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Project Information

1. **Project Title**  
   POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront

2. **Regional Transportation Plan ID**  
   5365, 5366, 5367; the 2022 RTP update will include the specific project location once a site is identified through the Alternatives Analysis.

3. **Sponsoring Agency**  
   Kitsap Transit

4. **Cosponsors**  
   Pierce Transit

5. **Does the sponsoring agency have "Certification Acceptance" status from WSDOT?**  
   N/A

6. **If not, which agency will serve as your CA sponsor?**  
   N/A

7. **Is your agency a designated recipient for FTA funds?**  
   Yes

8. **Designated recipient concurrence**  
   N/A

Contact Information

1. **Contact name**  
   Steffani Lillie

2. **Contact phone**  
   360-478-6931

3. **Contact email**  
   steffanil@kitsaptransit.com

Project Description

1. **Project Scope**  
   The project includes planning, environmental planning/permitting, and the preliminary engineering phases necessary to construct a new passenger-only ferry (POF) docking facility in Seattle, which will provide added capacity for both new and existing POF services. The Seattle Terminal Alternative Analysis, sponsored by Kitsap Transit, is currently underway and will help determine which specific location is optimal for a POF docking facility on the Seattle waterfront. This analysis is scheduled for completion in 2021. The PE phase will strive to design docking facility that will support multiple styles of vessels (Bow Loaders/Side Loaders) as well as different height freeboards to ensure the growth of the POF systems in the Puget...
This funding opportunity will be used to conduct more detailed terminal planning and preliminary engineering design, building upon the findings of the Alternatives Analysis. Grant funds from this request will also be used to support the necessary environmental permitting efforts (NEPA) and any related construction permitting requirements. Design to 30% completion will be required to obtain applicable environmental permits.

Construction of the POF docking facility is outside the scope of this application.

2. **Project Justification, Need, or Purpose**

Kitsap Fast Ferry launched POF service in 2017 connecting Bremerton and Kingston (2018) to downtown Seattle at the Pier 50 POF terminal. Ridership on Kitsap Fast Ferry service has exceeded projections, providing faster transportation options for people traveling between the Kitsap Peninsula and downtown Seattle. This success has encouraged other communities across Puget Sound, like Tacoma, to evaluate the feasibility of POF service.

Kitsap Transit is preparing to launch its third POF route with service from Southworth to Pier 50 while POF travel demand to downtown Seattle is increasing on existing Kitsap Transit routes. New POF service is also being considered between Tacoma and downtown Seattle and from Seattle's Ballard community to downtown Seattle. Expanded POF service will bring more riders and vessels to the Seattle waterfront and its only existing POF terminal at Pier 50.

With just a single float and only two vessel slips, the capacity of the Pier 50 facility is already near full capacity during peak travel periods with the current four routes. The additional route from Southworth to Seattle will need to squeeze into an already crowded schedule and facility, with no ability to optimize schedules to accommodate passenger preferences and with very limited ability to adjust to unanticipated but inevitable sailing delays by any operator. With implementation of the Southworth to Seattle service, it will not be possible to add additional routes or to expand service on current routes. Accordingly, additional facility capacity is needed to allow operations of planned additional routes in a manner that is safe, efficient, and reliable.

The goal of this project is to support POF docking needs in Seattle for the next fifty years or longer and to provide critical infrastructures to support the regional POF system as it continues to grow in size, complexity, and ridership.

**Project Location**

1. **Project Location**
   City of Seattle Waterfront

2. **Please identify the county(ies) in which the project is located. (Select all that apply.)**
   King

3. **Crossroad/landmark nearest the beginning of the project**
   Downtown Seattle Waterfront

4. **Crossroad/landmark nearest the end of the project**
   Downtown Seattle Waterfront

5. **Map and project graphics**
   KT_FTA_Grant_Project_Location_Graphics.pdf

**Plan Consistency**

1. **Is the project specifically identified in a local comprehensive plan?**
   Yes

2. **If yes, please indicate the (1) plan name, (2) relevant section(s), and (3) page number where it can be found.**
   - PSRC Regional Transportation Plan: Plan Investments, pages 52 - 53
   - Kitsap Transit Long Range Plan: Capital Facilities Plan, page 70
   - Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan: Transportation, page 64
   - City of Bremerton Comprehensive Plan: Transportation, page T-15
   - City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan: Connecting to the Region, page 90; Transportation in the Shoreline, page 176
   - King County Comprehensive Plan: Transportation, page 26
   - City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan: Transportation, pages 57-59 (This refers to multimodality and support for bikes & pedestrians. No POF is specifically mentioned.)

3. **If no, please describe how the project is consistent with the applicable local comprehensive plan, including specific local policies and provisions the project
supports. In addition, please describe how the project is consistent with a transit agency plan or state plan, if applicable.

N/A

Federal Functional Classification

1. **Functional class name**
   00 Not applicable (transit, enhancements, Etc.)

Support for Centers

1. **Describe the relationship of the project to the center(s) it is intended to support.**
   Identify the designated regional growth or manufacturing/industrial center(s) and whether or not the project is located within the center or along a corridor connecting to the center(s).

   This project directly supports connections between the regional growth centers (RGC) in Bremerton and the Seattle CBD and will support potential future connections between Seattle CBD and Tacoma downtown/Port of Tacoma. One of the main goals of Kitsap Fast Ferry service is to strengthen existing connections from Bremerton, Kingston and Southworth to the Seattle regional centers, including the CBD, Uptown, First Hill/Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, Ballard/Interbay, and Duwamish centers. This project will also provide the opportunity for new POF connections and faster transportation options between Tacoma and the regional growth centers in Seattle.

Criteria: Benefit to Center

1. **Describe how the project will benefit or support the existing and planned housing and employment development of a center or centers. Does it support multiple centers?**

   PSRC’s Vision 2050 Housing Background Paper determined that with a job to housing ratio of 1.71, the Seattle-Shoreline area is relatively employment rich, while Kitsap County and Pierce County, with job to housing ratios of 0.96 and 1.02, are relatively housing rich. By supporting connections between housing-rich communities and employment-rich communities, the new POF docking facility will help support the employment development of key centers and increase economic opportunity. The new docking facility will also support key employment for reverse commuters from Seattle to either Kitsap or Pierce County.

   The Seattle POF docking facility will support multiple centers including Bremerton, Tacoma, Port of Tacoma, and Seattle CBD and will indirectly support the Uptown, Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, Ballard/Interbay, and Duwamish centers located in Seattle. Existing Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry routes connecting employees that live on the Kitsap Peninsula to their Seattle employment will be maintained and enhanced by these terminal improvements. The project will increase accessibility for people traveling from the Seattle area to the Kitsap Peninsula to access jobs in Bremerton. This access supports the planned growth of jobs at key Kitsap County employers including the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, CHI Franciscan Hospital, and the new Amazon distribution facility. Additionally, by providing capacity for POF expansion to Tacoma, this project will allow for POF service from Tacoma that would provide a fast, reliable transportation option for Tacoma residents to connect to jobs in Seattle. Providing another travel options for Tacoma residents and Seattle residents will support existing employment and future job growth within the Tacoma and Seattle regional growth centers.

   All of the Seattle RGCs and MICs served by this project have experienced significant growth in employment and housing. Between 2010 and 2017, the Seattle metropolitan statistical area (MSA) has experienced job growth of over 22%, leading to the addition of over 308,400 new jobs to the area, while between 2010 and 2019, Seattle’s population has grown by almost 23%. In addition, the Tacoma and Bremerton RGCs along with the Port of Tacoma manufacturing industrial center (MIC) have also experienced significant growth, signaling a POF connection would provide another option for residents in Seattle to connect to these centers. Between 2010 and 2017, the Bremerton metropolitan statistical area (MSA) and the Tacoma SMA experienced job growth of 9% and 17% respectively, collectively creating over 54,400 new jobs during that time.

   Some key data for and a summary of each of the relevant RGC and MIC that will benefit from this project are included below. This data has been gathered from the 2010 census data provided by the PSRC center profiles.

   **Seattle CBD RGC**
   - Population: 25,920
   - Housing Units: 19,185
   - Employment: 135,285
Access to Transit (Employee or Resident): 100%
With 27.8 people and 144.8 jobs per acre, the Seattle CBD is Seattle’s largest RCG. A
significant employment draw in the PSRC region, the majority (58%) of jobs in the region are
in the services industry, with the next-largest industry being the government, which accounts
for 12% of jobs. The majority (52%) of total daily trips from the Seattle CBD are focused on
destinations in RGCs. This includes trips within the Seattle CBD (28% of all trips) and trips to
other RGCs (24% of total trips). The mode share of single-occupant vehicles (SOV) trips in
this center is only 40%, which is low in comparison to other RGCs throughout the region.
Transit trips represent 34% of daily trips from the center while walking and biking account for
20% of trips taken from the center.
Connection to the Project: The new docking facility will provide direct pedestrian access to
the Seattle CBD RGC, helping support employment growth, reduced SOV trips, and
continued economic development.

Seattle Uptown RGC
Population: 7,641
Housing Units: 6,110
Employment: 13,910
Access to Transit (Employee or Resident): 100%
Consisting primarily of Uptown Queen Anne, the Seattle Uptown RGC is smaller in population,
employment, and housing than the Seattle CBD, though it has many of the same patterns in
employment and travel characteristics. Regarding employment, the majority (54%) of jobs in
this RGC are in the services industry. Of the total daily work-based trips taken from this center,
44% are SOV trips, 24% are transit trips and 25% are taken via walking or biking. The total
daily trips from Seattle Uptown are focused on destinations in other RGCs (45% of all trips),
with 9% of all trips within the Seattle Uptown RGC and 36% of all trips having destinations in
other centers. This RGC also has 99% sidewalk coverage and complete access to transit,
with 100% of residents and employees being able to access a transit stop within a quarter-mile
walk.
Connection to the Project: The new docking facility along the Seattle waterfront will provide a
connection to and from the RCG via connecting to another mode of transportation, helping
support employment growth, reduced SOV trips, and continue economic development.

Seattle South Lake Union RGC
Population: 4,234
Housing Units: 3,107
Employment: 20,058
Access to Transit (Employee or Resident): 99%
Home to Amazon headquarters the Fred Hutch Campus, and the Gates Foundation campus,
the Seattle South Lake Union RGC has experienced rapid growth and is now considered a
major employment and tech hub. This RGC has many more jobs than it does residents. The
majority (75%) of jobs in this RGC are in the services industry. Most people traveling to this
RCG take a SOV to their jobs. Of the total daily work-based trips taken from this center, 72%
are SOV trips, 14% are transit trips and 5% are taken via walking or biking. Many of the total
daily trips from Seattle South Lake Union are to destinations in other regional centers (44% of
all trips), with 10% of all trips within the center itself and 34% of trips having destinations in
other centers. This RGC also has 99% sidewalk coverage and complete access to transit,
with 99% of residents and employees being able to access a transit stop within a quarter-mile
walk.
Connection to the Project: The new docking facility along the Seattle waterfront will provide a
connection to and from the RCG via connecting to another mode of transportation, helping
support employment growth, reduced SOV trips, and continue economic development.

Seattle First Hill/ Capitol Hill RGC
Population: 36,502
Housing Units: 25,972
Employment: 41,645
Access to Transit (Employee or Resident): 100%
With more residential units than most other Seattle centers, the Seattle First Hill/Capitol RGC
includes the Capitol Hill, 12th Avenue, First Hill, and Pike/Pine Urban Village. The majority
(74%) of jobs in this RGC are in the services industry. Many of these jobs are for medical
employers such as Harborview, Swedish, and Virginia Mason medical centers. Many people
traveling to this RGC take transit, walk or bike to their their place of work. Of the total daily
work-based trips taken from this center, 40% are SOV trips, 34% are transit trips and 20% are
taken via walking or biking. The total daily trips from the Seattle First Hill/Capitol RGC are to
destinations in regional centers (57% of all trips), with 25% of all trips within the center itself
and 32% of trips having destinations in other centers. This RGC also has 100% sidewalk
coverage and complete access to transit, with 100% of residents and employees being able
to access a transit stop within a quarter-mile walk.
Connection to the Project: The new docking facility along the Seattle waterfront will provide a
connection to and from the RCG via connecting to another mode of transportation, helping
support employment growth, reduced SOV trips, and continue economic development.
Ballard/Interbay MIC Population: 1,846
Housing Units: 780
Employment: 14,237
Access to Transit (Employee): 68%

With the smallest land area of the regional MICs, the Ballard/Interbay MIC industrial cluster is home to a diverse mix of jobs and businesses. Of the MIC’s 14,237 jobs, 6,170 jobs are included in industry clusters with 2,609 maritime cluster jobs. Like the South Lake Union RGC, most people use a SOV to connect to their jobs. Of the total daily work-based trips taken in this center, 68% are SOV trips, 10% are transit trips and 5% are taken via walking or biking. Among the MICs, Ballard/Interbay has the highest transit mode share and the lowest SOV mode share. The total daily trips from the center the majority of trips from the center are not to another RCG 9% of all and 20% of trips having destinations in other centers.

Connection to the Project: Improving access to the Seattle waterfront will help support access to key employment opportunities in this MIC.

Duwamish MIC
Population: 1,376
Housing Units: 523
Employment: 58,771
Access to Transit (Employee): 68%

Covering a large area and highly developed, the Duwamish MIC provided nearly 60,000 jobs in 2010, with key employers being Boeing and Starbucks. Many of the people working in the RCG take a SOV to get to and from work. Of the total daily work-based trips taken from this center, 73% are SOV trips, 10% are transit trips and 5% are taken via walking or biking.

Connection to the Project: Improving access to the Seattle waterfront will help support access to key employment opportunities in this MIC.

Bremerton RGC
Population: 1,821
Housing Units: 1,096
Employment: 1,946
Access to Transit (Employee, Resident): 99%, 92%

Adjacent to key employers such as the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, the Naval Hospital, and the Naval Supply Center, the City of Bremerton is Kitsap County's largest city with over 37,000 residents. The Bremerton RGC, located in downtown Bremerton, is forecast to grow significantly in employment and population over the next 20 years. Located in Kitsap County, the county with the best housing affordability index of all counties in the region, average rent in the Bremerton RGC is $777 cheaper than the average rent in the Seattle CBD (PRSC VISION 2050 Housing Background Paper). Of the total daily work-based trips taken from this center, 73% are SOV trips, 10% are transit trips and 5% are taken via walking or biking. The total daily trips from the Bremerton RGC are moderately focused on destinations in regional centers (23% of all trips), with 19% of all trips within the center itself and 4% of trips having destinations in other centers. This RGC also has 99% sidewalk coverage and complete access to transit, with 100% of residents and employees being able to access a transit stop within a half-mile walk.

Connection to the Project: The new POF docking facility will provide direct access to this regional center for people traveling from Seattle RCGs and will maintain existing employment for the center’s residents who currently work on the east side of Puget Sound.

Tacoma RGC
Population: 13,360
Housing Units: 7,990
Employment: 31,502
Access to Transit (Employee, Resident): 97%, 93%

After Seattle, the City of Tacoma is the second-most populous city in the Central Puget Sound region. The Tacoma RGC is located along the waterfront in downtown Tacoma and includes a variety of uses, supporting cultural opportunities and event centers. The majority (69%) of jobs in this center are in the services industry. Located in Pierce County, the county with the second-best housing affordability index of all counties in the region, average rent in the Tacoma RGC is $873 cheaper than the average rent in the Seattle CBD (PRSC VISION 2050 Housing Background Paper). Many people take SOVs to and from their jobs within the Tacoma RGC. Of the total daily work-based trips taken in this center, 71% are SOV trips, 12% are transit trips and 12% are walking or biking. The total daily trips from the Tacoma RGC are focused on destinations in regional centers (32% of all trips), with 25% of all trips within the center itself and 7% of trips having destinations in other centers. This RGC also has 94% sidewalk coverage and complete access to transit, with 100% of residents and employees being able to access a transit stop within a half-mile walk.

Connection to the Project: The new docking facility will provide direct access to and from this regional center for commuters and will maintain existing employment for the center’s residents who currently work in the Seattle area.
Port of Tacoma MIC
Population: 1,300
Housing Units: 25
Employment: 9,520
Access to Transit (Employee): 9%

Home to Pierce County’s highest concentration of manufacturing and industrial activities, the Port of Tacoma is one of the most important trade hubs in the region and in the nation. Major industry sectors served by the MIC include Wholesale, Transportation, and Utility sectors (37% of jobs), Manufacturing (36% of jobs) and Services (13% of jobs). Many people use SOV vehicles to travel to and from this MIC with 84% of total daily work-based trips taken in this center being SOV trips. Only 6% are transit trips with a mere 1% of trips taken via walking or biking. The total daily trips from the Bremerton RGC are slightly focused on destinations in regional centers (15% of all trips), with 2% of all trips within the center itself and 13% of trips having destinations in other centers.

Connection to the Project: Providing POF access to this MIC will increase access to Port jobs and will contribute to the thriving waterfront employment center that this MIC provides.

This project also supports the employment and housing in the centers summarized above by aligning with the following PSRC Vision 20250 Multicounty Planning Policies:

Economy & Development
MPP-DP-3: Enhance existing neighborhoods to provide a high degree of connectivity in the street network to accommodate walking, bicycling, and transit use, and sufficient public spaces.
MPP-DP-17: Promote cooperation and coordination among transportation providers, local government, and developers to ensure that joint- and mixed-use developments are designed to promote and improve physical, mental, and social health and reduce the impacts of climate change on the natural and built environments.
MPP-EC-6: Ensure the efficient flow of people, goods, services, and information in and through the region with infrastructure investments, particularly in and connecting designated centers, to meet the needs of the regional economy.

Environment & Climate Change
MPP-En-21: Continue efforts to reduce pollutants from transportation activities, including through the use of cleaner fuels and vehicles and increasing alternatives to driving alone, as well as design and land use.
MPP-En-22: Meet all federal and state air quality standards and reduce emissions of air toxins and greenhouse gases.
MPP-CC-12: Prioritize transportation investments that support achievement of regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals, such as by reducing vehicle miles traveled.

Transportation
MPP-T-1: Maintain and operate transportation systems to provide safe, efficient, and reliable movement of people, goods, and services.
MPP-T-7: Fund, complete, and operate the highly efficient, multimodal system in the Regional Transportation Plan to support the Regional Growth Strategy, Coordinate WSDOT, regional, and local transportation agencies, in collaboration with the state legislature, to build the multimodal system.
MPP-T-8: Strategically expand capacity and increase efficiency of the transportation system to move goods, services, and people consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy. Focus on investments that produce the greatest net benefits to people and minimize the environmental impacts of transportation.
MPP-T-10: Ensure mobility choices for people with special transportation needs, including persons with disabilities, seniors, youth, and people with low incomes.
MPP-T-12: Emphasize transportation investments that provide and encourage alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel and increase travel options, especially to and within centers and along corridors connecting centers.
MPP-T-13: Increase the proportion of trips made by transportation modes that are alternatives to driving alone, especially to and within centers and along corridors connecting centers, by ensuring availability of reliable and competitive transit options.
MPP-T-14: Integrate transportation systems to make it easy for people and freight to move from one mode or technology to another.
MPP-T-15: Prioritize investments in transportation facilities and services in the urban growth area that support compact, pedestrian- and transit-oriented densities and development.
MPP-T-17: Promote and incorporate bicycle and pedestrian travel as important modes of
Describe how the project will support the development or redevelopment plans and activities (objectives and aims) of a center or centers.
The project will be located along the Seattle waterfront where the City of Seattle is rebuilding the waterfront. One of the main goals of the City's project is to increase public space. Increasing the passenger-only ferry docking capacity along the improved waterfront and attracting new/enhanced POF services aligns well with the aims of the waterfront project by helping bring more users to waterfront public space increasing access to the new multimodal terminal at Colman Dock. Moreover, these passengers will enter the city without vehicles and will utilize pedestrian and bicycle waterfront paths along with pedestrian connections to other areas of the city.

The anticipated future Tacoma to Seattle POF route would also support the development of parks and pedestrian spaces along the Tacoma waterfront, including the redevelopment of Melanie's Park and Waterway Park. The new POF route will help bring more users to waterfront public spaces. Moreover, passengers will enter Tacoma without vehicles and will utilize pedestrian and bicycle waterfront paths along with pedestrian connections to other areas of the city.

Describe how the project improves access to major destinations within the center, including enhanced opportunities for active transportation that can provide public health benefits through the following relevant areas: walkability, public transit access, public transit speed and reliability, bicycle mobility and facilities, streetscape improvements, etc.
The Kitsap Fast Ferries and potential Tacoma ferries, support active transportation through design. The fast ferries are passenger-only ferries that allow only pedestrians and bicycles; no vehicular traffic. POF service reduces vehicles in the downtown core and supports cleaner air, reduced vehicle emissions, and increased active transportation. The vessels provide space for multiple bicycles, the new docking facility will provide more opportunities for cyclists and pedestrians to access downtown Seattle from new destinations. Close to multiple downtown employment and recreational destinations, the POF docking facility will also improve pedestrian and bicycle access to, and utilization of, these opportunities.

The POF docking facility will also be integrated with the new Seattle waterfront redevelopment, providing pedestrian and bicycle access to new multi-modal waterfront trails, providing fast, reliable, and direct connections to the new active transportation corridor along the Seattle waterfront streetscape that includes a two-way bicycle path.

Transit services may also be offered more frequently. Increased POF service may be possible with the availability of more docking space. Current demand for access to the Seattle center from Kitsap County is high, with most vessels already running at capacity. The rapid growth in ridership on Kitsap Fast Ferry services has indicated that additional ferry runs are warranted to provide adequate access. Kitsap Transit plans to operate more vessels as soon as possible, and the new docking facility will help facilitate this, as the existing two-slip dock is too constrained to allow for additional services and ferry runs.

Describe how the project provides a range of travel modes to users traveling to centers, or if it provides a missing mode.
Currently, the regional centers of Tacoma and Seattle are not connected by a POF. This project would allow for the connection to be established and would increase mode options connecting the new centers. This additional mode option can improve the overall efficiency of the regional transportation system and lead to decreasing traffic congestion on major roadways, such as the I-5 corridor, freeing up capacity for other modes. Congestion in the Seattle area is high with the INRIX Global Traffic Scorecard reporting that, in 2018, the average annual number of hours spent in traffic delays was 138 hours per driver. Providing POF service between Seattle and Tacoma would provide commuters with another option and...
contribute to easing traffic congestion. The new docking facility would also allow for POF transfers connecting Tacoma to key Kitsap County destinations including Bremerton, Kingston, and Southworth.

A range of transit modes is also available to travelers on either end of POF travel. Potential Tacoma POF landing sites are being considered that have access to bike lanes and numerous bus routes, while the Seattle waterfront already provides a range of connecting options including, biking, walking, bus, and light rail.

5. Describe how the project will benefit a variety of users, including commuters, residents, and commercial users).

Increased POF docking space in the City of Seattle will facilitate the expansion of POF services that will benefit commuters with faster and more reliable travel times. With riders switching from their car to POF, roadways will be freer and more open for commercial traffic. Commercial areas along the waterfront will benefit through an increased volume of potential customers, with waterfront businesses being supported by reliable foot traffic patterns. Nearby residents will benefit from additional recreational travel opportunities, and the POF service provided at the facility will draw tourists to the unique experience provided by POF.

The new docking facility will be fully accessible and will meet all ADA requirements, ensuring that riders of all abilities will be able to use POF services.

6. Describe how the project will benefit those groups identified in the President's Order for Environmental Justice, seniors, people with disabilities, those located in highly impacted communities, and/or areas experiencing high levels of unemployment or chronic underemployment.

This project will benefit minority and low-income populations, seniors, people with disabilities, and those in highly impacted communities in the Puget Sound region by providing them continued reliable, safe, and sustainable ferry service to and from the Seattle waterfront. The PSRC 2018 Project Selection Interactive Resource Map (https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/projectselectionresourcemap01312020.html) shows the regional demographic populations served by the ferry services are:

Downtown Seattle
- Minority population: 9%
- Poverty: 7%
- Elderly population (65+): 27%
- Disabled population: 19%

City of Tacoma (https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/tacomacitywashington):
- Minority population: 35%
- Poverty: 12%
- Elderly population (65+): 16%
- Disabled population: 11%

Kitsap County (https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/tacomacitywashington):
- Minority population: 17%
- Poverty: 9.7%
- Elderly population (65+): 18%
- Disabled population: 11%

The additional ferry access provides a critical link for Kitsap County residents, where, in 2019, the poverty rate was 9.7% (9.5% in King County) and the unemployment rate was 4.8% (3.5% in King County in 2018). It is vital that the residents of Kitsap County continue to have access to reliable ferry transit services because many Kitsap County residents, who have affordable housing options on the west side of the Sound, must commute to jobs located on the east side of the Sound (data: U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts, 2018). High housing costs in King County, where average rent is $2,037, lead many to select more affordable housing options across the sound in Kitsap County, where the average rent is $1,446 (https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/trend-housing201905.pdf). Consequently, Kitsap Transit's POF services provide access to employment centers that benefit low income and unemployed populations looking to access the Seattle area's growing economy. Crucially, these services provide direct access to jobs without adding traffic to the already congested highways.

The new POF service from Pierce County, where, in 2019, the poverty rate was 11.2% and the unemployment rate was 5.4%, will also provide access to employment centers benefitting the poor and unemployed who are looking to access the resilient and growing economy of the Seattle area.

Recognizing the high proportion of senior and disabled populations in the area surrounding the new Seattle docking infrastructure will be fully ADA compliant to ensure that the region’s most vulnerable citizens have full access to POF service between Seattle, Bremerton, Kingston, Southworth and possibly Tacoma.

(data: US Census Bureau; Washington State Employment Security Department)
7. Describe how the project will support the establishment of new jobs/businesses or the retention of existing jobs/businesses including those in the industry clusters identified in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy.

Unless otherwise noted, the information provided in this section was taken from the 2017 PSRC Regional Economic Strategy, Amazing Place: Growing Jobs and Opportunity in the Central Puget Sound Region.

Maritime-
This project will continue to expand the POF industry, resulting in more maritime employment opportunities and the preservation of a key employment sector in the Puget Sound region, as identified by the Regional Economic Strategy. The statewide maritime industry is estimated to contribute approximately $37.8 billion to the Washington economy.

With almost 30,000 maritime jobs in the PSRC region, this sector is a major employer for multiple maritime industry clusters, including Boat Building & Ship Repair, Water Cargo Transportation, Fishing & Fishing products, and Water Passenger Transportation.

New jobs directly provided by the new POF docking facility would include additional vessel operating crews and maintenance positions to support the operation, maintenance, and repair of the additional vessels and landing infrastructure associated with new routes and expanded service. This employment would contribute to the growth of the Water Passenger Transportation and Boat Building & Ship Repair clusters, which region-wide are estimated to have 1,800 and 16,000 jobs respectively.

The new docking facility will also support maritime jobs by improving access to and strengthening connections between the key maritime employment centers of the Puget Sound region. The POF service supported by the project will provide increased access to the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard (PSNS) which is home to nearly a quarter of the maritime jobs in Washington State, providing key maritime employment opportunities for reverse commuters from Seattle. In recent years, PSNS has experienced 25% employment growth, and this project will continue to improve access to the key maritime employer. New POF service will also provide additional economic opportunity by improving access to the Port of Tacoma MIC and the Port of Seattle (located in the Duwamish MIC), which PSRC has identified as two key employment hubs for Water Cargo Transportation. The Port of Tacoma, in particular, has a cluster of Water Cargo Transportation jobs that is 6 times larger than the national average.

Transportation and Logistics-
The Central Puget Sound Region is home to 6,700 Water Cargo Transportation jobs and 1,800 Water Passenger Transportation jobs. The ports of Seattle and Tacoma operate jointly as the Northwest Seaport Alliance, and together are the third-largest port for containerized cargo in the country. In 2016 alone, the alliance handled $75.2 billion in two-way international trade. By strengthening the access and facilitating the movement of employees between the two ports, a new Tacoma to Seattle POF service could reduce the cost of doing business, and allows for more resources to support overall job creation.

Tourism-
Identified as a key cluster of tourism employment, Water Passenger Transportation employs approximately 1,800 people in 2015 and experienced 1.7% job growth between 2010 and 2015. The POF Docking Facility along the Seattle waterfront will allow for the expansion of POF services to and from Seattle which will further contribute to job growth in this industry. Currently, roughly 20% of Kitsap Transit’s summer ridership can be attributed to tourism. The POF facility will allow for new routes to come online and increase access to tourist and recreation destinations. New POF services will provide tourists and residents with the ability to take scenic POF trips to and from Kitsap County and Tacoma for cultural and recreational opportunities.

Information and Communications Technology (ICT)-
The Central Puget Sound region is home to a growing and thriving ICT industry, with almost 149,000 ICT jobs currently in the region with Amazon, Microsoft, and Expedia representing key ICT employers. Amazon contributed to a 24.9% growth in Electronic and Catalog Shopping jobs between 2010 and 2015. Headquartered in Seattle Amazon is expected to continue to grow jobs throughout the Central Puget Sound region. By expanding access to the City of Seattle, particularly to the Seattle CBD and Seattle South Lake Union, the new POF docking facility will increase access to key ICT jobs and connect new workers more directly and reliably to the ICT center. Growth in Kitsap Fast Ferry services will also serve to support the growing ICT industry in Kitsap County, which is home to Critical Informatics and Paladin Data Systems.

Military and Defense-
The POF docking facility will increase access and provide a reliable, fast connection to key military employers such as PSNS. PSNS alone provides approximately 13,500 of the PSRC region’s 98,400 jobs in the military industry, including active duty military and civilian personnel.

8. Does the project promote Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) opportunities?
This project promotes CTR opportunities by providing another transportation option that is time competitive with single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel. Current Kitsap Fast Ferry services provide time savings of between 20 and 40 minutes in comparison to SOV vehicle options, while the new service from Southworth could provide travel times up to 60 minutes faster than SOV travel in high traffic conditions. The POF system promotes pedestrian and bicycle travel by only allowing non-motorized modes onboard the ferries. Moreover, the new facility will provide key connections to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure, which further decreases vehicle travel for any potential connecting trips taken by passengers upon landing in Seattle. Numerous connecting transit options are available with Sound Transit Link light rail and King County Metro bus services both operating along or within a short walking distance of the Seattle waterfront. Kitsap Transit also offers business account ORCA cards that are valid on all POF services to encourage employees to use an alternative other than driving alone.

The POF docking facility will allow for new POF service between Tacoma and Seattle that would provide a reliable, fast alternative to the current transportation options, with travel time savings of between 65 and 80 minutes when compared to other modes such as bus or SOV.

Criteria: System Continuity/Long Term Benefit-Sustainability

1. **Describe how this project provides a "logical segment" that serves a center, or allows users to access the system.**

   The city of Seattle is a significant economic engine in the Pacific Northwest and is home to a vibrant mix of work and leisure activities. In particular, the Seattle shoreline along Elliott Bay is a transportation hub for a working waterfront, an access point to the Seattle business district, and a destination for recreational activities. The expansion in vessel docking capacity along this transit hub will allow an increasing number of users to access these benefits by providing opportunities for additional POF routes to be implemented and for service to increase on existing routes. The addition of a Tacoma to Seattle POF route would provide access for users by bypassing congested highways on their journey, while additional service on existing routes allows for more passengers to access the existing POF system from Kitsap County to Seattle.

2. **Describe how the project fills in a missing link or removes barriers to a center (e.g. congestion, inadequate transit service/facilities.). Describe how this project will relieve pressure or remove a bottleneck on the Metropolitan Transportation System and how this will positively impact overall system performance.**

   The existing POF facility in Seattle is comprised of a single float that supports a maximum of two side-loading vessels (one on each side) at any one time. With four existing routes calling at these facilities, there are vessel safety challenges associated with the navigating multiple vessels at the same time to/from the dock. The insufficiency of currently available dock space is already limiting the route schedules, particularly during peak commute periods, and the unanticipated but inevitable disruption of any ferry sailing schedule can result in cascading impacts that negatively affect all other services operating out of the facility.

   The increased docking capacity provided by this project will reduce vessel congestion, free up service schedules, and provided needed space to meet POF expansion needs. It will also provide additional space to efficiently queue, board, and debark passengers, and will provide the increased opportunities for removing and reducing vessel conflicts. The increased docking capacity provided at the facility will support bow-loading and -unloading of passengers, which also increases throughput and service frequency at the facility. The time needed to dock, off-load, and on-load passengers is notably improved for a bow-loading vessel, compared to a side-loading vessel. Bow loading vessels are able to dock more rapidly, avoiding the need to put over and handle lines and align the vessel with the side-loading ramp. Between the docking and loading/unloading processes, the difference in dwell time for bow-loading vessels can be reduced by as much as 50%, freeing up dock space to other vessels and facilitating the rapid movement of ferry passengers. This streamlined docking process for small passenger vessels likely saves several minutes, which further encourages commuter to choose POF over other, more congested modes of transportation, such as SOV roadways. Furthermore, this project will improve service reliability by increasing resiliency to potential sailing delays due to weather-related, unanticipated safety/security events, and/or mechanical issues.

3. **Describe how this project addresses safety and security.**

   The new POF docking facilities will support/enhance the safe and secure transportation of both commuters and recreational users, supporting the existing and planned expansion of passenger ferry services to Seattle.
   - **Stable Landing Platform** - The proposed new POF docking facilities would provide a stable landing platform for small passenger ferries calling in Seattle. The addition of this stable platform would be a critical component to the safety of the passenger moved, particularly during the winter periods in Puget Sound when weather can present a safety concern.
   - **Accessible Infrastructure** - The new facility will have ADA accessibility improvements to help avoid customer trips/falls. The facility will also provide dedicated bicycle access to avoid conflicts between pedestrians and bicycles.
   - **Navigation** - The proposed expansion to docking facilities will directly reduce the potential...
5. If applicable, describe how the project provides an improvement in travel time and/or reliability for transit users traveling to and/or within centers.

By their nature, POF services/routes already provide significant travel time savings and reliability by using available, relatively uncongested waterways to support the rapid movement of POF riders. Not subject to automobile traffic, POF service provides a travel time with improved reliability when compared to car or bus travel and in many cases travels a more direct path through waterways than is possible on land. Consequently, the POF routes provide a quicker and more reliable commute option when compare to existing bus or car travel.
This project will markedly improve reliability for existing Kitsap Fast Ferry routes by increasing schedule availability at shared facilities, with the goal of dramatically reducing vessel competition for docking space, particularly during high demand commute periods. This will facilitate getting travelers to their destinations during the desired time windows and enhance connections with other travel modes.

The project will also have a notable impact on POF system reliability, as sufficient flexibility will be provided to accommodate any unanticipated delays that would currently result in one or more vessels needing to wait for dock space to become available. POF operations could continue even if one of the existing tie-up slips were encumbered by a disabled vessel, or the slip was unavailable due to a safety or security event, directly contributing to POF system reliability.

The Kitsap Fast Ferry between Bremerton and Seattle provides a travel time of approximately 25 minutes faster than the Washington State Ferries (WSF) auto ferry for the Bremerton route. Further, the Kingston-Seattle route provides a 20-minute savings when compared to driving a SOV to Seattle via the WSF Kingston-Edmonds ferry, and a 40-minute savings when compared to taking the WSF ferry as a walk-on passenger and connecting onward to Seattle via transit.

Current travel times from Southworth to Seattle range between 50 and 90 minutes depending on transportation mode. Once implemented, the direct Southworth - Seattle route with an approximate crossing time of less than 25 minutes, will provide a minimum of 20 minutes travel time savings (40% quicker than the current best-case travel time). Travel time savings could be up to 60 minutes (60% quicker than the current worst-case travel time) depending on traffic conditions and transportation mode.

According to the 2018 Tacoma Fast Ferry Feasibility study, the Tacoma-Seattle POF service route will have a travel time of between 43 and 55 minutes, depending on the specific landing location selected. These travel times are competitive with existing mode options, particularly car or bus whose trip times range between 50 and 120 minutes and between 65 and 80 minutes respectively. This project creates crucial Seattle docking space that is a prerequisite for the implementation of the Tacoma - Seattle POF route.

6. If applicable, describe how the project increases transit use to or within centers.

POF services consistently provide travel time savings and reliable travel times. Further, they provide a pleasant travel experience that offers the ability to work while traveling, or just relax and appreciate water views. By providing a time competitive option to SOV travel, this project is designed to encourage travelers to select POF transit as their commute mode and increase the overall transit use of those traveling to the Seattle regional center from areas such as Kingston and Southworth. POF service between the regional centers of Bremerton, Seattle, and Tacoma is similarly time competitive and would encourage users to pick POF transit over driving alone. Projected ridership for Southworth service is approximately 217,350 annual riders while Tacoma service is projected to have an average of 114,400 annual riders, leading to an increase in transit users of up to 331,750 annually. The new docking facility will also allow increased ridership on existing routes through more rider demand optimized service schedules and additional sailings made possible by fleet expansion. The recent introduction of two boat service suggests that ridership increases of up to 33% of existing peak commute service numbers or up to 76,000 annual riders are possible if more landings can be made in Seattle.

Because the current POF docking facility does not have sufficient capacity for expanded services, whether that be increased services on existing routes or the addition of new routes, the increased docking capacity provided by this project will allow more POF transit services and routes to be provided, increasing transit options for both currently served and new communities.

7. Describe how this project supports a long-term strategy to maximize the efficiency of the corridor? Describe the problem and how this project will remedy it.

The utility of the Seattle waterfront as a hub for passenger-only ferry services has not been fully realized. Ongoing efforts to examine closely the waterfront and identify the optimum location for passenger-only ferry services will provide the basis for this project. The recently rebuilt POF terminal in Seattle located at Pier 50 has been upgraded, with consideration of existing and future regional ferry services integral to the design. However, the facility is limited by the vessel docking capacity.

Regional passenger ferry studies conducted in recent years all identified the need to be able to connect regional communities with the downtown Seattle business district. Expanding POF docking capabilities on the Seattle waterfront is the most logical strategy to maximize the efficiency of travel into Seattle from outlying communities, whether to the West (such as expanding services to the Kitsap Peninsula), South (such as potential services from Olympia or Tacoma), or North (such as Ballard or communities in Snohomish County like Edmonds or Everett).
Establishing adequate operationally efficient and effective facilities that support POF services along the Seattle waterfront is the most rational approach to support the growing ferry services now and in the future. The most significant, and widely recognized, problem with the existing POF facility is limited docking capacity. The single two-sided float already limits when and how many vessels may call at the terminal, making current landing and departure times less than optimal for the traveling public on existing routes, limiting their service effectiveness for existing routes and precluding introduction of routes beyond the planned Southworth Seattle route. The addition of a new multi-use dock will relieve current constraints on expanding service levels and allow additional routes to be implemented.

Expanding POF operations will improve the overall efficiency of the multimodal regional corridor through additional mode options for travelers in key transit corridors. By providing time competitive options, overall efficiency is increased when each traveler has the ability to pick the most efficient option for them. Moreover, increased POF mode share can contribute to decreasing roadway congestion due to grade separation.

Criteria: Air Quality and Climate Change

1. Please select one or more elements in the list below that are included in the project’s scope of work, and provide the requested information in the pages to follow.
   - Transit and Ferry Service, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Air Quality and Climate Change: Transit and Ferry Service

1. What is the current transit ridership for the affected transit stops or routes?
   Annual ferry ridership on the Kitsap Fast Ferry system in 2019 was 476,936 boardings, which is up from 297,094 boardings in 2018.

2. What is the average transit trip length for the affected routes?
   The average one-way trip length for the Southworth - Seattle POF route is 9.8 nautical miles, the average trip length for the Bremerton - Seattle POF route is approximately 13.7 nautical miles and the average transit trip length for the Kingston - Seattle POF route is approximately 16.8 nautical miles. The anticipated average transit trip length for a future Tacoma - Seattle route is approximately 25 nautical miles. However, these values do not include the complete average transit trip length for passengers. From the doors of their homes to their final destinations, passengers may spend additional time traveling on either end of their ferry trip. This time spent on other forms of public transit, personnel vehicles, and/or active transportation facilities is not included the average transit trip length.

3. What is the average transit trip length of the entire system?
   Customers on the Southworth route will be on board the vessel for a total of approximately 22 minutes, including time spent boarding, disembarking, and in transit, saving almost 40 minutes for passengers historically traveling from Southworth to Seattle per trip. The average transit trip length for vessels throughout the entire system, including the Southworth and Tacoma routes, is 16.3 nautical miles. However, these values do not include the complete average transit trip length for passengers. From the doors of their homes to their final destinations, passengers may spend additional time traveling on either end of their ferry trip. This time spent on other forms of public transit, personnel vehicles, and/or active transportation facilities is not included the average transit trip length.

4. If the project includes a park and ride, how many new stalls are being provided?
   A park and ride will not be provided for the Seattle waterfront POF facility.

5. Are there other amenities included to encourage new transit ridership? If so, please describe.
   Amenities to be provided at the docking facility include enhanced traveler information technologies such as electronic vessel tracking and reporting and real-time passengers counting reporting to help riders decide if there will be space on the next sailing. These amenities will encourage new ridership by improving traveler experience and facilitating easy trip planning for potential riders.

6. What is the expected increase in transit ridership from the project?
   Estimated annual ridership for the Southworth - Seattle route supported by the new docking facility is 217,350 annual riders. Tacoma-Seattle POF service is expected to draw up to 114,400 riders. Together, the two routes could increase transit ridership by as many as 331,750 riders annually.

The new docking facility will also allow increased ridership on existing routes through more rider demand optimized service schedules and additional sailings made possible by fleet expansion. The recent introduction of two boat service suggests that ridership increases of up to 33% of existing peak commute service numbers or up to 76,000 annual riders are
7. If a new or expanded ferry service, what is the length of the driving route being replaced? The existing and expanded POF service served by the facility replaces approximately 248 miles of driving route.

8. Please describe the source of the project data provided above (e.g., Environmental Impact Statement, EPA/DOE data, traffic study, survey, previous projects, etc.). The Kitsap Transit data is from the Kitsap Transit Business Plan and Long Range Strategy. Projections for the Tacoma route were derived from the Tacoma Fast Ferry Feasibility Study that was undertaken by Pierce Transit, the Port of Tacoma, and the City of Tacoma in 2018.

Air Quality and Climate Change: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

1. Describe the facilities being added or improved Bicycle storage facilities will be provided at the new docking facility as will walkways and bicycle path connections to the new trails proposed as a part of the adjacent Seattle waterfront project. Bicycle storage space is also provided on Kitsap Fast Ferry vessels, allowing cyclists to connect to and onward from POF terminal facilities.

2. What is the length of the proposed facility? Approximately 0.75 miles

3. Describe the connections to existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities and transit. All vessels that land at the new docking facility will have on-board space for bicycle storage, allowing cyclists to connect to and onward from the POF terminal via the streetscape’s two-way bicycle lane. Walk-on passengers will be able to connect to the sidewalks that run along Alaskan Way and subsequently to the WSF Colman dock ferry terminal. Multiple other transit opportunities are available nearby with King County Metro bus routes stopping along the waterfront and nearby Sound Transit Link Light rail stations within walking distance.

4. Describe the current bicycle/pedestrian usage in the project area. If known, provide information on the shift from single occupancy vehicles. N/A

5. What is the expected increase in bicycle/pedestrian usage from the project? If known, provide information on the shift from single occupancy vehicles N/A

6. What is the average bicycle trip length? N/A

7. What is the average pedestrian trip length? N/A

8. Please describe the source of the project data provided above (e.g., Environmental Impact Statement, EPA/DOE data, traffic study, survey, previous projects, etc.) N/A

Criteria: Project Readiness and Financial Plan

1. What is the PSRC funding source being requested? N/A

2. Has this project received PSRC funds previously? No

3. If yes, please provide the project’s PSRC TIP ID N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Alternate Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Request: $2,500,000.00

Total Estimated Project Cost and Schedule

Planning
Funding Source | Secured/Unsecured | Amount
--- | --- | ---
Local | Secured | $400,000.00

**Expected year of completion for this phase:** 2021

**PE**

Funding Source | Secured/Unsecured | Amount
--- | --- | ---
5307 | Reasonably Expected | $2,500,000.00
Local | Secured | $1,075,000.00

**Expected year of completion for this phase:** 2026

**ROW**

Funding Source | Secured/Unsecured | Amount
--- | --- | ---
Local | Reasonably Expected | $2,500,000.00

**Expected year of completion for this phase:** 2026

**Construction**

Funding Source | Secured/Unsecured | Amount
--- | --- | ---
Other State | Reasonably Expected | $3,000,000.00
5307 | Reasonably Expected | $5,000,000.00
Local | Reasonably Expected | $8,510,000.00

**Expected year of completion for this phase:** 2028

**Summary**

1. **Estimated project completion date**
   June 2028
2. **Pretty total project cost**
   $22,985,000.00

**Funding Documentation**

1. **Documents**
2. **Please enter your description of your financial documentation in the text box below.**
   State and local sales tax will provide local funding for this project. Bond financing repaid with sales tax revenue may be employed. State and federal grants may also be sought to support the construction phase funding needs.

   Pierce Transit is sponsoring this application on behalf of Kitsap Transit as demonstrated in the attached letter from Pierce Transit. No financial support from Pierce Transit is being provided at this time but may be offered for future phases depending on the City of Tacoma’s fast ferry initiatives.

**Project Readiness: PE**

1. **Are you requesting funds for ONLY a planning study or preliminary engineering?**
   Yes
2. What is the actual or estimated start date for preliminary engineering/design?
   October 2023

3. Is preliminary engineering complete?
   No

4. What was the date of completion (month and year)?
   N/A

5. Have preliminary plans been submitted to WSDOT for approval?
   N/A

6. Are there any other PE/Design milestones associated with the project? Please identify and provide dates of completion. You may also use this space to explain any dates above.

7. When are preliminary plans expected to be complete?
   March 2026

Other Considerations

1. Describe any additional aspects of your project not requested in the evaluation criteria that could be relevant to the final project recommendation and decision-making process.
   Beyond addressing the expansion potential of POF service within the PSRC region, providing additional docking capacity in the City of Seattle could also be used to address demand from other nearby regions to Seattle where potential new POF may be feasible. The ongoing PSRC Passenger-Only Ferry Study is currently evaluating the presence and extent of this POF demand outside of the PSRC region.

2. Describe any innovative components included in your project: these could include design elements, cost saving measures, or other innovations.
   The project will utilize innovative docking design elements that support for use by both side-loading and bow-loading vessels. Bow-loading will be of particular importance as it speeds up debarking and boarding times which will allow for shorter dwell times and more throughput at the facility and improves employee and passenger safety during the docking and loading process. Design will provide the ability for vessel docking versatility for future POF partners and vessels.

3. Describe the process that your agency uses to determine the benefits of projects; this could include formal cost-benefit analysis, practical design, or some other process by which the benefits of projects are determined.
   The agency typically uses some form of cost-benefit analysis, though the exact nature of this analysis varies depending on the nature of the project, with some analyses being more quantitative than others. The current planning study related to this project is utilizing a cost-benefit analysis approach that focuses on a variety of forms of benefits, including ridership levels, level of connectivity to transit, and access to jobs, among numerous others.

4. Final documents
   City_of_Tacoma_Letter_of_Support.pdf,
   Sponsorship_Documentation__Seattle_POF_Docking_Facility_FTA.pdf,
   Tacoma_Fast_Ferry_Feasibility_Study_Results.pdf,
   Kitsap_County_Board_of_Commissioners_Letter_of_Support.pdf,
   KT_POF_Business_Plan_Phase__1.pdf,
   KT_POF_Business_Plan_Phase__2.pdf,
   State_Legislative_Agenda_-_City_of_Tacoma.pdf,
   City_of_Port_Orchard_Letter_of_Support.pdf,
   Kitsap_Transit_POF_Docking_Facility_on_Seattle_Waterfront_-_City_of_Bremerton.pdf,
### Section VII: Capital Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Funding</td>
<td>Local Funding</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>$11,802,916</td>
<td>$515,017</td>
<td>$12,317,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Ferry Vessels</td>
<td>$1,183,588</td>
<td>$40,449,904</td>
<td>$41,633,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Bases</td>
<td>$922,041</td>
<td>$506,500</td>
<td>$1,428,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Ferry Terminals</td>
<td>$7,225,148</td>
<td>$2,829,952</td>
<td>$10,055,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride/Transit Centers</td>
<td>$9,976,573</td>
<td>$2,852,467</td>
<td>$12,829,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Systems - Ferry</td>
<td>$114,200</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$334,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Systems - Bus</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,666,451</td>
<td>$1,666,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,224,466</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49,040,291</strong></td>
<td><strong>$80,264,757</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Funding</td>
<td>Local Funding</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride/Transit Centers</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Systems - Ferry</td>
<td>$455,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$705,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Systems - Bus</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$532,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$312,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,920,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,411,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,331,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kitsap Transit is awarded $1,500,000 in Transportation Development Credits annually to use toward qualified project matching funds and has a Capital project reserve fund to help offset local contributions towards grant matches.
April 24, 2020

Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave
Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront

Dear Puget Sound Regional Council Members:

I am writing on behalf of the City of Port Orchard, to express our support for Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Regional Competition for a Passenger-Only Ferry (POF) Terminal Docking Facility along the Seattle waterfront. We believe increasing POF landing facilities in Seattle is key to the ongoing viability of current POF services and to the success of new and expanded POF services. We commend Kitsap Transit for taking the initiative in this effort for the benefit of travelers around the Puget Sound.

Providing an essential connection between Kitsap County and Seattle, Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry Service has exceeded ridership projections with its first two routes and is planning to implement a third route in 2020. However, limited terminal space and slip availability along the Seattle waterfront constrains future POF growth for both Kitsap Transit and the King County Water Taxi and opportunities for new POF service to land in Seattle. The City of Port Orchard believes that this project mitigates these constraints and fulfills a vital need for travelers within the Greater Puget Sound area.

The additional docking capacity will both improve operations on existing POF routes and allow for future service expansion that contributes further to reduce congestion along highly travelled corridors. POF service provides communities with greater access to work, education, and services, strengthening the economic growth of urban and rural areas. As a key proponent of improving regional multimodal connections and providing greater access to transit options, the City of Port Orchard endorses the Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility.

The City of Port Orchard endorses Kitsap Transit’s pursuit of funding for the Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront. These funds are essential to the preliminary engineering and environmental review/permitting phases of the project. Our agency promotes funding of this project due to its extension of the benefits of safe, reliable, and economical POF service to new users and communities throughout our region.
The City of Port Orchard recognizes that Kitsap Fast Ferry service is an important part of the region’s transit network and of the overall Regional Transportation Plan. and fully support Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 FTA Regional Competition and looks forward to the success of the Kitsap Transit (POF) Terminal Docking Facility project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Putaansuu
Port Orchard Mayor
April 24, 2020

Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave
Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront

Dear Puget Sound Regional Council Members:

I am writing on behalf of the City of Poulsbo, to express our support for Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Regional Competition for a Passenger-Only Ferry (POF) Terminal Docking Facility along the Seattle waterfront. We believe increasing POF landing facilities in Seattle is key to the ongoing viability of current POF services and to the success of new and expanded POF services. We commend Kitsap Transit for taking the initiative in this effort for the benefit of travelers around the Puget Sound.

Providing an essential connection between Kitsap County and Seattle, Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry Service has exceeded ridership projections with its first two routes and is planning to implement a third route in 2020. However, limited terminal space and slip availability along the Seattle waterfront constraints future POF growth for both Kitsap Transit and the King County Water Taxi and opportunities for new POF service to land in Seattle. The City of Poulsbo believes that this project mitigates these constraints and fulfills a vital need for travelers within the Greater Puget Sound area.

The additional docking capacity will both improve operations on existing POF routes and allow for future service expansion that contributes further to reduce congestion along highly travelled corridors. POF service provides communities with greater access to work, education, and services, strengthening the economic growth of urban and rural areas. As a key proponent of improving regional multimodal connections and providing greater access to transit options, the City of Poulsbo endorses the Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility as it aligns well with our values.
The City of Poulsbo endorses Kitsap Transit's pursuit of funding for the Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront. These funds are essential to the preliminary engineering and environmental review/permitting phases of the project. Our agency promotes funding of this project due to its extension of the benefits of safe, reliable, and economical POF service to new users and communities throughout our region.

The City of Poulsbo recognize that Kitsap Fast Ferry service is an important part of the region's transit network and of the overall Regional Transportation Plan, and fully support Kitsap Transit's application to the 2023 - 2024 FTA Regional Competition and looks forward to the success of the Kitsap Transit (POF) Terminal Docking Facility project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rebecca Erickson
Mayor
April 26, 2020

Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave
Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront

Dear Puget Sound Regional Council Members:

On behalf of the City of Tacoma, I write to express our support for Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Regional Competition for a Passenger-Only Ferry (POF) Terminal Docking Facility along the Seattle waterfront. Increasing POF landing facilities in Seattle is key to the ongoing viability of current POF services. For Tacoma, a community that currently does not have POF service directly to Seattle, increasing landing facilities is essential to expand and develop new POF services. We commend Kitsap Transit for taking the initiative in this effort for the benefit of travelers around the Puget Sound.

Limited terminal space and slip availability along the Seattle waterfront constrains future POF growth in the Puget Sound. With a growing population and increased traffic congestion, the Puget Sound region needs to look at new and creative ways to transport people. The City of Tacoma has invested in its own feasibility study of expanding POF service and championed State investment in studying how to expand this service to complement mobility options in the Puget Sound. The City of Tacoma believes that Kitsap Transit’s proposal to expand POF terminal docking space along the Seattle waterfront mitigates the constraints on future POF growth and fulfills a vital need for travelers within the Greater Puget Sound area. POF service provides communities with greater access to work, education, and services, strengthening the economic growth of urban and rural areas.

The City of Tacoma endorses Kitsap Transit’s pursuit of funding for the Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront in order to conduct the preliminary engineering and environmental review/permitting phases of the project. The City of Tacoma promotes funding of this project due to its extension of the benefits of safe, reliable, and economical POF service to new users and communities throughout our region.
The City of Tacoma supports Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 FTA Regional Competition and looks forward to the success of the Kitsap Transit (POF) Terminal Docking Facility project for the benefit of the region’s overall transportation network.

Yours in Service,

Victoria R. Woodards, Mayor
April 27, 2020

Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave
Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Kitsap Transit Terminal Facility on the Seattle Waterfront

Dear Puget Sound Regional Council Members:

The Kitsap County Board of Commissioners wishes to express our strong support for Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Regional Competition for a Passenger-Only Ferry (POF) Terminal Facility on the Seattle waterfront. Increasing POF landing facilities in Seattle is key to the ongoing viability of current POF services and to the success of expanded POF services. Fast Ferry service is an important part of the region’s transit network and of the overall Regional Transportation Plan. These funds will be used for preliminary engineering and environmental review/permitting phases of the project.

Providing an essential connection between Kitsap County and Seattle, Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry Service has exceeded ridership projections with its first two routes and is planning to implement a third route in 2020. The Fast Ferry Service has also been attracting new residents to Kitsap County. However, limited terminal space and slip availability along the Seattle waterfront constrains future POF growth for Kitsap Transit and the King County Water Taxi. This project will alleviate dock space constraints and allow for future growth of POF service.

POF service provides communities with greater access to work, education and services, strengthening the economic growth of urban and rural areas. A key transportation goal in Kitsap County’s 2016 Comprehensive plan is to coordinate with Kitsap Transit to ensure that the marine transportation system meets commuter, commercial, industrial and recreational demands in the most efficient and reliable manner possible. The proposed facility in Seattle will do just that.

Thank you for considering Kitsap Transit’s request for funding for a POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront. Kitsap County fully supports Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 FTA Regional Competition and looks forward to the success of the Kitsap Transit (POF) Terminal Docking Facility project.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Garrido
Chair
Robert Gelder
Commissioner, District 1
Edward E. Wolfe
Commissioner, District 3
April 27, 2020

Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave
Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront

Dear Puget Sound Regional Council Members:

I am writing on behalf of the City of Bremerton to express our support for Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Regional Competition for a Passenger-Only Ferry (POF) Terminal Docking Facility along the Seattle waterfront. We believe increasing POF landing facilities in Seattle is key to the ongoing viability of current POF services and to the success of new and expanded POF services. We commend Kitsap Transit for taking the initiative in this effort for the benefit of travelers around the Puget Sound.

Providing an essential connection between local communities and Seattle, Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry Service has exceeded ridership projections with its first two routes. The agency is also planning to implement a third route in 2020. However, limited terminal space and slip availability along the Seattle waterfront is likely to constrain future POF growth for both Kitsap Transit and the King County Water Taxi as well as impact future opportunities for new POF service to land in Seattle. The City of Bremerton believes that this project mitigates these constraints and fulfills a vital need for travelers within the Greater Puget Sound area.

The additional docking capacity will both improve operations on existing POF routes, including service in Bremerton, and allow for future service expansion that contributes further to reducing congestion along highly travelled corridors. POF service provides communities with greater access to work, education, and services, strengthening the economic growth of urban and rural areas. As a key proponent of improving regional multimodal connections for employers, residents and visitors, the City of Bremerton endorses the Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility as it aligns well with our values of enhancing the economy and supporting quality of life.

The City of Bremerton endorses Kitsap Transit’s pursuit of funding for the Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle waterfront. These funds are essential to the preliminary engineering and environmental review/permitting phases of the project. Our City promotes funding of this project due to its extension of the benefits of safe, reliable, and economical POF service to new users and communities throughout our region.

Our community recognizes that Kitsap Fast Ferry service is an important part of the region’s transit network and of the overall Regional Transportation Plan. The City of Bremerton fully supports Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 FTA Regional Competition and looks forward to the success of the Kitsap Transit (POF) Terminal Docking Facility project.

Sincerely,

Greg Wheeler
Mayor
April 10, 2020

Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
614 Division St. MS4
Port Orchard, WA 98366

RE: Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront

Dear Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council Members:

On behalf of Pierce Transit, I am writing to express our sponsorship and support for Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 FTA Regional Competition for the Kitsap Transit Passenger-Only Ferry (POF) Terminal Docking Facility. The new regional POF docking facility will be located in King County along the downtown Seattle waterfront. The funding requested supports planning, environmental planning/permitting, and preliminary engineering phases associated with constructing a new POF docking facility.

Limited terminal space and slip availability impairs POF growth and expansion of necessary transit service connections to Regional Growth Centers Bremerton, Tacoma, and Seattle. This project will mitigate the constrained landing facilities to support the increasing demand for POF service connections within the Greater Puget Sound area. Additional POF routes and service expansion will provide viable regional commuter transportation options to reduce congestion along heavily travelled corridors.

Pierce Transit encourages Kitsap Transit’s pursuit of funding for the Kitsap Transit POF Terminal Docking Facility on the Seattle Waterfront. With a greater capacity for both new and existing POF routes our agency sponsors and supports this project due to potential future partnership based on Tacoma’s interest in Fast Ferries.

Kitsap Transit’s services provide communities with more transportation choices for greater access to work, education, and services through safe, reliable, and economical public transportation. Kitsap’s service is an important part of the region’s transit network and overall Regional Transportation Plan. Connections to communities strengthen the economic growth in urban and rural areas. I ask for full and fair consideration of Kitsap Transit’s application to the 2023 - 2024 FTA Regional Competition.

Sincerely,

Sue Dreier
Chief Executive Officer

C: Barb Hunter
The 2020 City of Tacoma State Legislative Agenda
These are the 2020 State Legislative priorities for the City of Tacoma as adopted by the Tacoma City Council on December 10, 2019.

State Legislative Priorities and Detailed Agenda Information

General Government Priorities
Northwest ICE Processing Center
Affordable Housing
Transportation

Street Maintenance and Preservation
Prior to the passage of I-976, the Joint Transportation Committee (JTC) released a report on city transportation revenue and highlighted Tacoma as a case study. The JTC report states that Tacoma's street maintenance backlog is approximately four times the size of its annual budget. This need is further exacerbated by the passage of I-976, which the City anticipates will reduce revenue by $2.9 million a year, or 12% of the City’s street maintenance

budget. The City requests that the Legislature provide enhanced tools for cities to meet local street maintenance needs, including councilmanic local options.

**Passenger-Only Ferry Service**

Authorization for the city to provide passenger-only ferry service, allowing the City to proceed forward with developing a passenger-only ferry investment plan. The development of this plan would advance forward simultaneous to the completion of the PRSC regional study on passenger-only ferry service.

**Project Requests**

As the Legislature develops a revenue package, the City requests that the following projects receive funding:

- $650,000 to complete the Access Revision Report to provide an offramp from I-5 to the Tacoma Mall Regional Center
- $110 million to fund the $140 million effort to complete improvements to Fishing Wars Memorial Bridge
- The City requests additional funding to construct the Schuster Parkway Promenade. To finalize project vision, the City requests that $1 million of the $4 million appropriated be advanced:
  - Current: $2 million in 2021-23 and $2 million in 2023-25.
  - Request: $3 million in 2021-23 and $1 million in 2023-25.

**Tacoma Dome Investments**

State Legislative Agenda

**Tacoma Public Utilities (TPU) Priorities**

Tacoma Power
Tacoma Water
Tacoma Rail
Figure 1. Study Area for Seattle Terminal Alternative Analysis
Figure 3. Potential Tacoma-Seattle POF Route
Taken from the 2018 Tacoma Fast Ferry Feasibility Study
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1 Introduction/Overview

Successful passenger-only service in Kitsap County will involve a phasing plan that introduces service in an incremental way and then builds upon its successes. The plan will build upon existing infrastructure, including terminal, vessel, and staff expertise, both in-house and in partnering agencies, to bring a safe, efficient and reliable travel option to Kitsap County residents.

1.1 PURPOSE
This business plan and long-range strategy will be the blueprint for implementation of Passenger-Only Ferry (POF) service in Kitsap County. The plan includes a comprehensive near-term and long-range financial plan.

1.2 SCOPE
To prepare a comprehensive business plan that builds upon past experience and existing resources in the region, the project addressed the following questions:

- What can we learn from past POF service?
- What are the options for organizing and funding POF service?
- What do potential riders and the community tell us about POF service?
- Where are the riders?
- What terminal facilities and vessels do we need?
- How should we manage and operate the service?
- How should we phase implementation?
- How much will this cost and how do we pay for it?
- What economic benefits will the service bring?

1.3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN
Kitsap Transit’s strategy for informing and involving the public and key stakeholders in the development of the business plan and long-range strategy to implement POF service between Kitsap County and Seattle is outlined in the Public Involvement Plan (PIP). The goals of public involvement for this project were the following:

- Inform the public and key stakeholders.
- Seek input to inform the POF business plan.
- Gauge community interest in POF.
- Build understanding about POF.
Project information sheets were developed throughout the project to inform the public. Potential rider and general community input was received during the project through two online surveys which focused on interest in the service, travel patterns, potential fare, and funding mechanisms. The outcomes of these surveys are further documented in Section 4 of this report.

1.4 ROUTES IDENTIFIED FOR SERVICE

Three routes were identified for analysis: one in north, south, and central Kitsap County. The routes and corresponding Kitsap terminal locations were chosen based on a number of factors, including infrastructure, proximity to other transportation modes, and access. The terminal locations are:

- **Bremerton**: At the location of the existing Kitsap Transit foot ferry terminal, located northeast of the Washington State Ferries (WSF) terminal; the site of the newly constructed A-float and associated improvements.
- **Kingston**: At the location of past passenger-only ferry operations, located southwest of the WSF terminal.
- **Southworth**: At a proposed location southeast of existing WSF terminal.
- **Pier 50 in Seattle**: The eastern hub of the Kitsap County passenger-only ferries would be located at Pier 50, the current location of the King County Water Taxi, located south of the existing WSF vehicle ferry terminal. Pier 50 is currently preparing redevelopment plans as part of the Colman Dock project. As part of the Seattle Permanent Facility Siting Study prepared for the King County Water Taxi, Pier 50 was identified as the best location for POF service.

2 What Can We Learn From Past POF Service?

Prior to beginning work to outline a proposed service or a potential finance plan, the team researched the history of passenger-only ferries in Kitsap County and the Puget Sound. The goal with this research was to learn from past failures and successes alike. The findings are clear: there is a demonstrated desire for POF service in Kitsap County, and the majority of past unsuccessful service attempts can be attributed to unsustainable financial plans and, in the case of past Bremerton—Seattle POF service, to environmental concerns, specifically wake wash impacts. Refer to Table 2-1.

Extensive research has been undertaken on the beach impacts of wake wash in Rich Passage, including regular monitoring of beach conditions for a period of time. This research found that high-speed, passenger-only ferry service is feasible through Rich Passage with the use of the specially designed vessel, the Rich Passage 1 (RP1)\(^1\).

Figure 2-1: Passenger-Only Service History in Kitsap County
3 What Should the Governance Structure Be?

There are a number of different governance structures that Kitsap Transit could adopt for POF service, which include a Public Transportation Benefit Area (PTBA), Ferry District, or Port District. Of these, the PTBA model appears to be the best fit for the envisioned service by providing the most flexibility and funding authority. Additionally, Kitsap Transit is currently designated as a PTBA, therefore no additional legislative action would be required.

A PTBA is a special taxing district established by Washington State for the purpose of providing public transportation. As a PTBA, Kitsap Transit has the authority to raise funds through voter-authorized tax packages by way of the sales and use tax up to 0.9 percent, as well as the motor vehicle excise tax (MVET) up to 0.4 percent. As a PTBA with a boundary located on the Puget Sound, Kitsap Transit is authorized to provide POF service; however, prior to introducing such service, the development of a POF business plan is required. This body of work will serve as that business plan.

4 What Do Potential Riders and the Community Tell Us About POF Service?

As part of the public involvement effort on the project, two public surveys were administered. The surveys were administered online and advertised on several internet news sites, at tabling events around the community, on WSF Ferries, and through Kitsap Transit’s rider alert system. The first of the surveys focused on general interest in POF, understanding that additional local funding is needed to run the service, and the public’s willingness to pay higher than current prices for alternative travel modes. The second survey focused on opinions regarding fares and funding as well as service preferences for the proposed and extended service.

4.1 SURVEY RESULTS

More than 1,200 respondents completed the online survey in June 2014 and 950 more completed the survey in August 2014. Potential Bremerton riders were the largest group of survey responders. The majority of respondents strongly agreed with statements about the benefits of POF service, particularly that a 35-minute or shorter trip is important, and that this POF service will help create easier access to jobs. Other factors regarding the service that were identified as important include: travel time, schedule flexibility, and fares. Refer to Figure 4-1.
When asked about service schedules, respondents indicated that arrival and departure times should revolve around the commute period. If additional service is provided outside of those commute periods, the majority of respondents indicated that additional sailings should be offered on weekday evenings.

While it was clear that responders were willing to pay a premium for faster service, there was no consensus on what that fare level is reasonable. Contrary to common wisdom and past experience with voter tax preferences, more respondents said they preferred the MVET over the other tax options. However, when asked how much sales tax is reasonable for passenger-only ferry service, more than half (58%) said they consider a 0.2 to 0.4 percent increase in sales tax a reasonable way to pay for POF. Refer to Figure 4-2.
4.2 STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS
Stakeholder interviews were held over the phone with nine leaders of the Kitsap County community. Questions ranged from their understanding of public opinion regarding POF to potential benefits, challenges, advice, and specific funding ideas. The stakeholder interview participants were:

- Scott Bosch, Harrison Medical Center
- Pete DeBoer, Commissioner for Port of Kingston
- Walt Draper, Bremerton Community Leader
- Charlotte Garrido, Commissioner for Kitsap County
- Patty Lent, Mayor of the City of Bremerton
- Mary McClure, Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
- Dan Mundle, South Kitsap
- Rex Nelson, Ferry Advisory Committee
- Guy Stitt, President of AMI International
Key Themes
Key themes from these conversations included input and impression of general public opinion about POF and its potential, the benefits and challenges associated with POF service, and advice regarding implementation (Refer to Figure 4-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Opinion</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existing community support for POF</td>
<td>• Build support among private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Previous POF service was great and well-used</td>
<td>• Offering reliable, frequent trips would gain support among commuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concern of cost to benefit ratio</td>
<td>• Coordinate landside transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Fares &amp; Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Connectivity</td>
<td>• 8 of 9 understood need for some local tax support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic opportunities and employment</td>
<td>• There was no consensus about an appropriate sales tax levy rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better quality of life</td>
<td>• Suggestion on the appropriate level of fare box recovery ranged between 20–50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Building regional, political and leadership support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited State and Federal funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-3: Stakeholder Interview Key Themes
5 Where Are The Riders?

Ridership projections for the proposed POF service were developed through a mode-choice model using census data and past POF ridership. Figure 5-1 below defines the catchment area used in this analysis, which in some cases extended just beyond Kitsap County. The population data shows an increasing population alongside a slight decrease in commuters to downtown Seattle. This could be due to the current, slower modes of transportation available to commuters or a demographic shift to living closer to the workplace, or the ability for some commuters to occasionally telecommute.
Table 5-1: Market Demand for POF Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000 Total</th>
<th>2010 Total</th>
<th>Compound Annual Growth Rate 2000-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>329,500</td>
<td>371,965</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force</td>
<td>157,615</td>
<td>182,681</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters to Downtown Seattle</td>
<td>5,851</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>-2.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Population of Kitsap County in 2010 was 251,133. The catchment area represents an area larger than the County as identified in Figure 5-1 above.

5.1 PAST RIDERSHIP

The ridership analysis was calibrated using past ferry ridership. The following Figure 5-2 illustrates the high level of foot passengers on the WSF vehicle ferry (in blue), as well as the high ridership experienced on WSF’s previous Bremerton-Seattle POF (in green). The POF service experienced a significant drop in ridership when speeds were slowed and the service became less competitive with the existing WSF vehicle ferry service. The other past services represented on the figure were operated for short periods of time with relatively small capacity vessels. Limited operating schedules and unsustainable funding led to the discontinuation of these services. The latest experience with passenger-only service was the RP1 test service out of Bremerton.

Figure 5-2: Past Ferry Ridership
5.2 ALTERNATIVE ROUTES

The mode-choice model used to determine ridership is based on the likelihood of someone choosing a specific route or mode of travel based on the competing or alternative route. In order to analyze this for our three routes, the alternative routes were outlined for each proposed service (Bremerton/Seattle, Kingston/Seattle and Southworth/Seattle), including major components such as cost, travel time, and availability of trips during the commute period. Transit time to the initial departure terminal are not included in the alternatives analysis.

The alternatives for Bremerton are relatively straightforward. One can take the 60 minute Bremerton/Seattle WSF ferry, at $8 for a roundtrip cash fare, or walk-on at the Southworth terminal and take transit to downtown Seattle. Refer to Table 5-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-2: Bremerton to Seattle Modeling Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Trip Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WSF does not offer ferry service from Kingston to downtown Seattle. Therefore, the alternatives for Kingston range a bit more than Bremerton. In these scenarios, one could take the ferry from Kingston to Edmonds, either in their car with the intent to drive and park in Seattle or on foot with the intent to use public transit. Additionally, one could take the Bainbridge Island WSF ferry directly to downtown Seattle. Although this trip is a quick 35 minutes, it would require parking on Bainbridge Island. While transit time to the ferry was not taken into account in the modeling, Bainbridge Island experiences very high traffic volume and can become very congested, therefore increasing transit time to and from the ferry. Refer to Table 5-3.
The Southworth to Seattle route offers the most travel alternatives. WSF currently provides service via a triangle route from Southworth (Kitsap County) to Vashon Island (King County) and on to Fauntleroy, located approximately nine miles from downtown Seattle in West Seattle. From Fauntleroy, King County Metro transit would need to be used to access downtown, adding more time to the commute. Additionally, the King County Water Taxi provides service from Vashon Island to Seattle. Alternatively, one could drive around the Sound, utilizing an often congested I-5 freeway. Each alternative is identified as 50 to 90 minutes in travel time, which greatly exceeds the proposed 30 minute direct route from Southworth to downtown Seattle. Refer to Table 5-4.

### Table 5-4: Southworth to Seattle Modeling Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Routes</th>
<th>Proposed POF Service</th>
<th>WSF Southworth - Fauntleroy + Drive to Seattle</th>
<th>WSF Southworth - Fauntleroy + Transit to Seattle</th>
<th>WSF Southworth - Vashon + Water Taxi to Seattle</th>
<th>Drive + WSF Bremerton - Seattle</th>
<th>Drive to Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>80 min</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>75-90 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Trip Cost</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$55.40</td>
<td>$11.25</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$17.95*</td>
<td>$30-35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Trips</td>
<td>6 and 12 during commute period</td>
<td>7 during commute period</td>
<td>7 during commute period</td>
<td>4 WSF trips in AM commute and 3 KCMD trips in PM commute period</td>
<td>6 during commute period</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes parking costs are included in round trip costs.
5.3 RIDERSHIP PROJECTIONS

Ridership projections for each proposed route predict ridership for a mature service and are not adjusted for the ramp up period typical for a new service. Six round-trips in the commute period window were analyzed for all three routes. Ridership for a 12 round-trip schedule was also examined for the Bremerton route, due to the high ridership demand, cross-directional traffic and the limited capacity of the RP1 Vessel (118 passengers) in comparison to the other two routes. Refer to Figure 5-3.

Figure 5-3: Ridership Demand Forecast Summary
5.4 PEAK SAILINGS

The ridership analysis also estimated peak sailings for each route, with the highest peak coming from the west in the AM commute and from the east in the PM commute period. As mentioned above, there will be a ramp-up period before full ridership projected will be experienced. While ferry systems are not designed to the apex of peak ridership, this information is useful when deciding on vessel size, as outlined in the following section. Refer to Table 5-5. The table identifies the number of expected riders at system maturity by sailing. For Kingston and Southworth, one directional ridership (Kingston to Seattle) ridership has been shown. For Bremerton, cross directional traffic has been included, which is why the low end of the range is lower than the range provided for Kingston and Southworth, where cross directional flow would be even less.

Table 5-5: Peak Sailing Ridership Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Sailings</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Bremerton</th>
<th>Kingston</th>
<th>Southworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 RT/Day</td>
<td>36-128/per sailing</td>
<td>71-178/per sailing</td>
<td>59-147/per sailing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 RT/Day</td>
<td>29-173/per sailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 What Terminal Facilities and Vessels Do We Need?

6.1 TERMINAL LOCATIONS

Four terminal locations have been identified for analysis. Three of these terminals are located in Kitsap County: Bremerton, Kingston, and Southworth. The fourth location is in downtown Seattle at Pier 50, the current location of the King County Water Taxi service.

6.2 TERMINAL PROGRAMMING

Facility requirements for a Kitsap County POF terminal should be consistent for all terminal locations.

- Accommodate berthing of two vessels and passenger loading (to accommodate a back-up vessel if needed)
- Ticket vending machines
  - Two each at Bremerton and Southworth
  - One at Kingston
- Fresh water, shore power, and communications
- ADA compliant
- Midday and overnight tie up and routine maintenance capabilities
- Multi-modal connections (transit, parking, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure)
6.3 PROPOSED TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS

Improvements proposed at each terminal location vary based on the existence and condition of infrastructure in place. Terminal infrastructure needed is very minimal for the Bremerton and Kingston routes. A whole new terminal is needed at Southworth and would require substantial capital and time to design, permit, and construct the facility. It is estimated that it would take approximately 18 months for Kingston improvements and four years for Southworth improvements.

**Bremerton Terminal**

Due to recently completed work (Fall of 2014) at the A and B floats, no additional infrastructure improvements are recommended for this site in order to begin POF operations. Wayfinding features, such as branding and signage, may be proposed; however this work would be minimal in nature. Refer to Figure 6-1.

**Kingston Terminal**

Proposed improvements include potential repair or replacement of the existing wooden elevated walkway as well as architectural and/or aesthetic improvements to the existing covered walkway. Additionally, in the long term, fuel, potable water, and sewage services should be provided at the Kingston terminal. A new fuel line should be run from the existing Port of Kingston fuel pier to a fueling station on the boarding float. Refer to Figure 6-2.
Southworth Terminal

Proposed passenger-only improvements would attempt to follow WSF’s past plans as applicable. Proposed improvements would include an elevated walkway, a gangway, and an approximately 100-foot-long by 40-foot-wide float to accommodate the berthing of two 150-passenger vessels. Refer to Figure 6-3.

The existing WSF terminal building could be utilized for waiting and weather protection as needed.

The improvements required at this location are extensive and would require much interagency coordination and environmental permitting, as further discussed in the Terminals Report in Appendix C.

Seattle (Pier 50) Terminal

Improvements at Pier 50 are currently in the design phase and include plans to accommodate additional routes from Kitsap County. The design, as currently proposed, would serve four routes with a new fixed pier built adjacent to the WSF trestle expansion. Refer to Figure 6-4.
6.4 MAINTENANCE FACILITIES
Facilities must be available for a range of vessel maintenance tasks. On a daily basis, west side terminals will be equipped to handle day to day light maintenance needs of the vessels. Additionally, partnership with King County will allow for the potential sharing of the new King County Maintenance Barge, where intermediate maintenance can be performed. Major maintenance needs will be met at one of the region’s shipyards. By utilizing terminal facilities and King County assets, additional dedicated maintenance facility space will not be needed.

6.5 VESSEL DESIGN CRITERIA
Vessel design criteria were guided by ridership demand by route, taking into account the speed and hull form needed to meet the proposed schedule requirements.

The Bremerton route is the only route with specific vessel requirements for wake wash performance. The RP1 vessel, which Kitsap Transit currently owns, has been specially designed and tested to meet the wake wash requirements for the Bremerton route. This is currently the only vessel design that can serve this route and meet the desired transit times. The RP1 has capacity for 118 people and 15 bicycles.

Passenger demand indicates that a 150-passenger (T-boat) vessel will accommodate the Kingston and Southworth routes. Due to the varying lengths of the routes, vessel speed requirements also vary in order to meet the program of a minimum of three trips in the AM commute and three in the PM commute period. For example, Kingston is a greater distance away from Seattle than Southworth and therefore will require a vessel that can achieve much higher speeds. Proposed crossing times and associated speeds by route are outlined below.

- Bremerton – 35 knots – 35 Minute Route
- Kingston – 34 knots – 40 Minute Route
- Southworth – 28 knots – 30 Minute Route

The Kingston route is the longest in distance of the three and requires a fast, 150-passenger, long-hull-form vessel. This specialized vessel will likely need to be built for the Kingston route. The Southworth route is the shortest distance and requires an average speed, 150-passenger vessel. This type of vessel may be available on the market for lease or purchase. While a standardized system is ideal to streamline maintenance and operation training, the Bremerton route necessitates vessel-type restrictions to minimize damage to the beaches of Rich Passage from both natural and wake impacts, making standardization difficult. Efforts should be made to standardize when possible while also utilizing shared or available assets in the area, such as those vessels currently owned or leased by King County Marine Division.
In addition to capacity and speed requirements, there are standard regulatory criteria any passenger vessel must meet. Those regulations include the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) as well as the US Coast Guard (USCG) regulatory compliance 46 CFR T.

Passenger amenities are not required by law, however prove to be important when passengers chose a mode of travel, as confirmed by respondents in the project’s first customer survey. Design amenities identified by survey takers include:

- Bicycle Racks
- Comfortable Seating
- Wi-Fi
- Bathroom Facilities
- Adequate Ventilation

### 6.6 BACKUP VESSEL REQUIREMENTS

As mentioned above, there are three different types of vessels required for the three routes. In a short-term back-up situation; however, there may be some opportunities for standardization and/or vessel sharing between agencies. The extent to which the routes are phased will play a role in which vessels are available to serve as back-up vessels. For the system in its maturity, with two vessels operating out of Bremerton and one each out of Kingston and Southworth, the following vessel back-up strategy could be assumed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Primary Vessel</th>
<th>Backup Vessel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton (1)</td>
<td>RP1 (118 PSGR)</td>
<td>RP2 (118 PSGR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton (2)</td>
<td>RP2 (118 PSGR)</td>
<td>RP3 (118 PSGR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>T-Boat (150 PSGR) – 34 knot capable</td>
<td>RP2/3 &amp; KCMD Spirit of Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth</td>
<td>T-Boat (150 PSGR) – 28 knot capable</td>
<td>RP2/3 &amp; KCMD Spirit of Kingston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 How Should We Manage and Operate the Service?

Several service delivery alternatives were initially considered for appropriateness and feasibility. The results of this initial evaluation process can be summarized by the following list of options that were considered further:

- Direct agency delivery of ferry services including capital assets such as vessels and terminals.
- Private contractor provision of all ferry services including capital assets.
- Public/Private partnership to share delivery of ferry services (two similar options with the only difference being who performs system maintenance).
  - Public agency owns and maintains vessels, owns or leases facilities; Private contractor crews and operates vessels and facilities.
  - Public agency owns vessels, owns or leases facilities; Private contractor crews, operates, and maintains vessels and facilities.
- Public/Public partnership as means to deliver, or share delivery of, all ferry services with vessels and some terminal assets provided by Kitsap Transit.

Each of these service delivery options was evaluated for potential benefits and drawbacks to determine the most appropriate option.

7.1 RECOMMENDED SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL

The recommended service delivery option is a partnership between Kitsap Transit partners and King County Marine Division (KCMD) in a Public/Public partnership. This option takes advantage of KCMD’s passenger ferry expertise and in-place management, and allows for sharing of some assets. With this model, Kitsap Transit can leverage its resources most effectively and, if successful, it could be used as the model for expanded regional interagency public cooperation and efficiency. This option also serves as an intermediate step to a publicly owned and operated Kitsap Transit system in the future.

Through a dedicated, in-house marine unit, Kitsap Transit, would directly provide:

- Needed interagency oversight for terminal leasing or purchase
- Appropriate terminal facilities (through purchase or lease).
- Vessels, including those necessary to provide back-up services (may be shared vessels).
- Needed support staffing to perform oversight and hire appropriate staff.
- Interagency agreement with public operator to provide all ferry operating services.
- Coordination for Kitsap Transit policy decisions regarding fare levels, media, collection, service levels, and schedules.
Kitsap Transit would provide the full range of direct operating services, including:

- Vessel operating, crewing, training, and maintenance services.
- Terminal operating, staffing, and maintenance services as applicable.
- Compliance with all applicable vessel-related safety, security, environmental protection, and emergency response requirements.

### 7.2 PROPOSED STAFFING

The marine operating environment is unique and requires specific knowledge and expertise in both operations and management. Vessels will operate in varying sea-state conditions, utilizing fast vessels, safely navigating around other vessel traffic, and abiding by maritime regulatory requirements for safety and security. Figure 7-1 represents an example of how this service could be staffed, with the orange boxes representing Kitsap Transit staff and the blue boxes representing King County staff.

#### Figure 7-1: Recommended Service Delivery Model—Public/Public Partnership

**Vessel Crew**

Vessel crew size is determined by the local US Coast Guard. A Coast Guard licensed Captain is required on all passenger ferries. Additionally, due to the high-speed nature of the proposed service, a senior deckhand will be required.

**Customer Service and Shoreside Staffing**

It is assumed that each west side terminal will have a customer service agent present during the AM commute period during start-up to handle crowd management and ticketing questions for passengers. Additionally, adequate customer service staff will be available at Pier 50 to accommodate the PM peak rush.
7.3 MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS/PLAN

Provisions must be made for both terminal and vessel maintenance. Generally, when possible, vessel crew and/or KCMD maintenance crews will undertake the daily and scheduled routine maintenance work on both vessels and terminals. To supplement this effort, it is recommended that a mobile maintenance crew, managed by KCMD, be assembled to service the west side Kitsap terminals. This mobile crew could assist with both vessel and terminal needs.

Terminal

Terminal maintenance will include light preventative and regular maintenance, scheduled preventative maintenance and repairs, and heavy maintenance, upgrades, and repairs. Light, day-to-day maintenance will be performed by the vessel crew. This will include tasks such as sweeping and garbage removal. Scheduled preventative maintenance and repairs may be performed by a mobile maintenance crew. Heavy maintenance, upgrades, and repairs will be accomplished by other Kitsap Transit departments, or will be contracted to outside vendors.

Vessel

Much like the terminal maintenance, vessel maintenance will involve a similar three tier approach. Daily maintenance needs such as vessel cleaning, fueling, water tank fill, and sewage pump-outs will be performed by the vessel crew. Intermediate maintenance such as heavy oil changes and minor repairs could be completed by a mobile maintenance crew or by King County maintenance crews at their maintenance barge. Annual dry-docking and major repairs would be serviced by local shipyards.
7.4 OPERATING SCHEDULE

An example service schedule was developed for the proposed service, assuming six roundtrips per day for each route: three roundtrips in the AM commute period and three roundtrips in the PM commute period. The crossing times for each route differ due to the distance from downtown Seattle and/or operating constraints. The total route time includes the crossing time, approach time, and a seven minute dwell time to account for passenger loading and unloading at the dock.

The example schedules outlined below were created through careful review of existing passenger-only sailings out of Pier 50, existing WSF sailing schedule, and fueling requirements. They also address the most effective use of crew time. Operating hours indicated in Table 7-1 include 20 minutes for start-up activities and approximately 15 minutes for shutdown activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7-1: Operating Schedule Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton (35 Min Route)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depart Bremerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **BOLD** indicates PM. Asterisk (*) indicates a crossing without passengers for fueling.

**Landside Transportation Coordination**

To create an efficient system for commuters, several adjustments will need to be made to bus transit to meet the POF schedule. These alterations will vary from 3 to 15 minute arrival time revisions or, in the case of Kingston and Southworth, additional bus service to serve planned POF departures. The majority of this coordination will occur internal to Kitsap Transit.
7.5 FARE COLLECTION STRATEGY

The fare collection strategy recognizes POF customers have a choice of services, and will seek the best value for their transportation budget. This value extends beyond the dollar amount; however, as the rider survey indicates customers see the value in the time savings offered by POF and are willing to pay an additional amount for this and other amenities. A properly-priced service that balances the advantages with the costs of premium service will help to achieve ridership targets and support the long-term sustainability of the service. Recommendations for Kitsap Transit’s fare collection strategy are summarized as follows:

- Fares are priced and collected in each direction to help mitigate AM and PM ridership imbalances that can result when a free (no cost to the passenger) option is available for eastbound travel.
- Full-fare cash prices are set at the lowest-cost alternative plus a premium of one to three dollars per trip. Where appropriate, fares are set at common levels similar to WSF’s central sound fare to address equity and community concerns.
- The majority of fares will be collected via the ORCA card. All currently-accepted pass products will be valid for POF travel. If the per-trip value of the pass is less than the POF fare, the remainder will be deducted from stored e-purse funds. The Kitsap Transit low-income fare will be supported.
- For frequent riders of both Kitsap Transit and POF who do not regularly ride transit on the east side of Puget Sound, a new monthly pass product that combines Kitsap Transit bus, foot ferry, and POF access should be provided as an alternative to current products, possibly along with a ferry-only pass. Pricing for these products should consider the current monthly cost a typical commuter incurs and the additional amount that person would be willing to pay for passenger-only service.
- For non-ORCA customers, tickets are sold at the terminals and cash (exact change) is collected on board. In the near term, the ticket vending machines will likely be the same or similar to models used by the King County Water Taxi; however, Kitsap Transit should seek opportunities to partner with KCMD to purchase an upgraded model. Cash/ticket fares may be priced slightly higher to incentivize ORCA use.

8 How Should We Phase Implementation?

The Bremerton service is the first priority for implementation. This is due to the presence of existing infrastructure at the terminal and the fact that Kitsap Transit owns the RP1 vessel, specifically designed to serve the route. The successful implementation and operation of this route can serve as a model for the other two routes, providing insights along the way.
8.1 SERVICE DELIVERY PLAN

A proposed phasing/service schedule can be viewed below. This schedule represents an aggressive approach to service implementation with the goal of providing service shortly after tax revenues are available. Although the phasing is premised upon a successful tax measure early in 2015, the phasing plan can be moved out in time to reflect the tax measure schedule set by the Kitsap Transit Board and grant funding cycles for capital improvement.

The phasing plan (refer to Figure 8-1) recognizes the timing of key elements, such as the ability of Pier 50 in Seattle to accept new routes given existing redevelopment projects and current infrastructure, as well as capital improvements to both vessels and terminal infrastructure needed for each route.

As mentioned above, the first route proposed for service is the Bremerton route with its existing terminal and vessel infrastructure in place. The second route to come online would be the Kingston route. This route has existing terminal infrastructure in place that would need only minimal improvements. Vessel infrastructure will be the determining factor for when this route is ready for service. The third route to come online would be the Southworth route. This is due to the extensive infrastructure improvements required at this terminal and the timeframe required for designing, permitting, and constructing the facility.

Figure 8-1: Proposed Phasing Plan

Note: Actual start date dependent upon successful ballot measure.
8.2 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Prior to service start-up, a host of administrative and organizational actions will need to be completed. Most important among them is determining a reliable local funding source. Determining the structure and efficacy of a ballot measure, properly setting a levy rate, and obtaining the necessary votes in support of said measure and levy requires organization and time. Additional required administrative actions should be identified with a plan for action based on the voting timeframe decided upon by the Kitsap Transit Board. This section discusses the recommended administrative actions in more detail, including the convening of an implementation task force consisting of representatives from King County, Kitsap Transit, and WSF. It also includes the identification of potential grant funding sources, internal Kitsap Transit staffing planning, and the acquisition of lease agreements.

Recommended Actions

The majority of immediate action items are organizational, involving legal structure, funding, operating arrangements, and interagency planning and coordination. These organizational actions are identified in Table 8-1 and can be summarized as follows:

- **Legal Framework**: Once the Kitsap Transit Board identifies their preferred governance structure and local funding source for the service, they may need to seek additional statutory authority.
- **Structure and Staffing**: Staffing adjustments will need to be made within Kitsap Transit to manage the additional workload, and a partnership agreement with King County must be outlined.
- **Implementation Task Force**: An interagency implementation task force should be established to identify specific POF implementation tasks and to ensure that the necessary coordination occurs. This task force would include policy makers and staff from the public partnering agencies (Kitsap Transit, King County, and WSF).
- **Existing Transit Service Modifications**: Modifications may be required to service the new POF routes. It is important to ensure these landside transportation connections are in place to serve the commuter.
- **Fare Collection**: A fare collection plan should be developed to address new fare products, fare levels, revenue apportionment, and modifications to ORCA.
- **Capital Grant Sources**: Applicable state and federal grant programs should be identified and preliminary work should be completed to ensure that grant applications are submitted in a timely manner once local funding is secure.
### Table 8-1: Implementation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Actions</th>
<th>Partner Agencies</th>
<th>Prior to Tax Measure</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 KT Board decision to move forward with tax initiative</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Prepare for tax initiative</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Identify applicable grants</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Alterations to legal framework</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Interagency Implementation Committee</td>
<td>KT/KCMD/WSF/POK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Amend CIP to prioritize for POF improvements</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Develop and execute MOU for KCMD partnership</td>
<td>KT/KCMD</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Develop and initiate internal KT staff organization to accommodate service</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Fare collection program development</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bremerton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Prepare RP1 for service</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Commission building of RP2</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Capital terminal improvements (minimal)</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Implement service (w/o backup vessel)</td>
<td>KT/KCMD</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingston</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 Lease agreement with Port of Kingston</td>
<td>KT/POK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 Capital terminal improvements at Kingston</td>
<td>KT/POK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3 Procure vessel</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4 Implement service (share RP2 as back-up vessel)</td>
<td>KT/KCMD</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southworth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 Lease agreement with WSF</td>
<td>KT/WSF</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Capital terminal improvements at Southworth</td>
<td>KT/WSF</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 Procure vessel</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 Procure back-up vessel</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 Implement service</td>
<td>KT/KCMD</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peek SD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC1 Lease agreement with KCMD</td>
<td>KT/KCMD</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC2 Capital infrastructure contribution</td>
<td>KT/KCMD</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KT = Kitsap Transit
KCMD = King County Marine Division
WSF = Washington State Ferries
POK = Port of Kingston
CIP = Capital Improvement Plan
MOU = Memorandum of Understanding
9 How Much Will This Cost and How Do We Pay For It?

A comprehensive financial plan was developed for the cross-sound passenger-only ferry program. The plan addresses capital and operating costs as well as tax, grant, and operating revenue.

9.1 HOW MUCH WILL IT COST?

Costs for construction of both vessels and terminals were estimated and inflated over the investment period. Operating costs, including terminal and vessel operations and management and support, were estimated and projected over a 20 year period.

- $45 Million in capital investment will be required between 2015 and 2023 to launch all three routes, including two vessels operating in Bremerton.
- $26 Million of that total will be needed between 2015 to 2018 for the launching of the Bremerton and Kingston services.
- Ongoing operating subsidy requirements are:
  - $2.0 Million for one boat in Bremerton
  - $5.5 Million for two boats in Bremerton and one for Kingston
  - $8.1 Million when all three routes are operating in 2023

9.2 HOW DO WE PAY FOR IT?

Adequate funding is critical to a sustainable service. While a portion of operating costs will be covered by farebox revenue, a large portion of capital outlays will need to be covered through other funding sources. Grant funding will be utilized whenever possible; however, competition for these funds can be very competitive. Local funding in the form of tax levies will be required to support capital needs and sustain the service over the long-term. Short term bond funding will help cover cash flow in the first few years.

Operating Revenue

Fare revenue estimates were calculated by applying a range of full-fare levels to the forecasted ridership demand, and then discounted by 25 percent to address incremental ridership growth and uncertain economic conditions.

Grant Revenue

A number of state and federal grant programs offer funding for passenger ferry capital assets such as the U.S. Department of Transportation’s (USDOT) New Starts, Ferry Boat Discretionary, Surface Transportation Funds, and Fixed Guideways programs. State administered grant programs such as the Regional Mobility Program are also viable funding sources for passenger ferry assets. The USDOT’s Small New Starts program is a very promising funding source and might provide the majority of the required initial capital funding.
Bond Funds
Depending upon the project schedule, a relatively small bond issuance might be required to meet cash flow needs while grant and local revenues are assembled. The cost of issuance and debt service will be paid back as local and grant revenue funds become available.

Local Tax Revenue
It is assumed that a sales tax levy would be pursued to provide local funds to subsidize ongoing operations and to supplement grant funds for capital requirements. Based on past sales tax collection experience, it is estimated that a two-tenths countywide sales tax would be sufficient. Additional analysis would be required if a smaller ferry taxing district was established or other tax mechanism selected.

9.3 PROJECTED FINANCIAL PLAN
Route financial projection statements are prepared for each of the three identified routes and include operating revenue, operating costs, and capital costs. They reflect the implementation schedule proposed in the overall business plan and are consolidated into a system-wide route financial projection statement that incorporates funding for both the operating subsidy and the capital program. Refer to Attachment 1.

10 What Economic Benefits Will The Service Bring?

The proposed POF service offers economic benefits to both the users of the service and the community at large. Drawing from experience with other land-based transit services, potential benefits were calculated for the user of the service, proximate real estate, and wider economic benefits.

10.1 USER BENEFITS
User benefits are a measureable direct impact to users of the POF service. These benefits include:

- Travel time savings for the users who ride POF
- Increased accessibility for users who take other modes of transportation

Potential user benefits from the proposed POF service were calculated utilizing the ridership model in place for the project. A value was assigned to time savings, and overall totals were calculated based on the projected ridership demand by route. The findings indicate that annual user benefits are nearly double the annual projected revenue by route. This is a common finding in economic benefit analysis of increased transit service. Refer to Table 10-1 for total projected economic benefits by route.
10.2 REAL ESTATE BENEFITS
Real estate benefits relate to the increase in property values in proximity to the ferry terminal. While Kitsap County is a much more rural environment than the dense urban centers many of these studies focused on, the conclusion that property values do increase when this premium service is provided can be drawn from this research alongside past experience in Kitsap with WSF POF service. These premiums can be expected within a half-mile of the ferry terminal, but may extend beyond as well.

10.3 WIDER ECONOMIC BENEFITS
Wider Economic Benefits (WEBs) refer to the positive impact in productivity due to enhanced transportation services. This productivity is realized through easier interaction between firms, higher-density employment clusters, and a more accessible labor force. This clustering provides increased efficiency though improved communication, lower infrastructure costs, and increased small business interaction.

10.4 TOTAL ECONOMIC BENEFITS
It is clear that this faster commute service from Kitsap to Seattle would bring value to those who use the service. Additionally, those who opt not to use the service will see benefit in the form of decreased congestion and enhanced transportation options. The region as a whole will benefit from increased efficiency, and Kitsap County real estate will see value increases due to decreased travel time to and from a major employment center, downtown Seattle. While user benefits and WEBs can be calculated annually, real estate values will only be realized at the time of transaction.

Table 10-1: Total Projected Economic Benefits by Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Annual Benefits</th>
<th>One Time Benefits</th>
<th>Total Real Estate Value Created within ½ Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User Benefits in Travel Time Savings</td>
<td>Wider Economic Benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton / Seattle</td>
<td>$3.2M</td>
<td>$0.8M</td>
<td>$3.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston / Seattle</td>
<td>$2.2M</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>$3.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth / Seattle</td>
<td>$2.1M</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>$2.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$7.5M</td>
<td>$1.8M</td>
<td>$9.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 Conclusions and Next Steps

The demand for POF service between Kitsap County and Seattle is clear. Both ridership demand projections and community input indicate strong potential ridership to support service in Bremerton, Kingston, and Southworth. There are no insurmountable challenges to acquiring the vessels, building or modifying the terminals, or making the arrangements needed to manage and operate the service. Furthermore, as demonstrated by past experience, passenger-only service can improve the economic well-being of the county and improve the overall quality of life of many county residents.

However, passenger-only service, like any other public transportation mode, is not self-sustaining and will require sustainable local tax support. To implement the plan outlined in this study, local voters must approve a tax measure to supplement fare and grant revenue. This plan identifies additional work that should be undertaken by the Board and Kitsap Transit to prepare for implementation before a final decision is made regarding the form and timing of a ballot measure.
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Attachment 1

Kitsap Passenger-Only Ferry Projected Financial Plan
All Routes 2015 -2034
## Kitsap Transit - Passenger-Only Ferry Business Plan and Long Range Strategy

### Summary Report

#### Attachment 1: Kitsap Passenger-Only Ferry Projected Financial Plan – All Routes 2015 -2034

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note
Numbers may not add up due to rounding.
### Attachment 1: Kitsap Passenger-Only Ferry Projected Financial Plan – All Routes 2015-2034

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sales</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grant Funding</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td>6,685,000</td>
<td>2,436,000</td>
<td>1,545,000</td>
<td>703,000</td>
<td>5,678,000</td>
<td>5,388,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Debts - New Small Start</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>1,065,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Grant Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,285,000</td>
<td>2,710,000</td>
<td>1,825,000</td>
<td>963,000</td>
<td>8,558,000</td>
<td>5,688,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Operations</td>
<td>1,481,000</td>
<td>8,930,000</td>
<td>8,348,000</td>
<td>1,811,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Passage Monitoring</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>247,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>272,000</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,621,000</td>
<td>9,154,000</td>
<td>8,583,000</td>
<td>1,858,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>272,000</td>
<td>2,031,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Terminal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,825,000</td>
<td>882,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Terminals</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>489,000</td>
<td>493,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,348,000</td>
<td>957,000</td>
<td>2,965,000</td>
<td>2,151,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skansonia Terminal Debt Repayment</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Terminals</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>1,161,000</td>
<td>2,369,000</td>
<td>1,532,000</td>
<td>2,823,000</td>
<td>957,000</td>
<td>2,965,000</td>
<td>2,151,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Capital Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>1,786,000</td>
<td>10,315,000</td>
<td>10,369,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,282,000</td>
<td>1,229,000</td>
<td>8,198,000</td>
<td>7,095,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Capital Funding Required</td>
<td>(1,786,000)</td>
<td>(10,315,000)</td>
<td>(10,369,000)</td>
<td>(3,000,000)</td>
<td>(2,282,000)</td>
<td>(1,229,000)</td>
<td>(8,198,000)</td>
<td>(7,095,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Local Funding Required</td>
<td>(2,495,000)</td>
<td>(12,314,000)</td>
<td>(12,173,000)</td>
<td>(6,144,000)</td>
<td>(6,193,000)</td>
<td>(6,272,000)</td>
<td>(5,964,000)</td>
<td>(9,090,000)</td>
<td>(7,810,000)</td>
<td>(8,214,000)</td>
<td>(9,030,000)</td>
<td>(9,066,000)</td>
<td>(9,593,000)</td>
<td>(10,146,000)</td>
<td>(11,562,000)</td>
<td>(12,920,000)</td>
<td>(11,953,000)</td>
<td>(12,950,000)</td>
<td>(13,178,000)</td>
<td>(13,836,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>(2,920,000)</td>
<td>(12,314,000)</td>
<td>(12,173,000)</td>
<td>(6,144,000)</td>
<td>(6,193,000)</td>
<td>(6,272,000)</td>
<td>(5,964,000)</td>
<td>(9,090,000)</td>
<td>(7,810,000)</td>
<td>(8,214,000)</td>
<td>(9,030,000)</td>
<td>(9,066,000)</td>
<td>(9,593,000)</td>
<td>(10,146,000)</td>
<td>(11,562,000)</td>
<td>(12,920,000)</td>
<td>(11,953,000)</td>
<td>(12,950,000)</td>
<td>(13,178,000)</td>
<td>(13,836,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Debt Service</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td>1,103,000</td>
<td>1,158,000</td>
<td>1,216,000</td>
<td>1,278,000</td>
<td>1,340,000</td>
<td>1,407,000</td>
<td>1,477,000</td>
<td>1,551,000</td>
<td>1,628,000</td>
<td>1,710,000</td>
<td>1,795,000</td>
<td>1,880,000</td>
<td>1,965,000</td>
<td>2,079,000</td>
<td>2,193,000</td>
<td>2,292,000</td>
<td>2,407,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Cash Balance</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may not add up due to rounding.
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Plan Highlights

Over the past two years Kitsap Transit has been preparing a business plan for cross-sound passenger-only ferry (POF) service between three ports in Kitsap County and downtown Seattle. Extensive public outreach was conducted to shape a plan that is both feasible and meets the communities’ needs. The service would be governed by Kitsap County elected officials through either the existing Kitsap Transit Public Transportation Benefit Area or a newly formed ferry district.

Routes
Three routes, originating in Bremerton, Kingston and Southworth, that all arrive at Pier 50 in Seattle. All three routes would be in service by 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Proposed Service Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vessels
Total of six vessels – Existing Rich Passage 1, plus five new vessels as described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessels</th>
<th>Bremerton</th>
<th>Kingston</th>
<th>Southworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Passage 1 (KT owns)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Passage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Passage 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-speed 150-passenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Loading 250-passenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Loading 250-passenger (high-speed)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ = Dedicated vessel  
X = Backup vessel
Service Schedule Examples
Example commute and expanded service schedules for each route:

**Bremerton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October - April (Base Season)</th>
<th>Round Trips</th>
<th>First Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Seattle Morning Departure</th>
<th>First Afternoon Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Departure Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5:45 AM</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>3:25 PM</td>
<td>6:20 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May – September (Peak Season)**

| Expanded Service - High       | Monday - Thursday | 12 | 5:45 AM | - | - | 7:35 PM |
|                               | Friday            | 15 | 5:45 AM | - | - | 11:10 PM |
|                               | Saturday          | 12 | 9:15 AM | - | - | 11:10 PM |

**Kingston**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October - April (Base Season)</th>
<th>Round Trips</th>
<th>First Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Seattle Morning Departure</th>
<th>First Afternoon Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Departure Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5:40 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>2:20 PM</td>
<td>6:40 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May – September (Peak Season)**

| Expanded Service - High       | Monday - Thursday | 10 | 5:40 AM | - | - | 8:05 PM |
|                               | Friday            | 12 | 5:40 AM | - | - | 11:00 PM |
|                               | Saturday          | 10 | 9:00 AM | - | - | 11:00 PM |

**Southworth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October - April (Base Season)</th>
<th>Round Trips</th>
<th>First Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Seattle Morning Departure</th>
<th>First Afternoon Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Departure Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>3:10 PM</td>
<td>6:20 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May – September (Peak Season)**

| Expanded Service - High       | Monday - Thursday | 13 | 6:00 AM | - | - | 7:20 PM |
|                               | Friday            | 17 | 6:00 AM | - | - | 10:30 PM |
|                               | Saturday          | 13 | 9:30 AM | - | - | 10:30 PM |
Fares
The proposed fare schedule would include the following fare amounts and types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Fare</td>
<td>$12 round trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Ferry Incentive Pricing</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Fare</td>
<td>$6 round trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Delivery
An interagency agreement between Kitsap Transit and the King County Department of Transportation Marine Division (KCMD) would provide for operation of the service by the KCMD with Kitsap Transit retaining responsibility for service schedules, fare products, fare levels, and capital investment programs.

Financial Plan
The financial plan is balanced with a combination of grants, fares, and 3/10ths of one percent sales tax.

Planning around the POF Business Plan and Long Range Strategy has been completed in two phases. The following report outlines the work and findings of Phase Two. Information about the first phase is available in the Phase One Summary Report and appendices.
1 Introduction/Overview

A comprehensive business plan is essential to successful POF service in Kitsap County. The business plan must also address the investment plan requirements of RCW 36.57A.200 for all elements of a passenger ferry program, including proposed routes and ridership, vessel and terminal capital requirements, service schedules, fares, and an operating plan. The business plan must also demonstrate how the proposed service can be financially viable over the long term. Kitsap Transit has developed a business plan with these components in two phases. This report, together with the Phase One report and the technical appendices of both phases, documents Kitsap Transit Passenger-Only Ferry Business Plan and Long Range Strategy.

1.1 PURPOSE

In January 2015, the Kitsap Transit Board of Commissioners accepted the Phase One Passenger-Only Ferry Business Plan and Long Range Strategy and directed Kitsap Transit to expand the planning effort, including broad public outreach and refinements to the business plan.

1.2 SCOPE

Phase Two built upon the previous work performed in Phase One and focused on the following questions:

- What did we hear from the community and how was feedback incorporated in the plan?
- What capital and operating plan refinements have been made?
- What are the legal structure options?
- How much will service cost and how will we pay for it?

1.3 PHASE ONE BUSINESS PLAN OVERVIEW

The POF business plan developed during Phase One:

- Reviewed the history of POF service in Puget Sound;
- Identified routes for analysis;
- Produced and implemented a public involvement plan to guide business plan development;
- Evaluated governance structures;
- Developed a model to analyze POF market demand and project ridership;
- Identified terminal locations and enhancements and vessel requirements;
- Prepared a management strategy and operating schedule;
- Formulated a phasing and implementation plan for service;
- Developed a cost model to develop a sustainable financial plan; and
- Analyzed the economic benefits of POF service.

For more information about Phase One, refer to the January 2015 Passenger-Only Ferry Business Plan and Long Range Strategy.
2 What Did We Hear from the Community and How Was Feedback Incorporated in the Plan?

The key objectives of community engagement were gauging community interest in passenger ferry service and gaining feedback about the potential service. Phase One outreach included two online surveys, stakeholder interviews, and information tables with a focus on current ferry riders. The feedback from Phase One helped shape the initial POF business plan.

Phase One outreach concluded:

- There was general community support for POF service;
- Benefits and economic opportunities in Kitsap County would increase with POF service;
- Individuals were willing to pay more for faster service;
- More than half of individuals were willing to pay a 2/10ths to 4/10ths of one percent increase in sales tax for POF service to Kitsap County; and
- Regional support and continued funding is essential to successful POF service.

Building upon Phase One, Kitsap Transit conducted additional detailed and diverse public outreach efforts in Phase Two to further refine the POF business plan.

2.1 PHASE TWO OUTREACH

Public outreach was a significant focal point of Phase Two. A robust engagement plan sought to reach a more diverse cross-section of residents, community and business leaders, and dive deeper into concerns and opportunities related to the POF business plan and potential service.

Phase Two public engagement included conducting stakeholder interviews, telephone surveys and roundtable discussions, and launching an informational website. In addition, an independent, informal, Task Force formed during Phase Two and provided additional input. Public engagement efforts focused on the following issues:

- Familiarity with the POF business plan;
- Reactions to descriptions of potential service scenarios;
- Reasons to use POF service;
- Interest in service beyond commute hours; and
- Reactions to potential ballot measure proposals.

Figure 2-1 outlines the timeline and activities for public outreach completed during Phase Two.
2.2 KEY THEMES

A major objective of the public outreach completed in Phase Two was to gain detailed feedback on specific components of the POF business plan. Several consistent themes emerged across the stakeholder interviews, telephone surveys, and roundtable discussions. Many of these themes have been addressed in the Phase Two version of the POF business plan.

Specific changes to the business plan as a result of community feedback include:

- Single fare structure for all three POF routes, instead of route-dependent fare structure proposed in Phase One;
- Additional service beyond peak commute periods, including mid-day, evening, and Saturday service;
- Accelerated implementation of service for the Southworth route; and
- Recommendation for 3/10ths of one percent increase in sales tax to support desired service levels.

Additionally, consistent overall themes heard in Phase Two engagement include:

- POF service will have a positive impact on Kitsap County economy and quality of life;
- There is a desire for increased vessel size and/or sailings to move more people;
- Most participants support Kitsap Transit pursuing a local revenue measure to fund POF service, but acknowledge there will be challenges in passing a measure; and
- Cost of service is the most common concern.
Table 2-1 provides a summary of the overall findings from these outreach activities. The full report of findings can be found in Appendix A.

### Table 2-1: Key Results from Public Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POF service is a benefit to Kitsap County and the Puget Sound region.</th>
<th>Cost of implementation is the most common concern.</th>
<th>Strong preference for additional service beyond commute hours, but not all want to pay more for it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ✓ Stakeholders say POF service would improve the economy, provide reliability to commuters, and open up access to economic hubs  
✓ 86% of survey respondents say POF would help the local economy  
✓ Roundtable participants say POF is an economic driver that addresses regional issues like congestion and growth | ✓ Stakeholders question whether costs outweigh benefits  
✓ Taxpayer cost is the top reason provided by survey respondents for opposing POF service  
✓ Roundtable participants support the POF service measure but think costs may result in an unsuccessful measure | ✓ Survey respondents’ top priority is service for special events, personal activities, and tourism promotion  
✓ Support for funding additional service (special events, non-commute sailings) drops nearly 25% in public opinion surveys  
✓ Roundtable participants reinforce need to support tourism with additional capacity and sailings |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliable, efficient, and rider-friendly service is desired.</th>
<th>Proposed fare rates for POF service do not cause concern.</th>
<th>POF service must be guided by a sound plan. But most do not know about POF/business plans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ✓ All groups agree that service has to be frequent, easy to use, and integrated with existing transit modes | ✓ Almost all roundtable participants say proposed fares are reasonable  
✓ 69% of survey respondents disagree that POF service would cost riders too much | ✓ Stakeholders and roundtable participants say Kitsap Transit must communicate the work completed in the plan  
✓ Four in ten survey respondents know about POF plans |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong support exists for Kitsap Transit pursuing POF service.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ✓ Nearly three in four survey respondents support Kitsap Transit pursuing service  
✓ Most roundtable participants support placing a measure before voters |  |
3 What Business Plan Refinements Have Been Made?

The following key elements were assessed as part of the Phase Two evaluation:

- Opportunities to accelerate the implementation timeframe for Southworth;
- Alternative fleet configurations to accommodate the revised phasing schedule and terminal facilities;
- Further definition of operating agreements with partnering agencies;
- Opportunities to optimize vessel maintenance processes;
- Alternate fare levels and refinement of the fare collection strategy; and
- Expansion of operating schedules to include mid-day, evening, and Saturday service options.

3.1 TERMINAL FACILITIES

The Southworth terminal facilities have been reevaluated in response to community feedback and a strong interest in accelerating service startup at this location. The Kingston and Bremerton terminal facility requirements did not change in Phase Two and the terminals still require only minor improvements such as wayfinding and aesthetic upgrades, plus dock repairs at Kingston. KCMD is continuing to work on the design for the new terminal facilities at Pier 50 to incorporate Kitsap routes.

**Southworth Terminal**
Initially, a new POF terminal facility for side-loading 150-passenger vessels at Southworth was assumed requiring an extensive design and permitting effort, and delaying service start-up. The existing Washington State Ferries (WSF) terminal facility at Southworth is designed for a vehicle ferry and not a typical passenger-only vessel. To accelerate the implementation timeframe at Southworth, the feasibility of designing and constructing a new bow-loading passenger-only vessel that could fit in the existing vehicle slip was explored. This would eliminate the need for terminal improvements at Southworth and could accelerate implementation of the Southworth route by three to five years.

**Pier 50 Terminal**
Design of Pier 50 improvements is progressing in conjunction with the redesign of WSF’s Colman Dock facilities. The key design elements have not changed since Phase One. WSF and KCMD currently anticipate completion of the new terminal facilities in fall 2018. KCMD anticipates the need to operate from a temporary facility for approximately one year while the permanent facility is constructed.
3.2 VESSEL INFRASTRUCTURE

Based on the community’s significant interest to accelerate the timeframe of the Southworth route, Phase Two included a feasibility study of a passenger ferry designed to fit within the existing WSF vehicle slip. The feasibility study examined the dimensional parameters required for a passenger-only vessel berthing in the vehicle slip at Southworth as well as the ability to berth at the Pier 50 float. The feasibility study determined a passenger-only vessel capable of both bow-loading and side-loading could be designed for operation out of both locations, while sustaining the requisite 28-knot cruising speed.

Additionally, the feasibility study indicated it would be impractical for Kitsap Transit to modify an existing vessel that would be both wide enough to fit within the vehicle slip, and be able to berth at Pier 50. Therefore, the study concluded that designing and constructing a new vessel class specifically designed for this route was preferable. Vessels with the required width typically have capacity for 200 to 300 passengers. See Appendix B for the Technical Feasibility Study.

Phase Two Fleet Configuration

To maintain consistent POF service, an appropriate backup vessel(s) must be available. Modifying the vessel serving Southworth also requires modification of the fleet configuration. The bow-loading vessel would be unique to the Southworth route and would need a specific backup vessel of similar design.

As determined in Phase One, the Kingston route would require a new 150-passenger vessel capable of maintaining a 35-knot cruising speed to achieve the desired crossing time. In Phase One, the Spirit of Kingston and/or Rich Passage 2/3 (RP2/3) class vessel(s) were suggested as a backup vessel for this route. However, each of these vessels would lead to degradation in the level of service, with the Spirit of Kingston not able to maintain the required service speed and the RP vessels not having the same passenger capacity.

Consequently, to meet the expanded service schedule demands of the Phase Two operating scenario with an uninterrupted and comparable level of service, a backup vessel for the Kingston and Southworth routes is required. Rather than providing separate backup vessels for these two routes, the recommendation is for a single vessel designed to possess the requisite bow-loading for Southworth service and the speed necessary to maintain the sailing schedule at Kingston.

Therefore, three types of vessels would be required including: (1) three high-speed, low wake 118-passenger vessels RP1/2/3, (2) one high-speed 150-passenger vessel, and (3) two bow/side-loading, 250-passenger vessels, one moderate and one high-speed. The fleet configuration is provided in Table 3-1.

The Phase Two POF service plan for Bremerton is built on a commute service schedule of six round-trips per day and the expanded seasonal service plan. The Phase One plan envisioned expanding to twelve round-trips in the commute period as demand grew and when the third RP could be built. In the Phase Two service plan, the expansion to twelve round-trips during the commute period is suspended until shoreline monitoring demonstrates the feasibility of the additional trips. However, provisions for construction of a RP3 are incorporated into the business plan to support the twelve round-trip commute schedule in the future.
Table 3-1: Phase Two Fleet Configuration by Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Primary Vessel</th>
<th>Backup Vessel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton (1)</td>
<td>RP1 (HS 118 PSGR)</td>
<td>RP2 (HS 118 PSGR) RP3 (HS 118 PSGR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton (2)</td>
<td>RP2 (HS 118 PSGR)</td>
<td>RP3 (HS 118 PSGR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>T-Boat (HS 150 PSGR)</td>
<td>RP3 (HS 118 PSGR) or Bow-Loading (HS 250 PSGR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth</td>
<td>Bow-Loading (MS 250 PSGR)</td>
<td>Bow-Loading (HS 250 PSGR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HS = High-speed  
MS = Moderate speed

From a maintenance and operational perspective, it is beneficial to have the same vessel classes in a fleet. However, all three proposed routes have unique characteristics that are not conducive to a uniform fleet configuration. With multiple vessel classes in the fleet, there would be slightly different training and maintenance requirements that can be accommodated by appropriate staffing and procedures.

### 3.3 OPERATING PLAN/AGREEMENTS

The Phase One report recommended that Kitsap Transit contract with KCMD for operations and maintenance of Kitsap’s cross-sound ferry service. During Phase Two, the POF planning team met with KCMD staff to explore opportunities and formulate an approach to partnering in the delivery of Kitsap’s POF service. An initial outline of the partnership approach was developed.

Under this public/public partnership arrangement, Kitsap Transit would provide administrative and capital program oversight and KCMD would operate the POF service. As part of this agreement, KCMD staff and maintenance facilities could be used for routine and intermediate maintenance of vessels at either the overnight tie-up location or the existing KCMD Pier 48 Maintenance Barge. Table 3-2 provides a potential framework for roles in the partnership.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Kitsap Transit</th>
<th>KCMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Coordinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vessel Operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew recruitment and training</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew dispatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard certification and inspection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine vessel maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual vessel maintenance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminal Operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West side terminals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 50</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminal Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West side terminals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 50</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Scheduling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Scheduling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure and fare levels</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue processing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side terminals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side terminals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 50</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing and contracting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While formal agreements with KCMD have not been developed, agency leaders began discussing potential agreements during Phase Two. The POF project team worked closely with KCMD leadership to identify common management and support costs and to evaluate allocation alternatives.

The King County Executive and King County Department of Transportation have both expressed strong support for this partnership plan. They see it as a sound example of regional cooperation and an excellent opportunity to leverage local resources to the benefit of both Kitsap and King counties. King County is prepared to continue work to develop the partnership agreement over the coming months.

Partnering with KCMD would require both Kitsap and King County internal review and approvals prior to adopting an interagency agreement that would be approved through the budget cycle. The anticipated timeframe for completing the interagency agreement is as follows:

- Approximately six to nine months to complete the initial development that includes:
  - Development of terms and conditions
  - Legal review
  - Director’s review
- Approximately four to six months to secure appropriate council and commission approvals and authorizations.

### 3.4 MAINTENANCE FACILITIES

In addition to the initial discussions of an operating agreement, Kitsap Transit continued to explore the possibility of partnering with KCMD for vessel maintenance. Analysis was completed to assess advantages and disadvantages of different maintenance strategies. The study evaluated the capacity of the KCMD Pier 48 Maintenance Barge to berth the vessels and the option of mooring and maintaining the vessels within Kitsap County.

Through discussions with KCMD, it was determined that the Pier 48 Maintenance Barge would have capacity to maintain and moor the Kitsap Transit vessels, and KCMD expressed interest in this arrangement. The analysis examined the pros and cons of topics such as: utilizing the qualified KCMD crew at the Pier 48 Maintenance Barge to perform intermediate level maintenance activities, and positioning the vessels on either the east or west side of Puget Sound. Additional analysis is required to determine the most appropriate maintenance plan. See Appendix C for the Vessel Maintenance Staffing analysis.

Maintenance and mooring arrangements would be part of the interagency agreement between Kitsap Transit and KCMD.
3.5 FARE COLLECTION

The Phase One analysis focused on an approach that included varied fare levels by route resulting in round-trip fares for Bremerton and Southworth at $11 and $15 for Kingston. In Phase Two a single cross-sound fare level was recommended to provide consistency across all routes and equity for all users. Relying on survey findings that riders were willing to pay an additional $1 to $3 for the premium service, a system-wide $12.00 round-trip full fare and $10.50 round-trip frequent user fare is proposed. See Table 3-3 for a breakdown of the proposed fares.

Table 3-3: Proposed Fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastbound Direction (Rounded to Nearest $0.25)</th>
<th>Full Fare</th>
<th>Effective Monthly Pass Fare</th>
<th>Reduced Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Fare</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Service Charge</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total One-Way Price</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westbound Direction (Rounded to Nearest $0.25)</th>
<th>Full Fare</th>
<th>Effective Monthly Pass Fare</th>
<th>Reduced Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Fare</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Service Charge</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total One-Way Price</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Round Trip Price</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td>$168(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work began in Phase One to identify an initial fare structure and an approach to fare collection, and the following work continued in Phase Two which:

- Further refined the directional fare concept to help mitigate ridership imbalances while retaining a simple and easy-to-administer structure;
- Identified the proposed frequent user and monthly pass prices using the new, single cross-sound fare;
- Analyzed and determined the approach to adopting the One Regional Card for All (ORCA) as the preferred fare medium; and
- Examined the establishment of discount programs and practices and opportunities for bus/ferry incentive pricing and developed an approach to integrate the pricing into the ORCA based system, and also identified new opportunities to potentially leverage off of mobile ticketing technology that King County Metro and Sound Transit are piloting in 2016.

\(^1\) This is consistent with how WSF prices its fare products; the monthly pass cost is calculated based on 16 round trips per month.
3.6 SERVICE PLANNING

The Phase One study focused on commute-only service with three round-trips in the morning and three round-trips in the evening. Vessel speed specifications reflect the crossing time required to meet the commute schedule. These one-way crossing times are indicated below for each route:

- Bremerton – 35 minutes (28-minute transit time and 7-minute loading/unloading)
- Kingston – 40 minutes (33-minute transit time and 7-minute loading/unloading)
- Southworth – 30 minutes (23-minute transit time and 7-minute loading/unloading)

Responding to community feedback, Kitsap Transit explored expanding service schedules beyond the commute-only service level. Example expanded service schedules were developed for three levels of implementation during peak season (May to September): lower, moderate, and high to illustrate how, and at what cost, Kitsap Transit might implement various levels of expanded service. Further analysis demonstrated that fares and operating subsidies could fund year round commute and the high level of expanded service.

Table 3-4, Table 3-5, and Table 3-6 illustrate the total daily round-trips and potential schedules for Bremerton, Kingston, and Southworth respectively for the three levels of service.

Table 3-4: Potential Bremerton Schedules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October - April (Base Season)</th>
<th>Round Trips</th>
<th>First Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Seattle Morning Departure</th>
<th>First Afternoon Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Departure Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5:45 AM</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>3:25 PM</td>
<td>6:20 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May - September (Peak Season)**

*Expanded Service - Lower*

| Monday - Thursday           | 7           | 5:45 AM                           | 8:40 AM                       | 3:25 PM                                     | 7:35 PM                |
| Friday                      | 10          | 5:45 AM                           | 8:40 AM                       | 3:25 PM                                     | 11:10 PM               |
| Saturday                    | 10          | 11:40 AM                          | -                             | -                                           | 11:10 PM               |

*Expanded Service - Moderate*

| Monday - Thursday           | 9           | 5:45 AM                           | 9:55 AM                       | 2:10 PM                                     | 7:35 PM                |
| Friday                      | 12          | 5:45 AM                           | 9:55 AM                       | 2:10 PM                                     | 11:10 PM               |
| Saturday                    | 10          | 11:40 AM                          | -                             | -                                           | 11:10 PM               |

*Expanded Service - High*

| Monday - Thursday           | 12          | 5:45 AM                           | -                             | -                                           | 7:35 PM                |
| Friday                      | 15          | 5:45 AM                           | -                             | -                                           | 11:10 PM               |
| Saturday                    | 12          | 9:15 AM                           | -                             | -                                           | 11:10 PM               |
Table 3-5: Potential Kingston Schedules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October - April (Base Season)</th>
<th>Round Trips</th>
<th>First Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Seattle Morning Departure</th>
<th>First Afternoon Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Departure Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5:40 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>2:20 PM</td>
<td>6:40 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May - September (Peak Season)

Expanded Service - Lower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday - Thursday</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5:40 AM</th>
<th>9:00 AM</th>
<th>2:20 PM</th>
<th>8:05 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5:40 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>2:20 PM</td>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11:50 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expanded Service - Moderate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday - Thursday</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>5:40 AM</th>
<th>10:30 AM</th>
<th>1:00 PM</th>
<th>8:05 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5:40 AM</td>
<td>11:50 AM</td>
<td>2:20 PM</td>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11:50 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expanded Service - High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday - Thursday</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5:40 AM</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>8:05 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5:40 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-6: Potential Southworth Schedules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October - April (Base Season)</th>
<th>Round Trips</th>
<th>First Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Seattle Morning Departure</th>
<th>First Afternoon Departure West Side Terminal</th>
<th>Last Departure Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>3:10 PM</td>
<td>6:20 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May - September (Peak Season)

Expanded Service - Lower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday - Thursday</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6:00 AM</th>
<th>8:30 AM</th>
<th>3:10 PM</th>
<th>7:20 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>3:10 PM</td>
<td>10:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:30 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expanded Service - Moderate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday - Thursday</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>6:00 AM</th>
<th>9:35 AM</th>
<th>2:10 PM</th>
<th>7:20 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>9:35 AM</td>
<td>2:10 PM</td>
<td>10:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:30 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expanded Service - High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday - Thursday</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>6:00 AM</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>7:20 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:30 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 RIDERSHIP

Phase Two analyzed the potential demand for the expanded service scenarios for each route. Ridership was forecasted for each level of expanded service. The ridership analysis indicates with more sailings, annual ridership increases. Figure 3-1 illustrates the annual Phase One ridership projections as well as annual ridership projections with expanded service evaluated in Phase Two. The figure also indicates the percent increase in ridership from Phase One to Phase Two.

![Annual Ridership for Phase One (Commute-Only) and Phase Two (with Expanded Service)](image)

Figure 3-1: Annual Ridership for Phase One (Commute-Only) and Phase Two (with Expanded Service)

3.8 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

With bow loading at Southworth, the revised implementation plan projects all three routes to be operational by 2020, within four years of local funding approval. While Kitsap Transit has initiated partnership agreement discussions with KCMD, they would also need to engage in lease agreement discussions with WSF and the Port of Kingston for use of their terminal facilities.

Bremerton service would commence in the summer of 2017 as only minor aesthetic terminal improvements are required and the RP1 has already been built. The Kingston route requires construction of a high-speed vessel as well as dock improvements and would be operational approximately one year after Bremerton, in the summer of 2018. Startup of Southworth service would require design and construction of a new 250-passenger vessel and small modifications to accommodate bow-loading and upland passenger staging and would occur in the summer of 2020. Figure 3-2 illustrates the proposed phasing plan for implementing the three routes.
4 What are the Legal Structure Options?

In developing a POF service business plan, Kitsap Transit explored a legal structure to govern the service, a local tax source to support the service, and boundaries for inclusion in the proposed ferry service area. The Phase One business plan recommended that Kitsap Transit employ their current Public Transportation Benefit Area (PTBA) municipal corporation to govern the cross-sound POF service. It was noted in the Phase One report that Kitsap Transit was pursuing additional statutory authority for the establishment of a ferry user district. The 2015 Washington State Legislature and the Governor did approve expanded authority allowing Kitsap Transit to also consider establishment of a ferry district to govern POF service.

Analytical work was performed during Phase Two to support Kitsap Transit’s evaluation of legal structure alternatives and boundary establishment. The project team:

- Estimated ridership originating within Kitsap County and subsections of the county;
- Estimated voter population distribution within Kitsap County and subsections of the county; and
- Estimated taxable retail sales and sales tax yields by precinct within Kitsap County.
The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4-1 through Table 4-4 below.

**Table 4-1: POF Ridership Projections by Route**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>% of All Ridership originating within Kitsap County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total within Kitsap County</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outside Kitsap County</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix E - Kitsap Transit Passenger-Only Ferry Business Plan and Long Range Strategy: Detailed Ridership Analysis

**Table 4-2: POF Ridership Projections within Alternative Boundary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>% of All Ridership within Proposed Boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total within Proposed Boundary</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix E - Kitsap Transit Passenger-Only Ferry Business Plan and Long Range Strategy: Detailed Ridership Analysis

**Table 4-3: Registered Voter Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>% of All County Registered Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>153,571</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Ferry District</td>
<td>129,426</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kitsap County Elections

**Table 4-4: Taxable Retail Sales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2014 Taxable Retail Sales Reported for all Precincts in Kitsap County</th>
<th>% of Reported Taxable Retail Sales(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>2.577 B</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Ferry District</td>
<td>2.525 B</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Washington State Department of Revenue

\(^2\) The Washington State Department of Revenue is unable to track all taxable sales in the county to a specific precinct or other geographical unit. Total taxable retail sales for Kitsap County are higher than reported in this table.
5 How Much Will POF Cost and How Do We Pay For It?

A comprehensive financial plan was developed for the cross-sound POF program in Phase One. The plan addressed capital and operating costs as well as tax, grant, and operating revenue. In Phase Two the financial plan:

- Incorporated a higher level of service;
- Financed a greater portion of start-up costs with local funds to demonstrate viability at a lower level of grant funding while maintaining the implementation schedule;
- Adopted bow loading at Southworth to expedite implementation of service from Southworth;
- Incorporated revised capital investment requirements;
- Adopted a single cross-sound fare for all routes; and
- Evaluated the sustainability of the financial plan to withstand economic and performance uncertainty.

5.1 COST OF EXPANDED SERVICE AND FUNDING MECHANISMS

As in Phase One, costs for construction of both vessels and terminals were estimated and inflated over the investment period. Operating costs for the higher level of service, including terminal and vessel operations and management and support, were estimated and projected over the term of the financial plan.

- $48 million in capital investment would be required between 2017 and 2022 to support all three routes with the vessel configuration described in Section 3.2.
- Nearly $13 million of local funds would be committed to capital investments required to launch the first two routes.
- Ongoing operating subsidy requirements\(^3\) once all three routes are in service with year round commute and the high level of expanded service would be $8 million per year:
  - $2.5 million for Bremerton
  - $3.1 million for Kingston
  - $2.4 million for Southworth

As noted in the Phase One report, adequate funding is critical for sustainable, long-term service. While a portion of operating costs would be covered by fare-box revenue, the remainder of operating costs and capital outlays would need to be covered through other funding sources. Grant funding would be utilized whenever possible; however, competition for these funds can be intense and an alternative that does not depend upon grant revenue to cover start-up capital was

---

\(^3\) Subsidies estimated in 2016 dollars.
evaluated and is discussed below. See Appendix F for an inventory of grant opportunities. Local funding in the form of tax levies would be required to support capital needs and sustain the service over the long-term.

The financial plan, at the higher level of seasonal expanded service with the required capital investments, is balanced with fare revenue, grant revenue to cover approximately 50 percent of start-up capital requirements, and 3/10ths of one percent sales tax. Local tax revenues supplement capital investments in the early years as service ramps up. Local tax revenues are dedicated to subsidizing ongoing operation and maintenance of the system once all three routes are fully implemented. Funding to subsidize the existing Port Orchard Foot Ferry is also covered through the revenues generated by the 3/10ths of one percent sales tax, freeing up approximately $1.5M per year for bus service.

5.2 FINANCIAL PLAN SUSTAINABILITY

Like the Phase One plan, the Phase Two financial plan continues to adopt a conservative approach to estimating both costs and revenues. Some key elements of the financial assumptions are discussed below.

Fuel Prices
Fuel prices were assumed to be $4 a gallon, a conservative estimate in 2015 when Kitsap Transit was paying approximately $2.50 a gallon and even more conservative now when fuel is as low as $1 a gallon.

General Cost Escalation
Cost escalation was assumed to be 5 percent per year, in line with actual experience for Kitsap Transit and well within the rate experienced by other ferry operations.

Fare Structure
The Phase One business plan proposed a two-tier fare structure with Bremerton and Southworth priced at $11 for full adult fare and Kingston at $15. In Phase Two, a single cross-sound fare was evaluated with a goal of remaining relatively revenue neutral. A system-wide cross-sound full adult fare of $12 was recommended and incorporated into the Phase Two ridership and revenue projections.

Ridership and Fare Revenue
As part of the Phase One planning work, a rider choice model was built to project ridership for each of the three proposed routes. Rider choice models have been shown to be very reliable in projecting ridership for many other land and ferry transit systems.4

Using the ridership model, baseline ridership and revenue was estimated using the recommended expanded service schedule and a $12 adult full fare. An average realization of 85 percent was applied to the revenue forecast to account for frequent use and other fare discounts. The estimate was further reduced by 25 percent to account for ridership ramp-up and economic uncertainty. A 5 percent escalation factor was applied annually to fare revenue to keep fare growth in line with cost escalation. No additional factor is applied for ridership growth.

4 See Appendix F of the Phase One report for a full discussion of ridership modeling and projection.
Local Tax Revenue
Current Kitsap Transit sales tax receipts were used to establish base year collections at 3/10ths of one percent sales tax. Tax revenue growth was assumed to be 3.5 percent per year, well below the average predicted for the next three years in Kitsap County by the Puget Sound Economic Forecaster.

Grant Revenue
Responding to a suggestion from the Federal Transit Administration, the overall level of federal grant support was re-evaluated. The proposed financial plan does assume grant support to start-up capital investment at approximately 50 percent. However, an alternative premised on no start-up capital grants was developed. In this case, fares and 3/10ths of one percent sales tax would be supplemented with debt funding in the range of $21 million. This would provide funding for the required capital, debt service, and operating subsidy to operate all three routes with commute service at the level of six round-trips per day during the off-peak season and the higher level of expanded service during peak season. In the no-grant-revenue alternative, a third vessel for Bremerton would be contingent upon the later availability of grant funds. Total debt service for this alternative was estimated to be approximately $5 million.

5.3 PROJECTED FINANCIAL PLAN
Route financial projection statements were prepared for each of the three routes and include operating revenue, operating costs, and capital costs. They reflect the implementation schedule proposed in the overall business plan and are consolidated into a system-wide route financial projection statement that incorporates funding for both the operating subsidy and the capital program. Refer to Attachment 1 for a summary of the financial plan and Appendix G for financial plans of each route.

6 Key Findings and Next Steps
Through the work performed in Phase Two, Kitsap Transit has gained a deeper understanding of community and stakeholder support and concerns for POF service. Community interest in more than just commute service was a very strong theme in all forms of outreach. The potential schedule development, demand forecasting, and financial analysis completed in Phase Two illustrates that expanded service is feasible. Additionally, modifications for a Southworth vessel are feasible that would result in an accelerated timeframe for beginning operations at that terminal. By implementing expanded POF service, a broader spectrum of community members would be able to utilize and benefit from this service. Although the proposed plan offers a viable plan for sustainable passenger ferry service, no plan can anticipate all future developments. Kitsap Transit should develop a performance monitoring and evaluation program to ensure that the ferry program remains viable and to make the inevitable course changes dictated by rider needs, evolving economic conditions, and the costs of service delivery.
Key findings from Phase One and Phase Two of the business plan include:

- There is broad community support for POF service.
- There are two viable legal structures available to support Kitsap POF service: the current Kitsap Transit PTBA and the new statutory authority to establish a separate Ferry District.
- Bow loading in the WSF slip allows Southworth service to begin three to five years sooner.
- Incorporating an expanded seasonal service plan for POF service is financially feasible based on projected ridership and revenue, with a 3/10ths of one percent sales tax levy and grant funding.
- King County is a willing partner in providing cross-bound POF service.

Should the Kitsap Transit Board of Commissioners choose to refer the business plan to the voters, work should continue to:

- Refine elements of the plan such as fare structure and fare collection, vessel moorage and maintenance arrangements, and an internal staffing and management plan;
- Conduct preliminary design and acquisition work for capital investments;
- Coordinate with the Federal Transit Administration for submission of a project application as the first step in seeking New/Small Starts grants; and
- Initiate development of an interagency agreement with King County and other partnering agencies.
Attachment 1

Kitsap Passenger-Only Ferry Projected Financial Plan
All Routes 2017-2036
## Attachment 1: Kitsap Passenger-Only Ferry Projected Financial Plan – All Routes 2017-2036 ($ in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>5,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Operating/Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>5,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

#### Direct Operating/Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>5,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Operating/Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Operating Expenses</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>4,698</td>
<td>5,069</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>5,919</td>
<td>6,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Management and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT FOF Management and Support</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Management and Support</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Management and Support</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>4,312</td>
<td>4,537</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>4,991</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating/Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>9,363</td>
<td>12,513</td>
<td>14,213</td>
<td>14,924</td>
<td>15,670</td>
<td>16,453</td>
<td>17,276</td>
<td>18,149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Operating/Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy per Ride</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may not add up due to rounding.
## Attachment 1: Kitsap Passenger-Only Ferry Projected Financial Plan – All Routes 2017-2036 ($ in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Government Grant Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Grant Revenue</strong></td>
<td>7,129</td>
<td>12,199</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Leases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>7,129</td>
<td>12,199</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Capital Required</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Capital Required</strong></td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Repayment - Port of Bremerton</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Funding Required for Capital and Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Funding Required</strong></td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Revenue</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bond/Revenue</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may not add up due to rounding.
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Study Elements

Feasibility analysis

Technology and policy considerations
- Funding
- Plans and policies
- Vessel technology review

Route analysis
- Ridership potential
- Time competitive
- Financial analysis

Site evaluation
- Transit and pedestrian access
- Infrastructure assessment
LANDING SITE ASSESSMENT

Three geographical areas:

○ Downtown
○ Old Town
○ The Point
ROUTE PROFILE ASSESSMENT

- TRANSIT CONNECTIONS
- FARE ASSUMPTIONS
- TRAVEL TIMES COMPARISON
- OPERATING PROFILES
### Time and Fare Competitive Travel

#### Potential Tacoma Passenger-Only Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Travel Time (Minutes)</th>
<th>Fare (One-Way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th Street</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Ruston</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Defiance</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mode Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Travel Time (Minutes)</th>
<th>Fare (One-Way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sounder Train</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Bus</td>
<td>65-80</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>50-120</td>
<td>$33.44*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes federal mileage costs and parking costs in Seattle*
**ESTIMATED WEEKDAY RIDERSHIP**

- **2020**: Point Ruston site has highest daily ridership (523 riders)
- **2040**: 11th Street Dock catches up
ESTIMATED CAPITAL COSTS

Estimated Terminal Facility Cost

- 11TH STREET: $1 M
- OLD TOWN: $1.9 M
- PT. RUSTON: $3.1 M
- PT. DEFIANCE PARK: $2.8 M
- PT. DEFIANCE - WSF: $0.5 M

- Terminal facility cost estimates differ by location.
- Potential pilot service opportunities at:
  - Point Defiance parks facilities
  - Old Town
  - 11th Street Marina
ESTIMATED CAPITAL COSTS

- Two service vessels and one back up vessel would ensure reliability.
- 150-passenger vessel (appropriate for the predicted ridership).
- A larger vessel would be required for bow loading in the WSF slip, with more passenger capacity.

**Estimated Vessel Cost**

- 150-PASSENGER: $10 - 13.2 M
- 250-PASSENGER: $13 - 17.5 M
## START-UP CAPITAL COSTS BY LANDING SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landing Site</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Diagram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Defiance</td>
<td>$40,595,000</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Ruston</td>
<td>$41,459,000</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>$42,674,000</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Street</td>
<td>$42,412,000</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Defiance Park</td>
<td>$53,335,000</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vessel costs uses high end of range provided*
ESTIMATED OPERATING COSTS

*Operating costs identified are for a projected 2020 start-up*
## OPERATING COST COMPARISON

- Comparable operating costs and revenue recovery for all sites
- Farebox recovery ranges from 32.5% to 37.7% for all sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11th Street</th>
<th>Old Town</th>
<th>Point Ruston</th>
<th>Point Defiance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidy Required</strong></td>
<td>$1.96 M</td>
<td>$1.88 M</td>
<td>$1.71 M</td>
<td>$1.79 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Rider</strong></td>
<td>$28.77</td>
<td>$27.88</td>
<td>$24.80</td>
<td>$26.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Service Hour</strong></td>
<td>$1,431</td>
<td>$1,394</td>
<td>$1,364</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating costs identified are for a projected 2020 start-up.
## Modal Cost Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potential POF from Point Ruston</th>
<th>King County Water Taxi</th>
<th>Sounder Train</th>
<th>Sound Transit Express Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Ridership</strong></td>
<td>114,400</td>
<td>657,600</td>
<td>4,650,000</td>
<td>18,860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td>$2.83 M</td>
<td>$7.53 M</td>
<td>$53.89 M</td>
<td>$141.30 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidy Required</strong></td>
<td>$1.71 M</td>
<td>$4.52 M</td>
<td>$38.76 M</td>
<td>$103.57 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Rider</strong></td>
<td>$24.80</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$11.59</td>
<td>$7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Service Hour</strong></td>
<td>$1,364</td>
<td>$1,477</td>
<td>$721</td>
<td>$178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farebox Recovery</strong></td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNDING NEEDS & OPPORTUNITIES

- **Start-up investment**
  - Grants
  - Bonds

- **Ongoing subsidy**
  - Partnerships
  - Local tax revenue
  - Fares
CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

- **Tacoma to Seattle Fast Ferry Service Is Feasible**
- **Further Analysis Is Required to Develop a Viable Business Plan**
  - Funding Plan
  - Schedule and Ridership
  - Preferred Landing Location(s)
  - Economic Impact
  - Seattle Facilities
  - Regional Coordination/Collaboration
  - Community Support