

SKAGIT COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Adoption of permanent Guemes Island Ferry Sailing Schedule.

2. Name of applicant/proponent:

Skagit County Department of Public Works, Ferry Division.

3. Address and phone number of applicant/proponent and contact person:

*1800 Continental Place, Mount Vernon, WA 98273; 360-336-9400
Contact: Ron Panzero ext. 7618*

4. Date checklist prepared:

November 4, 2008

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Skagit County Planning & Development Services Department

6. Proposed project timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

The proposal is to adopt the current temporary ferry sailing schedule and make it permanent, effective January 1, 2009.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

No. The proposal is a non-project action relating to the permanent adoption of a previously temporary schedule that has been in place for more than 28 months. No physical improvements are related to, or necessitated by, the proposal.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

An Environmental Assessment Report, assessing the potential for growth inducement and attendant impacts to water resources, a SEPA checklist, and supporting information was prepared for the interim expanded service now being provided to Guemes Island under Skagit County Resolution Number R20060184 (dated June 28, 2006). An addendum to the SEPA DNS issued for that proposal is also a matter of public record and provides additional background information. Appendices to Environmental Assessment Report provide further additional information.

9. Do you know of pending applications for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

Not applicable; there are no other pending governmental approvals related to the proposal.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposals, if known:

No permits are required for the proposal. Environmental review under SEPA is required, as is Board of Commissioners adoption and approval of the proposed permanent ferry sailing schedule by way of ordinance or resolution, as appropriate.

11. Give a complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.

The proposal is to adopt permanent changes to the scheduled ferry service between Anacortes and Guemes Island, Washington. On May 30, 2006, Skagit County adopted Resolution Number R20060184. That resolution amended the sailing schedule of the Skagit County owned and operated Guemes Island Ferry, which runs between Anacortes and Guemes Island by adding five (5) additional runs (at 6:30 p.m., 7:00 p.m., 8:30 p.m., 9:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m.) on Mondays through Thursdays. The pre-existing scheduled runs on Mondays through Thursdays (from 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.), Fridays and Saturdays (from 6:30 a.m. to 12:00 midnight), and Sundays and holidays (from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) were essentially unchanged. The 2006 resolution only approved a two-year trial period for the expanded service, which expired on June 30, 2008. On June 16, 2008, Skagit County adopted Resolution Number R20080289, which amended the sailing schedule and extended the trial to December 31, 2008. The proposal would seek to make the current, temporary sailing schedule permanent.

Historically, the ferry has been in operation since before WW II. The county began to subsidize the ferry's operation in 1963 and eventually took it over as a part of the county's road system. In 1980, the county began using the present ferry, which can transport about 22 cars and 99 passengers. Ferry runs were routinely extended past the presently scheduled runs. The county had adopted a "no passenger left behind" policy that allowed the ferry to continue to make runs until everyone in line was transported. Vehicles would often be queued up for transport at the last scheduled run on Monday – Thursday, necessitating up to two (2) additional unscheduled runs. Skagit County Public Works Department data for the period July 2004 through June 2006 show additional runs after the 6 p.m. run resulting from excess traffic. These range from up to seven (7) extra runs per week during some weeks in the summer to zero (0) extra runs during other weeks. The county also has historically extended operating hours, on holidays, the day before and after holidays, and for civic and school events. The lack of evening runs on weekdays created uncertainty and hardships for families whose children want to participate in school events and activities and for those seeking to attend higher education. The unscheduled runs were costly since they routinely required the payment of overtime and delays.

12. Location of the proposal. Please give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any. If a proposal should occur over a range of area, please provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Please provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map if possible. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist. (Indicate if maps or plans have been submitted as part of a permit application).

500 I Avenue, Anacortes, Washington and the southern terminus of Guemes Island Road, Anacortes, Washington encompassing the Guemes Island Ferry terminals located in Anacortes, Washington and on Guemes Island, Skagit County, Washington.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site (circle one): flat, rolling, hilly, steep, slopes, mountainous, other (describe).

Guemes Island is situated in the northern part of Puget Sound. It is roughly triangular in shape and covers about eight (8) square miles or

approximately 5,136 acres. It is separated from Anacortes on Fidalgo Island by the Guemes Channel and is served by the Skagit County public ferry service from Anacortes ferry dock at 6th Avenue and I Street. The existing ferry terminals (Anacortes and Guemes Island) extend approximately 100 feet into Guemes Channel, and include associated public roads and parking lots.

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate % slope)?

The steepest slope on ferry terminal property is 12%; however, the proposal to expand the hours of ferry service operation is a non-project action under SEPA and would not affect, or is affected by, topographical conditions.

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, please specify and note any prime farmland.

The soils are clay, sand, and gravel, however, the proposal to expand the hours of ferry service operation is a non-project action under SEPA and would not affect, or is affected by, on-site soil conditions.

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe:

No – there are no indications of unstable soils in proximity to the ferry terminal locations; moreover, the proposal to expand the hours of ferry service operation is a non-project action under SEPA and would not affect, or be affected by, unstable soils..

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

No filling or grading is proposed; the proposal to expand the hours of ferry service operation is a non-project action under SEPA and would not involve physical improvements of any kind. .

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable; as noted previously, the proposal is a non-project action and would not involve clearing, construction or use that would result in erosion.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

Not applicable; as noted previously, the proposal is a non-project action and would not involve the construction of new impervious surfaces.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

Not applicable; because the proposal would have no impacts, no mitigation measures are proposed.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction, and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

No significant increase in emissions is expected from extended operating hours. New engines were installed on the M/V Guemes in 2005 in order to meet EPA Tier II standards (i.e., reducing emissions). Additional vehicular traffic will be associated with additional ferry runs; however, it is anticipated that these vehicles would have used the ferry during existing hours in any event, or would have gained passage later than 6:00 p.m. under the County's no passenger left behind policy.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

No – no off-site emissions sources would affect the proposal.

- c. What are the proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts, if any?

Not applicable; because the proposal would have no significant impacts to air quality, no mitigation measures are proposed.

3. Water

- a. Surface:

- 1) Is there any surface water on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal stream, saltwater, lakes, ponds, or associated wetlands)? If yes, describe type, provide names, and, if known, state what stream or river it flows into.

Yes. The proposal is to expand scheduled ferry service to and from Guemes Island, which is separated from Anacortes and Fidalgo Island by Guemes Channel.

- 2) Will the project require any work over or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

No; the proposal is a non-project action and would not involve project-related improvements over or adjacent to the marine waters of Guemes Channel. That said the proposal will result in five (5) additional ferry crossings per day, during evening hours Mondays through Thursday from 6:30 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., by the 22 vehicle and 100 passenger ferry M/V Guemes.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

None; the proposal is a non-project action and would not involve filling or dredging in any amount.

- 4) Will surface water withdrawals or diversions be required by the proposal? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No. The proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, and would not necessitate any surface water withdrawals or diversions.

- 5) Does the proposal lie with a 100-year flood plain? Note location on the site plan, if any.

No.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No. The proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, and would not involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters.

b. Ground:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn or recharged? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No. The proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, and would not involve any ground water withdrawals or recharging.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

None.

c. Water runoff (including storm water):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff and storm water and method of collection and disposal, if any (including quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, please describe.

Inapplicable. The proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, and would not result in the generation of any new impervious surfaces or stormwater impacts.

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

No. The proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, and would not result in the generation of any new waste materials that might potentially enter ground or surface waters.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

None. Because the proposal would pose no impacts to surface, ground or runoff water, no mitigation measures are proposed.

4. Plants

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

X deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation.

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

None. The proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, and would not require the removal or alteration of any vegetation.

- c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None. The proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, and would not require any site alteration or modification that might impact threatened or endangered species in the vicinity of the ferry terminals.

- d. List proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

None. Because the proposal would pose no impacts to vegetation, no mitigation measures are proposed.

5. Animals

- a. Circle (or highlight) any birds and animals that have been observed on or known to be on or near the site:

Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other

Mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other

Fish: bass, salmon, trout, shellfish, other

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site:

No threatened or endangered species are known to be on or near the ferry terminal sites. Moreover, because the proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, and would not require any site alteration or modification that might impact threatened or endangered species, this question is inapplicable.

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

As is the case with nearly all of the lowland areas of Western Washington, the ferry terminals and crossing lie within the Pacific Flyway. However, because the proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes, it would not be expected to pose any impacts to migratory animal use.

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

Because the proposal occasions no impacts, no mitigation measures are proposed; however, existing safety and environmental protection measures applicable to ferry operations would remain in effect.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Expanded ferry operations will require the use of additional fuel.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

No. The proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled operation of the M/V Guemes. It would not involve any structural improvements that would affect the solar access of adjacent or nearby properties.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal?

No specific energy conservation features are proposed. However, new engines were installed on the M/V Guemes in 2005 in order to meet EPA Tier II standards (i.e., reducing emissions). These engines are also more fuel-efficient than their predecessors.

- d. What are the proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any?

No specific mitigation measures are proposed. However, new engines were installed on the M/V Guemes in 2005 in order to meet EPA Tier II standards (i.e., reducing emissions). These engines are also more fuel-efficient than their predecessors.

7. Environmental Health

- a. Are any environmental health hazards, exposure to toxic chemicals, including risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, likely to occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

No. Again, the proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled ferry service to include the evening hours up to 10:00 p.m. on Mondays through Thursdays. The proposal would not increase the risk of environmental health hazards.

- b. Describe special emergency services that might be required.

No special emergency services would be required as a result of the proposal. However, the proposal would improve fire and EMS access to Guemes Island.

- c. What are the proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any?

Because the proposal occasions no environmental health hazards, no mitigation measures are proposed; however, provision of expanded ferry service to Guemes Island would improve fire and EMS access to the island.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The terminal sites are presently used as ferry landings and parking lots. Adjacent properties are devoted to shoreline, marina, and city park uses.

- b. Has the site been used for agricultural purposes? If so, describe.

No – no portion of the ferry terminal sites has been in agricultural use.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Both the Guemes Island and Anacortes ferry landings include docks, ferry terminal facilities, and passenger waiting areas.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

No structures will be demolished; the proposal is a non-project action to extend the hours of scheduled ferry service to and from Guemes Island.

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The ferry terminal property on the Anacortes side is zoned Light Manufacturing; the terminal property on the Guemes Island side is zoned Rural Reserve.

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The ferry terminal property on the Anacortes side is designated Light Manufacturing (LM); the terminal property on the Guemes Island side is zoned Rural Intermediate (RI).

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program environment designation of the site?

The ferry terminal property on the Anacortes side is designated Urban II. No specific shoreline designation has been applied to the Guemes Island ferry terminal property.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally sensitive” area? If so, specify.

Yes. The existing terminal access ramps are located on pilings that extend into Guemes Channel, which is designated as an environmentally sensitive area, as well as critical area under Skagit County’s Critical Areas Ordinance.

- i. What are proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any?

The proposal is a non-project action to permanently adopt the current temporary ferry sailing schedule during the evening hours Mondays through Thursdays. The proposal is necessitated by ridership demand and need occasioned by continued dwelling unit and population growth occurring under Skagit County’s GMA compliant rural residential land use scheme for Guemes Island. Thus, the proposal assures the provision of necessary transportation services to the island in a manner consistent with the adopted land use plan. Because the proposal is compatible with current land use and shoreline designations, no mitigation measures are necessary. Please refer to the Environmental Assessment Report submitted coincident with this checklist for additional information regarding potential land use and growth impacts occasioned by the proposal, and strategies to further reduce the potential for impacts.

- j. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The proposal would not directly result in the employment of additional ferry crew. The Skagit County Department of Public Works, Ferry Division, indicates that two employee shifts per day are required for the Guemes Island ferry service, regardless of whether or not scheduled service terminates at 6:00 p.m. or 10:00p.m. However, the proposal would be likely to reduce employee turnover, which was common prior to the passage of interim expanded schedule now being provided to Guemes Island under Skagit County Resolution Number R20060184 (dated May 30, 2006) and R20080289 (dated June 16, 2008). Under the previous schedule, the two (2) shifts consisted of one (1) ten (10) hour shift and one (1) three and one-half hour (3.5) shift. Because this 3.5 hour shift did not offer sufficient hours to generate a living wage for employees, employee turnover was frequent. In consequence, the costs to the Ferry Division were driven upwards, as employee training time rose. For example, approximately 100 hours of training is required for new employees, along with approximately \$2,000 per employee expended on fire safety training. Under the proposal, two full shifts would be possible, likely decreasing employee turnover and training costs.

- k. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

No one would be displaced as a result of the proposal.

- l. What are proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement or other impacts, if any?

Because no impacts have been identified, no mitigation measures have been proposed.

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

No housing units would be provided as a result of the proposal. The Environmental Assessment Report, submitted coincident with this checklist, provides a detailed discussion of the potential island-wide housing effects of the proposal.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

No housing units would be eliminated as a result of the proposal.

- c. What are proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any?

Because the proposal would not result in any housing impacts, no mitigation measures are proposed. However, the Environmental Assessment Report, submitted coincident with this checklist, provides a discussion of potential programmatic steps that Skagit County might undertake to further reduce the likelihood of growth-related impacts to Guemes Island.

10. Noise

- a. What types of noise exist in the area that may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

Noise sources are not likely to affect the proposal. Vehicular traffic and ferry engine noise are endemic to ferry operations, and would continue with or without the proposed action to extend the hours of scheduled ferry service to Guemes Island.

- b. What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)?

No construction would occur as a result of the proposal. However, action alternatives 2 and 3 (i.e., described in the Environmental Assessment Report submitted coincident with this checklist) would be likely to cause minor to moderate traffic and noise impacts, for short periods of time, at times of ferry loading and unloading. However, these impacts would be expected to be localized in proximity to the ferry landings (both on Guemes and in Anacortes), and would likely be rapidly attenuated as vehicular traffic disperses on Guemes Island's rural road network.

- c. What are the proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any?

No measures are necessary or proposed. Under current ferry operational rules the ferry's slip whistle is not used except at the Anacortes terminal where vessel traffic warrants its use.

11. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

No structures are proposed. The question is inapplicable.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
No views would be altered or obstructed as a result of the proposal.
- c. What are the proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any?
Because no impacts have been identified, no mitigation measures have been proposed.

12. Light and Glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?
Existing ferry safety lights and vehicle lights will continue to be needed during hours of darkness.
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?
No. Light from ferry safety lights and vehicular traffic operating in evening hours would be unlikely to materially affect views or cause safety hazards.
- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
None.
- d. What are the proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any?
Because no significant impacts have been identified, no mitigation measures have been proposed.

13. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
Fishing, walking, and kayak launching.
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
No – no displacement impacts would be occasioned by the proposal.

- c. What are the proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any?

Because no impacts have been identified, no mitigation measures are proposed.

14. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

No – no listed or proposed listed sites or objects are in proximity to the ferry terminals.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on the site.

No landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific or cultural importance are known to be on either ferry terminal site.

- c. What are the proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any?

Because no impacts have been identified, no mitigation measures have been proposed.

15. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

6th Street serves the Anacortes ferry terminal; South Shore Road and Guemes Island Road serve the Guemes Island ferry terminal.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

SKAT (Skagit County Public Transit) serves the Anacortes terminal and the Guemes ferry itself, which is a part of the county's road system, serves Guemes Island.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

The proposal is a non-project action to adopt the temporary extended hours of scheduled ferry service between Guemes Island and Anacortes to include evening hours on Mondays through Thursdays. As such, the proposal does not involve or necessitate the construction of additional parking areas. Sufficient public parking areas already exist at, or in proximity to, both ferry terminals.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to any existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

No; the proposal is not anticipated to require road improvements, or affect level of service standards on existing roadways.

- e. Will the project use or occur in the immediate vicinity of water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

The proposal is to adopt and make permanent the current, temporary extended ferry sailing schedule between Guemes Island and Anacortes to include evening hours (up to 10:00 p.m.) on Mondays through Thursdays. The ferry service is a form of water borne transportation across the Guemes Channel, and is a part of the Skagit County's road system.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

The expanded ferry service schedule is not anticipated to generate significant new vehicular traffic. Instead, the proposal is a necessary response to growing ferry ridership demand and need which is occurring as a result of continued dwelling unit and population growth occurring on Guemes Island under the GMA compliant rural land use scheme. While the addition of five (5) ferry crossings would add vehicle carrying capacity to the service (i.e., up to 22,880 additional vehicles ferried annually), it would not generate vehicular trips per se. It is the continuing growth, development and visitation of the island that has been the cause of increased ridership and demand for expanded service, not the service itself. Ferry ridership data collected by the Skagit County Department of Public Works, Ferry Division, indicates that the expanded service provided during the effective period of the trial indicates a shift in ridership patterns has occurred, but not a material change in total ridership, which still remains below the levels observed in 2001 and 2002.

- g. What are proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any?

The proposal itself is a transportation mitigation measure, intended to provide ferry service commensurate with the demand and need created under the adopted rural land use designations for the Island. Thus, no specific additional measures are necessary or proposed. That said, fare changes implemented in January of 2006 have succeeded in increasing the number of walk-on passengers, and somewhat reducing vehicular traffic. Also, public parking (park and ride lots) facilities were constructed or expanded in Anacortes and on Guemes Island in 2005.

16. Public Services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

No. The proposal is in response to an increased need for public ferry service occasioned by growth, development and visitation occurring under the adopted rural residential land use scheme for the island.

- b. What are proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any?

Because no impacts have been identified, no specific mitigation measures have been proposed. However, increased operating hours will provide increased access to public services for residents of Guemes Island. As noted previously, the ferry is a public road and therefore a public service. The extended operating hours are intended to respond to existing and projected ridership demand and need, while at the same time providing certainty for the traveling public and eliminate the overtime and scheduling difficulties associated with the previous "no passenger left behind policy" and the additional runs previously needed for school and civic events, holidays, and emergencies.

17. Utilities

- a. Circle/highlight the utilities currently available at the site: **electricity**, natural gas, **water**, **refuses service**, **telephone**, **sanitary sewer**, **septic system**, other (describe).
- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities of the site or in the immediate vicinity that might be needed.

No additional utilities are proposed, or made necessary by the proposal.

C. SIGNATURE

The answers above and on the attached supplemental sheet for non-project actions are true to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency, Skagit County, is relying on them to make its decision.

[signed]

Signature: _____

Ron Panzero, Ferry Division Manager,
Skagit County Public Works Department

Date Submitted: November 4, 2008

D. SUPPLEMENT SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(DO NOT USE THIS SHEET FOR PROJECT ACTIONS)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production or noise?

The proposal is not likely to increase discharges to water, or production, storage or release of toxic or hazardous substances. Minor increases in emissions to air are possible as a result of the additional ferry runs, as is minor additional noise associated with ferry loading and unloading during evening hours. These potential impacts are discussed more fully in the Environmental Assessment Report submitted coincident with this checklist.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life?

The proposal would not be likely to materially affect plants, animals, fish or marine life. Prior to the enactment of the interim ferry schedule, scheduled service to the island was from 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Mondays through Thursdays. The proposal would involve five (5) additional evening crossings, terminating by 10:00 p.m. No impacts above baseline conditions would be expected as a result of the proposal.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish or marine life?

Because no impacts have been identified, no mitigation measures have been proposed.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The addition of five (5) evening ferry crossings would be likely to result in the consumption of a modest additional amount of fuel by the M/V Guemes.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

No specific energy resource conservation measures are proposed. However, new engines were installed on the M/V Guemes in 2005 in order to meet EPA Tier II standards (i.e., reducing emissions). These engines are also more fuel-efficient than their predecessors. Additionally the Ferry is now burning Bio-diesel which further lowers carbon emissions.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farm lands?

The proposal is unlikely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas. The Environmental Assessment Report, submitted concurrent with this checklist, discusses the potential for the proposal to induce additional growth and development of the island and the potential for such development to cause attendant impacts to surface and ground water. The report concludes that no significant land use, population, or surface or ground water impacts are likely to occur as a result of the proposal.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

No specific mitigation measures are proposed. The information and analysis set forth within the Environmental Assessment (EA) Report does not indicate that probable significant adverse land use impacts would be likely as a result of adoption of the proposal. Nevertheless, the EA Report does describe a number of measures that Skagit County might employ to further reduce the possibility of future land use, population and surface and ground water impacts, however remote or unlikely.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposal is unlikely to affect land or shoreline use, whether directly, indirectly, or cumulatively. The proposal is entirely consistent with the adopted rural land use designations for Guemes Island, and is necessitated by increasing ridership demand occasioned by continued growth and development occurring under the land use plan. The Environmental Assessment Report, submitted concurrent with this checklist, discusses the potential for the proposal to affect land use and population growth on the island. The report concludes that no significant impacts are likely to occur as a result of the proposal.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

No specific mitigation measures are proposed. The information and analysis set forth within the Environmental Assessment (EA) Report does not indicate that probable significant adverse land use impacts would be likely as a result of adoption of the proposal. Nevertheless, the EA Report does describe a number of measures that Skagit County might employ to further reduce the possibility of future land use, population and surface and ground water impacts, however remote or unlikely.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The proposal would not be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities. Instead, the proposal is in response to an increased demand and need for public ferry service occasioned by growth, development and visitation occurring under the adopted rural residential land use scheme for the island.

As discussed previously, increased operating hours will provide increased access to public services for residents of Guemes Island. The ferry is a public road and therefore a public service. The extended operating hours are intended to respond to existing and projected ridership demand and need, while at the same time providing certainty for the traveling public and eliminate the overtime and scheduling difficulties associated with the previous "no passenger left behind policy" and the additional runs previously needed for school and civic events, holidays, and emergencies.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

The proposal itself is a transportation mitigation measure, intended to provide ferry service commensurate with the demand and need created under the adopted rural land use designations for the Island. Thus, no specific additional measures are necessary or proposed. That said, fare changes implemented in January of 2006 have succeeded in increasing the number of walk-on passengers, and somewhat reducing vehicular traffic. Also, public parking (park and ride lots) facilities were constructed or expanded in Anacortes and on Guemes Island in 2005.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

No aspect of the proposal is in conflict with local, state, or federal environmental protection requirements.

8. The following historical information is also submitted:

Overview.

The Guemes Island ferry is operated and maintained by Skagit County as a part of the county's road system. See [State ex rel. King County v. Murrow, 199 Wash. 685, 93 P.2d 304](#) (1939). The extension of ferry operating hours on Monday through Thursday evenings is a non-project action (WAC 197-11-774.) It is authorized under RCW 36.54.010. The extension was implemented for a trial period, ending June 30, 2008, to allow the county to evaluate operational and financial information gathered during the trial period.

The extension of ferry operating hours will have no impact on the county's Comprehensive Plan, development regulations, zoning, shoreline planning, or land use plans. It will not require any changes to the existing ferry facilities, parking, or lighting. Although the Guemes Island ferry is a part of the county's road system, the change in ferry schedule primarily concerns a specific geographic area – Anacortes and Guemes Island – and a site specific analysis is not required. WAC 197-11-442(3).

History of increasingly restrictive zoning on Guemes Island.

1. On July 24, 1961, in resolution No. 3678, Skagit County established a planning department and created a planning commission of nine members as a component of that department.
2. In May 1963, M. G. Poole and Associates, a firm of professional planners and consultants, delivered a 51-page report in booklet form entitled "Regional Planning in Skagit County" to the county commissioners. M. G. Poole and Associates identified all of Guemes Island as "livable area." Map: Skagit County, page 2; Map: Distribution of Population in Lowland Area, page 5. Guemes Island was not identified as an area incompatible with residential development, i.e., floodplain, agricultural area, septic tank problem area, port district or airport (Map: Skagit Lowland Area, page 9), and M. G. Poole and Associates recommended a minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet for residential lots. Page 8.
3. On April 12, 1966, the Skagit County Board of County Commissioners adopted an Interim Zoning Ordinance, including a zoning map. At that time, all of Guemes Island was zoned Residential-single and two families. Other than requiring a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet, water availability, and septic needs, land division and development were unrestricted. See Interim Land Use Plan-map adopted 4-5-1966

4. On September 10, 1968, Skagit County adopted a Comprehensive Plan. Under the plan, Guemes Island was zoned (1) Residential-single and two family and (2) Heavy Industrial. The Heavy Industrial mapping change was reversed on appeal. See *Smith v. Skagit County*, 75 Wn.2d 715, 748, 453 P.2d 832 (1969).

5. Skagit County revised its Comprehensive Plan in July 1972. The 1972 Comprehensive Plan provided for five zoning districts on Guemes Island:

- Rural (RU)
- Residential (R)
- Rural Intermediate (RI) (estimated 30 acres)
- Public Use (P) (estimated < 5 acres)
- Commercial-Limited Industrial (C-LI) (estimated < 5 acres)

6. Under the Skagit County Zoning Ordinance adopted June 11, 1979 (Resolution no. 8003), the following development regulations applied to the zoning districts on Guemes Island:

<u>Section</u>	<u>Zoning District</u>	<u>Minimum Lot Size</u>	<u>Former SCC</u>
	Commercial-Limited Industrial (C-LI) ¹	10,000 square feet	14.04.070
	Residential (R)	varies ²	14.04.090
	Rural Intermediate (RI)	2.5 ac.	14.04.098
	Rural (RU)	5 ac.	14.04.100
	Public Use District (P)	N/A	14.04.130

Most of Guemes Island was zoned RU on this 1979 pre-GMA zoning map. Only thin strips of the outer shoreline area on some parts of the island were zoned R, or in one very small case, RI.

7. In 2000, the county rezoned much of the 5 acre rural zoned land on Guemes Island to Rural Reserve, with a minimum 10 acre lot size, and placed 502.2 acres in the Rural Resource zone, which has a 40 acre minimum lot size. The Comprehensive Plan adopted July 24, 2000, provides for the following zoning districts on Guemes Island:

<u>Zoning District</u>	<u>Minimum Lot Size</u>	<u>SCC Section</u>	<u>Total area</u>
Rural Reserve (RRv)	10 ac.	14.16.320	3,984.6 ac.
Rural Intermediate (RI)	2.5 ac.	14.16.300	801.4 ac.

¹ The C-LI zone was deleted following its challenge in *Smith v. Skagit County*, 75 Wn.2d 715, 435 P.2d 832 (1969).

² A single-family residence served by public sewer could be built on an 8,400 sq. ft. lot. With Health Department approval, a single-family residence on a septic system could be built on a 12,500 sq. ft. lot, and a duplex on a septic system could be built on a 13,000 sq. ft. lot.

Rural Resource-NRL (RRc-NRL)	40 ac.	14.16.430	502.2 ac.
Rural Business (RB)	N/A	14.16.320	9.3 ac.
Small Scale Recreation and Tourism (SRT)	n/a	14.16.130	15.8 ac.
Rural Center (RC)	N/A	14.16.110	1.6 ac.

Island geography restrains development on Guemes Island.

1. On February 12, 1991, the Skagit Valley Herald reported that DOE “has identified six pockets of saltwater intrusion along the south, west and northwest coasts of the island.” Funding sought for USGS study.

2. The 1994 Hydrogeology and Quality of Ground Water on Guemes Island report, which was considered during the adoption of zoning amendments for Guemes Island, addresses regional and local geologic history; area distribution and physical properties of significant hydro-geologic units; basic principles of the hydrologic cycle and ground-water occurrence; precipitation; recharge and discharge of ground water on the island; water-level fluctuations and trends; water budget of the island; seawater intrusion; general chemistry of ground water; and the need for monitoring and additional studies. (Comprehensive Plan, Appendix C at 13-14.)

3. In June 1994, Skagit County adopted a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for adoption of the Land Use Element in the Comprehensive Plan

a. The Final EIS provides that “[t]he Proposed Action [adoption of the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element] analyzes how growth will occur in unincorporated Skagit County during the next 20 years.” (At page 5)

b. The Final EIS identified significant unavoidable adverse impacts that would occur (at page 6):

The following are unavoidable adverse impacts that are common, to a greater or lesser degree, to each of the alternatives:

- The population will increase over the next twenty years. With this growth will come increased development, noise, light and glare, potential for traffic congestion and demand for public services.
- With new development, the loss of environmentally critical areas and wildlife habitat areas may occur.
- Changes to the drainage pattern, soils, geology and topography will occur with new development.

c. The final EIS provides that “[because of existing low light levels in rural County areas, rural development could have a significant light and glare impact on adjacent land uses.” (Page 90).

d. The final EIS provides that “Skagit County operates the Guemes Island Ferry, a 22 vehicle vessel, which provides frequent daily service between Guemes Island and Anacortes.” (Page 95)

e. The Final EIS adopted the following projections for population and housing:

Total Population (page 20)

<u>1990</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2010</u>
79,555	93,647	111,567	113,885

Rural Population and Housing Distribution (population/housing) (page 21/24)

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>Rural:</u>	38,186/16,038	44,951/18,879	48,535/20,385	53,741/22,628
<u>Total:</u>	79,555/33,413	93,647/39,331	111,567/46,859	137,597/57,934

f. The Final EIS provides that the “development forecast for the “Rural” designated area of the county would likely be evenly distributed as the alternative does not incorporate any goals to manage this growth in any fashion.” (Page 21)

g. The Final EIS provides that “Skagit County intends to adopt the proposed Comprehensive Plan prior to initiating final development guidelines and regulations to implement the Plan.” (Page 37)

h. The Final EIS recommends that Guemes be zoned rural. Figure 1, Appendix C.

4. Resolution 15570 Adopting an Interim Seawater Intrusion Policy (December 12, 1994) restricted development on Guemes Island by providing, in part:

The Washington State Department of Ecology identified coastal seawater intrusion areas on Guemes Island in the late 1980s. A U.S. Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.) groundwater study began in October, 1991. More than forty individual wells have been drilled on Guemes Island since the beginning of the U.S.G.S. study. Additional hydro-geological investigative work by Dr. John Oldow will begin in late 1994 and continue through 1998 on Guemes Island. A Sole Source Aquifer application has been filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for Guemes Island.

...
 This Interim Policy is based on the hypothesis that low pumping rates, lowered water use, and judicious location of well sites will eliminate or reduce seawater intrusion in newly developed wells and surrounding wells. However, the cumulative effect of additional wells on seawater intrusion into the aquifer is not yet known. The observation of significant increases in aquifer chloride levels may result in a modification of this policy.

...

Limits placed on building permits.

Land divisions with chloride test results < 199 ppm may be approved with conditions.

Land divisions with chloride test results > 200 ppm will be denied.

5. The county's critical areas ordinance further restricts development that would harm sole source aquifers such as those found on Guemes Island.

6. The Guemes Island Planning Advisory Committee commented during the SEPA process:

a. County islands generally have less groundwater supply because of the prominence of bedrock located near the surface, lower levels of precipitation and salt water intrusion." (DEIS at 43)

b. On Guemes Island, the bedrock indeed limits the amount of water which may be stored in the lower aquifer. Moreover, an unknown portion of the so-called recharge seeps out along the coastal bluffs as highly impermeable layers prevent it from reaching the deeper water-bearing layers.

Much of the problem concerning salt water intrusion has to do with the residential development along the shores of these islands and the fact that many wells are thus located close to the fresh water/seawater interface.

[Guemes Island is a sole source aquifer.] The ground water of such areas must be protected from depletion and contamination. Growth and development shall not be directed to them by any means. Rezones, variances, and special use permits shall only be issued after careful consideration of possible impacts to the ground water.

7. Gerald Steel commented and proposed that rural density be changed from an average 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres to 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres:

The DEIS shows that there are an excess of building sites in the unincorporated county under all plans considered. To better meet the goal of the cities and the county to have an 80% - 20% growth allowance, I suggest that the rural recommendation of an average density in the rural area be reduced from 1 unit per 5 acres proposed by committee to 1 unit per 10 acres.

8. The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan, May 1997, recognized that development of existing lots was restricted by poor soils (for septic systems) and water resources.

9. Holiday Hideaway contains minimum size lots (6,000 to 9,000 square feet) with extremely poor soils and a water system of questionable capacity for full development. (Skagit County memo Re: UGAs and Land Capacity Analysis, and Clustering dated January 13, 1997.)

10. On December 1, 1997, the U.S. EPA designated Guemes Island as a sole source aquifer (62 FR 230 at 63545-48, December 1, 1997.) This designation requires that “all Federal financially-assisted projects proposed in the designated area will be subject to EPA review to ensure that they do not create a significant hazard to public health.”

11. The Skagit County Coordinated Water System Plan Regional Supplement (July 2000) estimated the Guemes Island recharge area at 5.75 square miles with the remainder of island being bedrock. It also provided that Guemes Island contained indications of saline water intrusion on wells on southwest, southeast and north coasts and some inland wells.

12. The Square Harbor area of Guemes Island was undeveloped in 1990 and remains substantially undeveloped forest. The area is a poor choice for intensive construction because it is largely underlain by rock and has little water available to support development, it contains critical areas: several eagle nest sites, wetlands, stream, steep and unstable slopes; and it is zoned for 5 and 10 acre lots. (Roz Glasser comment on Comprehensive Plan Update, April 18, 2006.) “Devastating impacts to the sole source aquifer and rural character of the island would be likely.”

Litigation has imposed limits on development on Guemes Island.

1. The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board has ruled that any density increases on Guemes Islands be preceded by detailed studies. The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board held:

Evergreen Islands did an intricate study of Fidalgo and Guemes Islands showing the number of new lots that theoretically could be created after aggregation was rescinded. It claimed that dropping the aggregation requirement would significantly increase the density potentials for those Islands and would contribute to a new pattern of low-density sprawl.

Evergreen Islands, et al. v. Skagit County, WWGMHB No. 00-2-0046c, Final Decision and Order at 3 (February 6, 2001)

2. The county dropped the challenged lot aggregation ordinance and earned an accolade:

[Friends of Skagit County] complimented the County on not allowing development on substandard lots one acre or less within the Fidalgo

Island Subarea Plan boundary and on Guemes Island until those subarea plans are adopted.

Evergreen Islands, et al. v. Skagit County, WWGMHB No. 00-2-0046c, Compliance Order at 3 (June 23, 2004).

3. One Hearings Board member reiterated the kudos:

Also, the County has responsibly disallowed the development of substandard lots of less than an acre on Fidalgo Island and Guemes Island until subarea plans for those areas are completed.

Evergreen Islands, et al. v. Skagit County, WWGMHB No. 00-2-0046c, Compliance Order at 9 (June 23, 2004) Gadbaw (concurrence).

4. To settle another GMA issue, the County disallowed the development of substandard lots of less than an acre on Guemes Island until subarea plans for those areas are completed. (Evergreen Islands, et al. v. Skagit County, WWGMHB No. 00-2-0046c, Compliance Order Lot Aggregation at 15 (May 19, 2005).)

Growth has created a need for additional ferry service.

1. In 2001, Skagit County commissioned a comprehensive review of ferry operations, planning, management, and policies. Adequacy of the schedule and its impacts on Ferry operations were included in the issues the review was commissioned to address.

2. The Final Report Guemes Island Ferry Operations Management Analysis (March 4, 2003, provides:

a. The report recognizes that growth on the island creates a need for additional ferry service:

The Guemes Island Ferry Capital Facilities Plan 2001-2015, documented that in the previous two decades the Guemes Island population has grown and Ferry System ridership has increased significantly.

b. The report provides the following information about ridership composition and growth between 1980 and 2000:

Ridership composition

	<u>Vehicle/ Driver</u>	<u>Walk-ons</u>	<u>Non-paying</u>	<u>Total</u>
1980	43,429	49,778	12,785	105,992
1990	71,874	59,729	11,527	143,130
2000	106,410	86,862	8,604	201,876

Change Since 1980				
	<u>Vehicle/ Driver</u>	<u>Walk-ons</u>	<u>Non-paying</u>	<u>Total</u>
1980	----	----	----	----
1990	65.5%	20.0%	-9.8%	35.0%
2000	145.0%	74.5%	-32.7%	90.5%

c. The 1991 Guemes Island Ferry Capital Facilities Plan projected “total ridership on the system in the year 2005 to range from 182,000 to 196,500 representing an increase of 28% to 38%.” (The 1991 projections were low. Actual ridership in 2000 exceeded the estimates for 2005.)

d. The Guemes Island Ferry Capital Facilities Plan (2006-2020) estimated a 29.0% growth in total ridership over the next 15 years. (Chart 4.15, page 34).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Estimated total ridership</u>
2010	250,000
2016	285,000
2020	300,000+

e. The county estimates that current total vehicle carrying capacity will be exceeded in 2014 and that “the data suggests that in about 10 years, without the addition of runs or a bigger vessel, the ferry system will not be able to accommodate more growth.” Level of Service (page 35)

f. Ferry employees assessed the adequacy of the Ferry schedule and its impact on Ferry operations, in part, as follows:

- It provides good service to the customer; however, the number of additional trips is increasing. The best that can occur are two trips within the 30-minute schedule. Since the vessel is making more trips, the crews need to go to 8-hour days, 13.5 and 14 hour days are too long.
- An increase in unscheduled trips and changes in the Purser’s reconciliation activities require crews to work more than the Certificate of Inspection (COI) limited 12 hours. Due to the increased activity, crews are getting tired and should not be working beyond 12 hours.
- The number of extra runs is increasing. The 12.5-hour day ends up being 13.5 hours. Two trips can be delivered, however, a third trip can only be accomplished when a person is left on the dock to collect money and sell tickets to drivers and passengers.
- The current schedule does not meet demand. Trips are needed before 6:00 a.m. and after 6:00 p.m. in the summer.

- There is demand for additional service in the evening; other runs are not full.

...

- Increased demand has resulted in additional unscheduled trips and is increasing the need to work more than 12 hours per day. A 12.5-hour day is too long when making additional trips. At a minimum, shorter work shifts need to be created for the summer schedule.

...

- Very busy, demand is greater than the available service. Difficult to consistently stay with scheduled sailings during the half scheduled service.

- Create 8-hour day schedules for crews; expand the operating day to accommodate the increase in demand. .

g. Ferry customer responses to a survey question about service expansion were summarized as follows:

Ridership is divided regarding service expansion. Almost 53% of respondents (251 people) did not want the schedule to be extended and 45% (215 people) did. Those against extending the schedule favor using it as a growth management or land use tool. Those who want service expanded also added comments, including “reluctantly,” “seasonally,” “for holidays, specifically,” “between the hours of 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m.,” or cite their interest in being able to access school activities or services off-island. Full-time residents/property owners were less likely to favor (38.4% yes) extending the schedule than part-time residents/property owners (49.1%), full-time residents/renters (57.9%), and non-resident Ferry customers (66.7%).

h. The report concluded, from survey responses, that:

- The most popular time to extend service to was 10 p.m. – almost one quarter of those selecting a preferred hour to extend service (a total of 226 or 46% of respondents) selected this hour.
- Regarding continued double trips (on-demand, unscheduled trips), almost 90% of respondents felt that the current on-demand schedule should “remain as is.” Written comments included:

- The System should return to running three trips per hour’
- Provide more trips when “backed up” at the beginning, middle and end of the day;
- “Until all cars are gone;”
- Adding a 12:30 p.m. Ferry run during summer weekdays;
- Reducing the break in the middle of the day; or

-Running service on the half hour for the majority of the day until 6:00 p.m.

i. Survey respondents ranked the following as the top five management and operating priorities:

Vessel safety	73%
Continuation of Ferry service available on demand	42%
Planning for future Ferry traffic growth	36%
Maintaining current weekday hours of operation	33%
Expanding weekday hours of operation	31%

j. The report assessed the impact of ridership growth on ferry scheduling as follows:

Growth in Ferry Passengers impacts schedule requirements and reliability in three aspects:

1. There is increased vehicle demand at both trip ends, and therefore, increased frequency of sailing operating at capacity on both legs of the round-trip. In the past, the Ferry was more likely to be operating at capacity on one side of the Guemes Channel, but not on the other. As the population of the Island grows and demand increases, so has and will the frequency of trips operating at capacity on both sides of the crossing. Concomitant with this growth comes other impacts, i.e. an increase in passengers not traveling on frequent user (punch) cards, and therefore an increase in full fare ticket sale requirements.

2. There has been an increase in the number of oversize and large vehicles that require additional loading and unloading time. This includes construction-related vehicles such as lumber and concrete trucks.

3. There is an increase in the number of walk-on passengers. This increase has two separate impacts: offloading time increases as vehicles wait for passengers to clear the ramp; and time is required for passenger ticket sales. In the September 27 videotape, the volume of additional walk-on passengers was a significant determinant of ticketing time: because there is only one ticket seller for both vehicles and walk-on passengers, the seller must interrupt his/her processing of vehicles, turn and sell tickets to the walk-ons, then return to vehicle ticking – all of which adds time to the process.

- k. The report addressed the popularity of unscheduled weekday runs after 6 p.m.:

A defining feature of Guemes Island Ferry service is the practice of providing additional Ferry runs when the vessel overloads, i.e. when vehicle demand exceeds capacity for a given sailing. Historically, the Ferry has provided double and triple runs beyond the regularly scheduled sailing. This has the effect of providing continuous, on-demand Ferry service during and extending beyond the scheduled hours of operation. Such on-demand service is extremely popular with Ferry riders. . .

- l. The report addressed the significance of the county's practice of providing unscheduled weekday runs after 6 p.m.:

Impact of Level of Service Standards on Current Practices. Although the County does not have a Ferry System level of service in place, it does have a practice in effect: all vehicles in line at Anacortes at 6:00 p.m. are provided with passage to the island. As previously noted, it is not possible to determine how many of the unscheduled sailings are related to the 6 p.m. mid-week termination time, versus those that occur at other times in the schedule. This is important since there is material differences between demand that can be met by having the passenger wait for the next sailing, versus a passenger who needs to go home for the evening.

There is a real question as to whether vehicle demand – at least in the summer months – has now grown to the point where the system is bumping up against capacity constraints: there is or very shortly will be insufficient capacity available to respond to demand. . . . What is clear, even without the reports, is that demand is exceeding scheduled sailing capacity during some periods, and the County is providing this service.

. . . .
. . . The community is split on the schedule extension, with a significant degree of passion and emotion on all sides of the issue. However, what has emerged from this analysis is – in the aggregate – a disconnect between people's stated preferences and their behavior. (There is also a disconnect within the state preferences – i.e. "leave the schedule as it is" and "continue double trips.") While both the Management Analysis and GIPOA survey found that the Guemes community, by a small percentage, prefers the schedule to remain as it is, down at the docks actual demand for services is extending beyond the regular sailing schedule.

4. The 2001 Capital Facilities Plan notes that “[actual total ridership on the Guemes Island Ferry system in the year 2000 has exceeded the highest 2005 growth projections in the 1991 Capital Facilities Plan . . .” and “if growth trends continue, it may create capacity issues for the ferry.” (Page 6)

5. The Guemes Island Ferry Capital Facilities Plan (2006-2020) provides the following chronology of ferry service:

- Guemes Island settlement began in late 1800s and a private ferry, which could carry six cars, served settlers
 - 1958: private ferry service expanded with M/V Almar, capacity of 9-11 vehicles
 - Mid-1960s: Skagit County purchased the ferry service
 - 1978: planning began for larger ferry and services
 - 1979: county purchases M/V Guemes, capacity of 22 vehicles and 99 passengers
 - 1983: Guemes parking area for 60 vehicles constructed
 - 2004: two additional lots purchased to double Guemes parking purchased
 - 2005: extra lanes for auto staging added to I Avenue in Anacortes
 - 2005: parking lot for additional 70 ferry passengers constructed in Anacortes, increasing available parking near Anacortes terminal from 45 to 115 parking spaces.
 - 2005 schedule call for 6,760 runs per year
 - additional runs provided as needed
 - \$315 for special run + \$325/hour standby charge
 - \$1,000 special run during normal operating hours
 - Runs to isolate vehicles carrying flammable materials
- provided
- Runs for emergencies provided

6. The Capital Facilities Plan provides the following information about development on Guemes Island:

a. Total assessed value of land/property on Guemes Island

1980:	\$19,967,213
2004	\$178,246,172

b. Historical development of single-family residences (SFR) on Guemes Island:

	<u>New SFRs</u>	<u>Avg/Year</u>	<u>Total SFRs</u>	<u>% Increase</u>	<u>Avg. %/year</u>
1951-60	+67	6.79	101	197.1	19.7
1961-70	+74	7.4	178	76.2	4.4
1971-80	+146	14.6	329	84.8	4.5
1981-90	+136	13.6	472	43.5	3.1
1991-00	+178	17.8	666	41.1	2.9

2001-04 +28 7.0 695 4.4 1.1

c. Identified constraints on development excluded ferry service as a controlling factor:

- saltwater intrusion
- steep slopes
- water and septic concerns
- environmental regulations
- market conditions (\$ property values)

d. Existing potential for future development:

“It is impossible to know how many lots will ultimately be affected by development constraints, but it is clear that there is great potential for additional residential development on Guemes Island” (page 22)

“At this point in time, there are no indications that residential growth on Guemes Island will slow down.” (Page 23)

An estimated that 228 new single-family residences will be built from 2005-2020 resulting in a grand total of 891 homes on Guemes Island in the year 2020. (Page 23.)³

The Skagit County Comprehensive Plan includes a Transportation Element which details transportation goals, objectives, and policies for the county.

³ 2000 Assessor’s data provides that there are 1,589 parcels on Guemes Island, 681 are developed (43%) and 908 are undeveloped (57%).