

APPENDIX B

TASK 102 SITE RANKING SCORES AND COMMENTS

**Gooseberry Point Ferry Dock
Relocation Feasibility Study
Site Ranking Scores and Comments
March 5, 2009**

West End of Slater Road

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Level of service and safety are issues due to longer run and storm exposure.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer traffic impacts, off-reservation minimizes cultural/historic impacts.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Longer run and more storm exposure. Dock would need to be oriented so that angle of dock is away from the West wind at that location.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Longer run means fewer runs per day = decrease in level of service provided. Some runs may need to be cancelled due to bad weather.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: **0**

Explanation: New boat not required but some runs may need to be canceled due to bad weather.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Location off Reservation would do nothing to promote this development.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Location at north of Reservation would reduce traffic conflicts at all but Slater Road area.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Equal number of assessed U & A and salmonid species are present as at existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: +1

Explanation: No recorded archaeological sites at this location; however, the land has not been previously surveyed. Archaeological assessment required prior to construction to determine if significant resources are present.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Would require new dock, longer than existing, major elevation change from headland area to water would increase costs of design and construction.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Increased O & M due to longer dock, more exposure to weather and currents, longer boat run = more miles = more maintenance required.

Available Land

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Desirable location. Rumored that it might be available if County wanted it. However, land is on a high bluff and would require extensive establishment expenses.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: -2

Explanation: No existing water supply, sewer, parking, queuing, lighting, etc.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Most destinations are I-5, Ferndale, & Bellingham. Longer route time may be offset by less travel time from end of Slater Road to intersection of Axton and Slater than from current dock. Access to destinations largely unchanged.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Depth is shallower than at existing site so a new dock would have to be longer than the existing or dredging would need to occur.

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Site has more permitting issues than existing site such as the presence of herring spawning beds and unstable slopes within vicinity of the potential site.

West of Existing Dock

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar location to existing dock and little, if any, change from County's perspective.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar location to existing dock and little, if any, change from Lummi's perspective.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Little, if any, change due to proximity to existing location.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: 0

Explanation: No significant difference from existing location.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation:

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Location to west MAY provide less interference with Tribal plans for Gooseberry Point area but would still require queuing and parking areas.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Impacts would be very similar to existing conditions.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar number of assessed U & A and salmonid species are present as at the existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Location of cultural resources.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: New dock and facilities required. Similar to existing facilities. Could use existing parking and queuing but Tribe prefers other arrangements.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar facilities should be similar in O & M costs to existing dock.

Available Land

Ranking: 1

Explanation: Pretty good location; similar to what's already there. Land availability unknown.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Location is close enough to have same access to local infrastructure as existing dock.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: 0

Explanation: No change from existing dock.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Site is better suited for depth, and therefore a shorter dock would be required than at the existing site.

Is it “Permittable?”

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Site has more permitting issues than at existing location.

Grace Ericson

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Level of service and safety are issues due to longer run and storm exposure.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer traffic impacts, off-reservation minimizes cultural/historic impacts.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Longer run and more storm exposure. Dock would need to be oriented so that angle of dock is away from the West wind at that location.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Longer run means fewer runs per day = decrease in level of service provided. Some runs may need to be cancelled due to bad weather.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation: New boat not required but some runs may need to be canceled due to bad weather.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Location at Sandy Point would do nothing to promote this development in the Gooseberry Point area.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Location at Sandy Point would resolve ferry traffic-related conflicts on Lummi Peninsula but would create some traffic congestion in Sandy Point/Slater Road area.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Equal number of assessed U & A and salmonid species are present as at existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: +1

Explanation: No recorded archaeological sites at this location; however, the land has not been previously surveyed. Archaeological assessment required prior to construction to determine if significant resources are present. Consideration of nearby cultural resources will also be necessary.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Requires all new facilities for dock and parking and queuing. Dock likely would need to be longer than existing dock. Requires new water supply, sewer, etc.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Longer dock and more exposure would require additional maintenance.

Available Land

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Residential area and Sandy Point location could be a problem for both Sandy Point and Lummi. Land availability unknown.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Sandy Point water supply is not adequate to meet this additional demand. Lummi Sewer and Water District does not serve water to this area at the present time. Lummi Sewer District serves the Sandy Point Area so sewer service may be available.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Similar to West End of Slater Road but a bit farther removed and would create increased local congestion in Sandy Point area.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Depth is shallower than at existing site so a new dock would have to be longer than the existing or dredging would need to occur.

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: 0

Explanation: This received a median score relative to the other potential sites and therefore maintains a score of zero.

Beach Way

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Level of service and safety are issues due to longer run and storm exposure.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer traffic impacts, off-reservation minimizes cultural/historic impacts.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Longer run and more storm exposure. Dock would need to be oriented so that angle of dock is away from the West wind at that location.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Longer run means fewer runs per day = decrease in level of service provided. Some runs may need to be cancelled due to bad weather.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0.

Explanation: New boat not required but some runs may need to be canceled due to bad weather.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Location at Sandy Point would do nothing to promote this development in the Gooseberry Point area.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Location at Sandy Point would resolve ferry traffic-related conflicts on Lummi Peninsula but would create some traffic congestion in Sandy Point/Slater Road area.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Equal number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present as at existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: +1

Explanation: No recorded archaeological sites at this location; however, the land has not been previously surveyed. Archaeological assessment required prior to construction to determine if significant resources are present.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Requires all new facilities for dock and parking and queuing. Dock likely would need to be longer than existing dock. Requires new water supply, sewer, etc. Lummi sewer may be available. Sandy Point water supply likely is not adequate to meet this additional demand. Lummi Sewer and Water District does not serve water to this area at the present time.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Longer dock and more exposure would require additional maintenance.

Available Land

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Residential and Sandy Point location could be a problem for both Sandy Point and Lummi. Land availability unknown.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Sandy Point water supply is not adequate to meet this additional demand. Lummi Sewer and Water District does not serve water to this area at the present time. Lummi Sewer District serves the Sandy Point Area so sewer service may be available.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Similar to West End of Slater Road but a bit farther removed and would create increased local congestion in Sandy Point area.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Depth is shallower than at the existing site so a new dock would have to be longer than the existing or dredging would need to occur

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Site has more permissibility issues than at existing location such as presence of herring spawning beds.

North of Elder Center

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Location near existing dock. Total run length only slightly longer. Similar level of protection from storms and, therefore, safety and reliability.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Location SE of existing dock required longer drive on Reservation hence increased traffic impact but may be more compatible with future planned marina.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar location and similar protection to existing dock.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar run length and safety would likely result in a similar reliability of service from the existing boat.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation: No alternative boat required.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: This location is farther East than the optimum location identified in the Lummi Marina Feasibility Study and would not appear to provide good integration with the proposed marina project.

Avoid or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Increased traffic impact due to longer travel on the Reservation to/from the dock.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Equal number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present as at existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Location of an important cultural resource.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Due to shallow water, longer dock is required.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Periodic dredging may be required and longer dock would increase O & M costs.

Available Land

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Steep bank. Availability unknown.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Lummi Sewer and Water provides both water and sewer services in this area.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Location is farther from most of the destinations for ferry users.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Depth is much shallower than at existing site so a new dock would have to be longer than the existing or dredging would need to occur.

Is it “Permittable?”

Ranking: 0

Explanation: This received a median score relative to the other potential sites and therefore maintains a score of zero.

South of Elder Center

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Location near existing dock. Total run length only slightly longer. Similar level of protection from storms and, therefore, safety and reliability.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Location SE of existing dock requires longer drive on Reservation hence increased traffic impact but may be more compatible with future planned marina.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar location and similar protection to existing dock.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar run length and safety would likely result in a similar reliability of service from the existing boat.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation: No alternative boat required.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: This location is farther East than the optimum location identified in the Lummi Marina Feasibility Study and would not appear to provide good integration with the proposed marina project.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Increased traffic impact due to longer travel on the Reservation to/from the dock.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Equal number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present as at existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Location of an important cultural resource.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Due to shallow water, longer dock is required.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Periodic dredging may be required and longer dock would increase O & M costs.

Available Land

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Steep bank. Availability unknown.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Lummi Sewer and Water provides both water and sewer services in this area.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Location is farther from most of the destinations for ferry users.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Depth is much shallower than at existing site so a new dock would have to be longer than the existing or dredging would need to occur.

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: 0

Explanation: This received a median score relative to the other potential sites and therefore maintains a score of zero.

Stommish Grounds and Lummi School

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Total run length only slightly longer. Similar level of protection from storms and, therefore, safety and reliability.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Increased traffic impacts due to travel distances. Conflicts with community use of the Stommish Grounds and with school-related traffic and student pedestrian traffic. These impacts may be partially mitigated through design.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar location and similar protection to existing dock.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar run length and safety would likely result in a similar reliability of service from the existing boat.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation:

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Conflicts with ceremonial use of canoes at Stommish Grounds, may interfere with Marina, fishing vessels, and would increase traffic congestion in the vicinity of the school.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Longer travel on Reservation to reach site increases impacts plus congestion around school increases the likelihood of vehicle/vehicle and vehicle/pedestrian accidents.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Equal number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present as at existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Location of cultural resources and a traditional cultural location.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Due to shallow water, longer dock is required.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Periodic dredging may be required and longer dock would increase O & M costs.

Available Land

Ranking: 1

Explanation: Good open location, good potential for parking nearby.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Lummi Sewer and Water provides both water and sewer services in this area.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Longer travel distance to destinations plus increased vehicle and pedestrian traffic during peak school traffic periods of the day.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Depth is much shallower than at existing site so a new dock would have to be longer than the existing or dredging would need to occur.

Is it “Permittable?”

Ranking: 0

Explanation: This received a median score relative to the other potential sites and therefore maintains a score of zero.

North of Lummi Sewage Treatment Plant (STP)

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Total run length only slightly longer. Similar level of protection from storms and, therefore, safety and reliability.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Increased traffic impacts due to travel distances.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar location and similar protection to existing dock.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar run length and safety would likely result in a similar reliability of service from the existing boat.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation:

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Longer travel on Reservation would result in more transportation conflicts. Also, this location is too far east to serve as a logical multi-modal transportation center for the Reservation given it’s relatively remote location compared to the focus of residences and commercial activities on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Long distance travel on the Reservation would tend to increase rather than mitigate traffic impacts and traffic would need to pass through the relatively busy school area with associated risks to traffic and pedestrian safety.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Equal number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present as at existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Location of a cultural resource.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Shallow water would require a long dock.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Long dock would require increased O & M costs over existing facility.

Available Land

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Steep bank. Availability unknown.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Location is near Lummi Sewer Treatment Plant for easy sewer connection and is in area served by Lummi Water System.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Inconvenient location for access to the destinations identified in the Lummi Reservation Traffic Safety Study.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Depth is much shallower than at existing site so a new dock would have to be longer than the existing or dredging would need to occur.

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: 0

Explanation: This received a median score relative to the other potential sites and therefore maintains a score of zero.

South of Lummi STP

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Total run length only slightly longer. Similar level of protection from storms; therefore, safety and reliability.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Increased traffic impacts due to travel distances.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar location and similar protection to existing dock.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Similar run length and safety would likely result in a similar reliability of service from the existing boat.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation:

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Longer travel on Reservation would result in more transportation conflicts. Also, this location is too far east to serve as a logical multi-modal transportation center for the Reservation given it's relatively remote location compared to the focus of residences and commercial activities on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Long distance travel on the Reservation would tend to increase rather than mitigate traffic impacts and traffic would need to pass through the relatively busy school area with associated risks to traffic and pedestrian safety.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Equal number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present as at existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -1

Explanation: No recorded sites directly at South of Lummi STP site, but adjacent to cultural resources.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Shallow water would require a long dock.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Long dock would require increased O & M costs over existing facility.

Available Land

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Steep bank. Availability unknown.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0 -

Explanation: Location is near Lummi Sewer Treatment Plant for easy sewer connection and is in area served by Lummi Water System.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Inconvenient location for access to the destinations identified in the Lummi Reservation Traffic Safety Study.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Depth is much shallower than at existing site so a new dock would have to be longer than the existing or dredging would need to occur.

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: 0

Explanation: This received a median score relative to the other potential sites and therefore maintains a score of zero.

Mt. Baker Plywood

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Year round (365 day) service may be more difficult given extreme storm conditions and open water in crossing Bellingham Bay.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Ferry dock is removed from Lummi Reservation, no traffic conflicts, no land needed for parking or queuing, etc.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Existing boat could not be used safely in adverse weather. A new boat, if properly designed, could provide safe service but at considerable expense.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Longer travel time, especially during adverse weather, would reduce the number of runs per day and the level of service provided.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation: It is presumed that a new boat would be designed with this crossing/route in mind and would provide a safe means of crossing in all weather.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: The location off of the Reservation would do nothing to foster the development of the multi-modal center on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: +2

Explanation: This location would eliminate all ferry traffic-related impacts on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: -2

Explanation: A greater number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present than at the existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Within historic district and nearby other cultural resources. Location not as heavily developed as the other locations in Bellingham, but there would still need to be additional archaeological assessments.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: A new boat capable of safe year round operation on this route would be very expensive and this location would require the purchase of prime waterfront land within the City of Bellingham for dock and related facilities. There does not appear to be much undeveloped land in the vicinity so would likely require purchase or condemnation of currently used property.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: New boat would require maintenance and, because of longer route, would have increased fuel costs and increased wear and tear due to increased distances traveled. This may be partially offset by the increased efficiencies afforded by new marine technologies in boat design.

Available Land

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Possibly a good physical location. However, potential contamination of area a high probability. Land availability unknown.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Water, sewer and power appear to be available to this industrialized portion of the Bellingham waterfront.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Many ferry users cited Bellingham as their destination which may afford some riders the opportunity to travel as foot passengers. Others may still require vehicles but will be closer to their destination. Riders for Ferndale and other points to the North would be farther from their destination and those going South would need to traverse the City to access I-5 which would increase traffic in parts of Bellingham.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Waterway is suitable for a shorter pier length than at existing site and no dredging is required.

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: 2

Explanation: Fewer assessed permitting issues are present than at other potential sites, such as no potential to result in shellfish closure.

Hilton Harbor

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Although this site may have some benefit for the ferry dock because of its location in the heart of Bellingham and because most passengers are bound for Bellingham, year round (365 day) service may be more difficult given extreme storm conditions and open water in crossing Bellingham Bay.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Ferry dock is removed from Lummi Reservation, no traffic conflicts, no land needed for parking or queuing, etc.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Existing boat could not be used safely in adverse weather. A new boat, if properly designed, could provide safe service but at considerable expense.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Longer travel time although a bit less than the Mt. Baker Plywood site, especially during adverse weather, would reduce the number of runs per day and the level of service provided.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation: It is presumed that a new boat would be designed with this crossing/route in mind and would provide a safe means of crossing in all weather.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: The location off of the Reservation would do nothing to foster the development of the multi-modal center on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: +2

Explanation: This location would eliminate all ferry traffic-related impacts on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Fewer assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: -1

Explanation: A greater number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present than at the existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Ferry Dock construction could affect cultural resources at Hilton Harbor, and depending on depth of construction, construction could impact potential pre-contact deposits. Area is within a historic district and is adjacent to and nearby other cultural resources. A benefit of this site is NWAA has recently done an assessment for and is knowledgeable about the cultural resources in this location.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: A new boat capable of safe year round operation on this route would be very expensive and this location would require the purchase of prime waterfront land within the City of Bellingham for dock and related facilities. Broad expanses of flat land are in the vicinity and appear to be well-suited to the kind of development needed to support a ferry terminal.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: New boat would require maintenance and, because of longer route, would have increased fuel costs and increased wear and

tear due to increased distances traveled. This may be partially offset by the increased efficiencies afforded by new marine technologies in boat design.

Available Land

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Land availability unknown and purchase of prime waterfront land within the City of Bellingham would be most expensive.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Water, sewer and power appear to be available to this industrialized portion of the Bellingham waterfront.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Many ferry users cited Bellingham as their destination which may afford some riders the opportunity to travel as foot passengers. Others may still require vehicles but will be closer to their destination. Riders for Ferndale and other points to the North would be farther from their destination and those going South would need to traverse the City to access I-5 which would increase traffic in parts of Bellingham.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Waterway is suitable for a shorter pier length and no dredging required.

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: 2

Explanation: Fewer assessed permitting issues are present than at other potential sites, such as no potential to result in shellfish closure.

Whatcom Waterway

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Year round (365 day) service may be more difficult given extreme storm conditions and open water in crossing Bellingham Bay.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Ferry dock is removed from Lummi Reservation, no traffic conflicts, no land needed for parking or queuing, etc.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Existing boat could not be used safely in adverse weather. A new boat, if properly designed, could provide safe service but at considerable expense.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Longer travel time, especially during adverse weather, would reduce the number of runs per day and the level of service provided.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation: It is presumed that a new boat would be designed with this crossing/route in mind and would provide a safe means of crossing in all weather.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: The location off of the Reservation would do nothing to foster the development of the multi-modal center on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: +2

Explanation: This location would eliminate all ferry traffic-related impacts on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Fewer number of assessed natural resources are present than at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: -2

Explanation: A greater number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present than at the existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Ferry Dock construction could affect historic archaeological resources and has a high potential for impacting undiscovered pre-contact deposits along the historic shoreline. Potential site is adjacent to and nearby other cultural resources as well. NWAA has recently done an assessment for and is knowledgeable about the cultural resources in this location.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: A new boat capable of safe year round operation on this route would be very expensive and this location would require the purchase of prime waterfront land within the City of Bellingham for dock and related facilities. There are two existing buildings at this site that look as though they could be easily converted to serve as offices and other administrative support for the ferry such as a waiting room and ticketing facilities.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: New boat would require maintenance and, because of longer route, would have increased fuel costs and increased wear and tear due to increased distances traveled. This may be partially offset by the increased efficiencies afforded by new marine technologies in boat design.

Available Land

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Land availability unknown and purchase of prime waterfront land within the City of Bellingham would be most expensive.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Water, sewer and power appear to be available to this industrialized portion of the Bellingham waterfront.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Many ferry users cited Bellingham as their destination which may afford some riders the opportunity to travel as foot passengers. Others may still require vehicles but will be closer to their destination. Riders for Ferndale and other points to the North would be farther from their destination and those going South would need to traverse the City to access I-5 which would increase traffic in parts of Bellingham.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Waterway is suitable for a shorter pier length and no dredging required.

Is it “Permittable?”

Ranking: 2

Explanation: Fewer assessed permitting issues are present than at other potential sites, such as no potential to result in shellfish closure.

Fairhaven

Consistency with County Vision

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Year round (365 day) service may be more difficult given extreme storm conditions and open water in crossing Bellingham Bay.

Consistency with Lummi Vision

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Ferry dock is removed from Lummi Reservation, no traffic conflicts, no land needed for parking or queuing, etc.

Safety of Ferry

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Existing boat could not be used safely in adverse weather. A new boat, if properly designed, could provide safe service but at considerable expense.

Reliability of Service

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Longer travel time, especially during adverse weather, would reduce the number of runs per day and the level of service provided.

Safety of an Alternative Boat

Ranking: 0

Explanation: It is presumed that a new boat would be designed with this crossing/route in mind and would provide a safe means of crossing in all weather.

Fosters Development of a Multi-Modal Center

Ranking: -2

Explanation: The location off of the Reservation would do nothing to foster the development of the multi-modal center on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Traffic Impacts on the Reservation

Ranking: +2

Explanation: This location would eliminate all ferry traffic-related impacts on the Reservation.

Avoids or Mitigates Significant Environmental Impacts

Ranking: 0

Explanation: An equal amount of assessed natural resources are present as at existing site.

Avoids or Mitigates Impacts to Treaty-Reserved Usual and Accustomed Fishing, Hunting, and Harvesting Areas

Ranking: -1

Explanation: A greater number of assessed U & A areas and salmonid species are present than at the existing site.

Avoids Significant Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources

Ranking: -1

Explanation: Adjacent to a cultural resource that has undefined boundaries because it is currently buried under landfill. Other cultural resources located nearby.

Anticipated Total Costs

Ranking: -2

Explanation: A new boat capable of safe year round operation on this route would be very expensive and this location would require the purchase of prime waterfront land within the City of Bellingham for dock and related facilities.

Anticipated Operations and Maintenance (O & M) Costs

Ranking: -1

Explanation: New boat would require maintenance and, because of longer route, would have increased fuel costs and increased wear and tear due to increased distances traveled. This may be partially offset

by the increased efficiencies afforded by new marine technologies in boat design.

Available Land

Ranking: -2

Explanation: Availability of land unknown although the land would be very expensive.

Local Infrastructure

Ranking: 0

Explanation: Water, sewer and power appear to be available to this industrialized portion of the Bellingham waterfront.

Access to Destinations

Ranking: +1

Explanation: Many ferry users cited Bellingham as their destination which may afford some riders the opportunity to travel as foot passengers. Others may still require vehicles but will be closer to their destination. Riders for Ferndale and other points to the North would be farther from their destination and those going South would need to traverse the City to access I-5 which would increase traffic in parts of Bellingham.

Geotechnical Considerations

Ranking:

Explanation:

Suitable Water Depth/Bathymetry:

Ranking: +2

Explanation: Waterway is suitable for a shorter pier length and no dredging required.

Is it "Permittable?"

Ranking: 0

Explanation: This score received a median score relative to the other potential sites and therefore maintains a score of zero.