Eng., but has received nothing.

Start with the Chief –

- Can’t we start with the Skagit County Ferry Report as a template?
- 8 years ago the County came to the conclusion that the Chief needed to be replaced (for the second or third time – Bill Hawley in 1993).
  - Find the documentation
  - PW says it costs more to maintain than replace – documents
  - If they wanted to do in ’93 and it has lasted this long – how?

- PW always wants new big boy toys and did not let the Council explore the middle ground of a used ferry. They were not interested in Jim’s research on used ferries. The information on the Chief and on new or used ferries must be in a documented such that it can’t be disputed.

- The group needs to work through Rob Ney and request the information and documents discussed. We need to set up the process to do this.

- We should not have to spend a great deal of time debating the need to replace the Chief as the documentation already exists that addresses this based on existing records.
The Vessel Association Report goes into detail on how you age a salt water vessel. They grudgingly give the State of Washington 60 years on a total mid-life rebuild and 45 years if it did not. This may be important for the determination of a used ferry also.

We have a short window to evaluate the Chief and the HIYU which is between now and next spring. Many are counting on us to miss this opportunity.

Look at option of getting rid of the Chief and buying the Trek as a spare ferry.

We need to look at used ferries is term of “can we make them work here? Size, crew, etc.

The Ferry Crew does not determine what the Island needs for a ferry. The ferry is to service the people and visitors to the Island; it is not for the people who run the ferry. This subcommittee should speak for the people of the Island, not for the people who run the ferry and not to please PW.

We have been directed to work through the new ferry manager for information, but we (LIFAC) don’t report to PW. We report to the Council. LIFAC is Council appointed committee.

We will have to look and costs, life and safety for each vessel.

We need to find any written documentation that will verify that the Coast Guard actually allows loading of the Chief that does not allow for proper vehicle access and egress. If there is a “waiver” it should be attached to the front of the Certificate of Inspection. If this waiver is not written, then there is great concern for the liability of the County if there is an incident. Also, the Island people would be without a ferry.

The Chief was designed to be extended, but it got too old to do so.

Criteria for a used Ferry are listed on the item for the sub-committee to review. – Attached. Does there need to be a separate category for the Chief or id it part of the Used Ferry listing?

The ferry docks will have to be re-visited due to the lack of foresight in the recent dolphin improvements. Simply moving the dolphins about 6” would have allowed a vessel the size of the Christine Anderson to dock while it would not reasonably effect the docking of the Chief. We will remind then when the times come how cheap and easy they said that they could move the dolphins.

The group reviewed, slightly modified and accepted the overall listing of items to be reviewed.

The people, who want to keep the Chief, are also people who don’t want any pollution. Pollution improvements have been done to the HIYU but were not done by PW to the Chief.
Tonnage is an important issue in terms of crew size. This needs to be understood and addressed in regard to used ferries. This may involve more than just the Coast Guard when if a time comes for a different ferry.

An Additional ferry member could possibly be accounted for by the saving from a different ferry, i.e. dry dock, fuel (# of runs), etc. PW could move the bookkeeper to the boat, as you only need the 4th person when the vessel is making a run.

Is there a need for toilet facilities on the ferry? Is there a requirement for ADA facilities?

Talked about the next meeting and decided that we should wait until after the next LIFAC meeting so we have presented our statement and scope.

Finished the meeting looking at pictures of the HIYU
Ferry Tech Subcommittee

Some of the Technical Items to be examined 7/31/2014

Many items will cross categories Revised at meeting.

1. Used Ferries
   A. Suitability
   B. Purchase Cost
   C. Fuel Use
   D. Crewing
   E. Capacity
   F. Seaworthiness
   G. Vessel Life
   H. Maintenance Costs
   I. Modifications Needed?
   J. Modifications to Infrastructure

2. New Vessels
   A. Layout
   B. Purchase Cost
   C. Fuel Use
   D. Crewing
   E. Capacity
   F. Future Enlargement?
   G. Seaworthiness
   H. Vessel Life
   I. Maintenance Costs
   J. Modifications to Infrastructure

3. Coast Guard Rules
   A. Tonnage and related Classifications
   B. Crewing Licenses
   C. Automobile Stowage
   d. ADA Requirements

4. Infrastructure
   A. Dock Structures relating to above
   B. Loading lines
   C. Other

5. Ferry Propulsion Systems
   A. Propellers, fixed and Controllable Pitch
      Other Methods, Jets, Voith Schneider
   C. Engines
      a. Pollution Standards
      b. Size and Longevity
      c. Fuel Use
      d. Like Exchanges
      e. Aftermarket Pollution Systems, .UltraBurn, etc.
Sign In

1. Barten Brunner
2. Jim Dickinson
3. Jensen Pierce  jansenp@q.com
4. Mike Kimiecik  pisces022009@yahoo.com
5. Greg Brown
6. Bill Fox - mail@savetheferry.com
7. Nancy Gale - nancy@nancygale.com
8. Tom PhilipPot  tphilpot@dralin.com