# Appendix A: Compendium of Plans

## Washington State Ferries (WSF) Portion of the Washington State Transportation Plan

- **Washington State Ferries Systems Plan 1999-2018, Final June 1999** (KJS Associates, Inc.**,** Berk & Associates, Inc.**,** LRS & Associates**,** Pacific Rim Resources**,** Reid Middleton, Inc.)
- **Washington State Ferries Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 Strategic Service & Investment Plan, April 2006**

## Passenger Only Ferries (POF) Studies

- **Ten-Year Passenger Strategy for Washington's Multimodal Ferry Transportation System, January 2005** (Ten) (Burke & Associates, Inc.)
- **Joint Transportation Committee Passenger-Only Ferry Task Force Report, January 2006** (Task)
- **Passenger-Only Ferry Cost Analysis, January 2006** (Parametrix)

**Objectives- 2004/05 Legislature**

- Long-range plan and supporting strategy to provide policy guidance to define and maximize efficient delivery of quality marine transportation services to the traveling public.
- The strategy should identify the most appropriate means of moving foot passengers across central Puget Sound using WSF vessels, alternative operators or a hybrid combination of both in the short and longer-term. Focus on Seattle-Vashon, Seattle-Southworth, Seattle-Kingston & Seattle-Clinton.
- A long-term plan for the existing terminals considering revenue-generating opportunities and potential partnerships with the private sector, including a plan for generating non-operating revenues.
- A more equitable fare structure for the San Juan Islands, especially for Island residents.
- 2005 Task Force: examine issues related to, but not limited to, the long-term viability of different providers, cost to ferry passengers, the state subsidies required by each provider, and the availability of federal funding for the different service providers.

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategies/Factors to Consider | 1) Capacity: Increasing the capacity of the ferry system to carry passengers and vehicles to meet the adopted level of service standards.<br>2) Terminals: Completing improvements to terminals that are needed to accommodate new vessels and increased customer demand, and to improve intermodal connections.<br>3) South Sound Routes: Improving the route structure to provide more efficient and direct services, especially in the south Sound (Fauntleroy Vashon Southworth) and in the San Juan Islands.<br>4) Inter-modal Connections: Improving integration of WSF | 1) Capacity: Meet projected customer demand consistent with Washington State Transportation Commission adopted level of service standards.<br>2) Prices: Charge prices that are reasonable & equitable as required by RCW 47.60.326.<br>3) Environment: Act responsibly with regard to the natural environment.<br>4) Finances: Plan within financial constraints, particularly 80% farebox recovery rate determined by the Legislative Joint Task Force on Ferries in 2001. | Four guiding principles<br>1) Cost-effectiveness: Cost-effectively utilize WSF's existing assets and passenger carrying capacity, including passenger-vehicle vessels and terminals.<br>2) Inter-Modal Connections: Leverage the region's multimodal transportation infrastructure and investments.<br>3) Efficiency: Help mitigate bottlenecks and chokepoints in WSF's system, to increase overall network efficiency. |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | and local transportation facilities and services, especially public transit connections.<br>5) Traffic Demand Management: Increasing the modal share for walk-on passengers and carpools/vanpools and decreasing the modal share for single occupant vehicles.<br>6) Finances: Tying ferry system improvements to a realistic financial plan. (p 32-33) | 5) Local Governments: Respect the land use and growth management plans of local governments, while staying mindful of its primary mission and role as state agency.<br>6) Inter-Modal Connections: Plan facility improvements and service to facilitate connections with other modes of transportation.<br>7) Public: Consult with the public as plans are developed and on policy changes. (p 6-8)<br>Policy Issues<br>1) Funding framework assumes fare levels will remain close to today's as adjusted for inflation, i.e., annual increase of 2.5%. (p 51)<br>2) Key question is whether 80% farebox recovery should be the target or a *minimum* target. (p 62)<br>a) To reach 80% farebox recovery, WSF would need the planned fare increases through 2008, but could hold fares flat for 2009-21, since ridership is projected to increase. (p 63)<br>b) Since ridership is sensitive to fares, holding rates flat would increase ridership. (p 63)<br>c) This increased ridership would result in more crowding on all routes. (p. 64)<br>d) To meet this increased demand would call for capital investments in larger vessels, double-decker vessels and loading, and larger holding areas. (p. 64)<br>e) 80% farebox recovery would eliminate excess operating subsidies, requiring additional tax subsidy for both capital and operating costs. (p. 64)<br>3) Plan represents the maximum service possible with current terminals and vessels. By 2030, WSF will need to either accept lower service levels or make capital investments to expand service. (p. 66)<br>4) Change in Fauntleroy-Southworth-Vashon service adds pressure for redevelopment of Colman Dock and holding areas. (p. 67) | 4) Finances: Be operationally and financially sustainable, to enable ferry riders and communities to make long-term employment and location decisions. (Ten p 51)<br>Recommended Goals<br>1) Importance: POF service is an important component of the transportation infrastructure & should be promoted where appropriate.<br>2) Coordinated: Planning for POF service should be coordinated with regional, state & local priorities, carriers, routes, related links and fare policies.<br>3) Subsidy: When POF helps achieve public transportation objectives, reasonable levels of subsidy to fund it should be considered.<br>4) Priorities: Immediate and long-term<br>5) Immediate Priorities: Immediate priorities should receive reasonable levels of state and/or local assistance.<br>6) Immediate Priorities Criteria: POF service currently exists; there is no practical alternative; financial stability, infrastructure exists or is planned & funded; adds cost effective value to the regional transportation system; integrated with local planning & land use requirements.<br>7) Immediate Priorities: POF service between Seattle and Bremerton, Kingston, Southworth & Vashon. |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5) Seattle-Bainbridge plans will work only if privately-run Seattle-Kingston POF service draws away enough traffic. Policies might be needed to ensure the private POF provides this service level. (p 67)<br>6) Issues of moving people vs. moving vehicles come to play around congestion standards and fare policies. (p 68) | |
| Level of Service | Central Sound/North Sound/South Sound Service Areas<br>• Defined - Westbound PM Weekday Peak 3 PM-7PM boat-waits<br>• Pedestrians – no wait<br>• Vehicles – 1 boat-wait, except Bainbridge 2 boat-wait<br><br>San Juan Service Area<br>• Defined - % of monthly sailings where demand exceeds capacity<br>• Peak – 25% -<40%<br>• Off-peak – 15%-<25% (p 5) | Central Sound/North Sound/South Sound Service Areas<br>• Defined - Westbound PM Weekday Peak 3 PM-7PM boat-waits<br>• Pedestrians – no wait (measured by most congested sailing) (p 21)<br>• Vehicles – 1 boat-wait, except Bainbridge & Mukilteo 2 boat-wait (measured by average during peak) (p 21)<br>• Translated into wait times (p 7)<br>San Juan Service Area<br>• Daily and seasonal capacities are tracked<br>• Service growth to meet traffic growth (p 7) | |
| System-wide Ridership Projection/ Capacity | Basis<br>• Puget Sound Regional Council Projection<br>• 1993 Origin & Destination Study | Basis<br>Central Puget Sound & South Puget Sound Corridors<br>• 1999 Origin & Destination Study<br>• Puget Sound Regional Council model projects the growth rates for cross-sound commute period trips<br>• WSF transportation model estimates route choice & mode of access for each trip. (p ii)<br>• Uses historic ridership data on the relationship between commute-period ridership to project annual ridership. ( p iii)<br>• Use afternoon peak for service planning (p 13) | Basis<br>• POF service plays a small but targeted role in providing passenger service (Ten p. C-6)<br>• 2004: 5.7 million walk-on riders in Puget Sound corridors of which 3.4% on the Seattle-Vashon POF (Ten p 15) |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | North Puget Sound and San Juan Islands Corridors<br>• Office of Financial Management population projections through 2025 (p 11)<br>• Use afternoon peak for service planning in North Puget Sound (p 13)<br>• Use daily ridership in San Juan Islands Corridor (p 13) | |
| | Growth<br>70% growth in riders (p 3) | Growth<br>70% growth in riders with current service (p 15)<br>88% growth in riders with projected service (p 42,<br>Three principal factors affect ridership demand:<br>1) Demographic growth –particularly Kitsap County with 75% of peak afternoon commutes to expanded Tacoma Narrows Bridge & 25% to ferries<br>2) Financial – Ferry fares are planned to continue to increase annually, however the rate will be capped at 2.5% in line with inflation. As fares stabilize, growth will return to pre-I-695 levels.<br>3) Service related growth – As service improves, demand increases. (p 14) | Growth<br>35% Puget Sound routes 2003-2015 during the westbound peak (3:00 -7:00) (Ten, p 18) |
| | Capacity Increases if Plan Implemented<br>Vehicles – 55%<br>Passenger – 57% (p 33) | Capacity Increases if Plan Implemented<br>Service hours – 40% | Capacity Central Sound<br>• There is expected to be significant passenger-carrying capacity available on the passenger-vehicle ferries through the ten-year study period (2005-2015) (Ten p 16)<br>• All routes except POF Vashon & Bainbridge remain at less than 60% utilization during the peak 4-hour period westbound commute. POF Vashon at 118% utilization in 2015/Bainbridge at 73% (Ten p 19-20) |
| | Mode Change<br>• 55% walk-on from 41% during peak period (p 37)<br>…the future system must rely on more people walking on, rather than driving on to meet level-of-service standards (p. 13) | Mode Change<br>• 62% walk-on from 44% in 2003 during peak periods (p 14)<br>• 39% of total walk on from 27% in 2003 (p 42)<br>...will make WSF perhaps the most effective people- | Mode Change<br>• Of total Puget Sound growth, 74% from walk-on segment due primarily to the constraints on vehicle capacity – a greater share of future trips will be made using the interconnected |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | moving element of the state highway system. (p 14) | multimodal system. (Ten p. 33) |
| Central Sound Corridor<br>Edmonds-Kingston<br>Seattle-Bainbridge<br>Seattle-Bremerton | Ridership Current<br>• % of system- 54%<br>• 38% walk-on (p 42)<br>Ridership Projected<br>• 136% increase (p 10) | Ridership Current (2003)<br>• % of system- 56%<br>• 40% walk-on (p 42)<br>Ridership Projected<br>• 82% increase (p 42)<br>• Impact of private passenger only service on Bremerton route not known and could impact need and service. (p 35) | Peak Ridership Current (2003)<br>• % of Puget Sound ridership –62%<br>• 12.1 million riders (Ten, p 18)<br>Peak Ridership Projected<br>• 35% increase (Ten, p 18)<br>• Diversion impact of Seattle-Bremerton POF service -14.5% annual ridership (Parametrix, p 3-4)<br>• Diversion impact of Seattle-Kingston POV service -1.87% on Bainbridge-Seattle & Kingston-Edmonds passenger-vehicle ferries (Parametrix, p 3-4) |
| | Issues<br>1) Balance the attractiveness of the three routes to get better trip distribution.<br>2) Meeting total passenger demand vs. meeting projected vehicle demand for vehicles on the ferries.<br>3) Increasing the proportion of travelers who walk on the ferries and reducing the proportion who drive on. | Issues<br>1) Growth in vehicle demand in Kingston, Bremerton & Bainbridge Island routes. (p 34)<br>2) Growth in passenger demand on the Bainbridge route. (p 34)<br>3) Maintain manageable levels of vehicle traffic at Colman Dock and on SR-305 on Bainbridge Island. (p 33 Options Analysis) | Issues<br>1) Kitsap Transit plans to provide POF service from Bremerton to Pier 66 & 48 which could include up to five 149-passenger vessels operating at 15-minute headways. (Ten p 46)<br>2) Eighty-three percent of ridership on this route will come from existing & future WSF riders. The ridership diversion is significant given the available capacity on WSF's passenger-vehicle routes. In 2015 – 57% on Seattle-Bremerton capacity/73% on Seattle-Bainbridge. (Ten p 46) |
| | Plan designed to:<br>1) Accommodate doubling of demand.<br>2) Distribute demand by improving Bremerton service.<br>3) Reduce % of passengers who drive on-board.<br>4) Provide quicker service for commuters. (p. 44) | Plan designed to:<br>1) Expand capacity of existing Mark II vessels to increase passenger capacity for Bainbridge runs.<br>2) Distribute demand by improving Bremerton & Kingston service. Add third vessel to Bremerton and fourth vessel to Kingston, & assume private passenger-only ferry on Kingston route. | |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Edmonds-Kingston<br>• Service every 30 minutes<br>• 3 vessels: 206 car, 160 car, 218 car<br>• Edmonds – new terminal<br>• Kingston – additional POF slip | Edmonds-Kingston<br>• Service n/a<br>• 4 vessels: 144 cars (p 36)<br>• Assume private passenger only ferry Kingston Seattle (p 36)<br>• Edmonds – new terminal, two additional slips, overhead pedestrian loading complete by 2017 (p 49) | Edmonds-Kingston<br>• Operates at 22% of passenger capacity during peak PM in 2003/27% in 2015. (Ten p 19)<br>• WSF should not support private POF service given the ridership diversion from WSF's existing passenger-vehicle routes, the substantial passenger capacity available on these routes, & the regional investments in multimodal transportation linkages between Edmonds & downtown Seattle. (Ten p 34)<br>• State's interest to renew POF service between Kingston & Seattle<br>  • POF service existed<br>  • Infrastructure exists<br>  • Part of Kitsap County's land use & transportation planning<br>  • Part of Kingston's goals<br>  • Relieve pressure on state to provide service (Task p 8-9) |
| | Seattle – Bainbridge<br>• Service every 35 minutes<br>• 2 vessels: 218 car, 160 car<br>• Bainbridge – reconfigure & improve terminal.<br>• Seattle – expand existing terminal/add auto-passenger slips. | Seattle – Bainbridge<br>• Service every 35 minutes<br>• 2 vessels: with increased seating capacity (p 36)<br>• Bainbridge-expand terminal not because of new service but to accommodate growth. (p 50)<br>• Seattle – Remodel & add fourth slip by 2014. (p 50) | Seattle-Bainbridge<br>• Edmonds-Kingston POF would relieve pressure on Bainbridge Island peak. (Task p 9/ Parametrix p 3-4)<br>• Operates at 53% of passenger capacity during peak PM in 2003/73% in 2015. (Ten p 19) |
| | Seattle-Bremerton<br>• POF service every 45 minutes/auto-passenger every 60 minutes.<br>• 2 vessels: 218 car, 160 car<br>• Bremerton: reconfigure & improve terminal.<br>• Seattle – expand existing terminal/add POF & auto-passenger slips. (p 44) | Seattle-Bremerton<br>• Service every 50 minutes<br>• 3 vessels: 144 car and 2 with 188-202 cars | Seattle-Bremerton<br>• Operates at 61% of passenger capacity during peak PM in 2003/57% in 2015. (Ten p 19)<br>• Kitsap Transit plans to provide POF service from Bremerton to Piers 66 & 48, which could include up to five 149-passenger vessels operating at 15-minute headways. (Ten p 46)<br>• Primary state interest in POF service between Seattle & Bremerton.<br>• POF service exists |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • Service complements WSF service<br>• Infrastructure exists<br>• POF service part of Kitsap County's and Kitsap Transit plans<br>• Helps achieve City of Bremerton & City of Seattle goals. (Task, p 9) |
| North Sound<br>Mukilteo-Clinton<br>Port Townsend-Keystone | Ridership Current<br>• % of system - 21% with 85% of corridor ridership on Mukilteo-Clinton route<br>• 12% walk on/afternoon peak 23% (p 46)<br>Ridership Projection<br>• 43% increase in ridership (p 10)<br>Issues<br>1) Meeting increased demand on Mukilteo-Clinton route<br>2) Develop vessel technology to meet navigational issues on the Port Townsend-Keystone route. (p.46)<br><br>Plan designed to:<br>1) Address capacity issues on the Mukilteo-Clinton route<br>2) Address operational & regulatory issues on the Port Townsend-Keystone route.<br><br>Mukilteo-Clinton<br>• Service every 20 minutes<br>• 3 vessels: 130 cars<br>• Mukilteo- New terminal<br>• Clinton – Expansion & improvement to existing terminal.<br><br>Port Townsend-Keystone<br>• Service every 45 minutes<br>• 2 vessels: 110 cars<br>• Port Townsend terminal - No change<br>• Keystone terminal – No change (p 48) | Ridership 2003<br>• % of system - 20% with 84% of corridor ridership on Mukilteo-Clinton route<br>• 12% walk –on (p 42)<br>Ridership Projection<br>• 62% increase in ridership<br>Issues<br>1) Meeting vehicle demand on the routes<br>2) Tentative plan pending completion of Keystone Harbor Study. (p 37)<br>3) Keep vessel & terminal costs as low as possible. (p 39 Options Analysis)<br>Plan designed to:<br>1) Increase vehicle carrying capacity<br>2) Review service options when Keystone Harbor Study complete (p 37)<br><br>Mukilteo-Clinton<br>• Service n/a<br>• 3 vessels: 2- 144 cars and 1- 124 cars<br>• Mukilteo – Relocate with new terminal connected to Sounder station and bus transit center – complete 2010. (p 49)<br>• Clinton – Third slip & overhead loading by 2015.<br>Port Townsend-Keystone<br>• Study underway<br>• Plan assumes major harbor reconstruction & widening to allow use of larger vessels with 124-144 vehicle capacity. (p 38) | Peak Ridership Current (2003) (Mukilteo-Clinton)<br>• % of Puget Sound ridership –18%<br>• 3.5 million riders (Ten, p 18)<br>Peak Ridership Projected<br>• 29% increase (Ten, p 18)<br>Issues<br>1) Difficult to provide POF service given the relatively low demand and length of the route. (Ten p 32)<br>2) Clinton corridor has ample capacity to serve passenger demand – 2015 Mukilteo-Clinton will operate at 47% of capacity during the 4-hour P.M. peak. (Ten p 32)<br><br>Mukilteo-Clinton<br>• No POF service (Ten p 32)<br>• Operates at 36% of passenger capacity during peak hours in 2003/47% in 2015. (Ten p 19) |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| South Sound Corridor<br>Seattle-Vashon POF<br>Fauntleroy-Vashon-Southworth<br>Point Defiance-Tahlequah | Ridership Current<br>• % of system - 18%<br>• 13% walk on/afternoon peak 33% (p 38)<br>Ridership Projection<br>• 68% increase (p 10)<br><br>Issues<br>1) Constraints on any expansion at Fauntleroy terminal to meet projected demand.<br>2) Operational inefficiencies and problems associated with the triangle route.<br>3) Demand for direct service to Seattle from south corridor terminals. (p.40)<br><br>Plan designed to:<br>1) Accommodate increased total and demand for more direct connections.<br>2) Divert traffic increases away from Fauntleroy terminal which is currently operating at capacity.<br>3) Increase the proportion of passengers who walk-on & reduce the proportion that drive-on.<br>4) Split triangle route into three routes to provide direct | Ridership Current<br>• % of system -16%<br>• 19% walk on (p 42)<br>Ridership Projection<br>• 113% increase (p 42)<br><br>Issues<br>1) Fauntleroy terminal bottleneck primary challenge. (p 31)<br>2) Create a route structure that is convenient for the greatest number of riders. ( p 19 – Options Analysis)<br>3) Cost-effectiveness of solving Fauntleroy capacity issue. (p 19 Operations Analysis)<br><br>Plan designed to:<br>1) Divert traffic away from Fauntleroy (p 31)<br>2) Break-up triangle route and re-direct Southworth route & create three routes Fauntleroy & Vashon, Southworth & Vashon and Southworth & Seattle (p 31) | Peak Ridership Current (2003)<br>• % of Puget Sound ridership –20%<br>• 4 million riders (Ten, p 18)<br>Peak Ridership Projected<br>• 43% increase (Ten, p 18)<br>• POF diversion impact of Seattle-Bremerton POF service -14.5% annual ridership (Parametrix, p 3-4)<br>Issues<br>1) Kitsap Transit plans to provide POF service from Bremerton to Piers 66 & 48, which could include up to five 149-passenger vessels operating at 15-minute headways. (Ten p 46)<br>2) Eighty-three percent of ridership on this route will come from existing & future WSF riders. The ridership diversion is significant given the available capacity on WSF's passenger-vehicle routes. In 2015 – 56% on Fauntleroy-Southworth. (Ten p 46)<br>3) If Seattle-South Kitsap POF service is implemented by a public-private provider, WSF's South POF Triangle route would not be feasible. Choices for WSF then:<br>•Continue service after investing in smaller vessels.<br>••Leave the POF service, limited WSF service to the Vashon market to the Fauntleroy-Vashon passenger-vehicle route.<br>• Allow the Vashon market to be served by a new public sector operator, such as King County. (Ten p 47) |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | service between Southworth & Vashon, Fauntleroy & Vashon, and Fauntleroy & Southworth.<br>5) Increase capacity of POF between Seattle & Vashon. (p 40)<br><br>Fauntleroy-Vashon-Southworth<br>• No triangular service.<br>• Southworth: Additional POF slip<br>Fauntleroy –Southworth<br>• Service every 60 minutes<br>• 1 vessel – 130 cars<br><br>Seattle/Vashon<br>• POF service every 60 minutes<br>• 1 vessel – 350 passengers<br><br>Fauntleroy-Vashon<br>• Service every 30 minutes<br>• 2 vessels – 110/130 cars | Fauntleroy-Vashon-Southworth<br>• No triangular service after 2014. (p 32)<br><br>Southworth-Seattle<br>• Service every 50 minutes<br>• 2 vessels – 144 car, 2,000 passenger (p 33)<br>• New Colman Dock terminal (p 24)<br>• Southworth – add second slip by 2010 (p 50)<br><br>Seattle-Vashon<br>• Non-WSF operation (p 32)<br><br>Fauntleroy-Vashon<br>• Service every 30 minutes<br>• 2 vessels – 124 cars (p 32) | Fauntleroy-Vashon-Southworth<br>• Develop South Sound POF triangle route to serve existing Vashon & Southworth markets evolving toward a Seattle-Southworth passenger-vehicle ferry service. (Ten, p 51)<br>Southworth-Seattle<br>State interest in POF service between Southworth & Seattle:<br>• Community does not currently have POF service – must transfer on Vashon.<br>• A growing % of Vashon POF ferry commuters are from Southworth.<br>• Infrastructure exists. (Task p 8)<br>Seattle-Vashon<br>State interest in Seattle-Vashon POF service:<br>• Service for last 15 years.<br>• Vashon has no bridges – ferries only alternative.<br>• Constraints on passenger-vehicle service between Vashon & downtown Seattle due to Fauntleroy dock.<br>• Infrastructure exists.<br>• Helps achieve City of Seattle traffic congestion goals. (Task, p 8)<br>• POF service operates at 59% of passenger capacity during PM peak in 2003/118% in 2015 (Ten, p 19)<br>Fauntleroy-Vashon<br>• Operates at 33% of passenger capacity during PM peak in 2003/39% in 2015. (Ten, p 19) |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Vashon-Southworth<br>• Service every 60 minutes<br>• 1 vessel – 65 cars<br>Point Defiance-Tahlequah<br>• Service every 50 minutes<br>• 1 vessel – 75 cars (page 40) | Vashon-Southworth<br>• Service every 50-60 minutes<br>• 1 vessel - 40 cars (p 33)<br>Point Defiance-Tahlequah<br>• Service n/a<br>• 1 vessel – 87 cars | Vashon Southworth<br>• Operates at 4% of passenger capacity during PM peak in 2003/7% in 2015. (Ten, p 19)<br>Point Defiance-Tahlequah<br>• Operates at 25% of passenger capacity during peak hours /2015 from 15% due to additional capacity with new vessel. (Ten p 19) |
| San Juan Islands Corridor<br>Anacortes-Friday Harbor routes<br>Inter-Island routes<br>International route | Ridership Current<br>• % of system- 6% of which 71% bound for Orcas Island or Friday Harbor<br>• 13% walk-on (p 50)<br>Ridership Projected<br>• 68% increase<br>Issues<br>1) Balancing service to all destinations.<br>2) Meeting vehicle demand vs. person demand.<br>3) Operating within the constraints of single lane loading at the island terminals. (p 52)<br><br>Plan designed to:<br>1) Separate the routes from Anacortes so the each route serves one or two islands instead of the current system of dual, multi-terminal routes.<br>2) Meet additional vehicle demand to Orcas Island and Friday Harbor.<br>3) Minimize the use of Super Class vessels in order to minimize dock time at island terminals. (p. 52)<br>Anacortes/San Juans/Sidney<br>• Change to individual routes<br><br>Anacortes – Lopez<br>• Service every 120 minutes<br>• 1 vessel: 100 car<br>• Anacortes – Expand multi-modal terminal. | Ridership Current<br>• % of system – 8%<br>• 17% walk-on<br><br>Ridership Projected<br>• 77% increase<br>Issues<br>1) Meet vehicle demand in all three sectors. (p 39)<br>2) Configure service to best serve the greatest number of customers. (p 41)<br>3) Keep vessel & terminal costs as low as possible. (p 41)<br>Plan designed to:<br>1) Maximize possible service by adding one vessel to the Anacortes/San Juans/Sidney routes. (p 39)<br><br>Anacortes/San Juans/Sidney<br>• Vessels: 5 in spring & fall/6 in summer/winter 4 vessels (p 39-40)<br>• Anacortes – Expanded multi-modal terminal to be complete 2015/third slip 2011/tie-up slips re-located. | Issues<br>Do not modify San Juan Islands rate structures. (Ten, p ES-10) |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Anacortes - Orcas - Shaw<br>• Service every 180 minutes.<br>• 1 vessel : 160 car<br>• Anacortes – Expand multi-modal terminal.<br>Anacortes – Orcas & Friday Harbor<br>• Service every 120 minutes<br>• 1 vessel: 160 car<br>• Anacortes – Expand multi-modal terminal.<br>• Friday Harbor – Minor improvements to improve loading capacity 2 lanes & pedestrian improvements.<br>Anacortes –Friday Harbor<br>• Service every 120 minutes<br>• 1 vessel: 160 car<br>• Anacortes – Expand multi-modal terminal.<br>• Friday Harbor – Minor improvements to improve loading capacity 2 lanes & pedestrian improvements.<br>Interisland Ferry<br>• Service every 120 minutes<br>• 1 vessel: 100 car<br>Anacortes –Sidney by 2015<br>• Non-WSF carrier (p 50) | Interisland Ferry<br>• 1 vessel – 90 cars (p 40)<br><br>Anacortes –Sidney by 2015<br>• One daily trip<br>• 1 vessel-124 car possibly different (p 40)<br>• Anacortes – Expanded multi-modal terminal to be complete 2015/third slip 2011/tie-up slips re-located. | |
| Union Agreements | | | • The peak nature of POF demand is a defining feature of the service, and a critical issue to address in designing a cost-effective and sustainable operating plan. (Ten p 27)<br>• The ability to match service provision to morning and afternoon peaks affected by WSF's ability to work with its labor unions to implement split shifts. WSF has traditionally been tied to continuous 8-hour shifts. Given morning & evening demand, it is necessary to |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | employ two of these 8-hour blocks, resulting in 16 hours of service. Because demand is low during the mid-day, the result is inefficient service with low vessel utilization and relatively low cost-recovery. (Ten p 29)<br>• WSF now has very few part-time employees – about 10 on the vessel side and 35 on the terminal side-and no split shifts. Split shifts are widely used by transit agencies to efficiently match hours of crew service with peak travel demand periods. In Western Washington split shifts are the rule among transit providers. (Ten p 31)<br>• To provide POF service that is financially feasible, WSF & labor will need to agree on a flexible approach to crewing the service. WSF's interest should be to realize the most cost-effective approach to manning the vessels that is still within the requirements set by the Coast Guard. (Ten p 31)<br>• On call practice needs to change, from relief crews guaranteed a minimum of 8 hours pay for call-outs, to work for/work paid practice. (Ten, p 31) |
| Terminal Revenues | | | • Terminal concession plan – five RFPs issued before responses received. (Ten p F-1)<br>• Colman Dock – project $538,000 in FY 2006/ WSF contributed $50 per sq. ft. to develop.<br>• Anacortes – Café fees projected $47,000 in FY 2006.<br>• Bainbridge – Concessions projected $58,000 in 2006 (if moved inside).<br>• Clinton – Concessions projected $10,000 FY 2006.<br>• Edmonds – marginal revenue.<br>• Southworth – Projected $15,000 FY 2006.<br>• Sidney – summer 2004 concessions $16,000. |

| Area | WSF Systems Plan 1999-2018 (Final June 1999) | WSF Draft Long Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 | Passenger-Only Studies |
|---|---|---|---|
| San Juan Fare | | | • Tariff Policy Committee recommended that WSF maintain the current fare structure in the San Juan Islands because the fares are consistent with overall system priorities and have been refined to reflect the unique nature of the San Juan Islands travel corridor. (Appendix p 1)<br>• Tariff Policy Committee has agreed to review the spread between regular fares and frequent user fares in 2005. (Appendix p 2)<br>• Policy basis for WSF fares<br>  • CUBE – Amount of space occupied by a vehicle on a vessel. (Appendix p 2)<br>  • Tariff Route Equity – tariffs related to time on ferry with all routes defined by their relationship to Bainbridge Island.<br>  • Relationship of vehicle & passenger fares: 3.5:1 ratio on all routes except San Juan Islands.<br>  • Fares set for Seattle-Bainbridge car vehicle driver and then adjusted.<br>  • Implementation of Tariff Route Equity scheduled from 2000-2009.<br>• San Juan specific policies<br>  • Reflect difference from other routes in customer base (few commuters).<br>  • Fares in San Juans have different discounts than others/unique time of week discounts etc. |