ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
JOINT MEETING
HOUSE TRANSPORTATION STANDING COMMITTEE
SENATE TRANSPORTATION STANDING COMMITTEE
February 28, 2013
1:02 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

HOUSE TRANSPORTATION

Representative Peggy Wilson, Chair
Representative Doug Isaacson, Vice Chair
Representative Eric Feige
Representative Lynn Gattis
Representative Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins
Representative Bob Lynn

SENATE TRANSPORTATION

Senator Dennis Egan, Chair
Senator Fred Dyson, Vice Chair
Senator Click Bishop
Senator Hollis French

MEMBERS ABSENT

HOUSE TRANSPORTATION

Representative Craig Johnson

SENATE TRANSPORTATION

Senator Anna Fairclough

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

PRESENTATION: NORTH LYNN CANAL FERRY CONCEPTUAL DESIGN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & PUBLIC FACILITIES

- HEARD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

No previous action to record

WITNESS REGISTER

REUBEN YOST, Deputy Commissioner
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF)
Juneau, Alaska
POSITION STATEMENT: Testified and answered questions during the Department of Transportation & Public Facilities' (DOT&PF) presentation on the North Lynn Canal Ferry Conceptual Design.

CAPTAIN JOHN FALVEY, Captain; General Manager
Marine Highway System (AMHS)
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF)
Ketchikan, Alaska
POSITION STATEMENT: Testified and answered questions during the Department of Transportation & Public Facilities' (DOT&PF) presentation on the North Lynn Canal Ferry Conceptual Design.

ACTION NARRATIVE

1:02:22 PM

CHAIR DENNIS EGAN called the joint meeting of the House and Senate Transportation Standing Committees to order at 1:02 p.m. Present at the call to order from the House Transportation Standing Committee were Representatives Gattis, Kreiss-Tomkins, Isaacson, Feige, and P. Wilson; Representative Lynn arrived as the meeting was in progress. Present from the Senate Transportation Standing Committee were Senators Dyson, Bishop, French and Egan.

Presentation: North Lynn Canal Ferry Conceptual Design by the Department of Transportation & Public Facilities

1:02:41 PM

CHAIR EGAN announced that the only order of business would be a presentation: North Lynn Canal Ferry Conceptual Design by the Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF).

1:03:58 PM

REUBEN YOST, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), introduced himself and offered to provide an overview PowerPoint presentation on the Northern Lynn Canal Ferry Conceptual Design.

1:05:17 PM

MR. YOST discussed the mission requirements [slide 1]. He said this ferry will be the next generation of ferry. The report provides how the new ferry design can be used on existing and potential future routes. Whatever ferry is built will have a 50-60 year life and some of the basic elements will determine its potential operation. Thus the department has an opportunity to make changes and while change can be uncomfortable to many, some of the changes will be very beneficial. This report lays out some of the benefits, he stated.

1:06:34 PM

MR. YOST explained the ferry would be a roll-on roll-off (RORO) bow stern ferry. This concept means the vehicles all roll in in one direction, but also roll off in the same direction. This means vehicles do not need to be sorted based on port destination and vehicles do not need to be backed off or turned. In fact, this becomes important in order for the boat to be operated as a 12-hour day boat. Basically, the 12-hour rule is that the crew works for an average of 12 hours and the schedule is built around this factor. This is important when considering the primary service in Lynn Canal. If the two vessels were to replace the M/V Malaspina one of the vessels must complete a round trip between Haines and back within that 12-hour period. In addition to a fast RORO, it is also important to have speedy mooring capabilities and loading ability.

1:07:44 PM

MR. YOST indicated the DOT&PF has heard loud and clear that people want seakeeping ability similar to the M/V Taku, or better than the M/V LeConte in terms of winter operations with 99 percent sailing frequency, which means it can handle all but the most extreme weather conditions.

MR. YOST turned to vessel requirements [slide 3]. He said the overall length of the proposed 280 feet overall or 260 feet at the waterline, which is approximately 40 feet longer than the M/V LeConte. The speed would need to be at 15.5 knots, which is not the maximum speed of the vessel but the speed needed to stick to the 12-hour schedule.

1:08:53 PM

SENATOR DYSON asked whether this is the hull speed.

MR. YOST answered no; the hull speed would be approximately 16.5 knots.

1:09:08 PM

MR. YOST continued. The vessel would have a bow and stern door. Most of the current ferries have a forward side door, which means all vehicles either must turn or back in. The bow would be designed to minimize spray. In fact, one problem the Alaska Marine Highway System (AMHS) has with the M/V LeConte is that the bow and side sponsons throw a lot of spray and in freezing conditions it means the spray freezes on life boats, davits, and other working gear and creates a safety issue. Additionally, the vessel would need the capability to load aft, port, and starboard to allow functioning for existing side load ports.

MR. YOST anticipated the capacity at 300 passengers and a minimum of 53 Alaska standard vehicles. He explained that the Alaska standard vehicle is a measurement that AMHS uses, which is a vehicle approximately 24 feet in length. He explained the department reviewed the current traffic in Lynn Canal and accommodating 95 to 96 percent of the traffic days. He explained that 95-96 percent of the time, the ferries load 53 or less vehicles, although a few specific events such as 4th July, the Haines fair, or the Klondike or Kluane races. The AMHS would need to schedule some additional service to cover those events.

1:11:11 PM

MR. YOST turned to the Lynn Canal day boat schedule [slide 3]. He asked to focus on the Juneau-Haines and Haines-Skagway schedules. coordinated between Juneau and Haines and Haines and Skagway. In order for people to travel to and from Juneau to Skagway, the arrivals and departures in Haines need to be coordinated. He pointed out that the schedule shows that both vessels would arrive in Haines at approximately noon. That means the Juneau vessel would leave at approximately 7:30 a.m., which can be shifted, and the vessel homeported in Haines would leave approximately 9:30 a.m. and complete a trip to Skagway in time to meet the Juneau vessel. At that point vehicles and passengers would off-load and if the Juneau passengers or vehicles are destined for Skagway they would embark on the second vessel.

1:12:22 PM

CHAIR P. WILSON asked whether this schedule would leave from Juneau-Haines and return twice a day.

MR. YOST answered the schedule anticipates one trip from Juneau to Haines and return. The Haines to Skagway vessel would make two round trips. That would mean a 12-hour day for the Juneau-Haines vessel, whereas the other would operate approximately eight hours. This would allow four hours to service the vessel and a night crew would service the Juneau-Haines vessel.

1:13:35 PM

MR. YOST related that these are closer to daylight hours. Noon, 10 a.m.; returns at 6:30 p.m. To do this with one vessel means an 11 p.m. arrival; now the trip is more condensed. One advantage to the schedule is that it operates largely during daylight hours whereas using a single vessel the vessel would start at 7 a.m. from Skagway or Juneau and returning at 11 p.m.

1:14:45 PM

MR. YOST discussed the roadmap design [slide 5]. Granted, this is one example of how to meet the mission requirements. The vessel will be similar to this design in terms of the length, the number of cars and passengers, the clamshell style bow, and stern center doors; however to calculate a cost estimate the department needs to have a design to evaluate the space, steel, and arrive at a pound metric estimate for the overall design cost. He detailed the length, beam, depth, and draft as per the drawing. The service speed would travel at 16 knots at 85 percent power with a higher sprint speed of approximately 16.5 knots. Passenger capacity would be 300 persons and is based on 2 x 3,000 horsepower (hp) engines. People have expressed concern about an open deck; however, the department is considering a partially open aft roof. Thus one part of the car deck would be exposed, but would be surrounded by an 18-foot high bulwark. He detailed that the door would be six feet above the water line so the total height of the enclosure would be 24 feet. He reiterated that the design may be partially open to the sky, but would be well protected from sea water and spray.

MR. YOST showed a side view of the day boat entitled, "ACF "Roadmap" Vessel" with the clamshell bow, no forward side door, not sponson, and the aft deck is surrounded by the 18-foot bulwark.

1:17:45 PM

CAPTAIN JOHN FALVEY, Captain; General Manager, Marine Highway System (AMHS), asked to address the bow configuration. He said that presently the inland certified vessels, the mainliners, such as the M/V Malaspina, M/V Taku, and the M/V Matanuska have forward car doors as well as a stern cargo door. He said that frequently ships of this type of certification are designed with sponsons, which run the entire length of the ship, but also can be slightly forward of the cargo doors. He acknowledged the stability benefits of the sponsons; however, three ships: M/V Kennicott and the M/V Tustemena do not have sponsons. He explained the sponsons tend to create slamming and excessive spray. Thus it is important to be very careful about the inland designed boats, such as the M/V Aurora, due to the slamming problem. He pointed out that the M/V Lituya, at 198 feet, does not have sponsons and has a modified North Sea bow or one with a lot of flair.

1:19:24 PM

CHAIR P. WILSON asked more specifically where the sponsons are located.

MR. YOST offered that the sponsons are shown on subsequent slides. In response to a question, he agreed the sponsons are not planned for the day boats.

CAPTAIN FALVEY responded that the department will make the case for the seaworthiness of the road map vessel. He said the roadmap vessel will not have sponsons. He pointed out that a modified sponson would end at a certain point, since the slamming effect would be on the forward quarter of the ship. Thus, without the sponsons and with the flared bow, the AMHS believes the combination will make for a very seaworthy vessel. He said this ship would operate at 280 feet, whereas the M/V Tustumena - without sponsons - operates at 290 feet in some of the worst weather conditions in Alaska. He indicated this will truly assist in the seakeeping of the ship, in general.

1:21:42 PM

SENATOR DYSON thought he saw a bulb bow in the schematic.

CAPTAIN FALVEY answered that the bulb technology will reduce wave making and in essence creates a slip stream. Additionally, it helps with fuel efficiency.

SENATOR DYSON asked whether it would help with buoyancy and reduces pitch.

CAPTAIN FALVEY agreed that the design reduces wave making resistance.

1:22:53 PM

MR. YOST said the next two slides look at the deck level; [slides 7-8]. He stated the upper passenger deck is a crew lounge, but the middle deck would have a lounge, a quiet library computer room, and a family/play and movie area.

1:24:07 PM

CHAIR EGAN asked whether Wi-Fi - wireless capability - will be offered so the Internet can be accessed.

CAPTAIN FALVEY answered that the final process is installing satellite technology. The department had hoped for Wi-Fi on the ships and some vessels currently have hot spots installed. The AMHS attempted to do so but broadband costs were too expensive. Several years ago the AMHS started the process to have satellite systems installed. Next, the ship's crew also needs to communicate from shore to ship, which uses some broadband, which has been assessed. At the same time the AMHS is building a new reservation system, which will be live on ships. He reported a request for proposal (RFP) will go out in July and the department anticipates it will be successful. Currently, the AMHS needs to get the new reservation system operational and then assess how much available broadband is left. It may be necessary to purchase more broadband; however, the department is also looking at cellular technology since smart phones has driven connectivity. He suggested that the route contains numerous cell towers. He reiterated that the department will look closely and weigh against the cost of additional broadband. He estimated that it could be $500,000, since the AMHS currently pays close to $1 million right now. He summarized the Wi-Fi situation is on hold until the reservation system is up, but the department will decide whether to offer the service through satellite or Wi-Fi.

1:28:11 PM

SENATOR BISHOP said he was glad to see the comments were considered.

1:28:33 PM

CHAIR P. WILSON asked whether the design has been narrowed down to avoid additional add-on costs, since retrofitting costs can be higher.

CAPTAIN FALVEY answered that the design currently includes installing hot spots on the capital improvement projects. This installation throughout the ship ensures it will have connectivity. He has considered having a provider pay for the service. Unless large volumes exist, such as at the Ted Stevens International Airport it is hard to provide; however the marketing department sees it as a marketing tool that should be provided at no additional cost and be open to the public. He said the AMHS receives requests due to school children traveling on the ferries.

1:30:35 PM

CHAIR P. WILSON said she would not want to pay extra fees for Wi-Fi.

CHAIR EGAN admitted he paid for Wi-Fi on the airplane, but north of Vancouver the service disappeared.

CAPTAIN FALVEY interjected that he hopes it will work out soon to provide Wi-Fi on the ships.

1:31:50 PM

SENATOR DYSON said with the magnitude of the funding and the issues being discussed that it seems unprofitable to pursue [the Wi-Fi.]

CHAIR EGAN related that the $1 million would be spread through the fleet and he's responding to constituent concerns.

CAPTAIN FALVEY acknowledged that broadband is not cheap, but it also increases safety, provides 24/7 communication, and have experienced about 95 percent reliability. He maintained that broadband not inexpensive.

1:33:01 PM

MR. YOST discussed the day boat ACF "Roadmap" vessel [slide 7]. He explained that the department envisions vending machines and not full food service to reduce operational costs. He explained

the department will consider the most advanced vending machines and some foods may be able to be heated in a microwave. He directed attention to the shaded area, which could be a partially-open aft roof. He explained that 33 spaces would be completely covered and the average winter load is approximately 25 cars. However, that is not to say any would not be exposed, but generally the winter vehicle traffic is about half of the summer traffic. Essentially, ways exist so the deck can be open, but still covered so snow will not be on the deck.

1:35:08 PM

CAPTAIN FALVEY emphasized the need to understand that this roadmap vessel is only a roadmap to guide the primary naval architect to move forward with the envelope and parameters. The department will look at a closed deck and a partially open deck. The AMHS will look at closed deck in terms of cost differences since the partially covered deck would mean less weight, some reductions in heating and ventilation issues. However, where the bow opens, behind them are up to two bulkheads and the configuration will depend on watertight or waterproof considerations, such that the method to self-clear and not trap water. He related that USCG rules govern this. He emphasized that if it were open, three-fourths of the vehicles are tucked away. He acknowledged that sea spray in the winter is greater. He predicted that on average some of the cars in winter will be protected.

1:38:43 PM

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE expressed concern about the open deck concept. He asked whether it would be wasted deck space that could be used for other cargo, such as oversized cargo, and how people would be transported off the vessel if it became necessary to MEDIVAC people. He noted there seems to be room for a helicopter pad.

CAPTAIN FALVEY acknowledged these are good points. He stated that these vessels seldom MEDIVAC since the AMHS tends to divert its ships to the nearest dock. The odds of a MEDIVAC on this route would be fairly low, in particular, since the maneuver is a dangerous measure for the USCG and for the ships. Granted, it could happen and if so, it would likely be executed on the bow of the vessel. If the car deck is closed, it would likely be a lighter aluminum material and not suitable to support substantial weight. The car deck would be RORO and while it

would not be carrying freight the deck will have access for 40-foot vans.

1:40:50 PM

CHAIR P. WILSON asked for the height [from the waterline] at the point of the solarium.

MR. YOST responded that the passenger walkway will have railings around the space, just as at on the enclosed aft deck. In further response, he said a person would need to hop a railing. He further clarified that the six feet he referred to earlier related to the car deck being six feet above the waterline and with the bulwarks at 18 feet would total 24 feet from the waterline. Thus this 24 feet distance represents the height a wave would need to climb before it could come in the opening, which is not experienced in Lynn Canal. The railing would be the same height as on the aft deck on the existing vessels. He reiterated it would require someone to crawl over a railing before the person could fall into the car deck space, which would be less of a drop than falling overboard.

CAPTAIN FALVEY interjected that railing heights on vessel are standard heights and while he doesn't know the specific requirements offhand, he assured the committee the railing height would be standard.

1:43:21 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked for the maximum wave height in Lynn Canal.

MR. YOST responded that the department is currently evaluating it. In the past, computer modeling using wind and wave data at Eldred Rock has been done. He offered to research this further and provide it to the committee. He recalled it is approximately 12-15 feet. Additionally, the department is preparing a more detailed wind and wave analysis and motion comfort, which has been an issue and concern. In fact, all the alternatives have day boats, such as the Juneau Access Road project. Thus it's the time to have a detailed study for the design team and the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked whether the design would be changed, if necessary, based on the results of the wave and wind study.

MR. YOST answered yes; the design would be changed to maintain seakeeping ability comparable to the M/V Taku.

1:44:53 PM

CHAIR EGAN recalled experiencing 70-knot winds in Northern Lynn Canal while traveling on the M/V Malaspina. He expressed concern about the capabilities of the day boat and what would happen if a ship with an open stern must turn around due to weather and freezing spray comes into the open stern. He wondered whether vehicles would be frozen in and need to thaw before they could be offloaded.

MR. YOST answered that would be an extreme situation.

CHAIR EGAN answered that Northern Lynn Canal has extreme weather situations. He pointed out several cancellations of the M/V LeConte this winter.

MR. YOST related that turnaround situations with the M/V LeConte are primarily due to ice spray freezing on the davits of the lifeboats and not due to the ship being threatened.

1:46:37 PM

CAPTAIN FALVEY understood the route between Metlakatla and Ketchikan is different; however, he has operated the M/V Lituya in up to 75 knot winds with a completely open car deck in Ketchikan in the winter. He acknowledged this represents an extreme situation.

CHAIR EGAN cautioned that wind chill factors of 20 degrees below zero are not present.

CAPTAIN FALVEY answered that freezing spray does happen, but he acknowledged Chair Egan raises a good point.

1:47:33 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS appreciated the bow design and spray reduction capabilities. He related a scenario in which the day boat is headed south to Juneau and experiences a following sea. He asked what aspects of the vessel design takes into account a following sea.

CAPTAIN FALVEY said, technically, a following sea is not as harsh since the vessel is running with the weather and the wind.

He acknowledged 50-knot winds could be at the stern; however, it tends not as severe as driving into a headwind.

1:48:41 PM

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON said he's been wondering about the fairness and equity of charging the same vehicle fees for those covered and not covered. He asked whether these ships would be limited to Lynn Canal.

1:49:32 PM

MR. YOST answered that considering the schedule the vessels could travel to Hoonah, Angoon, Gustavus and Tenakee. The day boats could fill in for emergencies to Sitka and would be designed for those weather conditions, as well.

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON questioned vessels designed with an open bay, which would capture moisture.

MR. YOST answered the design will be analyzed. He reiterated that the top of the deck is 24 feet above the waterline in inside waters. The vessels will not experience big swells, but rather wind-driven waves. In further response, he acknowledged the day boats would be open to snow and rain, which is the same as any vehicle on any highway in the state.

1:51:04 PM

CHAIR EGAN remarked that the Lynn Canal travel is not the same as taking a day cruise in [Washington state waters.] Even if the deck is covered it would not be compatible with International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) rules, so it couldn't cross Dixon Entrance without a waiver.

CAPTAIN FALVEY answered that it can cross Dixon Entrance; however, the vessel couldn't into British Columbia due to international regulations. He clarified that SOLAS implements increased safety regulations on ships that run outside the international boundaries. He characterized SOLAS as literally being lines drawn throughout the world that dictate whether ships must follow inland or international rules of the road. In further response to Chair Egan, he reported the M/V Matanuska, M/V Kennicott, and M/V Taku as the only three SOLAS ships. However, the AMHS can secure waivers to go to Prince Rupert, if necessary, for emergencies under SOLAS.

1:52:39 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS, among the safety concerns he has, besides an open deck, is the clamshell RORO bow door and the unsavory North Sea accident, when in 1994 the M/V Estonia sank with the loss of 852 people when the bow door failed due to heavy seas. He was unsure of the harsh weather comparisons, but asked what safety considerations are envisioned to prevent such a thing from happening in Southeast Alaska.

1:53:40 PM

CAPTAIN FALVEY related the M/V Estonia capsized due to free surface. While the bow door failed the rules and regulations has subsequently changed that that require internal watertight or waterproof doors depending on the type of deck. He recounted the incident, noting the bow door failed, the vehicle filled with water, free surface took affect - there was nowhere for the water to escape - the water went to one side and the ship rolled over. Since then the rules and regulations have changed and require internal doors, sturdier bulkhead doors behind the bow or clamshell type doors to increase the safety of this type of vessel. These vessels are very common with large ferries that operate in the North Sea.

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS understood the day boat design would have redundant doors in the bow.

CAPTAIN FALVEY answered that if the design includes a moveable bow door, the vessel will have bulkheads behind it to provide watertight safety of the deck to avoid free surface.

CHAIR EGAN related the M/V Bartlett operated in Prince William Sound and the AMHS did not experience any problems.

CAPTAIN FALVEY agreed.

1:55:39 PM

MR. YOST discussed the vessel comparison, which shows the size, M/V LeConte is 237 feet, the day boat estimated at 278 feet, and the M/V Tustumena at 296 feet [slide 8]. He highlighted that the day boat would be closer in length to the M/V Tustumena. He also pointed out the sponson on the M/V LeConte. He predicted the proposed design would have greater seakeeping ability. In response to a question, he answered the height of the stern is

approximately 24 feet, but the ships are all to scale on the slide.

CAPTAIN FALVEY related that the profile of the M/V LeConte shows the sponson just below the car deck whereas the day boat proposed design shows the modified sponson much further aft than on the M/V LeConte.

1:57:44 PM

MR. YOST discussed preliminary cost estimates, noting the purpose of the preliminary design is to apply costs [slide 9]. The line drawings were used to create a parametric analysis, which is the typical process used prior to creating detailed line drawings. The process considers recently constructed vessels and creates estimates for the spaces. He reported that Coastwise came up with cost of first-vessel construction at $45-55 million. The preliminary engineering and construction engineering is based on a fixed percentage.

1:59:11 PM

CHAIR P. WILSON asked whether the cost for adjustments necessary to retrofit harbors to accommodate the RORO design is included in these figures.

MR. YOST answered no; these figures apply only to vessel construction. He recalled end berths or bow berths would be required at Haines, which is estimated at $20 million. The 350-foot Alaska Class ferry also called for a stern berth in Haines which was estimated at $18 million and obviously to have two stern berths would cost a bit more; however, they will be able to use common elements.

2:00:20 PM

CHAIR P. WILSON recalled $117 million remained, which leaves $10 million.

MR. YOST answered that even with the original ACF, the intention was to finance the terminal modifications from FHWA, separate from the $120 million or $150-$160 million in estimated vessel costs.

CHAIR P. WILSON pointed out that problems have arisen with respect to modifications to the Petersburg terminal. She explained that the terminal cannot be used. It was originally

modified for the Inter-Island Ferry Authority (IFA), but it sits unused. She expressed concern that if federal funding is used, the facility may not be used for all Alaskan ships.

MR. YOST answered that the Haines ferry terminal is only used by the AMHS vessels. Most of the terminals are only available to AMHS vessels. The design would be structured so it does not preclude using the existing side berth. Further, the AMHS has used federal funds for all Southeast terminals so they are not available for lease to private entities.

CHAIR P. WILSON maintained her concern.

MR. YOST answered that the Haines facility was built with federal aid so adding a stern berth or end berth won't change that situation.

2:02:31 PM

CHAIR EGAN asked whether an additional $40 million would be necessary to upgrade the terminal.

MR. YOST responded the cost would be $20 million for a dual end berth facility.

2:03:01 PM

CHAIR EGAN understood the proposed plan is to construct the vessel in Ketchikan without any federal funds so federal funds will not be accepted.

MR. YOST answered yes; the federal funds would not be used for the vessel construction. In response to a question, Mr. Yost agreed that every Southeast ferry terminal has been built with federal funds. He clarified that the proposed day boat vessel has always been planned to call at federal aid modified terminals. He maintained that the defederalized construction of the ferries will not affect the terminals.

2:03:41 PM

MR. YOST said that based on Washington state's experience and other places in which identical vessels have been constructed by the same shipyard, the department anticipates a 10 percent cost savings to build the second vessel. He elaborated that the shipyard does not have any engineering to contend with for the second vessel and other efficiencies will occur in assembly.

However, the department did use mid-range figures for cost savings. He recalled that Washington state experienced 8-18 percent cost savings. This leaves approximately $10 million for contingencies. If vessel cost projections come in higher than the $117 million, the AMHS will either redesign the day boats or request additional funds. At this point, the department anticipates the costs to build two day boats for the $117 million remaining ACF appropriation.

2:05:10 PM

MR. YOST related the timeline [slide 10]. He reported that the Design Study Report & Concept Design was released on February 25. It is out for public review, is on the department's website, and comments should be submitted by March 8 since the Elliott Bay Design Group will need to analyze the report and provide detailed analysis and prepare a concept design, that a parametric cost estimate will be done and it will move to preliminary design. In fact, the process the department uses for any capital construction project is the same.

2:06:07 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked whether the $20 million for two end berths in Haines is the only modification necessary and no other modifications would be needed to other terminals, except for Tenakee, which is slated to undergo renovation.

MR. YOST answered yes; noting the $20 million is only an estimate since the preliminary design has not yet been done. Referring to page 25 of the report, he noted the conceptual design of two end berths, but as soon as the bow configuration is known, more detailed design will be performed.

2:07:07 PM

CHAIR P. WILSON asked to pose some questions for the department to consider. She asked whether the crew comparisons - the current 84 crew for the M/V Malaspina as compared to 44 for the day boats - seemed questionable. Thus crew for the day boats needs further explanation. She recalled the ACF was slated to for 28 crewmembers and to go from a larger ACF to the day boat the crewmember figures did not comport. She understood unaccompanied vehicles would not be allowed and asked if this is correct.

MR. YOST answered she is correct. He clarified that every vehicle would need a driver and a power source so it can be driven off for the RORO design. In other words, it won't work to have to back in a tractor to haul off a trailer, he said.

CHAIR P. WILSON asked for further consideration of this issue. She asked whether freight would only be able to go through Haines. She expressed concern if unaccompanied containers can't be moved between Skagway Haines southbound that freight can't be moved in the way it currently flows. Further, people in many communities currently have groceries delivered by van, she said. She understood vending machine usage, which is the direction airlines have gone, too. Additionally, she asked for clarification on the reason the Haines to Skagway run requires a 12-hour crew since the travel could be accomplished in less than 12 hours. She recalled the trip was estimated at 7 hours, yet it only takes an hour to travel between Haines and Skagway.

2:10:18 PM

MR. YOST agreed it takes an hour, but he offered to provide an explanation.

CHAIR EGAN offered that public testimony would be taken at the next meeting and questions could be answered at that time.

2:11:24 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS related that unaccompanied vehicles on the ferry system have been an important means to move freight throughout the region. He asked the department to quantify how much freight will not move up and down Lynn Canal if unaccompanied vehicles will not be allowed on the day boats. He further asked how this freight will otherwise move if the ferry system can no longer accommodate freight movement.

MR. YOST offered to provide answers to the committee.

2:13:37 PM

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committees, the joint meeting between the House and Senate Transportation Standing Committees was adjourned at 2:13 p.m.