

Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project

Preliminary Site Screening and Evaluation July 2023



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	3
What is the KT Ferry Program?	3
What is the Project?	3
2. Purpose and need	4
Purpose of the Project	4
Need for the Project	4
3. Early Alternatives Identification	6
Why was this report developed?	6
What sites were considered as part of the Project?	7
How has public engagement informed the Project?	7
Early Scoping	9
4. Criteria and Alternatives Development	10
Identify Range of Alternative Locations	10
Physical and Operational Requirements of the Facility	12
Resulting Criteria	13
5. Preliminary Site Screening	17
Criterion 1: Site Zoning Consistency	17
Criterion 2: Compatibility with Existing and Planned Uses	18
Criterion 3: Terminal Access and Multi-modal Connections	21
Criterion 4: Water Depths	25
Criterion 5: Vessel Programming and Navigation	26
Preliminary Site Screening Summary	30
6. Preliminary Site Screening Findings by Site	31
7. Next Steps: Evaluation of Alternatives	48

Appendices

- Appendix A Survey Results for Proposed Terminal Location Criteria
- Appendix B Early Scoping Outreach Summary Report
- Appendix C Pier 50 Constraints and Conflicts
- Appendix D Summary of Waterfront Sites
- Appendix E Summary of Physical and Operational Requirements
- Appendix F Site Access Analysis
- Appendix G- In-water Layouts

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
City	City of Seattle
DPR	Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
KCMD	King County Marine Division
KT	Kitsap Transit
MLLW	Mean Lower Low Water
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
POF	Passenger-only Ferry
Port	Port of Seattle
Project	Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project
PSRC	Puget Sound Regional Council
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
WDNR	Washington Department of Natural Resources
WSF	Washington State Ferries
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

The Kitsap Transit (KT) Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project (Project) seeks to expand passenger-only ferry (POF) terminal capacity in downtown Seattle. The first phases of the Project, described in this report, provide an assessment of potential ferry terminal locations along the downtown Seattle waterfront that could support long-term operational needs of KT's Fast Ferry service. This report summarizes the process used to define the physical and operational needs for the ferry terminal, identify possible terminal locations, establish site screening criteria, and conduct preliminary site screening that resulted in the identification of reasonable alternatives for further study. Additional environmental and technical analysis is planned on the three selected sites that best meet the preliminary screening criteria.

Alternatives Development and Screening

The alternatives development and site screening process included the following steps:

- **Identify potential locations**. The range of alternative sites considered in this study included properties along the downtown Seattle waterfront between Pier 46 and Pier 70 (shown in Figure Ex.1).
- Define the physical and operational needs for the facility. The operational requirements and infrastructure needed to support KT's current POF service was used as the basis to define the minimum spatial requirements of an expanded KT POF terminal, including the infrastructure and space needed for vessels, passengers and crew.
- Establish screening criteria. Five criteria were established to evaluate sites based on minimum physical and operational needs of a long-term POF terminal facility. Preliminary screening criteria reflect feedback from early scoping and discussions with stakeholders
- **Conduct preliminary site screening**. The range of alternative sites were screened based on the screening criteria established: site use compatibility, terminal access and modal connections, and space for vessel programming and navigation.

Results of Alternative Screening

Preliminary site screening identified three sites that meet all screening criteria and could reasonably support a long-term POF terminal facility. The three sites are all located on the southern end of the Seattle waterfront and share many of the same opportunities and challenges. Each site would require coordination with multiple stakeholders. KT selected the Pier 48 property as the proposed preferred alternative because it ranks high on all five criteria and is the only one that has sufficient space to support a long-term POF terminal facility without affecting other waterfront properties. A new terminal located at the Pier 46 North Apron is feasible but would require demolition of the existing Pier 48 and long-term use of in-water space on the Pier 48 property. The Pier 58 location is also feasible with respect to available space but would require coordination with the City of Seattle (City) for potential modifications of the City's plans for their new park.

A summary of the screening results for all sites is presented in Table 5.7. Individual site maps and a summary of screening results by site are available beginning on page 34.

Pier 48 (*Proposed preferred alternative*) is owned by Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and is comprised of upland areas and an over-water wooden dilapidated pier structure. WSDOT has plans to remove the pier structure and has programmed \$20 million in their 2023-2025 Capital Improvement and Preservation Program budget. The site uplands are temporarily in use by Washington State Ferries (WSF) for overflow vehicle holding and have been identified for potential future use for WSF electrification charging infrastructure. Additionally, King County holds a short-term lease for location of the King County Water Taxi vessel maintenance float on the north side of the existing pier with adjacency to the water taxi operating slip from Pier 50.

Pier 46 North Apron is owned by the Port of Seattle (Port), who is currently reviewing potential future uses for the site. With only 240 feet of existing open waterway, the site would require additional in-water space from the planned removal of Pier 48 to accommodate POF terminal operations and allow for maneuvering of vessels from the adjacent site.

Pier 58 is owned by City of Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation and is currently under construction to become a public park in 2025 known as Waterfront Park. The current park design does not provide space for a POF terminal or operating slips; therefore, this site would require physical modifications and/or changes to programmed park features in order to incorporate POF operations. Site use would also require a lease from WDNR for tidelands space.

Figure Ex. 1 shows the range of alternatives and highlights the three sites identified to reasonably support a POF facility.

A summary of all site screening results can be found in Table 6.1, followed by detailed overviews of site screening results for each site.



Figure Ex.1: Range of Alternatives

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 2

I. INTRODUCTION

What is the KT Ferry Program?

Kitsap Transit's (KT) ferry program is part of the Puget Sound regional passenger-only ferry (POF) system. KT operates local Foot Ferry service from Port Orchard and Annapolis to Bremerton as well as crosssound Fast Ferry service from three Kitsap County communities to downtown Seattle. The three cross-sound routes provide faster transportation options for people traveling between the Kitsap Peninsula and downtown Seattle than the alternative roadway or auto ferry options. Service from Bremerton to Seattle was implemented in July 2017, Kingston to Seattle in November 2018 and the Southworth to Seattle route began operations in March 2021.

The KT ferry program has grown to a fleet of ten vessels including seven high-speed vessels available for cross-sound service. Currently, four of the high-speed vessels Figure 1.1: Kitsap Fast Ferry Route Map showing the three KT routes connecting to the Pier 50 facility in downtown Seattle.



provide scheduled service and the remaining three are used as back-up. Four of the high-speed vessels are equiped for bowloading, the most efficient way to move passengers on and off the vessel. However, bowloading is currently only utililized at the Southworth terminal in the Washington State Ferries (WSF) auto slip, which does not have specific side-loading POF facilities available.

In downtown Seattle, the three KT routes land at Pier 50—the only public POF facility serving downtown Seattle.

What is the Project?

KT launched the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project (Project) to expand POF terminal facility capacity in downtown Seattle. Sites along the downtown Seattle waterfront are limited and in demand for water-dependent uses and available space is constrained. The Project's first phase focused on assessment of potential terminal locations for KT's long-term Fast Ferry operations, reviewing potential sites along the waterfront and identifying preferred downtown Seattle terminal locations. Development of a new POF terminal facility would improve reliability of this regional transit service by addressing the current limited POF landing site capacity on the Seattle waterfront at the current Pier 50 location.

2. PURPOSE AND NEED

KT and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) identified a preliminary purpose and need for the Project as part of early scoping conducted under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The purpose and need is also the basis for screening of alternatives in this report, which uses planning level evaluation criteria based on the Project purpose and need.

Purpose of the Project

Expanded POF terminal facilities will increase vessel docking capacity and provide increased space for passenger staging capacity and improved rider amenities, including restrooms and bicycle storage. Additionally, the Project seeks to incorporate shoreside infrastructure and equipment to support electric vessel charging.

The purpose of the Project is to improve regional mobility through expanded POF terminal facilities on the downtown Seattle waterfront to:

- Increase vessel docking capacity.
- Increase passenger staging capacity and improve rider amenities, including restrooms and bicycle storage.
- Incorporate shoreside infrastructure and equipment to support electric vessel charging.
- Increase integration of passenger only ferry travel with other transit modes.
- Maintain or improve rider accessibility to Seattle business, employment, cultural and retail destinations.
- Create opportunities for growth of regional passenger-only ferry routes throughout the Puget Sound Region.
- Improve access to jobs and housing opportunities in regional growth centers.
- Expand mobility options for minority and low-income populations.

Need for the Project

Additional terminal facilities are needed because:

- The current POF terminal in downtown Seattle, Pier 50, is the only public facility of its kind. This facility can only accommodate two vessels at one time.
- The Pier 50 POF terminal facility does not have shoreside space for equipment and infrastructure needed to support future electric vessel charging, such as energy storage systems.
- Kitsap Transit's passenger-only ferry service frequency cannot be increased during peak commute periods due to the limited landing site capacity. Current service is limited to 12 landings from the three Kitsap Transit routes within the peak period.
- Terminal docking congestion leads to cascading departure delays and schedule disruptions.

- Access between the more affordable housing on the Kitsap peninsula and the Downtown Seattle job center is constrained due to limited frequency of the POF ferry service. Alternatives to POF ferry service include auto/passenger ferry service provided by WSF, bus transit, or driving; all of which result in travel times roughly twice as long as KT's POF service routes.
- The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) 2020 Puget Sound Passenger-only Ferry Study identified the lack of landing site capacity in downtown Seattle as a barrier to potential future routes or service expansion.

All three KT Fast Ferry routes, served by four vessels, currently operate out of Pier 50 on the Seattle side. KT shares the use of Pier 50 with King County Metro, the facility owner and operator of two water taxi routes, under a five-year use agreement expiring August 2024. The Pier 50 facility is a single float that supports a maximum of two side-loading vessels (one on each side) at any one time. Sailing times for the KT routes are limited by slip availability at Pier 50 and additional landing facilities are required to ensure reliable, on-time service that meets rider travel needs now and into the future. With only two operating slips, the Pier 50 facility has limited capacity to accommodate rider-optimized service schedules. In addition, existing



operators are struggling at the current facility to accommodate existing service levels and do not have landing capacity to accommodate additional routes or expansion of current route service levels, should they be pursued in the future.

The Project aims to identify a site that will increase integration of POF travel with other transit modes and maintain or improve rider accessibility to Seattle business, employment, cultural and retail destinations. Additional POF landing capacity will accommodate the long-term operation of current KT POF

service, with the goal of improving access to jobs and housing opportunities in regional growth centers and expanding mobility options for minority and low-income populations. Additionally, expanded POF terminal facilities will be designed with consideration of not precluding future opportunities for expansion or growth of regional POF service.

Appendix C provides additional detail on the constraints to expanding in-water and uplands capacity at Pier 50.

3. EARLY ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFICATION

Why was this report developed?

As a first step in planning and constructing an expanded POF terminal facility in Seattle, KT conducted an alternatives development process to identify potentially viable site options for the Project, in alignment with the Project purpose and need and FTA guidelines. This report summarizes the process used to define the physical and operational needs for the facility, identify possible locations, establish screening criteria, and conduct preliminary site screening to identify reasonable alternatives. Additional future work will include more detailed environmental and technical analysis on those sites that best meet the preliminary screening criteria identified in this report.

The site selection process included site alternative identification, narrowing of potential sites and additional review and analysis is detailed in Figure 3.1. This Preliminary Site Screening and Evaluation report represents completion of the second phase of alternatives development.



Figure 3.1. Alternatives Development Process

What sites were considered as part of the Project?

The range of alternative sites considered in this study included properties along the downtown Seattle waterfront, which extends as far south as Pier 46 and as far north as Pier 70, as shown in Figure 3.2. The range of alternatives was defined by the following Project siting requirements:

- Located in proximity to downtown Seattle, recognized as the most in-demand destination in Seattle.
- Located within walking distance of destinations including transit connections, job centers, and other attractions.
- Meet KT obligation to voters by providing three POF routes connecting to downtown Seattle. Kitsap Fast Ferries is partially funded by a voter approved local sales tax, and therefore the agency is obligated to provide the service that was proposed in the ballot measure.



Study Area for Seattle Terminal Alternative Analysis

How has public engagement informed the Project?

Public engagement, including Tribal and agency outreach, was conducted throughout the early phases of project development and is planned to continue in future NEPA and SEPA processes. project. Initial engagement included a public survey and early stakeholder outreach to waterfront property owners and local agencies. This initial outreach focused on understanding priorities for a new POF landing and identifying site physical and operational requirements. During the subsequent early scoping process, outreach was expanded to include publishing the Project preliminary purpose and need and hosting three public meetings. Through early scoping, KT garnered feedback from many local and regional agencies and interested organizations, Fast Ferry users, members of the public, and Tribes. The feedback gathered from each of these public engagement opportunities informed and strengthened the development of screening criteria which helped to narrow potential sites.

Outreach and Stakeholder Discussions

Preliminary criteria and alternatives development and site screening were informed by feedback from key waterfront stakeholders (property owners, agencies, and resource managers):

- Washington State Ferries
- Port of Seattle
- King County Metro
- City of Seattle Office of the Waterfront
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources
- Sound Transit
- Miner's Landing (Pier 57)
- Argosy (Pier 55/56)
- Ivar's (Pier 54)
- Puget Sound Regional Council
- United States Coast Guard

Information and feedback gathered through discussions with stakeholders included the following:

- Stakeholders recognized the need for additional POF terminal capacity in Seattle and were supportive of this effort.
- Additional study considerations and facility programming needs for a new or expanded POF terminal facility should include a focus on multi-modal connections, rider destinations, and walkability (including elevation).
- Stakeholders also emphasized the importance of proximity to the transit hub at WSF's Colman Dock.
- There are greater redevelopment opportunities at the southern end of the waterfront, and opportunities to support future routes and operators through its potential for expansion.

Public Survey Results

An online survey was conducted to gather feedback on a preliminary list of site assessment criteria. The survey was open between May 15 and May 31, 2021, and received 1,074 responses.

The survey asked respondents to review the proposed criteria for site assessment listed below and to provide feedback or suggestions of additional criteria for site assessment.

- Access and Connections for Riders
- Passenger and Vessel Programming Needs
- Vessel Navigation Requirements
- Environmental, Cultural and Historical Impacts
- Environmental Justice
- Community Input

- Land Use and Ownership
- Expansion Capacity
- Financial Feasibility

Seventy-three percent of respondents were satisfied with the proposed criteria with no changes. Of the respondents with suggestions, one of the top themes resulted in the addition of the criterion for access, connections, and integration to transit, ferries, the downtown, and jobs. Another suggestion was for the passenger and facility programming needs criterion to include covered areas with places to sit. An additional point of emphasis was for the safety and security requirements of vessel navigation. A summary of the study criteria survey results is included in Appendix A.

Early Scoping

Because KT anticipates applying for grant funds from the FTA for future Project phases, the Project must comply with the NEPA. In conjunction with the FTA, KT conducted early scoping as part of the siting study in preparation for later NEPA reviews. Early scoping is an optional step in the NEPA process that is intended to invite input from agencies, Tribes, members of the public, and other interested parties early in project planning. A summary of the early scoping process is included in Appendix B..

During early scoping, KT asked for comments on:

- The Project's proposed purpose and need statement developed for the Early Scoping Notice published by KT and FTA.
- The refined list of evaluation criteria presented in the Early Scoping Information Report.
- The potential impacts and benefits of the Project.
- Other considerations that are relevant to the evaluation of alternatives.

KT and FTA published an Early Scoping Notice in the Federal Register on May 12, 2022, to advise Tribes, agencies, and the public about the Project and invite comments, which were accepted through June 13, 2022. A total of 57 comments were received, with each comment addressing one or more topics, from the following groups:

- Tribal: 1 comment (Muckleshoot Indian Tribe)
- Government/Agencies: 7 comments
- Non-Profit Organizations: 4 comments
- General Public: 45 comments

The Federal Register notice stated that KT will use the comments received from early scoping to help identify and narrow the range of Project location alternatives for future evaluation in a combined NEPA/SEPA environmental document. As such, input from early scoping informed the preliminary site screening summarized in this report and will inform future environmental and technical site analyses.

4. CRITERIA AND ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

The first step of the alternative development process included the development of the criteria that would be used to screen potential sites for viability as a long-term KT Fast Ferry terminal facility. It also involved initial identification and review of potential site locations and the refinement of screening criteria informed by public outreach and the FTA early scoping process. KT completed the following steps as a part of the criteria and alternatives development, as depicted in Figure 4.1 and outlined in more detail in the following section:

- <u>IDENTIFIED</u> the range of alternative locations.
- <u>DEFINED AND REFINED</u> the physical and operational requirements for a long-term POF terminal facility.
- <u>DEVELOPED</u> initial site screening criteria to identify feasible alternatives.
- <u>CONDUCTED EARLY SCOPING AND OTHER OUTREACH</u> to gather feedback on the range of alternative locations, to develop and refine the Project purpose and need and screening criteria. Outreach activities included:
 - o Discussions with waterfront stakeholders
 - o Public online survey on study criteria
 - FTA early scoping

Identify Range of Alternative Locations

The downtown Seattle waterfront, between the north end of Pier 46 and Pier 70, was examined to identify the initial range of alternative locations that would go through the site screening process. This geographic area was identified as reasonably close to employment, services and transportation hubs in downtown Seattle.

The 17 potential alternative site locations in the range were identified by parcel, and pier identification number associated with the landside (upland) property. The piers or in-water infrastructure of each property is shown on Figure 4.2 with additional property detail in Table 4.1. Appendix D provides an overview of site ownership, existing uses, and known development plans of each site included in analysis.

Figure 4.1: Project Process Diagram—Criteria and Alternatives Development





Figure 4.2. Downtown Seattle Waterfront Project Study Area Map

Table 4.1: Alternative Location Information Matrix

Pier	Site	Site Owner	
46	Port of Seattle North Apron	Port of Seattle	
48	KCMD Maintenance Barge/WSF vehicle queuing	WSDOT (WDNR owns waterway)	
50	Existing POF Facility	WSDOT	
52	Colman Dock WSF Terminal	WSDOT	
53	Fire Station No. 5	City of Seattle	
54	lvar's	Privately held	
55	Argony	Drivetely held	
56	Argosy		
57	Miner's Landing & Great Wheel	Privately held / WDNR	
58	Waterfront Park	Seattle DPR	
59	Seattle Aquarium	WDNR/ Seattle DPR	
62	Park	Seattle DPR	
63	Park	Seattle DPR	
66	Bell Harbor Marina	Port of Seattle/ WDNR	
67	Edgewater Hotel	State of WA / WDNR / Private owner	
69	Clipper Vacations	Port of Seattle	
70	Office/Restaurant Space	Privately held	

WDNR: Washington State Department of Natural Resources DPR: Department of Parks and Recreation

KCMD: King County Marine Division WSDOT: Washington State Department of Transportation

Physical and Operational Requirements of the Facility

With the Project purpose and need as a starting point, and with input from stakeholders and operating staff, KT identified the minimum physical and operational requirements for a Seattle POF terminal facility. These requirements include the infrastructure and space needed to support vessel and terminal operations and provide a minimum level of space and amenities for passengers and crew. The requirements can be broken down into the categories summarized below. Refer to Appendix E for a detailed list of physical and operational requirements.

Site Use and Existing/Planned Use Compatibility

To support KT's long-term needs for POF service, POF must be an allowable use. Additionally, the existing and planned uses of a site must be able to operate in proximity to POF without potential safety or security conflicts.

Terminal Access and Connections

The facility requires a high level of pedestrian and multi-modal connectivity to provide riders with convenient access to jobs, services and connections to other regional transit connections such as Link light rail and Rapid Transit bus service. Additional terminal needs will include vehicle access for deliveries, passenger pick-up/drop-off spaces, and storage/access for bikes and scooters.

Vessel Capacity and Navigation

Currently, four vessels operate on KT's three cross-sound routes from Kingston, Bremerton and Southworth during the morning and evening commute periods, as shown in Table 4.2. This means vessels are arriving and departing many times during two compact time frames every weekday. To accommodate this docking demand there should be one dedicated slip for each of the three routes. For system resiliency, an additional slip is needed to either perform routine repairs, inspections or provide a lay-over space when needed.

Of the minimum four operating slips (three in service and one back-up/lay-up) needed for vessels operations, at least two of these slips will need to support bow-loading vessels and at least two will support side-loading. All slips at the facility must have adequate protection from wind, waves, and wakes from vessel traffic. Additionally, the facility will require sufficient inwater space to allow simultaneous maneuvering for at least two vessels.

Route Served	Vessel (8 of 10 in fleet)	Length (feet)	Beam (feet)	Bow or Side Loading
Kingston	Finest	125	32.9	Side
Bremerton	RP1 / Reliance /Lady Swift	78-81.7	28.2	Side
Southworth/Kingston	Enetai / Commander	140	39	Bow
Back-up	Solano	125	39.4	Bow & Side

Table 4.2: KT Fast Ferry Cross-Sound Fleet

Passenger Capacity and Amenities

To promote on-time, reliable service, the new facility must allow queuing and disembarking of passengers on all three KT routes simultaneously. The passenger capacity of the vessels assigned to the three routes ranges from the 118-passenger ultra-low-wake Rich Passage class vessels, designed to minimize wake impacts to Rich Passage beaches, to the 350-passenger *MV Finest*, acquired from NY Waterways to initiate service on the Kingston-Seattle route. Queuing capacity for the three routes is approximately 700 passengers in three designated lanes. The passenger spaces must be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible and include covered queuing for all riders.

The new facility must include 2 ADA-compliant restrooms and should have other amenities including ticket vending machines and electronic signage.

Crew and Staff Spaces

The new facility should include an office space/staff breakroom for approximately six people and will have a designated space for secure storage of supplies and operating equipment. An employee restroom would also be provided, and two parking spaces will be available at the facility for KT maintenance vehicles. Because the three KT cross-sound routes homeport in Kitsap County, crew spaces will not need to support the day-to-day needs of vessel operating crew.

Future Flexibility

Within the design life of the facility, KT anticipates that vessel electrification or use of alternative fuels will be required for ferries to achieve state goals for reduced or zero emissions. Although space and equipment needs are currently unknown, the new facility will include additional upland and in-water space where infrastructure can be added for future electric charging of vessels or to accommodate the future adoption of other alternative fuels. Although future service expansion or new routes are not planned at this time, sufficient additional space to not preclude future expansion of existing service and/or new routes is also desired.

Resulting Criteria

The physical and operational program requirements for KT Fast Ferry service were used to develop site evaluation criteria. Available space on the Seattle waterfront is limited, particularly for sites which meet KT's needs for site use compatibility, terminal access and modal connections, and vessel programming and navigation. Sites that did not meet these criteria were deemed unreasonable for development of a POF terminal facility and eliminated. More detailed information about the analysis of these criteria can be found in the next sections of this report.

These criteria were grouped into five main categories, which include the following:

- 1. Zoning Is POF an allowable use?
- **2.** Existing and Planned Use Compatibility Are the existing and planned uses on the site compatible with POF programming and operations?
- **3.** Terminal Access and Modal Connections Does the site provide access to the downtown jobs, services, entertainment destinations and transit connections that riders want? How convenient is this access?
- 4. Water Depths Are water depths at the site sufficient to support safe vessel operations?

5. Vessel Programming and Navigation – Does the site have sufficient in-water space for the proposed slips and for POF vessels to operate safely and reliably?

Additional review criteria associated with how a particular site fits the needed operational program will be addressed in the future design phase of the project, depicted in Figure 4.3 below. Based on project goals, potential criteria identified for future evaluation include the following:

- Passenger Spaces Does the site have space for the covered queuing and passenger amenities proposed?
- Staff/Crew Spaces Does the site provide enough space to accommodate the staff/crew spaces proposed for the facility?
- Future Flexibility How flexible is the site for future POF needs? Does the site have sufficient space to not preclude potential expansion for in-water and uplands infrastructure?

Figure 4.3: Site Alternatives Review Diagram



Criteria Defined

The specific elements of the five criteria can be found in Table 4.3. As mentioned above, this first level of review focused on these five criteria, while evaluation of the remaining criteria will be incorporated in a future NEPA/SEPA environmental review process that will evaluate reasonable alternatives.

Preliminary Site Screening Criteria				
Criterion 1: Site Zoning Consistency	Criterion 2: Existing and Planned Site Use Compatibility	Criterion 3: Terminal Access and Modal Connections	Criterion 4: Water Depths	Criterion 5: Vessel Programming and Navigation
Current zoning designation supports a POF terminal facility as an allowable use	POF operations are compatible with existing and planned site uses	Ped/Bike : Easy pedestrian and bike connections to downtown core and transit connections Multi-modal : Access to multi- modal connections	Sufficient water depths for safe POF operations in areas where vessels will operate	Sufficient distance between structures or property boundaries to accommodate POF infrastructure without infringing on regulated waterways or view corridors, existing critical transportation infrastructure and allow two vessels to maneuver simultaneously

Table 4.3: Preliminary Site Screening Criteria (1-5)

Early Scoping Feedback on Criteria

During early scoping, KT and FTA requested feedback on the proposed preliminary site screening criteria, as presented in the Early Scoping Information Report, included as an attachment to Appendix B. KT and FTA reviewed all feedback received for consideration in this and future project phases. Feedback regarding site screening criteria was mainly focused on site use compatibility and site access (criteria 1 and 2), including specific criteria that should be considered in evaluation of pedestrian and multimodal connections, as detailed below in Table 4.5. Feedback related to terminal access and modal connections was incorporated into site analysis by influencing which measures of access were weighted more heavily in site analysis.

Table 4.5: Incorporation of Early Scoping Comments into Screening Criteria

Early Scoping Comments and Related Criterion			
Early Scoping Comment	How comment has been incorporated into site screening criteria analysis		
Include consideration of planned site uses in review of site compatibility	Captured in Criterion 2: Existing & Planned Site Use Compatibility. In addition to current uses, future planned uses were considered.		
Importance of considering bicycle access	Captured in Criterion 3: Terminal Access and Modal Connections. Certain measures of access were weighted more heavily than others based on early scoping feedback received.		
Importance of proximity to transit (including WSF's Colman Dock)	Captured in Criterion 3: Terminal Access and Modal Connections. Certain measures of access were weighted more heavily than others based on feedback received.		
Importance of proximity to central business district and stadium district	Captured in Criterion 3: Terminal Access and Modal Connections. Certain measures of access were weighted more heavily than others based on feedback received.		

Feedback from early scoping relevant to initial site assessment criteria was incorporated into the criteria, as detailed in the following sections. A summary of the early scoping process and all early scoping feedback is included in Appendix B

.

5. PRELIMINARY SITE SCREENING

Preliminary site screening focused on five criteria that relate to physical and operational requirements: site use compatibility, terminal access and multimodal connections, and vessel programming and navigation. The following sections detail the results of site assessment and screening.

Criterion I: Site Zoning Consistency

Property zoning is a designation of allowable use of a property that is established by the local jurisdiction to guide development and property use consistent with its community vision. For this siting analysis, a site is considered a reasonable alternative if the current zoning designation supports a POF terminal facility as an allowable use.

Criterion Application

Each site alternative was reviewed to assess current zoning designation and ownership.

Criterion Scoring Definition

High – POF is an allowable use

Low – POF would not be an allowed use

Preliminary Screening Results

Review of City of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections land use code definitions showed that POF is an allowed use for all sites. Zoning designations by site are presented in Table 5.1.



Figure 5.1: Project Process Diagram

Site Identification	Zoning ^{1,2} and Shoreline Designation	Screening Result
Pier 46 (North Apron only)	IGI U85, Urban Industrial	High
Pier 48	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 50	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 52	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 53	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 54	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 55/56	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 57	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 58	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 59	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 62	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 63	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 66	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 67	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 69	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High
Pier 70	DH1/45, Urban Harborfront	High

Table 5.1: Criteria 1 – Site Zoning Consistency Preliminary Screening Results

¹ IGI U85: General Industrial 1 / Unlimited 85

² DH1/45: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Next Steps for Further Evaluation

Detailed review of zoning and permitting requirements would occur for site design and environmental review.

Criterion 2: Compatibility with Existing and Planned Uses

The Seattle waterfront has many established uses including water-dependent businesses, parks, and cultural and recreational attractions. Additionally, the waterfront has undergone extensive planning and construction to support the Waterfront Seattle revitalization projects and the State Route 99 tunnel and surface transportation improvements. These projects include transportation, parks and shoreline restoration improvements. The Existing and Planned Uses criterion is focused on minimizing displacement of existing water-dependent uses on the Seattle waterfront to the extent possible—to reduce both the potential impact of this Project and the need to relocate existing uses, which would increase the difficulty and cost to the Project.

Compatability of a site to POF operations considers ferry operations with vessel maneuvering and landing in and out of an in-water landing site up to 33 times per day. Space uplands of the in-water infrastructure would require spaces for queuing and pedestrian movement to accommodate up to 700 passengers queuing for departing sailings and up to 350 passengers unloading a single vessel, as well as crew spaces and facilities to support operations. Additional detail on KT's operating and programming requirements is provided in the project purpose and need, included in Appendix B.

Criterion Application

For each site, the existing and planned uses were reviewed. Site-specific feedback was gathered from relevant stakeholders and was then incorporated into the review. Feedback received during the early scoping process refined the criteria to include evaluation for *planned* uses as well as existing uses. Appendix D provides an overview of site ownership, existing uses, and known development plans of each site.

Criterion Scoring Definition

High – Compatable uses, no current or planned uses would conflict with POF use (includes underutilized sites or sites with existing public waterborne transportation)

Medium – Potential for existing or planned non-ferry uses to co-locate with POF, with some relocation and/or operating agreements

Note:

Parks: Co-location with park facilities can present potential pedestrian conflicts or use of space that may currently or be planned for other park programming. Additionally, park project funding sources can also restrict some future uses.

Private businesses: Would require some level of relocation of current businesses/uses; relocation of an existing waterborne transportation use is anticipated to be challenging due to the limited availability of waterfront sites.

Low – POF use would conflict with security/safety of an essential public facility or public conservation resource

Preliminary Screening Results

Preliminary screening results are summarized in Table 5.2. Four sites were determined to be highly compatible with POF terminal use, because of existing or planned use as public transportation.

Site	Existing/Planned Uses and Compatibility with POF	Screening Result
Pier 46 (North Apron only)	Currently an underutilized site, with temporary water-dependent uses. Port of Seattle (property owner) is reviewing potential water dependent uses for the site, including POF	High
Pier 48	Currently underutilized site, with temporary uses including WSF vehicle holding and KCMD maintenance float (located with a short-term lease). Pier structure is derelict and planned for removal by WSDOT.	High
Pier 50	Existing public waterborne transportation (King County Water Taxi), compatible with POF	High
Pier 52	Existing public waterborne transportation (WSF), compatible with POF	High

Table 5.2: Criteria 2 – Compatibility with Existing/Planned Uses Preliminary Screening Results

Site	Existing/Planned Uses and Compatibility with POF	Screening Result
Pier 53	Seattle Fire Department Fire Station No. 5. POF use would conflict with Fire department use. Relocation is infeasible as the station provides the only waterborne fire operations for the Seattle waterfront and recently completed significant improvements.	Low
Pier 54	Non-transportation related private business(es). Site space is fully used; POF use would require some level of relocation of current businesses/uses.	Medium
Pier 55/56	Private tour boat company. Site space is fully used; POF use would require some level of relocation of current businesses/uses.	Medium
Pier 57	Non-transportation related private business(es). Site space is fully used; POF use would require some level of relocation of current businesses/uses.	Medium
Pier 58	Section 4(f) resource (Waterfront Park, currently under construction). Would require agreement with City of Seattle Parks and POF facilities would require some dedicated space currently used for park programming.	Medium
Pier 59	Seattle Aquarium. Ferry use would impact marine conservation resource, relocation is infeasible.	Low
Pier 62	Section 4(f) resource (Waterfront Park). Would require agreement with City of Seattle Parks and POF facilities would require some dedicated space currently used for park programming. Further review and outreach to the Seattle Aquarium to understand its relationship with vessel operations may be required.	Medium
Pier 63	Section 4(f) resource (Waterfront Park). Would require agreement with City of Seattle Parks and POF facilities would require some dedicated space planned for use for park programming.	Medium
Pier 66	Bell Harbor Marina (Port of Seattle). Private marina; POF use would require full relocation.	Medium
Pier 67	Non-transportation related private business(es). Site space is fully used; POF use would require some level of relocation of current businesses/uses.	Medium
Pier 69	Private tour boat company. Site space is fully used; POF use would require some level of relocation of current businesses/uses.	Medium
Pier 70	Non-transportation related private business(es). Site space is fully used; POF use would require some level of relocation of current businesses/uses.	Medium

Next Steps for Further Evaluation

Further review of site use compatibility should include outreach with property owners and tenants to discuss existing and planned site uses.

Criterion 3: Terminal Access and Multi-modal Connections

To be attractive for potential riders, the new POF terminal facility must provide riders easy access and connections to reach their desired destinations. Because most KT POF riders are commuters, easy access to downtown jobs and transit connections are important. The identified sites were evaluated based on ease of access for pedestrians and bicyclists, and for connections to multimodal facilities to other destinations.

Criterion Application and Assessment Approach

To efficiently evaluate the relative access of sites along the waterfront, the access and egress evaluation focused on the following five alternate ferry terminal locations: Pier 69, Pier 66, Pier 55/56, Pier 48, and Pier 46; each representing different zones of the waterfront. The analysis also included the current KT Fast Ferry terminal location, Pier 50, for comparative purposes. Sites/groups of sites were evaluated on their proximity and access to destinations and demand based on Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) travel demand data.

Two sets of scores were developed based on the evaluation: Unweighted (equal weighting given to each measure of access, and weighted (more importance given to certain measures of access based on early scoping feedback).

The methodology used in site access evaluation is summarized below, and additional detail and scoring results are presented in Appendix F:

- Travel Analysis Zones (TAZs) from the PSRC travel demand model were aggregated into 20 groups (hereafter referred to as "zones"). For each of these 20 zones, pathways to and from each of the four potential ferry terminal locations were examined.
- For each ferry terminal location, each of the 20 zones was assigned one of three categories based on the likely access modes: bike/walk, transit only, or transitional (50-50 split between bike/walk and transit). Pathways from the ferry terminal to each zone were then scored based on various aspects of the path to the destination, including length, steepness, and the overall quality/safety from the ferry terminal to a rider's destination.
- The points for each pathway were weighted using PSRC travel demand model data. Existing passenger flow volumes were weighted by a factor of 2, recognizing this is an important consideration for potential site selection. Pathways that would be traversed by more potential ferry riders received more weight than pathways that were expected to be traversed by fewer riders.
- Points were also awarded based on the proximity of the potential sites to the transit hub at WSF Colman Dock (Pier 52).
- During the early scoping process, feedback from stakeholders suggested that greater weight be given to metrics that measured the distance and safety of the route between the potential site and Link light rail connections, as well as the proximity of the site to Colman Dock. This feedback was considered and led to the development of the weighted score.

Analysis considered infrastructure improvements along the Seattle waterfront that are complete or expected to be complete by 2025 that, once complete, would impact paths of travel from the

waterfront piers to destinations throughout Seattle. These improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A new street, Elliott Way, between Alaskan Way and Bell Street with sidewalk and bike facilities
- A new protected bike lane along the west side of Alaskan Way
- An elevated pedestrian bridge from the WSF ferry terminal along Marion Street to 1st Avenue
- The Overlook Walk, an elevated public park and bike/pedestrian connection between Pier 62 and Pike Place Market
- A new staircase, elevator, and elevated walkway on Union Street connecting Western Avenue to Alaskan Way
- An updated pedestrian bridge and elevator on Lenora Street connecting Elliott Way to Belltown
- New pedestrian connections along Railroad Way connecting the waterfront to Pioneer Square and the Stadium District
- Improved bike and pedestrian facilities along Pike and Pine Streets

The updated analysis also considered changes to Seattle's public transportation network that are currently in place or expected to be operational by 2025. These include but are not limited to:

- New RapidRide H line service, connecting Downtown to West Seattle
- New RapidRide G line service, connecting Downtown to Madison Valley
- Sound Transit East Link Extension, connecting Downtown to Mercer Island, Bellevue, Redmond, and Kirkland

There are other transit improvements in the study area that are in the planning stage but are not anticipated to be complete/implemented before 2025 and, as such, were not considered in this analysis. These projects include:

- New stations and service associated with the West Seattle-Ballard Link Extensions, including Jackson Hub
- City Center Connector Streetcar
- RapidRide J Line
- RapidRide R Line

Criterion Scoring Definition

- High Site access score is within the top third of the range of scoring results
- Medium Site access score is within the middle third of the range of scoring results
- Low Site access score is within the bottom third of the range of scoring results

Preliminary Screening Results

The nature of the Seattle waterfront geography, curving out and away from the more interior transit spine of Link Light Rail and connections to other transit services make some locations better than others due to distance alone. In addition to distance, topographic conditions change from north to south, being a steeper climb up from the waterfront to the central spine in the north. Figure 5.2 shows the relative results of site access scoring (weighted to incorporate early scoping comments), and identifies Link Light Rail stations, recent and planned projects to improve pedestrian accessibility to the waterfront, and the grade of select streets which provide access between the waterfront and downtown Seattle.



Figure 5.2: Transit Access Map

A preliminary review was completed prior to early scoping, with a revised review after early scoping where public comments stressed the importance of proximity to transit connections. This additional weighting further highlighted sites at the southern end of the waterfront as having the best overall and relative site access. These locations are located closest to the Financial District and Pioneer Square/International District, the destination of more than 50% of Kitsap Transit passenger-only ferry users. These sites are also closest to the existing Colman Dock location. Piers 46 and 48 score slightly higher than Pier 55/56 because these locations are also the least impacted by steep topography and staircases along the pedestrian routes and have very short walking distances to major transit stops.

Table 5.3 shows the results of site access evaluation (unweighted and weighted based on early scoping feedback) by comparing the resulting site scores. Full detail on evaluation methodology and scoring is included in Appendix F.

	Screening Result		
Site	Access and Multi-modal Connections (w/o Early Scoping feedback)	Access and Multi-modal Connections (w/ Early Scoping Feedback)	
Pier 46 (North Apron only)	High	High	
Pier 48	High	High	
Pier 50	High	High	
Pier 52	High	High	
Pier 53	High	High	
Pier 54	High	Medium	
Pier 55/56	High	Medium	
Pier 57	High	Medium	
Pier 58	High	Medium	
Pier 59	High	Medium	
Pier 62	Medium	Medium	
Pier 63	Medium	Medium	
Pier 66	Medium	Medium	
Pier 67	Low	Low	
Pier 69	Low	Low	
Pier 70	Low	Low	

Table 5.3: Criteria 3 – Terminal Access and Multi-modal Connections Preliminary Screening Results

Next Steps for Further Evaluation

Detailed evaluation of site access for the site alternatives carried forward for environmental review will include assessment of traffic, parking, pedestrian and bike connectivity, transit connectivity, and compatibility with non-motorized access improvements.

Criterion 4: Water Depths

POF operations require minimum water depths of 10 feet mean lower low water (MLLW) in areas where vessels will operate.

Criterion Application

The water depth of each site was reviewed using available National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) Navigational Chart data to determine if water depths are sufficient to support vessel operations. The minimum depth to support safe operation of KT POF vessels was defined as 10 feet MLLW.

Criterion Scoring Definition

- High Minimum 10 feet MLLW in areas where terminal could be located
- Medium Potential water depths less than 10 feet MLLW limit areas where terminal could be located and vessels could operate
- Low Water depths are insufficient for POF operations

Preliminary Screening Results

Review of available water depth data found that most sites have adequate water depths in areas where a POF terminal would be located, with the exception of Pier 50 and Pier 66 which have some areas of shallower water, as shown below in Figures 5.3 and 5.4¹ (blue shading shows areas of shallower water depths). Findings by site are presented in Table 5.4.



¹ Figures 5.3 and 5.4 from NOAA Chart 18450, 20th Ed., Jan. 2017. Last Correction: 11/9/22.

Site	Water Depth	Screening Result
Pier 46 (North Apron only)	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 48	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 50	Shallow depths around habitat beach limit the available area where terminal could be located and ferries could operate	Medium
Pier 52	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 53	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 54	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 55/56	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 57	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 58	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 59	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 62	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 63	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 66	Shallow depths inside marina limit the available area where terminal could be located and ferries could operate	Medium
Pier 67	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 69	Adequate depths on site	High
Pier 70	Adequate depths on site	High

Table 5.4: Criteria 4 – Water Depths Preliminary Screening Results

Next Steps for Further Evaluation

Detailed evaluation of water depths would occur during site design.

Criterion 5: Vessel Programming and Navigation

To be considered a reasonable alternative for the proposed Seattle POF terminal facility, a site must have sufficient in-water space to accommodate the landing of KT vessels and to allow vessels to navigate safely to provide service. Although future service expansion or new routes are not planned at this time, sufficient additional space to not preclude future expansion of existing service and/or new routes is also desired.

Criterion Application

A high-level engineering review was conducted to estimate the space needed to meet the minimum requirements for the KT vessels, terminal infrastructure, and vessel maneuvering.

Each site was then reviewed for approximate dimensions in areas with sufficient water depths between existing infrastructure (except for Pier 48, which is assumed to be removed) and space available for accommodating KT vessels and in-water POF terminal infrastructure. Minimum in-water dimension needs differed based on site orientation and layout of existing infrastructure.

The space requirements for POF infrastructure and maneuvering were identified from preliminary landing site layouts and vessel maneuvering diagrams developed for preliminary site screening evaluation, using the infrastructure needs and maneuvering capabilities of KT's largest current vessels. Vessel programming requirements assume the space needed to allow two vessels to maneuver simultaneously and were developed to accommodate the different layouts and orientations of the waterfront sites. Example layout options and associated space and dimensional requirements are shown below in Figures 5.5 and 5.6 and included with more detail in Appendix G.



Figure 5.5: Example Vessel Infrastructure and Maneuvering Diagram A

Figure 5.6: Example Vessel Infrastructure and Maneuvering Diagram B



Minimum width used for site assessment:

254 feet

Based on the minimum requirements established in the example vessel infrastructure and maneuvering diagrams, the available width of each site was measured as the distance between piers and/or boundaries of where in-water infrastructure can be located including the outer harbor line and City of Seattle right-of-way or view corridors.

Each site was reviewed for approximate dimensions in areas with sufficient water depths between existing infrastructure (except for Pier 48, which is assumed to be removed) and space available for accommodating KT vessels and in-water POF terminal infrastructure. Minimum in-water dimension needs differed based on site orientation and layout of existing infrastructure.

During the early scoping process, no feedback from stakeholders was received that impacted the assessment methodology for in-water space.

Criterion Scoring Definition

- High Site has sufficient in-water space without removal of existing in-water infrastructure, excluding any structures planned for removal
- Medium To have sufficient in-water space or provide landing site access, site would require removal or relocation of existing in-water infrastructure including floats and ramps currently in use. Removal or relocation options exclude in-water infrastructure currently in use by public transportation services including WSF and King County Water Taxi which are deemed to be critical transortation infrastructure.
- Low Sufficient space is not available on the site within areas where infrastructure could be located, or is only available with full or partial removal of a pier structure, excluding any pier structures planned for removal.

Preliminary Screening Results

Preliminary review of in-water space and dimensions by site found that eight of the site alternatives do not have the requisite in-water space to accommodate KT's vessel programming and operating needs, as identified as Low scores in Table 5.5 below. Three sites (Piers 69, 62 and 56/55) do not currently have sufficient in-water space but could potentially have sufficient in-water space if existing in-water infrastructure and transportation uses were relocated.

Appendix G provides high-level layouts of in-water POF infrastructure and vessel maneuvering diagrams used to estimate in-water space requirements. Site summaries provided in Section 6 provide aerial images for each site with measurements of available in-water space and indicate whether that space meets minimum dimensional requirements for in-water infrastructure and vessel maneuvering.

Table 5.5 provides the approximate site width (in feet), the assumptions used to measure available space and site width, and the results of criterion application.

Site	Available Width (feet)	Assumptions	Screening Result
Pier 46 (North Apron only)	Up to 615 (with Pier 48 space)	Would require partial or full removal of Pier 48 pier structure	High
Pier 48	500	Would require partial or full removal of existing pier	High
Pier 50	180	Would require removal of existing POF float	Low
Pier 52	170	Would require removal of at least one existing WSF berth	Low
Pier 53	130	Insufficient space (site width)	Low
Pier 54	95	Insufficient space between piers 54 and 55	Low
Pier 55/56	260	Would require removal of existing vessel floats in use by private tour boat company	Medium
Pier 57	120 (north) 80 (south)	Insufficient space (north to WDNR property line, and south to Pier 56)	Low
Pier 58	300	Would require WDNR space north of 57	High
Pier 59	285 (north), 238 (south)	Would require in-water space from Pier 62 park (north) or Pier 58 park (south)	High
Pier 62	280	Would require removal or relocation of in-water park float to provide landing site access.	Medium
Pier 63	195	Insufficient space between Pier 62 and marina. Less space will be available when Pier 63 is rebuilt (future design currently unknown).	Low
Pier 66	160	Insufficient space with adequate depths inside protected marina	Low
Pier 67	80 (north) 90 (south)	Insufficient space between piers	Low
Pier 69	180	Would require removal of existing vessel float in use by private tour boat company	Medium
Pier 70	130	Insufficient protected space south of pier	Low

Table 5.5: Criterion 5 – Vessel Programming and Navigation Preliminary Screening Results

Next Steps for Further Evaluation

Environmental review of sites that move past initial site screening will include conceptual level design to evaluate feasibility, operational considerations, and environmental impacts.

Preliminary Site Screening Summary

Preliminary site screening results are shown in Table 5.7. Any sites receiving a "Low" score or three or more "Medium" scores were not carried forward from preliminary screening. Site screening found that the three sites, Pier 46 North Apron, Pier 48, and Pier 58 could reasonably support a long-term POF terminal facility. Screening results by site are included in Section 6.

Site	Site Zoning Consistency	Existing/ Planned Use Compatibility	Site Access	Sufficient Water Depths	Vessel Programming Space
Pier 46 (North Apron)	High	High	High	High	High
Pier 48	High	High	High	High	High
Pier 50	High	High	High	Medium	Low
Pier 52	High	High	High	High	Low
Pier 53	High	Low	High	High	Low
Pier 54	High	Medium	Medium	High	Low
Pier 55/56	High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
Pier 57	High	Medium	Medium	High	Low
Pier 58	High	Medium	Medium	High	High
Pier 59	High	Low	Medium	High	High
Pier 62	High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
Pier 63	High	Medium	Medium	High	Low
Pier 66	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
Pier 67	High	Medium	Low	High	Low
Pier 69	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium
Pier 70	High	Medium	Low	High	Low

 Table 5.7: Preliminary Screening Results Summary

6. PRELIMINARY SITE SCREENING FINDINGS BY SITE

The following pages present a summary of each site including site context and findings from preliminary screening evaluation. Each summary concludes with discussion of why each site is screened out or carried forward for further evaluation.

The following assumptions apply to the site summaries:

- Aerial maps are from King County Parcel Viewer, and map images are dated 2021.
- Distance measurements are estimates made using Google Earth.
- Vessel infrastructure and maneuvering diagrams are conceptual layouts shown for illustrative purposes.
- Walk times and distances are from Google Maps, adjusted to reflect waterfront improvements planned to be in place by 2025.

Pier 46 (North Apron)



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Port of Seattle

Zoning: Industrial General 1 Unlimited/85

Shoreline Zone: Urban Industrial

On-site uses: Temporary water-dependent uses, including berthing of cargo barges, moorage of large catcher/processor fishing vessels. Planned replacement of the timber and concrete pier structures has been delayed.

vessel lavout and navidational baths are conceptual and for preliminary evaluation (onl	lion	latic	lui	ava	Vi	nar	mi	eli	pr	for	nd l	a	otua	once	are	IS a	path	inal	atio	via	na	and	avout	ssel	Ve
--	-----	------	-------	-----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	------	---	------	------	-----	------	------	------	------	-----	----	-----	-------	------	----

Criterion	Screening	g Evaluation Results
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	High	Site is currently underutilized. The Port of Seattle is currently studying potential water-dependent uses, including POF.
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	High	Site provides relatively higher access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 5 min walk, 0.3 miles Distance to nearest light rail station (Pioneer Square): 10 min walk, 0.4 miles
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	High	Sufficient in-water space is available, with partial or full removal of Pier 48 pier structure (planned for removal by WSDOT). Would require site ownership or operating agreement to ensure long-term availability of Pier 48 in-water space.

Pier 48



Site Characteristics

Ownership: WSDOT

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: WSF temporary vehicle holding lanes, King County Water Taxi maintenance facility

ή	loccol launut and	navinational	nathe are concentual	and for oraliminar	view protection view
. 1	coser layour and	naviyalional	pairis are conceptuar	and for preliminal	y evaluation only.

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results						
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.					
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	High	The site provides opportunity for development as a POF facility—Pier 48 over-water structure is planned for removal. Temporary uses include WSF's use of the uplands for remote vehicle holding during the Colman Dock construction project, and King County Marine Division's leased location for their maintenance float.					
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	High	Site provides relatively higher access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 4 min walk, 0.2 miles Distance to nearest light rail station (Pioneer Square): 8 min walk, 0.3 mile					
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.					
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	High	Sufficient in-water space is available on the site with partial or full removal of existing pier structure; pier removal is planned by WSDOT.					


Site Characteristics

Ownership: WSDOT

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Passenger-only Ferry facility used by King County Water Taxi and Kitsap Fast Ferries

*Vessel layout and navigational paths are conceptual and shown to illustrate space requirements only.

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results				
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.			
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	High	The site is in use as the only public POF landing facility on the Seattle waterfront—currently in use by King County Water Taxi and Kitsap Fast Ferries.			
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	High	Site provides relatively higher access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 3 min walk, 0.1 miles Distance to nearest light rail station (Pioneer Square): 7 min walk, 0.3 miles			
4. Water Depths	Medium	Shallow depths around the recently constructed habitat beach limit the area where terminal could be located and ferries could operate.			
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	To provide sufficient space, site would require removal or relocation of the existing POF float, recently constructed in 2019.			

is not available without removal or relocation of the existing POF float currently in use by King County Water Taxi and Kitsap Fast Ferry.

Pier 52 - Colman Dock



Site Characteristics

Ownership: WSDOT

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Washington State Ferries terminal

*Vessel layout and navigational paths are conceptual and shown to illustrate space requirements only.

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results			
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.		
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	High	POF would be compatible with existing public waterborne transportation use on the site.		
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	High	Site provides relatively higher access for passengers. Distance to nearest light rail station (Pioneer Square): 11 min walk, 0.5 mile		
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.		
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	To provide sufficient space, site would require removal of at least one existing WSF berth.		

Summary: Site is **not** recommended for further evaluation because sufficient vessel programming space is not available without removal or relocation of the existing vessel berths currently in use by Washington State Ferries, part of the state highway system.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: City of Seattle

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: City of Seattle Fire Station

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results				
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.			
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Low	Site is currently fully used by City of Seattle Fire Station No. 5, the only waterborne fire department facility on the Seattle waterfront. POF use would conflict with fire department operations.			
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	High	Site provides relatively higher access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 3 min walk, 0.1 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (University Street): 11 min walk, 0.4 mile			
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.			
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	Site width is insufficient for POF programming and navigation.			

compatibility with existing and planned uses or minimum size needed for vessel programming.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Private

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Restaurant and retail businesses.

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results				
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.			
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require some level of relocation of non-transportation related private business(es).			
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Medium	Site provides relatively moderate access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 3 min walk, 0.1 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (University Street): 10 min walk, 0.4 mile			
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.			
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	The width between Piers 54 and 55 is insufficient. POF programming could not be located south of Pier 54 due to potential conflicts with Fire Station No. 5.			

Pier 55/56



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Private

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Privately-owned tourboat company, restaurant and office space

*Vessel layout and navigational paths are conceptual and shown to illustrate space requirements only.

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results				
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.			
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require some level of relocation of current private tour boat company use, anticipated to be challenging due to the limited availability of waterfront sites.			
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Medium	Site provides relatively moderate access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 4 min walk, 0.2 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (University Street): 9 min walk, 0.3 mile			
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.			
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Medium	Would require require removal of existing vessel floats to provide sufficient space for vessel programming.			

Summary: Site is **not** recommended for further evaluation because of medium screening evaluation scores related to compatibility with existing and planned uses, terminal access, and vessel programming and navigational space, indicating a higher anticipated level of project complexity and cost.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Private, Department of Natural Resources (in-water parcel)

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Restaurant and retail/amusement, private tour boat company

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results				
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.			
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require some level of relocation of non-transportation related private business(es) and existing tour boat company.			
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Medium	Site provides relatively moderate access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 6 min walk, 0.2 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (University Street): 8 min walk, 0.3 mile			
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.			
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	Insufficient space for POF programming south to Pier 56 and north to DNR property.			

vessel programming.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation, WDNR (tidelands)

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Section 4(f) Resource

+1	Vessel la	vout and	navioational	paths are	conceptual	and for	oreliminary	evaluation only.
	the second second second	the second second second	and a second sec	for second second second	and the second second	and the state of		a contraction of the second seco

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results				
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.			
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require agreement with City of Seattle Parks, and facility programming would require space currently dedicated to park use.			
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Medium	Site provides relatively higher moderate for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 7 min walk, 0.3 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (University Street): 8 min walk, 0.3 mile			
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.			
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	High	Sufficient in-water space is available on the site.			

Summary: Site is selected for further evaluation because sufficient vessel programming space is available, and POF could potentially be compatible with existing park use if an agreement can be made with City of Seattle Parks and a tidelands lease obtained from WDNR.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Natural Resources

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Seattle Aquarium

Vessel layout and nav	vigational paths are	conceptual and shown	to illustrate sp	ace requirements only.
-----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------	------------------------

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results			
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.		
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Low	Ferry use would impact marine conservation resource.		
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Medium	Site provides relatively higher moderate for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 9 min walk, 0.4 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (Westlake/University Street): 10 min walk, 0.4 mile		
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.		
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	High	Sufficient in-water space is available north or south of the existing aquarium facility.		



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Section 4(f) Resource

*Vessel layout and navigational paths are conceptual and shown to illustrate space requirements only.

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results			
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.		
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require agreement with City of Seattle Parks, and facility programming would require space currently dedicated to park use. Vessel operations would occur near the aquarium facility, which may		
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Medium	Site provides relatively moderate access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 11 min walk, 0.5 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (Westlake): 12 min walk, 0.5 mile		
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.		
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Medium	Would require removal or relocation of existing park float to provide landside access and sufficient in-water space. Vessel operations would require use of in-water space near the aquarium facility.		

Summary: Site is **not** recommended for further evaluation because of medium screening evaluation scores related to compatibility with existing and planned uses, terminal access, and vessel programming and navigational space, indicating a higher anticipated level of project complexity and cost.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Section 4(f) Resource

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results			
1. Site Zoning	High	Passenger-only ferry is an allowable use		
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require agreement with City of Seattle Parks, and facility programming would require space currently dedicated to park use.		
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Medium	Site provides relatively moderate access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 11 min walk, 0.5 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (Westlake): 12 min walk, 0.5 mile		
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.		
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	Insufficient space available between north edge of pier and marina entrance.		

Summary: Site is eliminated from consideration because it does not meet the minimum size needed for vessel programming.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Port of Seattle

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Conference center, restaurant, marina, cruise terminal

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results			
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.		
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	Private marina uses		
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Medium	Site provides relatively moderate access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 16 min walk, 0.8 mile Distance to nearest light rail station (Westlake): 15 min walk, 0.7 mile		
4. Water Depths	Medium	Shallow depths inside marina limit area where terminal could be located and ferries could operate.		
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	Insufficient space with adequate depths inside protected marina		

Summary: Site is eliminated from consideration because it does not meet the minimum size needed for vessel programming.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Private, Department of Natural Resources

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Hotel

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results			
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.		
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require some level of relocation of non-transportation related private business(es).		
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Low	Site provides relatively lower access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 20 min walk, 1 miles Distance to nearest light rail station (Westlake): 18 min walk, 0.8 mile		
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.		
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	Insufficient space between piers		

passengers and does not meet the minimum size needed for vessel programming.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Port of Seattle

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Private tour boat company

	-1	lessel.	lavout and	navigational	paths are c	onceptual a	and shown to	illustrate	space requirements only	И.
--	----	---------	------------	--------------	-------------	-------------	--------------	------------	-------------------------	----

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results			
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.		
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require some level of relocation of non-transportation related private business(es) and existing tour boat company.		
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Low	Site provides relatively lower access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 23 min walk, 1.1 miles Distance to nearest light rail station (Westlake): 20 min walk, 0.9 mile		
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.		
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Medium	Would require removal of existing Clipper vessel float		

passengers.



Site Characteristics

Ownership: Private

Zoning: Downtown Harborfront 1/45

Shoreline Zone: Urban Harborfront

On-site uses: Office and restaurant

Criterion	Screening Evaluation Results			
1. Site Zoning	High	POF is an allowable use.		
2. Compatibility with Existing & Planned Uses	Medium	POF use would require some level of relocation of non-transportation related private business(es).		
3. Terminal Access & Multi-modal Connections	Low	Site provides relatively lower access for passengers. Distance to Colman Dock: 24 min walk, 1.2 miles Distance to nearest light rail station (Westlake): 22 min walk, 1.0 mile		
4. Water Depths	High	Water depths on site are adequate for POF operations.		
5. Vessel Programming & Navigation	Low	Insufficient protected space south of pier. North side of pier is too exposed for POF operations.		

7. NEXT STEPS: EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

With preliminary site assessment completed and three reasonable alternatives identified, KT is poised to begin environmental review. The purpose of the environmental review process is to provide full and open consideration of potential environmental impacts from Project alternatives, including a comparison between alternatives and a no-build condition. The process will also inform decision-makers and the public on any measures to avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the environment.

Figures 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 below summarize elements for consideration and compatibility of the three sites identified through this process.

Pier 48 is owned by WSDOT. The wooden pier structure occupying the site is dilapidated and not in use. WSDOT has plans to remove the pier structure and has programmed \$20 million in their 2023-2025 Capital Improvement and Preservation





Program budget. The site uplands are temporarily in use by WSF as overflow vehicle holding and have been identified for potential future use for the WSF electrification program, and the King County Water Taxi vessel maintenance float is located on the north side of the existing pier with a short-term lease. Kitsap Transit selected the Pier 48 property as the proposed preferred alternative because it provides sufficient space to support a long-term POF terminal facility without affecting other waterfront properties.



Figure 7.2: Pier 48 Site Profile

Pier 46 North Apron is owned by the Port of Seattle, who is currently reviewing potential future uses for the site. With only 240 feet of existing open waterway, the site would require additional in-water space from the planned removal of Pier 48 to accommodate POF terminal operations and allow for maneuvering of vessels from the adjacent site.



Figure 7.3: Pier 46 Site Profile

Pier 58 is owned by City of Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation and is currently under construction to become a public park in 2025 known as Waterfront Park. The park design does not provide space for a POF terminal or operating slips; therefore, this site would require physical modifications and/or changes to programmed park features to incorporate POF operations at Pier 58.



Figure 7.4: Pier 58 Site Profile

Next Steps

KT and FTA plan to prepare an environmental impact statement, which will include a formal scoping comment period. This will allow agencies, Tribes, the public, and all other interested parties an opportunity to comment on the scope of analysis in the environmental impact statement and range of alternatives.

Upon completion of the environmental review process, KT plans to advance design for the selected alternative, secure permits and necessary property rights, and construct the facility.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY RESULTS FOR PROPOSED TERMINAL LOCATION CRITERIA

lund faucett



PROPOSED SEATTLE TERMINAL LOCATION CRITERIA SURVEY

RESEARCH RESULTS

Prepared by Lund Faucett

June 9, 2021

RESEARCH PURPOSE

• Gather feedback on proposed criteria for evaluating potential fast-ferry landing sites/terminal locations in downtown Seattle.



Study Area for Seattle Terminal Alternative Analysis

METHODOLOGY

- Online survey (Survey Monkey)
- Asked 5 questions (closed and open-ended)
- Disclosed Kitsap Transit as the research sponsor
- Promoted survey through Kitsap Transit communications channels
- Fielded May 15-31, 2021

This presentation provides a high-level summary; an additional document with detailed verbatim responses is also available.

1,074 responded to the survey



- Strong response, overall
- Reminders helped
- Overall, n=1074. Number responding to each question fluctuated so n is reported for each.

MOST RESPONDENTS ARE FROM KITSAP COUNTY

4. Do you primarily live in...? (Select one.)



74% ARE AREA RESIDENTS OR COMMUNITY MEMBERS

5. Which of the following describes you? (Select all that apply.)



RESPONDENTS REVIEWED PROPOSED CRITERIA

Criteria	Description
Access and Connections for Riders	Pedestrian and bike connections to downtown jobs/amenities and transit
Passenger and Vessel Programming Needs	 Space for covered passenger loading, unloading and queuing and other passenger needs including ticketing, pick-up/drop-off, restrooms, etc.
	• Space for vessel operating slips to accommodate current and future routes, including ADA access and power (including potential vessel electrification), water, sewer needs
Vessel Navigation Requirements	In-water space to support safe and reliable service, including width and depth of waterways for maneuverability
Environmental, Cultural and Historical Impacts	Effects on habitat, environmental, cultural and historic resources
Environmental Justice	Impacts on low-income and minority populations
Community Input	Community feedback, needs and concerns
Land Use and Ownership	 Compatibility of fast-ferry service with surrounding land use and property conditions Time to start-up service at the location
	Property owner supportive of long-term fast-ferry service and/or potential for Kitsap Transit ownership
Expansion Capacity	Ability to support future routes
Financial Feasibility	Highest cost-benefit ratio

A MAJORITY (73%) ARE SATISFIED WITH THE CURRENT CRITERIA

1. Are there any changes to the above criteria or additional criteria that Kitsap Transit should consider when evaluating potential downtown fast-ferry terminal sites?



MOST COMMENTS FOCUSED ON EXISTING CRITERIA

2. Are there any additional criteria Kitsap Transit should consider when evaluating potential downtown fast-ferry terminal sites? [open ended]

Top Themes

- Access/Connections/Integration
 - o Convenient to transit, ferries, downtown, jobs
- Passengers/Programming Needs
 - o Covered areas, covered passenger holding with places to sit
 - o Schedule
- Vessel Navigation
 - o Safety/security

Additional comments:

- Environmental justice
- Environment
- Cost
- Land use
- Other

LUND **\$**FAUCETT

n=153

VERBATIM RESPONSES ARE PROVIDED SEPARATELY

There's rich information in respondents' comments. Many explained why the criteria mattered to them or reflected on current services.

Additional/Existing Criteria Quotes

A highly visible location in a core downtown waterfront area that will encourage tourism ridership. The southern industrial sites don't satisfy this criteria.

> Earlier times for shipyard employees. The beginning shift for shipyard employees which are most of the first couple sailings in the mornings start at 0520. It would allow those who start earlier shifts to commute from Seattle via the fast ferry.

Need to have seating in the line for passengers. Some older people have issues standing for longer than 15-20 minutes. I have sat on the ground waiting to load on a fast ferry. It was damp, dirty & uncomfortable.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS EMPHASIZED PREFERRED CRITERIA

3. Do you have any other comments or input to provide on the proposed criteria? [open ended]

Top Themes

- No comments/none
- Access/specific site recommendations
- Programming Needs

n=383

LUND **\$**FAUCETT

Focus on building a shared intermodal passenger only ferry facility that incorporates an "activated" space besides just a transportation hub. Thinking of what can passenger do while waiting for the next leg of their journey. A chance to grab a bite, maybe shop for something unique (like an open market space?) while waiting for the next boat or the bus/cab/Uber/light rail outside the door of the terminal. Think thoughtfully of what a public/private venture to re-develop Pier 48 as an example to reflect the best of the ideas of the San Francisco Passenger Only Ferry Terminal on its Wharf.

So great to hear this being considered, and that public input is being solicited. Bravo!

LUND **\$**FAUCETT

Vanessa Lund, Research Director/Partner <u>vanessa@lundfaucett.com</u> Kris Faucett, Partner <u>kris@lundfaucett.com</u> 206-385-6789

LundFaucett.com

APPENDIX B

EARLY SCOPING OUTREACH SUMMARY REPORT



Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility

Early Scoping Outreach Summary Report October 2022

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

FTA	Federal Transit Administration
КТ	Kitsap Transit
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
POF	Passenger-only Ferry
PSRC	Puget Sound Regional Council
WSF	Washington State Ferries
Project	Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

T/	ABLE C	OF CONTENTS	ii			
1	INTRODUCTION					
	1.1	Overview	1			
	1.2	Purpose of Report	2			
2	EAF	RLY SCOPING PROCESS	3			
	2.1	Purpose of Early Scoping	3			
	2.2	Public Notice in the Federal and SEPA Registers	3			
	2.3	Opportunities to Comment	3			
	2.4	Summary of Comments Received	4			
3	AG	ENCY EARLY SCOPING	5			
	3.1	Agency Early Scoping Meeting	5			
	3.2	Summary of Comments from Agencies	6			
4	TRI	IBAL AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS EARLY SCOPING	9			
	4.1	Tribal Early Scoping Meeting	9			
	4.2	Summary of Comments from Tribes	9			
5	PUE	BLIC EARLY SCOPING	10			
	5.1	Planning and Initial Outreach	10			
	5.2	Public Early Scoping Meetings	10			
	5.3	Outreach Materials and Tools	10			
	5.4	Summary of Public Comments	11			
6	NEX	XT STEPS	13			

Atta

Attach	ments
А	Federal Register Notice
В	SEPA Register Notice
С	Early Scoping Information Report
D	Scoping Materials

- Agency Comment Letters Е
- F Tribe Comment Letter
- G Public Comments

I INTRODUCTION

I.I Overview

Kitsap Transit's Fast Ferry program is part of the regional passenger-only ferry (POF) system that provides faster transportation options for people traveling between the Kitsap Peninsula and downtown Seattle. Kitsap Transit (KT) launched fast-ferry service on the Bremerton/Seattle route in July 2017, Kingston/Seattle in November 2018, and Southworth/Seattle in March 2021. The service is partially funded by a three tenths of a cent local sales tax approved by Kitsap County voters in 2016.

POF docking facilities at the Seattle waterfront, the most in demand destination in downtown Seattle, are limited and inhibit any increases to service on current routes or introduction of new routes due to capacity constraints at the existing facility. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) forecasted in 2018 that the region will add 1.8 million people and 1.2 million jobs by 2050. This growth is supported by PSRC's regional transportation forecasting models that predict continued growth over the next 20 years.

All three KT Fast Ferry routes, served by four vessels, currently operate out of Pier 50 on the Seattle side. KT shares the use of Pier 50 with King County Metro under a five-year use agreement expiring August 2024. The Pier 50 facility is a single float that supports a maximum of two side-loading vessels (one on each side) at any one time. Sailing times for the KT routes are limited by the slip availability at Pier 50 and necessary landing facilities are required to ensure reliable, on-time service that meets rider travel needs now and into the future.



Figure 1. Kitsap Fast Ferry Route Map showing the three KT routes connecting to the Pier 50 facility in downtown Seattle.

KT launched the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project (Project) to assess downtown Seattle waterfront locations to identify a preferred downtown terminal location to support KT's long-term fast ferry operations. The Project would improve reliability of this regional transit service by addressing the current lack of POF landing site capacity on the Seattle waterfront.



Study Area for Seattle Terminal Alternative Analysis Figure 2. Downtown Seattle Waterfront Project Study Area Map

I.2 Purpose of Report

Because KT anticipates applying for grant funds from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Project must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Early scoping is an optional step in the NEPA process that is intended to invite input from agencies, Tribes, members of the public, and other interested parties early in a project's planning.

KT and FTA conducted early scoping for the Project from May 12 through June 13, 2022. This report describes the outreach conducted by KT and FTA in support of early scoping and summarizes the comments received from the public, as well as agency and Tribal entities. Appendices A through G provide supplementary information and materials on the Project and comments received during early scoping.
2 EARLY SCOPING PROCESS

2.1 Purpose of Early Scoping

Early scoping provides agencies, Tribes, and the public an opportunity to learn about a project and comment early in the planning process to help define and refine the project purpose and need, alternatives, and criteria used for evaluation of alternatives.

During early scoping, KT asked for comments on:

- The Project's purpose and need
- The assessment criteria presented in the Early Scoping Information Report
- The potential impacts and benefits of the Project
- Other considerations that are relevant to the evaluation of alternatives

Based on input received during early scoping, KT will refine the screening criteria used to assess potential alternatives for terminal site locations. Those screening criteria will then be applied to Seattle waterfront properties to identify potential terminal site alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the Project. These locations will be further evaluated as part of the Alternatives Development process.

2.2 Public Notice in the Federal and SEPA Registers

FTA published an early scoping notice in the Federal Register and KT published an <u>early</u> <u>scoping notice</u> in the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Register on May 12, 2022, initiating early scoping and starting the comment period. The notices included information about the Project; dates and times of the agency/Tribe and public meetings; how to provide comments during the comment period; and where to learn more information. A copy of the Federal Register notice is provided in Attachment A and a copy of the SEPA Register notice is provided in Attachment B.

KT also prepared an Early Scoping Information Report that provides information on the Project's context and background, the early scoping process, ways to provide comments, the Project's purpose and need, the alternatives development process, and the Project timeline. This report was linked to the early scoping notice and published on the Project webpage, and is included as Attachment C.

2.3 Opportunities to Comment

KT and FTA invited early scoping comments from May 12 through June 13, 2022. Federal, state, and local agencies; Tribes; community-based organizations and non-profits; transit riders; property owners; businesses; and all other interested parties were invited to comment, with multiple methods for providing comments.

Participants were able to provide comments in the following ways:

• Online: www.kitsaptransit.com/agency-information/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project

- Email: <u>Ktplanning@kitsaptransit.com</u>
- Phone: (360) 478-6931
 - **Mail:** Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie, Service & Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200

Bremerton WA 98337

- Online meetings:
 - Public meeting (#1): June 6, 12-1 pm
 - o Tribal/Agency meeting: June 6, 2-3 pm
 - A court report attended this meeting to record comments
 - Public meeting (#2): June 8, 6-7 pm

Meetings were recorded and the recordings were posted to the Project website.

2.4 Summary of Comments Received

Kitsap Transit received a total of 57 comments submitted by 10 agencies, 1 Tribe, 4 non-profit organizations, and 46 members of the public (summarized below and detailed in the following sections). The online comment tool was the most common format used, followed by written letters and emails.

- 1 comment was submitted by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe
- 7 comments were submitted by governments / agencies
 - o 1 from Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
 - o 1 from the Environmental Protection Agency
 - o 1 from the Washington State Department of Ecology
 - o 1 from Washington State Department of Transportation/Washington State Ferries
 - 1 submitted jointly by the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and Puget Sound Partnership
 - o 1 from the City of Seattle Department of Transportation
 - o 1 submitted jointly by the Port of Seattle and Northwest Seaport Alliance
 - 4 comments were submitted by non-profit organizations
 - o 1 from the Cascade Bicycle Club
 - 1 from Friends of the San Juans
 - o 1 from Puget Soundkeeper
 - o 1 from the Washington Environmental Coalition
- 45 comments submitted by individuals (1 comment was submitted jointly by 2 individuals)

In general, agency and non-profit comments focused on considerations for environmental review and pedestrian/multi-modal access; the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe was primarily concerned with Treaty fishing rights; and public comments fell into two main categories – location and safety. The following sections provide more detail on comments received.

3 AGENCY EARLY SCOPING

3.1 Agency Early Scoping Meeting

KT and FTA hosted an online early scoping meeting for federal, state, regional, and local governments and other entities having jurisdiction on Monday, June 6, 2022, from 2-3 p.m. (Some representatives attended the public online meetings.) Tribes were also invited to participate in the early scoping meeting, and otherwise engage with KT as described further in Section 4.

KT and FTA distributed meeting invitations to the following agencies and other parties:

- Federal agencies (8)
 - o US Federal Émergency Management Agency
 - US Federal Highway Administration
 - o US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 - US Army Corps of Engineers
 - o US Coast Guard
 - o US Fish and Wildlife
 - o US Environmental Protection Agency
 - o Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- State agencies (6)
 - o Washington State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation
 - o Washington State Department of Ecology
 - o Washington State Fish and Wildlife
 - Washington State Department of Natural Resources
 - Washington State Department of Transportation
 - Washington State Transportation Commission
- Regional and local agencies (9)
 - o City of Seattle
 - King County
 - King County Metro
 - Pierce Transit
 - Port of Seattle
 - Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
 - Puget Sound Partnership
 - Puget Sound Regional Council
 - Sound Transit
- Other entities having jurisdiction (1)
 - Pacific Merchant Shipping Association

Representatives from 15 agencies attended one of the online meetings:

- US Environmental Protection Agency
- US Coast Guard
- US Army Corps of Engineers

- US Federal Emergency Management Agency
- Washington State Department of Transportation/Washington State Ferries
- Washington State Transportation Commission
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Washington State Department of Ecology
- Washington State Department of Archeology
- Port of Seattle
- Puget Sound Regional Council
- Puget Sound Partnership
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
- King County Metro

KT and FTA began the meeting by welcoming participants and providing a meeting overview and ground rules. KT then presented information on the Project including background; timeline and process; Project purpose and need; approach to alternatives development; fast-ferry landing site programming needs and proposed criteria to be utilized for site screening; and the early scoping process. A question and answer session followed the presentation, and attendees were given an opportunity to submit formal early scoping comments verbally or using the chat function.

3.2 Summary of Comments from Agencies

Agencies provided comments on topics ranging from underwater noise, safety concerns, and multi-modal compatibility to consistency with existing and planned uses on the Seattle waterfront. Agencies also commented on the Project's purpose and need, both expressing support for it as written and providing recommendations for refinements.

Figure 3 identifies the downtown Seattle waterfront sites referenced in comments.



Figure 3. Downtown Seattle Waterfront Project Study Area Map

The below table identifies the agencies that provided early scoping comments and summarizes the major themes in their comments. Copies of the comment letters are included in Attachment E.

AGENCY	MAJOR COMMENT THEMES
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) declined an invitation to be a Participating Agency pursuant to NEPA for the Project. ACHP will instead participate, as needed, as FTA complies with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). ACHP says the FTA should initiate consultation with the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Indian tribes, and other consulting parties with an interest in historic properties.
City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)	SDOT recommended screening criteria to guide site selection for the Project, including pedestrian connections to businesses, transit options, and amenities; ability to provide ADA-accessible vehicular passenger loading; and access to the Alaskan Way bike path. SDOT and the City Office of the Waterfront also noted a strong desire to engage in a discussion of site alternatives with KT once site alternatives are identified.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	EPA recommended that the Project purpose and need capture the context of the larger area the Project will serve, including route destinations and potential expansion. EPA also recommended general topics to consider for the Project's future SEPA and NEPA analysis, including the range of alternatives, aquatic/water resources; air quality; environmental justice; contaminated sites; threatened, endangered and sensitive species and associated habitats; green infrastructure; intermodal connections; growth-related impacts; cumulative effects; climate change; coordination with tribal governments; and monitoring and adaptive management to ensure the Project continues to meet environmental objectives after

Port of Seattle (Port) and the	The Port and NWSA recognized the need for additional
Northwest Seaport Alliance (NWSA)	 ferry terminal facility. The agencies proposed additional language to be integrated into the purpose and need for the Project regarding compatibility with existing and planned uses along the Maritime Industrial Waterfront. The Port and NWSA also provided comments on potential site locations including: Terminal 46: not available for a Fast Ferry Terminal. Pier 46 North: currently under study for a range of maritime uses including waterborne transportation. Pier 48: one site included in a multi-site habitat mitigation bank Project Pier 66/Bell Harbor Marina: the location may meet some needs of a fast ferry terminal, but is unlikely to meet the needs of a permanent facility. Pier 69: the site has two developed berth areas, but the north berth does not have uplands space availability.
	requirement of space to incorporate vessel electrification or use of alternative fuels, and recommended that site alternatives analysis identify alignment and inconsistencies with the Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy. The Port and NWSA offered edits to proposed criteria regarding site use compatibility, access, and future use planning.
Washington State Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and Puget Sound Partnership (Joint Comments)	Puget Sound Partnership and the Washington State Governor's Salmon Recovery Office requested that environmental review include consideration of the need to better understand and mitigate for underwater radiated noise from fast ferry routes, including an understanding of potential system expansion and additional routes.
Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)	Ecology recommended general topics to consider for the Project's future SEPA and NEPA analysis, including resources provided by the Toxics Cleanup Program, Southern Resident killer whales, tribal resources, ferry traffic and safety, and environmental justice.
Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division (WSF)	WSF provided comments on the Project purpose and need, including the purpose statement regarding integration with other modes and the needs statement regarding expansion of mobility options for minority and low-income populations. WSF identified opportunity for compatible use and connections to transit in the area between Pier 58 and Pier 63. WSF recommended exploring options for reducing the footprint of electrification infrastructure and minimizing impacts to the marine environment during terminal development. WSF also noted support for the proposed initial site screening criteria.

4 TRIBAL AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS EARLY SCOPING

4.1 Tribal Early Scoping Meeting

KT and FTA invited Tribes and a Tribal organization to provide input during early scoping. FTA invited the following federally recognized Tribes to participate in early scoping via letters emailed to tribal chairs with copies to tribal staff on May 14, 2022:

- Muckleshoot Indian Tribe
- Snoqualmie Indian Tribe
- Tulalip Tribes of Washington
- Suquamish Indian Tribes of the Port Madison Reservation
- Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians of Washington
- Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation

KT invited the Duwamish Tribal Organization, a non-federally recognized Tribe, to participate in early scoping via a letter emailed to the tribal chair.

The method of Tribal participation was open to a Tribe's preference. They could join the Agency Early Scoping held on June 6, 2022, or attend the Public Early Scoping meetings held on June 6 and 8, 2022. Tribes were also encouraged to meet with the Project team at their convenience.

Four tribal representatives from the following Tribes attended one of the three online meetings:

- Muckleshoot Indian Tribe
- Suquamish Indian Tribes of the Port Madison Reservation

4.2 Summary of Comments from Tribes

The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe submitted comments which included concern that the Project could result in ongoing and expanding negative impacts to the Tribe's Treaty fishing rights in the study area, including disruption or displacement of Tribal fishers from fast ferry vessel traffic, and potential Tribal fishing gear damage from ferry operations. The full comment letter is included as Attachment F.

5 PUBLIC EARLY SCOPING

KT conducted broad outreach and engagement during the early scoping period for the Project. Community-based organizations and non-profits, transit riders, businesses, property owners, and the public are part of the affected and interested community.

The early scoping period was open May 12, 2022, through June 13, 2022. Early scoping materials are included in Attachment D.

5.1 Planning and Initial Outreach

Before the early scoping comment period began, KT developed a public involvement approach and plan to guide engagement activities. The Project team also identified key contacts within the study area and developed a Project database with stakeholder contacts and information.

Initial outreach to waterfront property owners and local agencies and a public survey were also completed. This outreach focused on understanding priorities for a new fast-ferry landing site, identifying site physical and operational requirements, and gaining feedback on site screening criteria.

5.2 Public Early Scoping Meetings

Public meetings were conducted to provide an opportunity for people to learn about the Project and early scoping, to engage directly with the Project team, and to provide formal comments during the scoping period. Meetings were online in response to continued COVID-19 prevalence.

- Held two online public meetings on June 6, 2022 (12-1pm) and June 8, 2022 (6-7 pm)
- Promoted meetings via Project emails/rider alerts, news release, social media, and information on Project webpage
- A <u>Kitsap Sun</u> article about the Project included information about the meetings
- Meeting format: welcome, Project presentation followed by Q&A and formal public comment
- Meeting recordings and presentation were posted to Project webpage

5.3 Outreach Materials and Tools

Materials and tools to inform about the Project and gain comments were utilized throughout the early scoping period and can be found in Attachment D:

- **Project** <u>webpage</u>: housed all information about the Project, including how to comment and comment form and FAQ (<u>www.kitsaptransit.com/agency-information/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project</u>)
- Early Scoping notices: published in both the Federal and SEPA Registers

- Early Scoping Information Report: posted with scoping notice and on Project
 webpage
- **Project emails/rider alerts:** sent to Project database and rider lists on May 16 (launching early scoping) and June 10 (encouraging comment before early scoping close)
- **News media release:** distributed June 2, 2022 regarding the Project and online meetings; the <u>Kitsap Sun covered</u> the Project (including attending an online meeting)
- **Social media:** posted information related to early scoping launch (May 16, 2022) and online meetings (June 2, 2022)
- Project presentation: utilized during online meetings and posted on Project webpage
- Comment form: available on Project webpage

5.4 Summary of Public Comments

Comments could be submitted through the Project webpage comment form, email, US mail, voicemail or provided at the online meetings.

The following table identifies the non-profits that provided early scoping comments and summarizes the major themes in their comments. Copies of the comment letters are included in Attachment G.

NON-PROFIT	MAJOR COMMENT THEMES
Cascade Bicycle Club	Cascade Bicycle Club requested that a new
	terminal be functional for people that bike or
	ride scooters onto the ferry, and recommended
	elements to include in further study in support
	of that goal, including demand trends for use of
	bikes and other wheeled mobility devices,
	connectivity, terminal design, bike storage,
	safety, and future demand projections.
Friends of the San Juans	Friends of the San Juans requested that
	environmental review address all of the direct,
	indirect and cumulative impacts from Project-
	related vessel traffic, particularly how increased
	vessel traffic from increased docking capacity
	could adversely impact Southern Resident killer
	whales.
Puget Soundkeeper	Puget Soundkeeper requested that
	environmental review considers a no-action
	alternative and ways to avoid (rather than
	minimize) Project impacts. Puget Soundkeeper
	also noted environmental and community
	impacts that could result from the Project
	including impacts to orcas, air quality and noise
	impacts, and community impacts.

Washington Environmental Council	Washington Environmental Council requested a better understanding of potential system expansion, recommended extensive environmental review of impacts from terminal
	construction and development, and review of greenhouse gas emissions from increased ferry
	transits.

The table below identifies topics found in comments from the public. The most common are presented first, followed by the less common. Full comments are included in Attachment G.

	24 comments concern the importance of proximity to
	transit connections, especially convenient access to link
Proximity to transit connections	
	13 comments concern the importance of proximity to the
Proximity to central business district	downtown central business district/downtown offices
	12 comments express dislike for north-end location
	options. This overlaps consistently with comments
	concerning the importance of proximity to downtown
Preference against far-north locations	transit, central business district, and stadiums/events
	10 comments concern the importance of proximity to
	WSF, used as a backup travel option when the Fast
Proximity to WSF	Ferries are full
	7 comments express preference for locating the new
Pier 50	terminal at Pier 50
	7 comments concern the importance of proximity to
Proximity to stadiums/events	stadiums/event venues
General support for Project	5 comments express general support for the Project
	4 comments express interest in locations in the central
	(Pier 54) or north (Pier 62, 70) end of the potential
Preference for center/north-end	alternatives, citing proximity to SLU (2), the 6th and Pine
locations	office area (1), and tourist attractions/shopping (1)
	3 comments address safety concerns. 2 focus on the
	importance of proximity to the University Street light rail
	station as the Pioneer Square Station feels unsafe. 1
	focuses on importance of ensuring safe pedestrian
Safety concerns	crossings are near the terminal
-	3 comments express the need for the new terminal to
	have shelter from the weather (2) and seating/phone
Terminal features	charging (1)
	2 comments express the need for secure blke storage
Bike storage	options as part of a new terminal

KT received one comment submitted jointly by two individuals which outlines a proposed passenger ferry facility. This comment letter is included in Attachment G.

6 NEXT STEPS

Input received during the early scoping comment period will be considered by KT and the FTA in refining the list of potential alternatives and the criteria to be used for initial site screening. The draft purpose and need may also be refined based on input received during early scoping and throughout the alternatives development process. Potential Project alternatives that meet the draft purpose and need will be evaluated through the Alternatives Development process, shown in Figure 4.

Now that early scoping is closed, FTA and KT will consider input from early scoping and the Project team will refine criteria for defining alternatives. it is determined that the Project will likely have significant impacts to the natural or built environment, an Environmental Impact Statement would likely be required.

The purpose of the environmental process is to provide full and open evaluation of environmental issues and alternatives, and to inform decision-makers and the public of reasonable alternatives that could avoid or minimize adverse impacts and enhance the quality of the environment. KT and FTA will conduct the appropriate environmental process, which may include another round of scoping meetings and a formal comment period, after the screening evaluation is complete. This will allow agencies, Tribes, the public, and all other interested parties an opportunity to comment on the results of the analysis and to weigh in on the alternatives presented.



Figure 4. Alternatives Development Process







announces that FRA is forwarding the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the information collection and its expected burden. On February 11, 2022, FRA published a notice providing a 60day period for public comment on the ICR.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before June 13, 2022.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed ICR should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to *www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.* Find the particular ICR by selecting "Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments" or by using the search function.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Hodan Wells, Information Collection Clearance Officer, at email: *Hodan.Wells@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The PRA, 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR part 1320, require Federal agencies to issue two notices seeking public comment on information collection activities before OMB may approve paperwork packages. *See* 44 U.S.C. 3506, 3507; 5 CFR 1320.8 through 1320.12. On February 11, 2022, FRA published a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** soliciting comment on the ICR for which it is now seeking OMB approval. *See* 87 FR 8082. FRA received no comments related to the proposed collection of information.

Before OMB decides whether to approve the proposed collection of information, it must provide 30 days for public comment. Federal law requires OMB to approve or disapprove paperwork packages between 30 and 60 days after the 30-day notice is published. 44 U.S.C. 3507(b)-(c); 5 CFR 1320.12(a); see also 60 FR 44978, 44983 (Aug. 29, 1995). OMB believes the 30day notice informs the regulated community to file relevant comments and affords the agency adequate time to digest public comments before it renders a decision. 60 FR 44983 (Aug. 29, 1995). Therefore, respondents should submit their respective comments to OMB within 30 days of publication to best ensure having their full effect.

Comments are invited on the following ICR regarding: (1) Whether the information collection activities are necessary for FRA to properly execute its functions, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of FRA's estimates of the burden of the information collection activities, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used to determine the estimates; (3) ways for FRA to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information being collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of information collection activities on the public, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

The summary below describes the ICR that FRA will submit for OMB clearance as the PRA requires:

Title: State Safety Participation Regulations and Reporting of Remedial Actions.

OMB Control Number: 2130-0509.

Abstract: The collection of information is set forth under 49 CFR part 212, and requires qualified State inspectors to provide various reports to FRA for monitoring and enforcement purposes concerning State investigative, inspection, and surveillance activities regarding railroad compliance with Federal railroad safety laws and regulations. Additionally, under 49 CFR part 209, subpart E, railroads are required to report to FRA actions taken to remedy certain alleged violations of law.

Type of Request: Extension without change (with changes in estimates) of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Businesses.

Form(s): FRA F 6180.33/61/67/96/ 96A/109/110/111/112/144.

Respondent Universe: States and railroads.

Frequency of Submission: On occasion.

Total Estimated Annual Responses: 24,066.

Total Estimated Annual Burden: 11,958 hours.

Total Estimated Annual Burden Hour Dollar Cost Equivalent: \$970,427.

FRA informs all interested parties that it may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, a collection of information that does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501-3520.

Brett A. Jortland,

Deputy Chief Counsel. [FR Doc. 2022–10206 Filed 5–11–22; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Early Scoping Notice for the Kitsap County Public Transportation Benefit Area Authority Proposed Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation (DOT). **ACTION:** Early scoping notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Kitsap **County Public Transportation Benefit** Area Authority (Kitsap Transit), the operator of Kitsap Fast Ferries, issue this early scoping notice to advise tribes, agencies, and the public that FTA and Kitsap Transit will explore potential expansion of passenger-only ferry facility capacity on the downtown Seattle waterfront for the Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project (Project). The Project would improve regional transit service by addressing the current lack of passenger-only ferry landing site capacity on the Seattle waterfront, the most in-demand destination in downtown Seattle.

DATES: Two online public early scoping meetings will be held at the following times (all times are Pacific Daylight Time):

• Monday, June 6, 2022, 12:00–1:00 p.m.

• Wednesday, June 8, 2022, 6:00–7:00 p.m.

Links for the online public early scoping meetings can be found at the project web page: https://www.kitsap transit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminalsiting-study.

In addition, an interagency and tribal early scoping meeting will be held Monday, June 6, 2022, 2:00–3:00 p.m., to receive comments from tribes and agencies who have an interest in the proposed Project. Invitations to the tribal and agency early scoping meeting will be sent to appropriate federal, tribal, state, and local government units and will include details on how to participate in the online meeting.

These early scoping meetings will be conducted in a webinar format, accessible via the internet and by teleconference.

FTA and Kitsap Transit will offer individual meetings with federallyrecognized tribes having usual and accustomed (U&A) rights in the project area at their convenience.

Additional information about the Project is provided in the following sections and the Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry Terminal Siting: Early Scoping Information Report available on the project website identified below. Kitsap Transit will also provide information on the alternative analysis at the early scoping meetings, along with opportunities for comment. Information is also currently available on the Kitsap Transit website at the following project web page (*https://*

www.kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fastferry-terminal-siting-study).

Written early scoping comments are requested by June 12, 2022, and can be mailed or emailed to the addresses below. Comments can also be provided via the online comment form available at the website address below or left as a voicemail at the phone number below.

ADDRESSES: Steffani Lillie, Kitsap Transit Service and Capital Development Director, 60 Washington Avenue, Suite 200, Bremerton, WA 98337, Email: *SteffaniL@ kitsaptransit.com*, Project website: *https://www.kitsaptransit.com/seattlefast-ferry-terminal-siting-study*, Telephone: (360) 478–6931. Information for alternate formats: (360) 479–4348.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Assam, Environmental Protection Specialist, Region X, Federal Transit Administration, 915 Second Avenue, Suite 3142, Seattle, WA 98174, phone: (206) 220–4465, email: mark.assam@ dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Early Scoping

Early scoping is an optional step in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process that is intended to invite public, agency, and tribal comments at the earliest reasonable time in project planning. FTA is the lead federal agency under NEPA. Early scoping is also being conducted under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) rules regarding expanded scoping (Washington Administrative Code 197–11–410). Kitsap Transit is the lead agency under SEPA.

Early scoping is being initiated during this Project's site screening and alternatives development phase. This early scoping notice invites the public and other interested parties to comment on the scope of the site screening and alternatives development analysis, including the following: (a) The purpose and need for the Project; (b) the assessment and criteria presented in the Early Scoping Information Report; (c) the potential impacts and benefits of the Project; and (d) other considerations that are relevant to the evaluation of alternatives. These early scoping efforts are being conducted in accordance with NEPA and its implementing regulations.

Purpose and Need for the Project

The purpose of the proposed Project is to improve regional mobility through expanded passenger-only terminal facilities on the downtown Seattle waterfront to:

• Increase vessel docking capacity.

• Increase passenger staging capacity and improve rider amenities, including restrooms and bicycle storage.

• Incorporate shoreside infrastructure and equipment to support electric vessel charging.

• Increase integration of passengeronly ferry travel with other transit modes.

• Maintain or improve rider accessibility to Seattle business, employment, cultural and retail destinations.

• Create opportunities for growth of regional passenger-only ferry routes throughout the Puget Sound Region.

• Improve access to jobs and housing opportunities in regional growth centers.

• Expand mobility options for minority and low-income populations.

Additional terminal facilities are needed because:

• The current passenger-only ferry terminal in downtown Seattle, Pier 50, is the only public facility of its kind. This facility can only accommodate two vessels at one time.

• The Pier 50 passenger-only ferry terminal facility does not have shoreside space for equipment and infrastructure needed to support future electric vessel charging, such as energy storage systems.

• Kitsap Transit's passenger-only ferry service frequency cannot by increased during peak commute periods due to the limited landing site capacity. Current service is limited to 12 landings from the three Kitsap Transit routes within the peak period.

• Terminal docking congestion leads to cascading departure delays and schedule disruptions.

• Access between the more affordable housing on the Kitsap peninsula and the Downtown Seattle job center is constrained due to limited frequency of the passenger-only ferry service. Alternatives to passenger-only ferry service include auto/passenger ferry service provided by WSF, bus transit, or driving; all of which result in travel times roughly twice as long as Kitsap Transit's passenger-only ferry routes.

• Additionally, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) 2020 Puget Sound Passenger-only Ferry Study identified the lack of landing site capacity in downtown Seattle as a barrier to potential future routes or service expansion.

Project Description

Kitsap Transit is exploring potential expansion of passenger-only ferry facility capacity on the downtown Seattle waterfront to support ongoing operations of Kitsap Fast Ferries and growth of regional passenger-only ferry service. The first step in the Project is to assess downtown Seattle waterfront locations to identify a preferred downtown terminal location to support long-term passenger-only ferry operations.

Project Context and History

Passenger-only ferry docking facilities at the Seattle waterfront, the most in demand destination in downtown Seattle, are limited and inhibit any increases to service on current routes or introduction of new routes due to capacity constraints at the existing facility. The PSRC forecasts in 2018 that the region will add 1.8 million people and 1.2 million jobs by 2050. This growth is supported by PSRC's regional transportation forecasting models that predict continued growth over the next 20 years.

Passenger-only ferry service to downtown Seattle, the region's economic and cultural center, offers an alternative to the region's capacity strained land-based transportation systems and complements existing Washington State Ferries (WSF) service. Passenger-only ferry transportation continues to expand, with Kitsap Transit implementing three routes in the last four years (Bremerton-Seattle, Kingston-Seattle, and Southworth-Seattle) with four vessels, and with ridership growing on the two existing King County Water Taxi routes (West Seattle-Seattle and Vashon Island-Seattle), operated by the Metropolitan King County, Metro Transit Department, Marine Division (King County Metro). In addition to existing operators, a recent PSRC 2020 Puget Sound Passenger-only Ferry Study identified additional potential ferry routes into the congested downtown Seattle waterfront.

The Kitsap Transit passenger-only ferry program is an important transportation link connecting the Kitsap Peninsula to downtown Seattle. To ensure this service is reliable and meets rider needs, adequate landing facilities must be available on both ends of the routes. Kitsap Transit has built adequate landing facilities at two of their four landing locations: Bremerton and Kingston. The Southworth-Seattle route currently shares a single slip with WSF at Southworth, and Kitsap Transit is working with WSF to make facility improvements to expand docking facilities. However, all three Kitsap Transit routes share two slips with the two King County Metro routes at Pier 50 on the Seattle waterfront (Kitsap Transit's fourth landing location). Pier 50's designed operating capacity is insufficient for five distinct routes, serviced by six operating vessels, arriving 20 times during both the morning and afternoon commute periods.

Kitsap Transit is the secondary user at Pier 50 and must fit their service schedule around King County Metro's schedule. Hence, the driving factor in Kitsap Transit's service schedule is docking availability. This means that landing times are limited to available docking windows rather than customer preferences for arrival and departure times. With 12 landings in the peak commute ridership periods (5 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.), Kitsap Transit's current schedule fully utilizes the docking times not reserved for King County Metro. Although there are a few remaining dock openings during the commute window, they cannot be accommodated within Kitsap Transit vessel headways and dwell times.

Additional challenges to maintaining service schedules occur when Kitsap Transit and King County Metro vessels experience inevitable transit delays due to weather conditions such as fog or marine traffic that lead to cascading departure delays and service disruptions that cannot be mitigated with two landing slips.

Kitsap Transit must stay within their docking windows in Seattle so as not to disrupt King County Metro's schedule. To maintain docking windows, Kitsap Transit routinely has to travel at higher than planned speeds to maintain the Seattle arrival and departure schedule. At these higher speeds, Kitsap Transit consumes more fuel leading to higher carbon emissions and increased operating costs from higher fuel expense. Higher-speed operations also place greater loads on vessel engines and other vessel systems leading to increased maintenance costs.

Kitsap Transit temporarily operated their Bremerton-Seattle route from a leased private dock at Pier 54. The lease could not be renewed, forcing Kitsap Transit to consolidate all three routes with King County Metro's two routes at Pier 50 beginning May 2, 2022. With five routes and six vessels operating from two slips, the risk of arrival and departure delays and higher operating costs will increase.

Next Steps

Following early scoping, FTA and Kitsap Transit will use the comments received from early scoping to help identify and narrow the range of Project location alternatives for further evaluation in a combined NEPA/SEPA environmental document. If the resulting range of alternatives involves the potential for significant environmental impacts requiring an environmental impact statement (EIS), FTA will publish a Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS in the Federal Register, and Kitsap Transit will publish a Determination of Significance/Scoping Notice. Tribes, agencies, and the public will be invited to comment on the scope of the EIS at that time.

Authority: 49 CFR 622.101, 23 CFR 771.111, and 40 CFR 1501.7.

Linda M. Gehrke,

Regional Administrator. [FR Doc. 2022–10156 Filed 5–11–22; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. DOT-MARAD-2022-0101]

Request for Comments on the Renewal of a Previously Approved Information Collection: Request for Transfer of Ownership, Registry, and Flag, or Charter, Lease, or Mortgage of U.S. Citizen Owned Documented Vessels

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, DOT. **ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Maritime Administration (MARAD) invites public comments on our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. The collection involves documenting Transfer of Ownership, Registry, and Flag, or Charter, Lease, or Mortgage of U.S. Citizen owned documented vessels.

We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. **DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or July 11, 2022.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Docket No. DOT–MARAD–2022–0099 through one of the following methods:

• *Federal eRulemaking Portal: www.regulations.gov.* Search using the above DOT docket number and follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

• Fax: 1-202-493-2251.

• Mail or Hand Delivery: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Room W12– 140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except on Federal holidays.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number for this rulemaking.

Note: All comments received will be posted without change to *www.regulations.gov* including any personal information provided.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the Department's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for the Department to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

Electronic Access and Filing

A copy of the notice may be viewed online at *www.regulations.gov* using the docket number listed above. A copy of this notice will be placed in the docket. Electronic retrieval help and guidelines are available on the website. It is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. An electronic copy of this document may also be downloaded from the Office of the Federal Register's website at *www.FederalRegister.gov* and the Government Publishing Office's website at *www.GovInfo.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Katrina McRae, Vessel Transfer Specialist, Office of Sealift Support, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590, (202) 366–3198, *katrina.mcrae@ dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Request for Transfer of Ownership, Registry, and Flag, or Charter, Lease, or Mortgage of U.S.-Citizen Owned Documented Vessels.

OMB Control Number: 2133–0006. *Type of Request:* Extension of currently approved collection.

Background: This collection provides information necessary for MARAD to approve the sale, transfer, charter, lease, or mortgage of U.S. documented vessels to non-citizens, or the transfer of such vessels to foreign registry and flag, or the transfer of foreign flag vessels by their owners as required by various contractual requirements. The







State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Register

SEPA and NEPA documents posted by the Department of Ecology since 2000

Search (../../) / 202202355 - Kitsap Transit

202202355 - Kitsap Transit

Lead Agency

Kitsap Transit

Website

https://www.kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project (https://www.kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-f...

Contact

Steffani Lillie (360) 478-6931 steffanil@kitsaptransit.com (mailto:steffanil@kitsaptransit.com)

County KITSAP

Region Northwest

SEPA

202202355

Document Type

DS/SCOPING

Date Issued

05/12/2022

Comments Due

06/12/2022

Proposal Name

Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Siting Early Scoping

Proposal Description

Kitsap Transit (KT) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are conducting an early scoping effort for the Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project (Project). The Project will assess downtown Seattle waterfront locations to identify a preferred downtown terminal location to support KT's long-term fast ferry

202202355 - Kitsap Transit

operations. Expanded landing facilities in downtown Seattle are necessary to support the KT fast ferry service approved by Kitsap voters in 2016. The Project would improve reliability of this regional transit service by addressing the current lack of passenger-only ferry (POF) landing site capacity on the Seattle waterfront, the most in demand destination in downtown Seattle. KT received federal grant funding to support this Project. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements apply to any project receiving federal grant funding that might have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment, including those involving construction, expansion, renovation, facility planning, site selection, site preparation, and security or facility upgrades. The grantee must be in compliance with NEPA requirements during the initiation of the project, as part of planning, site selection, and site preparation, and the grantee must complete the NEPA process prior to actual project construction. Early scoping for the Project is occurring within the context of the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for NEPA compliance. FTA is the lead agency under NEPA and KT is the lead agency under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act.

Related Record

Location

Address: Bremerton, WA 98337 Longitude: -122.624950 Latitude: 47.563440 Other identifying information: Downtown Seattle waterfront locations

Applicant

Steffani Lillie, Service & Capital Development Director - Kitsap Transit

Applicant Contact

60 Washington Ave., Ste. 200 Bremerton, WA 98337 360-478-6931 steffanil@kitsaptransit.com

Documents

■ 202202355_ECYCommentLetter.pdf (Document/DocumentOpenHandler.ashx?DocumentId=137072) (630 KB)

■ 220425_KT Siting_Early Scoping Info Report_final.pdf (Document/DocumentOpenHandler.ashx? DocumentId=134995) (697 KB)

Please email <u>SEPA Help (mailto:sepahelp@ecy.wa.gov)</u> with any updates, problems, or questions about SEPA Register.

© 2022 Washington State Department of Ecology - Shorelands Environmental Assistance Program



Attachment C Early Scoping Information Report



Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility

Scoping Information Report

May 2022



Acronyms and Abbreviations

EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
King County Metro	Metropolitan King County, Metro Transit Department, Marine Division
кт	Kitsap Transit
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
POF	Passenger-only Ferry
PSRC	Puget Sound Regional Council
WSF	Washington State Ferries

I. INTRODUCTION

Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Siting Early Scoping

Kitsap Transit (KT) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are conducting an early scoping effort for the Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project (Project). The Project will assess downtown Seattle waterfront locations to identify a preferred downtown terminal location to support KT's long-term fast ferry operations. Expanded landing facilities in downtown Seattle are necessary to support the KT fast ferry service approved by Kitsap voters in 2016. The Project would improve reliability of this regional transit service by addressing the current lack of passenger-only ferry (POF) landing site capacity on the Seattle waterfront, the most in demand destination in downtown Seattle. KT received federal grant funding to support this Project.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements apply to any project receiving federal grant funding that might have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment, including those involving construction, expansion, renovation, facility planning, site selection, site preparation, and security or facility upgrades. The grantee must be in compliance with NEPA requirements during the initiation of the project, as part of planning, site selection, and site preparation, and the grantee must complete the NEPA process prior to actual project construction. Early scoping for the Project is occurring within the context of the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for NEPA compliance. FTA is the lead agency under NEPA and KT is the lead agency under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act.



Figure 1. Kitsap Fast Ferry Route Map showing the three KT routes connecting to the Pier 50 facility in downtown Seattle.

What is Scoping?

Scoping is a process that over time, with coordination and engagement, defines and refines the project. This process includes multifaceted engagement with tribal governments, agencies, and the public. The "public" includes transit riders, property owners, business owners, community-based organizations and all other interested parties. The Project will engage with the public on both sides of the Kitsap Fast Ferry route, in Kitsap County and in downtown Seattle, where the scope of the terminal siting project is focused.

The scoping process will include a series of meetings to define the criteria for the Project that will be used to screen sites and help form the development of alternative site locations and terminal layouts on the Seattle waterfront (discussed further in Section 4). KT is seeking comments on the Project purpose and need as well as positive and negative effects each potential site may have on the surrounding areas that should be considered during site screening and alternative development.

Once input is received through early scoping, KT will refine the screening criteria used to assess potential alternatives for terminal site locations. Those screening criteria will then be applied to Seattle waterfront properties to identify potential terminal site alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the Project. These locations will be further evaluated as part of the Alternatives Development process (described in Section 4 of this document).

After the completion of the early scoping notice period, FTA will determine what level of analysis will be required during environmental review. If it is determined that the Project will likely have significant impacts to the quality of the human environment, a formal decision will be made to proceed with an appropriate environmental process, which may trigger the need to file a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register. The purpose of the EIS is to provide full and open evaluation of environmental issues and alternatives, and to inform decision-makers and the public of reasonable alternatives that could avoid or minimize adverse impacts and enhance the quality of the environment. KT and FTA will conduct the appropriate environmental process, which may include another round of scoping meetings and a formal comment period, after the screening evaluation is complete. This will allow the public, agencies, tribes, and all other interested parties an opportunity to comment on the results of the analysis and to weigh in on the alternatives presented.

Involvement of KT Board

The KT Board includes 10 members, nine elected officials and a non-voting member who represents the agency's labor unions, and makes decisions regarding policy, operations, and project planning. All board meetings are public and anyone may attend. At the conclusion of early scoping, the KT board will adopt the alternative(s) that advance to the environmental review process. Screening criteria and initial site assessment, informed by input from all interested parties, will be presented to the KT Board.

Early Scoping Meetings

Early scoping includes a public comment period that will run 30 days. Public meetings will be held at the following times:

- Monday, June 6, 2022, 12:00-1:00 p.m. (PST)
- Wednesday, June 8, 2022, 6:00-7:00 p.m. (PST)

These early scoping meetings will be conducted in a webinar format, accessible via the internet and by teleconference. Links for the online public early scoping meetings can be found at the project webpage: <u>https://www.kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-siting-study</u>.

To identify concerns and interests due to the potential historical and ecological nature of the project sites, regulatory agencies and tribes will be given opportunities to review project information and provide comments throughout the scoping process. Potentially interested federally-recognized tribes will be contacted and offered individual meetings at their request. Invitations to the regulatory agency and tribal early scoping meetings will be sent to the appropriate federal, tribal, state and local governmental contacts. The meetings will be accessible online via the internet and by teleconference.

How to Comment

Written early scoping comments on this notice are requested by June 12, 2022, to Steffani Lillie, Service and Capital Development Director at the contact information below.

Email Address: <u>SteffaniL@kitsaptransit.com</u>.

Telephone Number: (360) 478-6931

Mailing Address:

Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie, Service and Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton, WA 98337

Information for Alternate Formats: (360) 479-4348.

2. Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal and the Regional Passenger-Only Ferry System

The KT Fast Ferry program is part of the regional POF system that provides faster transportation options for people traveling between the Kitsap Peninsula and downtown Seattle.

Regional Passenger-only Ferry System

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) is the regional metropolitan planning organization that incudes Kitsap County and develops policies and coordinates decisions about regional growth, transportation and economic development planning as well as secures federal funding for transportation projects. In 2008, PSRC conducted a POF Study that identified Bremerton-Seattle, Kingston-Seattle and Southworth-Seattle as the most viable new routes for implementation based on ridership demand, land use compatibility, ease of operational and system integration, capital and operating costs and assessment of environmental impacts. Supported by a voter-approved tax initiative, KT has implemented these three POF.

Currently, KT and Metropolitan King County, Metro Transit Department, Marine Division (King County Metro) operate POF services in the Puget Sound region. KT operates local POF service from Annapolis and Port Orchard to Bremerton via the Foot Ferry and cross sound fast ferry service between three sites on the Kitsap Peninsula (Kingston, Bremerton and Southworth) and downtown Seattle all arriving at the existing POF facility at Pier 50. The King County Metro Water Taxi provides service on two routes, between Vashon Island and Pier 50 as well as West Seattle and Pier 50.

A 2020 PSRC POF study identified current and future capacity constraints at the current Pier 50 facility as a challenge for existing and expanding interest in POF systems as a regional transportation option.

Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry Program

KT launched its first Fast Ferry POF route between Bremerton and Seattle in 2017. The Kingston-Seattle route followed in 2018, and the Southworth to Seattle route in 2020. The service is partially funded by three tenths of a cent local sales tax approved by Kitsap County voters in 2016. All three routes offer morning and afternoon weekday commute service year-round, with all-day service on Saturdays from May through September. Operating two vessels on weekdays, the Bremerton-Seattle route also offers some midday service. The Kingston-Seattle and Southworth-Seattle routes each operate a one-vessel schedule. Since the launch of Southworth-Seattle service, the Bremerton-Seattle route has operated its two-vessel service from a float at Pier 54 which is temporarily leased from a private operator. KT's lease of Pier 54 will end in May 2022 when Pier 54 undergoes renovations. On May 2, 2022, all three Kitsap Fast Ferry routes, served by four vessels, will operate from Pier 50. The sailing times for these routes are limited by the slip availability at Pier 50 and may not be the ideal peak travel times desired by the KT customer.

Existing POF Facility in Downtown Seattle

KT shares the use of Pier 50—the only public POF facility serving downtown Seattle with King County Metro under a five-year use agreement expiring August 2024. The existing POF facility in Seattle is a single float that supports a maximum of two, sideloading vessels (one on each side) at any one time. The float currently serves four routes with four vessels, and in May 2022, will also be the landing site for the Bremerton-Seattle service and its two additional service vessels.

Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project Development

KT began developing their 2040 Long Range Plan in 2021 with an existing conditions analysis identifying limited docking facilities on the Seattle waterfront as a constraint to full realization of the goals of the Fast Ferry program and highlighting the importance of the current Project. Securing adequate landing and shoreside facilities on the Seattle waterfront will be a key goal of the marine component of KT's Long Range Transportation Plan.



Study Area for Seattle Terminal Alternative Analysis

Figure 2. Downtown Seattle Waterfront Project Study Area Map

Project Funding

Recognizing the increasing need for docking capacity on the Seattle waterfront to address existing landing capacity limitations and service level and reliability issues, KT has dedicated some local funds in their capital budget to initiate site procurement. Additional funding will be sought through grants and other local sources to complete detailed planning, environmental review and preliminary engineering work. Additionally, the project is included in the PSRC 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program and identified as project KT-66 in the Washington State 2022-2025 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

Project Context and History

Passenger-only ferry docking facilities at the Seattle waterfront, the most in demand destination in downtown Seattle, are limited and inhibit any increases to service on current routes or introduction of new routes due to capacity constraints at the existing facility. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) forecasts in 2018 that the region will add 1.8 million people and 1.2 million jobs by 2050. This growth is supported by PSRC's regional transportation forecasting models that predict continued growth over the next 20 years.

Passenger-only ferry service to downtown Seattle, the region's economic and cultural center, offers an alternative to the region's capacity strained land-based transportation systems and complements existing Washington State Ferries (WSF) service. Passenger-only ferry transportation continues to expand, with KT implementing three routes in the last four years (Bremerton-Seattle, Kingston-Seattle and Southworth-Seattle) with four vessels, and with ridership growing on the two existing King County Water Taxi routes (West Seattle-Seattle and Vashon Island-Seattle), operated by the Metropolitan King County, Metro Transit Department, Marine Division (King County Metro). In addition to existing operators, a recent PSRC 2020 Puget Sound Passenger-only Ferry Study identified additional potential ferry routes into the congested downtown Seattle waterfront. King County and other municipalities continue to explore passenger-only ferry service to downtown Seattle.

The KT passenger-only ferry program is an important transportation link connecting the Kitsap Peninsula to downtown Seattle. To ensure this service is reliable and meets rider needs, adequate landing facilities must be available on both ends of the routes. KT has built adequate landing facilities at two of their four landing locations: Bremerton and Kingston. The Southworth-Seattle route currently shares a single slip with WSF at Southworth, and KT is working with WSF to make facility improvements to expand docking facilities. However, all three KT routes share two slips with the two King County Metro routes at Pier 50 on the Seattle waterfront (KT's fourth landing location). Pier 50's designed operating capacity is insufficient for five distinct routes, serviced by six operating vessels, arriving 20 times during both the morning and afternoon commute periods.

KT is the secondary user at Pier 50 and must fit their service schedule around King County Metro's schedule. Hence, the driving factor in KT's service schedule is docking availability. This means that landing times are limited to available docking windows rather than customer preferences for arrival and departure times. With 12 landings in the peak commute ridership periods (5 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.), KT's current schedule fully utilizes the docking times not reserved for King County Metro. Although there are a few remaining dock openings during the commute window, they cannot be accommodated within KT vessel headways and dwell times.

Additional challenges to maintaining service schedules occur when KT and King County Metro vessels experience inevitable transit delays due to weather conditions such as fog or marine traffic that lead to cascading departure delays and service disruptions that cannot be mitigated with two landing slips. KT must stay within their docking windows in Seattle so as not to disrupt King County Metro's schedule. To maintain docking windows, KT routinely has to travel at higher than planned speeds to maintain the Seattle arrival and departure schedule. At these higher speeds, KT consumes more fuel leading to higher carbon emissions and increased operating costs from higher fuel expense. Higher-speed operations also place greater loads on vessel engines and other vessel systems leading to increased maintenance costs.

This is particularly a problem on the Southworth-Seattle route where KT shares a single operating slip in Southworth with WSF's Fauntleroy-Vashon-Southworth route which has high potential for delays due to ridership congestion and the complicated landing schedule with multiple destinations. On average, five of the fourteen KT service trips per day are forced to run at higher than planned speeds during a portion of the route to meet scheduled arrival times in Seattle. Three of these five trips are typically required to run at top speed of 38 knots. On an annualized basis these five trips consume approximately 27,000 more gallons of fuel and cost approximately \$82,000 more than planned.

KT temporarily operated their Bremerton-Seattle route from a leased private dock at Pier 54. The lease could not be renewed, forcing KT to consolidate all three routes with King County Metro's two routes at Pier 50 beginning May 2, 2022. With five routes and six vessels operating from two slips, the risk of arrival and departure delays and higher operating costs will increase.

3. THE PURPOSE AND NEED

In the sections below, KT defines what the project intends to accomplish (project purpose) and the problems the project plans to address (project need). The purpose and need statement will be refined throughout the scoping phase in response to public and agency comments.

Project Purpose

The purpose of the proposed Project is to improve regional mobility through expanded passenger only terminal facilities on the downtown Seattle waterfront to:

- Increase vessel docking capacity.
- Increase passenger staging capacity and improve rider amenities, including restrooms and bicycle storage.
- Incorporate shoreside infrastructure and equipment to support electric vessel charging.
- Increase integration of passenger-only ferry travel with other transit modes.
- Maintain or improve rider accessibility to Seattle business, employment, cultural and retail destinations.
- Create opportunities for growth of regional passenger-only ferry routes throughout the Puget Sound Region.
- Improve access to jobs and housing opportunities in regional growth centers.
- Expand mobility options for minority and low-income populations.

Need for the Project

Additional terminal facilities are needed because:

- The current passenger-only ferry terminal in downtown Seattle, Pier 50, is the only public facility of its kind. This facility can only accommodate two vessels at one time.
- The Pier 50 passenger-only ferry terminal facility does not have shore-side space for equipment and infrastructure needed to support future electric vessel charging, such as energy storage systems.
- KT's passenger-only ferry service frequency cannot by increased during peak commute periods due to the limited landing site capacity. Current service is limited to 12 landings from the three KT routes within the peak period.
- Terminal docking congestion leads to cascading departure delays and schedule disruptions.
- Access between the more affordable housing on the Kitsap peninsula and the Downtown Seattle job center is constrained due to limited frequency of the passenger-only ferry service. Alternatives to passenger-only ferry service include auto/passenger ferry service provided by WSF, bus transit, or driving; all of which result in travel times roughly twice as long as KT's passenger-only ferry routes.
- Additionally, the PSRC 2020 Puget Sound Passenger-only Ferry Study identified the lack of landing site capacity in downtown Seattle as a barrier to potential future routes or service expansion.

4. ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Figure 3 provides a summary of the alternatives development process that will be completed in the planning phase of the Project. The Project is currently in the first step of the alternative development process, which includes development of site screening criteria, initial review of site options, and early scoping. Outreach completed to date to support site screening includes a public survey and initial stakeholder outreach to waterfront property owners and local agencies. Initial outreach focused on understanding priorities for a new POF landing and identifying site physical and operational requirements.



Figure 3. Alternatives Development Process

Defining Site Alternatives

Since the Project kick-off in 2020, KT has conducted initial property site screening to document ownership and site dimensional characteristics of Seattle waterfront properties. KT has also identified preliminary physical and operational requirements for infrastructure and facilities to support vessels and passengers. The assessment of physical and operational requirements has included in-water dimensional requirements and uplands space needed for a KT terminal facility to serve the operational needs of their three cross-sound routes. Site screening and alternatives development will continue after input from the early scoping comment period and continue through the scoping process as stated in this document.

As part of the early scoping process, KT is seeking input on the screening criteria to both narrow the list of sites considered and to further analysis of remaining sites to become site alternatives.

The criteria below will be applied to initial site screening:

Site use compatibility

- Site allows POF landing site use
- o POF operations are compatible with existing site uses

In-water space to accommodate KT's operating needs

- Four operating slips (three in service and one back-up)
 - Provide capacity for KT's current three routes during peak hour commute, with capacity to accommodate potential future growth
 - 2 bow-loading, 2 side-loading
- o Simultaneous maneuvering space for a minimum of two vessels
- o Adequate protection from wind, waves, and wakes from vessel traffic

Space for passenger programming

Space for covered queuing and amenities to support at least three POF routes

Access

- o Multimodal-Pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections
- Maintaining current POF crossing times

Future use planning

- Uplands and in-water space to add equipment to support electric charging for vessels or
- o Space to accommodate future application of alternative fuels

5. PROJECT TIMELINE

KT is in the early planning phase of the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal project. After the planning phase, KT will move into the design phase and later construction of the terminal. The timeline below includes estimated years for completion of each phase.





Attachment D Scoping Materials



From:	Kitsap Transit
To:	Recipient
Subject:	Rider Alert: Your Comments Needed for Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project - Early Scoping
Date:	Monday, May 16, 2022 12:09:32 PM

 Your Comments Needed Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project Early Scoping Kitsap Transit has kicked off the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project to evaluate options for an additional downtown Seattle landing site to supp Kitsap Fast Ferries' ongoing operations as well as create future capacity regional passenger-only ferry service. Kitsap Transit and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are conduct Early Scoping for the Project to help define and refine the Project purpor and need, alternatives, and criteria used for evaluation of alternatives. Early Scoping is an opportunity for tribal governments; federal, state and local agencies; transit riders; property owners; businesses; community-to organizations; and all other interested parties to submit comments on th purpose and need, as well as potential impacts and benefits to the community and the environment that should be considered when develor and evaluating alternative site locations. Kitsap Transit will hold two virtual public Early Scoping meetings on Jun from 12:00-1:00 PM and June 8 from 6:00-7:00 PM. Please join us to more about the project and provide comments. Comments may also be submitted online or sent by mail or email. Public comment is open through June 12, 2022. More information on the project, the public meetings, and how to comme can be found at https://kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-projec 	?
Kitsap Transit has kicked off the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project to evaluate options for an additional downtown Seattle landing site to supp Kitsap Fast Ferries' ongoing operations as well as create future capacity regional passenger-only ferry service. Kitsap Transit and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are conduct Early Scoping for the Project to help define and refine the Project purpor and need, alternatives, and criteria used for evaluation of alternatives. Early Scoping is an opportunity for tribal governments; federal, state and local agencies; transit riders; property owners; businesses; community-to organizations; and all other interested parties to submit comments on th purpose and need, as well as potential impacts and benefits to the community and the environment that should be considered when develor and evaluating alternative site locations. Kitsap Transit will hold two virtual public Early Scoping meetings on Jun from 12:00-1:00 PM and June 8 from 6:00-7:00 PM . Please join us to more about the project and provide comments. Comments may also be submitted online or sent by mail or email. Publi comment is open through June 12, 2022 . More information on the project, the public meetings, and how to comme can be found at <u>https://kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-projec</u>	nts Needed Ferry Terminal Project Early Scoping
Kitsap Transit and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are conduct Early Scoping for the Project to help define and refine the Project purper and need, alternatives, and criteria used for evaluation of alternatives. Early Scoping is an opportunity for tribal governments; federal, state and local agencies; transit riders; property owners; businesses; community-borganizations; and all other interested parties to submit comments on the purpose and need, as well as potential impacts and benefits to the community and the environment that should be considered when develor and evaluating alternative site locations. Kitsap Transit will hold two virtual public Early Scoping meetings on Jun from 12:00-1:00 PM and June 8 from 6:00-7:00 PM . Please join us to more about the project and provide comments. Comments may also be submitted online or sent by mail or email. Public comment is open through June 12, 2022 .	has kicked off the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project to ns for an additional downtown Seattle landing site to support erries' ongoing operations as well as create future capacity for enger-only ferry service.
Early Scoping is an opportunity for tribal governments; federal, state and local agencies; transit riders; property owners; businesses; community-to organizations; and all other interested parties to submit comments on the purpose and need, as well as potential impacts and benefits to the community and the environment that should be considered when develor and evaluating alternative site locations. Kitsap Transit will hold two virtual public Early Scoping meetings on Jun from 12:00-1:00 PM and June 8 from 6:00-7:00 PM . Please join us to more about the project and provide comments. Comments may also be submitted online or sent by mail or email. Public comment is open through June 12, 2022 . More information on the project, the public meetings, and how to commer can be found at https://kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project	and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are conducting g for the Project to help define and refine the Project purpose matives, and criteria used for evaluation of alternatives.
Kitsap Transit will hold two virtual public Early Scoping meetings on Jun from 12:00-1:00 PM and June 8 from 6:00-7:00 PM. Please join us to more about the project and provide comments. Comments may also be submitted online or sent by mail or email. Public comment is open through June 12, 2022. More information on the project, the public meetings, and how to comme can be found at https://kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project	is an opportunity for tribal governments; federal, state and ; transit riders; property owners; businesses; community-base and all other interested parties to submit comments on the leed, as well as potential impacts and benefits to the d the environment that should be considered when developing g alternative site locations.
Comments may also be submitted online or sent by mail or email. Public comment is open through June 12, 2022 . More information on the project, the public meetings, and how to comme can be found at https://kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project	will hold two virtual public Early Scoping meetings on June 6 00 PM and June 8 from 6:00-7:00 PM . Please join us to learn e project and provide comments.
More information on the project, the public meetings, and how to comme can be found at <u>https://kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project</u>	ay also be submitted online or sent by mail or email. Public ppen through June 12, 2022 .
	ion on the project, the public meetings, and how to comment, at <u>https://kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project</u> .
You can also sign up for e-mail updates on the project by <u>clicking here</u> subscribing to the Seattle Fast-Ferry Terminal Project e-mail list.	sign up for e-mail updates on the project by <u>clicking here</u> and the Seattle Fast-Ferry Terminal Project e-mail list.

STAY CONNECTED:

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES: Manage Subscriptions | Unsubscribe All | Subscriber Help |




Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project Early Scoping Comment Period Ends June 13

The Early Scoping comment period for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project ends **Monday, June 13, 2022**. Comments may be provided by mail, email, phone, or online. More information on how to comment, as well as details on the project can be found at <u>https://www.kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project.</u>

About the Project and Early Scoping

Kitsap Transit has kicked off the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project to evaluate options for an additional downtown Seattle landing site to support Kitsap Fast Ferries' ongoing operations as well as create future capacity for regional passengeronly ferry service.

Kitsap Transit and the Federal Transit Administration are conducting Early Scoping for the Project to help define and refine the Project purpose and need, alternatives, and criteria used for evaluation of alternatives.

About Kitsap Transit and our Fast Ferries

Kitsap Transit has been operating friendly, convenient public transit since 1983. The transit agency for Kitsap County carried more than 3.8 million riders in 2019 across a multi-modal system of routed buses, passenger ferries, paratransit shuttles, vanpools, and worker/driver buses for the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

In 2016 voters approved a ballot proposition for a dedicated sales tax to support Kitsap Transit's plan for passenger-only ferry service to downtown Seattle from Bremerton, Kingston and Southworth. Kitsap Transit launched fast-ferry service on the Bremerton/Seattle route in July 2017, Kingston/Seattle in November 2018 and Southworth/Seattle in March 2021.

You can also sign up for e-mail updates on the Project by <u>clicking here</u> and subscribing to the Seattle Fast-Ferry Terminal Project e-mail list.





Kitsap Transit

Published by Sprout Social 💿 · May 16 · 🕤

As frequent ferry riders know, the passenger-only ferry facility at Pier 50 in Seattle can only fit two vessels at a time. Kitsap Transit is taking the first steps toward evaluating options for additional landing facilities in Seattle, and we want to hear from you! The public will be able to submit comments online or weigh in at one of two public meetings next month.

Read more about the project and learn how you can submit feedback at our Headways blog: https://bit.ly/3LnMaCa



2,518 People reached **136** Engagements **Boost unavailable**

19

4 Comments 5 Shares



Kitsap Transit is taking the first steps toward evaluating options for additional ferry landing facilities in Seattle, and we want to hear from you! Submit a comment online or attend one of two public meetings next month. Read more at our Headways blog: bit.ly/3LnMaCa



7:56 PM · May 16, 2022 · Sprout Social

1 Retweet 2 Likes



Kitsap Transit

Published by Sprout Social 💿 · June 2 at 3:23 PM · 🕄

Reminder: We're holding two virtual public meetings next week for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project. Please join us to learn more about why Kitsap Transit is evaluating options for an additional downtown landing site and to provide comment. Details: https://bit.ly/3MijM4N

2,347 People reached

8

107 Engagements ↑ +1.5x higher
Distribution score

Boost unavailable

3 Shares



Reminder: We're holding two virtual public meetings next week for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project. Please join us to learn more about why Kitsap Transit is evaluating options for an additional downtown landing site and to provide comment. Details: bit.ly/3MijM4N



3:23 PM · Jun 2, 2022 · Sprout Social

1 Quote Tweet 2 Likes







in

Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project: Addressing crowded landing space at Pier 50

Projects • News • Surveys May 16 • Written By Christian Vosler



https://www.ktheadways.com/blog/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project



Kitsap Transit shifted Bremerton fast ferry sailings from Pier 54 to Pier 50 last month, a move that necessitated a small schedule change. Frequent ferry riders will probably be familiar with these moves – we occasionally have to alter our fast ferry

schedules to fit into one of the two available slips at Pier 50 in downtown Seattle.

Ferries arrive and depart the passenger-only facility at Pier 50 on a tight schedule. Between Kitsap Transit's three ferry routes – <u>Kingston, Bremerton and Southworth</u> – and King County Water Taxi's Vashon Island and West Seattle routes, there's a lot of traffic coming and going from a landing facility capable of serving only two ferries at one time. If a ferry misses its window, it risks having to cancel or delay sailings because of the other vessels waiting to dock there.

Solving this problem of insufficient landing space will help improve reliability and consistency for our riders. It's why Kitsap Transit, along with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), is taking the first steps toward <u>evaluating options for additional</u> <u>landing facilities</u> in downtown Seattle that could accommodate multiple ferries docking at one time and ensure we have capacity for future routes.

Right now, we're in the **Early Scoping** stage of the project, a process that involves getting feedback from all the stakeholders involved: tribal governments, agencies, transit riders, property owners, businesses, community organizations and anyone else who may be interested.

The goal is to gather feedback about the project's purpose and need plus any potential impacts and benefits to the community and the environment that we should consider while evaluating site locations. The public comment period is open **May 12 – June 12, 2022**.

If you're interested in weighing in, you can submit a public comment online, or

attend one of our two public meetings, held virtually at the following times:

- Monday, June 6 from 12:00 1:00 PM
- Wednesday, June 8, from 6:00 7:00 PM

You can also sign up for our email list to follow along with the project's progress! Learn more at <u>https://www.kitsaptransit.com/static/486/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project</u>.

56 f 10 ♂ m m m

Fast Ferry • Seattle • Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project • Projects • Public Comment • Bremerton • Kingston • Southworth • Ferries • Ferry • Study

Groundbreaking kicks off Silverdale Transit Center construction

Help us shape the future of Kitsap Transit

Questions ?	Blog	Rider Alerts	
	<u>About</u>	How to Ride Kitsap Transit	
<u>us</u>	Events Español and Tagalog		



PRESS RELEASE

Public Meetings Next Week for Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project

Public comment period for Early Scoping open through June 12

June 2, 2022

Contact: Sanjay Bhatt, Marketing & Public Information Director, sanjayb@kitsaptransit.com

BREMERTON, Wash. – Kitsap Transit will hold two virtual public meetings for Early Scoping for its Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project on June 6 from 12-1 PM and June 8 from 6-7 PM.

Transit riders, property owners, businesses, community-based organizations, and all other interested parties are invited to learn more about why Kitsap Transit is evaluating options for an additional downtown Seattle landing site and to provide comment.

More information, including meeting links, project background, and additional ways to comment can be found at <u>https://www.kitsaptransit.com/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project</u>.

About the Project and Early Scoping

Kitsap Transit has kicked off the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project to evaluate options for an additional downtown Seattle landing site to support Kitsap Fast Ferries' ongoing operations as well as create future capacity for regional passenger-only ferry service.

Kitsap Transit and the Federal Transit Administration are conducting Early Scoping for the Project to help define and refine the Project purpose and need, alternatives, and criteria used for evaluation of alternatives.

About Kitsap Transit and our Fast Ferries

Kitsap Transit has been operating friendly, convenient public transit since 1983. The transit agency for Kitsap County carried more than 3.8 million riders in 2019 across a multi-modal system of routed buses, passenger ferries, paratransit shuttles, vanpools, and worker/driver buses for the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard. In 2016 voters approved a ballot proposition for a dedicated sales tax to support Kitsap Transit's plan for passenger-only ferry service to downtown Seattle from Bremerton, Kingston and Southworth. Kitsap Transit launched fast-ferry service on the Bremerton/Seattle route in July 2017, Kingston/Seattle in November 2018 and Southworth/Seattle in March 2021.

Kitsap <mark>Sun</mark>

NEWS

Kitsap Transit eyeing its own landing dock on Seattle waterfront

Zachary Fletcher Kitsap Sun Published 11:16 a.m. PT June 8, 2022

Kitsap Transit is scoping out a new location on the Seattle waterfront for its fast ferries to dock.

The Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project, led by Kitsap Transit and the Federal Transit Administration, is in the beginning stages of creating a dedicated landing dock for passenger-only ferry service. Kitsap Transit currently shares space on the Seattle waterfront with the King County Water Taxi. That terminal is operated by King County Marine Division and only has space for two vessels to dock at a time. Kitsap Transit's fast ferry fleet has four total boats from its three routes vying for space at the Pier 50 terminal.

Kitsap Transit's Fast Ferry service launched in 2017 and now operates three routes to downtown Seattle from Southworth, Bremerton and Kingston. The King County Water Taxi operates two separate routes.

Until May 2, 2022, the Bremerton-Seattle Fast Ferry route docked at a private location at Pier 54. After a lease for the site was not renewed, the Bremerton-Seattle route was moved to Pier 50. There are now five routes and six vessels sharing a two-boat dock.

Project officials are looking for a space that can manage all three of Kitsap Transit's fast ferry's routes and provide one backup slip. Increased space for passenger waiting areas, transit access and future planning for electric vessel charging are also considerations for the new site.

There is no current cost estimate for the project, but Kitsap Transit spokesman Sanjay Bhatt says that close to \$2.5 million in a 2024-2025 grant from the Federal Transit Administration has already been secured. To apply for these federal grants, Bhatt says, Kitsap Transit is required to seek public input on the project.

Kitsap Transit opened a public comment period on May 12 and is currently seeking input from other agencies, tribal governments and riders. Along the Seattle waterfront, the project is looking as far north as Pier 70 and as south as Pier 46 for potential building sites. Kitsap Transit is not aware of any dock space currently for sale. Construction is estimated to begin in 2027.

The project's next public meeting is Wednesday, June 8 at 6 p.m. Community members can share their comments

at https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/86effccb244f4afbb07de9486796fa77 through June 13.

Seattle Fast-Ferry Terminal Project Early Scoping Meetings

JUNE, 2022



Welcome

- Please sign in using the chat function
 - Click the Chat button at the bottom of your screen



 Enter your first name, last name, email, and affiliation (optional) in the Chat window



Only the meeting hosts and panelists can see what attendees type in the Chat

Ground Rules & Logistics

- Meeting will be recorded and available on the project website:
 - www.kitsaptransit.com/agency-information/seattle-fast-ferryterminal-project
- All attendees will remain muted unless asking a question or making public comment
- Opportunities for Q&A and Public Comment will come at the end of the meeting

Agenda

- Welcome
- Project Overview
- Q&A
- Public Comment
- Other Ways to Comment
- Next Steps
- Adjourn

Kitsap Transit

- Public Transportation Benefit Area Authority established by public vote in 1982
- Initially provided service to the greater Bremerton and Port Orchard areas; has since expanded to cover the entire county
- Foot Ferry service operated since 2002
- Fast Ferry service launched:
 - Bremerton 2017
 - Kingston 2018
 - Southworth 2021

Kitsap Transit System Map



Kitsap Fast Ferries

Three Fast Ferry routes connect Kitsap County to downtown Seattle, providing a transportation alternative with roughly half the travel time as other modes (WSF, bus, autos)

Current Fleet

Route Served	Vessel	Length (feet)	Beam (feet)	Passenger Capacity
Kingston	Commander	140	39	250
	RP1			
	Reliance			
Bremerton	Lady Swift	78	28.2	118
Southworth	Enetai	140	39	250
Back-up	Finest	125	32.9	350
Back-up	Solano	125	39.4	320



Seattle Pier 50 POF Facility

- Owned by King County Metro
- Designed before Kitsap Fast Ferry service started, the facility was sized for two King County routes
 - o Two side-loading vessel slips
 - Covered queuing space for approximately 500 passengers
- Currently supporting five total routes (two King County Water Taxi and three Kitsap Fast Ferry)
- Potential expansion of in-water or shoreside facilities is limited and inadequate for Kitsap Transit's program
- No electric vessel charging infrastructure





Why is Expanded POF Capacity Needed?

- Downtown Seattle is the region's economic and cultural center, and the waterfront is the most in-demand destination in downtown Seattle
- Pier 50 is the only public POF terminal facility, and it is constrained
 - o Only two side-loading vessels can land at one time
 - Landing times are fully utilized during peak AM and PM commute periods
 - Limited space for potential facility expansion or addition of shoreside equipment and infrastructure to support future electric vessel charging

Why is Expanded POF Capacity Needed?

- Capacity constraints create challenges for current KT service and limit potential expansion
 - Impacts: delays and cancellations; more fuel consumption/higher carbon emissions when vessels have to travel at higher speeds to meet limited docking windows
 - KT offers a faster trip between the Kitsap peninsula and downtown Seattle, but cannot add trips during peak demand periods
- Downtown Seattle landing site capacity is a barrier to potential future routes or service expansion

o Identified in the PSRC 2020 POF Study

Expanded Capacity will Improve Regional Mobility

- Increase number of vessel docking slips and passenger queuing and amenities
- Continue reliable and safe operation of Kitsap Fast Ferry routes
- Create opportunities for growth of passenger-only ferries throughout Puget Sound
- Increase integration of passenger-only ferries and other transit
- Improve access to jobs and housing in regional growth centers
- Expand mobility options for minority and low-income populations
- Maintain/improve rider access to Seattle business, education and cultural destinations
- Incorporate shoreside infrastructure to support electric vessel charging

Alternatives Development Approach



What Has Happened to Date?

- Identification of range of alternative locations
- Identification of programming needs
- Outreach to waterfront stakeholders
- Public online survey on study criteria
- Initial assessment of waterfront sites

Downtown Seattle waterfront sites included in preliminary assessment



POF Facility Programming Needs

- Site control: Site available for long-term use as a POF landing site
- Vessel programming and navigation: Sufficient space for safe and reliable passenger-only ferry operations and future flexibility/expansion
- Passenger programming: Space for covered queuing and amenities to support three current Fast Ferry routes, with potential for future expansion



Criteria to be Applied to Initial Site Screening

Site use compatibility

- Site allows passenger-only ferry landing use
- Passenger-only ferry operations are compatible with existing site uses

In-water space

- Accommodate current Kitsap Fast Ferry operating needs
 - Four operating slips (three in service and one back-up)
 - Space for simultaneous maneuvering of at least two vessels
 - Adequate protection from wind, waves, and wakes from vessel traffic
- Space to accommodate potential future growth

Criteria to be Applied to Initial Site Screening

Space for passenger programming

 Space for covered queuing and amenities to support at least three passenger-only ferry routes

Access

- Multimodal-pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections
- Maintain current Fast Ferry route crossing times

Future use planning

• Uplands and in-water space to add equipment to support electric charging for vessels or accommodate future use of alternative fuels

Project Timeline and What's Next



Early Scoping – Feedback is Important!

- Scoping helps define and refine the project purpose and need, alternatives, and criteria used for evaluation of alternatives.
- Includes engagement with tribal governments, agencies, transit riders, property owners, businesses, community-based organizations and all other interested parties on both sides of the fast ferry routes.
- Seeking comments on the following:
 - The purpose and need for the Project
 - Proposed criteria for site assessment
 - Potential impacts and benefits of the Project
 - Other considerations that are relevant to the evaluation of alternatives

Questions

- To ask a question:
 - Raise your hand

👃 Raise Hand

or

Type your question into the Chat window



Public Comment

- To make a public comment:
 - Request to speak by raising your hand

🖖 Raise Hand

 Comments or requests to speak may also be submitted in writing in the Chat window



Other Ways to Comment

• Online:

www.kitsaptransit.com/agency-information/seattle-fast-ferry-terminal-project

- Email: KTplanning@kitsaptransit.com
- Phone: (360) 478-6931
- Mail:

Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie, Service & Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton WA 98337

The public comment period for Early Scoping is open through June 13, 2022.



Attachment E Agency Comment Letters





May 19, 2022

Ms. Linda Gehrke Regional Administrator Federal Transit Administration, Region X 915 Second Avenue Federal Building, Suite 3142 Seattle, WA 98174-1002

Ref: Kitsap Transit – Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project – Early Scoping Invitation King County, Washington ACHP Project No. 018334

Dear Ms. Gehrke:

On May 16, 2022, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) received correspondence from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) inviting the ACHP to be a Participating Agency pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act for the referenced project. While we appreciate the invitation, we respectfully decline and will instead participate, as needed, as FTA complies with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800).

At this time, to comply with Section 106, the FTA should initiate consultation with the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Indian tribes, and other consulting parties with an interest in historic properties. FTA should consult with the SHPO and other consulting parties to delineate an Area of Potential Effects and develop an appropriate strategy to identify and evaluate historic properties, and to assess adverse effects. Should FTA determine, through consultation with the consulting parties, that the undertaking will adversely affect historic properties, or that the development of an agreement document is necessary, FTA will need to notify the ACHP and provide the documentation detailed at 36 CFR § 800.11(e).

Should you have any questions regarding compliance with the requirements of Section 106, please contact Mr. Anthony Guy Lopez at (202)517-0220 or via e-mail at alopez@achp.gov.

Sincerely,

jarme Widninger

Jaime Loichinger Assistant Director Federal Permitting, Licensing and Assistance Section Office of Federal Agency Programs

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION


MEMORANDUM

Date:	June 10, 2022
To:	Steffani Lillie, Kitsap Transit
From:	SDOT Street Use, Development Review program
Subject:	Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry Terminal Project – SDOT Early Scoping Comment

Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Development Review has coordinated departmental comment on the Early Scoping Report published by Kitsap Transit for that agency's Fast Ferry Terminal Project. This memo summarizes the current SDOT comments on that proposal. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Kitsap Transit is currently seeking comment on the screening criteria proposed to guide site selection for the project. As the terminal project is for a passenger ferry, pedestrian connections to surrounding businesses and transit options should be a leading criterion for site selection. Connections to the LINK 1 Line stations at Pioneer Square and University St, King County Metro service on Alaskan Way and Western Ave, and the Center City Connector streetcar expansion stops planned at Cherry-Columbia and Madison-Spring streets should be prioritized. Access to destination amenities like the Stadium District, Seattle Aquarium, and Seattle Art Museum should likewise be considered. As feasible, the site screening criteria should prioritize these connections based on study of the destinations of ferry ridership.

Pedestrian transfers will more convenient and more attractive the closer the terminal site can be located to a signalized crossing, or pedestrian overpass, of the rebuilt Alaskan Way. The Marion St walkway, for example, will be rebuilt as the Office of the Waterfront's work is completed (https://waterfrontseattle.org/waterfront-projects/marion-street-bridge).

It is unlikely that new load zones, parking or vehicle queuing areas could be accommodated in City ROW to support Transportation Network Company (TNC), taxi, or "kiss-and-ride" transfers for the new terminal. Dock location screening should therefore include consideration of the ability to provide ADA accessible shore side vehicular passenger loading areas on-site.

Site screening should include consideration of the new Alaskan Way bike path project by evaluating the space at prospective site entrances available to accommodate pedestrian - bike access and interaction. More detail on the Waterfront bike path project can be found here: https://waterfrontseattle.org/waterfront-projects/park-promenade-bike-path

SDOT and the City Office of the Waterfront have a strong desire to engage a discussion of constraints and trade-offs of site alternatives with Kitsap Transit once alternatives are identified. We will look forward to continued coordination with Kitsap Transit as the project develops.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at <u>Jackson.Keenan-Koch@seattle.gov</u>.

Jackson Koch Development Review Program Seattle Department of Transportation – Street Use Division



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 10 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 155, 14-D12 Seattle, WA 98101-3144

REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S DIVISION

June 9, 2022

Steffani Lillie Kitsap Transit Service & Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton, Washington 98337

Mark Assam Federal Transit Administration Region 10 915 Second Avenue, Suite 3142 Seattle, Washington 98174

Dear Steffani Lillie and Mark Assam:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed Federal Transit Administration's May 2022 Early Scoping Notice for the Kitsap County Public Transportation Benefit Area Authority (Kitsap Transit) Proposed Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project (EPA Project Number 22-0027-FTA). EPA has conducted its review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and our review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The CAA Section 309 role is unique to EPA and requires EPA to review and comment publicly on any proposed federal action subject to NEPA's environmental impact statement requirement.

This early scoping effort assesses downtown Seattle waterfront locations for a permanent terminal to support Kitsap Transit's fast ferry operations for passenger-only travel between Kitsap Peninsula and downtown Seattle. Early scoping is being conducted under NEPA with FTA as the lead federal agency and under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) with Kitsap Transit as the lead SEPA agency. The agencies are seeking comments on the scope of the site screening and alternatives development analysis including project purpose and need; the Early Scoping Information Report; potential project impacts and benefits; and other considerations that are relevant to the evaluation of alternatives.

EPA appreciates the information provided during early scoping. EPA offers FTA the enclosed early scoping comments on specific topics we believe are important to consider in the NEPA analysis for this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide early scoping comments for this project. If you have questions on our comments, please contact Emily Bitalac of my staff at (206) 553-2581 and bitalac.emily@epa.gov, or me, at (206) 553-1774 or at chu.rebecca@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Chu, Chief Policy and Environmental Review Branch

U.S. EPA Detailed Comments on the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project Early Scoping King County, WA June 2022

Purpose and Need

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the project's purpose and need statement. EPA appreciates that the proposed purpose includes incorporating shoreside infrastructure and equipment to support electric vessel charging, increasing integration of passenger-only ferry travel with other transit modes, and expanding mobility options for minority and low-income populations. EPA recommends the purpose and need statement also clearly capture the proposal in the context of the larger area the project will serve (i.e., to include the route destinations of the ferries, not just Seattle terminal location) and the degree of expected expansion for near-term and potential future operations (e.g., increased service on current routes, additional vessels, new routes, etc.). This will help ensure the project is single and complete, demonstrate that the project has independent utility, and incorporates sustainability as a need to be addressed in the project proposal.

Alternatives Analysis

EPA recommends the NEPA document include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet the stated purpose and need for the project which are responsive to the issues identified during the scoping process. A reasonable range of alternatives includes options for avoiding environmental impacts, while the alternatives analysis describes the approach used to identify environmentally sensitive areas and the process used to designate areas in terms of sensitivity. The NEPA document should clearly describe the rationale used to determine whether impacts of an alternative are significant or not.

The Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA state that agencies shall include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives (40 CFR 1502.14). Include a discussion of the reasons for the elimination of other alternatives considered and not evaluated in detail in the NEPA document. Identify the preferred alternative in the NEPA document, if known.

Aquatic Resources

Clean Water Act Section (CWA) 404

Given the proximity of the project to aquatic resources, this project may involve the discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional wetlands and waterways. Discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States require authorization by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under CWA Section 404. The Federal Guidelines at 40 CFR Part 230 promulgated under CWA Section 404 (b)(1) provide substantive environmental criteria that must be met to permit such discharges into waters of the United States.

The purpose of the Guidelines is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of waters of the U.S. These goals are achieved, in part, by controlling discharges of dredged or fill material (40 CFR 230.1(a)). Fundamental to the Guidelines is the principle that dredged or fill material should not be discharged into the aquatic ecosystem, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no less environmentally damaging practicable alternative that achieves an applicant's project purpose. In addition, no discharge can be permitted if it will cause or contribute to significant degradation of the waters of the United States, cause or contribute to a violation of a State water quality standard or jeopardize a federally listed species.

When evaluating the impacts of the proposed project on aquatic resources, EPA recommends that the NEPA analysis include identification and description of:

- Direct impacts arise from the actual placement or "footprint" of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. Direct impacts are typically measured in area (e.g., acres) or linear (e.g., linear feet) terms. Include the depth of dredging operations, and the nature and extent of dredging impacts, including impacts to water quality, bay bottom habitats, and shoreline habitats, in the context of endangered species and essential fish habitat, along with appropriate mitigation.
- Secondary effects effects on an aquatic ecosystem that are associated with a discharge of dredged or fill materials, but do not result from the actual placement of the dredged or fill material. Common examples of secondary effects include: 1) changes in flow regime or water quality upstream or downstream; 2) increased flooding or dewatering; 3) fragmentation of aquatic habitats; 4) blockage/interruption of wildlife travel corridors; 5) polluted runoff; and 6) thermal impacts to the aquatic environment.
- Cumulative effects the changes in an aquatic ecosystem that are attributable to the collective effect of a number of individual discharges of dredged or fill material A watershed in which 25% of the original wetland acreage has been lost due to fill associated with development would be an example of a documented cumulative effect. Cumulative effects may also include "reasonably foreseeable" future activities that would impact the aquatic ecosystem. For example, the potential for future roadway or other development should be considered in the context of cumulative impacts.
- Plans for disposing of dredged material, required sediment testing, and whether the project will require maintenance dredging.
- Consider combined sewer overflows existing caps that may be impacted.¹ Preserving cap stability may be an important component in the analysis of alternatives.
- Existing data describing sediment quality in the project area.

CWA Section 303

The proposed project may include construction of roads, parking areas, emergency vehicle roads, and the terminal building which can all alter water quality. Section 303(d) of the CWA requires the state of Washington to identify those waterbodies which are not meeting or not likely to meet State water quality standards. This section of the CWA also requires the development of water quality restoration plans (Total Maximum Daily Loads, or TMDLs) to meet established water quality criteria and associated beneficial uses.

When evaluating the impacts of the proposed project on water quality, EPA recommends the NEPA analysis identify:

- Waterbodies that may be impacted by the proposed project, the nature of those impacts, and specific pollutants likely to impact those waters.
- Waters identified as "impaired" on the EPA-approved CWA Section 303(d) list for Washington State.
- Any TMDLs that apply to those waters and requirements associated with the TMDLs that may apply to the proposed project.
- Where potential water quality impacts may occur, steps to address those potential impacts.

¹ <u>https://kingcounty.gov/services/environment/wastewater/sediment-management/plan-implementaton.aspx.</u>

Aquatic Habitat

EPA recommends the NEPA document describe aquatic habitats in the affected environment (e.g., habitat type, plant and animal species, functional values, and integrity) and the environmental consequences of the proposed action on these resources. Evaluate impacts to aquatic resources in terms of the acreage to be impacted and by the functions they perform. Project construction, operation, and maintenance may affect a variety of aquatic resources. These resources may experience varying degrees of impacts and alteration of their hydrologic functions and the project may degrade habitat for fish and other aquatic biota. For any impacts that cannot be avoided through siting and design, describe the types, location, and estimated effectiveness of best management practices applied to minimize and mitigate impacts to aquatic resources.

Noise Impacts to Aquatic Species

EPA recommends FTA work closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to devise the best possible mitigation plan to alleviate any noise impacts to aquatic species and birds from vessel traffic. Early scoping states that the ferry terminal will be utilized by passenger-only ferries. Discuss the impacts of vessel noise with how it relates to this type of ferry compared to other boat types in Puget Sound, such as vehicle ferries and barges and the potential to alleviate some of the noise from other, larger vessels. Given that the purpose and need statement includes incorporating shoreside infrastructure and equipment to support electric vessel charging, EPA recommends discussing the expected engine mix of the ferry fleet (e.g., electric, diesel, etc) and how that impacts noise from the project.

Action Agenda for Puget Sound

The CEQ NEPA implementing regulations (40 CFR 1502.16(a)(5)) indicate the environmental consequences section shall include a discussion of possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, Tribal, and local land use plans, policies, and controls. For the Puget Sound area, the Action Agenda for Puget Sound – the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan under Clean Water Act Section 320 – is a key regional plan to consider for this purpose.² The Action Agenda for Puget Sound charts the course to recovery of the nation's largest estuary by volume and complements and incorporates the work of many partners from around Puget Sound to describe regional strategies and specific actions needed to recover Puget Sound. EPA recommends the NEPA document discuss how the project supports or potentially conflicts with the Action Agenda for Puget Sound. Also consider the Implementation Strategies³ for Puget Sound which lay out the background, approaches, and plans for achieving progress on implementing the Action Agenda for Puget Sound.

Air Quality

EPA recommends the NEPA document discuss air quality impacts from project construction, maintenance, and operations including ferry trips and transportation utilized to arrive at the ferry terminal with respect to criteria air pollutants and air toxics, including diesel particulate matter emissions. Also discuss the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of project related air emissions. Disclose current representative background criteria air pollutant concentrations in the areas of the project, compared to the state and federal ambient air quality standards and disclose any other air quality regulations and requirements related to the project. EPA appreciates that the project purpose and need

² <u>https://www.psp.wa.gov/2022AAupdate.php</u>.

³ <u>https://www.psp.wa.gov/implementation-strategies.php</u>.

incorporates shoreside infrastructure and equipment to support electric vessel charging and recommends the NEPA document clarify the engine mix of the near-term and future vessel fleet.

EPA recommends the NEPA document address the feasibility of implementing air quality related mitigation to reduce equipment and marine-vessel emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants from construction and operations by:

- Using low sulfur diesel and ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel for off-road and marine vessels. If low sulfur fuel is not available, FTA may determine if making low sulfur fuel readily available and incorporating the appropriate retrofits would be feasible in reducing diesel emissions of idling ferries and other watercraft at the new terminal.
- Subsidizing the retrofit of older marine vessels and the construction of passenger ferries with cleaner technology, including electrification of the fleet. Quantify the reduction of diesel emissions that could be reduced with retrofitted vessels and/or with vessels constructed utilizing newer, cleaner technology and discuss the feasibility of such measures.
- Providing infrastructure for alternative power options for ferries and other watercraft to reduce diesel emissions related to idling.

It is important to note that an effective air quality mitigation program constitutes "pollution prevention" as defined by CEQ.⁴ Any feasible measures to reduce marine vessel emissions should be described in the NEPA document. If techniques exist, but may not be feasible for this project, an explanation should be included in the NEPA document.

EPA recommends the NEPA document also address potential air quality impacts during the construction period to reduce construction emissions. EPA suggests the following:

- Stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering or by applying water, chemical, or organic dust palliative where appropriate to both active and inactive sites to control fugitive dust sources
- Install wind fencing and phase grading operations where appropriate and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions and control of fugitive dust.
- Develop a construction traffic and parking management plan that minimizes traffic interference and maintains traffic flow.
- Identify sensitive receptors in the project area, such as daycare centers, schools, nursing homes, hospitals, and other health-care facilities, and minimize impacts to these populations. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners.
- Utilize cleanest available fuel engines in construction equipment and identify opportunities for electrification. Meet EPA diesel fuel requirements for off-road and on-highway, and, where appropriate, use alternative fuels such as natural gas and electric.⁵
- Include a commitment in the NEPA document to require, or provide contractor incentives to obtain, air quality construction mitigation measures to minimize construction-related emissions of air toxics and diesel particulates.

Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 directs federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health on environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations,

⁴ <u>https://www.epa.gov/nepa/pollution-prevention-guidance-national-environmental-policy-act-reviews.</u>

⁵ <u>https://www.epa.gov/vehicles-and-engines.</u>

to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. EO 13985 on *Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government* should also be incorporated to FTA's analysis since it includes a modern definition of equity that clarifies a broader approach.

Assessing EPA's Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool (EJScreen) information is a useful first step in understanding or highlighting locations that may be candidates for further review or outreach.⁶ EPA considers a project to be in an area of potential environmental justice (EJ) concern when an EJScreen analysis for the impacted area shows one or more of the eleven EJ Indexes at or above the 80th percentile in the nation and/or state. At a minimum, EPA recommends an EJScreen analysis consider EJScreen information for the block group(s) which contains the proposed action(s) and a one-mile radius around those areas. For the proposed project, consider block groups around the proposed project area and around the ferry destinations in Kitsap County and how increased access to public transportation may impact these communities.

It is important to consider all impacted areas by the proposed action(s). Areas of impact can be a single block group or span across several block groups and communities.⁷ When assessing large geographic areas, consider the individual block groups within the project area in addition to an area wide assessment. Important caveats and uncertainties apply to this screening-level information, so it is essential to understand the limitations on appropriate interpretations and applications of these indicators.⁸ As the screening tool does not provide data on every environmental impact and demographic factor that may be relevant to a particular location and/or proposed project, consider additional information in an EJ analysis to supplement EJScreen outputs. Further review or outreach may be necessary for the proposed action(s). To address these potential concerns, EPA recommends:

- Applying methods from "Environmental Justice Interagency Working Group Promising Practices for EJ Methodologies in NEPA Reviews" report, or the Promising Practices Report, to this project.⁹ The Promising Practices Report is a compilation of methodologies gleaned from current agency practices concerning the interface of EJ considerations through NEPA processes.
- Characterizing project site(s) with specific information or data related to EJ concerns.¹⁰
- Describing potential EJ concerns for all EJ Indexes at or above the 80th percentile in the state and/or nation.
- Describing block groups which contain the proposed action and at a minimum, a one-mile radius around those areas.
- Describing individual block groups within the project area in addition to an area-wide assessment.
- Supplementing data with county level reports and local knowledge such as WA's Environmental Health Disparities mapping tool.¹¹

⁶ <u>https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/</u>.

⁷ Agencies should define community as "either a group of individuals living in geographic proximity to one another, or a geographically dispersed set of individuals (such as migrant workers or Native Americans), where either type of group experiences common conditions" (Interim Justice40 Guidance – Executive Order 14008 on Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad, January 27, 2021).

⁸ <u>https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen/technical-documentation-ejscreen</u>.

⁹ https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-08/documents/nepa_promising_practices_document_2016.pdf.

¹⁰ For more information about potential EJ concerns, refer to the July 21, 2021, Memorandum for the Heads of Departments and Agencies Interim Implementation Guidance for the Justice40 Initiative. <u>https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/M-21-28.pdf</u>.

¹¹ https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/wtn/WTNIBL/.

Contaminated Sites

EPA recommends FTA coordinate with the Washington Department of Ecology and EPA's Superfund program to identify any contaminated sites in the area.¹² Past and ongoing industrial uses of the potential project area have led to ongoing environmental cleanups, pollution source control, and restoration work. Siting and construction may have impacts on these sites.

Endangered Species Act

EPA recommends the NEPA document identify any endangered, threatened, and candidate species under the ESA, and other sensitive species within the project area and vicinity. Describe the critical habitat for the species; identify any impacts additional ferry trips, variations in marine vessel speeds, and associated activities would have on the species and their critical habitats; and how the proposed program will meet all requirements under ESA, including consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Please note that if impacts to listed species are significant, a biological assessment and a description of outcomes of ESA consultation with the NOAA and USFWS may be required. EPA recommends that the NEPA document discuss how the proposed project will contribute to the recovery of listed or declining species, including candidate for listing species, sensitive, and other species of concern Federal or State fish and wildlife agencies.

Green Infrastructure

EPA recommends that NEPA document include facilities that are certified as "green buildings" per the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) green building rating system wherever feasible. LEED emphasizes state-of-the-art strategies for sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and indoor air quality.¹³

EPA also encourages the implementation of "green infrastructure"¹⁴ in onsite stormwater management features, such as bioretention areas, vegetated swales, porous pavement, and filter strips. These features can serve as both stormwater treatment and visual enhancements.

EPA recommends any construction of new infrastructure incorporate industrial materials recycling, or the reusing or recycling of byproduct materials generated from industrial processes into the project design. Nonhazardous industrial materials, such as coal fly ash, foundry sand, or flue gas desulfurization gypsum are valuable products of industrial processes and have the potential to be beneficially used instead of disposed.¹⁵

Intermodal connections

EPA recommends the NEPA document fully describe the transit network and intermodal connections that will provide access to the proposed project locations including discussion of transit bus routes, bike lanes, proximate bus and bike access, the Orca card system, comparable fares, and other designs to facilitate and encourage intermodal ferry ridership. EPA recommends the NEPA document identifies a strategy to ensure that the local transit network connectivity will be integrated into ferry terminal design and planning.

The early scoping notice does not mention plans for any "park and ride" structures. EPA is concerned with air quality impacts that would result from single passenger vehicles if the new ferry terminal is not

¹² https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/neighborhood/?lat=47.605005&lon=-122.334407&zoom=14&radius=false.

¹³ https://www.usgbc.org/leed.

¹⁴ <u>https://www.epa.gov/green-infrastructure/what-green-infrastructure.</u>

¹⁵ <u>https://www.epa.gov/smm/sustainable-management-industrial-non-hazardous-secondary-materials.</u>

integrated with local transit service and requires increased vehicular trips combined with a large parking structure. EPA recommends the NEPA document include a forecast of anticipated vehicular traffic to the proposed project, parking space estimates, and designs for any new or additional parking structures. Also discuss whether any possible increase in operations affect parking needs at the route destinations.

Growth-related Impacts

EPA recommends the NEPA document evaluate and address impacts for communities or neighborhoods that would potentially be most affected by the proposed project, including those with the potential for induced development from growth-related impacts at the Kitsap County destinations. Impacts from construction, increased number or frequency of ferries and other issues that may arise should be addressed.

The indirect and cumulative effects that would result from growth and development that may be stimulated by the proposed project should be analyzed. For example, the proposed project may stimulate transit-oriented development, commercial and residential mixed-use areas, amenities that improve walkability/livability of the area, and so on. The project could also stimulate development that has the potential to encroach upon or otherwise impact sensitive habitat areas, important community resources, or displace vulnerable or disadvantaged populations. EPA recommends the NEPA document analyze and disclose both the positive and negative potential environmental, social, and economic effects.

A key benefit of the indirect and cumulative effects analysis is that it may reveal outcomes that should be avoided, minimized, or otherwise mitigated. As mitigation for project stimulated effects, EPA encourages the project proponents to work collaboratively with local land use planning entities and affected residents to ensure that the land resources are used wisely and that environmental protections are incorporated prior to stimulating new growth. Consider applying methods from Smart Growth and Transportation and *Effects of Transit-Oriented Development on Housing, Parking, and Travel*.^{16,17}

Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects are those that are reasonably foreseeable, related to the proposed action under consideration, and subject to the agency's jurisdiction and control. EPA recommends that the NEPA document analysis consider evaluation of impacts over the entire area of impact and consider the effects of projects when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the analysis area. Considering all the actions in this area together would help decision makers to understand more clearly what the cumulative impacts on environmental resources are likely to be and identify ways to ensure the project is sustainable. EPA has issued guidance on how to provide comments on the assessment of cumulative impacts, *Consideration of Cumulative Impacts in EPA Review of NEPA Documents.* ¹⁸ The guidance states that to assess the adequacy of the cumulative impact assessment, there are five key areas to consider:

- Resources, if any, that are being cumulatively impacted.
- Appropriate geographic area and the time over which the effects have occurred and will occur.
- All past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that have affected, are affecting, or would affect resources of concern.
- A benchmark or baseline.

 $^{^{16}\ \}underline{https://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/smart-growth-and-transportation.}$

¹⁷ <u>https://www.trb.org/Publications/Blurbs/160307.aspx</u>.

¹⁸ https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-08/documents/cumulative.pdf.

• Scientifically defensible threshold levels.

Climate Change

In characterizing the affected environment and environmental consequences of the proposed action, EPA recommends the NEPA document:

- Include existing and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends related to a changing climate.
- Discuss reasonably foreseeable effects that a currently changing climate will have on the proposed project and the project area, including its infrastructure. This helps inform the development of measures to improve the climate resilience of the proposed project. If projected climate-related changes could notably stress the affected environment or exacerbate the environmental impacts of the project, these impacts should also be considered as part of the NEPA analysis.
- Estimate the direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions that will result from proposed construction, operations, and maintenance activities. Estimated emissions can serve as a useful proxy for assessing relative effects, comparing alternatives, and supporting the need for practicable mitigation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Assess the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with U.S. and global policy to limit greenhouse gas emissions.
- Identify how climate resiliency has been considered in the Proposed Action and Alternatives.
- Relate climate change to environmental justice and human health impacts, prevent environmental damage that harms communities and poses a risk to public health and safety.
- Identify and address regional specific climate plans to ensure that the proposed project aligns with these plans such as the Seattle Climate Action Plan,¹⁹ King County's 2020 Strategic Climate Action Plan,²⁰ and Kitsap County Climate Resiliency Assessment.²¹

Coordination with Tribal Governments

EPA encourages FTA to consult with the Tribes and incorporate feedback from the Tribes when making decisions regarding the project. EPA recommends the NEPA document describe the issues raised during the consultations and how those issues were addressed, consistent with Executive Order 13175, *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments*.

Monitoring

As the proposed project has the potential to impact many environmental resources for an extended period, EPA recommends that the project be designed to include an environmental inspection and mitigation monitoring program to ensure compliance with and efficacy of mitigation measures. EPA recommends the NEPA document describe the monitoring program and how it will be used as an effective feedback mechanism so that the project can be adaptively managed over time, and any needed adjustments can be made to the project to meet environmental objectives throughout its lifespan.

²¹ https://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Kitsap_climate_assessment/KitsapCountyClimateAssessment_June2020%20-

¹⁹ <u>http://greenspace.seattle.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/SeaClimateAction_April2018.pdf.</u>

²⁰ https://kingcounty.gov/services/environment/climate/actions-strategies/strategic-climate-action-plan.aspx.

^{%202%20}Full%20Assessment%20LowRes.pdf.





June 13, 2022

Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie, Service and Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton, WA 98337

Via email: <u>KTPlanning@KitsapTransit.com</u>; SteffaniL@kitsaptransit.com

Re: Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project -- Early Scoping Comments

On behalf the Port of Seattle (Port) and The Northwest Seaport Alliance (NWSA), thank you for the opportunity to provide early scoping comments on the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project (Project). We appreciate your direct engagement with Port staff in preliminary analysis in prior years and hope to continue this approach for the duration of the project.

In 1911, the Port was authorized by the citizens of King County under Chapter 53 of the Revised Code of Washington to serve as a public port authority, charged with ensuring that Seattle's deep-water harbor is protected to serve as an economic engine for the region. Since 2015, the NWSA has been operating as a marine cargo operating partnership of the Port of Seattle and Port of Tacoma – the fourth-largest container gateway in the United States. Under a port development authority, the NWSA manages the container, breakbulk, auto and some bulk terminals in Seattle and Tacoma. Together, the Port and NWSA operate and maintain the more than \$1 billion in investments made into maritime and industrial operations in Seattle, and work to protect the tens of thousands of family-wage jobs and \$4.0 billion in revenue that these sectors generate for the region and state.

The Port and NWSA are codified as assets of statewide significance in the RCW, serving as critical gateways for international trade, agricultural producers, and manufacturers across Washington. Our cargo facilities cannot be replicated elsewhere and provide a crucial function in the resiliency of our state's economy. Further, our agencies, and the economic value they provide, depend on an ecosystem of supporting infrastructure, related businesses, and environmental conditions around us.

We recognize the need for an additional ferry terminal facility and support your efforts to improve regional transportation for personal mobility, while ensuring that maritime and industrial land uses and freight mobility are protected. Below are our comments on the (1) purpose and need statements, (2) potential site locations and supporting infrastructure, and (3) analysis criteria.

Purpose and need statements

We note your purpose and need statements for the project and have the following comments. The purpose to improve regional mobility through expanded passenger only terminal facilities on the downtown Seattle waterfront is valid. At the same time, part of our responsibilities as port authorities is to ensure the continued and efficient operation of our facilities in support of our mission. Using this lens, we recognize that your proposal may be inconsistent with some of the industrial working waterfront uses at Terminal 46 and points south on the East Waterway. We propose integrating the following into the purpose and needs statement to ensure that our facilities can continue to fulfill their vital functions:

• Recognize other critical public institutions and purposes by partnering effectively to plan, deliver and operate the project in a manner that is compatible with existing and planned economic development uses along the Maritime Industrial Waterfront and the freight infrastructure supporting them.

We believe that you will need to develop your plan in cooperation with multiple agencies and stakeholders with individual missions. We will work with fellow agencies to find the best mutually beneficial outcomes.

Potential site locations and supporting infrastructure

The study area for Seattle Terminal Alternative Analysis includes several Port of Seattle sites, including one licensed to the NWSA. Additionally, at Pier 48, it includes a Washington State Ferries (WSF) site proposed for inclusion in a mitigation bank project proposed by the Port of Seattle. To the extent a Fast Ferry terminal facility could be placed at or near our properties, we look forward to clear identification of potential effects on existing or planned operations and proposals to mitigate any negative impact.

<u>Terminal 46</u>: This facility is not available for a Fast Ferry Terminal. T46 is currently licensed to the NWSA and is developed to accommodate container cargo operations. It has been in its current physical configuration since 1980, situated at the edge of the City-designated and regionally recognized Duwamish Manufacturing Industrial Center (Duwamish MIC). For decades, the approximately 86-acre terminal site has been used as an international marine cargo terminal and was designed and permitted to accommodate throughput of up to 600,000 TEUs per year. The facility has two operating deep-water shipping berths in the west part of the site. The truck gate located in the site's southeastern corner has nine inbound and eight outbound lanes.

Both Tacoma and Seattle in the NWSA gateway have been impacted by the global supply chain disruptions. In Seattle, there has been a renewed cargo interest in utilizing Terminal 46, starting with the opening of an off-dock cargo storage yard in the spring of 2021. Most of the site is continuing to act an off-dock cargo storage yard. In addition, the NWSA continues to field interest in reopening the facility to international cargo movement and are exploring the opportunity to open a one-berth cargo facility in early 2023. This summer, NWSA is considering allowing the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) to short-term lease 18-acres of the terminal and approximately 1,100 linear feet of the berth on the south end of Terminal 46. The USCG seeks this short-term lease to allow clean-up and dredging of their own basin as well as modifications to their existing docks and upland space for equipment movement. Their temporary usage of the south end of Terminal 46 will provide space for the USCG's displaced vessels and personnel. The first public consideration of this lease occurred at the NWSA Managing Members' June public meeting.

Kitsap Transit should also be aware that May 2021, USCG released a <u>Notice of Intent</u> to expand and modernize Coast Guard Base Seattle that includes a portion of Terminal 46 as an option that would be considered under its related Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. NWSA is in ongoing dialogue with USCG to both better understand their proposed long-term expansion and provide details of our gateway's growing cargo space needs as we explore bringing back two-berth international cargo operations following the USCG short-term lease. Given these existing and planned conditions, Terminal 46 is not available for a Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility.

<u>Pier 46 North</u>: P46N is a relatively small north facing apron and upland area, adjacent to the Terminal 46 area, but on the northern end. On-site uses have included berthing of cargo barges and moorage of large catcher/processor fishing vessels. Most recently, P46N (and portions of T46) were used in support of the spoils-removal barge operations for the SR 99 Seattle Waterfront Tunnel. This 1.6-acre site is currently under study by

the Port as part of a plan to restore assets and preserve valuable deep-water moorage for a diverse range of maritime uses in support of the Port's mission, including Fishing and waterborne transportation.

<u>Pier 48</u>: P48, owned by WSF, is one site included in a multi-site habitat mitigation bank project, which is being proposed through Washington State's Mitigation Banking System and under review by the Interagency Review Team (IRT) co-chaired by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). The project also may be submitted for certification by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as a conservation bank. Upon certification by the IRT the proposed Bank project will provide compensatory mitigation for endangered species defined within a service area.

<u>Pier 66/Bell Harbor Marina and north slip</u>: Pier 66/Bell Harbor Marina is Seattle's only downtown marina, extending south from Pier 66. Its slips and charter boat tie-up area are beyond a secured gate which creates an access issue that would have to be resolved. There is also overnight, transient, recreational moorage which could be impacted by fast ferry operations (for example, security, safety and noise). Although the location may meet some of the needs for a passenger terminal, the current configuration would likely need to be modified to meet the needs of a permanent Fast Ferry Terminal. At the Bell St Pier, there are a few restaurants, a conference center, and a cruise terminal operating seasonally April – October, up to five days per week in 2023. Additionally, on the north facing wall of Pier 66, there is a small slip (south of the Edgewater Hotel), which is unlikely to meet the space requirements described for a Fast Ferry Terminal Facility. During Summer 2022, the Bell Harbor Marina will serve as a terminus for a City of Des Moines "pilot project" of a passenger ferry service.

<u>Pier 69/Victoria Clipper (south) berths and North Apron berths</u>: P69 lies nearly at the north end of the study area. It also has two developed berth areas. The southern pier side is leased to FRS Clipper, with passenger service between Victoria, British Columbia and Seattle, and, pre-COVID sailings to San Juan Island. On the north apron, adjacent to P70, are two berths of 90 linear feet and 220 linear feet, with water and power. The north apron does not include upland space, which has been described as a requirement for a Fast Ferry Terminal Facility.

<u>Electric vessel charging and alternative fuels</u>: Your project purpose requirement to incorporate shoreside infrastructure and equipment to support electric vessel charging is notable. Electrification planning (and analysis of alternatives) in this area will be very important because of the convergency of power loads and related infrastructure capacity limits.

Through the <u>Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy</u>, the Port and NWSA, along with the Port of Tacoma and the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, have established strategies and a vision to phase-out all emissions from seaport-related activities in the airshed by 2050. The Port in partnership with the NWSA and Seattle City Light (SCL) are currently developing a plan for decarbonization of waterfront properties to help meet this goal and related equity and environmental justice objectives. The Seattle Waterfront Clean Energy Strategy includes consideration of operations and energy infrastructure needs for port facilities as well as adjacent properties, including facilities within the study area - specifically Terminal 46, Pier 46 North, Colman Dock, Pier 66 and Pier 69.

Your analysis of options for terminal site alternatives should identify alignment and inconsistencies with this plan and include analysis of: proposed vessel propulsion systems and related shoreside infrastructure needs; shoreside energy availability, upgrade requirements and potential impacts or co-benefits to neighboring properties (including consideration of related future decarbonization plans); alternative fueling infrastructure needs onsite or in the vicinity (renewable fuels, hydrogen or other); positive and negative impacts relative to climate, air emissions and equity goals.

Analysis criteria

The criteria that you will apply to your initial site screening is shown on page 11 of your Early Scoping Information Report. We offer the following edits (as underlines or strike throughs), as to criteria you have listed.

- Site Use compatibility: please add "existing and planned site uses" under site use compatibility.
- Access: we recommend you screen for (and provide) <u>sufficient loading areas for passenger pick-up and</u> <u>drop-off from taxis, TNCs and personal vehicles</u>, in addition to Pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections."
- Future use planning: recommend consideration of (and planning for) sea-level rise.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide early scoping comments. We look forward to continuing our work with Kitsap Transit toward a terminal siting that complements the Port and NWSA ongoing economic development work for the region.

Sincerely,

Buddine Hloo-

Geraldine H. Poor Senior Regional Transportation Manager Port of Seattle P: 206-390-9047 www.portseattle.org

Devoto hiloon

Deirdre Wilson, AICP Senior Planning Manager The Northwest Seaport Alliance P: 253.365.7283 www.nwseaportalliance.com

Natural Resources Building P.O. Box 40917 Olympia, WA 98504-0917

1111 Washington St. S.E. Olympia, WA 98501



(360) 902-3000 TTY: (800) 833-6388

E-mail: Info@rco.wa.gov Web site: www.rco.wa.gov

STATE OF WASHINGTON RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE



June 10, 2022

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide early scoping comments.

We recognize that the emphasis during this stage of the screening evaluation is on the siting of potential new dock capacity to accommodate potential growth in the Kitsap Transit fast ferry fleet and that a fuller environmental evaluation is expected in one or more subsequent stages. Nevertheless, we think there is value in articulating a few considerations for this and future processes going forward.

The final recommendation from the Governor's Orca Task Force (2019) advised that the region should: "Conduct a comprehensive environmental review and take action to minimize potential whale-strike risk and underwater noise posed by the growing number and distribution of fast-ferries and water taxis in Southern Resident critical habitat."

We appreciate that Kitsap Transit has been actively engaged in implementing basic policies and procedures to reduce the risk of ship strikes with orcas and other marine mammals over the past several years. We hope to see Kitsap Transit continue to be proactive and follow best management practices in alignment with multiple Orca Task Force recommendations for ferries (including electrification, maximal use of the Whale Report Alert System, and participation in Quiet Sound).

Now, at this point, we request consideration of the need to better understand and mitigate for underwater radiated noise. Many of the Kitsap Fast Ferry routes overlap with a key portion of the range of Southern Resident Orcas, especially in fall and winter. Thus, the underwater noise the ferries generate (and the vessels' movement) may disturb and compromise the successful foraging and communication of orcas (and other species). Therefore, it is essential that any environmental review includes explicit consideration of options and alternatives to reduce underwater noise. This could include more overt identification, and potential selection and use of relatively quieter propulsion options like waterjets (rather than conventional propellers) for routes, seasons, and times of day where ferry and orca use patterns are expected overlap to a great degree. On a related note, the Orca Task Force also advised that the region should explore and integrate related technology and innovation solutions for fast ferries.

We note that in the supplementary documentation for this scoping, Kitsap Transit describes the frequent need for ferries to travel at higher than planned speeds (often 38 knots) to try to stay on schedule, and that additional dock space could help reduce the need to use this less fuel-efficient (and higher emissions) mode. Because underwater noise typically gets disproportionately louder with

increasing speed, we note that additional dock capacity could provide noise (and strike risk) reduction benefits over the status quo. Logically, higher speeds elevate strike risks too.

Because additional capacity could facilitate system expansion, we see a need to better understand the number, location, and frequency of additional routes that might be enabled by additional dock space. If a new terminal precipitates system expansion, we infer that underwater noise could also increase spatially and temporally from today's levels. Currently, some routes have minimal service in the middle of the day, which has yielded a potentially beneficial window of lower disturbance to orcas that would likely be compromised with expansion.

In conclusion, we again want to express our appreciation for the opportunity to provide these introductory comments on one aspect of environmental review. We welcome the opportunity to engage at a deeper level as the evaluation of environmental impacts are further assessed.

Jara Holuska

Tara Galuska Orca Recovery Coordinator Governor's Salmon Recovery Office



WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

Todd Hass Special Assistant to the Director Puget Sound Partnership





STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

Northwest Regional Office • PO Box 330316 • Shoreline, Washington 98133-9716 • (206) 594-0000 711 for Washington Relay Service • Persons with a speech disability can call 877-833-6341

June 9, 2022

Steffani Lillie, Service and Capital Development Director Kitsap Transit 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton, WA 98337

Re: Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Siting Early Scoping Ecology SEPA# 202202355

Dear Steffani Lillie:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) determination of significance, early scoping period (DN/SCOPING) for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project. Based on review of the checklist associated with this project, the Department of Ecology (Ecology) has the following comments:

TOXICS CLEANUP PROGRAM

Kim Smith, (425) 200-2834, kim.smith@ecy.wa.gov

There are many known contaminated sites located within the downtown Seattle area currently under review by Kitsap Transit and Federal Transit Administration as they seek to identify a permanent location for the fast ferry operations. The Toxics Cleanup Program (TCP) has provided resources below for identifying known contaminated sites and gathering available information. Once a location has been identified, TCP would expect the environmental review process to discuss areas of contamination and how they might impact the project area for all identified state cleanup sites on or adjacent to the selected property where impacts may occur.

- Ecology's What's in My Neighborhood provides an interactive map showing known contaminated sites throughout Washington State and can be accessed at https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/neighborhood.
- Cleanup site webpage provides access to electronically available documents, which can be found by searching the site name or CSID at <u>https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/gsp/SiteSearchPage.aspx</u>.

Steffani Lillie June 9, 2022 Page 2

• A public records request is available for reviewing documents not available electronically. Use the instructions or online submission form available at https://ecology.wa.gov/About-us/Accountability-transparency/Public-records-requests.

SPILL PREVENTION, PREPAREDNESS, AND RESPONSE PROGRAM Brittany Flittner, (360) 584-4490, <u>brittany.flittner@ecy.wa.gov</u>

Ecology recommends the following be included in the EIS scoping for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal's proposed project.

Animals: Southern Resident Killer Whales

Southern Resident Killer Whales (SRKWs) along with other threatened and endangered species may be present within the project area and along ferry routes. The scope should consider the following:

- Impact of increased ferry traffic and speed along ferry routes to and from the new terminal. Potential impacts include underwater noise pollution, ferry strikes, and a major spill incident.
- Measures to mitigate ferry traffic and speed impacts on SRKWs.
- Measures to successfully implement Washington State's Be Whale Wise laws (RCW 77.15.740).

Tribal Resources

An assessment of how this project will impact tribal resources in the project area and along ferry routes should be considered. The scope should consider the following:

- How will the increase in ferry traffic and speed impact tribal fishing areas in terms of safety, access, and spill risk?
- How will the increase in ferry traffic and speed impact availability of tribal fishing areas during fishing seasons with high trafficked ferry routes?
- Ensure all Tribes in the project area are consulted during the EIS scoping, drafting, and project approval process. This should be a collaborative and inclusive process.

Transportation: Ferry Traffic and Safety

The EIS should include information about the changes in ferry traffic. With faster ferry speeds, there is an increased risk of collisions, allisions, and groundings, leading to an increased risk of oil spills. Additional areas of consideration include:

- Changes in the number of ferries, transit routes, and transit times.
- Measures to mitigate the increased risk of collisions, allisions, and groundings.
- Measures to prepare for the increased risk of an oil spill through oil spill response equipment staging at the terminal and along ferry routes.

Steffani Lillie June 9, 2022 Page 3

Environmental Justice

All members of the community in and surrounding the project area need to be included in the scoping process.

- How will increased ferry schedules and access impact marginalized communities in the project area?
- How can those impacts be mitigated to ensure there is no unfair distribution of harm to these communities?
- Will the terminal location take into consideration ferry access for underserved communities?
- Ensure all those in the community are involved in a meaningful way.

Thank you for considering these comments from the Department of Ecology. If you have questions or would like to respond to these comments, please contact one of the commenters listed above.

Sincerely,

Kelli Sheldon

Kelli Sheldon SEPA Coordinator

Sent by email: Steffani Lillie, steffanil@kitsaptransit.com

ecc: Kim Smith, Ecology Brittany Flittner, Ecology



WSDOT Ferries Division (WSF) 2901 3rd Avenue, Ste. 500 Seattle, WA 98121-3014 206-515-3400 TTY: 1-800-833-6388 www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries

June 13, 2022

Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie Service and Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave., Suite 200 Bremerton, WA 98337

RE: Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project, Early Scoping Comments

Dear Steffani:

The Washington State Department of Ferries Divisions (WSF) appreciates the early opportunity to review the proposed Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility project in Elliott Bay, Puget Sound. WSF understand the purpose of early scoping is to provide comments on the four areas noted below towards the aim of assessing potential permanent terminal locations to support long-term operations of the Kitsap Transit Ferry Program in the downtown Seattle waterfront area.

WSF provides the following comments for consideration.

Proposed purpose and need – There appears to be no corresponding need statement for the purpose, "Increase integration of passenger-only ferry travel with other transit modes." Further, the needs section only partially addresses the purpose statement, "Expand mobility options for minority and low-income populations." Lower cost housing availability in Kitsap County does not necessarily equate to the need for minority and low-income population mobility options, and the barrier for potential route and service expansion in downtown Seattle identified by the PSRC 2020 Puget Sound Passenger-only Ferry Study, does not explicitly address minority and low-income mobility options. If the main purpose of the project is to increase Passenger-only ferry (POF) routes and services, and there is no constructive means foreseen to expand mobility options for minority and low-income populations, it is better to consider it as a goal: an element that could addressed on some level by the proposed project.

Study area and locations being analyzed – The study area as shown from Terminal 46 in the south to Pier 70 in the north provides opportunity to review potential locations associated with current and future projects of the Waterfront Seattle program

Lillie June 13, 2022 Page 2 of 2

that aim at creating active hubs of recreation and business. In particular, the area spanning Pier 58 to Pier 63 will become a zone designed to accommodate high foot traffic and would be compatible with POF transit to connect with bus and light rail transit service of the downtown core, and to areas north and south.

Potential project benefits and impacts on the community, the environment and transportation –WSF appreciates the foresight of the project towards vessel electrification and alternative fuels. As the project progresses, consider creative engineering solutions that may reduce the footprint of shoreside electrification infrastructure. The downtown Seattle waterfront environs, both nearshore and upland, has an extensive history of sediment contamination due to decades of industrial development. As the project progresses, implement feasible and practical planning to support terminal development that would minimize impact to the marine environment and contribute to the sustainability of existing nearshore habitat improvements, such as the seawall fish passage and habitat beaches, and the system of sediment containment caps along the waterfront.

Criteria used for initial site screening –The screening criteria appear to be useful towards understanding how alternative sites would meet the stated purpose and need for the future terminal.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide early scoping comments. Early coordination can lead to stronger partnerships and WSF looks forward to future opportunities for comment and discussion regarding the Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry Terminal Facility project. If you have any questions about these comments or require further information, please contact Marsha Tolon at 206-359-0864, or by email at tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

David Sowers

David Sowers Terminal Engineering Director Washington State Ferries

MRT:mrt

cc: Kevin Bartoy, Chief Sustainability Officer Leonard Smith, Operations Manager









MUCKLESHOOT INDIAN TRIBE Fisheries Division

39015 - 172nd Avenue SE • Auburn, Washington 98092-9763 Phone: (253) 939-3311 • Fax: (253) 931-0752



13 June 2022

Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie, Service and Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave., Suite 200 Bremerton, WA 98337

Re: Early Scoping Comments regarding Kitsap Transit's Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project

Dear Ms. Lillie,

The Habitat Program of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division has reviewed the Early Scoping information regarding Kitsap Transit's Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project. The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe is a successor in interest to tribes and bands that were parties to the Treaty of Point Elliott, 12 Stat 927, and the Treaty of Medicine Creek, 10 Stat 1132. Through these treaties, the Tribe has reserved Treaty fishing, hunting, and gathering rights, including the right to take fish at its usual and accustomed fishing grounds and stations. *United States v. Washington*, 384 F. Supp. 312 (W.D. Wash. 1974); *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe v. Hall*, 698 F. Supp. 1504 (W.D. Wash. 1988). These fishing rights and resources are integral to the Tribe's history and cultural identity and the sustainability of both are therefore essential to the Tribe. The entire study area identified for the Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project is within the Tribe's Usual and Accustomed fishing area.

The Early Scoping opportunity for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project identifies a number of criteria for site screening, including, but not limited to: 1) Provide capacity (four operating slips) for Kitsap Transit's current three routes during peak hour commute with one backup slip, and capacity to accommodate potential future growth, and 2) Simultaneous maneuvering space for a minimum of two vessels. Based on our review, we are concerned that the project, when selected, could result in ongoing and expanding negative impacts to the Tribe's Treaty fishing rights in the study area. These potential negative impacts include, but are not limited to, disruption or displacement of Tribal fishers as a result of new vessel activities and facilities associated with this project, and potential Tribal fishing gear damage from transiting ferry operations.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide Early Scoping comments for this project. We look forward to working directly with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Kitsap Transit, and others regarding this project. Please do not hesitate to call me at (253) 876-3130 with any additional questions.

Sincerely,

ATHOS

Glen R. St. Amant Fisheries Habitat Protection Assistant Director

cc: Mr. Mark A. Assam, AICP, FTA, mark.assam@dot.gov



Attachment G Public Comments





7787 62nd Avenue NE Seattle, WA 98115-8155 P (206) 552-3222 • www.cascade.org • info@cascade.org

f /CascadeBicycleClub 🍯 @cascadebicycle 🖸 @cascadebicycle

June 10, 2022

Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie, Service & Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton WA 98337

Dear Kitsap Transit,

Thank you for your work building and operating much needed passenger ferry service to Kitsap County over the last several years. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the early scoping phase of the Kitsap Transit project to site a permanent passenger ferry dock in downtown Seattle in order to better support existing and future passenger ferry traffic between Kitsap County and Seattle, the region's largest employment hub, tourist destination and cultural center.

Cascade Bicycle Club's mission is to support the needs of people who bike or want to. A cornerstone of our advocacy is encouraging seamless, simple and safe connectivity between bikes and transit. Already, the Kitsap Transit Fast Ferries are used by numerous riders who choose to bring their bikes aboard the ferry, so they may bike the "last mile" of their journey. Some passengers park their bikes at the dock and board the ferry on foot. As the region grows, and non-motorized networks mature in Seattle as well as in Kitsap's population centers served by the foot ferry, including Bremerton and Kingston, more people will rely on biking as an affordable, safe means of first and last mile connectivity to transit. Regional plans, such as the recently adopted PSRC Regional Transportation Plan support this hypothesis.

We provide the following requests for study by Kitsap Transit during the early EIS scoping. The desired outcome of studying these important aspects pertaining to accommodating people who bike is that the new terminal is functional for people who choose to bike to the ferry, is additive to the experience of bringing a bike aboard - not the opposite. While our history is rooted in advocating for people who bike - the new mobility landscape is shifting, and already scooters aboard Kitsap Transit fast Ferries are commonplace. As such, our comments are meant to be inclusive of that shifting landscape where the next innovation is doubtless around the corner, and flexibility to accommodate that next innovation is required for positive customer experience.



f /CascadeBicycleClub 🍯 @cascadebicycle 🖸 @cascadebicycle

Please study the following:

- Study the demand trends for people biking and using other wheeled mobility devices in using the foot ferry and plan accordingly in regards to ferry terminal siting, design, and all access components.
- Impacts of bike access in regards to the terminal <u>location</u>, including connectivity to the existing and planned Seattle bike network and existing and planning Link Light Rail stations.
- Impacts of bike access in regards to the terminal <u>design</u>, including connectivity to the existing and planned Seattle bike network and existing and planning Link Light Rail stations.
- Access to both short term (less than 2 hours) and secure (on demand bike locker) long term (longer than 2 hours) bicycle parking at the terminal locations, to support people's ability to bike aboard the ferry and have flexibility of their transportation options once in Seattle. This includes ensuring you can provide sufficient parking at the chosen location. Consider co-location with the new WSF ferry terminal.
- Safety in regards to bicycle circulation in the terminal area, such that waiting to board the ferry is safe and convenient for all ferry users including those walking on and biking or using other wheeled mobility devices.
- Future-proof the terminal design and location based on regional and local planning projections for increased bike-mode share and increased population in both Seattle and Kitsap County.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to engaging as the project moves forward.

Sincerely,

Vicky Clarke Policy Director Cascade Bicycle Club



June 13, 2022

Steffani Lillie Kitsap Transit Service & Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton WA 98337

Sent via email: <u>KTplanning@kitsaptransit.com</u>

RE: Early Scoping for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project

Dear Steffani Lillie,

Thank you for this opportunity to submit early scoping comments for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project (project). Since 1979, the mission of Friends of the San Juans, a nonprofit organization based in Friday Harbor, Washington, has focused on protecting and restoring the San Juan Islands and the Salish Sea for people and nature. We represent over 2,000 members and work with diverse stakeholders including citizens, committees, tribal and governmental agencies, and other non-profit organizations in the transboundary region of the Salish Sea. In 2001, Friends of the San Juans was a co-petitioner that led to the federal listing of the Southern Resident killer whales as an endangered species. The protection and recovery of the Southern Residents continues to be one of our top priorities.

Friends of the San Juans urges Kitsap Transit and the Federal Transit Administration to thoroughly address all of the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts from project-related vessel traffic, and in particular, how the siting of potential new dock capacity to accommodate potential growth in the Kitsap Transit fast ferry fleet and associated increased fast ferry traffic could adversely impact the critically endangered Southern Resident killer whales.

The Southern Resident killer whale population was listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act in 2005, following a precipitous drop in abundance from 98 whales in 1995 to 78 in 2001.¹ Today, there are only 73 Southern Residents.² The Southern Resident killer whales' recovery is

¹ National Marine Fisheries Service, Endangered Status for Southern Resident killer whales. 70 FR 69903.

² The Center for Whale Research reports the official annual count of Southern Resident killer whale twice a year on July 1 and December 31. The population as of December 31, 2021 is 73 whales: J Pod=24, K Pod=16, L Pod=33. https://www.whaleresearch.com/orca-population.

impacted by a lack of their primary prey, Chinook salmon; anthropogenic disturbance including vessel noise and presence impacts; and impacts from toxic contaminants.³

Increases in fast ferry traffic could have significant adverse impacts to the critically endangered Southern Resident killer whales, which are identified as a most highly at-risk marine species.⁴ Disturbance from vessels and vessel noise are identified impacts to the Southern Resident killer whale population.⁵ Southern Resident killer whales rely on echolocation to hunt for their preferred prey, Chinook salmon.⁶ Vessel traffic noise masks or impairs Southern Residents' communication and echolocation, making it more difficult to communicate and to find prey and requiring increased energy expenditures.⁷ There are also impacts from the presence of vessels which displace the Southern Residents' foraging behavior.⁸ Project-related increase in fast ferries would increase the risk of vessel strikes, which can be fatal.⁹ Given the Southern Residents' small population size, just one Southern Resident death as a result of a fast ferry strike could have significant population consequences.

Thank you for your attention to these early scoping comments.

Sincerely,

Lace Pratt

Lovel Pratt Marine Protection and Policy Director

³ National Marine Fisheries Service. December 2021. *Southern Resident Killer Whales (Orcinus orca) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation*. (National Marine Fisheries Service West Coast Region, Seattle, 2021) <u>https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2022-01/srkw-5-year-review-2021.pdf</u>.

⁴ NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION (NOAA) FISHERIES. U.S. Species Directory. Southern Resident Killer Whale. <u>https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/killer-whale#spotlight</u>

⁵ National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS] (2016). Southern Resident Killer Whales (Orcinus orca) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. Seattle, WA: National Marine Fisheries Service West Coast Region.

⁶ Au, W. W. L., Ford, J. K. B., Horne, J. K., and Newman Allman, K. A. (2004). Echolocation signals of free-ranging killer whales (Orcinus orca) and modeling of foraging for Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha). J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 115, 901–909. doi: 10.1121/1.1642628

⁷ Holt, M. M., Noren, D. P., Veirs, V., Emmons, C. K., and Veirs, S. (2009). Speaking up: killer whales (Orcinus orca) increase their call amplitude in response to vessel noise. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 125, EL27–EL32.

⁸ D. Lusseau, D. E. Bain, R. Williams and J. C. Smith, "Vessel traffic disrupts the foraging behavior of southern resident killer whales Orcinus orca," Endangered Species Research, pp. Vol 6: 211-221, 2009.

Holt MM, Tennessen JB, Ward EJ, Hanson MB, Emmons CK, Giles DA and Hogan JT (2021) Effects of Vessel Distance and Sex on the Behavior of Endangered Killer Whales. Front. Mar. Sci. 7:582182. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2020.582182. ⁹ Ferrara, G.A., T.M. Mongillo, L.M. Barre. 2017. Reducing disturbance from vessels to Southern Resident killer whales: Assessing the effectiveness of the 2011 federal regulations in advancing recovery goals. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-58, 76 p.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada. July 22, 2019. Necropsy results: Southern Resident Killer Whale J34. https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fm-gp/species-especes/mammals-mammiferes/j34-eng.html.

June 10, 2022

Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie, Service & Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton WA 98337



Re: Public Scoping for the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project

Dear Director Lillie:

Thank you for providing an opportunity for Puget Soundkeeper Alliance (Soundkeeper) to review the Scoping Information Report, May 2022, and comment on the Early Scoping for Kitsap Transit Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project.

The purported purpose of this project is to "create opportunities for growth of regional passenger-only ferry routes throughout the Puget Sound Region." To establish a basis for this contention, the proponents note that "the PSRC 2020 Puget Sound Passenger-only Ferry Study identified the lack of landing site capacity in downtown Seattle as a barrier to potential future routes or service expansion."

As an initial observation, Soundkeeper notes that not all capacity limits are hurdles to be overcome; we've long learned that ignoring the carrying capacity of nature leads to detrimental outcomes and destabilized ecosystems. In Seattle, a mix of ferry traffic, container ports, sports facilities, tourism venues, marinas, residences, commercial and industrial sites do indeed fully occupy every inch of the waterfront. Soundkeeper views this status quo as a limiting factor; our waterfronts need to be less fully occupied, need more room for ecosystem function, more access for communities, and more protections to encourage resiliency. That said, investment in mass transit provides, generally, relief from other burdens placed on our waterways and aquatic ecosystems, including, in part, climate-driven impact. Thus, Soundkeeper asks that you undertake this impact review with an open mind toward the no-action alternative here, and with an eye toward ways to <u>avoid</u> (not just minimize) impacts from this project.

More substantively, Soundkeeper wants to bring your attention to a host of environmental and community impacts that could result from this project and thus merit study as part of your review. First and foremost, the increase of fast ferry routes and service expansion are directly harmful to orcas in the Puget Sound. Fast ferries create noise pollution which has a detrimental effect on orcas' foraging and communications. The purpose and need for this project – specifically, increases to fast ferry routes and service, would make the orcas' foraging and communications more difficult and would decimate the orca population.

The harmful impact of this project on Orcas cannot be compatible with Washington State Governor Inslee's Orca Goals. The Governor's office ascribes noise disturbance from boats and vessels as one of the three key problems impacting the health of orcas.

Protecting and Preserving Puget Sound

130 Nickerson Street, Suite 107 Seattle, WA 98109

> P 206.297.7002 F 206.297.0409

www.pugetsoundkeeper.org

One of the recommendations from the Southern Resident Orca Task Force is to decrease disturbance and other risks posed by vessel traffic and noise. This project's goal of creating opportunities for growth of fast ferry routes and service expansion are incompatible with decreasing noise disturbance.

Orca in the Sound, need more of two things: food and silence. This project, woth additional coastal crowding, pollution, vessel traffic, and construction, threatens both of these prerequisites to orca survival. Put simply, more interference is a threat to orca survival; this is a high bar for the project to overcome, and the impact review must carefully review this threshold matter.

Second, Soundkeeper urges you to examine the impacts this project may have on our communities. From the air quality impacts of additional marine engines running at peak intensities (to speed as rapidly as possible across the Sound) to the above-the-water noise impacts on the neighborhoods around these facilities, there are a host of impacts to fast ferry routes that potentially trigger environmental justice reviews. Moreover, given the route's costs, potential loss of public space for access and recreation at new or expanded terminals, and likely interference with traditional fisheries, Soundkeeper recommends that Kitsap take a close look at this project's community impacts – including issues that need review under Washington State's HEAL Act.

Again, Soundkeeper is encouraged that more and more folks around the Sound are looking to get out of cars and make use of mass transit options, such as ferries, and recognizes that this shift has the potential to drive vital reductions in our region's greenhouse gas emissions. Given the environmental impacts disproportionally borne by our local coastal communities, the extremely dire state of our endangered resident (and transient) orca populations, and the diminished biomass of our salmonids, even otherwise ideal mass transit projects like ferry services must take a hard look at their impacts before putting new propellers in the water.

Soundkeeper looks forward to working with you on your review of these impacts, and thanks you for considering investments in sustainable, low-impact mass transit options for the communities of Puget Sound.

Please contact me if there are any questions regarding my comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Dixon Executive Director

wecprotects.org



1402 Third Ave, Suite 1400 Seattle WA, 98101 206.631.2600

June 13, 2022

Kitsap Transit Steffani Lillie, Service & Capital Development Director 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton WA 98337

Federal Transit Administration Barney Remington, Environmental Protection Specialist 915 Second Avenue, Suite 3142, Seattle, WA 98174

Via Email: KTplanning@kitsaptransit.com and barney.remington@dot.gov

RE: Early Scoping Notice for the Kitsap County Public Transportation Benefit Area Authority Proposed Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project

Hello Ms Lillie and Mr. Remington,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the early scoping notice for the Kitsap County Public Transportation Benefit Area Authority Proposed Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Facility Project. Washington Environmental Council is a nonprofit, statewide conservation organization that has been driving positive change to solve Washington's most critical environmental challenges since 1967. A top priority for us and hundreds of our members in Skagit County is the protection and restoration of the Salish Sea, Puget Sound and the rivers that feed this inland sea. Development of smart land use regulations, and implementation of them, is one essential tool to ensure a healthy environment, clean water, and thriving communities.

It is our understanding that the purpose and need of the project is the siting of potential new dock capacity in order to accommodate passenger ferry growth in the Kitsap Transit ferry fleet and to improve regional mobility through expanded passenger-only terminal facilities on the downtown Seattle waterfront to.

We greatly appreciate Kitsap Transit mindfulness, responsibility and engagement in implementing basic policies, procedures and best practices to reduce the risk of ship strikes with marine mammals, especially the highly endangered Southern Resident Killer Whale. We hope to see Kitsap Transit

wecprotects.org



1402 Third Ave, Suite 1400 Seattle WA, 98101 206.631.2600

continue be a leader in the fast ferry transportation arena to effectively implement several of the Orca Task Force recommendation for ferries including fleet electrification, use of Whale Report Alert System, and active engagement in Quiet Sound.

The final recommendation from the Governor's Orca Task Force (2019) advised that the region should: "Conduct a comprehensive environmental review and take action to minimize potential whale-strike risk and underwater noise posed by the growing number and distribution of fast-ferries and water taxis in Southern Resident critical habitat."

This project along all of Kitsap Fast Ferry routes overlap with a key portion of the range of Southern Resident Orcas, especially in fall and winter when they are known to be in the central Puget Sound foraging for coho and chum. Thus, underwater noise the ferries generate (and the vessels' movement) may disturb and compromise the successful foraging and communication of orcas (and other species) must be analyzed and reviewed for cumulative impacts along with options and alternatives that would minimize impacts from increased daily vessel transits across the water.

Because additional capacity could facilitate system expansion, we see a need to better understand the number, location, and frequency of additional routes that would occur by increased dock capacity for fast ferries at Pier 50. It is essential to understand what the ferry ridership projections are in 10 years, 20 years, 30 years etc.

Given that the project would necessitate in-water construction to expand Pier 50's vessel capacity, it is critical to included extensive environmental review of pile driving noise in the water and impacts to shoreline habitat along Seattle's water front. The massive water front revitalization effort that has been ongoing for numerous years includes elements to help juvenile salmon migrating along the nearshore, including daylighting walkways over the water, naturally sloping nearshore gradient, and creation of new pocket beaches such as the one right next to Pier 50. If Pier 50 where to be expanded what would be the impacts on that pocket beach? What mitigation measures will be in place to alleviate under noise from pile driving? How will the expansion of the pier impact salmon along the nearshore?

Furthermore, given that this is a transportation infrastructure project, the environmental review must address greenhouse gas emissions from the increased number of ferry transits across the water, the variable speeds the ferries travel as the faster the ferry travels that more fuel it consumes, and the idling time at the ferry dock in between service runs. It also must be aligned with Washington State's Climate Commitment Act which establishes a comprehensive program to reduce carbon pollution and achieve the greenhouse gas limits set in state law.





1402 Third Ave, Suite 1400 Seattle WA, 98101 206.631.2600

Please add me to the project mailing list as we would like to continue to be involved in this project proposal.

Thank you, Rein Attemann

Puget Sound Campaign Manager 1402 Third Avenue | Suite 1400 Seattle, WA 98101 206.631.2625 • <u>rein@wecprotects.org</u> Washington Environmental Council • <u>wecprotects.org</u>

Appendix G: Public Comments

First Name	Last Name	Source	Comment
Bruce	Agnew	Website Comment Form	See attached letter
Amy	Augustine Grappone	Website Comment Form	As a single parent getting ready to return to work, a fast ferry from Bainbridge to Seattle would significantly ease the burden of commuting from the island to the city. I understand that Kitsap Fast Ferries is considering a line between Bremerton and Bainbridge. I see that as a large expense with little benefit. As a Bainbridge resident who has to deal with the hassle of summer ferries, I can tell you that a fast ferry between Bainbridge and Seattle would be much more beneficial for Kitsap residents and tourists alike. It would encourage more walk-ons on both sides and incentivize commuters to use more environmentally friendly forms of transportation. I hope you will consider a fast ferry between Bainbridge and Seattle. Thank you.
К	В	Website Comment Form	I am against moving the Kitsap foot ferries to another location. I understand the difficulties and challenges of the current shared space but the convenience of the location is really important to so many commuters. Access to bus lines in the downtown area is key for commuters who must connect to get to their final destination. The comfort of the brand new passenger ferry terminal that has ticket kiosks, space heaters, and seating is instrumental for accessibility and ease of use. For Bremerton commuters, being near the WSF service is essential for those who miss their fast ferry or cannot get a seat on them to then hop over and catch a different boat home or to work. I have recently moved to Port Orchard and work in downtown Seattle because of the new Southworth fast ferry and it's location to downtown connections. I used to live in Bremerton was constantly disappointed by the fast ferry service there but it was helpful to be near the WSF as a backup. I absolutely do not want the landing for Kitsap ferries to move. Please do not move it. They should have built a bigger landing terminal, why was not that not considered and executed knowing full well the region has growing foot ferry system? When there's challenges, it always feels like Kitsap gets the short end of the stick and suffers the consequences the most.
Linda	Bacorn	Website Comment Form	 I really, really dislike Pier 50. It means I get off the lightrail at Pioneer Square station, a station in which I feel unsafe, especially in the winter months, when we commute in the dark both ways. I feel unsafe at the station and walking to the pier. Pier 54 was nice because I could get off at University Street and felt safer there. Because of the schedule change and further distance to Pier 50, I cannot make to the now 5:05 ferry. I could make it as the 5:10 at Pier 54. Staff at Pier 50 is unfriendly, the place is cold and dreary. Too much traffic with the State ferry traffic. Staff at Pier 54 was friendly, the atmosphere was relaxed and there were restaurants and tourists to watch as we waited. I've been a regular commuter for almost 4 years. We have changed locations from Pier 52, to Pier 50, to Pier 54 and now back to Pier 50. Pier 52 was the worst.

Appendix G: Public Comments

			I don't know the details of the contract with Argosy cruises and Pier 54, but I would vote to go back there.
Brett	Barbakoff	Website Comment Form	Please create a fast ferry from Bainbridge Island to Seattle. More options the better.
Sheldon	Beddo	Website Comment Form	I am an advocate for a future landing north of pier 50. Pier 50 services commuters in the stadium area and downtown core well, but commuters moving north into the SLU area and beyond not so much. The SLU area is rapidly growing (climate pledge arena, construction, and the tech industry are examples). A landing well north of Pier 50 will better serve commuters headed in that direction.
Jackie	Blanken	Website Comment Form	Please keep the dock as close to yesler/T-Mobile park/lumen field as possible for easy access to transit/light rail usage! Don't put it down in the north end where nothing is this will hurt everyone that uses the ferry to get to work that relies on other methods of transit after the boat to get to work.
Kevin	Byrd	Website Comment Form	Please consider reopening Pier 54 or having a pier further up Alaska Ave. Many of us work around 6th and Pike St. The move to Pier 50 added several minutes to our walk to work. Many are
			considering getting scooters due to the increased walking distance, however the boat can only accommodate a few scooters.
Steve	Coulter	Website Comment Form	I love that the current passenger terminal is close to the Coleman dock; but even more that it is a flat walk to the light-rail and the C-Line. It would be great to see a new terminal in this area. The old SDOT pier 48 seems ideal or the section of 46 that was going to become a cruise terminal (what a bad idea that was!). Kitsap Transit is doing a great job of reviving the mosquito fleet that used to run all over Puget Sound. As a Seattle resident I really appreciate it. I use all three lines that leave from the Pier 50. Thanks for the great service.
Kathleen	Crowell	Website Comment Form	Please consider the location of the light rail stations when evaluating a new location for ferry dock. It currently takes me 10 minutes to walk from pier 50 to pioneer square station. A longer walk would impede my ability to artive at work on time.
Mitch	DeRidder	Website Comment Form	Hi, I live in Kingston, WA, and we have a household employee / personal assistant commuting to our home five days a week from Northgate, where she lives just two blocks from the light rail terminal. We had hoped that the light rail in combination with the fast ferry would provide her a fast and efficient way to commute to Kingston via mass transportation. We are fully covering her ferry and mass transit commuting costs by funding an Orca card.

Appendix G: Public Comments

			When the Northgate rail terminal opened, she tried our proposed transportation strategy for a while but felt too great a fear of personal risk from ne'er-do-wells while walking between the Pioneer Station terminal and the fast ferry terminal. I am hoping that the new fast ferry terminal location will facilitate an efficient and safer connection between the light rail and the fast ferry terminal
Nicolas	Duchastel de Montrouge	Website Comment Form	 The Seattle terminal should be near to transit and easily accessible to downtown foot traffic. Pier 62 (or around) would be a good location - closest to Westlake light rail station. Also take note of new Overlook Walk being developed by Seattle city and Aquarium. 1. Pier 62 to Westlake station - 1840 feet up Pine Street. 2. Pier 56 to University station - 1,285 feet up University street. 3. Colman docks to Pioneer station - 1,850 feet - Columbia, 1st street and then Yesler. Consider adding more fast ferries: from Bainbridge, from Poulsbo. Maybe consider a Bremerton to Poulsbo to Bainbridge to Bremerton fast ferry? Can we have WIFI on the fast ferries? that would be great.
crispin	faget	Website Comment Form	 I am a resident of Kingston. I travel to Seattle 2 - 3 times a week as a walk on passenger. With regard to the Kingston based fast ferry, I would like to have access to: 1. increased number of midday sailings 2. increased weekend sailings
Stephen	Fesler	Website Comment Form	The new ferry pier should be located very near or at Colman Dock. My evaluation of the site is that there is room to construct additional piers at the dock that don't impede existing ferry services. Colocation is super important to maximise options and connections to ferries and other transit and amenities for ferry riders. Please use Colman Dock.
Luke	Greenway	Website Comment Form	It's a priority for me that the fast ferries connect seamlessly with public transportation, especially the light rail and rapid ride bus services. It also seems to make sense to have the terminal as close as possible to other ferry terminals.
Tim	Hachfeld	Website Comment Form	 Good Afternoon, As a resident of Kitsap county, the selection of this new ferry landing site is the next important decision in improving our transit access to Seattle. I support the location of the terminal at Pier 46 or as close to existing Water Taxi and WSF facilities. This selection is VITAL! Locating the ferry terminal at Pier 70 makes no sense and risks reducing ridership. Locating near the existing King County Dock and WSF docks enable ferry riders a variety of options and build on existing transit networks. Ferry riders have easy access to downtown, light rail and other connections.
			This also puts ferry riders in easy reach of the stadiums.
-----------	------------	----------------------------	---
			Locating at Pier 46 is the right choice.
			Sincerely,
			Tim Hachfeld
Jack	Harrington	Website Comment Form	Any location north of Pier 56 would be self-limiting. You want to locate as close to Pier 50 as possible for convenient access to downtown business locations, the stadiums, and transit to the airport and distant light rail destinations, among others.
			WHILE YOU'RE AT IT: consider dispensing with the convoluted \$2/\$10 fare set-up \$6 one-way), and ENCOURAGE TOURISM from Seattle to West Sound destinations, through an on-going marketing plan. This is a lost opportunity for such communities as Kingston, Bremerton and south Kitsap areas.
Stephanie	Hudson	Website Comment Form	Pier 70, to Pierre 46 all are fine options. Good luck finding a venue. Please keep this valuable service, and Saturday fast ferry service! Thank you for all the hard work.
Evan	Kaufman	Website Comment Form	I would have definite interest in later morning routes (10-11am) on the Southworth to Seattle. Ditto for evening routes (8-9pm) on the Seattle to Southworth.
Susan	Kelly	Website Comment Form	We use the Kitsap Fast Ferry from Kingston to Seattle. It is so convenient for getting to downtown Seattle. Please do not move it as far as Pier 70. That would defeat the purpose of the ease of getting to businesses in the downtown core. It needs to be kept close to where it is. Also, if the Fast Ferry is canceled we need to hop on a Washington State Ferry.
Craig	Kelly	Website Comment Form	I am not sure how well the system would work if the terminal is all the way down by pier 70. The closer to WSF terminal the better. We have often had to jump on a WSF vessel when the Fast Ferry went down unexpectedly. Also, the current location is extremely well suited for ease to downtown. Pier 70 is way too far away from core downtown sites.
Carol	Koppelman	Website Comment Form	The Kitsap Fast ferry, as well as Jefferson Transit Kitsap Express, makes it possible for me to commute without driving, to downtown Seattle. It's a wonderful option. Possible other locations for docking are another pier further north (such as closer to the Victoria Clipper). Another option is the cruise ship terminal north of the Grain Tower.

Mary	Kulish	Website Comment Form	A reliable and robust ferry service with other transit connections is necessary for this area to continue to thrive. Kitsap Transit has done a commendable job thus far. Now, keeping the ferries operating on consistent, reliable schedules that serve commuters is critical. I mostly use the Kingston-Seattle route. The bus connections are imperative for convenience and for reducing traffic/parking issues. I support the terminal project!
David	Leiker	Website Comment Form	 Why in the world would you consider spending money for a new dock in Seattle just because you have "federal money " to pay for it ? Who do you think pays for upkeep and maintenance forever The current operation, sharing the dock with King Counties water taxi, is perfectly acceptable. The 15 minute staggered scheduling is plenty of time to board and disembark passengers for all the fast ferries routes that share the dock. Someone might want to ask why the Kings County watertaxi is allowed to pull straight in, but the Kitsap fast ferry has to "back " into the same dock ! Someone has forgotten that passengers take the fast ferry to connect with the Seattle transit system, not just to visit the Seattle waterfront. Move the Kitsap fast ferries to another location will make catching the busses, trams, or elevated line even more difficult You want to spend that money ! Come up with a way to get disembarking passengers safely across Alaskan Way. Right now passengers have to dodge cars entering the car ferry que, construction work, and mis-aligned crosswalks, just to cross the street . How long until a vehicle plows into a "crowd " crossing the street ?
Jordan	Lewis	Website Comment Form	As a ferry rider and bike commuter, one challenge is the fast ferry has limited bike capacity and the salt water spray causes corrosion to bikes very rapidly. It would be extremely useful to have secure bike lockers (rentable?) at the planned facility. The terminal location should be located in close proximity to the WSF terminal, so riders can have multiple options for when there are issues with one ferry option or the fast ferry is full. Pre-Covid, I would frequently line up at the fast ferry and it would be full so would then get on the next WSF. Integrate amenities such as a coffee shop or bar into the future terminal location as well as seating/and charging for phones.
Michael	magnan	Website Comment Form	I am writing in support of pier 50, and while I'm not against looking for a new terminal dock no alternative is superior to the existing terminal. The idea of a separate dock for Kitsap fast ferries is appealing, more space for ferry boats and passengers are both great things. But as is a lot of people, myself included, take the fast ferry as a better alternative to the existing WA car ferry because of expediency and location. Having it at the existing ferry terminal puts it at the prime location to other transit, busses and Light rail, as well as close to the Stadiums for games and great downtown business. A drastic shift away from this area, ie dock 70, would hurt ridership as that location would no longer be convenient for commuters such as myself. While I understand the existing terminal at pier 50 is crowded, both for boats and people, it is the best location for transit to and from Seattle.

			I implore Kitsap Transit to not abandon their current dock at pier 50 simply for want of a new terminal they can call their own but rather a location that provides clear benefit to all riders. And lastly, please do not decide on a new location simply to spend money and Garner attention.
Brayden	Meyer	Website	Commenting on the fast ferry early scoping.
		Form	I commute daily on the Bremerton fast ferry, while the current pier 50 terminal is sufficient for current traffic volumes it definitely already feels like it's nearly at max capacity.
			Personally, I would prefer something closer to pier 62 as it also currently sits empty and is closer to more of Seattle's businesses and tourist attractions, as well as shopping centers like Westlake and the transit options in that area as well. Not to mention vehicle traffic is a bit lighter in this area compared to the pier 50 terminals and lends itself better to foot and bike traffic.
			Also have there been any studies on the validity of a ferry route to Silverdale or Poulsbo? I want to stuff my fat face with Sluys doughnuts from the comfort of the ferry
Case	Myers	Website Comment Form	We have lived in downtown Seattle for 7 years, and have travelled extensively including many times to Kitsap county. We have not used the fast ferry once,L for one reason alone. We have a dog which currently not allowed. This expansion will not benefit a large portion of the people that live in the area unless our pets are allowed on the ferry. Please review your policies and consider allowing pets on the fast ferries. Most people will continue to use the state ferries and rental vehicles as opposed to leaving thier pets at home in order to use the fast ferry system instead.
Kris	Nakagawa	Website Comment Form	We have a home in Port Orchard, and will use both Southworth and Bremerton fast ferries. As such, support such project; but preference would be Pier 46 and Pier 70 is too far from the Ferry Terminal and other key downtown sites like the sports arenas and stadiums. Thank you for considering my comments and suggestions.
Rex	Nelson	Website Comment Form	I prefer pier 48 or as close as possible to the WSF dock. The further north the dock would go, the less relevant it would be to me. I have been a ferry rider since 1984, and a member of the Kitsap Transit CAC since 1996.
Kristin	Osborne	Website Comment Form	Hello, Bremerton rider here. A new terminal needs to be within easy reach of the central business/employment district, stadiums, and light rail/bus connections for the fast ferry to continue to be a useful service to many of us who ride regularly. Pier 70 (!!!) is too far north and would preclude easy access to light rail and a host of destinations now well-served via the fast ferry. Straying too far from the WSF ferry dock also makes it difficult for fast

			ferry passengers to switch in the event of service cancelations due to mechanical issues or unforeseen delays in reaching the dock (for example, light rail service disruptions). I strongly suggest you narrow your scope of potential site options to best serve your daily commuters, downtown event attendees and airport-bound customers, which I would surmise form the bulk of your customer base. Also, please keep in mind accessibility for those who use wheelchairs or other aids to travel — that's not me, at least not at present, but I notice it's already hard enough to get around Seattle, in particular, without adding to the ordeal for folks with mobility or visual impairments. Thank you.
Jake	Parks	Website Comment Form	 Hi, I began using the fast ferry during the pandemic and really liked the landing location at pier 54? near argosy. It was a favorable location because of proximity to my office. I also liked the location because there was typically less traffic and sidewalk congestion as compared to pier 50 near WSF. During the rainy months, having a covered shelter would be nice. I see that as the main advantage of pier 50 currently. Bicycle parking on the seattle side is lacking for both pier 50 and 54. Due to the sea spray, loading a bicycle onto the ferry is not always desirable, and there are very few bike lockable areas on the seattle side. I also work for Glosten, Inc. in Seattle which is very interested in increasing viability of ferry commuting, so I hope you can use me as a local resource if that is helpful
Carla	Peterson	Website Comment Form	I'm not a super frequent rider mostly because the fast ferry doesn't operate during times that I would ride. I wish it would because I would much rather take the fast ferry than WSF. My only other comments is that a passenger area is really needed. As you know, the current one overflows to the sidewalk and sucks when it's raining. I know umbrellas are provided and I always have my umbrella, but that doesn't help when the rain is coming sideways. :) It would be nice to have a little terminal building. Definitely close to transit connections is a must. I take the light rail. I don't feel like the bus in Seattle is very safe anymore. So it's the U Street light rail for me. Thanks for considering my feedback.
Venus	Pettersen	Website Comment Form	 Hello. A separate Kitsap passenger only terminal makes sense, but currently I think sharing with King County works. It doesn't seem packed like it used to be when it first opened and COVID-19 sure changed people's working location to more of a hybrid model. I think Pier 60 is too far north, especially since it's not in the main downtown core nowhere close to the Link Light Rail. I ride the Bremerton-Seattle ferry 2-3 times a week. Is this the most popular route? It sure seems like it is.
Peter	Philips	Website Comment Form	See attached letter

Kelly	Purnell	Website Comment Form	Dock space too far south doesn't seem very beneficial to passengers. The further south past Colman dock the more industrial the landscape becomes. Transit connections to the ferries are already poor. This will just be exacerbated on the southern end. North end or central dock options would better accommodate future potential transit connections, take advantage of the waterfront pedestrian infrastructure that is safer for foot and bicycle users, not to mention much better lit during the dark winter months, and have much more efficient connectivity to the Belltown, Denny, and Downtown core areas for commuters. Additionally, if there are Fremont or Ballard commuters, the Elliot Bay trail can be easily utilized by cyclists and scooter users. Usage rates of the ferries will depend on the provisions of safety and convenience. Going too far south will not provide either of those.
Jane	Richlovsky	Website Comment Form	Please locate the ferry terminal as close as possible to the other ferry terminals and to public transit and city amenities. It seems only reasonable that a dedicated passenger-only ferry should drop people off in a location where they can easily walk to transit and to downtown & waterfront destinations, including Pioneer Square. Piers 46-48 would be excellent choices that would benefit both the riders and the local businesses. Thank you.
Heja	Schmid	Website Comment Form	I commute by Southworth/Downtown Fast Ferry daily. I work in the lower Queen Anne area. While there are buses from core Downtown to Lower Queen Anne, most people walk from/to the ferry as waiting for bus and travelling by bus takes just about the same time as walking. There are plenty of commuters like me (working in Queen Anne and commuting by ferry). For commuters like me, it would be better if the ferry dock is moved to closer to Pier 70. It looks like between Seattle Aquarium and Port of Seattle piers would be good locations for consideration. It would benefit Seattle tourism, and Kitsap Transit may be able to negotiate to lower operation associated fees for such benefit Seattle would get.
Wanda	Selg- Gonzales	Website Comment Form	It would be wonderful to have late night ferries operate out of Seattle to Bremerton, at least for Friday and Saturday nights.
Melissa	Shumake	Website Comment Form	I'm in support of a new terminal, and I hope that alternatives are selected based on how well connections can be made (or already exist) to transit.
Philip	Siegfried	Website Comment Form	How about using Pier 48? It used to be for ferries and it's pretty easy to create a path to Alaskan Way. Plus it's right near a bus stop where 9 different Metro routes stop.
Justin	Smith	Website Comment Form	If the new dock for the passenger ferry is as far north as Pier 70, that will make it challenging to get around Seattle upon arrival. That's over a mile from the nearest light rail station, and it's more difficult to access buses and there are fewer routes. If it takes an extra 20 minutes just to get downtown after landing, that's not much less travel time than the ordinary ferry. Is running the Bremerton fast ferries even worth it at that point? These are passenger-only ferries, so walkability and appropriate public
			transportation at the dock needs to be a top concern.

Joel	Sparrow	Website Comment Form	Transit transfer options north of Pier 62 are difficult and burdensome. North of 62 should be considered a last resort option.
Ron	Thomas	Website Comment Form	The ferry terminal is seldom the final destination for most Fast Ferry passengers. Most need to travel further and I am always amazed by the significant number of passengers that travel to the Poineer Square LR station with kids and luggage that clearly indicates that planners have not considered coordinating transit for a group that could use assistance.
Jay	Thompson	Website Comment Form	The fast ferry terminal should be close to the regular ferry terminal. If the proposed terminal is more than a few blocks from the WSF terminal or further out from the terminal than where the Bremerton ferry was using over the last year or so, I'll probably not ride the fast ferry. The terminal needs to be covered and protected from the weather. My complaints about the temporary loading area used in the last year or so fell on deaf ears. I pay a lot of money to ride the ferry. Standing in a big puddle of water in the rain with wet feet in the winter is not really acceptable in the long run. I would hope you guys would be able to work something out for us to remain in the existing walk on ferry/water taxi terminal. Seems kind of odd that you are not able to continue using it.
Brendan	Weitzman	Website Comment Form	The fast ferry has really been a game changer since its inception, and any investments in extending capacitywith the headroom that would bring for greater frequency, expanded hours of service, and potential new routesare worth exploring. Lengthy & infrequent connection from Seattle to Kitsap via the current mix of fast and slow boats is the key factor keeping me from visiting friends and family who live in Bremerton and elsewhere on the west side of Puget Sound. Being able to walk on to a 30 minute fast ferry after work, attend a weeknight dinner or show, and return home without having to closely watch my watch and depart early to make the final boat, would open up whole new worlds of possibility. Far too often today I feel my only viable option is to drive down and around, across the Narrows Bridge, an expensive and time-consuming option of its own which contributes to gridlock through Tacoma and increased CO2 emissions. These ad hoc trips don't even scrape the surface of the pressure this could take off the King County housing market by making Kitsap a more-attractive commuting option for jobs & events in the citynot just core business hours, but sporting events, concerts, and all the other big draws that I felt I'd be too cut off from in ruling out Kitsap housing during my 2018 house search. The benefits of improving access and connection across the sound would be many, and I'd love to see this project move forward.

Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal Project Early Scoping Comment

Submitted by Bruce Agnew and Peter Philips

June 13th, 2022

Steffani Lillie Service & Capital Development Director Kitsap Transit 60 Washington Ave, Suite 200 Bremerton WA 98337

Dear Ms Lillie,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal early scoping.

We appreciate Kitsap Transit's leadership role in this effort and write today to propose developing an area adjacent to Pioneer Square, the Stadium District and the New Waterfront Park for such a facility.

We call it Salish Crossing Northwest. (Salish Crossing NW).

Operational Alternatives

We support Kitsap Transit's efforts to establish greater capacity on the Seattle Central Waterfront to handle their needs and believe the basin including Pier 48 and its uplands would provide that capacity to Kitsap Transit, and other regional ferry operators who might need access to the central waterfront.

We envision a multi-modal, multi-user transportation hub to be established in the marine basin formed by the north apron of Pier 46 to the south apron of Pier 50. This facility will provide short-term, immediate relief to the lack of docking space for the Kitsap Fast Ferries and expansion room as your service grows.

Additionally, the new facility would provide a much-needed terminal for expanding other passenger ferry service in Puget Sound with direct access to Seattle's re- developed and more accessible waterfront.

We would be supportive of a Kitsap Transit operated facility, assuming operators from other jurisdictions, and with different operating models, would be permitted to use the facility—thus achieving the goal of a multi-user passenger only ferry terminal that is so urgently needed on the Central Waterfront.

2

Alternatively, the facility could be developed, owned, and operated as an independent public facility district, with Kitsap Transit is its anchor tenant.

As the anchor tenant of Salish Crossing NW Kitsap Transit would achieve your goal of expanded capacity on the Seattle Central Waterfront, without the administrative and financial burden of construction and operation of the facility.

Salish Crossing NW with Kitsap as the anchor tenant would have a stable revenue base to help sustain ongoing operations. Kitsap's faith and good credit would provide confidence and collateral for the funding of the facility's construction.

Site Overview

Pier 48 is ideally suited for Salish Crossing NW, and development of the project would have the added benefit of connecting to other developments that are currently unconnected.

At present, the city's Waterfront Park extends from Pier 70 southward along Alaskan Way to Pier 50. From the south, the Stadium District development extends north along Railway Avenue to S King Street. The waterfront between S. King Street and Pier 50 is an undeveloped eyesore at the very heart of the city's central waterfront.

In addition to providing public access to the water and the other benefits described above, Salish Crossing Northwest will connect the Waterfront Park and the Stadium District development, while further connecting these two projects along S. King Street to Pioneer Square and the International District. The Salish Crossing concept is compatible with the Stadium District Concept plan that the Public Stadium Authority (public owner of Lumen Field and Event Center) and the Public Facilities District (public owner of T-Mobile Field) have been promoting for the past 10 years to the City and stakeholder groups. (See Image 1)

3



(Image 1. The Salish Crossing NW site will connect three adjoining neighborhoods, and enhance transit connections throughout the region)

Site Details

Salish Crossing NW would be located at the site of the current dilapidated Pier 48 on the Seattle Central Waterfront. We propose to pair the terminal with a tribal fishing dock on the uplands for a direct link to waterfront visitors and to the International District markets for their fish. To honor the rich history of the Salish Sea peoples, and to recognize the legacy of the adjacent "ballast island" in traditional tribal culture we further propose the construction of a Tribal Culture Center on the southwest corner of the site.

Pier 48 consists of two tax parcels owned by the state of Washington.

To the north is Pier 50, and the adjacent Pier 52, (Colman Dock), one of the City of Seattle's designated mobility hubs with good access to Pioneer Square, International and Stadium Districts and within 1,500 feet of King Street station. The Salish Crossing NW would have landside transit and rideshare pick up and drop off areas and would enhance Seattle's waterfront development plans for mobility and environmental enhancements. (See Image 2)

4



(Image 2 Photo depicting aerial view of existing Pier 48 with Colman Dock to the left and Terminal 46 to the right)

Colman Dock is currently under construction to expand capacity for Washington State Ferries. Pier 50 is the new King County Marine Division facility, which is already at capacity and struggling to accommodate both King County Marine Transit as well as Kitsap Transit's recently expanded service.

To the south is Terminal 46 owned by the NW Seaport Alliance and Port of Seattle for longshore training, container overflow and Coast Guard operations. Salish Crossing is entirely north of Terminal 46 and would have no impact on operations there.

The Salish Crossing uplands facility would be confined to the 1.5 acres uplands of the current Pier 48, currently being used by Washington State Ferries for temporary queuing of their operations during the Colman Dock reconstruction. (See Image 3)

5



(Image 3. View of Alaska Way, Pier 48 and Colman Dock with temporary ferry line queues on uplands of Pier 48)

Salish Crossing's uplands would include a large pedestrian plaza with a turnaround and drop-off section inland, alongside Alaskan Way to accommodate passenger arrival and departure.

The plaza would be flanked to the south by a tribal cultural center and to the north by a small fish market. (See Image 4)

Costs: Preliminary engineering would need to be conducted. Marine construction experts estimate that demolishing the existing 175,000-square-foot pier and constructing a new dock at about \$50 million. Costs include \$10 million for demolition and disposal, construction of a 40,000-square-foot concrete pier as well as outbuildings, floats with ramps, traffic and pedestrian circulation.

Financing: Recently the Legislature authorized a limited state <u>tax-increment financing</u> law, which allows local governments to issue bonds to finance public improvements, includes terminals as eligible uses. Tax increment financing could leverage private sector investment. This year the Legislature is considering a major transportation revenue package which would direct climate legislation funding for projects that reduce carbon such as marine transit. Finally the new Bipartisan Infrastructure law (BIL) continues long time federal ferry programs with new multi-modal electrification incentives.

6



(Image 4. Rendering of possible configuration with fast ferries, fishing boats and public plaza. Southern outbuilding is Tribal Center and Norther outbuilding is fish market.)

We believe a public, multi-user passenger-only ferry terminal on Seattle's Central Waterfront to be an essential regional public asset. It will provide a equal and equitable access to the economic and cultural center of the region to residents from around Puget Sound that don't currently have that access.

7

A public, multi-user terminal will provide Seattle residents and visitors with a convenient, affordable and accessible way to gain access to waterfront communities around Puget Sound that do not currently benefit from visitors from downtown Seattle.

And it will knit together the historic Pioneer Square and International Districts with the evolving Waterfront Park and Stadium district to the benefit of each of those currently isolated neighborhoods.

We reiterate here our support of Kitsap Transit's efforts to establish a Seattle Fast Ferry Terminal, and we appreciate your consideration of our comments related to project.

We stand happy to continue to participate in the discussions and planning for expanded marine transit throughout Puget Sound.

Sincerely,

Bruce Agnew and Peter Philips

APPENDIX C

PIER 50 CONSTRAINTS AND CONFLICTS

Note: Example POF floats show the largest vessels in the current KT fleet (140 feet long)



Constraints and Conflicts:

1

Maneuvering conflicts: Insufficient space for two vessel slips without locating vessels within WSF security zone, within King County Water Taxi maneuvering path, or within the Pier 48 maintenance float area.

2

Pedestrian access west of current float: Clearance between stair and edge of walkway is 5'-9", insufficient for two-way pedestrian traffic.

infrastructure north of the city ROW.

equipment for future vessel electrification.

5

3

4

Maneuvering space for existing Pier 50 vessel slips.

Existing POF Facility Queuing for 500 passengers

Representative overwater coverage needed for added queuing for two additional landing slips Queuing for 1,100 passengers



Habitat Beach Extent of beach likely t limit location of overwater coverage & vessel maneuvering

ROW Conflict: If the passenger queuing space is expanded, there is insufficient space to locate float

Passenger queuing space: Current passenger queuing space capacity for 500 passengers (only two vessels) is insufficient for additional vessel landings. Does not provide space for shoreside charging

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF WATERFRONT SITES

SUMMARY OF DOWNTOWN SEATTLE WATERFRONT SITES AND ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

						Known environmental, cultural, and historical
	Site	Site Owner	Other Stakeholders	Known Construction/ Development Plans	Current use agreements	considerations
				 POS is studying potential uses for the North Apron, 		
				including POF, tug, fishing, and other marine uses.		
				T46 is currently being studied for proposed		
				public/private redevelopment as cruise terminal with		
				potential POF use.		
			Cruise Industry, Northwest	3) USCG is studying use of southern side of terminal for		
Pier 46	Port of Seattle North Apron	Port of Seattle	Seaport Alliance, USCG	headquarters.		
				1) WSDOT planned pier structure demolition		
				2) City of Seattle: Proposed use as public park/event space	1) KCMD maintenance barge under 5-year	Adjacent to waterfront park and historic Wash.
				and habitat beach	lease with five 5-year renewals	St. Boat Landing. Known contaminated
				3) Port of Seattle: potential use as mitigation bank being	2) WSF using uplands for vehicle holding	sediment area. Avoid Elliott Bay Seawall Project
		MICDOT (DND	Port of Seattle, King County,	studied	during Colman Dock construction (planned	and waterfront Seattle habitat features.
Pier 48	KCMD Maintenance Barge	WSDOT (DNR owns waterway)	KCIVID, WSF	4) Site of King County soil remediation	through 2023)	Ballast Island
						Adjacent to waterfront park and historic wash.
						St. Boat Landing. Known contaminated sediment
					KT has a E year loace agreement with KC for	area; sediment cap present. Avoid Elliott Bay
Dior EO	Evicting DOF Facility	WEDOT	KOND WEE		KT fids a 5-year lease agreement with KC for	features
Pier 50	Colman Dock W/SE Torminal	WSDOT	NCIVID, WSF	W/SE Colman Dock project planned completion in 2022		leatures.
Pier 53	Fire Station No. 5	City of Seattle	Seattle Fire Department	Recently improved		
1101 33	The station no. s	Pier 54 LLC (LA-based A.F.	Seattle The Department			
Pier 54	lvar's	Gilmore Co.)	Ivar's, restaurant/retail tenants	Planned float replacement on north side of pier		
Pier 55	Argosy	Piers 55 & 56 LLC	Argosy, Sailing Seattle,	Planned float and decking replacement project	Argosy likely to sign new 30-year lease (to be	Avoid Elliott Bay Seawall Project and Waterfront
Pier 56			office/restaurant tenants		confirmed with property owner)	Seattle habitat features.
		PIER 57 CORP (Hal Griffith) /				
Pier 57	Miner's Landing & Great Wheel	DNR	restaurant/retail tenants	Permits submitted for float expansion on south side of pier		
			Parks, Friends of Waterfront	Currently demolished. Planned project to rebuild		
Pier 58	Waterfront Park	Seattle DPR	Seattle (programming/events)	Waterfront Park pier and plaza.		
				Seattle Aquarium Ocean Pavilion planned completion in		
Pier 59	Seattle Aquarium	DNR/ Seattle DPR	Seattle Aquarium	2023		
			Parks, Friends of Waterfront	Rebuild project completed June 2020. Floating dock added		
Pier 62	Park	Seattle DPR	Seattle (programming/events)	on south edge of pier.		
			Parks, Friends of Waterfront			
Pier 63	Park	Seattle DPR	Seattle (programming/events)	Currently demolished with planned rebuild.		
			Anthony's, conference center,		Norwegian Cruise Line holds lease for	
			Norwegian Cruise Line and		preferential use during the cruise season	
Pier 66	Bell Harbor Marina	Port of Seattle/ DNR	Oceania Cruises		through 2030 with option for 5-year renewal	
		State of WA / DNR / Julia		Shoreline substantial development application filed in Nov		
Pier 67	Edgewater Hotel	Oleson (Private owner)	Edgewater Hotel	2018 to install new float and ramp		
				Shoreline substantial development application filed in	Clipper Vacations holds lease through 2029	
Pier 69	Clipper Vacations	Port of Seattle	Clipper Vacations	April 2019 to reconfigure moorage and add float	with one 5-year extension	
Pier 70	Office/Restaurant Space	Triad Pier 70 LLC	Office/restaurant tenants			

APPENDIX E

Summary of Physical and Operational Requirements

Minimum Site Requirements

	Physical and Operational Needs	Minimum Requirements
Criteria used for preliminary site screening Criteria for further site assessment	Site Use Compatibility Site available for long-term use as a POF landing site	 Site allows POF landing site use POF operations are compatible with existing and planned site uses and POF facilities can be accommodated on site
	Terminal Access and Modal Connections Seattle central waterfront location with convenient access to downtown jobs and transit connections	 Easy pedestrian and bike connections to downtown core and transit connections Access to multi-modal connections
	Vessel Programming and Navigation Sufficient space for safe and reliable POF operations and future flexibility/expansion	 Four operating slips (three in service and one back-up) Provide capacity for KT's current three routes during peak hour commute, with capacity to accommodate potential future growth 2 bow-loading, 2 side-loading Simultaneous maneuvering space for a minimum of two vessels Adequate protection from wind, waves, and wakes from vessel traffic
	Passenger Programming Space for covered queuing and amenities to support at least three POF routes	 Space for covered queuing and amenities to support at least three POF routes, including: simultaneous queuing and disembarking, two ADA-compliant restrooms, and amenities such as bike storage, TVMs, and electronic signage
	Staff/Crew Programming Space to support staff/crew needs and operations	 Office/breakroom space for 6 people, including: employee restroom, 2 nearby parking stalls for maintenance vehicles, and storage space
	Future Use Planning Space to provide flexibility for future needs	 Uplands and in-water space to add equipment to support electric charging for vessels or space to accommodate future application of alternative fuels Space for future expansion

APPENDIX F

SITE ACCESS ANALYSIS



MEMORANDUM

To: Kitsap Transit

From: Tim Payne, Nelson\Nygaard

Date: May 12, 2023

Subject: Ferry Terminal Access/Egress Evaluation

This memorandum documents the revised results of Nelson\Nygaard's access and egress evaluation of five ferry alternate terminal locations, plus the current location, being considered to accommodate and sustain Kitsap Transit's fast passenger ferry service. The analysis considers infrastructure improvements currently under construction along the Seattle waterfront as well as changes to public transit service that could impact the evaluation of potential ferry terminal locations. The analysis provides scores for the methodologies detailed in this memo. This access/egress evaluation is expected to be included as part of a broader site evaluation led by KPFF.

SITES EXAMINED

The access and egress evaluation focused on the following five alternate ferry terminal locations (as depicted in Figure 1): Pier 69, Pier 66, Pier 55/56, Pier 48, and Pier 46. For comparative purposes, the analysis includes the current location, Pier 50.



Figure 1 Locations Considered as part of Analysis

WATERFRONT AND TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS

The analysis considered infrastructure improvements along the Seattle waterfront that, once complete, would impact paths of travel from the waterfront piers to destinations throughout Seattle. These improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A new street, Elliott Way, between Alaskan Way and Bell Street with sidewalk and bike facilities
- A new protected bike lane along the west side of Alaskan Way
- An elevated pedestrian bridge from the WSDOT ferry terminal along Marion Street to 1st Avenue
- The Overlook Walk, an elevated public park and bike/ped connection between Pier 62 and Pike Place Market
- A new staircase, elevator, and elevated walkway on Union Street connecting Western Avenue to Alaskan Way
- An updated pedestrian bridge and elevator on Lenora St connecting Elliott Way to Belltown
- New pedestrian connections along Railroad Way connecting the waterfront to Pioneer Square and the Stadium District
- Improved bike and pedestrian facilities along Pike and Pine Streets

A comprehensive description of improvements can be found at <u>https://waterfrontseattle.org/</u>. The improvements are underway, with some already completed and some still in the design phase, but all construction is expected to be complete by 2025.



Figure 2 Waterfront Seattle Improvements

Source: Waterfront Seattle

The analysis also considers changes to Seattle's public transportation network that are currently in place or expected to be operational by 2025. These include, but are not limited to,

- New RapidRide H line service, connecting Downtown to West Seattle/Delridge
- New RapidRide G line service, connecting Downtown to Madison Valley
- Sound Transit East Link Expansions:
 - Connecting Downtown to Mercer Island, Bellevue, and Redmond
 - Extension of South Link from Angle Lake to Federal Way
 - Extension of North Link from Northgate to Lynnwood

There are other transit improvements in the study area that are in the planning stage but are not anticipated to be complete/implemented before 2025 and as such, were not considered in this analysis. These projects include:

- New stations and service associated with the West Seattle-Ballard Link Extensions, including Jackson Hub
- The City Center Connector Streetcar
- RapidRide J Line
- RapidRide R Line

SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

Two different methodologies were developed to evaluate potential sites.

- The first methodology was developed before the Early Scoping effort and gave equal weight to all evaluation criteria; however, scores were weighted by origin-destination pair based on the number of potential riders. Since the most important consideration is the number of people using a particular pathway, a weight of 2 was applied to passenger flows.
- The second methodology was developed in response to comments received during the Early Scoping effort. This methodology kept the weighting by ridership for each origin-destination pair and added weights to the distance and safety metric. Many individuals said proximity to Colman Dock is an important consideration, so this metric was added.

A summary of the methodology used in this evaluation along with results and key takeaways are summarized below:

- Using Travel Analysis Zones (TAZs) from the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) travel demand model, TAZs were aggregated into 20 groups (hereafter referred to as "zones"). For each of these 20 zones, pathways to/from each of the five potential ferry terminal locations were examined.
- For each ferry terminal location, each of the 20 zones was assigned one of three categories based on the likely access modes: bike/walk, transit only, or transitional (50-50 split between bike/walk and transit). Pathways from the ferry terminal to each zone were then scored based on defined point thresholds.
- The points for each pathway were weighted using Puget Sound Regional Council travel demand model data. Existing passenger flow volumes were weighted by a factor of 2, recognizing this is an important consideration for potential site selection. *However, as discussed in the section on evaluation criteria, all the trip characteristics that make up the evaluation criteria have equal weight other than the number of potential riders.* Pathways that would be traversed by more potential ferry riders received more weight than pathways that were expected to be traversed by fewer riders. The passenger flow data used in both rounds of analysis is the same, and shows that more than 70% of ferry passengers travel to a final destination in the Denny Triangle/Retail TAZ, Pioneer Square/International District TAZ, and the Financial District TAZ.
- Points were also awarded based on the proximity of the potential sites to the Washington State Ferries terminal at Colman Dock (Pier 52).

Ferry Terminal Access/ Egress Evaluation KITSAP TRANSIT

- Points were summed to determine the overall score for the five potential ferry terminal locations. Scores are relative to the alternate ferry terminal locations, with higher scores being better than lower scores. The existing location at Pier 50 was also included for comparison purposes The results of the original methodology were as follows:
 - o Pier 46: 65.88 points
 - o Pier 48: 66.03 points
 - o Pier 55-56: 62.45 points
 - o Pier 66: 60.16 points
 - o Pier 69: 56.38 points
 - o Existing Site (Pier 50): 65.89 points

Ordered by score the results are:

- o Pier 48: 66.03 points
- o Existing Site (Pier 50):65.89 points
- o Pier 46: 65.88 points
- o Pier 55-56: 62.45 points
- o Pier 66: 60.16 points
- o Pier 69: 56.38 points

Following the Early Scoping comment period, the scoring methodology was updated to give greater weight to metrics that measured the safety and distance to/from the potential site, as well as proximity to Colman Dock. The revised results were as follows:

- o Pier 46: 218.83 points
- o Pier 48: 218.01 points
- o Pier 55-56: 203.92 points
- o Pier 66: 201.20 points
- o Pier 69: 188.19 points
- o Existing Site (Pier 50): 217.36 points

Ordered by Score the updated methodology results are:

- o Pier 46: 218.83 points
- o Pier 48: 218.01 points
- o Existing Site (Pier 50): 217.36 points
- o Pier 55-56: 203.92 points
- o Pier 66: 201.20 points
- o Pier 69: 188.19 points

• The sites located in the span from Piers 46 to 56 ranked very closely. This is principally due to the proximity of destinations and volume of people currently arriving by ferry. The more northerly sites have lower scores because their location increases the distance to destinations traveled to by most passengers. Another factor in lower scores for the northernly located sites are their reduced access to major regional transit stations.

METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

The evaluation was structured to consider:

- Where passengers would be traveling to upon disembarking from the ferry (and how many were making that same trip).
- What travel mode (i.e., walk, bike, transit) passengers would take to get to their destination.
- The aspects of the path to the destination, including length, steepness, availability of elevators to cover vertical changes and the overall quality/safety from the ferry terminal to a rider's destination.
- Proximity of the potential sites to the Washington State Ferries terminal at Colman Dock (Pier 52) as the Kitsap Transit Fast Ferry and the Washington State Ferries provide complementary service to Bremerton. This proximity also works well to provide a detour route for Kingston-bound passengers who can access the Bainbridge Island ferry and then ride Kitsap Transit back to Kingston. For riders to Southworth, this provides a proximity to the King County Metro ferry to Vashon, as well as proximity to the final waterfront stop for King County Metro RapidRide C Line which provides a direct transit connection to the Fauntleroy Ferry terminal and another alternative way to reach Southworth.

A methodology was developed to evaluate potential sites.

- The first methodology (also referred to as the original scoring methodology) was developed before the Early Scoping effort and relied on passenger flow data from (PSRC's travel demand model to weight travel pathways. Pathways that are expected to be used by more passengers were given greater weight than pathways that fewer (or no) passengers would be taking. The most important consideration is the number of people using a particular pathway, and a weight of 4 was applied to passenger flows.
- The scoring methodology was developed after comments were received from the Early Scoping effort. This methodology builds upon the initial methodology. It introduced additional weights to give greater influence on the distance and safety metrics, as well as a metric for the proximity to Colman Dock.

The TAZs from the PSRC's travel demand model were more granular than necessary for this exercise, with many in downtown Seattle the size of a single block. As such, TAZs were aggregated into larger zones. Altogether, 20 zones were developed and used for this analysis (see Figure 3 and Figure 4). These zones include outlying areas, such as Bellevue, University of Washington, and Rainier Beach, as it is anticipated that a small portion of riders would be destined for these areas.

Upon disembarking, riders of a passenger-only ferry would have three potential options for continuing to their destination: Walking, biking, and transit.¹ For each of the five potential ferry terminal locations, each of the 20 zones were assigned one of the following access classifications:

- Walk/bike only
- Transit only
- Transitional Both walk/bike and transit (assume a 50-50 split)

The classification for each zone differs depending on the ferry terminal location being considered. Although a zone may be easily walkable/bikeable from one ferry terminal location, it may not be from another ferry terminal location.

¹ Private autos (e.g., Uber, Lyft, carpool) are also a potential option but are considered an unlikely mode for commuters on a regular basis.

Ferry Terminal Access/ Egress Evaluation

KITSAP TRANSIT



Figure 3 TAZ Groups Used in the Evaluation

Ferry Terminal Access/ Egress Evaluation KITSAP TRANSIT

9 W PR<u>OSPECT ST</u> AAVEN 10 HIGHLAND DR FARMENHEAREN 10TH AVE E HARVARD AVE E BELMONT PL E DEXTER AVE N WARD ST N HARD S 8TH AVE N AUROF KINNEAR PL W 4TH AVE N ALOHA ST OLYMPIC PL QUEEN ANNE AVE N WARREN AVE N VALLEY ST 8 3RD AVE W ROY ST 5TH AVE N 1ST AVE W 5TH AV MERCER ST 9TH AVE'N FEDERAL AVE E VESTLAKE AVE N EASTLAKE AVE E BROADWAY E PINE ST SUMMIT AVE E 1 MINOR AVE N PONTIUS AVE N ELHOT ENEM BOREN AVE N YALE AVE N HAF RISON ST AYLOR AVE N IOMAS ST JOHN ST CLAY ST ST ST E DENNY WAY E DENNY WAY BROP OTHAVE ERRYAVE WESTERN AVE VINEST HONELST HAVE 2 WALST STH AVE BATERIST ELLIOTTAV BELLEVUE AVE HROMAST STEWARTST ENORAST AROST OLIVEWAY PINEST E UNION ST TERRY WE SENECA ST 3 UNIONST BTHA 14 AVE UNIVERSITYST NORAVE ENAVE ARIONST 9TH AVE JEFFERSON ST 4 COLUMBIAST CHERRYST ALDERST JAMES ST S WASHINGTON ST E YESLER WAY 5 S MAIN ST S JACKSON ST 2N MAYNARD AVE 6 1ST AVE S OCCIDENTAL AVE S 16 **7TH AVE S** AIRPORT WAY -15 13TH AVE S 6TH AVE S 2 3RD AVE S 5TH AVE S UTAH AVE S Miles 0 0.25 0.5 0.125



How Scores are Calculated

Original Scoring Methodology

The evaluation framework was set up using points, which are based on a set of criteria that evaluate the pathway of travel between the ferry terminal and the centroid of each of the 20 zones.

First, a weight of 2 was applied to the proportion of passengers destined for each zone. Then, the scores for each criterion were added up and then multiplied by the weighted proportion of passengers destined for each zone. The weighted scores for each of the 20 zones were added to the points for proximity to Colman Dock metric to determine the score of the candidate site.

The walk/bike and transit only zones had their own criteria and point structure (thresholds outlined in the next section). The transitional zones assume a 50-50 split between walking/biking and transit use, and as such, is an average of the two scores.

This methodology is explained in formulaic terms below:

For all walk/bike zones:

```
Weighted percent of passengers destined for Zone X \times (Walk / bike score for Zone X)
= Weighted score for Zone X
```

For all transit zones:

```
Weighted percent of passengers destined for Zone Y × (Transit score for Zone Y)
= Weighted score for Zone Y
```

For transitional zones:

```
Weighted percent of passengers destined for Zone Z

\times ((Bike / walk \ score \ for \ Zone \ Z \ \times 50\%) + (Transit \ score \ for \ Zone \ Z \ \times 50\%))

= Weighted score for Zone Z
```

Score for each candidate site:

Score for Candidate Site 1 = Sum of weighted score for all 20 zones + points for proximity to Colman Dock

Post Early Scoping Scoring Methodology

The evaluation framework was set up using points, which are based on a set of criteria that evaluate the pathway of travel between the ferry terminal and the centroid of each of the 20 zones.

The final scoring methodology weights the distance and safety metrics. The following metrics (explained in greater detail in the next section) received the following weights. All other metrics received a weight of "1".

- Metric 1: Walk distance from ferry terminal Weight of 2
- Metric 2: Bike distance from ferry terminal Weight of 2
- Metric 3: Steepness of the walk Weight of 2
- Metric 4: Steepness of the bike ride Weight of 2

- Metric 5: Number of steps that must be climbed for walk trips modified if an elevator is present to avoid the steps Weight of 2
- Metric 9: Safety of the walk Weight of 2
- Metric 11: Safety of the bike ride Weight of 2
- Metric 13: Walk distance from ferry terminal to bus stop/transit station Weight of 3
- Metric 14: Steepness of the walk to transit stop/station Weight of 2
- Metric 15: Number of steps that must be climbed to transit stop/station trips modified if an elevator is present to avoid the steps Weight of 2
- Metric 18: Safety of the walk to transit stop/station Weight of 2
- Proximity to Colman Dock Metric Weight of 4

EVALUATION CRITERIA

This section describes the metrics that were used for evaluating the proposed ferry terminal locations. Most metrics are quantitative and data-driven, although a few are qualitative (i.e., safety and quality). These metrics were applied from each ferry terminal location to each zone.

Walk/bike metrics are presented first, followed by transit metrics. Transitional zones, which assume a 50-50 split between walk/bike and transit are an average of the walk/bike and transit scores.

Results are presented in the next section.

Walk/Bike Metrics

For each of the five ferry terminal locations to the centroids of the walk/bike and transitional zones identified, the following metrics were evaluated:

- Metric 1: Walk distance from ferry terminal
- Metric 2: Bike distance from ferry terminal
- Metric 3: Steepness of the walk
- Metric 4: Steepness of the bike ride
- Metric 5: Number of steps that must be climbed for walk trips modified for elevator access
- Metric 6: Number of intersections traversed for walk trips
- Metric 7: Number of intersections traversed for bike trips
- Metric 8: Safety of the walk
- Metric 9: Quality of the walk
- Metric 10: Safety of the bike ride
- Metric 11: Quality of the bike ride

Metric 1: Walk distance from ferry terminal

The longer the walking distance from the ferry terminal to the final destination, the more difficult it is to access the passenger-only ferry. Using Google Maps, pathways from the ferry terminal to each of the walk/bike and transitional zone centroids were traced. Shorter distances scored higher than longer distances.

Walk Distance	Points Awarded
0 to 0.5 miles	4
0.51 to 1.0 miles	3
1.01 to 2.0 miles	2
More than 2.0 miles	1

Metric 2: Bike distance from ferry terminal

Longer bike distances make it more difficult to access the ferry. Like the previous metric for walking, Google Maps was used to trace pathways from the ferry terminal to each of the walk/bike and transitional zone centroids. Shorter distances scored higher than longer distances.

Bike Distance	Points Awarded
0 to 1.5 miles	4
1.51 to 2.5 miles	3
2.51 to 3.5 miles	2
More than 3.5 miles	1

Metric 3: Steepness of the walk

The steepness of the walk and the length of that steep slope impacts access/egress to the ferry. Using the pathways developed for Metric 1, a composite score was developed that considered the steepness of the path and the duration of that steepness. Pathways that were on flatter terrain had a higher composite score than pathways along steep terrain. Higher composite scores were considered more favorable for pedestrians and thus were awarded more points.

Composite Score	Points Awarded
0 to 3.08 composite score	1
3.09 to 3.39 composite score	2
3.40 to 3.69 composite score	3
More than 3.69 composite score	4

Metric 4: Steepness of the bike ride

The steepness and the length of the steep slope impacts biking to/from the ferry. As in Metric 3, a composite score was developed that considered the steepness of the path and the duration of that steepness. Higher composite scores were associated with flatter terrain, which is more favorable for bicyclists, and thus were awarded more points.

Composite Score	Points Awarded
0 to 3.00 composite score	1
3.01 to 3.36 composite score	2
3.37 to 3.65 composite score	3
More than 3.65 composite score	4

Metric 5: Number of steps that must be climbed for walk trips

The City of Seattle has numerous staircases connecting one block to the next, with many located near the waterfront. Climbing steps can be an accessibility barrier to some individuals, including the elderly and persons with disabilities. The pathways identified in Metric 1 were compared to City of Seattle GIS data. Pathways with fewer steps scored better than pathways with more steps. In situations where staircases were coupled with a publicly accessible elevator, those steps were not counted.

Number of Steps	Points Awarded
No steps	4
1 to 50 steps	3
51 to 100 steps	2
More than 100 steps	1

Metric 6: Number of intersections traversed for walk trips

Each intersection traversed adds delay and variability in travel time getting to/from the ferry terminal as pedestrians must wait for a gap in traffic (or permission from the traffic signal) to cross the street. A trip will take longer and have a more uncertain arrival time when there are more street crossings. The number of intersections that must be traversed were counted using the pathways from Metric 1. The thresholds used were as follows:

Number of Intersections	Points Awarded
0 to 14 intersections	4
15 to 28 intersections	3
29 to 47 intersections	2
More than 47 intersections	1

Metric 7: Number of intersections traversed for bike trips

As with the walking metric, each intersection adds delay and variability in travel time when biking to/from the ferry terminal. Using the pathways from Metric 2, the number of intersections that must be traversed was counted. The thresholds used were as follows:

Number of Intersections	Points Awarded
0 to 17 intersections	4
18 to 29 intersections	3
30 to 51 intersections	2
More than 51 intersections	1

Metric 8: Safety of the walk

Safety is difficult to quantify as it comprises considerations including lighting at night, walking in undesirable areas (e.g., under a highway overpass, through an industrial area), and the need to cross the street at an unsignalized crosswalk. As such, this metric is qualitative rather than quantitative. Using the pathway generated for Metric 1, satellite imagery and Google Street View was used to assess how safe pedestrians would feel walking along the path identified to/from the ferry terminal. Points were awarded as follows:

Safety of Walk	Points Awarded
Walk feels safe	3
Walk feels somewhat safe	2
Walk feels unsafe	1

Metric 9: Quality of the walk

Quality measures quantitatively the overall pleasantness of the walk Although intertwined with safety, this metric is predominantly focused on the environment of the walk. A walk alongside a busy, high-speed roadway would score worse than walking alongside the waterfront or on a multi-use path. This evaluation was performed on the pathway generated in Metric 1 using satellite imagery and Google Street View. Points were awarded as follows:

Ouality of Walk	Points Awarded
Walk is pleasant	3
Walk is somewhat pleasant	2
Walk is not pleasant	1

Metric 10: Safety of the bike ride

This is a qualitative metric that assesses how safe bike riders would feel traveling along the path identified to/from the ferry terminal. It includes consideration for categories including lighting at night, biking in places without bike lanes or other dedicated facilities, or traveling through undesirable areas (e.g., under a highway overpass, through an industrial area). This evaluation was performed on the pathway generated in Metric 2 using satellite imagery and Google Street View. Points were awarded as follows:

Safety of Bike Ride	Points Awarded
Bike ride feels safe	3
Bike ride feels somewhat safe	2
Bike ride feels unsafe	1

Metric 11: Quality of the bike ride

This is a qualitative metric that assesses the overall pleasantness of the bike ride to/from the ferry terminal. Although intertwined with safety, this metric is predominantly focused on the environment of the bike ride. A bike ride along a busy, high-speed roadway (even if it is in a bike lane) would score worse than biking along a multi-use path. This evaluation was performed on the pathway generated in Metric 2 using satellite imagery and Google Street View.

Quality of Bike Ride	Points Awarded
Bike ride is pleasant	3
Bike ride is somewhat pleasant	2
Bike ride is not pleasant	1

Transit Metrics

The transit metrics applied to both the transit only and transitional zones. This evaluation analyzed the pathway from each of the five ferry terminal locations to the bus stop/transit station of the most frequent transit route that provided service to the centroid of the destination zone. Only walk trips were evaluated for accessing transit. The following metrics were used in the evaluation:

- Metric 12: Walk distance from ferry terminal to transit stop/station
- Metric 13: Steepness of the walk to transit stop/station
- Metric 14: Number of steps that must be climbed to transit stop/station
- Metric 15: Number of intersections traversed to transit stop/station
- Metric 16: Safety of the walk to transit stop/station
- Metric 17: Quality of the walk to transit stop/station

Metric 12: Walk distance from ferry terminal to bus stop/transit station

The longer the walk distance to/from the ferry terminal to the transit stop/station, the more difficult it is to access the passenger-only ferry. Using Google Maps, pathways from the ferry terminal to the identified transit stop/station with the most frequent service was traced. Shorter distances scored higher than longer distances. The thresholds used were:

Walk Distance to Transit Stop	Points Awarded
0 to 0.5 miles	4
0.51 to 0.75 miles	3
0.76 to 1.0 miles	2
More than 1.0 mile	1

Metric 13: Steepness of the walk to transit stop/station

The steepness of the walk and the length of that steep slope impact access/egress to the ferry. Using the pathways developed for Metric 13, a composite score was developed that considered the steepness of the path and the duration of that steepness. Pathways that were on flatter terrain had a higher composite score than pathways which did not. Higher composite scores were considered more favorable for pedestrians and thus were awarded more points.

Composite Score	Points Awarded
0 to 2.88 composite score	1
2.89 to 3.18 composite score	2
3.19 to 3.35 composite score	3
More than 3.35 composite score	4

Metric 14: Number of steps that must be climbed to transit stop/station

In many parts of the City of Seattle, there are staircases connecting one block to the next. Climbing steps can be an accessibility barrier to some individuals, including the elderly and persons with disabilities. The pathways identified in Metric 13 were compared to City of Seattle GIS data. Pathways with fewer steps scored better than pathways with more steps. In situations where staircases were coupled with a publicly accessible elevator, those steps were not counted.

Number of Steps	Points Awarded
No steps	4
1 to 50 steps	3
51 to 100 steps	2
More than 100 steps	1

Metric 15: Number of intersections traversed to transit stop/station

Each intersection adds delay and variability in travel time with biking to/from the ferry terminal. Using the pathways from Metric 13, the number of intersections that must be crossed was counted. The thresholds used were as follows:

Number of Intersections	Points Awarded
0 to 5 intersections	4
6 to 7 intersections	3
8 to 10 intersections	2
More than 10 intersections	1

Metric 16: Safety of the walk to transit stop/station

This is a qualitative metric that assesses how safe pedestrians would feel walking along the path identified from the ferry terminal to the transit stop/station. It includes consideration for categories including lighting at night, walking in undesirable areas (e.g., under a highway overpass, through an industrial area), and the need to cross the street at an unsignalized crosswalk. This evaluation was performed on the pathway generated in Metric 1 using satellite imagery and Google Street View.

Safety of Walk	Points Awarded
Walk feels safe	3
Walk feels somewhat safe	2
Walk feels unsafe	1
Metric 17: Quality of the walk to transit stop/station

This is a qualitative metric that assesses the overall pleasantness of the walk for pedestrians traveling along the path identified from the ferry terminal to the transit stop/station. Although intertwined with safety, this metric is predominantly focused on the overall environment of the walk. A walk alongside a busy, high-speed roadway would score worse than walking alongside the waterfront or a multi-use path. This evaluation was performed on the pathway generated in Metric 1 using satellite imagery and Google Street View.

Ouality of Walk	Points Awarded
Walk is pleasant	3
Walk is somewhat pleasant	2
Walk is not pleasant	1

Proximity to Colman Dock (Pier 52)

The proximity of the Kitsap Transit fast ferry dock to the Washington State Ferries terminal at Colman Dock (Pier 52) is also an important consideration. For passengers traveling to Bremerton, and to a lesser degree, Kingston, having two transportation options near each other – the fast ferry and the Washington State Ferry – can be important if someone misses a ferry and needs to wait for the next one.

A quantitative metric was developed to evaluate the distance from potential sites to Colman Dock. This evaluation was performed using walk distances in Google Maps.

Proximity to Colman Dock (Pier 52)	Points Awarded
Less than 0.25 mile away	4
0.25 to 0.5 miles away	3
More than 0.5 miles away	1*

*Note: This scoring is intentional because walk distances of greater than a half mile are generally considered undesirable for transit access

RESULTS

Original Scoring Methodology (Before Early Scoping Effort)

The results of the original scoring methodology were as follows. Scores are relative to the different sites, with higher scores being better than lower scores:

	Pre-Scoping Analysis
Pier 46	65.88
Pier 48	66.03
Pier 55-56	62.45
Pier 66	60.16
Pier 69	56.38
Existing Location (Pier 50)	65.89

Under this methodology, which weights scores by anticipated passenger volumes to destination zones (generated from the PSRC model), the results show that Piers 46, 48, and 55-56, are the top three scoring sites. The following pages include the raw data and subsequent scores that were awarded based on the thresholds presented in the previous section.

Revised Scoring Methodology (Following Early Scoping Effort)

During the Early Scoping effort, Kitsap Transit asked for public comments on the project and received 56 comments from individuals, agencies, and tribes. Many individuals stated they preferred a terminal location that was close to their destination and took them on a route that felt safe to use.

In response to these comments, the methodology was revised to give greater weight to metrics that measured the distance and safety of the route to/from the potential site. The revised results were as follows:

	Post Scoping Analysis
Pier 46	218.83
Pier 48	218.01
Pier 55-56	203.92
Pier 66	201.20
Pier 69	188.19
Existing Location (Pier 50)	217.36

Under this methodology, which adds additional weighting for safety and proximity to Coleman Dock, Piers 46, 48, and 55/56 are the three highest scoring sites. The following pages include the raw data and subsequent scores that were awarded based on the thresholds presented in the previous section.

Ferry Terminal Access/ Egress Evaluation KITSAP TRANSIT

Discussion of Results Post-Scoping

The results yielded the following ranking of possible sites:

- Pier 46
- Pier 48
- Pier 50 (Existing Location)
- Pier 55-56
- Pier 66
- Pier 69

It is worth noting that the top two sites not only have similar scores to each other but are also relatively close to the score computed for the existing site (Pier 50). Because the analysis is weighted to account for passenger destinations, it is logical that Piers 46, 48, and 55/56 are the highest scoring alternatives. These locations are located closest to the Financial District and Pioneer Square/International District, the destination of more than 50% of Kitsap Transit passenger-only ferry users. These sites are also closest to the existing Coleman Dock location. Piers 46 and 48 score slightly higher than Pier 55-56 because these locations are also the least impacted by steep topography and staircases along the pedestrian routes and have very short walking distances to major transit stops.

Pier 55-56, while still a top 3 alternative, is lower than Piers 46, 48, and 50 because more of the pedestrian/bike routes require a significant vertical climb to reach major downtown destinations. There are a number of factors influencing the lower scores for Piers 66 and 69. These locations are more than a mile away from the existing ferry terminal at Coleman Dock and where most passengers are headed. The Seattle topography is steeper in the Belltown area, which presents more barriers to vertical circulation on routes originating from the north end of the waterfront. There are also fewer regional transit connections within a short walk of these locations, which make connections to transitional and transit-dependent travel routes more cumbersome.

Summary Scores of Evaluation

	Revised Scoring	Original Scoring
Pier 46	218.83 points	65.88 points
Pier 48	218.01 points	66.03 points
Pier 55-56	203.92 points	62.45 points
Pier 66	201.20 points	60.16 points
Pier 69	188.19 points	56.38 points
Existing Location (Pier 50)	217.36 points	65.89 points

Scores are relative to the four ferry terminal locations.

Existing location (Pier 50) is included for comparison purposes.

Higher scores are better than lower scores.

Walk/Bike Zo	nes Analysis	

				Zone Type		Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of							
		Estimated	Percent of				Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to			or more		
Zone	Name	Passenger Flows	all Passengers	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Centroid (Miles)	Centroid (Miles)	% of Path Less than 2%	% Path 2 to 5%	% Path 6 to 10%	% Path More than 10%	Composite Score
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	9	1%		Х		2.36	2.32	62.2%	33.3%	0.0%	4.5%	3.53
2	Belltown	16	2%		Х		1.51	1.61	81.1%	11.5%	4.9%	2.5%	3.71
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	237	24%	Х			1.42	1.43	48.0%	42.3%	4.9%	4.9%	3.33
4	Financial District	197	20%	Х			0.92	0.90	67.1%	24.5%	8.4%	0.0%	3.59
5	Pioneer Square/International District	311	31%	Х			0.56	0.62	52.4%	47.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.52
6	Stadium District	19	2%	х			0.24	0.55	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00
7	SODO	9	1%		Х		1.37	1.53	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00
8	South Lake Union	48	5%		Х		2.46	2.59	33.7%	55.6%	9.4%	1.3%	3.22
9	Queen Anne	2	0%		Х		3.57	4.27	39.8%	40.7%	11.6%	7.8%	3.13
10	Interbay/Magnolia	0	0%		Х		5.55	6.69	78.5%	14.2%	7.3%	0.0%	3.71
11	Ballard	3	0%			Х	Transit Trips						
12	U of W/Fremont	42	4%			Х							
13	Capitol Hill	32	3%		Х		3.17	3.76	34.8%	28.9%	25.1%	11.2%	2.87
14	First Hill/Medical Centers	48	5%		Х		2.22	2.22	27.9%	31.6%	26.2%	14.3%	2.73
15	Beacon Hill	1	0%		Х		3.29	3.29	46.7%	45.5%	7.2%	0.6%	3.38
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	1%			Х							
17	Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0%			Х							
18	Mercer Island	3	0%			Х		Transit Trips					
19	Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1%			Х							
20	Kirkland/Redmond	1	0%			Х							
	TOTAL	1000											

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Composite Score based on Length of Bike Path and Grades of 2% or more		es of 2% or	Number of	Number of	Number of intersections in	Number of						
% of Path Less than 2%	% Path 2 to 5%	% Path 6 to 10%	% Path More than 10%	Composite Score	be climbed in Pedestrian Path	be bypassed by an elevator	Pedestrian Path	intersections in Bike Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride
57.6%	38.6%	3.8%	0.0%	3.54	0	76	36	29	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasar	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
71.6%	21.5%	6.9%	0.0%	3.65	0	76	22	22	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
42.3%	47.2%	5.3%	5.3%	3.27	0	0	26	26	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
76.7%	5.5%	6.2%	11.7%	3.47	0	0	15	16	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
73.7%	26.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.74	0	0	9	13	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
69.2%	30.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.69	0	0	4	6	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasar	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0	0	9	13	Walk feels unsafe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is not pleasant
40.0%	50.5%	6.3%	3.2%	3.27	109	0	42	39	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasar	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
30.0%	45.3%	23.3%	1.4%	3.04	57	0	59	72	Walk feels somewhat saf	Walk is somewhat pleasar	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
77.2%	18.5%	4.3%	0.0%	3.73	0	0	70	51	Walk feels somewhat saf	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa
Transit Trips												
24.4%	45.5%	24.0%	6.1%	2.88	0	0	50	61	Walk feels somewhat saf	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is not pleasant
27.9%	31.6%	26.2%	14.3%	2.73	0	0	33	36	Walk feels somewhat saf	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is not pleasant
46.7%	45.5%	7.2%	0.6%	3.38	0	0	50	50	Walk feels somewhat saf	Walk is somewhat pleasar	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa

Transit Trips

Transit Zones Analysis

Transit Poute Selected (Lise		Distance to Transit	Composite Sc	ore based on L	ength of Pedes or more	strian Path and	Grades of 2%	Number of		Number of	
most frequent)	Transit Stop	Access Point (Miles)	% of Path Less than 2%	% Path 2 to 5%	% Path 6 to 10%	% Path More than 10%	Composite Score	must be climbed	Elevator Modifier	in Pedestrian Path	Safety of Walk
C Line, Route 1, Route 13	Alaskan Way S & S Jackson St	0.19	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels safe
C Line, D Line, Route 1	Alaskan Way S & S Jackson St	0.19	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels safe
Walk/Bike Trips											
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.60	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		10	Walk feels safe
C Line	Alaskan Way S & S Jackson St	0.19	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels safe
C Line	Alaskan Way S & S Jackson St	0.19	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels safe
Route 24	4th and Jackson	0.51	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		8	Walk feels safe
Route 40	4th and Jackson	0.51	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		8	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.60	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		10	Walk feels safe
Route 12, G Line	Marion St & 1st	0.60	84.6%	7.2%	8.2%	0.0%	3.76	0		9	Walk feels safe
Route 3	James & 3rd	0.61	4.5%	33.3%	62.2%	0.0%	2.42	0		9	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.60	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		10	Walk feels safe
H Line	Alaskan Way S & S Jackson St	0.19	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels safe
Route 106	Jackson and 5th	0.52	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		8	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.60	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		10	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.60	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		10	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.60	44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		10	Walk feels safe

Adjacency to Colman Dock:

0.7 miles

Quality of Walk
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is not pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant

Walk/Bil

		-				· · · ·
	Estimated	Percent of		Walk		
Name	Passenger	all Passenger	Walk or Bike	Transition al	Transit	Distance to
		S	Dire	u.	Ully	Centroid
Uptown/Seattle Center	9	1%		Х		2.16
Belltown	16	2%		Х		1.50
Denny Triangle/Retail	237	24%	Х			1.23
Financial District	197	20%	Х			0.72
Pioneer Square/International District	311	31%	Х			0.36
Stadium District	19	2%	Х			0.41
SODO	9	1%		Х		1.58
South Lake Union	48	5%		Х		2.35
Queen Anne	2	0%		Х		3.38
Interbay/Magnolia	0	0%		Х		5.42
Ballard	3	0%			Х	Transit Trip
U of W/Fremont	42	4%			Х	-
Capitol Hill	32	3%		Х		2.99
First Hill/Medical Centers	48	5%		Х		2.05
Beacon Hill	1	0%		Х		3.20
Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	1%			Х	
Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0%			Х	
Mercer Island	3	0%			Х	
Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1%			Х	
Kirkland/Redmond	1	0%			Х	
TOTAL	1000		•	•	•	

ke Zones Analysis

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continue

Bike	Composit	te Score bas	ed on Leng	Compos	ite Score ba	sed on Len	gth of Bike P		
Distance to Centroid	% of Path Less than 2%	% Path 2 to 5%	% Path 6 to 10%	% Path More than 10%	Composit e Score	% of Path Less than 2%	% Path 2 to 5%	% Path 6 to 10%	% Path More than 10%
2.13	64.6%	28.6%	5.3%	1.5%	3.56	49.9%	45.6%	4.5%	0.0%
1.42	87.4%	5.9%	0.0%	6.7%	3.74	60.7%	29.8%	9.5%	0.0%
1.24	49.0%	41.7%	4.7%	4.7%	3.35	26.7%	60.0%	6.7%	6.7%
0.71	64.2%	26.6%	9.2%	0.0%	3.55	55.7%	10.4%	11.8%	22.2%
0.41	52.4%	47.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.52	54.5%	45.5%	0.0%	0.0%
0.47	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1.57	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.90	92.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2.20	25.9%	62.1%	10.5%	1.5%	3.12	31.1%	58.0%	7.3%	3.6%
4.08	51.3%	28.3%	12.9%	7.5%	3.23	25.7%	48.1%	24.7%	1.5%
6.50	72.7%	20.2%	7.2%	0.0%	3.66	76.3%	19.3%	4.5%	0.0%
IS						Transit Trip	S		
3.53	36.3%	29.5%	23.7%	10.6%	2.92	30.2%	44.3%	20.4%	5.2%
2.43	29.7%	33.6%	21.6%	15.2%	2.78	31.2%	44.5%	24.4%	0.0%
3.20	48.8%	41.2%	9.4%	0.6%	3.38	48.8%	41.2%	9.4%	0.6%
		Transit Trips	5						

ed)

[•] ath and Composit e Score	Number of steps that must be climbed in Pedestrian Path	Number of steps that can be bypassed by an elevator	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Number of intersections in Bike Path	Safety of Walk
3.45	0	76	34	27	Walk feels safe
3.51	0		20	20	Walk feels safe
3.07	0		24	24	Walk feels safe
3.00	0		13	10	Walk feels safe
3.55	0		7	10	Walk feels safe
4.00	0		6	7	Walk feels safe
3.92	0		14	15	Walk feels unsafe
3.17	0	90	44	37	Walk feels safe
2.98	57	0	55	70	Walk feels somewhat safe
3.72	0		76	49	Walk feels somewhat safe

2.99	0	51	59	Walk feels somewhat safe
3.07	0	34	37	Walk feels somewhat safe
3.38	0	48	48	Walk feels unsafe

Transit Trips

Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride
Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat safe	Bike ride is pleasant
Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat safe	Bike ride is pleasant
Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is not pleasant
Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat safe	Bike ride is pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is not pleasant
Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasant
Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat safe	Bike ride is not pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasant
Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasant

Transit Zones Analysis

		Distance
Transit Douto Colocted (Use most frequent)		to Transit
Transit Route Selected (Ose most frequent)	Transit Stop	Access
		Point
C Line, D Line, Route 1	Alaskan Way S and S Jackson St	0.05
C Line, D Line, Route 1	Alaskan Way S and S Jackson St	0.05

Walk/Bike Trips

Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.51
C Line	Alaskan Way S and S Jackson St	0.05
C Line	Alaskan Way S and S Jackson St	0.05
Route 24	4th and Jackson	0.42
Route 28	Alaskan Way S and S Jackson St	0.05
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.51
Routes 12, G Line	Marion and 1st	0.40
Route 3	James & 3rd	0.41
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.51
Route 131	3rd and Main	0.29
Route 106	Jackson and 5th	0.44
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.51
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.51
Link Light Rail	CID Station	0.51

Adjacency to Colman Dock:

0.5 miles

Composit	e Score bas	ed on Lengt	th of Pedest	rian Path	Number		Number of	
% of Path Less than 2%	% Path 2 to 5%	% Path 6 to 10%	% Path More than 10%	Composit e Score	of steps that must be	Elevator Modifier	intersections in Pedestrian Path	Safety of Walk
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels sa
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels sa
45.6%	34.4%	20.0%	0.0%	3.26	0		10	Walk feels s
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels sa
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels sa
44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		8	Walk feels sa
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		1	Walk feels s
45.6%	34.4%	20.0%	0.0%	3.26	0		10	Walk feels sa
84.0%	7.5%	8.5%	0.0%	3.76	0		9	Walk feels sa
43.2%	39.2%	17.6%	0.0%	3.26	0		8	Walk feels sa
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		10	Walk feels sa
77.0%	23.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.77	0		5	Walk feels s
44.4%	47.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.36	0		8	Walk feels sa
45.6%	34.4%	20.0%	0.0%	3.26	0		10	Walk feels sa
45.6%	34.4%	20.0%	0.0%	3.26	0		10	Walk feels s
45.6%	34.4%	20.0%	0.0%	3.26	0		10	Walk feels sa

Quality of Walk
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant

	Estimated Percent of						Composite Sc	ore based on L	ength of Pedes	trian Path and	Grades of 2%	
	Baccongor			zone rype		Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to			or more		
	Flows	dli Doccongore	Walk or Piko	Transitional	Transit only	Centroid (Miles)	Centroid (Miles)	% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite
Name	FIOWS	Passengers	Walk of Bike	Transitional	Transit only			Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score
Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.90%		Х		2.03	2.03	48.2%	48.7%	3.1%	0.0%	3.45
Belltown	16	1.60%	Х			1.42	1.42	63.3%	32.1%	0.0%	4.6%	3.54
Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.69%	Х			1.16	1.16	39.9%	48.8%	5.7%	5.7%	3.23
Financial District	197	19.69%	Х			0.59	0.59	86.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.0%	3.58
Pioneer Square/International Distric	311	31.13%	Х			0.35	0.35	23.4%	76.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.23
Stadium District	19	1.89%	Х			0.62	0.64	78.3%	21.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.78
SODO	9	0.95%		Х		1.77	1.77	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00
South Lake Union	48	4.80%		Х		2.19	2.32	23.5%	70.2%	3.2%	3.1%	3.14
Queen Anne	2	0.20%		Х		3.33	3.97	49.3%	29.5%	13.4%	7.8%	3.20
Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.00%		Х		5.28	6.31	81.6%	12.9%	5.5%	0.0%	3.76
Ballard	3	0.30%			Х	Transit Trips						
U of W/Fremont	42	4.25%			Х							
Captiol Hill	32	3.20%		Х		2.90	3.47	34.5%	30.2%	24.4%	10.8%	2.88
First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.80%		Х		2.08	2.27	31.6%	35.7%	16.5%	16.2%	2.83
Beacon Hill	1	0.10%		Х		3.30	3.30	48.3%	44.2%	6.9%	0.6%	3.40
Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.91%			Х							
Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.10%			Х							
Mercer Island	3	0.30%			Х	Transit Trips						
Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.10%			Х							
Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.10%			X							
TOTAL	1000		-	-	-							

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

							-						
Composite	Score based on	Length of Bike	e Path and Grac	les of 2% or	Number of	Number of steps	Number of	Number of		Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Bide	Quality of Bike Bide	
		more			steps that must	that can be	intersections	intersections	Safety of Walk				
% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite	be climbed in	bypassed by an	in Pedestrian	in Bike Path	Survey of Walk	Quality of Walk	Survey of Bike filde	Quality of Bike Mac	
Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score	Pedestrian	elevator	Path	III DIKC I dtil					
48.2%	48.7%	3.1%	0.0%	3.45	0		31	31	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant	
38.7%	56.6%	0.0%	4.8%	3.29	0		21	22	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant	
39.9%	48.8%	5.7%	5.7%	3.23	0		20	20	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant	
86.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.0%	3.58	0	36	6	6	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant	
23.4%	76.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.23	0		9	9	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant	
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		10	9	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant	
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		16	16	Walk feels unsafe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is not pleasant	
46.8%	43.6%	6.4%	3.2%	3.34	0	0	39	38	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant	
21.6%	50.7%	13.4%	7.8%	2.73	57	0	52	66	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is not pleasant	
73.5%	21.6%	5.0%	0.0%	3.68	0		65	55	Walk feels somewhat sat	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is somwehat please	
Transit Trips													
30.3%	42.3%	22.3%	5.2%	2.98	0		50	58	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is not pleasant	
32.0%	37.1%	27.1%	3.9%	2.97	0		36	43	Walk feels somewhat sat	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is not pleasant	
48.3%	44.2%	6.9%	0.6%	3.40	0		53	53	Walk feels unsafe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa	

Transit Trips

Transit Zones Analysis

		Distance to Transit	Composite Sc	ore based on L	ength of Pedes	strian Path and	Grades of 2%	Number of	Number of	Number of			
Transit Route Selected (Use					or more			steps that	steps that can	intersections	Safety of Walk		
most frequent)		(Miles)	% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite	must be	be bypassed	in Pedestrian	Salety of Walk		
		(ivilies)	Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score	climbed in	by an elevator	Path			
D Line	3rd and Columbia	0.32	19.9%	28.8%	31.1%	20.3%	2.48	0	36	2	Walk feels safe		
Walk/Bike Trips													
									-		-		
Link Light Rail	Pioneer Square	0.30	28.5%	71.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.29	0		8	Walk feels safe		
C Line	Alaskan Way and Columbia	0.11	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		2	Walk feels safe		
Route 3	3rd and Columbia	0.32	19.9%	28.8%	31.1%	20.3%	2.48	0	36	4	Walk feels safe		
Route 24	3rd and James	0.33	23.4%	53.4%	23.2%	0.0%	3.00	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Route 28	3rd and James	0.33	23.4%	53.4%	23.2%	0.0%	3.00	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Link Light Rail	Pioneer Square	0.30	28.5%	71.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.29	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Route 12	1st and Marion	0.16	76.8%	0.0%	0.0%	23.2%	3.30	0	36	1	Walk feels safe		
Route 4	3rd and James	0.33	23.4%	53.4%	23.2%	0.0%	3.00	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Link Light Rail	Pioneer Square	0.30	28.5%	71.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.29	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Route 131	3rd and Cherry	0.35	16.5%	42.0%	41.6%	0.0%	2.75	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Link Light Rail	Pioneer Square	0.30	28.5%	71.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.29	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Link Light Rail	Pioneer Square	0.30	28.5%	71.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.29	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Link Light Rail	Pioneer Square	0.30	28.5%	71.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.29	0		8	Walk feels safe		
Link Light Rail	Pioneer Square	0.30	28.5%	71.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.29	0		8	Walk feels safe		

Adjacency to Colman Dock:

400 ft

Quality of Walk
Walk is not pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is not pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is somewhat pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is not pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis

				Zone Type				Composite Sco	ore based on L	ength of Pedes	strian Path and	Grades of 2%
	Estimated	Percent of all				Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to			or more		
	Passenger Flows	Passengers	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Centroid (Miles)	Centroid (Miles)	% of Path Less	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite
Name								than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score
Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.90%	,	Х		1.79	2.08	28.3%	62.2%	9.6%	0.0%	3.19
Belltown	16	1.60%	X			1.09	1.03	56.9%	29.3%	13.8%	0.0%	3.43
Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.69%	X			0.85	0.84	7.9%	59.7%	28.3%	4.1%	2.71
Finanical District	197	19.69%	X			0.32	0.38	45.6%	25.4%	19.2%	9.7%	3.07
Pioneer Square/International District	311	31.13%	X			0.56	0.48	60.1%	30.7%	0.0%	9.2%	3.42
Stadium District	19	1.89%	X			0.78	0.85	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00
SODO	9	0.95%		Х		1.98	2.00	92.8%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.93
South Lake Union	48	4.80%		Х		1.92	2.01	18.4%	74.7%	5.1%	1.8%	3.10
Queen Anne	2	0.20%		Х		2.99	3.69	32.2%	47.0%	12.4%	8.4%	3.03
Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.00%		Х		4.89	6.11	79.9%	7.8%	6.2%	6.3%	3.61
Ballard	3	0.30%			Х			Tro	ncit Trinc			
U of W/Fremont	42	4.25%			Х			IId	nsit mps			
Capitol Hill	32	3.20%		Х		2.80	3.26	29.8%	32.8%	24.2%	13.2%	2.79
First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.80%		Х		2.17	3.06	20.9%	29.0%	34.5%	15.6%	2.55
Beacon Hill	1	0.10%		Х		3.51	3.48	49.9%	41.9%	7.7%	0.5%	3.41
Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.91%			Х		•			•		
Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.10%			Х							
Mercer Island	3	0.30%			Х	Transit Trips						
Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.10%			Х							
Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.10%			Х							
TOTAL	1000		•	•	•							

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Composite	Score based or	Length of Bike	e Path and Grac	les of 2% or	Number of	Number of	Number of					
	1	more	1		steps that must	steps that can	intersections	Number of				
% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite	be climbed in	be bypassed by	in Pedestrian	intersections	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride
Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score	Pedestrian Path	an elevator	Path	in Bike Path				
71.2%	18.9%	9.9%	0.0%	3.61	57	0	29	30	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
55.3%	39.3%	0.0%	5.4%	3.45	0		19	18	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
16.2%	68.6%	7.6%	7.6%	2.93	0		15	17	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
40.4%	35.3%		24.2%	2.92	57	0	6	8	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
58.7%	41.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.59	26	0	10	14	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
84.3%	15.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.84	0		13	17	' Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasa	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00	0		24	22	Walk feels unsafe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is not pleasant
4.8%	76.4%	9.6%	4.8%	2.72	0	170	37	29	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
17.5%	53.4%	27.5%	1.7%	2.87	57	0	52	62	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasa	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
74.5%	20.7%	4.8%	0.0%	3.70	25	0	42	41	. Walk feels somewhat saf	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa
Transit Trips												
33.5%	48.1%	13.7%	4.7%	3.10	0		50	49	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa
32.9%	37.5%	26.4%	3.2%	3.00	0		38	51	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa
49.9%	41.9%	7.7%	0.5%	3.41	0		60	60	Walk feels unsafe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa
							Transit Tri	DS .				

Pier 55-56 Raw Values

Transit Zones Analysis

Transit Route		Distance to Transit	Composite Sc	ore based on L	ength of Pedes or more	trian Path and	Grades of 2%	Number of steps that	Number of	Number of		
Selected (Use most frequent)	Bus Stop #	Access Point (Miles)	% of Path Less than 2%	% Path 2 to 5%	% Path 6 to 10%	% Path More than 10%	Composite Score	must be climbed in Pedestrian	steps that can be bypassed by an elevator	intersections in Pedestrian Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk
Route 1	3rd and Seneca	0.29	29.1%	13.5%	28.7%	28.7%	2.43	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
						Walk/I	3ike Trips					
Link Light Rail	University St	0.34	28.3%	62.2%	9.6%	0.0%	3.19	0	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
C Line	3rd and Seneca	0.29	29.1%	13.5%	28.7%	28.7%	2.43	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 3, Route 4	3rd and Seneca	0.29	29.1%	13.5%	28.7%	28.7%	2.43	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 24	3rd and Union	0.42	62.1%	0.0%	18.9%	18.9%	3.05	57	0	8	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
D Line	3rd and Seneca	0.29	29.1%	13.5%	28.7%	28.7%	2.43	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 70	3rd and Seneca	0.29	29.1%	13.5%	28.7%	28.7%	2.43	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 12, G Line	Marion and 1st	0.31	74.3%	12.1%	13.7%	0.0%	3.61	0	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Route 3	3rd and Union	0.42	62.1%	0.0%	18.9%	18.9%	3.05	57	0		Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Link Light Rail	University St	0.34	28.3%	62.2%	9.6%	0.0%	3.19	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Route 131	3rd and Seneca	0.29	29.1%	13.5%	28.7%	28.7%	2.43	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 7	3rd and Union	0.42	62.1%	0.0%	18.9%	18.9%	3.05	0	0	8	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Link Light Rail	University St	0.34	28.3%	62.2%	9.6%	0.0%	3.19	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Link Light Rail	University St	0.34	28.3%	62.2%	9.6%	0.0%	3.19	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Link Light Rail	University St	0.34	28.3%	62.2%	9.6%	0.0%	3.19	57	0	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant

Adjacency to Colman Dock:

0.2 miles

						Walk/Bike Zo	nes Analysis					
	Estimated	Percent of		Zono Typo				Composite Sc	ore based on L	ength of Pedes	trian Path and (Grades of 2%
	Dassenger	all		Zone Type		Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to			or more		
	Flows	all	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Centroid (Miles)	Centroid (Miles)	% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite
Name	110003	rassengers		Transitional				Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score
Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.90%	Х			1.27	1.46	30.5%	58.3%	5.6%	5.6%	3.14
Belltown	16	1.60%	Х			0.31	0.50	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.75
Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.69%	Х			0.66	0.64	16.2%	59.3%	12.3%	12.3%	2.79
Finanical District	197	19.69%	Х			0.67	0.77	83.6%	10.9%	0.0%	5.5%	3.73
Pioneer Square/International Distric	311	31.13%	Х			1.11	1.14	86.3%	13.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.86
Stadium District	19	1.89%		Х		1.46	1.53	90.7%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.91
SODO	9	0.95%		Х		2.59	2.60	94.6%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.95
South Lake Union	48	4.80%		Х		1.55	1.81	42.3%	42.7%	15.0%	0.0%	3.27
Queen Anne	2	0.20%		Х		2.31	3.07	41.7%	33.0%	16.6%	8.7%	3.08
Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.00%		Х		4.38	5.49	65.4%	25.0%	9.6%	0.0%	3.56
Ballard	3	0.30%			Х			Tr	ansit Trins			
U of W/Fremont	42	4.25%			Х							
Capitol Hill	32	3.20%		Х		3.04	3.30	17.6%	50.8%	26.3%	5.3%	2.81
First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.80%		Х		2.82	3.09	33.1%	27.4%	33.8%	5.7%	2.88
Beacon Hill	1	0.10%		Х		4.14	4.14	55.3%	37.9%	6.4%	0.5%	3.48
Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.91%			Х							
Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.10%			Х							
Mercer Island	3	0.30%			Х			Tr	ansit Trips			
Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.10%			Х							
Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.10%			X							
TOTAL	1000		-	-	-							

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Image: Note of Path More of Path	
% of Path Less than 2%% Path 6 to 10%% Path More than 10%Composite Scorebe climbed in Pedestrianbe bypassed by an elevatorPedestrian PathBike PathBike PathBike PathBike ride feels safeBike ride feels safeBike ride feels safe58.8%27.1%14.1%0.0%3.450851921Walk feels safeWalk is pleasantBike ride feels safeBike ride feels safeBike ride is pleasant31.7%40.4%27.9%0.0%3.0408568Walk feels safeWalk is pleasantBike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is pleasant	f Piko Pido
Less than 2%5%10%than 10%ScorePedestrianan elevatorPathDike PathImage: Constraint of the pathImage: Constraint of the pathImage: Constraint of the path58.8%27.1%14.1%0.0%3.450851921Walk feels safeWalk is pleasantBike ride feels safeBike ride is pleasant31.7%40.4%27.9%0.0%3.0408568Walk feels safeWalk is pleasantBike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is pleasant	DIKE MILE
58.8% 27.1% 14.1% 0.0% 3.45 0 85 19 21 Walk feels safe Walk is pleasant Bike ride feels safe Bike ride is pleasant 31.7% 40.4% 27.9% 0.0% 3.04 0 85 6 8 Walk feels safe Walk is pleasant Bike ride feels safe Bike ride is pleasant	
31.7%40.4%27.9%0.0%3.0408568 Walk feels safeWalk is pleasantBike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is pleasant	easant
	easant
15.8% 62.7% 10.7% 10.7% 2.84 0 85 10 13 Walk feels safe Walk is not pleasant Bike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is no	t pleasant
13.2%77.9%0.0%8.9%2.950851114Walk feels safeWalk is pleasantBike ride feels safeBike ride is pleasant	easant
86.3% 13.7% 0.0% 0.0% 3.86 0 0 20 20 Walk feels safe Walk is pleasant Bike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is ple	easant
87.9% 12.1% 0.0% 0.0% 3.88 0 0 26 25 Walk feels safe Walk is pleasant Bike ride feels safe Bike ride is ple	easant
89.2% 10.8% 0.0% 0.0% 3.89 0 0 33 38 Walk feels unsafe Walk is not pleasant Bike ride feels unsafe Bike ride is no	t pleasant
31.3% 55.9% 8.5% 4.3% 3.14 0 85 22 28 Walk feels safe Walk is pleasant Bike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is pleasant	easant
20.4% 42.0% 37.6% 0.0% 2.83 57 0 35 54 Walk feels safe Walk is somewhat pleasar Bike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is no	t pleasant
70.9%23.7%5.5%0.0%3.650853361Walk feels somewhat safWalk is not pleasantBike ride feels safeBike ride is somewhat is not pleasant	mewhat pleasa
Transit Trips	
21.6%56.7%15.5%6.2%2.940855051Walk feels somewhat saf Walk is not pleasantBike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is no	t pleasant
22.3%47.0%26.6%4.1%2.875704653Walk feels safeWalk is not pleasantBike ride feels somewhat sa Bike ride is no	t pleasant
55.3% 37.9% 6.4% 0.5% 3.48 0 0 67 Walk feels unsafe Walk is not pleasant Bike ride feels unsafe Bike ride is so	mewhat pleasa

Transit Trips

Transit Zones Analysis

		Distance to Transit	Composite So	ore based on L	ength of Pede	strian Path and	Grades of 2%	Number of	Number of	Number of	
Transit Route Selected (Use					or more			steps that	steps that can	intersections	Safety of Walk
most frequent)	Transit Stan	(Miloc)	% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite	must be	be bypassed	in Pedestrian	Salety Of Walk
	Transit Stop	(IVIIIes)	Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score	climbed in	by an elevator	Path	
					W	alk/Bike Trips					
		T	1	1				I	1	1	Γ
Route 113	2nd and Bell	0.28	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	2.33	C	85	5	Walk feels safe
Route 131	3rd and Bell	0.35	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.75	C	85	6	Walk feels safe
C Line	3rd and Virginia	0.48	0.0%	65.7%	17.1%	17.1%	2.49	C	85	11	Walk feels safe
Route 3, Route 2, Route 4	3rd and Bell	0.35	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.75	C	85	6	Walk feels safe
Route 24	3rd and Bell	0.35	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.75	C	85	6	Walk feels safe
Route 28	3rd and Bell	0.35	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.75	C	85	6	Walk feels safe
Route 70	Virginia & 6th	0.66	21.4%	47.4%	23.0%	8.1%	2.82	C)	10	Walk feels safe
Route 10	Pike and 4th	0.70	90.0%	0.0%	4.5%	5.5%	3.75	C	170	12	Walk feels safe
Route 3	3rd and Bell	0.35	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.75	C	85	6	Walk feels safe
Route 14	3rd and Bell	0.35	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.75	C	85	6	Walk feels safe
Route 131	3rd and Bell	0.35	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.75	C	85	6	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail to 106/107	Westlake Station	0.80	74.8%	0.0%	16.3%	8.9%	3.41	C	0 0	12	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail	Westlake Station	0.80	74.8%	0.0%	16.3%	8.9%	3.41	C)	12	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail	Westlake Station	0.80	74.8%	0.0%	16.3%	8.9%	3.41	C)	12	Walk feels safe
Link Light Rail	Westlake Station	0.80	74.8%	0.0%	16.3%	8.9%	3.41	C		12	Walk feels safe

Adjacency to Colman Dock:

0.9 miles

Quality of Walk
Walk is not pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is not pleasant
Walk is not pleasant
Walk is not pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant
Walk is pleasant

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis

	Ectimated	Dorcont of		Zono Tuno				Composite Sc	ore based on L	ength of Pedes	strian Path and	Grades of 2%
	Estimated			zone Type		Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to			or more		
	Flowe	dll		Transitional	Transit only	Centroid (Miles)	Centroid (Miles)	% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite
Name	FIOWS	Fasseligers	Walk of Bike	Transitional	Transit Only			Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score
Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.90%	Х			0.96	1.78	32.1%	53.5%	7.2%	7.2%	3.10
Belltown	16	1.60%	Х			0.58	0.45	67.1%	0.0%	9.7%	23.3%	3.11
Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.69%	Х			0.94	0.91	27.6%	53.7%	12.1%	6.6%	3.02
Financial District	197	19.69%	Х			0.99	1.09	90.4%	6.4%	0.0%	3.2%	3.84
Pioneer Square/International District	311	31.13%		Х		1.44	1.46	86.4%	9.5%	4.1%	0.0%	3.82
Stadium District	19	1.89%		Х		1.71	1.85	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.00
SODO	9	0.95%		Х		2.88	2.92	95.6%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.96
South Lake Union	48	4.80%		Х		1.71	1.84	49.5%	39.7%	3.2%	7.6%	3.31
Queen Anne	2	0.20%		Х		2.14	3.46	27.4%	43.5%	17.5%	11.8%	2.87
Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.00%		Х		4.05	5.17	75.3%	9.5%	7.5%	7.7%	3.52
Ballard	3	0.30%			Х			Те	ancit Tring			
U of W/Fremont	42	4.25%			Х				ansit mps			
Capitol Hill	32	3.20%		Х		3.21	3.62	22.1%	46.4%	24.5%	7.0%	2.84
First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.80%		Х		3.15	3.41	42.8%	24.4%	30.9%	1.9%	3.08
Beacon Hill	1	0.10%		Х		4.45	4.45	59.2%	34.6%	5.8%	0.5%	3.53
Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.91%			Х							
Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.10%			Х							
Mercer Island	3	0.30%			Х			Tr	ansit Trips			
Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.10%			X							
Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.10%	1		Х							
TOTAL	1000		-	-	-							

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Composite	Score based on	Length of Bike	e Path and Grad	les of 2% or	Number of	Number of	Number of	Number of				
		more			steps that must	steps that can	intersections	intersections	Safaty of Walk	Quality of Walk	Safaty of Piko Pida	Quality of Piko Pido
% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite	be climbed in	be bypassed by	in Pedestrian	in Rike Dath	Salety OF Walk	Quality of walk	Salety of bike kide	Quality of bike Ride
Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score	Pedestrian	an elevator	Path	In Bike Path				
45.4%	35.9%	18.7%	0.0%	3.27	0		13	19	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
50.0%	23.7%	13.1%	13.1%	3.11	0		5	7	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
28.3%	53.1%	12.0%	6.6%	3.03	0		13	16	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
30.8%	62.1%	0.0%	7.1%	3.17	102	34	14	17	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
88.3%	11.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.88	0		23	23	B Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
89.2%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.89	0		25	28	B Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is pleasant
89.9%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.90	0		36	41	Walk feels unsafe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is not pleasant
33.8%	54.4%	8.4%	3.5%	3.18	0		24	29	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasa	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa
24.8%	39.7%	35.5%	0.0%	2.89	57	0	32	57	Walk feels somewhat sat	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is not pleasant
69.7%	24.6%	5.7%	0.0%	3.64	25	0	28	58	B Walk feels somewhat sat	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels safe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa
Transit Trips												
26.2%	53.4%	14.6%	5.8%	3.00	0		58	54	Walk feels somewhat sat	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is pleasant
26.5%	44.5%	25.2%	3.9%	2.94	109	0	49	56	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant	Bike ride feels somewhat sa	Bike ride is not pleasant
59.2%	34.6%	5.8%	0.5%	3.53	0		72	72	2 Walk feels unsafe	Walk is not pleasant	Bike ride feels unsafe	Bike ride is somewhat pleasa
							Transit Trij	os				

Transit Zones Analysis

		Distance to Transit	Composite Sc	ore based on L	ength of Pedes	strian Path and	Grades of 2%	Number of	Number of		
Transit Route Selected (Use					or more			steps that	intersections	Safaty of Malk	Quality of Walk
most frequent)	Transit Stan	ALLESS POINT	% of Path	% Path 2 to	% Path 6 to	% Path More	Composite	must be	in Pedestrian	Safety of Walk	
	Transit Stop	(ivilies)	Less than 2%	5%	10%	than 10%	Score	climbed	Path		
					Walk/Bike	Trins					
					Wany Bite	inpo					
Route 14, Route 3	3rd & Cedar	0.42	36.7%	25.9%	11.5%	25.9%	2.73	0	6	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 113	2nd and Bell	0.56	42.4%	26.0%	9.3%	22.3%	2.88	0	8	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 131	3rd and Bell	0.63	61.5%	10.1%	8.4%	20.1%	3.13	0	9	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Route 3, Route 2, Route 4	3rd and Bell	0.63	61.5%	10.1%	8.4%	20.1%	3.13	0	9	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Route 13	Denny & 2nd	0.52	37.1%	41.2%	10.8%	10.8%	3.05	0	8	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Route 24	Denny & 2nd	0.52	37.1%	41.2%	10.8%	10.8%	3.05	0	8	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Route 28	3rd and Bell	0.63	61.5%	10.1%	8.4%	20.1%	3.13	0	9	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Link Light Rail	Westlake Station	0.96	17.4%	65.3%	11.2%	6.1%	2.94	0	14	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasant
Route 8	Denny & 2nd	0.52	37.1%	41.2%	10.8%	10.8%	3.05	0	8	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Route 3	3rd & Cedar	0.42	36.7%	25.9%	11.5%	25.9%	2.73	0	6	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 14	3rd & Cedar	0.42	36.7%	25.9%	11.5%	25.9%	2.73	0	6	Walk feels safe	Walk is not pleasant
Route 131	3rd and Bell	0.63	61.5%	10.1%	8.4%	20.1%	3.13	0	9	Walk feels safe	Walk is pleasant
Link Light Rail	Westlake Station	0.96	17.4%	65.3%	11.2%	6.1%	2.94	0	14	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasant
Link Light Rail	Westlake Station	0.96	17.4%	65.3%	11.2%	6.1%	2.94	0	14	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasant
Link Light Rail	Westlake Station	0.96	17.4%	65.3%	11.2%	6.1%	2.94	0	14	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasant
Link Light Rail	Westlake Station	0.96	17.4%	65.3%	11.2%	6.1%	2.94	0	14	Walk feels safe	Walk is somewhat pleasant

Adjacency to Colman Dock:

1.0 mile

Pier 46 Scores

		Estimated	Percent of	Weighted		Zone Type		Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to	Composite Score based	Composite Score based	Number of
Zone	Name	Passenger	all	Passenger		Transitiona		Controid	Controid	Dath and Grados of 2% or	and Grades of 2% or	be climbed in
		Flows	Passengers	Flows	Walk or Bike	i ransitiona	Transit only	Centrola	Centrola	Patri and Grades of 2% of	and Grades of 2% of	De climbed in
						1				more	more	Pedestrian Path
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.9%	1.8%		Х		1	3	3	3	4
2	Belltown	16	1.6%	3.2%		Х		2	3	4	3	. 4
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.7%	47.4%	Х			2	4	2	2	. 4
4	Finanical District	197	19.7%	39.4%	Х			3	4	3	3	4
5	Pioneer Square/International Distric	311	31.1%	62.3%	Х			3	4	3	4	. 4
6	Stadium District	19	1.9%	3.8%	Х			4	4	4	4	. 4
7	SODO	9	0.9%	1.9%		Х		2	3	4	4	. 4
8	South Lake Union	48	4.8%	9.6%		Х		1	2	2	2	. 1
9	Queen Anne	2	0.2%	0.4%		Х		1	1	2	2	. 2
10	Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.0%	0.0%		Х		1	1	4	4	. 4
11	Ballard	3	0.3%	0.6%			Х			Transit Trins		
12	U of W/Fremont	42	4.2%	8.5%			Х			Transit Trips		
13	Captiol Hill	32	3.2%	6.4%		Х		1	1	1	1	. 4
14	First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.8%	9.6%		Х		1	3	1	1	. 4
15	Beacon Hill	1	0.1%	0.2%		Х		1	2	2	3	, 4
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.9%	1.8%			Х					
17	Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.1%	0.2%			Х					
18	Mercer Island	3	0.3%	0.6%			Х			Transit Trips		
19	Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.1%	2.2%			Х					
20	Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.1%	0.2%			Х					
	TOTAL	1000										

Pier 46 Scores

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Transit Zones Analysis

Numer incressing bine bine bine bine bine bine bine bine														
133322320.521.73Rote 2 or 1344444333333333380.10380.1030.	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Number of intersections in Bike Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride	Raw Score	Original Scoring Methodology	Revised Scoring Methodology	Transit Route Selected (Use most frequent)	Distance to Transit Access Point	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more	Number of steps that must be climbed	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path
33333333341.093.58Rote 2444444333333314.6947.38<	2	3	3	2	2	3	29	0.52	1.73	Route 2 or 13	4	4	4	4
AABAA	3	3	3	3	3	3	34	1.09	3.58	Route 24	4	4	4	4
343333333314.846.47443333333.6577.21000<	3	3	3	3	2	3	31	14.69	47.38					
4 3	3	4	3	3	3	3	36	14.18	46.47			Walk/Rike Trins		
4 3 2 3 3 3 9 1.48 4.92 4 4 1 1 1 2 0.55 1.82 Link Light Rail 1 4 4 2 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2.11 6.72 Cline 1 4 4 4 1 1 2 3 3 20 0.08 Rote 8 1 1 4 4 4 1 2 2 1 3 2 25 0.00 Rote 8 1 1 4 4 3 1 2 2 1 3<	4	4	3	3	3	3	38	23.66	77.21			Walky blke Trips		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	4	4	3	2	3	3	39	1.48	4.92					
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	4	4	1	1	1	1	29	0.55	1.82	Link Light Rail	1	4	4	2
1 1 2 2 3 3 20 0.08 0.26 Route 3 1 4 4 4 1 2 2 1 3 2 25 0.00 0.00 Route 24 1 4 4 3 C Transit Trips Route 28 1 4 4 4 1 1 2 1 2 1 <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>22</td> <td>2.11</td> <td>6.72</td> <td>C Line</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td>	2	2	3	2	2	3	22	2.11	6.72	C Line	1	4	4	4
1 2 1 3 2 25 0.00 Route 24 1 4 4 3 2 2 1 3 2 25 0.00 Route 24 1 4 4 3 2 2 2 1 2 1 1 1 10 3.58 Route 30 1 4 4 3 2 2 2 1 1 19 3.58 Route 30 1 1 4 4 3 1 2 2 2 1 1 19 3.82 6.14 Route 30 1 1 4 4 4 3 1 2 2 2 1 2 2 0.04 0.15 Route 30 1 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>20</td> <td>0.08</td> <td>0.26</td> <td>Route 3</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td>	1	1	2	2	3	3	20	0.08	0.26	Route 3	1	4	4	4
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	1	2	2	1	3	2	25	0.00	0.00	Route 24	1	4	4	3
Route 70 1 4 4 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 16 1.02 3.58 Routes 12 1 4 4 3 2 2 2 1 1 19 1.82 6.14 Route 3 1 1 4 4 3 1 2 2 2 1 2 22 0.04 0.15 Route 39 1 4 4 4 2 4 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Transit Trin</td> <td>c</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Route 28</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td>					Transit Trin	c				Route 28	1	4	4	3
1 1 2 1 16 1.02 3.58 Routes 12 1 4 4 3 2 2 2 1 1 19 1.82 6.14 Route 3 1 1 4 4 3 1 2 2 2 1 2 22 0.04 0.15 Route 39 1 4 <										Route 70	1	4	4	2
2 2 1 1 1 1 9 1.82 6.14 Route 3 1 1 4 3 1 2 2 2 1 2 22 0.04 0.15 Route 39 1 4 <t< td=""><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>16</td><td>1.02</td><td>3.58</td><td>Routes 12</td><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>3</td></t<>	1	1	2	1	2	1	16	1.02	3.58	Routes 12	1	4	4	3
1 2 2 1 2 22 0.04 0.15 Routes 39 1 4 4 2 Route 100 1 4 4 4 4 3 Route 100 1 4 4 4 3 Route 550 4 4 4 4 Route 550 or 240 4 4 4 Route 550 or 245 4 4 4	2	2	2	1	1	1	19	1.82	6.14	Route 3	1	1	4	3
Route 131 1 4 4 Route 131 1 4 4 Route 106 1 4 4 Route 550 4 4 2 Route 550 or 240 4 4 2 Route 545 or 245 4 4 2	1	2	2	2	1	2	22	0.04	0.15	Routes 39	1	4	4	2
Route 106143Transit TripsRoute 5504442Route 550 or 2404442Route 545 or 2454442										Route 131	1	4	4	4
Transit TripsRoute 550442Route 550 or 240442Route 545 or 245442										Route 106	1	4	4	3
Route 550 or 240 4 4 2 Route 545 or 245 4 4 4 2					Transit Trip	S				Route 550	4	4	4	2
Route 545 or 245 4 4 2										Route 550 or 240	4	4	4	2
										Route 545 or 245	4	4	4	2

Pier 46 Scores

Transit Zon	Transit Zones Analysis (continued)					Transitional Zones Analysis				
	Quality of	Dave Caara	Original	Revised	Original Scoring Methodology			Revised Scoring Methodology		
Satety of wark	Walk	Raw Score	Scoring	Scoring	Bike/Ped	Transit Only	Blended	Bike/Ped	Transit Only	Blended
			Nethodology		Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
3	3	22	0.4	1.48	0.52	0.40	0.46	1.73	1.48	1.60
3	3	22	0.7	2.62	1.09	0.70	0.90	3.58	2.62	3.10
Walk/Bike Trips				Walk/Bike Trips						
3	2	16	0.3	1.10	0.55	0.30	0.43	1.82	1.10	1.46
3	3	19	1.8	6.14	2.11	1.82	1.97	6.72	6.14	6.43
3	3	19	0.1	0.26	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.26	0.26	0.26
3	2	17	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	2	17	0.1	0.36	,		Transit	Trinc		
3	2	16	1.4	4.92				Trips		
3	3	18	1.2	3.97	1.02	1.15	1.09	3.58	3.97	3.77
3	1	13	1.2	4.41	1.82	1.25	1.54	6.14	4.41	5.28
3	2	16	0.0	0.12	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.15	0.12	0.13
3	2	18	0.3	1.13						
3	2	. 17	0.0	0.12						
3	2	. 19	0.1	0.46	J		Transit	: Trips		
3	2	. 19	0.4	1.67						
3	2	. 19	0.0	0.15						

Totals

Zone	Nome	Final Sc	ores (Original	Final Scores (Revised Scoring)			
	Name	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Walk or Bike	Transition al	Transit only
1	Uptown/Seattle Center		0.46			1.60	
2	Belltown		0.90			3.10	
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	14.69			47.38		
4	Finanical Distirct	14.18			46.47		
5	Pioneer Square/International District	23.66			77.21		
6	Stadium District	1.48			4.92		
7	SODO		0.43			1.46	
8	South Lake Union		1.97			6.43	
9	Queen Anne		0.08			0.26	
10	Interbay/Magnolia		0.00			0.00	
11	Ballard			0.10			0.36
12	U of W/Fremont			1.36			4.92
13	Captiol Hill		1.09			3.77	
14	First Hill/Medical Centers		1.54			5.28	
15	Beacon Hill		0.04			0.13	
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac			0.33			1.13
17	Rainier Beach/Renton			0.03			0.12
18	Mercer Island			0.11			0.46
19	Bellevue/Eastgate			0.42			1.67
20	Kirkland/Redmond			0.04			0.15

Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Unwt):	3
Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Wt):	12
Original Scoring	65.88
Revised Scoring	218.83

Scores are relative to the four ferry terminal locations.

Higher scores are better than lower scores.

Zone	Name	Estimated Passenger	Percent of all	Weighted Passenger	Zone Type		
Lone		Flows	Passengers	Flows	Walk or Bike	Transitiona I	
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.9%	1.8%		Х	
2	Belltown	16	1.6%	3.2%		Х	
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.7%	47.4%	Х		
4	Finanical District	197	19.7%	39.4%	Х		
5	Pioneer Square/International Distric	311	31.1%	62.3%	Х		
6	Stadium District	19	1.9%	3.8%	Х		
7	SODO	9	0.9%	1.9%		Х	
8	South Lake Union	48	4.8%	9.6%		Х	
9	Queen Anne	2	0.2%	0.4%		Х	
10	Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.0%	0.0%		Х	
11	Ballard	3	0.3%	0.6%			
12	U of W/Fremont	42	4.2%	8.5%			
13	Captiol Hill	32	3.2%	6.4%		Х	
14	First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.8%	9.6%		Х	
15	Beacon Hill	1	0.1%	0.2%		Х	
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.9%	1.8%			
17	Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.1%	0.2%			
18	Mercer Island	3	0.3%	0.6%			
19	Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.1%	2.2%			
20	Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.1%	0.2%			
	TOTAL	1000					

	Walk/Bike Zones Analysis							
			Composite Score based	Composite Score based				
	Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to	on Length of Pedestrian	on Length of Bike Path				
Transit only	Centroid	Centroid	Path and Grades of 2% or	and Grades of 2% or				
Transit only			more	more				
	1	3	3	3				
	2	4	4	3				
	2	4	2	2				
	3	4	3	1				
	4	4	3	3				
	4	4	4	4				
	2	3	4	4				
	1	3	2	2				
	1	1	2	1				
	1	1	3	4				
Х			Transit Trips					
Х								
	1	1	1	1				
	1	3	1	2				
	1	2	2	3				
Х								
Х								
Х			Transit Trips					
Х								
Х								

Number of steps that must be climbed in Pedestrian Path 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path 2 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Number of intersections in Bike Path 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Safety of Walk 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 1	Quality of Walk 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 2 1	Safety of Bike Ride 2 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 1	Quality of Bike Ride 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 1
4	2	2	3	3	2	3
4	1	2	2	1	3	2
					Transit Trip	S
4	1	1	2	1	2	1
4	2	2	2	2	1	2
4	1	2	1	1	1	2
					Transit Trip	S

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)
Raw Score	Original Scoring Methodology	Revised Scoring Methodology	Transit Route Selected (Use most frequent)	Distance to Transit Access Point	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more
30	0.54	1.76	Route 2 or 13	4	4
35	1.12	3.71	Route 24	4	4
31	14.69	47.38			
35	13.78	44.11			Walk/Bike Trins
38	23.66	77.21			Walky blke Trips
39	1.48	4.92			
29	0.55	1.82	Link Light Rail	1	3
27	2.59	8.44	C Line	1	4
17	0.07	0.23	Route 3	1	4
24	0.00	0.00	Route 24	1	4
			Route 28	1	4
			Route 70	1	3
16	1.02	3.58	Routes 12	1	4
22	2.11	6.91	Route 3	1	3
20	0.04	0.14	Routes 39	1	4
			Route 131	1	4
			Route 106	1	4
			Route 550	4	3
			Route 550 or 240	4	3
			Route 545 or 245	4	3

Transit Zones Analysis

Number of steps that must be climbed	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Raw Score	Original Scoring Methodology	Revised Scoring Methodology
4	4	3	3	22	0.4	1.48
4	4	3	3	22	0.7	2.62
				Walk/Bike Trip	S	
4	2	3	2	15	0.3	1.02
4	4	3	3	19	1.8	6.14
4	4	3	3	19	0.1	0.26
4	3	3	3	18	0.0	0.00
4	4	3	0	16	0.1	0.35
4	2	3	3	16	1.4	4.75
4	3	3	3	18	1.2	3.97
4	3	3	3	17	1.6	5.57
4	2	3	2	16	0.0	0.12
4	4	3	2	18	0.3	1.13
4	3	3	2	17	0.0	0.12
4	2	3	2	18	0.1	0.43
4	2	3	2	18	0.4	1.58
4	2	3	2	18	0.0	0.14

Transit Zones Analysis (continued)

Transitional Zones Analysis

Origina	I Scoring Met	hodology	Revised	Scoring Meth	odology							
Bike/Ped	Transit Only	Blended	Bike/Ped	Transit Only	Blended							
Score	Score	Score	core Score		Score							
0.54	0.40	0.47	1.76	1.48	1.62							
1.12	0.70	0.91	3.71	2.62	3.17							
	Walk/Bike Trips											
0.55	0.28	0.42	1.82	1.02	1.42							
2.59	1.82	2.21	8.44	6.14	7.29							
0.07	0.08	0.07	0.23	0.26	0.24							
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00							
		Transit	Trips									
1.02	1.15	1.09	3.58	3.97	3.77							
2.11	1.63	1.87	6.91	5.57	6.24							
0.04	0.03	0.04	0.14	0.12	0.13							
Transit Trips												

Totals

Zone

Nomo	Final Sco	ores (Original	Scoring)	Final Scores (Revised		
Name	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Walk or Bike	Transition al	
Uptown/Seattle Center		0.47			1.62	
Belltown		0.91			3.17	
Denny Triangle/Retail	14.69			47.38		
Finanical Distirct	13.78			44.11		
Pioneer Square/International District	23.66			77.21		
Stadium District	1.48			4.92		
SODO		0.42			1.42	
South Lake Union		2.21			7.29	
Queen Anne		0.07			0.24	
Interbay/Magnolia		0.00			0.00	
Ballard			0.10			
U of W/Fremont			1.36			
Captiol Hill		1.09			3.77	
First Hill/Medical Centers		1.87			6.24	
Beacon Hill		0.04			0.13	
Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac			0.33			
Rainier Beach/Renton			0.03			
Mercer Island			0.11			
Bellevue/Eastgate			0.40			
Kirkland/Redmond			0.04			

Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Unwt):	3
Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Wt):	12
Original Scoring	66.03
Revised Scoring	218.01

Scores are relative to the four ferry terminal locations.

Higher scores are better than lower scores.

d Scoring)
Transit
only
0.35
4.75
1.13
0.12
0.43
1.58
0.14

Pier 50 Scores

								Walk/Bike Zo	ones Analysis			
Zone	Name	Estimated	Percent of	Weighted		Zone Type		Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian	Composite Score based on Length of Bike Path	Number of steps that must
20110	Name	Flows	Dassengers	Flows	Walk or Bike	Transitional		Centroid	Centroid	Path and Grades of 2% or	and Grades of 2% or	be climbed in
		110003	rassengers	110003		Transitional				more	more	Pedestrian Path
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.90%	1.8%		Х		1	3	3	3	4
2	Belltown	16	1.60%	3.2%	Х			2	4	3	2	4
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.69%	47.4%	х			2	4	2	2	4
4	Finanical District	197	19.69%	39.4%	х			3	4	3	3	4
5	Pioneer Square/International Distric	311	31.13%	62.3%	Х			4	4	2	2	4
6	Stadium District	19	1.89%	3.8%	Х			3	4	4	4	4
7	SODO	9	0.95%	1.9%		Х		2	3	4	4	4
8	South Lake Union	48	4.80%	9.6%		Х		1	3	2	2	4
9	Queen Anne	2	0.20%	0.4%		Х		1	1	2	1	2
10	Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.00%	0.0%		Х		1	1	4	4	4
11	Ballard	3	0.30%	0.6%			Х			Transit Trins		
12	U of W/Fremont	42	4.25%	8.5%			Х			Transit Trips		
13	Captiol Hill	32	3.20%	6.4%		Х		1	2	1	1	4
14	First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.80%	9.6%		Х		1	3	1	1	4
15	Beacon Hill	1	0.10%	0.2%		Х		1	2	3	3	4
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.91%	1.8%			Х					
17	Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.10%	0.2%			Х					
18	Mercer Island	3	0.30%	0.6%			Х	Transit Trips				
19	Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.10%	2.2%			Х					
20	Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.10%	0.2%			Х					
	TOTAL	1000										

Pier 50 Scores

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Transit Zones Analysis

waiky bike Zones Analysis (continued)														
Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Number of intersections in Bike Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride	Raw Score	Original Scoring Methodology	Revised Scoring Methodology	Transit Route Selected (Use most frequent)	Distance to Transit Access Point	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more	Number of steps that must be climbed	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	
2	2	3	3	3	3	30	0.54	1.80	D Line	4	1	4	4	
3	3	3	3	3	3	33	1.06	3.45						
3	3	3	3	2	3	31	14.69	47.38	38					
4	4	. 3	3	3	3	37	14.57	47.26			Walk/Bike Trips			
4	4	. 3	3	2	3	35	21.79	69.74						
4	4	. 3	3	3	3	39	1.48	4.85						
3	4	. 1	1	. 1	1	. 28	0.53	1.78	Link Light Rail	1	3	4	3	
2	2	3	3	3	3	28	2.69	8.83	C Line	1	4	4	4	
1	1	. 3	1	. 3	1	. 17	0.07	0.24	Route 3	1	1	4	4	
1	1	. 2	1	. 3	0	22	0.00	0.00	Route 24	1	2	4	3	
				Transit Trin	c				Route 28	1	2	4	3	
		-			5	-			Link Light Rail	1	3	4	3	
1	1	. 3	1	. 2	1	18	1.15	4.09	Route 12	1	3	4	4	
2	2	2	1	. 2	1	20	1.92	6.53	Route 4	1	2	4	3	
1	1	. 1	1	. 1	2	20	0.04	0.14	Link Light Rail	1	3	4	3	
									Route 131	1	1	4	3	
									Link Light Rail	1	3	4	3	
				Transit Trip	S				Link Light Rail	4	3	4	3	
										4	3	4	3	
									Link Light Rail	4	3	4	3	

Pier 50 Scores

Transit Zon	es Analysis	(continued)			Transitional Zones Analysis							
Coference of Wolk	Quality of		Original	Revised	Origin	al Scoring Me	thodology	Revise	d Scoring Methe	odology		
Satety of walk	Walk	Raw Score	Scoring	Scoring	Bike/Ped	Transit Only	Blended	Bike/Ped	Transit Only	Blended		
'	1		Niethodology	Niethodology	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score		
3	3	, 19	0.3	1.26	0.54	0.34	0.44	1.80	1.26	1.53		
		Walk/Bike Trip	JS				Walk/	Bike Trips				
3	2	16	0.3	1.06	, 0.53	, 0.30	0.42	1.78	1.06	1.42		
3	3	, 19	1.8	6.14	2.69	1.82	2.26	8.83	6.14	7.48		
3	3	,16	0.1	0.21	. 0.07	0.06	0.07	0.24	0.21	0.22		
3	2	. 15	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
3	2	. 15	0.1	0.31			Trar	osit Trins				
3	2	. 16	1.4	4.75	,			Sit mps				
3	3	,18	1.2	3.84	1.15	,1.15	1.15	4.09	3.84	3.97		
3	1	14	1.3	4.80	<u>1.92</u> ر	. 1.34	1.63	6.53	4.80	5.66		
3	2	. 16	0.0	0.11	. 0.04	0.03	0.04	0.14	0.11	0.13		
3	2	. 14	0.3	0.87	/							
3	2	. 16	0.0	0.11	_							
3	2	19	0.1	0.44	4		Trar	isit Trips				
3	2	19	0.4	1.63	\$							
3	2	19	0.0	0.15	5							

Totals

7000	Norre	Final Sc	ores (Original	Scoring)	Final Scores (Revised Scoring)			
Zone	Name	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	
1	Uptown/Seattle Center		0.44			1.53		
2	Belltown	1.06			3.45			
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	14.69			47.38			
4	Finanical Distirct	14.57			47.26			
5	Pioneer Square/International District	21.79			69.74			
6	Stadium District	1.48			4.85			
7	SODO		0.42			1.42		
8	South Lake Union		2.26			7.48		
9	Queen Anne		0.07			0.22		
10	Interbay/Magnolia		0.00			0.00		
11	Ballard			0.09			0.31	
12	U of W/Fremont			1.36			4.75	
13	Captiol Hill		1.15			3.97		
14	First Hill/Medical Centers		1.63			5.66		
15	Beacon Hill		0.04			0.13		
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac			0.25			0.87	
17	Rainier Beach/Renton			0.03			0.11	
18	Mercer Island			0.11			0.44	
19	Bellevue/Eastgate			0.42			1.63	
20	Kirkland/Redmond			0.04			0.15	

Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Unwt):	4
Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Wt):	16
Original Scoring	65.89
Revised Scoring	217.36

Scores are relative to the four ferry terminal locations.

Higher scores are better than lower scores.

		Estimated	Percent of	Weighted		Zone Type				Composite Score based	Composite Score based	Number of	
Zone	Name	Dassenger	all	Dassenger		Lone Type		Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to	on Length of Pedestrian	on Length of Bike Path	steps that must	
20116	Name	Flows	Daccongore	Flows	Walk or Dika	Transitional	Transit only	Centroid	Centroid	Path and Grades of 2% or	and Grades of 2% or	be climbed in	
		FIOWS	Passengers	FIOWS	Walk OF BIRE	Transitional	Transit Only			more	more	Pedestrian Path	
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.90%	1.8%		Х		2	3	2	3	2	
2	Belltown	16	1.60%	3.2%	Х			2	4	3	3	4	
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.69%	47.4%	Х			3	4	1	1	4	
4	Finanical District	197	19.69%	39.4%	Х			4	4	1	1	2	
5	Pioneer Square/International Distric	311	31.13%	62.3%	Х			3	4	3	3	3	
6	Stadium District	19	1.89%	3.8%	Х			3	4	4	4	4	
7	SODO	9	0.95%	1.9%		Х		2	3	4	4	4	
8	South Lake Union	48	4.80%	9.6%		Х		2	3	2	1	4	
9	Queen Anne	2	0.20%	0.4%		Х		1	1	1	1	2	
10	Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.00%	0.0%		Х		1	1	3	4	3	
11	Ballard	3	0.30%	0.6%			Х			Transit Trins			
12	U of W/Fremont	42	4.25%	8.5%			Х			Transit Trips			
13	Captiol Hill	32	3.20%	6.4%		Х		1	2	1	2	4	
14	First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.80%	9.6%		Х		1	2	1	1	4	
15	Beacon Hill	1	0.10%	0.2%		Х		1	2	3	3	4	
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.91%	1.8%			Х						
17	Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.10%	0.2%			Х						
18	Mercer Island	3	0.30%	0.6%			Х	Transit Trips					
19	Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.10%	2.2%			Х						
20	Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.10%	0.2%			Х						
	TOTAL	1000											

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Transit Zones Analysis

Numer interset (network) (network) Amount (network) (network) Amount (network) Amount (network) </th <th colspan="9"></th> <th></th>														
2 2 3 3 2 3 27 0.49 1.58 Route 1 4 1 2 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 1.09 3.58 3 4 3 1 2 3.73 3.33 3 3.33 <td>Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path</td> <td>Number of intersections in Bike Path</td> <td>Safety of Walk</td> <td>Quality of Walk</td> <td>Safety of Bike Ride</td> <td>Quality of Bike Ride</td> <td>Raw Score</td> <td>Original Scoring Methodology</td> <td>Revised Scoring Methodology</td> <td>Transit Route Selected (Use most frequent)</td> <td>Distance to Transit Access Point</td> <td>Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more</td> <td>Number of steps that must be climbed</td> <td>Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path</td>	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Number of intersections in Bike Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride	Raw Score	Original Scoring Methodology	Revised Scoring Methodology	Transit Route Selected (Use most frequent)	Distance to Transit Access Point	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more	Number of steps that must be climbed	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path
3 3	2	2	3	3	2	3	27	0.49	1.58	Route 1	4	1	2	4
AAA	3	3	3	3	3	3	34	1.09	3.58					
44333	3	4	3	1	. 2	3	29	13.74	44.53					
4 4 3 3 2 3 35 21.79 69.74 4 4 3 2 3 33 34 44.77 3 3 1	4	4	3	3	3	3	32	12.60	39.38			Walk/Bike Trips		
4 4 3 2 3 3 34 44 4.7 3 3 1 1 1 1 2 0.53 1.74 104 1 2 4 4 2 3 3 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 4 4 1 1 3 2 3 3 10 0.08 0.63 Rote3 1 1 2 4 2 2 2 1 3 2 2 0.00 0.00 Rote4 1 1 2 3 3 3 10 0.00 0.00 Rote24 1 1 2 3 3 1 2 2 1 1.34 0.16 1	4	4	3	3	2	3	35	21.79	69.74					
331111270.511.74Link Light Rail12442333233232332333	4	4	3	2	3	3	38	1.44	4.77					
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	3	3	1	1	. 1	1	27	0.51	1.74	Link Light Rail	1	2	4	4
1 1 3 2 3 3 19 0.08 0.25 Rote 3 1 1 2 4 2 2 2 1 3 2 24 0.00 Rote 24 1 1 2 3 3 L <thl< td=""><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>28</td><td>2.69</td><td>8.64</td><td>C Line</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>4</td></thl<>	2	3	3	3	2	3	28	2.69	8.64	C Line	1	1	2	4
2 2 1 3 2 24 0.00 Rote 24 1 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 7 8 7 8 7	1	1	3	2	3	3	19	0.08	0.25	Route 3	1	1	2	4
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	2	2	2	1	. 3	2	24	0.00	0.00	Route 24	1	2	2	3
Rote 70 1 1 2 4 1 2 3 1 2 2 1.34 4.61 Rote 12 1 4 4 4 2 2 3 1 2 2 2 1.34 4.61 Rote 12 1 4 4 4 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 0.04 0.04 Rote 3 1 2 2 2 2 0.04 0.04 Rote 7 1 1 2 2 4 4					Transit Trin	c				D Line	1	1	2	4
1 2 3 1 2 2 1 1.34 4.61 Route 12 1 4 4 4 2 2 3 1 2 2 21 2.02 6.72 Route 3 1 2 2 4 1 1 1 1 1 2 20 0.04 0.14 Route 7 1 2 2 4 4 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Route 70</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>4</td></t<>										Route 70	1	1	2	4
2 3 1 2 2 21 2.02 6.72 Route 3 1 2 2 4 1 1 1 1 2 20 0.04 0.14 Route 7 1 2 2 4 Link Light Rail 1 2 2 4 3 3 3 3 4 3 Link Light Rail 1 2 4 3 3 3 3 4 3 3 Link Light Rail 1 2 4 3 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 4 3 4	1	2	3	1	. 2	2	21	1.34	4.61	Route 12	1	4	4	4
1 1 1 1 2 20 0.04 0.14 Route 7 1 2 2 4 A	2	2	3	1	. 2	2	21	2.02	6.72	Route 3	1	2	2	4
Route 131 1 2 4 Link Light Rail 1 2 4 Route 554 4 2 2 4 Route 554 or 271 4 2 2 4 Route 545 or 245 4 2 2 4	1	1	1	1	. 1	2	20	0.04	0.14	Route 7	1	2	2	4
Ink Light Rail 1 2 4 3 Transit Trips Route 554 4 2 2 4 Route 554 or 271 A 2 2 4 Route 545 or 245 A 2 2 4										Route 131	1	1	2	4
Transit Trips Route 554 4 2 2 4 Route 554 or 271 4 2 2 4 Route 545 or 245 4 2 2 4										Link Light Rail	1	2	4	3
Route 554 or 271 4 2 2 4 Route 545 or 245 4 2 2 4		Transit Trips								Route 554	4	2	2	4
Route 545 or 245 4 2 2 4										Route 554 or 271	4	2	2	4
	R									Route 545 or 245	4	2	2	4

Pier 55-56 Scores

Transit Zon	es Analysis	(continued)			Transiti	onal Zone	s Analysis			
Cofoty of Malk	Quality of	Dow Coore	Original	Revised	Origina	Il Scoring Me	ethodology	Revised	Scoring Meth	nodology
Satety of walk	Walk	Raw Score	Scoring	Scoring	Bike/Ped	Transit	Blended	Bike/Ped	Transit	Blended
'	'		Methodology	Methodology	Score	Only Score	Score	Score	Only Score	Score
3	3	17	0.3	1.12	0.49	0.31	0.40	1.58	1.12	1.35
		Walk/Bike Trip	IS				Walk/F	Bike Trips		
3	2	16	0.3	1.02	0.51	0.30	0.41	1.74	1.02	1.38
3	3	14	1.3	4.22	2.69	1.34	2.02	8.64	4.22	6.43
3	3	14	0.1	0.18	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.25	0.18	0.21
3	2	13	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	2	13	0.1	0.25	,		Tran	-it Tring		
3	2	13	1.1	3.57			Irdiis	sit irips		
3	3	19	1.2	4.09	1.34	1.22	1.28	4.61	4.09	4.35
3	1	13	1.2	4.22	2.02	1.25	1.63	6.72	4.22	5.47
3	2	14	0.0	0.09	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.14	0.09	0.12
3	2	13	0.2	0.76	,					
3	2	15	0.0	0.10	,					
3	2	17	0.1	0.38	5		Tran	sit Trips		
3	2	. 17	0.4	1.41						
3	2	. 17	0.0	0.13						

Totals

7000	Namo	Final S	cores (Origina	al Scoring)	Final Scores (Revised Scoring)			
Zone	Name	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	
1	Uptown/Seattle Center		0.40			1.35		
2	Belltown	1.09			3.58			
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	13.74			44.53			
4	Finanical District	12.60			39.38			
5	Pioneer Square/International District	21.79			69.74			
6	Stadium District	1.44			4.77			
7	SODO		0.41			1.38		
8	South Lake Union		2.02			6.43		
9	Queen Anne		0.07			0.21		
10	Interbay/Magnolia		0.00			0.00		
11	Ballard			0.08			0.25	
12	U of W/Fremont			1.10			3.57	
13	Captiol Hill		1.28			4.35		
14	First Hill/Medical Centers		1.63			5.47		
15	Beacon Hill		0.03			0.12		
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac			0.24			0.76	
17	Rainier Beach/Renton			0.03			0.10	
18	Mercer Island			0.10			0.38	
19	Bellevue/Eastgate			0.37			1.41	
20	Kirkland/Redmond			0.03			0.13	

Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Unwt):	4
Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Wt):	16
Original Scoring	62.45
Revised Scoring	203.92

Scores are relative to the four ferry terminal

locations. Higher scores are better than lower

scores.

Pier 66 Scores

								Walk/Bike Zo	nes Analysis			
7000	Namo	Estimated	Percent of	Weighted		Zone Type		Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian	Composite Score based on Length of Bike Path	Number of steps that must
20116	Name	Fassenger	Dassongers	Fassenger	Malk or Dika	Transitional	Transit only	Centroid	Centroid	Path and Grades of 2% or	and Grades of 2% or	be climbed in
		FIOWS	Passengers	FIOWS	Walk OF BIKE	Transitional	Transit Only			more	more	Pedestrian Path
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.90%	1.8%	Х			2	4	2	3	4
2	Belltown	16	1.60%	3.2%	Х			4	4	1	2	4
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.69%	47.4%	Х			3	4	1	1	4
4	Finanical District	197	19.69%	39.4%	Х			3	4	4	1	4
5	Pioneer Square/International Distric	311	31.13%	62.3%	Х			2	4	4	4	4
6	Stadium District	19	1.89%	3.8%		Х		2	3	4	4	4
7	SODO	9	0.95%	1.9%		Х		1	2	4	4	4
8	South Lake Union	48	4.80%	9.6%		Х		1	3	2	2	4
9	Queen Anne	2	0.20%	0.4%		Х		1	2	1	1	2
10	Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.00%	0.0%		Х		1	1	3	4	4
11	Ballard	3	0.30%	0.6%			Х			Transit Trins		
12	U of W/Fremont	42	4.25%	8.5%			Х					
13	Captiol Hill	32	3.20%	6.4%		Х		1	2	1	1	4
14	First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.80%	9.6%		Х		1	2	1	1	2
15	Beacon Hill	1	0.10%	0.2%		Х		1	1	3	3	4
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.91%	1.8%			Х					
17	Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.10%	0.2%			Х					
18	Mercer Island	3	0.30%	0.6%			Х			Transit Trips		
19	Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.10%	2.2%			Х					
20	Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.10%	0.2%			Х					
	TOTAL	1000										

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Transit Zones Analysis

-			,							,			
Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Number of intersections in Bike Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride	Raw Score	Original Scoring Methodology	Revised Scoring Methodology	Transit Route Selected (Use most frequent)	Transit Stop	Distance to Transit Access Point	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more	Number of steps that must be climbed
3	3	3	3	3	3	33	0.59	1.94	ŀ				
4	4	3	3	2	3	34	1.09	3.45	5				
4	4	3	1	. 2	1	28	13.27	43.59			Walk/Bik	e Trips	
4	4	3	3	3	3	36	14.18	45.68	8				
3	3	3	3	2	3	35	21.79	72.23	8				
3	3	3	3	3	3	35	1.33	4.39	Route 28		4	1	2
2	2	1	1	. 1	1	23	0.44	1.52	Route 131		4	1	2
3	2	3	3	2	3	28	2.69	8.64	C Line		4	1	2
2	1	3	2	. 2	1	18	0.07	0.24	Route 3		4	1	2
2	1	2	1	. 3	2	24	0.00	0.00	Route 24		4	1	2
				Transit Trin	c				Route 28		4	1	2
									Route 70		3	1	4
1	2	2	1	. 2	1	18	1.15	3.97	Route 2 or 12		3	4	4
2	1	3	1	. 2	1	17	1.63	5.57	' Route 3		4	1	4
1	1	1	1	. 1	2	19	0.04	0.13	Route 14 or 106		4	1	4
									Route 131		4	1	4
									Link Light Rail or Ro	ute 106	2	4	4
				Transit Trip	S				Link Light Rail		2	4	4
									Link Light Rail		2	4	4
									Link Light Rail		2	4	4

Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path

Pier 66 Scores

Pier 66 Scores

Transit Zones Analysis (continued) **Original Scoring Methodology** Original Revised **Revised Scoring Methodology** Quality of Safety of Walk **Raw Score** Scoring Scoring Walk Bike/Ped Transit Only Bike/Ped Transit Only Blended Methodology Blended Score Methodology Score Score Score Score Score Walk/Bike Trips Walk/Bike Trips 2.20 1.33 0.57 0.95 2.20 15 4.39 3.30 3 0.6 1 15 0.3 0.44 0.28 1.52 1.31 1.10 0.36 1.10 3 1 12 1.2 4.99 2.69 1.15 1.92 8.64 4.99 6.81 3 1 15 0.23 0.23 0.24 3 0.1 0.07 0.06 0.07 0.24 15 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.0 0.00 0.00 0.00 3 15 0.35 0.1 3 Transit Trips 14 1.2 4.75 3 18 4.48 1.15 1.15 1.15 3.97 1.2 4.48 4.22 3 3 6.33 1.63 5.57 5.95 17 1.6 1.63 1.63 6.33 3 0.13 17 0.0 0.04 0.03 0.04 0.13 0.13 0.13 3 0.3 1.20 17 3 1 17 0.13 0.0 3 0.38 17 3 0.1 Transit Trips 1.41 17 0.4 3 3 17 0.0 0.13 3 3

Transitional Zones Analysis

Totals

7000	Namo	Final S	cores (Origina	Il Scoring)	Final Scores (Revised Scoring)			
zone	Name	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	0.59			1.94			
2	Belltown	1.09			3.45			
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	13.27			43.59			
4	Finanical Distirct	14.18			45.68			
5	Pioneer Square/International District	21.79			72.23			
6	Stadium District		0.95			3.30		
7	SODO		0.36			1.31		
8	South Lake Union		1.92			6.81		
9	Queen Anne		0.07			0.24		
10	Interbay/Magnolia		0.00			0.00		
11	Ballard			0.09			0.35	
12	U of W/Fremont			1.19			4.75	
13	Captiol Hill		1.15			4.22		
14	First Hill/Medical Centers		1.63			5.95		
15	Beacon Hill		0.04			0.13		
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac			0.31			1.20	
17	Rainier Beach/Renton			0.03			0.13	
18	Mercer Island			0.10			0.38	
19	Bellevue/Eastgate			0.37			1.41	
20	Kirkland/Redmond			0.03			0.13	

Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Unwt):1Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Wt):4Original Scoring60.16Revised Scoring201.20

Scores are relative to the four ferry terminal locations. Higher scores are better than lower scores.

Pier 69 Scores

		Estimated	Percent of	Weighted	zone Type					Composite Score based	Composite Score based	Number of		
		Dassenger	all	Dessenger		zone rype		Walk Distance to	Bike Distance to	on Length of Pedestrian	on Length of Bike Path	steps that must		
		Flows	Dassongers	Flows	Walk or Biko	Transitional	Transit only	Centroid	Centroid	Path and Grades of 2% or	and Grades of 2% or	be climbed in		
Zone	Name	110W5	rassengers	FIOWS		Transitional	Transit Only			more	more	Pedestrian Path		
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	9	0.90%	1.8%	Х			3	3	2	2	. 4		
2	Belltown	16	1.60%	3.2%	Х			3	4	2	2	. 4		
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	237	23.69%	47.4%	Х			3	4	1	2	. 4		
4	Finanical District	197	19.69%	39.4%	Х			3	4	4	2	. 1		
5	Pioneer Square/International Distric	311	31.13%	62.3%		Х		2	4	4	4	, 4		
6	Stadium District	19	1.89%	3.8%		Х		2	3	4	4	. 4		
7	SODO	9	0.95%	1.9%		Х		1	2	4	4	, 4		
8	South Lake Union	48	4.80%	9.6%		Х		2	3	2	2	. 4		
9	Queen Anne	2	0.20%	0.4%		Х		1	2	1	1	. 2		
10	Interbay/Magnolia	0	0.00%	0.0%		Х		1	1	3	3	3		
11	Ballard	3	0.30%	0.6%			Х			Transit Trins				
12	U of W/Fremont	42	4.25%	8.5%			Х			Transit Trips				
13	Captiol Hill	32	3.20%	6.4%		Х		1	2	1	1	. 4		
14	First Hill/Medical Centers	48	4.80%	9.6%		Х		1	2	1	1	. 1		
15	Beacon Hill	1	0.10%	0.2%		Х		1	1	3	3	. 4		
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac	9	0.91%	1.8%			Х							
17	Rainier Beach/Renton	1	0.10%	0.2%			Х							
18	Mercer Island	3	0.30%	0.6%			Х			Transit Trips				
19	Bellevue/Eastgate	11	1.10%	2.2%	X									
20	Kirkland/Redmond	1	0.10%	0.2%		X								
	TOTAL	1000												

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis

Pier 69 Scores

Walk/Bike Zones Analysis (continued)

Transit Zones Analysis

		,											
Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Number of intersections in Bike Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride	Raw Score	Original Scoring Methodology	Revised Scoring Methodology	Transit Route Selected (Use most frequent)	Distance to Transit Access Point	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more	Number of steps that must be climbed	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path
4	3	3	3	3	3	33	0.59	1.91					-
4	4	3	3	2	3	34	1.09	3.45			Malk/Dike Trine		
4	4	3	3	2	3	33	15.63	49.27					
4	4	3	3	3	3	34	13.39	42.53					
3	3	3	3	2	3	35	21.79	72.23	Route 124	4	1	4	4
3	3	3	3	3	3	35	1.33	4.39	Route 124	3	1	4	3
2	2	1	1	1	1	23	0.44	1.52	Route 131	3	2	4	3
3	3	3	2	1	2	27	2.59	8.44	Route 28	3	2	4	3
2	1	2	1	2	1	16	0.06	0.22	Route 13	3	2	4	3
2	1	2	1	3	2	22	0.00	0.00	Route 24	3	2	4	3
				Transit Trin	c				Route 28	3	2	4	3
									Route 70	2	2	4	1
1	1	2	1	2	3	19	1.22	4.09	Route 8	3	2	4	3
1	1	3	3	2	1	17	1.63	5.37	Route 3	4	1	4	4
1	1	1	1	1	2	19	0.04	0.13	Link Light Rail	4	1	4	4
									Route 131	3	2	4	3
									Link Light Rail	2	2	4	1
				Transit Trip	S				Link Light Rail	2	2	4	1
									Link Light Rail	2	2	4	1
									Link Light Rail	2	2	4	1

Pier 69 Scores

Transit Zon	es Analysis	(continued)			Transiti	onal Zones	s Analysis						
	Quality of	David	Original	Revised	Origin	al Scoring Me	ethodology	Revised	d Scoring Meth	odology			
Safety of Walk	Walk	Raw Score	Scoring	Scoring	Bike/Ped	Transit	Blended	Bike/Ped	Transit Only	Blended			
			wiethodology	wiethodology	Score	Only Score	Score	Score	Score	Score			
		Walk/Bike Trip	05				Walk/E	Bike Trips					
3	1	17	10.6	41.09	21.79	10.58	16.19	72.23	41.09	56.66			
3	1	15	0.6	2.20	1.33	0.57	0.95	4.39	2.20	3.30			
3	3	18	0.3	1.25	0.44	0.34	0.39	1.52	1.25	1.38			
3	3	18	1.7	6.33	2.59	1.73	2.16	8.44	6.33	7.39			
3	3	18	0.1	0.26	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.22	0.26	0.24			
3	3	18	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
3	3	18 14	0.1	0.40			Trans	sit Trips					
3	3	18	1.2	4.22	1.22	1.15	1.18	4.09	4.22	4.16			
3	1	17	1.6	6.33	1.63	1.63	1.63	5.37	6.33	5.85			
3	1	17	0.0	0.13	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.13	0.13	0.13			
3	3	18	0.3	1.20		•							
3	2	14	0.0	0.11	1								
3	2	14	0.1	0.32			Trans	sit Trips					
3	2	14	0.3	1.19									
3	2	14	0.0	0.11	11								

Transitional Zones Analysis

Totals

7	Nomo	Final S	cores (Origina	l Scoring)	Final Scores (Revised Scoring)				
zone	Name	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only	Walk or Bike	Transitional	Transit only		
1	Uptown/Seattle Center	0.59			1.91				
2	Belltown	1.09			3.45				
3	Denny Triangle/Retail	15.63			49.27				
4	Finanical Distirct	13.39			42.53				
5	Pioneer Square/International District		16.19			56.66			
6	Stadium District		0.95			3.30			
7	SODO		0.39			1.38			
8	South Lake Union		2.16			7.39			
9	Queen Anne		0.07			0.24			
10	Interbay/Magnolia		0.00			0.00			
11	Ballard			0.11			0.40		
12	U of W/Fremont			1.19			4.59		
13	Captiol Hill		1.18			4.16			
14	First Hill/Medical Centers		1.63			5.85			
15	Beacon Hill		0.04			0.13			
16	Harbor Island/West Seattle/Sea Tac			0.33			1.20		
17	Rainier Beach/Renton			0.03			0.11		
18	Mercer Island			0.08			0.32		
19	Bellevue/Eastgate			0.31			1.19		
20	Kirkland/Redmond			0.03			0.11		

Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Unwt):1Adj. to Colman Dock Score (Wt):4Original Scoring56.38Revised Scoring188.19

Scores are relative to the four ferry terminal

locations. Higher scores are better than lower

scores.

	Walk		Bike		Transit	
		Points		Points		Points
	0 to 0.5 miles 0	4	0 to 1.5 miles	4	0 to 0.5 miles	4
Distance to Centroid / Transit Access	0.51 to 1.0 miles	3	1.51 to 2.5 miles	3	0.51 to 0.75 miles	3
Point	1.01 to 2.0 miles	2	2.51 to 3.5 miles	2	0.76 to 1.0 miles	2
	More than 2.0 miles 2	1	More than 3.5 miles	# 1	More than 1.0 mile	1
		Points		Points		Points
	0 to 3 08 composite score	1	0 to 3 00 composite score	1	0 to 2 88 composite score	1 1
Composite Score based on Length of	3 09 to 3 39 composite score	2	3 01 to 3 36 composite score	2	2 89 to 3 18 composite score	2
Ped/Bike Path and Grades of 2% or	3 40 to 3 69 composite score	3	3 37 to 3 65 composite score	3	3 19 to 3 35 composite score	3
more	More than 3.69 composite score		More than 3.65 composite score	4	More than 3 35 composite score	1
more		4		4	More than 3.55 composite score	4
		Points				Points
	No steps 0	4			No steps	4
Number of steps that must be	1 to 50 steps	3			1 to 50 steps	1 3
climbed in Ped Path	51 to 100 steps	2			51 to 100 steps	2
	More than 100 steps	1			More than 100 steps	1
		Points		Points		Points
	0 to 14 intersections	4	0 to 17 intersections	4	0 to 6 intersections	4
Number of intersections in Ped/Bike	15 to 28 intersections	3	18 to 29 intersections	3	7 to 8 intersections	3
Path	29 to 47 intersections	2	30 to 51 intersections	2	9 to 10 intersections	2
	More than 47 intersections	1	More than 51 intersections	1	More than 10 intersections	1
		Points		Points		Points
	Walk feels safe	3	Bike ride feels safe	3	Walk feels safe	3
	Walk feels somewhat safe	2	Bike ride feels somewhat safe	2	Walk feels somewhat safe	2
Safety of Walk/Bike Ride	Walk feels unsafe	1	Bike ride feels unsafe	1	Walk feels unsafe	1
	Do you go through dark alleys? Is there	lighting at night?	Are there bike lanes or cycle tracks? I	Is there lighting at	Do you go through dark alleys? Is the	re lighting at night?
	Is there a lot of unsignalized crosswalks	? Do you go down	night? Would you feel safe biking on	this route?	Is there a lot of unsignalized crosswal	ks? Do you go
	streets without lots of pedestrians?				down streets without lots of pedestri	ans?
		Points		Points		Points
	Walk is pleasant	3	Bike ride is pleasant	3	Walk is pleasant	3
	Walk is somewhat pleasant	2	Bike ride is somewhat pleasant	2	Walk is somewhat pleasant	2
Quality of Walk/Bike Ride	Walk is not pleasant	1	Bike ride is not pleasant	1	Walk is not pleasant	1
	How is the environment? Are you walki	ng next to a busy	How is the environment? Are you bid	cycling next to a	How is the environment? Are you wa	Iking next to a busy
	high speed roadway? Are you walking a	long a plaza that	busy high speed roadway? Are you us	sing a multi-use	high speed roadway? Are you walking	g along a plaza that
		Points Applies to?				
	Loss than 1/4 mile away	1 Dior 50 55-56				

Proximity to Colman Dock (Pier 52) -Washington State Ferries

1 011125	Applies to:
4	Pier 50, 55-56
3	Pier 46, 48
1	Pier 66, Pier 69
	4 3 1

Weights Applied to Metrics

Weights for Original								<u>Weights f</u>	or Revise	d Metho	dology								
and Revised		Walk/Bike Zones Analysis					Transit Zones Analysis												
<u>Methodologies</u> Passenger Volume Weight	Dis C	Walk stance to Centroid	Bike Distance to Centroid	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more	Composite Score based on Length of Bike Path and Grades of 2% or more	Number of steps that must be climbed in Pedestrian Path	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Number of intersections in Bike Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	f Safety of Bike Ride	Quality of Bike Ride	Distance to Transit Access Point	Composite Score based on Length of Pedestrian Path and Grades of 2% or more	Number of steps that must be climbed	Number of intersections in Pedestrian Path	Safety of Walk	Quality of Walk	Colman Dock Weight
2		2	2	2	2	. 2	! 1	L	1	2 1	L 2	2 1	3	2	2 2	. 1		2 1	4

APPENDIX G

IN-WATER LAYOUTS



11/25/2020 11:49:46 AM

<u>NOTES</u>

- SIDE-LOADING OR BOW-LOADING AT EACH LOCATION
- PERPENDICULAR MOORING
 2-WAY TRAFFIC



В	PROJECT NO. 2000378	REFERENCE SHEET
	DATE	
ANDING ANAL 1313	11/25/20	SKETCH NO.
	BY	
	NAP	SK-041



11/25/2020 11:49:45 AM

<u>NOTES</u>

- SIDE-LOADING OR BOW-LOADING AT EACH LOCATION
- ANGLED MOORING
 2-WAY TRAFFIC



В	PROJECT NO. 2000378	REFERENCE SHEET			
	DATE				
ANDING ANAL 1313	11/25/20	SKETCH NO.			
	BY	01/ 024			
	NAP	SK-031			