

April 12, 2019

Dear Mr. Davis,

It is difficult to take the Steamship Authority's stated justifications for its proposed terminal building designs seriously after having read the document "Responses to Critical Public Comments Received by the Steamship Authority regarding the Proposed Design of the Woods Hole Terminal Building Presented in October 2018."

1. The document states that "... when looking west from Woods Hole Road, the terminal building in its proposed location will be hidden from view for most of the year by trees that are currently located alongside Railroad Avenue." (Page 1.)

The elevated bucket experiment showed the opposite. Only someone who was not at the experiment that day could make such a claim that trees will hide the new building for most of the year looking west from Woods Hole Road. The terminal building will be visible year-round from Woods Hole Road as the building is well to the south of Railroad Avenue.

2. The document states that "... This determination [of location] was made with input from the Woods Hole Community Association and the Woods Hole Business Association, and received the community's approval at a public meeting in June 2014." (page1-2)

As the *Falmouth Enterprise's* coverage of that June 2014 meeting describes, the project did not receive the community's approval at a public meeting.

3. The document's long discussion of the current employees' parking lot makes no mention of labor union arrangements. (page 3)

Mr. Davis at the April 2019 Port Council explained that a primary argument against using the employees' parking lot for a new building site are the costs related to labor union parking arrangements. Based on Mr. Davis' comment, the SSA would incur significant costs if union employees had to report earlier/leave earlier in their schedules to travel to more distant parking sites.

4. The document states that "Even a flat roof one-story structure placed parallel to the water and position 350 feet or more from the Crane St. Bridge will block all or most of the view of the water."

This blanket statement ignores the possibility of preserving the valuable views of a portion of Penzance Point, Devil's Foot, and the Elizabeth Islands. Such views would not necessarily be lost with only a single-story building.

5. "... We have been able to shorten the building's length by 10 feet." (page 4)

Such a small reduction in length of the building, that is by less than 10%, and by 0% in its width, is so minor a reduction that it is almost ludicrous to draw attention to it as an improvement.

6. "The waiting room needs to hold at least this many people [127] to accommodate the large number of customers who wait in line to buy tickets or ask information during the busy summer season" (page 5)

The Steamship Authority could provide information visually on signs and poster and thereby not require ticket agents to answer the same questions day in and day out. How could buying tickets to take a 30-minute ferry ride between a total of

three ports be more complicated than one's taking an airplane and navigating around any airport, which one can do quite easily in this day and age without speaking with anyone?

7. "In addition, there is no certainty that there will be a significant reduction in the number of over-the-counter transactions when SSA customers are able to purchase their passenger tickets online."

This statement is simply illogical. If the SSA could improve its online offerings and other capabilities for buying electronic tickets (including from cell phones) or use of automatic ticket machines as are in wide use elsewhere, one could very reasonably conclude that there would be a reduction in over-the-counter transactions.

8. "A pitched roof building (one or two stories) will always rise well above the horizon and block a view of the water and islands above." (page 10)

A pitched roof building located near Railroad Ave. and closer to the Crane St. Bridge would not "always" block a view of the water.

9. "In any event, as described above, the SSA cannot eliminate or move any more functions from the new terminal building." (page 10)

This is a statement of preference and not one of fact. If the SSA had the will, the SSA could move one or more functions away from the new terminal building. Such functions might include the employees' lockers (which as proposed will be quite distant from their private vehicles) and the multi-purpose room. The second floor as now proposed will be only for employees. If so much space will be for employee use only, then there is little justification for customers being in such close proximity within a single building.

10. “The terminal design has been developed to meet these modern requirements with thoughtful regionally appropriate concepts.” (page 12)

Please do not insult our intelligence with claims of “thoughtful regionally appropriate concepts”. The absence of a regional character in the proposed designs is exactly one of the largest points of criticism of those designs.

As stated in the “Responses to Critical Public Comments” document, the Steamship Authority’s arguments for the need for a two-story terminal building in Woods Hole are specious and ultimately unconvincing.

It is an insult to the public to have to read such an obviously self-serving document.

I remain categorically opposed to the Steamship Authority’s proposed building of a two-story building, rather than a one-story building together with ancillary services in a second building elsewhere on the property that would functionally (and quite logically) be for Steamship Authority employee use only.

Sincerely,

Nat Trumbull, 