BOATING ACCESS & PUBLIC FACILITIES PLAN

Adopted by the Port of Everett Commission by Resolution 968 on February 14, 2012
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I. CONTEXT & HISTORY OF THE PORT OF EVERETT

The Port of Everett was created in 1918 and is situated on Port Gardner Bay at the mouth of the Snohomish River; 28 miles north of Seattle and 83 miles south of the Canadian border. The Port District of Everett encompasses approximately 45 square miles stretching from Ebey Slough on the north and east, Port Gardner Bay on the west and approximately 112th Street on the south. The District includes portions of western Snohomish County, including the City of Everett, half of the City of Mukilteo as well as portions of unincorporated Snohomish County. This breakdown is shown in Figure 1 below.

![Figure 1 - Port of Everett District boundaries. The Port’s three elected commissioners represent one of these districts.](image)

Between 1890 and 1905, much of the early harbor development was influenced by activities carried out by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), including river improvements, maintenance dredging, and dredged material disposal. Between 1900 and 1918, harborfront development activities were predominantly private ventures, with many improvements financed by individual companies.

The Port of Everett was created and established by voters in July 1918 to promote shipping, trade and timber industries. As defined by state law, the primary role of a port district in Washington State is to provide economic development opportunities within local, regional, and international markets. Per this legal mandate, the Port has played an important role in the economic vitality of the City of Everett, Snohomish County and the Puget Sound region.

Port acquisitions began immediately after the Port’s creation in 1918. The first purchases included tracts of tidal land and upland properties along the Everett waterfront from the Everett Land Company, which was the major private developer in Everett’s early years. Since that time, the Port has acquired approximately 350 acres of property
and constructed a number of improvements, including facilities for deep-water marine
cargo terminals, marine facilities, properties for industrial development, including
facilities for public use on the waterfront. The Port’s harborfront area from South
Terminal to Preston Point now contains approximately 3,000 acres (including mudflats
and Jetty Island), approximately 950 of which can be developed. Today, the Port
handles exports of oil field and gold mining equipment, heavy machinery, containers,
windmill blades, timber products and other general purpose cargo. Currently imports
include aerospace parts for The Boeing Company, cement, heavy machinery, windmill
blades and transformers.

II. PURPOSE
The Port of Everett Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan serves as a policy
framework guiding the Port Commission related to boating access and public facilities
and to aid in the pursuit of grant funding. The Plan is not intended to limit the Port
exclusively to the specific projects listed in this plan. However, should opportunities
arise that further the objectives of this plan, the Port may choose to pursue those
opportunities. Generally a thorough review of the Plan is done every five to six years to
ensure the Plan remains current, maintains its effectiveness and eligibility and reflects
the Port District’s needs.

III. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
The following goals and objectives have been derived from existing Port planning
documents: the Port of Everett’s 2004-2007 Strategic Plan, and the Port’s
Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements and Final EIS, August 14, 1995.
Furthermore, the Port conducted sustainable strategic planning exercises during 2011,
which also influenced the goals and objectives. While many of these goals were met
during the previous planning period, the goals listed below still apply to the Port moving
forward.

Goal 1 – Align the Port’s policies and strategies with the City of Everett’s Shoreline
Public Access Plan to promote public access and boating recreation through coordinated
infrastructure and redevelopment projects.

Objectives:
- Support implementation of those plan elements identified in the City of Everett’s
  Shoreline Public Access Plan involving public access and boating recreation.
- Develop new boating access projects that provide for further boating recreation
  needs in the area, especially the need for transient/guest moorage.
- Develop new public facilities projects that provide for increased public use along
  the shoreline, such as recreational and waterfront uses.

Goal 2 – Manage the Port’s publicly accessible properties as high-quality facilities that
provide quality public access to the waterfront and to boating recreation facilities.

Objectives:
- Continue to expand and improve opportunities for public facilities on the
  waterfront and boating activities, by budgeting for and effectively using the Port’s
  2 percent for public access policy.
- Identify potential waterfront conflicts in future development proposals and resolve
  them in the context of City and Port plans.
Goal 3 – Incorporate public outreach, communication and community engagement as a critical element in the Port’s activities.

**Objectives:**
- On an ongoing basis, engage and involve key stakeholders in the Port’s planning efforts, including the City of Everett, neighbors, customers and tenants, business community, local public agencies, facility users and Port employees.
- Increase public awareness of the Port and the recreational opportunities for the boating and public citizen groups in the area.


**Objectives:**
- **Economic** – Budget for Best Management Practices and application; study if certification improves market position.
- **Environmental** – Implement BMPs, such as oil spill kits, recycle stations, disposal sites.
- **Community** – Continue public information on environmental programs; continue partnerships on clean up and environmental events.

Goal 5 – Maintain marina occupancy in 2011 and increase by three percent in 2012 with an overall 3-year goal of six percent by 2013.

**Objectives:**
- **Economic** – Develop initiatives to attract diversified users; increase occupancy through policies that improve financial margin.
- **Environmental** – Occupancy rate increases without impacting water quality levels; improve habitat to extent feasible.
- **Community** – Market marina facilities to permanent slip-holders/visitors; engage stakeholders; add amenities.

**Note** – Goals 4 and 5 are a result of the sustainable strategic planning exercises Port staff conducted during 2011. These goals take a special look and approach toward the Port’s triple bottom line impacts – Economic, Environmental and Community.

IV. INVENTORY
EXISTING BOATING ACCESS AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

The Port of Everett’s central waterfront has served as the focal point for marine activities in the region for more than 100 years. While providing an important economic benefit, it also provides important public amenities. The Port maintains the largest public marina on the West Coast, which encompasses a total of 2,330 slips, including substantial guest moorage facilities.

A figure depicting the current boating access and public facilities inventory can be seen in Appendix A.

North & South Marina
**Facility Description**
The Port of Everett North and South Marina is a full-service marina providing moorage space for approximately 2,110 vessels. The marina offers 20’–50’ open moorage with moorage at the ends of the docks up to 106’; 28’–50’ slips for covered moorage, as well as Port-owned and privately owned boathouses. While the marina is predominantly recreational, moorage space is also available for commercial fishing vessels, ranging
from 32' to 65' in length. Both marina facilities are surrounded by waterfront walkways and amenities. Current amenities include a hotel, retail offices, dining restaurants, café shops and restroom facilities for slipholders.

In addition to the slip accommodations listed above, the North Marina Visitor Dock has up to fifteen 40-foot slips available on the east side and 270 feet on the west side of the dock for use by visiting boaters.

The South Marina Visitor Dock provides 1,750 feet for visitor side tie-in only.

Along the eastern boundary of the marina, the Port’s Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) float provides a total of 218 feet of dock space for marina guests.

![Figure 2 - Port of Everett South Marina](image)

**Primary Use**
The North and South Marina are used for moorage of recreational and commercial vessels. They are also used to promote tourism throughout the city by offering a large number of guest slips for visiting boaters.

**Condition**
The North Marina was constructed in the 1960s, and the South Marina addition was constructed in the late 1970s. Both facilities are showing expected wear and tear. Significant capital improvements are planned in the future to update deteriorating docks and infrastructure in the South Marina. This construction includes covered moorage roof replacement, utility upgrades and float resurfacing work, among other projects. The Port is developing a Marina District Master Plan that concurrently looks at in-water boating needs and upland facilities that can both support the marina and provide the community recreational amenities on the waterfront.

**12th Street Yacht Basin**
**Facility Description**
The Port opened its new 12th Street Yacht basin in June 2007. This new 220-slip marina caters to yacht-class vessels, and includes a mix of permanent and transient moorage. Slips range from 40 to 70 feet in length with end ties up to 143 feet. This marina facility is served by the Craftsman District which includes a new, environmentally-friendly boatyard and is served by a 75-ton Travellift and vessel pressure washdown area. Use of the boatyard is open for the public’s use.
The 12\textsuperscript{th} Street Yacht Basin has two visitor docks:

- A-Dock, located on the west side of the marina is available for side tie vessels only and has 938 lineal feet available.
- J-Dock, located on the southern border has fifteen 40-foot slips and eighteen 50-foot slips available. The north side of the dock provides 139 feet of side tie slips, with 1,032 feet of side tie slips available on the south side of the dock.

![Figure 3 - 12\textsuperscript{th} Street Yacht Basin](image)

**Primary Use**

As mentioned above, the primary use of the 12\textsuperscript{th} Street Yacht Basin is to provide moorage for larger recreational vessels, and offer shore side Travelift and boatyard amenities. Guest slips are available to the public at A and J docks within the basin, providing an additional avenue of public waterfront access.

**Condition**

The 12\textsuperscript{th} Street Yacht Basin is a new facility, so there are no immediate plans for large upgrades or alterations.

**10\textsuperscript{th} Street Boat Launch and Marine Park**

**Facility Description**

The 10\textsuperscript{th} Street Boat Launch and Marine Park opened in 1976 and occupies approximately 20 acres at the northern end of the waterfront. The property is tri-owned with the Port, City of Everett, and Snohomish County. The Port of Everett is responsible for maintaining and operating the boat launch and park. The facility currently contains 13 public boat launch ramps and guest moorage floats. It provides paved parking for approximately 300 vehicles with boat trailers, along with a significant amount of unpaved overflow boat trailer parking during peak use periods. A small waterfront park has been developed south of the boat launch area with a separate parking area for approximately 50 vehicles. Guest moorage is available along the western most docks of the boat launch basin. The 10\textsuperscript{th} Street Boat Launch is the largest public launch in the Puget Sound, and serves as the access point for the Port’s Jetty Island. This island is a recreational and environmental asset.
Primary Use
This area is primarily used for public access, recreational boating and access to Jetty Island. During the annual Jetty Island Days the westernmost dock of the boat launch facility is used for the loading and unloading of anxious island goers during the summer months.

Future Plans
The Port of Everett is leading the planning effort with City and County staff to improve the 10th Street Marine Park by upgrading it to a user friendly and attractive recreational destination. Currently, the park consists of picnic tables, open space, visitor floats, the Jetty Island ticket booth, and restrooms.

Mukilteo Public Access Dock
Facility Description
The Port of Everett owns, operates and maintains a public access dock located in the City of Mukilteo adjacent to the Washington State Mukilteo Ferry Terminal.

Primary Use
The public access dock is primarily for recreational uses. These uses include sightseeing, crabbing and fishing.

Future Plans
In 2012, the Port plans to perform guide pile replacement work at the dock. It should be noted that the future of the public access dock may be influenced by the decision Washington State Ferries makes on the preferred alternative for the future of the Mukilteo Ferry Terminal.

Jetty Island
Facility Description
Jetty Island was created with clean sands dredged from the Snohomish River Navigation Channel from about 1900 through the early 1970s. The island is owned by the Port of
Everett and acts as a breakwater that separates Port Gardner and Possession Sound from the Navigation Channel. Jetty Island is both an environmental and recreational asset to the community, and is open to the public all year. Since the island can only be accessed via boat to a public dock, the City of Everett and the Port of Everett partner to provide the Jetty Island Days program that provides free ferry service to the island during the summer. In 2011 50,000 people visited Jetty Island during this 2½ month program.

![Jetty Island west side beach](image)

**Figure 5 – Jetty Island west side beach**

**Primary Use**
Jetty Island provides high quality habitat for a wide variety of plants and animals including several threatened species. A plethora of shorebirds, waterfowl, and raptors are seasonally abundant and use by juvenile salmon, forage fish and Dungeness crab is high. The island also provides a variety of recreational opportunities, including supervised and unsupervised beach recreation, environmental education, and bird watching. Portions of Jetty Island serve as placement locations for clean dredge sediment from the Army Corps of Engineers maintenance dredging program of the Snohomish River Navigation Channel. This beneficial use of the dredge material enhances shoreline habitat.

**Condition**
In December 2006, the Port Commission adopted the Jetty Island Management Plan. Through this plan, the Port reaffirmed its goals to maintain the island as a public recreational facility that also serves as a tool that teaches the importance of wildlife preservation of the island and the nearby Snohomish River estuary. Continuous work is being done to improve and expand the island's wildlife habitat. The Port and People for Puget Sound have partnered on monitoring, enhancement, and education events on Jetty Island. The Port is also working to expand the island to the south with dredge sands from the Army Corps of Engineers Snohomish River maintenance dredging efforts.

**Waterfront Trails**

**Primary Use and Future Plans**
The Port of Everett has recently constructed new public walking trails along the waterfront in the Marina District. This addition ties into 4-miles of trails that span from the Port’s Pigeon Creek Public Access Trail bordering the deepwater marine terminals,
north along the waterfront, passing the new Fisherman's Tribute Plaza and running to the 10th Street Boat Launch and Marine Park.

The Port recently completed the newest stretch of trails that wind along the North Marina uplands. The Port partners with the City of Everett and other community groups to offer a wide-variety of activities and events along these marina walkways and open spaces. These include the annual Fresh Paint Festival, Waterfront Concert Series, Farmers Market, the Holiday on the Bay Celebration and more. These trails provide access to the public waterfront for the public and help support the earlier referenced public events.

A graphic showing the Port's waterfront events and activities may be found in Appendix B.

Figure 6 - Fisherman's Tribute Plaza

Figure 7 - Marina District walking trails
V. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

This plan constitutes the Port of Everett's update to the original Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan, adopted May 2004. Coinciding with the public involvement process of the original plan, the Port still fashion its pertinent policies to align with the plan elements of the City of Everett's Shoreline Public Access Plan. Due to the high amount of public input received during the City's Shoreline Master Program update, it was determined that a standalone document was necessary. So, in November 2003 the City of Everett's Shoreline Public Access Plan was adopted, reaffirming the public's interest in the provision of waterfront access.

The Port of Everett has conducted its own public involvement process as part of the development of its Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan (BAPFP). That process included the following:

- An article on the BAPFP was included in the Port's Port Side Newsletter. The Port Side is mailed to all residences and businesses in the Port district, numbering more than 50,000 mailings.
- A BAPFP dedicated page on the Port's website provides information toward the purpose of the plan. It also gives a link to survey questions asking specific items as they relate to the Port’s current inventory, their uses and what the public feels may be warranted in the future. The link to this website and survey questionnaire was also listed in the Port Side article. Comments received included the desire to enlarge the Jetty Island dock which would allow more boats to visit the island at one time.
- The Marina Newsletter published the information, as detailed on the Port’s website, also providing the link to the survey questions.
- Port staff continues to meet with City of Everett and Snohomish County staff to discuss future RCO grant opportunities for shared ownership improvements at the 10th Street Boat Launch and Marine Park facility.
- A SEPA Notice of a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) for this plan was prepared and issued by the Port of Everett on January 24, 2012. The SEPA public comment period comprised 14 days, concluding on February 7, 2012.
- The BAPFP update was presented to the Port Commission in a public meeting forum on February 14, 2012 and adopted at the presentation conclusion. An opportunity for public comments was allowed at this Commission meeting.

It should be noted that in 2010, the Port of Everett hired Hebert Research, Inc. to embark on a wide ranging statistical analysis of the Port's marina and related facilities. Their finished product, titled Marina Demand Survey and Forecast, can be seen in Appendix G. While not directly related to the Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan, the efforts and goals of this research project correlate to the broader message.

To acquire valuable statistics for the project, Hebert Research conducted the following, but not limited to:

- Formed two separate focus groups comprised of current marina tenants and non-tenants, respectively. The focus groups provided feedback concerning steps the Port could take to improve customer satisfaction and occupancy rates, among other subjects.
- Hebert Research polled tenants and facility users at the 10th Street Boat Launch on multiple aspects over the course of two weekends. Some of those aspects included roughly, but are not limited to:
  - Describe the facilities you have used at the Port of Everett and your subsequent satisfaction.
  - What areas in the marina could benefit from new services and amenities?
  - How long have you been a boater and do you plan on purchasing a boat in the near future?
  - What can the Port do to make your experience more satisfactory?

Hebert Research then performed statistical analyses on their findings which yielded market research reports on the state of boating in the area and public outreach efforts listing the opinions of facility users, and other interested partners. Results from a handful of analyses are included in the forthcoming Demand and Need Analysis.

Similar to the Hebert Research Group's production of the Marina Demand Survey and Forecast, the Port Commission, in September 2011 directed staff to begin a "Marina District Master Plan" process. This master planning is guided to look at the in-water marina needs as well as the adjacent uplands to harmonize future upgrades and new development between those two zones.

An Ad Hoc committee was created to help set the needs and parameters of the formal planning process. These needs and parameters would provide guidance for the future consultant team charged with fulfilling the tasks. The Ad Hoc committee included representatives from the business community, waterfront users, real estate, boaters, construction, and the tourism industry.

During the summer months the Ad Hoc committee conducted formal meetings, site walks and roundtable conversations discussing the needs of the Marina District. The range of needs spanned from public amenities, to upland uses, in-water needs, site way-finding and housing, among others.

The final deliverable from the Ad Hoc committee, Report to the Everett Port Commission is attached in Appendix H.

VI. DEMAND AND NEED ANALYSIS
The following reports, surveys and public outreach methods were used to determine the demand and needs for public access and boating facilities in Washington State.

Washington Boater Needs Assessment
Introduction
An independent assessment of Washington State boaters' needs was conducted for the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) in 2007. The study included focus groups of boating services providers, a telephone survey of boating services providers, a telephone survey of the general public in Washington, and a telephone survey of registered boaters in Washington.

The Port of Everett is located in Snohomish County which ranked fourth among the counties in Washington State where respondents said they used motorized boats of 26 feet and less the most days in the past two years. Snohomish County also ranked in the
top six counties where respondents said they prefer to boat using motorized boats 26 feet and larger.

Snohomish County is ranked in the top four counties for respondents who paddle the most days in the past two years.

Snohomish County is one of the top two preferred counties for hand powered boating (excluding canoeists and kayakers).

The Port of Everett Marina has direct access to Puget Sound, the number one choice of body of water for all boaters for the most days in the past two years.

Recommendations
The study recommends considering the following ten topic areas.

Funding
There is an immediate need for additional funding for boating services and programs in Washington State. This includes law enforcement, education as well as additions and improvements to boating facilities. Additions and improvements include access, dock improvements, launch ramps and parking. Support facilities needed include fish cleaning stations and restrooms.

Boating Safety
Providers expressed boater safety as being the top rated service where they would like to see more time and money invested. Boaters also stated safety concerns for paddlers, sailboats, and hand powered craft other than canoes and kayaks. Boating safety is high on the list boaters are interested in.

Access
Both providers and users consider access as a major need affecting boating in Washington State. There is a need to improve and provide additional boat launches. The majority of respondents indicated the need for more boat launch ramps in their area plus improved management of boat launches.

Launches and Facilities Upkeep
Boating providers and users strongly agree that maintaining the existing access sites and launch ramps are more important than providing new launch ramp facilities. Providers stated support facilities that need to be improved include restrooms and parking areas. Boaters would like to see launch ramps improved followed by restrooms, mooring buoys or docks and day use parking areas.

Launches and Facilities Development
Providers and boaters would like to see more of the following facilities in their areas: launch ramps and additional parking ranked at the top followed by docks, pump-out stations, restrooms, courtesy tie-ups, dump stations, mooring buoys and camp sites.

Agency Administration and Coordination of Boating
With multiple agencies' administering boating programs and services in the state there is a fragmented perception of services. There needs to be continued coordination and communication among agencies; outside stakeholders and boating service providers
should be consulted as well. Law enforcement agencies also need better communication since enforcement responsibility is spread among several agencies.

**Increased Law Enforcement**
Providers indicated more money and time should be allocated to boating safety and law enforcement. Boaters stated that law enforcement was insufficient on the water.

**Information and Education Programs**
More than half of the boating providers said publications and information should be an on-going process, with safety being the first message. Providers believe safety information should be available in the field vs. a classroom and in a variety of formats such as kiosks, pamphlets and handouts. Boaters indicated they would like to receive information on ramps, marinas, maps and charts, general safety, boating rules and regulations, fishing, wildlife and boating programs.

**RCO Grant Process**
It is recommended RCO use the results of this study to set priorities for the Boating Facilities Program and Boating Activities Program. RCO may want to consider requests for proposals as part of the grant process to better state the office’s objectives.

**Environmental Issues**
Providers are more concerned with Washington’s environmental issues than boaters. Both enforcement personnel and boaters should be knowledgeable of environmental issues before there is a crisis. Many environmental concerns include invasive species, water quality and pollution from boaters. Agencies should increase environmental information and education efforts by establishing a communication plan for distributing this information.

**PORT OF EVERETT DEMAND AND NEED ANALYSIS**

The purpose of this additional analysis is to identify types of public facilities and boating access options that are most needed by the Port of Everett and the public, and to demonstrate the methodology used in determining what construction/maintenance projects should be included in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), discussed on page 20 and contained in Appendix C of this plan.

The following analysis is primarily intended to determine the demand for boat moorage and other boating facilities at the Port of Everett. However, the analysis will also examine:

- Marina and upland improvements that may increase future moorage demand or contribute to the retention of current marina tenants.
- Access to the waterfront.
- Recreation and open space amenities.
- Habitat restoration

The need for specific facilities or improvements is identified through a variety of sources, depending on the type of facility or improvement. For all types of improvements, the Port's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is the primary method for proposing, evaluating, and prioritizing the need for future projects. Demand for future moorage is determined by comparing projected moorage demand trends against existing marina
infrastructure. Surveys of marina users or potential marina users identify the demand for potential future projects. Repair and renovation projects are generally developed to address deficiencies in the condition or capacity of existing Port facilities. Public access and habitat restoration projects respond to needs that are in line with the City of Everett's Shoreline Public Access Plan. Recreation and open space projects address the need to complete aspects of previously planned projects, improve existing infrastructure to accommodate growing demand, or provide additional types of facilities that meet a diverse set of needs.

CIP Prioritization Process
Proposed projects that are part of the Port's CIP, including the projects listed in Appendix C, were evaluated using a prioritization process developed by the Port of Everett. Potential projects are evaluated and graded using the Risk - Benefit Analysis chart shown in Figure 8 below. Each project is assigned a score along the X and Y axis. The X axis identifies the relative consequences if a proposed project was not to occur, and the Y axis identifies the relative likelihood a facility will fail if the proposed project is not performed. A higher score along the X axis indicates greater consequences, should the project not take place; a higher score along the Y axis indicates a greater likelihood the project may physically take place. The resulting position in the matrix indicates the overall risk and importance associated with the project, ranging from light yellow being low risk to dark orange being high risk. The resulting risk figure gives the project a quantitative priority that can be judged against other projects.

Port Staff prepares this matrix on an annual basis in preparation for the annual CIP budgeting and update process. This methodology provides the staff with a technique to quantify projects based on their priorities and risks. Following this prioritization process, Port staff presents the CIP projects to the Port Commission during a public meeting. After reviewing the projects and receiving comments from the public, the Commission will vote on these projects as part of the upcoming year's budgeted CIP.
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consequences**

- **Low**
- **Medium**
- **High**
- **High**

**Risk Key:**

| 1-8 | 9-13 | 14-19 | 20-25 |

* "Likelihood" means what is the likelihood of being able to execute the proposed action.

** "Consequences" means how great the consequences would be if the proposed action does not occur or fails.

**Figure 8 – Port of Everett Risk Analysis**

Source: Port of Everett 2010

### In-Water Boating Facilities

The following is a discussion of specific data used to determine the demand for in-water boating facilities and upland boating-related facilities. A source of data for the analysis is the “Marina Demand Survey and Forecast” produced for the Port by Hebert Research Inc., dated September 2010. Existing moorage supply and occupancy data was provided by the Port. This analysis lists existing moorage supply and occupancy, reviews forecasted demand for moorage, and identifies gaps that need to be addressed in order to meet future demand.

### Existing Moorage Supply and Occupancy

**Figure 9** summarizes the number of open and covered slips, as well as slip sizes in the North, South, and 12th Street Marina’s. The number of vacant slips, and slip occupancy rates are also listed. These rates were derived from moorage availability data from August 2010, which roughly represents the peak moorage demand for that year. Moorage demand in any given year fluctuates seasonally, with peak demand occurring during the summer. Due to the current economic climate, current moorage demand has declined over the past five years. Potential future demand is discussed in the next section.

The Port of Everett has 1,969 total permanent slips, including 384 covered slips. Slip length ranges from 20 to 70 feet, with end ties up to 143 feet. There are 463 28-foot slips, making that the most common slip size. A total of 1,618 slips, or 82 percent of all permanent slips, are between 24 and 40 feet.

Demand is generally highest for slips in this size range as well, with several sizes requiring waiting lists. There is also high demand for slip sizes outside of this range.
The lowest demand exists for the larger slip sizes. However, these sizes represent a relatively small proportion of the total slip mix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slip Size/Type</th>
<th>Number of Slips</th>
<th>Number of Vacancies</th>
<th>% Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20' Open</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24' Open</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26' Open</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28' Open</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32' Open</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36' Open</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40' Open</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50' Open</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55' - 70' Open</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54' - 96' End Ties</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Open</strong></td>
<td><strong>1429</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | Covered         |                     |            |
|                |                 |                     |            |
| 28' Covered    | 60              | 9                   | 85%        |
| 30' Covered    | 60              | 0                   | 100%       |
| 32' Covered    | 78              | 27                  | 65%        |
| 36' Covered    | 64              | 26                  | 59%        |
| 40' Covered    | 40              | 13                  | 68%        |
| 40' POE Boathouse | 46          | 6                   | 87%        |
| 50' Covered    | 36              | 7                   | 81%        |
| **Total Covered** | **384**        | **88**              | **77%**    |

|                | 12th Street     |                     |            |
|                |                 |                     |            |
| 40'           | 32              | 0                   | 100%       |
| 45'           | 32              | 1                   | 97%        |
| 50'           | 29              | 0                   | 100%       |
| 55'           | 14              | 4                   | 71%        |
| 60'           | 12              | 4                   | 67%        |
| 65' Double    | 12              | 10                  | 17%        |
| 65' Single    | 10              | 6                   | 40%        |
| 70'           | 10              | 6                   | 40%        |
| 93' - 143' End Ties | 5            | 3                   | 40%       |
| **Total 12th Street** | **156**        | **34**              | **78%**    |
| **Total in Marina** | **1969**       | **323**             | **84%**    |

*Figure 9 – Existing Moorage Supply and Occupancy
Source: 8.05.10 Marina Moorage Availability List.*

As previously mentioned the existing supply and demand for slips within the 24- to 40-foot range corresponds to the most prevalent boat lengths of current tenants, as shown in *Figure 10*, with nearly 75 percent of those surveyed owning boats within this size range.
Figure 10 – Length of Boat Owned
Source: Port of Everett Marina: Marina Demand Survey and Forecast Executive Summary, Hebert Research, 2010.

This size range is appropriate given the prevalence of sailboats among tenants, with cabin cruisers being the second most common boat type, as shown in Figure 11. Boats that tend to be larger, such as motor yachts, are not as commonly represented among marina tenants.

Figure 11 – Type of Boat Owned
Source: Port of Everett Marina: Marina Demand Survey and Forecast Executive Summary, Hebert Research, 2010.
Moorage Demand Forecast
Hebert Research used an economic model to forecast moorage demand through 2020 using 3 percent and 5 percent growth rates. Demand was projected for slips of various lengths, for open and covered moorage, and for moorage within the 12th Street Yacht Basin. Assuming a more conservative 3 percent growth rate, overall moorage demand is not expected to rise back to 2005 levels until the mid- to late-2010s. The 5 percent growth rate forecasts demand to reach 2005 levels several years sooner.

At 3% growth, the demand for several slip sizes is expected to meet or exceed current supply, resulting in a waiting list within the 2011 – 2017 planning period for this plan. Those slip sizes are 32', 36', 40', 50', over 55-foot open slips, all of the current covered slip sizes, and 40', 45', 50', 55', and over 93-foot slips in the 12th Street Yacht Basin. Figures 12-14 summarize the projected demand for slips assuming 3 percent growth.

**Demand for Open Slips, 2005-2020 (3% Growth)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20'</th>
<th>24'</th>
<th>26'</th>
<th>28'</th>
<th>32'</th>
<th>36'</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>55'+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 12 – Demand for Open Slips, 2005-2020 (3% Growth)*
Source: Port of Everett Marina: Marina Demand Survey and Forecast Executive Summary, Hebert Research, 2010.
### Demand for Covered Slips, 2005-2020 (3% Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>28'</th>
<th>30'</th>
<th>32'</th>
<th>36'</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>B/H</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>Total Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 13 – Demand for Covered Slips, 2005-2020 (3% Growth)*

*Source: Port of Everett Marina: Marina Demand Survey and Forecast Executive Summary, Hebert Research, 2010.*
Demand for 12th Street Marina Slips, 2008-2020 (3% Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>45'</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>55'</th>
<th>60'</th>
<th>65' D.</th>
<th>65' S.</th>
<th>70'</th>
<th>93'+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14 – Demand for 12th Street Marina Slips, 2005-2020 (3% Growth)
Source: Port of Everett Marina: Marina Demand Survey and Forecast Executive Summary, Hebert Research, 2010.

Factors Affecting Moorage Demand
A number of factors will affect future moorage demand. These include broader economic factors such as unemployment, housing prices, and boat sales. Also affecting demand are actions taken by the Port. Moorage rates have the greatest influence on future demand; however, marina improvements and the institution of policies and programs may increase future demand. The Hebert Research study reported significant interest in seasonal and short-term moorage programs as well as a slip-exchange program. The study also reported that improvements such as a grocery store, grab-and-go restaurant, and the availability of Wi-Fi (wireless high speed internet) may increase future demand or increase retention of current tenants.

Given the projected demand demonstrated above, some adjustment of the current slip mix may be warranted to provide more slips, particularly those in the 30 to 50-foot range, and covered slips of all sizes.

Upland Boating Related Facilities
The Hebert Research Study surveyed tenants and non-tenants regarding potential marina improvements that may attract more tenants or retain current users. General maintenance, particularly in the South Marina, improving the condition of the floats, and electrical improvements were commonly cited. Upland improvements such as the availability of dining and shopping options and other upland amenities were also common responses. Increased availability of seasonal and short-term moorage was commonly cited by non-tenants as a factor that might attract additional users. Improved
parking and signage, security, cleanliness, availability of carts on docks, and additional pump-out services were some of the other recommendations.

Specific upland projects have been identified in the Port's overall CIP budgeting for future years. They have also been identified as a result of facilities surveys, or during other studies conducted by the Port, which are described in further detail below.

**Facilities Surveys**
A Condition Assessment of the Marina was performed by Moffatt and Nichol Consultant Group in 2005. This assessment examined the physical condition of floats and docks within the marina. In addition to this assessment, informal staff visual inspections of Port facilities and infrastructure reveal repair or renovation needs as well. The Port continues to use these formal and informal evaluations to guide the development of future projects, which may then go through the CIP prioritization process described earlier.

**Boatyard Demand Study**
In 2009, the Port commissioned a demand study for additional boatyard capacity, completed by BST Associates. The study found that the two boatyards in Snohomish County (in Everett and Edmonds, respectively), had a higher slip-to-boatyard capacity ratio than the average for the northeast Puget Sound region. Figure 15 summarizes these findings. The product of this study shows that Snohomish County's boatyard capacity is underserved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Marina Slips</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Est Boat Capacity</th>
<th>Slips per Boat Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Island County</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit County</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom County</td>
<td>3,463</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15 – Boatyard Capacity by County
Source: BST Associates

Based on the outcomes from this study, the Port is expanding and improving the existing Craftsman District Boatyard to increase boatyard capacity, addressing this need within Snohomish County.

**VII. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**
On November 29, 2011, the Port of Everett Commission adopted the latest Capital Improvement Program covering the years 2012-2016. For the purposes of this plan's use, potential grant eligible projects have been listed in Appendix C. They have been categorized based on funding calendar year. For example, projects with funding in 2012 have been itemized first, with projects for 2013 next in line and so forth. Funding levels
and a brief description of the projects are provided. **Appendix D** provides a graphic showing the layout of these future grant and public projects.

Projects listed in the CIP program have been identified through tools such as the Risk Analysis exercise chart as referenced in the Demand and Need Analysis and through activities like the Ad Hoc Committee’s report to the Port Commission. For example, some of their recommendations such as public restroom facility upgrades have been identified and slotted into the CIP.

The intent of these projects is to meet the strategic needs of the Port, including the goals and objectives stated earlier in this plan. Furthermore, these projects aim to meet the goals of the City of Everett’s *Shoreline Public Access Plan* which is in concert with the requirements of Washington State’s Shoreline Management Act and their own Shoreline Master Program.

**VIII. PLAN ADOPTION**

A formal resolution was adopted by the Port of Everett on February 14, 2012. A copy will be provided in **Appendix J** (to be attached post-adoption).
APPENDIX A
Existing Port of Everett Boating Access & Public Facilities graphic (attached).
APPENDIX B

Existing *Port of Everett Waterfront Events & Activities* graphic (attached).
APPENDIX C

Port of Everett Capital Improvement Program Projects 2012-2016 (attached).
Port of Everett
Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan

Future Projects
* Funding based on 2012 Port of Everett Budget, adopted 11/29/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIP No.</td>
<td>2-0-029-01</td>
<td>2-0-032-01</td>
<td>2-0-039-01</td>
<td>M4-2011</td>
<td>3-0-013-01</td>
<td>5-0-007-01</td>
<td>PA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding In*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$130,000.00</td>
<td>$1,175,000.00</td>
<td>$115,000.00</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>$335,000.00</td>
<td>$81,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$134,000.00</td>
<td>$1,020,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$134,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$134,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Replace damaged concrete float surfaces.</td>
<td>Maintenance dredging of the Port's existing North and South Marina basins, in phases.</td>
<td>Refurbish shower walls, lighting and fixtures.</td>
<td>Purchase and install a temporary restroom facility to serve guest moorage at J-Dock in the 12th Street Yacht Basin.</td>
<td>Planning, design and implementation of an Interpretive Program for the history of the lumber and shingle, commercial fishing and boat building industries on the North Marina Redevelopment site.</td>
<td>The purpose of this project is to re-align the downstream settling basin of the federal Snohomish River navigation channel in order to intercept riverine sediment at a more optimal location.</td>
<td>Replace existing worn timber guide piles with new steel guide piles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Eligible</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Public Benefit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Boat Launch Asphalt Improvements</td>
<td>Fuel Dock Expansion</td>
<td>South Marina Visitor Dock Replacement</td>
<td>Marina Asphalt Repairs</td>
<td>Jetty Island Upgrades</td>
<td>Marine Park Improvements</td>
<td>Boat Launch-Rebuild Lane 13 Dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP No.</td>
<td>PA2-2011</td>
<td>2-0-029-01</td>
<td>2-0-034-01</td>
<td>2-0-035-01</td>
<td>5-0-005-01</td>
<td>5-0-006-01</td>
<td>PA-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding In*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$ 60,000.00</td>
<td>$ 60,000.00</td>
<td>$ 35,000.00</td>
<td>$ 124,000.00</td>
<td>$ 165,000.00</td>
<td>$ 315,000.00</td>
<td>$ 120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 190,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 128,000.00</td>
<td>$ 320,000.00</td>
<td>$ 585,000.00</td>
<td>$ 415,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 133,000.00</td>
<td>$ 210,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,240,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Replacement of selected asphalt areas in the Boat Launch parking and roadway areas serving the Marine Park and Boat Launch.</td>
<td>Extend fuel dock southward, add east/west float with high speed diesel pumps for large yacht access. Extend dock northward to merge with new public access float/pier.</td>
<td>Replace south guest float with a wider, deeper guest float.</td>
<td>This project will perform much needed upkeep of the asphalt roadways and parking areas in the South and North Marina.</td>
<td>Addition of welcome signage, replacement of the north log boom, a new log boom south of the dock, additional float space, renovation of existing docks and new upland amenities.</td>
<td>This project will enhance the Marine Park at the 10th Street Boat Launch for recreational boater and public use. The project includes park improvements and landscaping.</td>
<td>Rebuild concrete portions of the existing Lane 13 dock at the 10th St. Boat Launch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Eligible</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y (a portion of the public)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Public Benefit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Marine Park Restroom Refurbishment**</td>
<td>South Marina Picnic Shelter</td>
<td>Equator Shelter Improvements</td>
<td>Jetty Island Restroom Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP No.</td>
<td>PA1-2011</td>
<td>PA3-2011</td>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>M3-2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding In*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$ 50,000.00</td>
<td>$ 60,000.00</td>
<td>$ 35,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Refurbish roof, flashing, gutters,</td>
<td>Installation of a new</td>
<td>Upgrade signs, improve</td>
<td>Convert the Jetty Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interior and exterior lighting,</td>
<td>covered open-sided</td>
<td>fencing and enhance</td>
<td>floating restroom to a Fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wall, ventilation/heating system and</td>
<td>picnic shelter in the</td>
<td>landscaping around the</td>
<td>Dock store.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toilet area fixtures/dividers.</td>
<td>southwest area, adjacent</td>
<td>Equator shelter building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to the Marina Village and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>property boundary with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naval Station Everett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Eligible</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Public Benefit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: On an annual basis the Port Commission adopts a Capital Improvement Budget of public works projects for the upcoming calendar year. The CIP budget that is ultimately approved covers the next 5 calendar years. Projects and funds for those projects not scheduled for the upcoming calendar year are re-evaluated during the next budgeting process.

** Per the Note above, this individual project may incorporate a scope of work revision. Since this project is not budgeted for 2012, the scope and funds will be open for upgrades and changes in the next CIP budgeting process for 2013.
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The City of Everett Shoreline Public Access Plan is a reference document recognized by the Port of Everett. The Port supports increasing and enhancing public access to its boating and public facilities as identified.
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Port of Everett Marina: Demand Survey and Forecast Executive Summary
Prepared by Hebert Research
Research Goal and Objectives

Research Goal
The goal of this research was to identify causes of, and solutions to, the current problem of decreased occupancy at the Port of Everett Marina. Finding a comprehensive solution will involve retaining existing marina tenants as well as bringing new tenants to the marina. Therefore, the research has targeted two distinct groups: current tenants, and boaters who are not current tenants.

Previously, Hebert Research conducted two focus groups, consisting of tenant and non-tenants, respectively. The participants in these groups offered numerous ideas and suggestions on steps the Port of Everett Marina could take to improve tenant satisfaction and occupancy rates. Through the statistical sample, these suggestions can be empirically tested, and the most promising options can be identified.

Additionally, Hebert Research has prepared a forecast demand at the marina over a ten-year period. This forecast draws on historical occupancy data, economic trends, and survey responses to predict occupancy for the various slip types and sizes at the marina.

Research Objectives
The following objectives were addressed in this research:

1. Identified the current boating habits of both tenant and non-tenant participants:
   a. Length of time as a boater
   b. Type and size of boat owned
   c. Boating activities
   d. Previous moorage venue(s) used or considered
   e. For non-tenants, current boat storage venue and type

2. Identified the primary criteria used by both tenants and non-tenants in selecting a location to moor or store their boat.

3. Assessed former Port of Everett Marina tenants' reasons for initially choosing the marina, their satisfaction with the marina while tenants, and their reasons for eventually leaving.

4. Assessed tenants' overall satisfaction with the Port of Everett Marina, as well as their likelihood to continue mooring there.
5. Investigated what tenants and non-tenants believe to be the most significant change or improvement the Port of Everett Marina should make.

6. Gauged how important boaters believe various services and attributes to be in their selection of a marina.

7. For the same list of attributes, measured tenants' level of satisfaction with the Port of Everett Marina, as well as non-tenants' assessments of the marina's performance.

8. Investigated how interested both tenants and non-tenants would be in various changes, improvements and services being considered by the marina.

9. Analyzed whether responses to the above questions varied across sub-groups of the sample, such as boat length, boat type, overall satisfaction with the marina, and likelihood to remain at the marina.

10. Based on the primary research as well as historical occupancy and economic data, constructed a model to forecast demand for slips at the Port of Everett Marina over a 10 year period.
Research Methodology

Focus Group
This research draws on information gathered through two focus groups conducted by Hebert Research, which consisted of tenants and non-tenants, respectively. The focus groups were held at the Port of Everett Marina on July 21 (tenants) and August 5, 2010.

Sampling Frame
The sampling frame for this research consists of current moorage tenants at the Port of Everett Marina, as well as boaters who are not current tenants (some of whom are former tenants of the marina). For a total sample size of 200, the maximum margin of error at the 95% confidence level is ± 6.89%.

On-Site Recruitment
Hebert Research data collection personnel visited the Port of Everett Marina to recruit tenants, who volunteered to take the survey, which would be administered later by telephone. Recruitment took place on the weekends of July 17-18, and August 14-15, 2010.

Non-tenants were recruited at the Port of Everett Marina’s 10th Street Boat Launch, as well as the Port of Edmonds Marina and Shilshole Bay Marina in Seattle, all during the weekend of August 14-15, 2010. As with the tenants, these participants agreed to take the later telephone survey.

Survey Administration
The survey was administered to the volunteering participants via interactive voice by Hebert Research data collection personnel. Copies of the survey questionnaires are attached as appendices to this report.

Weighting
The population of non-tenants sampled has a higher proportion of smaller (under 24 foot) boats compared to the tenants. This is largely due to recruitment of trailerable boats at the Port of Everett’s boat launch. To avoid overemphasizing the responses from this group, non-tenant data was weighted according to boat length to match the distribution found for tenants.

Analysis
The data gathered was analyzed using well-accepted univariate measures of central tendency. Where appropriate, we have included descriptive statistics for continuous (quantifiable) responses. Means represents the average value of the responses. Standard deviation indicates
the level of variation in responses: for normally distributed data, approximately 2/3 of responses fall with one standard deviation above or below the mean. Skewness measures the level of symmetry in response: a positive skewness indicates that most responses fall on the left (low) side of the graph, and vice versa. Kurtosis measures the peakedness of the data: in a positive kurtosis distribution, there are pronounced peaks with high frequencies. If kurtosis is negative, responses are more evenly distributed throughout the range.

Multivariate analyses were conducted to determine whether responses to multiple questions are correlated. Data on the multivariate testing is reported only when significant trends were found on a given question. The multivariate analysis consisted of t-tests, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Chi Square tests, as appropriate for the variables being tested. The statistical procedures utilized were applied with a 95% confidence level for estimating values and/or providing significant inferences. Statistical significance is measured by a p-value; if p ≤ 0.05, the statistical test is significant; if p > 0.05, the statistical test is not significant. The null hypothesis that was tested was the mean ratings for various variables were similar (95% confidence level) regardless of age, gender, race, income, etc. We have also included measures of association (Eta² for ANOVA, and Cramer’s V for Chi Square). These measures indicate what proportion of the variance in the dependent variable is due to the independent variable being examined.

Hebert Research has made every effort to produce the highest quality research product possible within the agreed specifications, budget and time schedule. Hebert Research uses those statistical techniques which, in its opinion, are the most accurate possible. However, inherent in any statistical process is a possibility of error, which must be taken into account in evaluating the results. Statistical research can predict respondent attitudes and behavior only as of the time of the sampling, within the parameters of the project, and within the margin of error inherent within the techniques used.

Evaluations and interpretations of statistical research findings, and decisions based on them, are solely the responsibility of the customer and not that of Hebert Research. The conclusions, summaries and interpretations provided by Hebert Research are based strictly on the analysis of the data gathered and are not to be construed as recommendations. Therefore, Hebert Research neither warrants their viability nor assumes responsibility for the success or failure of any customer actions subsequently taken based on these findings.
Boating Habits

Length of Time as a Boater
Respondents in both groups tended to be long-time boaters, reporting an average boating career of just under 24 years. Relatively new boaters comprised a small portion of the sample, with 20% of tenants and 8.3% of non-tenants who have begun boating within the last 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time as a Boater (Years)</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>Non-Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>18.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenants</td>
<td>25.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Multivariate Analysis**

Analysis detected statistically significant differences on length of time as a boater based on boat length ($p < 0.001$, $Eta^2 = 0.107$). There is a strong correlation between the two: those with longer boats have consistently been boating longer than owners of smaller boats. This confirms the anecdotal observation that boaters tend to move up in boat size through their boating careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, statistically significant differences were found based on boat type ($p = 0.028$, $Eta^2 = 0.062$). Owners of motor yachts and sailboats tend to be the longest-tenured boaters, while smaller craft such as fishing boats and runabouts are typically owned by newer boaters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishing Boat</th>
<th>Runabout</th>
<th>Cabin Cruiser</th>
<th>Sailboat</th>
<th>Motor Yacht</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td>28.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of Boat Owned

Next, respondents were asked to select which of several categories best describes their boat. Almost two thirds (62.2%) of tenants owned a sailboat, with cabin cruisers (15.6%) and fishing boats (13.3%) splitting most of the remainder of boat types. The only tenant boat that did not fit into these categories was a "trawler."

For the non-tenants, sailboats were also the most common type of boat, but with a lower overall percentage of 55.9%. As with the tenants, cabin cruisers were the next most popular type (25.7%), followed by fishing boats (6.8%). Vessels categorized under "other" included the following:

- Bayboat
- Ranger Tug
- Express Cruiser
- Kayak
- Pontoon Boat
- Utility Boat (vintage craft)
**Length of Boat Owned**

The boats owned by respondents range from 14 to 60 feet. The mean length of tenants' boats was 31.96 feet.

As discussed in the introduction, non-tenant responses were weighted according to boat length to match the distribution for tenants. Thus, the post-weighting distribution for non-tenants is the same as for tenants.
**Most Common Boating Activity**

Respondents also reported what types of activities they most commonly use their boats for. Differences between tenants and non-tenants were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$, Cramer’s $V = 0.372$).

For tenants, responses were divided fairly evenly amongst the three possibilities offered. Day trips were the most popular choice with 42.2% of respondents, followed by overnight or longer trips (33.3%), while fishing was the least popular (24.1%).

For non-tenants, day trips were by far the most common boating activity (68.4%). Fishing and crabbing was the second most popular choice with 13.1%, while only 11.1% of non-tenants primarily use their boat for multi-day trips. A few non-tenants listed activities that did not fall into these categories, including:

- Racing
- Camping
- Beach Clean-Ups
- Run Charter Boats

---

**Most Common Boating Activities**

![Bar Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>Non-Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing/ Crabbing</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Trips</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight or Longer</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multivariate Analysis

As would be expected, there is a highly significant relationship between boat type and primary boating activity \( (p < 0.001, \text{Cramer’s } V = 0.442) \). All owners of fishing boats, and the majority of runabout owners, primarily use their craft to fish or crab. For cabin cruisers and sailboats, day trips are the most common activity. For the larger motor yachts the most common use is for multi-day excursions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fishing/Crabbing</th>
<th>Runabout</th>
<th>Cabin Cruiser</th>
<th>Sailboat</th>
<th>Motor Yacht</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing/Crabbing</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Trips</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight or Longer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar relationship exists based on boat length \( (p < 0.001, \text{Cramer’s } V = 0.262) \). Fishing is the most popular activity for the smallest class of boats. Among all boats over 24 feet in length, day trips are preferred by the majority of owners. Overnight or longer trips are a minority in all sizes, but are relatively common among boats over 40 feet (29.0%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Under 24'</th>
<th>24' to 29'</th>
<th>30' to 39'</th>
<th>40' +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing/Crabbing</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Trips</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight or Longer</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For tenants, there is a significant relationship between likelihood to remain at the Port of Everett and primary boating activity \( (p = 0.004, \text{Cramer’s } V = 0.279) \). Tenants with a moderate likelihood to stay primarily use their boats for overnight or longer trips, while those most likely to stay cite day trips as their most common activity. The group of low-likelihood tenants is small enough that the distribution of this column is not statistically meaningful.
Significant differences for primary boating activity were also found with respect to tenants' overall satisfaction at the marina ($p = 0.046$, Cramer's $V = 0.222$). Again, tenants who reported moderate satisfaction were most likely to go on overnight trips, while highly satisfied respondents trended towards day trips. The group of unsatisfied tenants is small enough that the distribution of this column is not statistically meaningful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>Low (1-3)</th>
<th>Mod (4-5)</th>
<th>High (6-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing/ Crabbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight or Longer</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purchase of New Boats

Likelihood to Purchase a New Boat
When asked to rate their likelihood to purchase a new boat on a 0-10 scale, where 0 is highly unlikely and 10 is highly likely, both tenants and non-tenants gave relatively low ratings, with mean scores of 1.98 and 1.95, respectively. Over half of each group gave the lowest possible rating of zero. Conversely, only 11.1% of tenants and 5.6% of non-tenants reported a high likelihood of purchasing a new vessel (scores of 8 through 10).

Likelihood to Buy a New Boat within 24 Months (0-10 Scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Giving Rating</th>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>Non-Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.194</td>
<td>1.501</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenants</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.954</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Length of Prospective New Boat

Those boaters who reported a moderate to high likelihood to purchase a new boat (4 or higher on the 0-10 scale) were asked what length of boat they would be most likely to buy. Among this portion of the sample, the mean expected boat lengths were 34.73 for tenants, and 34.57 for non-tenants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
<th>Under 24'</th>
<th>24' to 29'</th>
<th>30' to 39'</th>
<th>40' or Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenants</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate Analysis

As expected, multivariate analysis found a strong relationship between length of current boat and the expected length of a new boat purchased (p < 0.001, $\eta^2 = 0.368$). The table below reports the mean lengths of an expected new boat based on current boat length categories. The results suggest that owners of smaller boats expect to upsize, while owners of larger boats would purchase a boat of similar or smaller size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Boat Length</th>
<th>Under 24'</th>
<th>24' to 29'</th>
<th>30' to 39'</th>
<th>40' or Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Tenants' Moorage Arrangements

Length of Time at Everett Marina
Generally, tenants at the Port of Everett Marina have been there for a considerable length of time, with a mean tenure of 7.18 years. Only 13.3% of the tenants surveyed had been there for under one year.

Length of Time as Tenant at Port of Everett Marina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 Year</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ Years</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>8.732</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>2.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Non-Tenants' Moorage Arrangements

**Type of Boat Storage Used**
Non-tenants were asked to select what type of storage or moorage they currently use. As the table below shows, the majority (57.4%) rent covered moorage at another facility. The next most common choice was storing their trailered boat on their own property. Additional responses categorized as "other" include:

- At a friend's property
- Docked at respondent's waterfront property on Lake Stevens
- Anchored on the open water

**Type of Storage/Moorage Facility Used by Non-Tenants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Storage/Moorage Facility</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trailer on Property</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer - Commercial Facility</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncovered Moorage</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Moorage</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Boat Moorage/Storage Facility (Non-Tenants Only)

Additionally, non-tenants reported the location they store their boat, including the name of the facility (if appropriate) and the city. The most frequently reported locations include:

- Shilshole (17)
- Seattle, other/general (7)
- Snohomish (6)
- Marysville (5)
- Everett (5)
- Bothell (4)
- Edmonds Marina (3)
- Edmonds, other/general (3)
- Stanwood (3)
Other Moorage Selection Questions

Other Moorage Facilities Previously Used
Members of both groups have used a variety of other moorage facilities. The most frequently reported facilities are listed below.

Tenants
- Shilshole Bay (3)
- Anacortes / Cap Sante (2)
- Elliott Bay Marina (2)

Non-Tenants
- Shilshole Bay (6)
- Anacortes / Cap Sante (4)
- Dagmars Marina (3)
- Edmonds Marina (3)
- Elliott Bay Marina (3)
- Everett Marina (3)
- La Conner (2)
- Lake Union (2)

Other Moorage Facilities Considered (Tenants Only)
Additionally, tenants listed other moorage locations they have considered using. The most frequently reported facilities and locations include the following:
- Dagmars Marina (8)
- Anacortes / Cap Sante (7)
- Edmonds (5)
- Shilshole Bay (5)
- La Conner (4)
- Bellingham (3)

Criteria in Selecting Current Moorage Location
Next, the participants described the single most important factor that led them to store their boat at its current location (the Port of Everett Marina for tenants, and the location given by non-tenants).

Proximity to home was the major factor that led most tenants (53.3%) to choose the Port of Everett Marina. The same consideration was also the most common reason that non-tenants chose their current moorage location, with 35.5% of total votes. Cost was the next most common determining factor for non-tenants (15.8%), while for tenants, a three way tie exists
between cost, proximity to boating destinations, and services and amenities, each receiving 8.9% of the selections. Responses categorized under the category “Other” include:

**Tenants**
- Positive word of mouth (2)
- Customer service
- Expected to buy a nearby condo
- Proximity to work
- Boat was moored there when purchased

**Non-Tenants**
- Easy access (2)
- Proximity to work (2)
- Operating hours
- Allows liveaboards

### Primary Factor Leading Boaters to Choose Moorage/Storage Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Proximity to Home</th>
<th>Proximity to Destinations</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Services / Amenities</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenants (Everett)</strong></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Non-Tenants</strong></td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Multivariate Analysis**

A statistically significant relationship exists between boat type and moorage location criteria \( (p < 0.001, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.311) \). Owners of all boat types except “Other” place high emphasis on proximity to home. Fishing boat owners are split between proximity to boating destinations and security as the next most important factor. For cabin cruiser owners, services and amenities are also highly important, while security is a major consideration for motor yachts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fishing Boat</th>
<th>Runabout</th>
<th>Cabin Cruiser</th>
<th>Sailboat</th>
<th>Motor Yacht</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to home</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to destinations</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant trends were also found based on boat length \( (p = 0.035, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.226) \). Again, proximity to home was highly important for all boat lengths, but the importance for this factor was lowest among the shorter, trailerable boats. On the other hand, proximity to boating destinations was most important to owners of boats under 24 feet. Among owners of large boats over 40 feet, services and amenities were the most important factor after proximity to home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Under 24</th>
<th>24 to 29</th>
<th>30 to 39</th>
<th>40+</th>
<th>40+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to home</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to destinations</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate testing also found that tenants’ primary criteria are significantly related to their likelihood to remain at the Marina \( (p = 0.039, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.315) \). Compared to moderate likelihood tenants, those most likely to stay tended to place less emphasis on cost and
availability, and more emphasis on convenient location and services offered. Again, the low likelihood group is too small to be statistically meaningful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Likelihood to Remain at Everett Marina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to Home</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to Destinations</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services or amenities</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Former Tenants

Proportion of Non-Tenants who Previously Moored at the Port of Everett Marina

Approximately one in ten of the non-tenants (10.6%) had previously moored at the Port of Everett Marina. Those who reported being former tenants were asked a set of additional questions, which follow below.

Why Former Tenants Chose the Port of Everett Marina
Former tenants were asked what factor was most significant in leading them to select the Port of Everett as their moorage venue. For nearly half of the non-tenants (48.2%), availability was the leading reason, signifying that in previous years, this was a more important consideration than it is today. Location (25.9%) and moorage rates (24.3%) were the second and third most common selections, respectively.
Primary Factor Leading Former Tenants to Choose Port of Everett Marina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Availability/Waiting List</th>
<th>Average Rates</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction of Former Tenants While at Port of Everett Marina

Although they all decided to leave, former tenants rated their satisfaction with the Port of Everett Marina quite highly, with a mean score of 7.26. Almost half (49.8% of respondents) gave the highest possible rating of 10, a higher proportion than for current tenants. A smaller cluster of 24.3% reported low satisfaction ratings of 2.

Former Tenants' Overall Satisfaction with Port of Everett Marina (0-10 Scale)
Reasons That Tenants Left the Port of Everett Marina

The most common reason that former tenants cited in their decision to leave the Port of Everett Marina was that another marina offered lower moorage rates (48.2%). The second largest group (24.3%) chose to leave because another marina had a more preferrable location. "Other" responses include the following:

- Opportunities to sail (currents, tides, etc.)
- Inadequate services onsite or nearby (boat repair, shopping, etc.)

Reasons that Former Tenants Left Port of Everett Marina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of Competing Marina</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Competing Marina</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating Habits Changed</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Satisfaction and Likelihood to Stay (Tenants Only)

Satisfaction with Overall Experience at the Port of Everett Marina
As the tables below demonstrate, current tenants report high overall levels of satisfaction with the Port of Everett Marina. The group reported an average satisfaction rating of 7.75, and over two thirds (68.2%) of tenants gave scores in the high range of 8 through ten. In contrast, only 6.8% gave scores in the low range of 0 to 3.

Likelihood to Remain at the Port of Everett Marina
Likewise, most tenants reported a high likelihood to remain at the marina, with a mean score of 7.82. Fewer respondents scored their likelihood to remain as a 10 than gave a 10 for satisfaction (20.5% compared to 40.9%). This suggests that even some very satisfied customers are not completely certain about their future decisions. Only 4.5% of tenants reported a low likelihood to stay (0 through 3), while 66% reported a high likelihood to stay.
Why Tenants are Considering Leaving the Port of Everett Marina

The 34% of tenants who rated a low or moderate likelihood to remain at the Port of Everett Marina were asked for the primary reason motivating them to consider leaving. Cost was the most significant factor for half of these tenants. Among the other options, location gathered the highest number of votes with 14.3% of respondents. Reasons categorized under "other" include:

- Dissatisfaction with maintenance condition of the facility
- Would prefer a marina with a higher level of convenience
- Annoyed by barking dogs

Reasons Motivating Tenants to Consider Leaving
Recommendations for Most Important Improvements

Tenants

Current tenants were asked to state the single most important thing the Port of Everett Marina could do to improve their satisfaction. A full listing of the responses is provided in Appendix A. Some of the most common responses are discussed below.

Lowering moorage rates was by far the most common theme in responses.

- Lower the rates. The marina started raising the rates even when the problems with our economy started, and they continued to.

Improving the maintenance of facilities was the second most common topic.

- Maintenance. They need to attend to the South Side as much as they do the North Side.
- Improve the physical condition of the docks - they need major repair of the floats and the electricity needs to work.

Next, several tenants advised increasing the selection of shopping and dining destinations available at the marina.

- We'd like to see more amenities such as groceries, restaurants. The ones that were supposed to accompany the Port Gardner Wharf development.
- Having more facilities and things to do in the marina, more restaurants and shops and stores. Where you don't have to run into town to do these type of activities.

Additional topics brought up by smaller numbers of respondents included:

- Improving cleanliness (trash, bird droppings, etc.)
- Increasing the number of carts available on the docks
- Improving the availability of parking, and making the signage less confusing
- Providing additional pumpout services
- Improving security
Non-Tenants
Similarly, non-tenants gave suggestions for the most important step(s) the Port of Everett Marina could take to increase their likelihood of becoming tenants. The full list of responses is provided in Appendix B.

The largest single proportion of non-tenants said that the Port of Everett Marina's location was not a good match for their location - to become tenants, either they or the marina would have to move.

Among those who reported that specific steps could improve their likelihood to become tenants, the most common suggestion was again to lower the moorage rates.

- Lower the rates because the Port of Everett is further away, so the gas prices need to be worthwhile for traveling up there.

- The rates are too expensive at the Edmonds Marina where I am at. If the Port of Everett were to offer lower rates, then I might just switch over there.

Several respondents reported that their boats were too small to make year-round moorage worthwhile. However, as in the focus groups, some of these boaters were interested in the prospect of temporary or seasonal moorage.

- During the Port of Everett Salmon derby, if there's openings, I would get a temporary moorage or three day thing (Friday, Saturday, Sunday) there.

- It would be nice to have seasonal moorage where everyone usually has a full year period. Maybe offer a four month period or six month period instead. During the winter for uncovered moorage, it's not worth keeping my small boat in the water. I can park it in a storage place. If the Port of Everett could store it for you dry for the winter and in the summer you will have it in the water, that would be cool.

Another suggestion made by several respondents was improving the amenities available.

- Good upland facilities like good bathrooms and laundry facilities and businesses on site, like a store that sells journals and groceries where you could pick up some good food. Good restaurants with a good bar along with easy parking would be wonderful.

- More dining, lodging, and shops in the area.
Satisfaction and Importance Ratings

In the next section, both tenants and non-tenants were read a list of marina services, attributes and amenities. Respondents rated how important each consideration is in their choice of a marina. Additionally, tenants rated their satisfaction with the Port of Everett Marina for each item. Non-tenants were asked to provide an assessment of the Port of Everett Marina's performance if they were sufficiently familiar with it to make a judgment. Mean importance and satisfaction/performance scores are provided in the following tables.
For tenants, the most important factors were security (9.09 mean rating), dockside amenities (8.78) location (8.60), maintenance/condition of facilities (8.58), and moorage rates (8.55). Satisfaction ratings for security and location were both quite high, at 8.78 and 8.24, respectively. However, tenants are less satisfied with the Port of Everett Marina’s moorage rates, returning a moderate satisfaction score of 6.49. These findings suggest that a rate reduction would have a highly substantial impact on improving overall customer satisfaction. For the other two highly important attributes, maintenance/condition and dockside amenities, satisfaction ratings were moderate (7.44 and 7.41, respectively). Targeted improvements, such as addressing the low amperage available at some slips, could bring this satisfaction level into the high range.

Tenants reported the lowest satisfaction score for nearby shopping opportunities. This rating reflects a sentiment seen in the open-ended questions and focus group. Providing basic good such as groceries and sundries within walking distance of the marina would likely address the satisfaction problem seen here.

Among the non-tenants, the most important attributes were location (8.87), security (8.71), dockside amenities (8.01), parking (8.00), and maintenance/condition (7.75). Across most categories, non-tenants gave performance ratings lower than tenants’ satisfaction ratings. Two notable exceptions were for parking and maintenance/condition, where non-tenants rated the Port of Everett Marina’s facilities more favorably than tenants did. The non-tenants scored the Port of Everett’s location relatively poorly at 5.22, reiterating the fact that its location is not ideal for boaters based in other parts of the region. Again, the non-tenants gave the lowest performance rating for the availability of shopping nearby.

In some cases, tenants gave a substantially higher satisfaction rating than the non-tenants' performance rating. It is possible that, on these attributes, the Port of Everett is providing a good product but non-tenants are unaware. An example of this occurred in the focus groups, when non-tenants spoke poorly of the marina’s travelift, but were not aware that a newer device was now available. These items could therefore be useful as subjects for marketing efforts. Excluding location, the attributes where tenant scores were over one point higher than non-tenants are:

- Customer service: other personnel (travelift, etc.)
- Security
- Laundry facilities
- Haulout/travelift services
- Pumpout services
Multivariate Analysis

Testing found significant differences between tenants' and non-tenants' responses regarding the following importance and satisfaction/performance ratings.

**Tenants v. Non-tenants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Tenant Rating</th>
<th>Non-Tenant Rating</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>F-stat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: Perf.</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Staff Service: Imp.</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff Service: Imp.</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff Service: Perf.</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security: Perf.</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: Imp.</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Amenities: Imp.</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms: Imp.</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms: Perf.</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry: Perf.</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping: Imp.</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Yard: Imp.</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulout: Imp.</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulout: Perf.</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic: Imp.</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpout: Imp.</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boat Length**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Rating by Boat Length</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 24'</td>
<td>24' to 29'</td>
<td>30' to 39'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Perf.</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Perf.</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Staff Service: Imp.</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere: Perf.</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: Imp.</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: Perf.</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking: Perf.</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Amenities: Perf.</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms: Imp.</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping: Perf.</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulout: Perf.</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic: Imp.</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Boat Type

| Item                          | Fishing Boat | Runabout | Cabin Cruiser | Sailboat | Motor Yacht | Other | Value | P>|< |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------|---------------|----------|-------------|-------|-------|----|
| Location: Perf.               | 9.05        | 8.50     | 7.69          | 6.66     | 9.31        | 7.18  | 0.010 | 0.086 |
| Mooring Rates: Perf.          | 6.07        | 6.20     | 6.90          | 6.76     | 6.51        | 1.25  | < 0.001 | 0.202 |
| Office Service: Imp.          | 7.98        | 7.89     | 8.21          | 7.16     | 9.31        | 7.59  | 0.009 | 0.082 |
| Office Service: Perf.         | 8.43        | 7.83     | 8.95          | 7.81     | 10.00       | 9.24  | 0.41  | 0.088 |
| Dock Staff Service: Imp.      | 6.99        | 7.22     | 7.83          | 6.38     | 9.31        | 7.06  | 0.002 | 0.105 |
| Dock Staff Service: Perf.     | 6.54        | 7.50     | 8.41          | 6.81     | 10.00       | 4.11  | 0.001 | 0.183 |
| Atmosphere: Imp.              | 8.13        | 8.21     | 8.05          | 7.53     | 8.35        | 6.05  | 0.031 | 0.062 |
| Atmosphere: Perf.             | 8.66        | 8.21     | 7.92          | 7.03     | 7.31        | 7.00  | 0.019 | 0.095 |
| Security: Imp.                | 9.44        | 8.50     | 9.23          | 8.61     | 9.65        | 9.43  | 0.015 | 0.070 |
| Security: Perf.               | 8.27        | 7.56     | 8.73          | 7.83     | 7.12        | 6.59  | 0.018 | 0.100 |
| Maintenance: Imp.             | 8.96        | 8.75     | 8.78          | 7.72     | 9.04        | 8.51  | < 0.001 | 0.108 |
| Maintenance: Perf.            | 8.17        | 7.55     | 8.41          | 7.21     | 8.69        | 6.43  | < 0.001 | 0.148 |
| Parking: Imp.                 | 8.70        | 8.23     | 8.86          | 7.61     | 9.65        | 9.61  | < 0.001 | 0.156 |
| Dockside Amenities: Imp.      | 7.78        | 6.11     | 9.12          | 8.17     | 9.65        | 8.75  | 0.003 | 0.089 |
| Bathrooms: Perf.              | 8.70        | 6.44     | 8.10          | 7.69     | 10.00       | 7.52  | 0.023 | 0.089 |
| Shopping: Imp.                | 6.33        | 3.71     | 6.18          | 5.09     | 4.65        | 7.53  | 0.001 | 0.100 |
| Hangout: Perf.                | 8.42        | 7.00     | 7.69          | 8.37     | 9.00        | 4.50  | 0.016 | 0.125 |

### Overall Satisfaction Level (Tenants Only)

| Item                          | Mean (1-10) | Overall Satisfaction | Value | P>|< |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------|----|
| Location: Perf.               | 6.50        | Low (0-3)             | 9.07  | 0.001 | 0.137 |
| Office Staff Service: Perf.   | 4.00        | Moderate (4-7)        | 9.03  | < 0.001 | 0.326 |
| Dock Staff Service: Perf.     | 2.00        | High (8-10)           | 7.91  | < 0.001 | 0.199 |
| Atmosphere: Perf.             | 7.00        | Low (0-3)             | 8.37  | < 0.001 | 0.224 |
| Security: Perf.               | 8.00        | Moderate (4-7)        | 8.66  | < 0.001 | 0.174 |
| Maintenance: Perf.            | 5.50        | High (8-10)           | 8.07  | < 0.001 | 0.243 |
| Bathrooms: Perf.              | 6.50        | Low (0-3)             | 9.03  | < 0.001 | 0.288 |
| Shopping: Perf.               | 2.50        | Moderate (4-7)        | 6.63  | < 0.001 | 0.240 |
| Pumpout: Perf.                | 3.50        | High (8-10)           | 8.00  | < 0.001 | 0.212 |
Likelihood to Remain at Port of Everett Marina (Tenants Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Rating by Likelihood to Remain at Port of Everett Marina</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Eta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: Imp.</td>
<td>Low (0-3) 7.27 Mod. (4-7) 9.00 High (8-10) 9.00</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Perf.</td>
<td>8.00 7.82 9.17</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock Staff Service: Perf.</td>
<td>6.67 5.36 8.18</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff Service: Imp.</td>
<td>7.00 8.33 8.52</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere: Perf.</td>
<td>8.33 6.36 8.07</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security: Perf.</td>
<td>8.67 6.82 8.70</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: Perf.</td>
<td>7.33 5.82 7.97</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry: Imp.</td>
<td>5.00 4.00 6.00</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Yard: Perf.</td>
<td>6.00 5.43 7.80</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulout: Perf.</td>
<td>8.50 7.11 9.00</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic: Perf.</td>
<td>6.00 5.75 8.11</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpout: Imp.</td>
<td>5.67 8.64 8.50</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interest in Changes and Improvements

The next group of questions was designed to test both tenants' and non-tenants' interest in a series of changes or improvements, many of which were enthusiastically received in the focus groups. For each proposed change or improvement, respondents rated their level of interest on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all interested and 10 is highly interested.
The two possibilities most interesting to current tenants were the addition of a small store for sundries and groceries (8.48 mean rating), and a grab-and-go restaurant (7.70). Again, these ratings are consistent with the findings throughout this research that customers strongly desire more dining and shopping opportunities. The other suggestions that tenants found highly interesting were Wi-Fi (7.20), a slip exchange program at another marina (6.57), cable/internet connectivity (6.33), and a secured storage facility (6.32).

The non-tenants were most highly interested in Wi-Fi (7.62). Additionally, they expressed substantial interest in two programs that offer moorage flexibility: the slip exchange program (6.63) short-term slip rentals (6.33). Since these programs could reduce two of the major deterrents to non-tenants -- cost and boating flexibility -- they have a potential to strongly increase demand. In fact, 44.2% of non-tenants described themselves as highly interested in the slip exchange program (8 through 10 rating); the figure was nearly as high for seasonal or temporary moorage at 39.0%. If even a small portion of highly interested non-tenants actually participated in these options, the increase in marina occupancy could be substantial.

Multivariate Analysis

Testing found significant differences between tenants' and non-tenants' responses regarding the following changes and improvements.

Tenants vs. Non-tenants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Tenant Mean Rating</th>
<th>Non-Tenant Mean Rating</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocery/Sundry Store</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab-and-Go Restaurant</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallroom</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Lifts</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boat Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Under 24'</th>
<th>24' to 29'</th>
<th>30' to 39'</th>
<th>40' +</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocery/Sundry Store</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab-and-Go Restaurant</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Delivery</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Storage</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Lifts</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Boat Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Fishing Boat</th>
<th>Runabout</th>
<th>Cabin Cruiser</th>
<th>Sailboat</th>
<th>Motor Yacht</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slip Exchange Program</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery/Sundry Store</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab-and-Go Restaurant</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailroom</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20' Covered Moorage</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Lifts</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Satisfaction Level (Tenants Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low (0-3)</th>
<th>Mod. (4-7)</th>
<th>High (8-10)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20' Covered Moorage</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Lifts</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likelihood to Remain at Port of Everett Marina (Tenants Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low (0-3)</th>
<th>Mod. (4-7)</th>
<th>High (8-10)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocery/Sundry Store</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20' Covered Moorage</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Changes or Improvements Desired

At the conclusion of the section on changes and improvements, respondents were given an opportunity to suggest items not mentioned in the survey. Some of these emphasized particular traits of previously discussed improvements, while others were entirely new.

Tenants
The most common responses among tenants involved improvements to parking availability and signage. In particular, several tenants noted that parking was insufficient during events such as boat shows and art fairs, and opined that the marina should make sure its tenants can still access the facility.

Again, dining and shopping opportunities were mentioned as high-priority areas to improve.

- I would like more full-service restaurants as originally planned with the Port Gardener Wharf Development.

- More shopping. I don't just mean marine goods, but something for the ladies. Now, the farmer's market is great, but someplace to get women's clothes. There were other things planned but the economy prevented certain things from turning out.

Storage amenities such as dock boxes were another popular suggestion.

Several tenants also mentioned that they would like more convenient options for pumpout.

- On the North side they have a pump-out which they don't have on the other docks. Those are a good idea - a huge time-saver.

Finally, several people suggested that the Port make additional efforts to publicize the amenities that are available. One suggestion was to invite non-tenants to the marina to see what it is like, through public activities such as 5k walks. Another idea was a kiosk listing services at the Port and the locations of nearby services, so that visitors to would know what was available and where to look for these services.
Non-Tenants

A substantial number of non-tenants' suggestions involved items that the Port of Everett Marina currently offers, suggesting that efforts to increase awareness of the amenities available could be useful.

The largest group of responses dealt with additional restaurant offerings:

- Pub style restaurant offering burgers, beer, etc.
- Full service sit down restaurant with bar

Other suggestions made by non-tenants included:

- More shopping
- Showers and storage for non-tenants
- A boat wash, similar to a car wash
- Free 4-hour dock parking
- Access to public transportation
- Improving the gas dock
Conclusions

1. Most participants in the sample have been boaters for a long period of time. Additionally, longer tenured boaters are more likely to own large vessels such as sailboats and motor yachts.

2. Sailboats were the most common type of boat in the sample, followed by cabin cruisers, with a smaller percentage of other motorized craft. This appears to be reflective of the current overall distribution of boats at the Port of Everett Marina.

3. Respondents were somewhat evenly divided as to their primary boating activity. While day trips for cruising or sightseeing were the most common activity overall, strong relationships were found between primary activities and type/length of boats owned.

4. Most respondents reported that they were highly unlikely to purchase a new boat in the near future. Among those who were moderately or highly likely to do so, the average boat size being considered was approximately 35 feet. Owners of small boats were more likely to move up in size, while owners of larger boats were more likely to stay in the same size range or move to a smaller craft.

5. Current tenants at the Port of Everett Marina have generally been there for a long period of time, with a mean tenure of over 7 years.

6. Approximately two thirds of the non-tenants currently store their boat in wet moorage, either covered or uncovered. The most common form of non-wet storage is keeping the boat on a trailer at one’s property.

7. For both tenants and non-tenants, proximity to home was easily the most important factor in the choice of a moorage location. Other important factors include cost, proximity to boating destinations, and services and amenities offered.

8. Among former tenants at the Port of Everett Marina, availability of moorage slips was the most important factor that led them to choose the marina in the first place. Cost, however, was the primary factor that caused these individuals to leave. Despite their decision to leave, most former tenants were satisfied with their experience at the Port of Everett Marina.

9. Current tenants were generally highly satisfied with their overall experience at the Port of Everett Marina, and also rated themselves as highly likely to continue mooring there.
Among those with a moderate or low chance of remaining at the marina, cost was the most significant reason why they are considering leaving.

10. Both tenants and non-tenants reported that the most significant action the Port of Everett could do to take or retain their business would be to lower the moorage rates. Adding shopping and dining options was another common suggestion among both groups. Tenants also recommended maintenance improvements, while several non-tenants were interested in temporary or seasonal moorage options.

11. Tenants generally gave strong satisfaction ratings for most of the specific services and attributes of the Port of Everett Marina. However, two areas received high importance ratings but relatively low satisfaction ratings: moorage rates and nearby shopping. Efforts to improve these attributes could have a large effect on tenant satisfaction.

12. Among various improvements and changes, tenants were most interested in a grocery and sundry store as well as a grab-and-go restaurant. Wi-Fi and a slip exchange program were the third and fourth most interesting options, respectively.

13. Non-tenants were most interested in Wi-Fi, but also rated the store and restaurant options highly. In addition, programs such as temporary moorage and a slip exchange program were well-received by non-tenants, and appear to be strong candidates for drawing non-tenants to the Port of Everett Marina.

14. When asked for other suggestions for changes or improvements, tenants reiterated their desire for more shopping and dining opportunities. Other frequently mentioned improvements included more storage facilities and pumpout services.

15. Non-tenants also requested more shopping and dining destinations, particularly full-service restaurants. Numerous non-tenants requested amenities that the Port of Everett Marina currently offers, suggesting that efforts to spread the word about the marina’s services could be useful in drawing in additional tenants.
Demand Forecast

Model Construction
The forecast models are constructed from time-series historical data. For each category of slips (open, covered, 12th Street Marina), Hebert Research constructed a series of regression equations that compared demand for slips in a given time period against economic, demographic and other variables. (Note: demand for slips is defined as the number of occupied slips plus the size of the waiting list, if applicable). The independent variables considered for the regression equations included:

- Moorage Rates
- Season
- Unemployment Rate
- Population
- Household Income
- Housing Price Index
- National Annual Boat Sales (outboard, sterndrive, inboard cruiser, sailboats and total)
- Demand for Other Slip Types

After running regression models with various combinations of the variables above, Hebert Research selected the model that best explained demand for each slip type. The following table reports the variables used for each slip type, as well as the overall goodness of fit for the model as a whole ($r^2$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Slips ($r^2 = 0.898$)</th>
<th>Covered Slips ($r^2 = 0.865$)</th>
<th>12th Street Marina ($r^2 = 0.878$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Demand for Covered Slips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Prices</td>
<td>Housing Prices</td>
<td>Housing Prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boat Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Boat Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Outlook

To forecast future demand, the mathematical relationships between marina demand and the selected economic variables were used to predict the effects of expected future values of those variables.

Needless to say, the American economy is currently in a vulnerable and unstable condition, and any prediction of its direction will face considerable uncertainty. However, the most likely scenario appears to be a very slow, gradual economic recovery, which may not see key economic indicators return to their pre-recession levels until approximately 2020.

The following are specific predictions of the economic statistics used in the forecast:

- **Unemployment** traditionally lags other measures of economic health at the end of a recession, and has declined only slightly from its peak level at the beginning of 2010. If the economic recovery continues in spite of the weakness seen this summer, we predict moderate decreases in the unemployment rate over the next two to three years (approximately 0.5% per year). However, it is likely that unemployment levels will remain persistently higher than those of the 1990s and 2000s; only around 2020 do we expect unemployment to reach pre-recession levels below 6%.

- **Housing Prices** are expected to recover at an extremely slow rate. The housing market still shows signs of great weakness: after the expiration of federal tax credits this summer, home sales and prices have continued the slide seen throughout the recession. The large inventory of unsold homes and homes in the foreclosure process indicate that, even if demand picks up, prices are unlikely to rebound for some time. We estimate that home prices will be essentially flat for the next two years, and thereafter will increase at a slow rate, mainly due to the effects of population growth and inflation.

- **Boat Sales** are expected to increase at a moderate rate throughout the period. Sales of boats have fallen continuously since 2005, and even more precipitously during the recession, with current annual sales approximately 50% down from the levels seen in 2005. Although boats are a premium good and the availability of credit may be a persistent problem, moderate growth of 3 to 4 percent per year is realistic given the very low current sales levels, and modest levels of economic growth. At the forecasted rate, annual boat sales at decade’s end would return to levels seen in early 2008, but still significantly down from the all-time high marks reached during the dot-com boom.
Marina Demand Considerations
The marina demand survey provided the following insights into likely trends in marina demand:

- Overall, most tenants are highly satisfied with their experience and rated themselves as highly likely to stay. Provided the economy does not seriously worsen and the Port of Everett Marina does not substantially raise moorage rates, the rate of tenant attrition is expected to be low.

- Non-tenants did not report that any single change or improvement would drastically increase their likelihood to become tenants. The most frequently mentioned step the Marina could take, lowering moorage rates, is unlikely to occur. Additionally, a large portion of the non-tenants reported that moorage at the marina would not be appropriate for their location and/or boats owned.

- However, the survey did identify a few steps that could lead to moderate increases in occupancy. Approximately 40% of non-tenants reported high levels of interest in a seasonal or short-term moorage and a slip exchange program. Instituting, expanding or publicizing these programs could lead to increased demand for at least a portion of the year.

- Additionally, potential improvements such as a grocery and sundry store, a grab-and-go restaurant and Wi-Fi were well received by both tenants and non-tenants. These endeavors, and similar programs that enhance the Port of Everett’s status as a liveable destination for tenants and visitors alike, could simultaneously increase tenant satisfaction and bring in additional demand.

Moorage Demand Forecast
The following estimates for slip demand were constructed for each slip type and size, using the growth rates predicted by the regression models and economic estimates described above. In addition to the economic effects predicted by the models, demand will be affected by population growth and the Port of Everett Marina’s internal improvements. Based on the expected low rate of tenant attrition, as well as the favorable ratings given for various changes and improvements, Hebert Research projects that the marina could experience 5% annual growth due to population and demand increases. If no steps are taken to increase demand, a 3% growth rate is likely due to expected population growth.

Demand can be defined as the number of boat owners who would want to moor their boat in a given slip category. If demand is less than the number of slips available, the result is a vacancy. If demand exceeds slip availability, the result is a waiting list.
## Demand for Open Slips, 2005-2020 (3% Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20'</th>
<th>24'</th>
<th>26'</th>
<th>28'</th>
<th>32'</th>
<th>36'</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>55'+</th>
<th>Total Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demand for Covered Slips, 2005-2020 (3% Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>28'</th>
<th>30'</th>
<th>32'</th>
<th>36'</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>B/H</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>Total Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand for 12th Street Marina Slips, 2008-2020 (3% Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>45'</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>55'</th>
<th>60'</th>
<th>65' D.</th>
<th>65' S.</th>
<th>70'</th>
<th>93'+</th>
<th>Total 12th St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demand for Open Slips, 2005-2020 (5% Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20'</th>
<th>24'</th>
<th>26'</th>
<th>28'</th>
<th>32'</th>
<th>36'</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>55'+</th>
<th>Total Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demand for Covered Slips, 2005-2020 (5% Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>28'</th>
<th>30'</th>
<th>32'</th>
<th>36'</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>40' POE</th>
<th>B/H</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>Total Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand for 12th Street Marina Slips, 2008-2020 (5% Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>40'</th>
<th>45'</th>
<th>50'</th>
<th>55'</th>
<th>60'</th>
<th>65' D.</th>
<th>65' S.</th>
<th>70'</th>
<th>93'+</th>
<th>Total 12th St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Verbatim Responses: Tenant Survey

Question 2: What type of boat do you own?

- Trawler.

Question 7: What other permanent moorage facilities have you moored at, if any?

- Alameda, Santa Cruz in California.
- Anacortes Marina. Cap Sante Marina.
- Bayside Drydock in Everett, Washington.
- Dagmar Marina.
- Dock Street in Tacoma.
- Elliott Bay Marina and a dry land marina in Anacortes.
- Elliott Bay Marina, Seattle, Washington.
- Everett is the only one.
- I have moored at Tulalip Bay for eight years.
- Kenmore Air Harbor.
- Kingston.
- La Conner.
- Lake Union Westlake North Moorage.
- None since I've been here so long, since it was built.
- Park Shore Marina in WA and Nickerson on Lake Union.
- Petersburg Harbor in Alaska.
- Port of Seattle and Ballard Mill.
- Port Orchard.
- Salmon Bay Marina, Washington.
- Shilshole Bay (3).
- South Park Marina.

Question 8: What other facilities have you considered for boat storage or moorage?

- Anacortes and Port Townsend, Washington.
- Anacortes, Edmonds.
- Anacortes, Washington.
- Anywhere that is cheaper especially on the peninsula. It's B.S. that Everett uses the excuse that they raise rates because Seattle does and yet they are less expensive than Seattle.
- Bellingham.
• Bellingham and Kingston and Port Orchard and Brownsville.
• Bremerton and Oak Harbor, Washington.
• Dagmars (3)
• Dagmars and Edmonds Marina.
• Dagmars Marina. Anacortes Marina.
• Dagmars, La Conner, Edmonds.
• Dagmir Marina, Marysville Marina.
• Edmonds Marina, Oak Harbor Marina, Port Townsend Marina.
• Edmonds Marina.
• Edmonds, Anacortes, Bellingham and Oak Harbor.
• Edmonds, Washington.
• Elliott Bay Marina.
• Elliott Bay Marina and the dryland marina in Anacortes and the Bremerton Marina.
• I have considered other local covered moorage that is less expensive that I will keep nameless.
• I was on the waiting list at La Conner.
• La Conner Marina. Dagmars Marina. Anacortes Marina.
• Mukilteo Marina.
• Poulsbo - Eagle Harbor.
• Shilshole.
• Shilshole Bay (3).
• Shilshole Marina.
• The Edmonds facility.
• The ones mentioned.

Question 9: What was the most important factor that led you to choose the Port of Everett Marina as your moorage facility?

• Attitude and philosophy and how the tenants are treated.
• Friends.
• My best friend had a moorage there. This was many years ago and his overall experience was so good, I picked it when I got into boating.
• Originally we moored here in expectation of purchasing a condo which never got built.
• Proximity to work
• The boat was moored there and I bought it and kept it there and all of the other options applied as well.

Question 11: If you scored your likelihood to stay at the Port of Everett Marina as 7 or lower, what is the most significant factor causing you to consider leaving?

• I am looking for a marina that has more conveniences.
Question 13: What is the most significant thing the Port of Everett Marina could do to improve your satisfaction?

- A change in the rates. I'm now a senior citizen and the rates have become very high. It would be nice to have a senior discount.
- A fish planing station or two needs to be put in at the Port.
- Add a store that sells groceries and sundries.
- Free and open internet would be great. The other thing is it would be nice if we could have storage boxes that are moorage slips like at Shilshole.
- Having a mobile pump-out service. They have pump-out, but it isn't mobile.
- Having more facilities and things to do in the marina, more restaurants and shops and stores. Where you don't have to run into town to do these type of activities.
- I think more owner events would be a good thing. The barbecue they had was good.
- I would say keep the trash areas cleaner.
- If they could clean the showers later in the evening instead of the day.
- Improve the physical condition of the docks - they need major repair of the floats and the electricity needs to work.
- In the last ten years, the moorage rates have increased substantially.
- Institute barking dog rules. Even from 20 slips away, they are noticeably vocal and annoying.
- Lower the price and have better security as something was taken from my boat last year. My boating neighbor also had his new outboard engine stolen two years ago.
- Lower the rates.
- Lower the rates. It is so frustrating to arrive and find no carts especially when I have to load for a several week trip. More carts are needed. Our dock is sinking and they have been promising for years to add more flotation but have neglected to do so. My covered moorage leaks water into my boat. Ha! Ha!
- Lower the rates. The marina started raising the rates even when the problems with our economy started, and they continued to.
- Maintenance of carts and other small things such as keeping the ice machine working and maybe a small food store.
- Maintenance. They need to attend to the South Side as much as they do the North Side.
- Stop raising the prices just because and not offering me something new. I would like to see a dinghy dock and it might even be an income producer. They took out the haulout area and put us in a much worse area but if we're willing to pay more, they will put us in the new area. We're now subject to electrocution unless we pay more. What was the reasoning behind raising the window sticker prices 500% with no benefit to me as a tenant?
- The ability to pay on my yearly lease on a monthly basis rather than bi-monthly.
- The amenities - we paid for a lot of things that are wide open to the public such as the bathrooms and showers. The tenants are supposed to use a key-pod, but during the day the bathroom is unlocked, and I have found homeless people hanging out in there. They just
refurbished the bathrooms and here they are being kept unlocked. I don't know what time the security locks them up at night.

- The concrete slabs on my pier are beginning to deteriorate and I think their repair is scheduled, hopefully. But this is a maintenance issue which I look forward to being addressed in a timely manner. Be proactive, for example, on the hottest day of the year, the ice machine was broken. So, try to plan ahead for things like this.

- The dock needs to be kept cleaner. There is too much duck excretion.

- The finger piers are too narrow and I can't easily get into my slip. The fees are too high and compared to where I was, the amenities are not as good.

- The last two to three years the management has been better than in prior years. Also, turn off the lights on top of Anthony's. They shine right down on my boat.

- The only thing I can say is to lower the rent. I like the marina. I have seen other places in Connecticut, and they are just not the same as far as the general feeling of the place.

- The parking signs are confusing as far as where it is ok to park for the marina and the restaurants.

- The Port needs to keep the maintenance up. I know some upkeep has been done in certain areas, but all the tenants need to be remembered. The F Dock on the main strip needs to be fixed. My mother-in-law had a fall there last year. The gate is unlocked half of the time. If someone would go out there with some WD-40, I'm sure the gate would stick. To sum it up - basic maintenance.

- The Port of Everett Marina could give discounts to year-round tenants - permanent tenants.

- The price for live-aboard is too high, and the parking is bad.

- The South men's shower was just remodeled and it is colder than heck in the winter because the big fan sucks the cold air into the shower room. They could install a safer newly designed power cord.

- The staff is grouchy and mean. The lady in the office and the dock staff. They do not treat me like a customer.

- There is inconsistent amperage availability which needs to be corrected. They need more carts. The pumpout located at the gas dock doesn't always work and it should.

- They could have locked bathrooms for the tenants on the south side 24 hours a day. This is both a security and cleanliness/maintenance issue.

- They could stop raising rates and do their facility repairs in a more timely manner.

- They eliminated the curbside permit parking and made it 2 hour parking which I don't like. There should be more carts available and it would be a good idea if they were marked for each of the docks.

- They need a little store. Dan's Store used to be there, but was moved out. They need a closer store, besides Popeye's where people can get supplies they need for the boat.

- They need to lower the price, to go back to the older prices. Fifty dollars a month is a large percentage of an increase. I can see a two hundred to two hundred and twenty percent increase, but going up to a two hundred and fifty percent increase is unfair.
• They should put in some new electrical outlets. They are hard to plug into and are junk. The visitor’s dock has new ones. The costs have skyrocketed. The sling is now $80 vs $35 or something and the increase is ridiculous.
• To continue to rotate the docks and to update them. The older ones need replacing, so a rotation is being done. That needs to be continued - to keep things up to date.
• Update the floats.
• We’d like to see more amenities such as groceries, restaurants. The ones that were supposed to accompany the Port Gardner Wharf development.
• Well, everything is very convenient for what we are doing - our fishing activity. Also, the parking is very convenient, and that is a big factor.

Question 16: Are there any other new services or amenities not listed above that you would like to see?

• A dinghy dock storage.
• A lot of ports are talking about inviting people into their port so they can see what is available. I read this in a newsletter. They are sponsoring 5k walks to the public. This way potential customers could walk through the Port and see what is available. Free t-shirts and coffee cups could be given away.
• A lot of the ports we have gone through are more inviting. They have flowers on the dock which are prettier, and more art fairs and music. Other places have these events more often than they do in Everett.
• A part-time agreement with Dagmars where you could store your boat in the winter out of water and still keep you slip reserved for when it goes back into the water or some kind of reduced rates pertaining to the above.
• Dock boxes would be a nice addition to each slip.
• Dock boxes.
• I am surprised that there were no specific questions concerning the fuel pumps considering all the issues that were covered and its importance. Green space for picnics and playgrounds for children or grandchildren. Better publicity regarding public transportation to and from the marina to other city amenities. Somewhat like a kiosk that tells overnighters what is going on currently in the community and where other necessary amenities are such as grocery stores, etc.
• I would like more full-service restaurants as originally planned with the Port Gardener Wharf Development.
• Make the finger piers wider so the carts can fit on them.
• Maybe a webcam that is more conducive to showing Port Gardner. Also, a weather station so we can check out the weather at the marina before we head out there.
• More parking. They raise our moorage and take our parking.
• More shopping. I don’t just mean marine goods, but something for the ladies. Now, the farmer’s market is great, but someplace to get women’s clothes. There were other things planned but the economy prevented certain things from turning out.
• On the North side they have a pump-out which they don't have on the other docks. Those are a good idea - a huge time-saver. On the gas dock they have padding on the sides so bumpers aren’t putting out the docks. Also, have electrical boxes for each boat drop down when the boats come in. Assigned parking for the live-aboards would be good. With the fifty dollar live-aboard fee little things help out.
• The boat shows at the marina really heats up the parking lot, but since it happens only once a year or so, I can't say much about it. I'm moored in front of Anthony's so I do have parking problems.
• The newly remodeled men's restroom at the D South Dock has a urinal installed at such a high level that I can't use it even though I am 5 ft 8 in. Instead, I have to use the kid's urinal. I think they should keep to basic installation standards, and think the contractor made a mistake. It is at least 4 inches higher than a typical installation. This bathroom is also like a sauna all year long which is ok in the winter but in the summer, one has to run in and out to avoid the extreme heat.
• The Port could make it known that there are boat bottom cleaning services that are very reasonable and close by for about $25.
• The pumpout by the station dock I have had trouble with, and the one by Lombardi's works perfect. I wish there was a Northern dock where I wouldn't have to take my boat to a pump-out station. Also, closer grocery stores would be good.
• The small storage and the stores are the most important additions to me.
• There are 2 weekends where they limit parking when they have the art fair and something else. Attendees should be shuttled to it rather than it impeding access of the boaters to their parking on these weekends. I don't want to walk 1 - 2 miles to get to my boat. Since I paid for the moorage, I shouldn't be deprived of my parking and the usual access to my boat.
• There needs to be better parking for the South Marina, letters B through A.
• Well, possibly a work room that people could rent to do projects for the boat. Then the dock doesn't have to be used. I mean small projects such as painting, sanding, and varnishing.
• When they come to cut your power for some reason, they don't knock on the boat to let you know what is about to happen. I have been on the computer working on a presentation for two days and lost all of the work when the power was cut. All they have to do is to knock ahead of cutting the power - common courtesy. I complained about this when I was on the board and they didn't listen at the Port to what I was saying.
• Yes, I would like pump-out facilities on my dock that are convenient to me - Dock South. Why am I charged for the length of the slip vs. the overall length of my vessel, 42 ft. vs 50 ft. in an area that is significantly vacant and also leaks.
Appendix B: Verbatim Responses: Non-Tenant Survey

Verbatim responses were recorded for open-ended questions and for other questions when a respondent gave a response that did not fit into an existing category.

Research assistants transcribed the verbatim responses while conducting each survey. The original transcriptions have been edited only for spelling, punctuation and major grammar. If multiple respondents gave identical replies, the total number is identified in parentheses.

Question 2: What type of boat do you own?

- Bayboat.
- Brand name-Ranger tug; trawler 21' powerboat.
- Express cruiser.
- Kayak (human propelled).
- Motor boat.
- Pontoon boat.
- Powerboat, 1966 utility boat with inboard engine (classic).

Question 4: What type of boating activity do you do most commonly?

- Camping
- Do beach cleanups for a non profit group called coastal footprint.
- I run charter boats. I am retired.
- Racing (2)
- Racing, and take classes on boating at Shishole Bay Marina.
- Sailboat racing.
- Vacationing. I've gone to the Fourth of July boating events.
- A little boat racing.
- Waterski.

Question 5: What type of moorage or storage facility do you currently use?

- At friend's for free.
- Boat is on anchor, and we are down in California on a small bay. We are constantly moving to different places and environments.
- I have a dock at Lake Stevens. It has a boat lift.
- In the winter I will store it.
Question 6: What marina (if applicable) or city is your boat stored or moored at?

- Anacortes.
- Arlington.
- Auke Bay in Alaska.
- Ballard.
- Bellevue.
- Bothell (3).
- Camano Island.
- Chehalis.
- Duvall.
- Edmonds (3).
- Edmonds Marina (3).
- Everett (4).
- Everett (Rucker Hill).
- Fall City.
- Gig Harbor at Murphy's landing ramp.
- Gig Harbor.
- Granite Falls (2).
- Home in Mukilteo.
- I keep it at home (Bothell, Washington).
- It's not moored, but it's in the garage (Camano Island).
- Lake Stevens (2)
- Lynnwood (2).
- Marysville (4).
- Marysville at my home.
- Mountlake Terrace, Washington.
- Newport, Oregon.
- On a trailer in Enumclaw.
- Port of Everett Marina.
- Queen city yacht club in Seattle, Washington.
- Seattle (3).
- Shišálh Bay Marina (17).
- Snohomish (3).
- Snohomish at home.
- Snohomish at my home.
- Spokane.
- Stanwood (3).
- Stimson Marina in Ballard, Washington.
- Thunderbird marina at Lake Union.
• We launch in Everett but store in Snohomish.

Question 7: What was the most important factor in your choice to store your boat at this location?

• Being in the water when I want to because the Port of Edmonds tells you when you can be in the water. They open up a couple hours after sunrise basically. They don't want fisherman down there. It would be run much better by a private company. Their guest moorage is accomodated by yacht club boats for more money.
• Close to where I work. Some marinas don't allow boaters to liveaboard. This marina does.
• Easy access and it's nice facility location to sail towards.
• Easy access to get in and out of. A very accessible port. Having nearby restrooms and showers is also considered to be convenient for us, especially when you are out there boating for a while.
• Proximity to work.

Question 9: What other moorage facilities, if any, have you previously been a tenant at?

• A private place in New York, on a canal behind somebody's house. No particular name for that.
• A tenant at Ballard Mills Marina, and at one time at Mcginnis Marina.
• Anacortes.
• Auke Bay in Alaska, Hanies, Alaska, Sitka, Alaska, Ketchakin, Alaska, Bellingham Washington, Shilshole Bay Marina. A spot in Newport, Oregon which is a private marina, but I can't remember the name of it right now. Then also bodega bay.
• Cap Sante at the Port of Anacortes. Port of Everett
• City of Des Moines marina.
• Dagmar and Gasworks Park Marina.
• Dagmar, also Elliott Bay Marina, Ballard Mill Marina and the Edmonds Marina.
• Edmonds Marina (2).
• Elliott Bay.
• Eliot Bay Marina. A boat on Lake Union at a private dock, and once before at the Poulsbo Yacht Club.
• Everett Marina.
• Fairview Marina on Lake Union.
• Huntington Harbor in south Los Angeles, and in San Diego.
• I used to be a yacht broker. I use to keep my boat at the marine services brokerage dock on Lake Union. It's not a marina with an exact name.
• In Anacortes just for the summer months.
• In Lake Union, but I don't remember the name of it. There has been a name change with that marina over the years.
• Inside the locks but I can't remember the name of it, and one in Lake Union twenty years ago, but I don't remember the name.
• I've come up here from California, and it was called the Santa Cruz Harbor.
• LaConner at the Port of Skagit County. Dagmar Marina in Everett.
• LaConner Marina, Coronet Bay, Bellingham Bay Marina, Warren Magnuson, Port of Everett.
• Never outside of Stimson Marina. We are five minutes away from this marina so we don't have to travel to anywhere else.
• Never.
• Never.
• Newport Beach Ca., Long Beach, CA.
• No.
• None (2).
• Olympia Swan Town.
• On an occasional basis, pay at the Everett dock, Kingston and a few times at Port Townsend. Also in Friday Harbor, but that was just for a couple times.
• One or two day places where I was a temporary tenant at, like at Friday Harbor, Everett Marina, Port Orchard, Poulsbo, Bell Harbor Marina, Fisherman's Terminal, Kirkland waterfront, Port Townsend.
• Outside moorage at Newport Yacht Basin by the shores. It's the marina that's right next to it in Bellevue. Seattle Boat, which is a facility by Lake Union, is another.
• Shilshole Bay Marina, a place in Kirkland called Kirkland Boat Marina and Leschi Marina.
• Shilshole Bay Marina 30 or 40 years ago.
• Shilshole Bay Marina, Ballard stacks.
• Shilshole Bay Marina, Kingston, Washington for a while, Nesh Bay, and Sekiu on the Strait of Juan de Fuca. I also get moorage at Poulsbo on the Kitsap Peninsula. Westport, Washington at Grays Harbor and Ilwaco is another. I've spent time at rivers in Eastern Washington as well.
• Shilshole Bay Marina, Newport Yacht Cub on Lake Washington.
• Dagmar's.
• Tacoma Yacht Club Basin, Bay Island Marina, Foss Waterway Marina.

Question 12: What caused you to leave the Port of Everett Marina?

• More opportunities to sail at Shilshole Bay Marina rather then Everett. The Everett marina is run very well, but it just didn't meet my personal expectations as to where and with whom I could sail with. The staff however at Everett was very good. The currents at the A dock at Everett at tide changes created a problem however for me. The work yard there however was very accommodating.
• We haven't left. We still launch from this marina.
Question 13: What is the most significant thing the Port of Everett Marina could do to make you more likely to become a tenant?

- A covered type of storage that is a little less expensive than what I have seen in the past.
- At the Everett Marina, the holding tank extraction system rarely work and should be repaired.
- Buy a house at Everett.
- Buying a condo with moorage available.
- Close the holes on the dock, slipped and fell in and tore my ACL.
- Competitive pricing.
- Costs.
- Cut their rates down. Otherwise, they were a good experience.
- Distance from the fishing grounds.
- Don't have a big enough boat.
- Drop their fees. They are high.
- Give me some reason to buy a house in that area. I don't know what types of facilities they have up there. It would be nice if they had a spot in there, where they could replace your light bulb mast on your boat. My personal one on my boat has an anchor light that is forty feet up in the air, and those are the things that I believe that every marina should have.
- Have it moved closer to where we live, but of course that is not possible. It's too far away.
- I can't think of anything because we are pretty well rooted here in Seattle.
- I don't have a boat that I would want to leave in the water there. During the Port of Everett Salmon derby, if there's openings, I would get a temporary moorage or three day thing (Friday, Saturday, Sunday) there. I wish they wouldn't raise the prices at the boat launch. There was a $3.00 boat launch fee at the time, now it's up to $8.00, and they also charge for parking.
- I don't know enough about their policies. I'm disappointed with their sub-letting arrangements. It's pretty self explanatory to them.
- I don't live up there, so there's nothing that they could do to make me become a tenant.
- I have several boats and some of them are co-owned and all these complications do not fit neatly into the Port's criteria.
- I just like having my boat at my house because it's easier for me to maintain it, when it's not in the water.
- I like Everett Marina, however it's too far away from my workplace. I will not endure that commute of thirty to forty minutes to travel over there.
- I live in Seattle, and Edmonds as well since Everett is too far away.
- I never launch there so I have no idea.
- I plan on moving up there someday. Being nearby my home would make me move to Everett, including my boat. I've worked on boats up there in the past and last time I was up there, there were many developments being made up at that area.
- I would be a tenant if I had a bigger size boat.
- I would have to buy a bigger boat.
- I would have to move to Washington.
• If I bought a bigger boat, I would consider it. Prices need to be advertised. I don't know the cost or what they could do. Brochures down at the marina would be handy.
• If I had a liveaboard situation. My wife works in Everett. There are people that actually live on their boat. Well lighted security gates are part of liveaboard. Some people in Everett are doing this right now.
• I'm ninety minutes away, so it would just be too far away.
• I'm not in that particular kind of market, for that particular type of boat. I'm more of the smaller boat type of guy. At one time, I was thinking about storage.
• It is good the way it is, I am going to become a tenant soon.
• It's an economical matter. I can't afford a moorage payment along with the boat payment together in general.
• It's not close to me right now, but only if I move close by there that it would become a possibility.
• It's too far away. If they could move the port down to Seattle would make it more convenient for us. It is a nice port however.
• I've worked on boats up there, but most of my work is in Seattle and distance is the problem because it's thirty miles away. The parking is good there however compared to here, and I like their docks. A lot of their water is fresh, flushing from the river so not much grows on the bottom.
• Keep it the same it is.
• Lower moorage rates and good upland facilities like good bathrooms and laundry facilities and businesses on site, like a store that sells journals and groceries where you could pick up some good food. Good restaurants with a good bar along with easy parking would be wonderful.
• Lower pricing
• Lower rates signifacntly
• Lower the price.
• Lower the prices. I don't like to leave a boat on the water. I would rather pull it out so it doesn't sink.
• Lower the prices. It seems to be flexible to get a pass there, but it's cheaper to trailer my boat at home. The port needs to consider the kiteboarding community and their needs. Kiteboarding is where you are on a board and you are holding on to a string with the kite flying in the air which you have got it flying by running with it first, and then relying on that to move you. I do this activity and of course there is no motor involved in this. It would be nice to have a separate little non-motorized launch for kayaks and things like that.
• Lower the rates because the Port of Everett is further away, so the gas prices need to be worthwhile for traveling up there.
• Lower their rates.
• Marinas that allow boaters to liveaboard because Everett currently does not. Cost is another reason.
• More dining, lodging, and shops in the area.
• Move down to Seattle. It was simply just the location.
• Move Everett closer to Tacoma. For me given the traffic between here and Everett, it would take too long to get there.
• Move the marina to Seattle. It's just not a viable location for me. The marina is very decent looking, and their moorage rates are reasonable.
• Move to Seattle.
• None. I live three miles away from Shilshole, so why would I want to go there?
• Nothing, because the Port of Everett is too far for us. We don't live in Everett.
• Open up more space.
• Price.
• Price and availability. It would be nice to have seasonal moorage where everyone usually has a full year period. Maybe offer a four month period or six month period instead. During the winter for uncovered moorage, it's not worth keeping my small boat in the water. I can park it in a storage place. If the Port of Everett could store it for you dry for the winter and in the summer you will have it in the water, that would be cool.
• Reduce the price.
• The long distance driving is the reason I wouldn't be a tenant with them. I really like Elliott Bay Marina because it's close to downtown Seattle, and it's really accessible and if the Port of Everett had those things, then I might consider it. But I currently live in Bellevue, so unfortunately it is too far for me.
• The rates are too expensive at the Edmonds Marina where I am at. If the Port of Everett were to offer lower rates, then I might just switch over there.
• The travel distance is one reason and I don't know what their moorage rates are. Another consideration is how close are they to other ports, like how close are they distance wise, like to the San Juan Islands, Bainbridge Island, Port Townsend and Port Ludlow. If it's more then a twenty mile distance to travel to and forth, then it's not worth it for my motor.
• They are far away from where we live.
• You have to move the moorage twenty miles south. It wouldn't make any sense.

Question 16: Are there any other new services or amenities not listed above that you would like to see?

• A full service restaurant with a bar would be nice.
• A gas dock placed there for boat gas.
• A marine tool library to try out or lend out one of the tools and try it out for a short period of time and learn a little bit about it, before returning it.
• A pub style restaurant where people can gather together after doing a whole day of boating activities and sailing and just a have a place to stop by and eat a good burger with beer and just chat. Maggie Bluffs at Elliott Bay is a good example of this pub style restaurant.
• Access to public transportation. Taxi, bus, and light rail service should be available nearby there. From the guest moorage, it would be nice if you can go and get a hold of a taxi or bus, and then
head over to town, and then maybe even head back to the marina depending on where you would like to go.

- At the boat ramp, I would like to see more fresh water wash down faucets in the area.
- Covered moorage.
- Dock boxes would be one. Reserved short term slips or stays.
- Fishing guide.
- I get scratches along my hull because the docks have nails sticking out. I would like to avoid this ongoing damage to my boat.
- I noticed when we came in there last Thursday night, at the entrance at the boat ramp there’s no green or red navigation lights at the entry into the docks.
- I think they should have dock parking for 4 hours for free in Edmonds or for overnight for a nominal fee.
- I want to say thank you to the Port of Everett for showing concern on what the customers are interested in for improvements, when in Seattle they don’t seem to care at all, and are just interested in making money only. It’s sad.
- Live entertainment.
- Maybe a place to buy fresh herring.
- More accessible restrooms for disabilities.
- More expansive fuel dock, expansion in guest moorage, lower guest moorage and regular moorage rates.
- More shopping stores placed close by to the marina. Just more variety of stores is needed there.
- No (8)
- Offering free Wi-Fi service rather then being charged to pay for it. Give the tenants with Wi-Fi, a complimentary secure code so others can’t access it would be good.
- Should just have one fee for launching. We should not have to pay twice for parking also.
- Showers and storage for non-tenants.
- Some kind of an intercom or communication device service attached or wired at the dock.
- Sunset platform on the break water. Dive capable mechanics.
- System for launching fees that work.
- The full service sit-down restaurant is what I am interested in. It’s needs to be more then just the to-go type, but offers quality food and not be super expensive. Something that is healthy and a place where you can go for dinner, after you’re done boating for the day.
- The Port of Edmonds guest moorage and overall attitude to the fishermen has been put far down on the list, and seemingly are more interested in the larger boats with the added money. They don’t have to do as much work with rough about fifty weeks a year, they sit there in their moorage, and it kills the economic engine drivers. They need to open their slings to accomodate the fisherman. There’s a lot of high end overhead.
- They need to have a boat wash there, similar to a car wash to wash your boat.
- When the computer age started twenty years ago, the next twenty years from today is going to be so electronically technological, it will be so amazing.
Appendix C: Tenant Questionnaire

Hello, my name is __________, and I'm a research assistant from Hebert Research in Bellevue. I'm calling regarding a survey for the Port of Everett Marina that will help enhance its services. Would this be a convenient time to conduct the survey?

1) How many years have you been a boater?

2) What type of boat do you own?
   a) Fishing boat
   b) Runabout
   c) Cabin cruiser
   d) Ski boat
   e) Sailboat
   f) Motor yacht
   g) Other:

3) What length is your boat? (Please round to the nearest foot.)

4) What type of boating activity do you do most commonly?
   a) Fishing and/or crabbing
   b) Day trips - cruising or sightseeing
   c) Overnight or longer trips
   d) Other:

5) How long have you been a tenant at the Port of Everett Marina?

    _______ years, _______ months

6) What section of the Marina are you moored at?
   a) North Marina
   b) South Marina
   c) 12th Street Yacht Basin
6a) On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all likely and 10 is highly likely, how likely are you to purchase a new boat within the next 24 months? [If 0-3, skip to q 7].

6b) What length of boat would you be most likely to purchase? [record number of feet]

7) What other permanent moorage facilities have you moored at, if any?

8) What other facilities have you considered for boat storage or moorage?

9) What was the most important factor that led you to choose the Port of Everett Marina as your moorage facility?
   a) Cost
   b) Proximity to your home
   c) Proximity to your boating destinations
   d) Availability / waiting lists
   e) Security
   f) Services or amenities offered
   g) Other:

10) On a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not at all likely and 10 is highly likely, how likely are you to continue as a moorage tenant at the Port of Everett Marina?

11) If you scored your likelihood to stay at the Everett Marina a 7 or lower, what is the most significant factor causing you to consider leaving?
   a) Another marina has a more preferable location
   b) Another marina has lower moorage rates
   c) Dissatisfaction with your experience at the Port of Everett Marina
   d) You are considering selling your boat
   e) You are considering storing your boat on land (e.g. trailer or dry stack)
   f) You have moved or may be moving
   g) Your boating habits have changed (e.g. your preferred activities or destinations)
   h) Other:

12) On a 0-10 scale, where 0 is highly unsatisfied and 10 is highly satisfied how satisfied are you with your overall experience at the Port of Everett Marina?

13) What is the most significant thing that the Port of Everett could do to improve your satisfaction?
Satisfaction with Everett Marina Features and Attributes

14) For each of the following features or attributes:
   - How important is the feature to you in your choice of a marina? Please use a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not at all important, and 10 is highly important.
   - How satisfied are you with the Everett Marina with respect to each feature? Please rate on a 0-10 scale, where 0 is highly unsatisfied and 10 is highly satisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature or Service</th>
<th>Importance for your choice of a marina</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Everett Marina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Moorage Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Customer service of office staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Customer service of dock supervision staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Customer service of other staff (travelift, maintenance, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Atmosphere of Marina (Is it welcoming? Fun? Is there a sense of community?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance / condition of facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dockside amenities (power, water, dock boxes, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bathrooms/showers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laundry facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping nearby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haulout / travelift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair and mechanic services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pumpout services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interest in Changes and Improvements

The Port of Everett Marina is considering various changes and improvements. How interested would you be in having each of the following items at the Port of Everett Marina? Please mark each on a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not at all interested and 10 is highly interested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature or Improvement</th>
<th>Level of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) An exchange program, where tenants could moor part of the year at Everett, and part of the year at a partner marina (such as one of the Anacortes marinas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A small store for groceries and sundries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A grab-and-go style restaurant that serves sandwiches and similar fare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A mailroom where newspapers, mail, and packages could be delivered for tenants to pick up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) An arrangement with a local grocery store to have groceries delivered to the marina office or a similar location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) A secured storage facility where tenants could rent small storage units to store extra equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Cable TV and internet connectivity at your dock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Wi-fi service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Remodeled covered moorage with a 20' clearance instead of the current 18'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Boat lifts that store your boat out of the water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) New boathouses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) Are there any other new services or amenities not listed above that you would like to see?
Appendix D: Non-Tenant Questionnaire

Hello, my name is ________, and I’m a research assistant from Hebert Research in Bellevue. I’m calling regarding a survey for the Port of Everett Marina that will help enhance its services. Would this be a convenient time to conduct the survey?

16) How many years have you been a boater?

17) What type of boat do you own?
   a) Fishing boat
   b) Runabout
   c) Cabin cruiser
   d) Ski boat
   e) Sailboat
   f) Motor yacht
   g) Other:

18) What length is your boat? (Please round to the nearest foot.)

19) What type of boating activity do you do most commonly?
   a) Fishing and/or crabbing
   b) Day trips – cruising or sightseeing
   c) Overnight or longer trips
   d) Other:

20) What type of moorage or storage do you currently use?
   a) Stored on trailer on your property
   b) Stored on trailer in a commercial storage facility
   c) Stored at a dry stack facility
   d) Uncovered moorage
   e) Covered moorage
   f) Boathouse
   g) Other:
5a) On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all likely and 10 is highly likely, how likely are you to purchase a new boat within the next 24 months? [If 0-3, skip to q 6].

5b) What length of boat would you be most likely to purchase? [Record number of feet]

21) What marina (if applicable) or city is your boat stored or moored at?

22) What was the most important factor in your choice to store your boat at this location?
   a) Cost
   b) Proximity to your home
   c) Proximity to your boating destinations
   d) Availability / waiting lists
   e) Security
   f) Amenities or services offered
   g) Other:

23) Have you ever been a permanent moorage tenant at the Port of Everett Marina?
   a) Yes
   b) No

24) What other moorage facilities, if any, have you previously been a tenant at?

Please answer questions 10-12 only if you have previously been a tenant at the Port of Everett Marina

25) What was the most important factor that led you to choose the Port of Everett Marina as your moorage facility?
   a) Location
   b) Availability / shorter waiting lists
   c) Moorage rates
   d) Services or amenities offered
   e) Other:

26) On a scale from 0-10, where 0 is highly unsatisfied and 10 is highly satisfied, how would you rate your overall experience at the Port of Everett Marina?
27) What caused you to leave the Port of Everett Marina?
   a) Another marina had a more preferable location
   b) Another marina had lower moorage rates
   c) Dissatisfaction with your experience at the Port of Everett Marina
   d) You stopped mooring your boat
   e) You moved
   f) You changed boating habits (e.g. your preferred activities or destinations)
   g) Other:

28) What is the most significant thing the Port of Everett could do to make you more likely to become a tenant?

Evaluation of Marina Features and Attributes

29) For each of the following features or attributes:
   • How important is the feature to you in your choice of a marina? Please use a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not at all important, and 10 is highly important.

   • If you have an impression of how well the Port of Everett Marina performs with regard to each feature or attribute, please rate on a 0-10 scale, where 0 is very poor and 10 is excellent. If you don’t know how well the Port of Everett Marina does, please leave the space blank or mark “N/A.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature or Service</th>
<th>Importance for your choice of a marina</th>
<th>Performance of Everett Marina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Moorage Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Customer service of <strong>office</strong> staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Customer service of <strong>dock supervision</strong> staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Customer service of <strong>other</strong> staff (travelift, maintenance, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Atmosphere of Marina (Is it welcoming? Fun? Is there a sense of community?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Maintenance / condition of facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Availability of parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Dockside amenities (power, water, dock boxes, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Bathrooms/showers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Laundry facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Shopping nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interest in Changes and Improvements

30. The Port of Everett Marina is considering various changes and improvements. How interested would you be in having each of the following items at the Port of Everett Marina? Please mark each on a 0-10 scale, where 0 is not at all interested and 10 is highly interested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature or Improvement</th>
<th>Level of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Renting slips on a short-term or seasonal basis (by the week or month)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A slip exchange program, where tenants could moor part of the year at Everett, and part of the year at a partner marina (such as one of the Anacortes marinas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A small store for groceries and sundries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A grab-and-go style restaurant that serves sandwiches and similar fare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>A mailroom where newspaper, mail, and packages could be delivered for tenants to pick up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>An arrangement with a local grocery store to have groceries delivered to the marina office or a similar location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>A secured storage facility where tenants could rent small storage units to store extra equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Cable TV and internet connectivity at your dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Wi-fi service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Remodeled covered moorage with a 20’ clearance instead of the current 18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Boat lifts that store your boat out of the water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>New boathouses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31) Are there any other new services or amenities not listed above that you would like to see?
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Introduction

The current North Marina (Port Gardner Wharf) Master Plan was developed between 2001-2005. It was approved by both the Port of Everett and the City of Everett and is the official plan guiding future development of the uplands within the area that the Port now refers to as the “Marina District.”

In early 2011, the Port Commission directed that a “Marina District Master Plan” be prepared that would not only update the Port Gardner Wharf Master Plan but also fully integrate the needs and interests of boaters, marina businesses, public access users, the hospitality, and residential sectors, other commercial businesses, and the general public. The Commissioners formed an Ad Hoc Committee to advise on strategies to secure a sensible mix of land uses for the District that complement one another, provide adequate parking and open space, is marketable to the investment community in the context of present economic realities, and is financially sustainable. Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee will be considered in the development of the scope of work of a Marina District Master Plan consultant team, which the Port is currently in the process of selecting. The consultant team’s work is expected to begin in the fall of 2011 and continue through 2012.

In creating the Ad Hoc Committee, the Port Commission specifically sought recommendations on several issues:

- How to improve upon the adopted Port Gardner Wharf master plan. The Commission believes the upland redevelopment effort needs to maximize previous efforts.
- How to integrate the needs of upland and marine users. How upland amenities can support the marina as one economic unit.
- How to ensure that the Port’s investments in its marina are cost-effective and flexible to respond to market trends and shifts.
- The types and mix of uses best suited to the Marina District, including public spaces.
- How to incorporate adequate public access elements on the site.
- Tools (events, activities, etc.) to attract users to the waterfront.
- Parking need, location and management.
- The effects of Master Plan modifications on the North End bluff residential area.
- Who should be included in an effective public outreach effort.
- Site re-development strategies:
  - Priority development
  - Single developer vs. Port as master developer
  - Phasing
  - Financing options
The Ad Hoc Committee was comprised of business people, boaters, residents, real estate investors, construction experts, tourism experts and waterfront users (See Attachment D). It considered the issues posed to it by the Commission at three meetings between June and August.

In June, the Committee used a day-long session to learn about the Port Gardner Wharf Plan, receive updated information from the Staff, tour the study area and give input to the Commission's issues. An "issues summary" was developed out of this meeting and discussed on July 21 at a morning session. From that discussion a draft of this report was developed, circulated and discussed on August 17. It is now presented to the Commission, the master plan update consultant team (to be selected in the fall of 2011) and the community for use in the next-phase Master Plan.
Executive Summary

1. A Plan for the future must honor the present and consider the waterfront uses that support the economic strength of the Port.

2. Future planning must complement Port efforts to deal with the current economy. The Plan must assist our economic recovery.

3. The Marina District Plan should be an update of the Port Gardner Wharf Master Plan (PGW), not a wholesale revision. The fundamentals of a mixed use master plan as outlined in the PGW Plan remain valid, although some of its features are recommended for change.

4. The entitlements, permits and the Development Agreement obtained for Port Gardner Wharf are of utmost importance and with a few recommended exceptions, should not be modified beyond the “design envelope” (height, bulk, open space) agreed to by the City and Port.

5. The Committee assumes that the “envelope” as defined in PGW entitlements potentially allow some flexibility in the arrangement of buildings without triggering a major modification process.

6. The Committee recommends focusing the intensity of development within the Marina District from east to west. The most intensive development is recommended for the easterly edge along West Marine View Drive. The Committee does not recommend increasing the maximum height of buildings allowed under the City/Port Development Agreement (65 feet); however, they do recommend relocating the taller buildings along the easterly edge of the site. If pursued, this would require a full discussion with the neighborhood during the master plan update and technical analysis by the consultant team; but, if valid, this may justify the time and expense needed to process the major modification through the City.

The Committee recommends increased pedestrian access (i.e. bridge and stairway) from the Grand Avenue or North End Bluff. This, too, will require full discussion with the neighborhood and may necessitate a major modification.

8. The Port must provide short-term, mid-term and long range plans. A clear strategy for the next five years is vital to the waterfront’s success. The Master Plan update should identify improvements and uses that can be implemented over the short term (five years). A longer term vision will not be fully marketable in the current economy and things need to start happening now.

9. The Port should identify and begin improvements to the Marina that will not be affected by the Master Plan update. Examples include clean up (staging) of the site, public access, restroom facilities, etc.

10. The Committee recommends moving forward with selected marina improvements as a first priority. Many of these need not await completion of the master plan update in 2012 and will enhance service to the boating community. Improvements include wayfinding; shuttle services;
in-water signing; and facility improvements at J-Dock. Improvements that will be identified as part of the Master Plan include pier replacement and realignment; improved power supply; etc.

11. Development on the upland should involve the same types of uses included in the PGW Plan, but the intensity of development should transition from higher density along West Marine View Drive to lower intensity on the west end, where soils and water table are problematic.

12. Parking presents a major challenge to a successful Marina District. Shared, mixed and lower intensity uses should be carefully considered to ensure a successful and marketable master plan that does not overwhelm the site with paved parking areas. A parking structure is likely required.

13. Beyond the District's boundaries, there should be efforts to make investors and visitors aware of its location, facilities and attractions. Physical connections are needed to the Marina District for pedestrians and cyclists.

14. The Committee recommends that the Port control sale, leasing, infrastructure and marketing to attract multiple developers to the site. One developer should not control the site.

15. The Port should stand ready to assist development projects that meet the broad vision for the Marina District, which may come forward before completion of the Plan update. The Plan should be able to adapt to a major project that brings immediate benefit to the Port and community.

Following is a more detailed report on the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. It is divided into three parts:

- The Starting Point -- What has been accomplished to date, what should be retained, what needs further study.

- The Vision -- Committee recommendations on what the future should hold for the Marina District

- How To Get There -- Recommendations on how to move from the existing plan to the future vision.
Part 1 - The Starting Point

Existing Entitlements

The Committee agrees that the Marina District Plan should be an update of the Port Gardner Wharf Master Plan (PGW), not a wholesale revision. The fundamentals of a mixed use master plan as outlined in the PGW Plan remain valid. Basic entitlements (approvals) from the City are in place including Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Shoreline Master Program Amendments; a Planned Development Overlay (PDO) with Development Agreement; and SEPA Compliance (including a Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements).

Preserving these entitlements is of paramount importance. Major versus minor modifications to the PGW project were defined in the Development Agreement between the City of Everett and the Port. Minor modifications will be addressed by the Planning Director, after consultation with affected City departments and agencies. Examples of minor amendments include construction of parking structures in areas shown for parking and changing from a building to public open space or recreational use.

Major modifications will require City Council approval. Examples of major amendments include increases in building height or a change in the use, intensity or character. The Committee was mindful in its work that major modifications require time, dollars and risk and it therefore limited suggestions for major changes to the Plan that were, in its view, necessary and compelling.

Existing Site Plan

The Plan around which these entitlements were drawn includes the following ranges:

- Marine sales and service: 98,600 to 117,900 SF
- Office, retail and commercial: 502,900 to 640,000 SF
- Housing: 430 to 660 units
- Hotel and restaurant: 75,000 SF
- Total Building Area: 1,440,000 to 1,558,900 SF

While these uses may be modified as part of the Master Plan update, the general use pattern and scale of development represents a reasonable and valid concept.

Allowed Site Improvements

The North Marina Redevelopment Shoreline Permits (1 and 2) are valid through January and February 2016. They cover several physical site improvements:

- Site preparation and building demolition (about 25 structures)
- Formal and voluntary clean-up plans (VCP) for soils (86,000 tons of contaminated soil)
- Infrastructure: roads and utilities (13th Street Infrastructure, Combined Sewer Outfall, West Marine View Drive)
- Bulkheads and Walkways (12th and 14th Streets)
- Marina support facilities: Craftsmen District
- Relocation of City combined sewer outfall
- New dry stack boat storage facility
- New buildings (Waterfront Center)
- Public access improvements (esplanade)
- A public plaza (Fishermen's Tribute Plaza)

Site Development Constraints

The Committee was informed of several site constraints which will affect whatever plans are put in place.

- Environmental Clean-up.
- High water table – complicates the construction of below-grade parking.
- Relocated combined sewer outfall utility line
- Site elevation – set to fit the proposed Port Gardner Wharf Master Plan
- Geotechnical considerations for building foundations

Adjacent Neighborhoods

The PGW Plan was developed after extensive public outreach, particularly with residents along the Grand Avenue bluff. Any impacts from the existing or updated plans will be to views, aesthetics, possibly noise and, if a connection is made to the waterfront, on parking in neighborhoods. Any Plan updates must be fully discussed with the neighborhood.
Part 2 - The Vision

The Ad Hoc Committee had extensive discussion of what the Marina District can and should be. The Everett waterfront is ideally located in central Puget Sound and should capitalize on its position. This was not fully recognized in the PGW Plan, which was more focused on the market goals of a single developer than the needs of marina users and the community. Everett lies between major boating destinations such as Poulsbo, Seattle, Bellingham and the San Juan Islands. It should, and can be, a highly competitive destination location for boaters and upland waterfront users.

A revised Plan should focus on how to draw boaters, citizens and commerce to the waterfront. For boaters, its moorage, fuel, and services are competitively priced. For upland visitors, the waterfront is easily accessed — if not well publicized. There is great potential for activities and amenities that would draw users from throughout the greater Puget Sound region. Upland and marina users should interact through a design that encourages public access while ensuring marina tenant security.

The Marina

The Committee agrees with many Port staff, boaters and citizens that the marina is the Port’s biggest asset. It can attract boaters, marine business, boat repair and upland visitors. The marina was not afforded proper attention in the PGW Master Plan according to many. It must compete with other marinas from La Conner to Edmonds and Seattle. The economic downturn has affected moorage occupancy rates (approx. 83% on average). Customers must be drawn back to the area.

There was some disagreement among Committee members as to how marina needs, per se, should be prioritized. Some asked, as important of asset the marina is, how great of priority should be assigned to a group of customers (boaters) who might not represent enough of a market to attract housing, retail and other investors to the District. Other members note that if price and service levels improve for the boaters, the moorage and visitor numbers will grow creating the beginnings of a market attraction for the other uses. It is a slow process, but building on the largest asset and current customer can be a key spark to the investment community. The market assessment in the updated plan should address this question of potential market and its effect on project prioritization and phasing.

From a practical standpoint, the current marina needs improvements to serve current boater customers. Improvements are needed to the physical plant and to customer service. To draw them back and keep their interest, boaters must be able to conveniently access the marina, register their visit, and travel to shopping and restaurants. Shared and improved shuttle-type transportation and new technologies may make for better access to these services.

Dock facilities need improvement and re-alignment to a North-South orientation. Some boat houses need maintenance and sprucing up; they should reflect a good aesthetic for the District.
J-Dock (the north visitors' pier) requires showers, restrooms and a laundry. It was recommended that key-pad security be provided on all visiting floats as well. This provides a good customer service for visiting boaters, and minimizes the need to go to the marina office to request a key. Other marinas are using this system, and it seems to be effective.

The use of kiosks or a satellite marina office is suggested to connect visitors to needed services in a convenient manner. This is especially important in the South Marina during the summer months, as 70 percent of the Port's moorage is located in the South Marina, and it is the most popular visiting boater location.

All docks require upgrades to their power supply, which now are at about 15 amps, but should be between 30-50 amps and up to 100.

**Upland Uses**

Among the suggested uses that could work well in the Marina District:

**Marine Service and Repair:** The Craftsman area is established and should be an economic centerpiece of the Marina District. It should be an “attraction” for the public to view “the working waterfront.”

**Office/Technology:** Office and technology uses are appropriate in a gateway office complex on West Marine View Drive. Not only does it help to develop a home-work-play environment with its synergistic effect, it is also true that new marina-related businesses are likely in limited supply in the current market. Office, clinic and non-marine retail are less appropriate further west where a more marina and waterfront user environment should be fostered.

**Retail:** This could be the economic foundation for development in the District, but the market analysis must find commercial uses that can grow and survive in an environment where half of the “market area” is water. Seasonal variability is also an issue, where summer customer counts might be very high, but winter numbers are very low. The Port should look at successful models in other Marina Districts where relief or alternative uses are granted to seasonal uses.

The need for a grocery story was mentioned frequently. If the marina is going to attract a higher number of boaters, the strong consensus is that grocery suppliers must be available. Markets are, in fact, developing now in response to boater demand. As housing and other uses develop in the future, the demand will increase and so must the supply.
The inability of boaters to access food and supplies is a major sore point with them. Innovative technology and enhanced delivery services might be used to get the groceries to the customer in cases where actual food markets are still beyond reach.

Public Markets

A Fish Market should be considered for the Marina District as a part of the existing Farmers Market that has proven successful. There has been some mention of a new Farmers Market being developed in the downtown area. Port Staff has indicated that this is a separate venture by others and will not influence the Port’s plans to continue this activity.

Commercial Fishing

Commercial fishing was a significant part of Everett’s history and culture. Although the fleet has been reduced significantly, a small moorage near the Fish/Farmers Market would honor its place in history and serve as an attraction to visitors.

Diversity in Moorage

The Port should explore diverse moorage options that would attract visitors, and build a steady customer base. Some options the Master Planning team should consider are the moorage needs of commercial fishing, houseboats, kiteboarding community, catamarans and other non-pleasure boat uses.

Hotel

A hotel with full services and facilities (pool, terrace, meeting rooms, suites, etc) would serve both upland and marina visitors. A location to the west would be best so that it brings people closer to the waterfront.

Community Building

The Port should facilitate the creation of a ‘Community Building for upscale weddings, conferencing, “Yacht Clubs”, and other events. It could serve as the conference center for an adjoining hotel on the Yacht Club footprint, if one develops.

How to integrate the needs of upland and marine users.

The Port Commission desires a master plan that serves both marina and upland users while having the District operate as a “single economic unit.”

Again, the Committee agrees that the marina is the centerpiece of the Marina District. The District is bounded on the north and south by guest and permanent moorage; the Craftsman Area predominates the northeasterly portion and boater related businesses are interspersed throughout. The Marina District name itself highlights its focus.

Successful upland uses will either support the marina’s success or borrow on its theme. A master plan should attract boaters to the marina, and in turn attract them to the upland areas for services
and entertainment. Boaters will use the upland amenities; upland visitors will use the retail along with the boaters. This inter-relationship should be fostered by the Master Plan.

The most immediate market demand is serving the retail and service needs of boaters, but with uses that also serve non-boaters. For example, the most immediate non-boater market is public access and events. A grocery store is desired by boaters and future residents, but cannot rely only on residents or boaters. A store scaled to the needs of boaters, residents and visitors would be a welcome addition by all. One has recently opened in the North Marina area. Also, a multi-purpose community events facility could be used by boating clubs; wedding parties; community organizations, etc. These and other areas of mutual interest should be explored in the Master Plan study and be used to define the use array in the District.

Uses that do not relate well or harm the essential marina function should be avoided. The South Marina is a good example. The Port entered into a long-term land lease at the South Marina. The former Marina Inn has been leased to a Sleep Center, which, while economically viable, does not represent the integration between upland and marina the Port should seek. It is recommended that the Port prevent future situations where it does not have control of the uses in its Marina District. Maintaining this control is essential for continuing to support the economic vitality of the boating and public access facilities.

Mix of Uses
The intensity of development on the various upland portions of the site may be shifted throughout the site in the revised plan, but the overall density levels outlined in the City/Port Development Agreement should remain. Exceeding these overall levels could trigger a major modification, but shifts will likely be approved as minor modifications, subject to review and approval by the City.

Development experts on the Committee strongly recommend that areas of poor soils and shallow water table should receive the least intense development. Beyond the obvious physical reasons, there is the marketing challenge of attempting to attract investment into an area that requires considerable cost. Costs to the Port could be as much as $17 million (in 2006 figures) to install stone columns (piling) around the edge of these areas, costs that could be avoided, in part, by lowering the intensity of development.

As a rule, the intensity of development within the Marina District should move from east to west. The most intensive development is recommended for the easterly edge along West Marine View Drive. The Committee does not recommend increasing the maximum height of buildings on the Marina District as allowed under the City/Port Development Agreement (65 feet) [See Attachment F]; however, they do recommend relocating the taller buildings along the easterly edge of the site. It would provide a readily identifiable "gateway" to the District and could bring high quality jobs to an area where housing and other amenities would provide a "live-work-play" environment. The cost/benefit of making any change to the height zone exhibit of the City/Port Development Agreement must be fully vetted before pursing this recommendation. Likewise, various potential
impacts would need to be addressed including, the aesthetics of new building roof tops, view corridors, and noise.

For reference purposes, the lowest point of the bluff is approximately 62 feet near 15th Street. The tallest existing structure on the site's West Marine View Drive frontage (the former Everett Engineering shop building) is approximately 50 feet high.

Job Creation: The PGW Master Plan assumed that 1,800 jobs would be located in the District. These would principally be in the office, retail and hospitality sectors. This represents a reasonable jobs goal, although the mix would change if the Housing sector became less intense, larger office buildings were located along Marine Drive and less intensive open space uses were sited along the westerly edge.

The Committee has not taken a position on the optimal jobs level in the Marina District. However, ports are tasked with economic development, so job creation needs to be a critical part of this plan. Quality of life opportunities help spur job growth in the city, and Committee members believe this is a great place to offer recreational amenities. More important is the marketability of a mixed use master plan. Whatever employment is generated by a successful plan will be a plus.

Housing
The PGW Plan allowed up to 660 housing units. These were originally envisioned as condominiums in a high density, residence-only environment. The ground was to be initially sold to the developer, who in turn would sell the land to the condominium association.

The overall housing model has changed given the current economy, housing market and consumer preference. The Committee recommends that a housing component still be a part of the Marina District plan, but that it might be less dense, contain more mixed use, and serve the rental not the condo market. After much discussion, the Committee declined to specify a unit count, a degree of density or intensity. This must be left to the market to decide.

Committee members also suggest a look at retirement housing for a portion of the area. Finally, the Port should consider mixed use with residential units over retail or office spaces, which is in keeping with the overall theme for the District. The consultant will, we assume, test these ideas based on the likely demographic of future residents, market trends, housing demand analysis, etc.

A key question affecting the development of housing in the District is whether Port land should be sold or leased to condominium owners or apartment developers. The PGW condominium project assumed that approximately 7 acres of land would be sold. Several Committee members cautioned that leasing the land could pose problems to potential condo or apartment owners trying to obtain financing. They argue that with a ground lease, banks aren't interested in financing unless there is a 10 year term beyond the loan amortization period, even for new owners coming in years later (See Hoban analysis – Attachment A). Each new owner would prompt the need for the extended amortization period. This puts the developer in the role of landlord for extensions, a significant hurdle to attracting investors to the site.
Also, as improvements age, the value of owned buildings can decline. As the underlying owned land appreciates, that offsets the decline of the building value. If the ground is leased, the developer foresees little, if any, net value increase and has no incentive to invest. In the opinion of some, the housing element won’t work if this issue can’t be resolved in favor of land ownership.

The Port Commission has apparently studied this issue at some length and agrees that a sale is preferred because of a concern over how leasing for this purpose comports with state law regarding the role of port districts in housing development.

The Committee recommends more study of this issue as an early part of the Master Plan update; earlier because of its effect on use, design and feasibility.

A final point on housing: in response to a Committee question, Port staff indicates that on-dock, at slip pump-out lines would need to be installed in the North and South Marina Basins in order to support the possible inclusion of house boats. House boats would have to be considered within the context of the existing Port/City Development Agreement as well as state and local shoreline regulations.

**Public Amenities**

Public access, woven throughout the mixed uses in the Marina District, will invite visitors, promote investment and enhance its regional reputation.

**Existing Amenities**

As a master plan is developed for the future, the current uses of benefit to the public must be acknowledged. The Marina District has several “attractors” that can draw boaters to Everett and that attract citizens to the waterfront.

- Summer concerts
- Farmers Market
- Fresh Paint
- “Walking the Wharf” trail system
- Fishermen’s Tribute Plaza
- Interpretative trail, documenting historic uses on the site
- Shuttle services
- Harbor Tours
- Equator
- Water events, such as carnivals, etc.

These should be augmented and coordinated in a Master Plan to create an identifiable Marina District with local, regional and national recognition.

**Public Open Space**

A significant open space element is an amenity that would attract development to the District. The
The current Master Plan lists roads, sidewalks and private landscape areas as part of the 18 acres of designated open space [See Open Space Diagram, Attachment E]. The Committee views this as an overstatement. Roads or private gardens should not be considered “public open space”. True open space should be a separate calculation and should include active recreation areas and a location for events. A more accurate estimate of PGW-designated open space would be about 9.8 acres.

Two larger parcels exist in or near the District boundaries. The first lies adjacent to the 10th Street Boat Launch. Use of this parcel is greatly restricted by the terms of the grant used to acquire it. It does allow certain open space access, but is probably being used to its ultimate intensity during the summer months right now (Jetty Island, Boat Launch, etc.). The second parcel is approximately 2+ acres and lies at the westerly boundary of the District, south of the 12th Street marina. It lies just north of the former Yacht Club, where a hotel and community center might be located. This parcel is viewed by the Committee as having good potential as an entertainment venue. The existing trail system is bona fide open space (and very popular).

Open space, per se, does not produce revenue. On that point, the Committee feels that ratepayers are paying into the Port and deserve a benefit for that. A certain level of public subsidy for open space is acceptable. Moreover, the Committee believes that revenue can be generated from open space areas. Indirectly, the presence of open space creates an environment that investors might be attracted to. More directly, it is also possible that with City and other involvement, an open space could be marketed for revenue producing events. Some elements (e.g. Salty Sea Days) could be co-funded by other public or private partners.

Port Staff correctly notes that as the level of performances rise, so do the costs (some concerts could cost $200,000) as well as the market competition with other venues (e.g. Comcast, Ste Michelle and Tulalip). The scale of some activities could overwhelm the site with people and cars. The Committee does not look to the Master Plan consultant to answer such detailed programming questions, but there should be some level of conversation regarding how these types of activities fit a future Marina District model in type and scale.

A final note on revenue, the westerly parcel is located in the poor soils area. If developed more in open space and public areas, installation of “stone columns” around this portion of the property could be avoided. Costs for this and other soil densification measures in the PGW plan were previously estimated to be as much as $17 million. Cost avoidance could be tantamount to revenue production.

**Other Potential Public Uses**

The Committee discussed other potential public uses for the District or surrounding areas that could help promote and build its reputation and commercial success.

- Space for concerts, July 4th, etc.
- Argosy cruises
- Kenmore Air – Everett to Victoria
- Salty Sea Days
- Cirque de Soleil or Shakespearian level performances
Other suggestions may grow out of the outreach efforts by the Master Plan consultant.

**Parking**

Parking is a major issue on the site. How it is handled will be a factor in the District’s marketability and success. The current PGW Master Plan had 4,550 spaces shown. One of the principal arguments for filling the central portion of the site was to accommodate parking for the condominium development. In a successful Marina District Plan there must be adequate parking for boaters, retailers, houses and events. The combined need for individual uses likely exceeds the land area available. Without shared, structured and/or underground facilities, an overabundance of the unbuilt surface area will be consumed by parking area or roads, and this is not desirable. With the current success of Waterfront Center, the parking challenges on the site are becoming abundantly clear, and must be strategically addressed. ADA should be taken into consideration in any parking solution.

A parking management plan was developed for the PGW Master Plan and its update must be strategic in its handling of parking demand. The PGW parking strategy was a complex, shared parking scheme designed to accommodate the density of development.

A revised parking plan must also balance proposed uses carefully to attract investors and users to the District. The Plan should include an assessment of use-mix alternatives and their effect on parking demand. Some mixtures will produce high parking demand and less opportunity for uses to share. Other alternatives may do the opposite: have lower average overall parking demand and have the ability to share. Sharing can be day/night, seasonal or daily versus weekend, etc. The Committee believes that a reduced housing count on the site would reduce the parking count significantly.

Because of its isolated location, the District must offer alternative means of bicycle, shuttle, bus or pedestrian access to reduce parking demand. We encourage the Port Commission to explore a partnership with the city for a shuttle service provider (similar to Olympia's Dash Program) that provides routine trips through the Marina District to the downtown core during boating season (May through September). The Committee also suggests looking off-site for other opportunities to share parking facilities.

**Off-Site Wayfinding**

Although not a feature, per se, of the PGW or Marina District Master Plan, the master planning effort must look at how to improve awareness of and access to the waterfront. The Master Plan update should pay particular attention to helping the public find the Marina District, then getting them there in a safe and convenient manner. The Committee notes that drivers on I-5 who don't know the area, likely do not even know that Everett sits on a substantial waterfront with Puget Sound. Through branding and other marketing efforts, the Marina District should immediately come to visitors' minds when thinking of Everett.

The City, WSDOT and Port must collaborate on how to get people guided to the Marina District from I-5 and points across the City. Once the visitor exits I-5 there should be an understandable, easy to follow, path to the waterfront. This “wayfinding” can be combined with signing for the
downtown, transit center and riverfront development, college, etc. to provide a coordinated signing
design program.

The key community gateways need to be improved to make users want to visit once the Marina
District brand becomes known. SR 529 is an improving entrance to the City with housing,
community college and other improvements along Broadway. However, Pacific Avenue at the I-5
off-ramp looks “unfinished.” 41st and Broadway will soon see constructed a new School District
administration building. Other new buildings line this gateway. The City of Everett has designated
other gateway corridors in the community with design and land use controls. The City is
encouraged to continue its work to improve these areas; and in a way that maintains an
unobstructed freight access to the interstate.

Once the visitor or resident has been attracted to the waterfront, existing obstacles to safe,
convenient travel need to be fixed. Cross walk and signalization are needed to protect and entice
pedestrians and bicyclists. Shuttles should be better coordinated to provide frequent service to
pedestrians and boaters. Once in the District, the “logistics” of moving visitors needs to be
addressed as they get to restaurants, entertainment, events, shopping and services. Port
businesses should partner with the city for a shuttle service provider (similar to Olympia’s Dash
Program) that provides routine trips through the Marina District to the downtown core during
boating season (May through September).

The Committee recommends that pedestrian access (e.g. bridge and stairway) from the top of the
bluff be studied as part of the update. There is both a physical and psychological separation
between large areas of the community and the waterfront that needs correction. There is a strong
walking and jogging constituency in the north end that would likely support a connection. The
neighborhood would have to have strong protections against it becoming essentially a parking lot
for the waterfront, but the Committee believes that these can be found. Gaining approvals from
BNSF could also be problematic and access could have to occur as far south as 21st Street. But
efforts should be taken to make a better connection from east to west.
Part 3: How To Get There.

The preceding sections outlined a vision that uses the best of what’s been done to date and addresses the future as best we know it. This section discusses the mechanics of updating the Plan to be a marketable, attractive and sustainable tool for growth. It offers recommendations on outreach, development of the Plan update and how to implement it effectively.

Public Outreach

As it did with Port Gardner Wharf and other planning efforts, the Committee expects that the Port will place great emphasis on reaching out to the public, boaters, bluff residents and others during this latest updating process. Certainly, the general public should be offered every opportunity to comment. The Committee would highlight the following groups as ones that must be deeply engaged to ensure a successful plan.

- Marina Working Group
- Existing users
- Northwest Neighborhood
- City of Everett
- Next generation
- Navy
- Tulalip Tribes
- PGW Interested condo Buyers
- Local developers
- Regional brokers
- Successful marina districts
- WSDOT
- Council of Neighborhoods
- Bayside Neighborhood
- Parks Board
- Historical Commission
- Commercial Fishermen
- Kite Boarders
- Jetty Island users/Everett Parks Dept.
- City of Everett Cultural Arts Dept.
- Snohomish County Tourism Office
- Hat Island Community
- Farmers Market

Some outreach will be well adapted to the work of the consultant team. More focused and intensive outreach efforts may be necessary for some groups that have a vital stake in how the detail of District development is carried out.

Developing the Plan

Market/Feasibility Analysis

Market analysis must be a significant component of the Master Plan update. It is essential to the Plan’s success. As the economy recovers over the next few years, the investment community will be very discerning in its decisions on where and what to invest in. A mixed use Marina District could be attractive to a single or multiple developers; however, the Master Plan and business plan must be sensitive to market dynamics so that investors are confident in the potential success of the Marina District. Each District feature – housing, moorage, office space, retail services and public spaces – must, together, be economically sustainable for the Plan to be marketable to the investment community.
There are several offsite features in Everett that can assist in attracting visitors to the community and the Marina District including:

- Jetty Island
- Performing Arts Center
- Imagine Children’s Museum
- Schack Art Center
- Providence Regional Medical Center
- Comcast Arena
- WSU/ECC Campuses
- Future of Flight

These should be factored into any market analysis for the Marina District Master Plan to help strategize how the Marina District can benefit from and benefit these other community assets.

User/Customer Research

The updated Plan must do a good job of identifying “the customer.” Consumers, businesses, recreational users, boaters are some of the customers who must see the benefit of coming to the Marina District versus other locations where they might otherwise spend their dollars. Because of the multiple customer base, the new Master Plan effort must do a good job of identifying who the customers are, what they want and how best to design to their needs. The Plan should not only consider who the customer is now but also who it will be 30 years from now. Generational changes may call for a different long term vision versus the short term.

Committee member Duane Pearson prepared Attachment B (“Marketing issues & Identification of The Customers”) as one approach to identifying potential investors and the factors for determining how uses are planned for the District.

Implementing the Plan

Phasing

The Committee recommends a prioritized phasing strategy as part of the Master Plan that will prepare the site for the earliest possible investment opportunities. Breaking suggestions down into a plan for 0-3 years, 3-10 years, 10-20 years and so on would assist the Port in developing a road map of priorities, while also taking into account timing of needed infrastructure. This report recommends that marina improvements to attract the boater community take a first priority and this will involve some infrastructure. (See Below) Infrastructure improvements will, in turn, stage the site for upland investments which will follow with economic recovery. An approach to infrastructure timing tied to priority uses is seen as cost efficient and strategic.

The phasing element should consider what Port or other public investment can best leverage private investment dollars to incentivize projects that will anchor future projects. Marina related businesses or a grocery store may see a need for infrastructure as they develop over the next few years. Their payment for these improvements would offset a portion of the cost, with the Port funding the balance. This could set the stage for further investments that would repay the Port. Early infrastructure
improvements should serve short term market demand. This will create momentum and create the market for later investments.

Short Term Improvements
Referring again to the early marina improvements, these should include the following:

1) Improve public access, finalize trail system
2) Add restrooms, showers, laundry facilities and keypad security next to guest moorage facilities at “F” Dock, and other guest moorage facilities.
3) Realign the fuel dock to provide access for larger commercial vessels.
4) Reorganize slips near the former haul-out.
5) Improve visibility of the Marina office via access, signage, etc.
6) Provide a satellite office at the South Marina during the summer months

Phasing Flexibility
The Port should not ignore projects that match the Marina District vision, but come sooner than expected. During the Plan update and during the economic recovery, there may be investors wishing to bring a significant project to the District. The Port should welcome development opportunities that create a positive financial cash flow, brings money back to the Port and provide a catalyst for development on the rest of the property. An early success could be an enormous positive impact on the balance of the development. The Port and the Plan should be flexible to accommodate these projects when they present themselves.

Staging
As part of early phasing, the Marina District needs to be cleared, cleaned and maintained (“Staged”) to convey a positive, self-assured image as marketing proceeds. Wide open areas (center of site, the future fill area, the west end open space, etc) could all be cleaned of debris, graded or seeded. Owners could be encouraged to fix up boat houses. Extraneous signage could be removed. The Port should work at giving the future District a smart appearance during the short term.

There were suggestions by several committee members that once environmental cleanup of the sites along West Marine View Drive were complete, and buildings demolished, the site would be more inviting to potential investors. The Committee acknowledges that that clean-up of the Everett Shipyard and similar properties must be coordinated with Ecology and other agencies and that the process is complicated.

Early Actions
Finally, discussions can begin anytime on several issues related to, but not an integral part of the Master Plan update. These include:

1) Exploring pedestrian access from the Bluff, and looking for interim solutions.
2) Traffic safety improvements on surrounding roads.
3) Wayfinding efforts with the City and WSDOT.
4) Exploring markets and generating interest among investors and brokers.
5) Naming of the District.
6) Service improvements such as kite boarding and commercial fishing moorage.

Port of Everett as Development Manager
The Committee looked at two questions posed by the Commission with regard to development strategy: whether there should be a single, master developer or multiple developers of the site after the master plan update; and how development might best be phased.

The Committee recommends that the implementation of the new Master Plan be managed by the Port and allow for multiple lessees, owners and developers. The Port should assume that the economy may not be positioned for significant new investment until 2014 or 2015. That is a few years after completion of the current update. During boom times it is difficult to bring all of the parts of a complex development together at one time. During a deep recession period when the market for one element will improve earlier than others, it is exceedingly difficult. For this reason, the Port should assume that development within the Marina District will occur in parts and that phasing is best managed by the Port itself.

The Committee emphasizes the importance and challenges of parking in our report. Multiple developers on multiple sites with varying uses strongly suggest the need for shared parking facilities under a parking management plan. Given phasing and the unsure nature of when the market will fully recover, management of shared parking should be assumed as a Port function in the current Master Plan effort.

The Port should also manage leases. The use of the former inn at the South Marina by a sleep clinic is indicative of non-competitive pricing of retail spaces in the area. Clinics are not the type of marine related business that strengthens the theme of the Marina District. A pricing structure for more compatible uses needs to be developed and then managed by the Port.
Attachments
Attachment A

Ground Lease vs. Ownership Analysis

Contributed by Tom Hoban

Where a ground lease exists, a borrower must offer a lender (bank) a ground lease term under the improvements he wishes to build or buy that exceeds the life of the loan. This makes sense when viewed from the lender's perspective. If a lender is offering a competitively priced 25 year term loan and they wish to collateralize that loan with the buildings, they would not want the ground lease under the improvements to expire before the loan is paid off. Improvements left on a property when the ground lease expires become the property of the land owner in most cases as they are considered “abandoned”. Consequently, lenders typically require the ground lease term under a loan they make on improvements extend at least ten years beyond the loan maturity date. The ten year additional term makes sense: Lenders must be assured that the ground lease runs far enough past the maturity date on the loan they are making that if they had to foreclose and take the improvements as collateral during the term of the loan, they a fighting chance to get enough value out of the sale of the Improvements to pay off the balance of their note. As a result, a ground lease term that extends well beyond the loan being granted to build or buy the improvements becomes a requirement of granting the loan in the first place.

The implications of a ground lease – as compared to a deeded or “fee simple” form of ownership – are revealed in meaningful ways. Improvements decline in value while land tends to appreciate in value. The calculation of value of the improvements is different as a result. A buyer really is only considering the cash flow potential of buildings located over a ground lease to measure what his investment will produce in the form of a return. There is no real “up-side” to a developer/investor in terms of land value. So the collateral a lender sees in the form of the improvements is assumed to decline in value in most cases. This creates new realities in sizing the loan, etc.

Lenders will force everyone’s hand by requiring term extensions on a ground lease anytime the borrower (or a buyer) wants to place a new loan on the improvements. An environment is established where for any sort of competitive new loan of some fixed term to be placed on the property, the borrower must ask for a ground lease term extension from the ground lessor (owner of the land). Since the owner of the land has the right to simply say “no” to an extension of the ground lease term, the property owner/borrower risks buying buildings that will decline in value over time with no prospects to sell for a reasonable price or limited options to refinance during their ownership. Because of this circumstance, there is a point where these properties no longer have any real market value – and it’s sooner than one might think. Who would buy a collection of buildings with 15 or even 20 years left on the ground lease under them that a lender will not lend a dime into? Answer: next to no one. As a consequence, any sort of sustained and quality long-term project at Port Gardner Wharf must have solutions to this issue.
There are solutions that can be considered. For example, installing automatic extensions of the ground leases under specific circumstances so that buyers, investors, lenders, etc. can see predictability in the ground lease term is one way. Or, the Port could offer very long initial ground lease terms (i.e., 99 years). There are other alternatives, too. Selling the land but with an option in place to buy it back at the then market value at the back end of some reasonable life cycle is another.

Broadly speaking, the power of deeded interest in land is relevant and must be sorted out as part of the panel’s work product. This key issue will have an impact on how actionable any desired uses might be. It’s one thing to put together what we think the community might want on this property. It’s an entirely different challenge to create an environment where private investors risking their own capital will step in to deliver something desirable for the community. Yet, such an approach is the way successful communities leverage the profit incentive of the private sector to do much more than could be done through other means. That, in many ways, summarizes the opportunity at Port Gardner Wharf. Understanding ground lease issues becomes an important component of this panel’s work, therefore.
Attachment B

Marketing Issues & Identification of

"The Customers"

Contributed by Duane Pearson

A recurring theme of the initial meeting of the Marine District Planning Committee was the need to identify the "customers" which would then dictate the type of uses that would be most financially viable on the subject properties. The term customer had somewhat of a double meaning since the customer is not only the user's we seek, but also the "customer" who will have an interest in living or shopping at the facilities constructed on the site.

Some noted that the customer base could change by the time actual construction begins given the state of the economy. Some believed we needed to meet with local major players such as the Navy, Hospital, Community College and others initially before we looked more outward. Some emphasized the importance of securing customers outside the area so as to not cannibalize other parts of Everett i.e. create new jobs with new money.

However, it became apparent that what the Port and City need is a much broader approach to marketing not only this site but the concept of upgrading the adjacent downtown area which includes construction of a pedestrian access to the waterfront.

In reviewing the make-up of the MDP committee, two well qualified real estate brokers are participating. But given the nature, size and importance of the site there is a need to broaden the input of additional experts located in other areas of western Washington and elsewhere. Customers for this size of property might well be single or multiple users who are located throughout the US and foreign lands. Many of these large clients have well established real estate brokerage relationships in place but may never have heard of Everett!

A Master Plan Consultant team will be selected in the near future and therefore it is recommended that the following item be included in their "scope of work".

PROPOSED TASK:

Certain members of the MDP Committee have agreed to meet separately for the purpose of preparing a list of recommended real estate brokers who specialize in this type of property, a few venture capitalists, and select members of the development community all of whom will not be local but have clients and experiences in competing markets. This list would be made available to the Master Plan Consultant. Certain members of the MDP Committee would agree to make a presentation regarding these individuals to the Consultant. Those MDP Committee members who wished to submit additional names could do so.

It is anticipated the Master Plan Consultant would follow-up with either a group or individual tour and a presentation of the site data to these individuals. The consultant would then request
their written responses. (The consultant should prepare a list of questions) These responses would be included in the Consultants final report to the Commissioners.

Since the work of these individuals will be gratis, it is obvious that they may well have an interest in heading up any subsequent marketing effort. Therefore, it is recommended that the Port include within the consultants scope of work, preparation of a draft of an RFP for marketing the property. Certain members of the MDP committee would be glad to participate in drafting such an RFP. The key issue for the Port is whether there should be an "open listing" of the property which would require individual brokers to submit proposals directly to the Port's Real Estate Manager; or, designation of an "exclusive" brokerage firm which would devote considerable time and financial resources in marketing the property and coordinate a marketing plan with the brokerage community throughout the United States and foreign countries. It is recommended that the "exclusive" option be pursued since most qualified brokers would refuse to participate in an open listing since there are substantial risks in client protection and other broker conflicts. In essence, there would be no real marketing plan since brokers would not spend the time or effort without knowing there was an exclusive agreement with a qualified broker in place. In addition, many brokers would not become aware of the property without a strong marketing effort by the listing broker.

Summary:
Several Members of the MDP committee have acknowledged the need for the Port to develop an aggressive marketing plan in connection with this site. Broadening the scope of the brokerage and user market will be the key, especially given the challenges in the market place which may extend longer than expected.
What Are The Marina District's Major Assets

- Close proximity to a population center (Everett) and residential neighborhoods
- Central location on Puget Sound
- Large marina with numerous berths
- The current size of the marina basins
- The number of guest moorage spaces
- Views of Puget Sound mountains/sunsets

What is Not Working Well

- Inadequate signage for existing marina businesses
- Lack of connection with downtown Everett and its amenities
- Shopping, dining, and entertainment
- Too few events for the public to attend on the waterfront
- Attracting more visitors - more Yacht Club or Boating Club cruises/help
- Shuttle service between marina areas and downtown

What Are Definite Needs

- Grocery store, more marine service businesses
- More retail services, clothing store
- Multi-purpose building for joint use by Yacht Clubs, Power Squadron, and Boston Education classes
- An amphitheater and more open space areas and plazas; some should be covered
- More restaurants, coffee shop, ice cream shop
- Hotel
- Additional bike racks
- Automated pay stations out on docks for guest boaters

Big Picture Items

- Need a 24/7 atmosphere in Marina District to make it vibrant and functional. This requires a mix of land uses, with a residential component - likely condos
- Proper parking space allocation among land uses and on-going parking management is a must; a parking structure should be considered
- Moorage rates are a major consideration for boaters
- The Snohomish River Navigation Channel needs to be adequately maintained for boat access to marina basins
- Planning and design of future marina improvements should consider the impact of climate change
- Marina security will need to keep up level of service as the district grows
Attachment D

Port Staff Work Group Report

Three meetings were held with staff serving the marina and boaters to hear suggestions on the Master Plan update. Following is a summary of those discussions. It has been divided among Facilities, Service and the Future Plan.

Facilities

The marina staff suggests several improvements to the Port’s existing facilities. Most of these would be incorporated in the new Marina District Master Plan, but they should be done regardless of the Marina District schedule. The staff sees the marina as a major economic asset that must compete with other marinas for boater business. The following will improve our competitive position compared with La Conner, Poulsbo, Bell Harbor, and others.

1. Recreation Areas:

   - Plan: Use West End of the North Marina Site for Events.
   - Plan: Build a ‘tail ship’ pier parallel to the open space on the West End to allow visitors a connection to the waterfront.
   - Plan: Consider areas for playground structures (e.g. in the South Marina, North Marina and 10th Street Marine Park). Look for innovative ways to fund these improvements (i.e. use parking fees to pay for playground equipment/park improvements).
     - Playground Theme: Keep nautical, i.e. sea creatures, whale slide.
     - Design to encourage families to come and enjoy from uptown and waterside.
     - Include a rain structure over the playground to allow for year-round use.
     - Engage the community in designing/planning/funding the project. Build’s community support.
   - Use Jetty More for Public Access – make a year-round asset. May alleviate some of the pressures for public access on the North Marina site.
   - Interpretive Signage that focuses on geography and wildlife.
   - Plan: Include space for a Recreation/Fun Plex. This would provide year-round use for families, and could include activities such as:
     - An indoor pool with a retractable roof
     - Mini-golf
     - IMAX theater
     - Driving range
     - Batting cages
     - Fitness center (look for partners such as the YMCA)
     - Tennis & basketball courts
     - Skate park
2. 10th St. Boat Launch
The Boat Launch brings people and boaters to the northerly edge of the Marina District. It should expand its facilities to create a reason for people to visit. These would include:
- Property acquisition to maximize uses.
- Amenities that would utilize our boat ramp facility, like expanded small boat/trailer storage for customers to lease that would provide close proximity to the launch.
- Possible outdoor dry stack storage.
- A gas station and grocery store on the corner that would serve boaters and customers on the waterfront.
- Possible small RV area.
- Consider a fish cleaning station at the boat launch.
- 10th Street Bathrooms are in poor shape, and are too small. Need to be updated badly.
- Bulkhead to the north of lane 13 at the boat ramp that would extend slightly beyond the western end of the existing lane 13 dock. Concrete walkway on top leading to a lookout at the west end overlooking the river. The bulkhead extension would provide a system that would help prevent accelerated sitting in lanes at the boat ramp, and would provide a great public lookout feature.

3. South Marina
The marina area will be re-designed as part of the Master Plan update. We should start phasing improvements in this area now, using operating funds now used to maintain existing float systems. It does not require waiting for entire process to be completed to begin these adjustments.
- Example: could take west end of Ono. A section at a time moving to the east and start extending I/J/K.
- All docks should have a North-South orientation.
- Docks should be adaptable to different sized boats. Current recession is impacting smaller slips (40' and under). This is affecting occupancy rates.
- Market the vacant covered moorage slips. They are good for keeping your boat clean and reducing maintenance costs.

4. North Marina
- Realign the floats in the NE Corner Re-align to match south marina.
- Start phasing improvements in this area.
- Some improvements don’t have to wait for Master Plan to be finished (e.g., take west end of O-No. a section at a time moving to the east and start extending I/J/K);
  - Use operating funds now used to maintain existing float systems.
  - Use existing money to drive new pile and extend docks.
  - Create a dock that would parallel the east bulkhead to moor the fishing fleet.
    - This would allow the public as they walk the promenade to view the boats and to possibly buy fish, shrimp, crab etc.
- Look at the option of building a wider dock that would allow the fisherman to have more space to work on their nets/boats right next to their boats.
* Possibly along in this area, create a fish market that would tie in with the fishing boats. Look at adding a restaurant, old pub, etc. that would serve seafood and complement that area.
* Remove the old existing Gno dock system.
* Create a new dock (which would run along the eastern edge of the existing structure) that would provide an opportunity to build new larger boathouses to the west.
  * In the middle of this dock, create a party float bump out for boathouse owners to meet and socialize together.
  * The larger boathouse gives owners more space for possible living/entertaining options as well as a great place for their yacht.
  * This would also make sure we are reusing any shading credit issues.
  * Possible houseboat location?
* Encourage owners to keep up/fix up boat houses.

5. **12th Street Marina**
   * J Dock needs shower, laundry and bathroom facilities.
     * Should consider security Keypads at visitor docks.

6. **Guest Moorage**
   * J-Dock (the north visitors’ pier) requires showers, restrooms and a laundry. It was recommended that key-pad security be provided on all visiting floats as well. This provides a good customer service for visiting boaters, and minimizes the need to go to the marina office to request a key. Other marinas are using this system, and it seems to be effective.
   * The use of kiosks or a satellite marina office as suggested to connect visitors to needed services in a convenient manner. This is especially important in the South Marina during the summer months, as 70 percent of the Port’s moorage is located in the South Marina, and it is the most popular visiting boater location.
   * All docks require upgrades to their power supply, which now are at about 15 amps, but should be between 30-50 amps and up to 100.

7. **Power Supply**
   * Docks are underpowered at 15 amps. Should be a minimum of 35-50 amps, or as high as 100 amps in some locations.

8. **Kayak and Kite Boater Docks.**

Kayakers and kite boaters need attention. Right now, kayak users and larger boats don’t mix well at the current visitor dock. They are “ambassadors” for the Port and do not feel appreciated. They are charged $80 for access to the docks and are complaining about it. They should be stakeholders who are consulted during the plan update.
* They should be allocated space at either J Dock or the south visitor’s pier to load and unload. These areas are too shallow for other boats and could accommodate these users.
Replace the old existing pier with a new pier with a covered pavilion at the east end. The pavilion would be over the water and would have 2 ramps leading to 2 docks on the north and south sides for kayak and small dinghy users only.

9. **Marine Repair**
   - Look at the option of building a mast tower for sailboats to do rigging repair.
   - The jib hoist should be replaced.

10. **Marina District Signage**
    - There are too many signs. They need to be organized and reduced.
    - Not only update the upland signage, including designating entry points into the Marina form WMVD and other roadways, but also from the water side (entrances to the 14th and 12th St. Marina’s, Jetty, and at various points in the Snohomish River Channel).
    - Upland map signage should have a “You Are Here” marker to help people find their way around.
    - Provide a “Gateway”
    - Visitors need to know that they are arriving at the Marina District whether from land or water.
    - An archway, monument or some other significant signing should be constructed at the main access road
    - Signing from the water can be confusing to boaters
    - From land, the buildings lining West Marine View Drive should be designed to distinguish this site from others
    - Need an electronic reader board along West Marine View Drive and maybe throughout the marina. Signage is expensive, and it is time consuming to do banners and A-boards for the various events.
    - Just not florescent lighting.
    - Cost affordable signage: Don’t make design standards so rigid that tenants can’t afford the signs.

11. **Storage and Refuse**
    - Ensure proper and well designed locations for storage and refuse containers. The former are in demand and the latter, if not handled well, affect the image of the marina.
    - There must be a dedicated impound lot for boats.

**Service**

Service to boaters is important to the marina’s success. In a competitive environment where boaters (customers) have a choice of one destination over another, the quality of service can be a determining factor. Some describe the “logistics” of the marina – how people, cars and services move around the marina to be in poor shape. Several improvements to our marina services will help single out Everett as the port of choice.

1. New Shuttle system to tie in the Marina District & Downtown Everett.
- Parking at the marina is an issue. As its popularity as a gathering place grows, this would put additional pressure on parking.
- Boating visitors will often ask what there is to do in Everett and how to get there.
- Boaters in the north and 12th Street marinas are a long distance from Anthony’s and other retail on the south marina.
- Grocery supplies are what boaters need, but they are too removed from grocery stores to fill their need.

Creating some type of public transportation network (possibly something similar to downtown Portland’s TriMet System or Olympia’s “DASH” system) that would tie the marina to downtown Everett, Everett Station, and the Riverside Project would be a great help, especially during events or peak summer days. Downtown parking garages and other viable lots could be utilized. Guests to the marina would have more options to visit uptown restaurants/shops.

2. Marina Office

In its new location, the office is difficult for the public to find. The entrance is shared with freight delivery for Scuttlebutt’s, which does not present of good boater-friendly image. Consider access revisions to the marina office.

Satellite facilities should be located in the south, north and 12th Street areas, perhaps with help of kiosks and electronics. People miss the old marina office at the south marina.

Need to re-open the 12th Street Operations office for boatyard users. People who are having their boat repaired would like a place to get a cup of coffee, watch some TV or read a magazine. We have the infrastructure there; it would be great to open it as a customer waiting room.

3. Technology Upgrades

The Port should consider certain technologies to enhance customer service.
- Kiosks to contact the marina office.
- Ordering groceries for delivery dockside (good seasonal work for youth).
- Keypad security for J Dock.

4. Gas Dock Considerations

- Convenient store on the gas dock.
- Secure a good fuel contract and market our gas prices. People plan their whole boating trips around gas prices.
- Adding an upland gas station along West Marine View Drive would satisfy boat launch customers, Hwy 529 drivers, and increase the Port’s fuel capacity to get a better rate for boaters.
- Consider future configuration carefully. Currents, boat sizes, location are important factors to consider.

5. Intermediate Wayfinding
Provide all security and maintenance staff with marina maps to hand out to visitors.

**Future Plan**

1. **Marina Improvements**
   - Priority: Upgrade North and South Visitor floats. They are aging, and they are the face of the Port of Everett from the waterside.
   - Don't eliminate the small slip moorage. This is full in the summer. If designing bigger slips, allow for additional cleats to tie up smaller boats in the summer months.
   - Tall Ship pier on the West End of the North Marina Area.
   - Need to provide a space for commercial fishermen. The current location where the nets are stored is insufficient, and makes it look like we don't want them here.
     - All marina office and maintenance staff agreed that commercial fishing should be a part of the Port's future.

2. **Create FUN!**
   - The marina should be both a boating place and a people place. The two can integrate, coexist and support on another.
   - Keep the lights up during the holidays. Create a sense of place.

3. **Signage: Provide a "Gateway"**
   - Visitors need to know that they are arriving at the Marina District whether from land or water.
     - An archway, monument or some other significant signing should be constructed at the main access road.
     - Signing from the water can be confusing to boaters.
     - From land, the buildings lining West Marine View Drive should be designed to distinguish this site from others.
     - Need way finding signage ... i.e. you are here.
     - Need an electronic reader board along West Marine View Drive and maybe throughout the marina. Signage is expensive, and it is time consuming to do banners and A-boards for the various events.
     - Cost affordable signage: Don't make design standards so rigid that tenants can't afford the signs.

4. **Trail System**
   - The Master Plan should be designed so that no matter where you go along the promenades and trail, you always have a different venue or something to do. It should be what connects people to places throughout the marina.

5. **Recreation Areas**
   - Plan: Use West End of the North Marina Site for Events.
     - Provide acreage that could create opportunities for a multitude of events for the marina and community.
     - Create a larger Summer Concert Series on the water. Would be a very popular venue.
* Other uses: farmers market, car shows, boat shows (this would be able to tie in J-dock/12th St. Visitor moorage for on the water and upland boat shows), possible outdoor movie theatre for boaters and public, kite festivals, beer and wine festivals, etc.
* Port should buy equipment and lease to event sponsors to increase marketability.
* Generational uses including Ultimate Frisbee, etc. will get younger generation familiar with waterfront culture and heritage. Will give it exposure to boating which may attract them in future years.
* Build a multi use building by J-Dock gatehouse for yacht clubs, boaters, and the public to rent for club events, etc., along with new public restroom/shower facilities.
* Build shelters for off-season use out of the weather.
* In the future build a dock to the west of the site for small ferry boats to access for public transportation or to bring people to the site for events, seasonal tours, etc.
* Publicize the Activity Barge more for private parties.

  * Plan: Build a 'tall ship' pier parallel to the open space on the West End to allow visitors a connection to the waterfront.
  * Plan: Consider areas for playground structures (e.g. in the South Marina, North Marina and 10th Street Marine Park). Look for innovative ways to fund these improvements (i.e. use parking fees to pay for playground equipment/park improvements).
    * Playground Theme: Keep nautical, i.e. sea creatures, whale slide.
    * Design to encourage families to come and enjoy from up town and waterside.
    * Include a rain structure over the playground to allow for year-round use.
    * Engage the community in designing/planning/funding the project. Build's community support.
  * Use Jetty More for Public Access – make a year-round asset. May alleviate some of the pressures for public access on the North Marina site.
  * Interpretive Signage that focuses on geography and wildlife.
  * Plan: Include space for a Recreation/Fun Plex. This would provide year-round use for families, and could include activities such as:
    * An indoor pool with a retractable roof
    * Mini-golf
    * IMAX theater
    * Driving range
    * Batting cages
    * Fitness center (look for partners such as the YMCA)
    * Tennis & basketball courts
    * Skatepark

6. Hospitality/Restaurants/Retail Considerations

  * Could be used for possible hotel activities/events if hotel is built on Conf. Center site.
  * Bring in more diverse restaurants (Mexican, affordable breakfast joint, English Pub, Pizza, etc.) and shops from this site to Scuttlebutt along the south 12th St. trail/future promenade.
- Grocery store, such as Trader Joe's/Whole Foods
- Shopping options, arts & crafts, clothing, etc.
- Coffee Shops, ice cream shops, etc.

7. Create a "Bell Harbor" type Marina at the ADA Dock, Old Jib Hoist Dock, & Seine Dock Area
   - Add more docks/activity barges for visitors, boat shows, etc. along old jib hoist dock and seine wharf.
   - Take portion of area where old Scuttlebutt used to be, put in other restaurants, pubs, shops in and around area to add to existing restaurants and hotel. Possible office space upstairs.
   - Have shuttle service available to area.
   - Could create a very cool, intimate, fun area for boaters to come into.
   - Very protected from the weather.
   - Provide the same technology service that Bell Harbor offers (i.e. one stop shopping).

8. Housing area
   - This area should allow mixed use development instead of housing only. Condos or apartments above ground level retail or office.

9. Parking
   - There will have to be shared parking and a parking structure to accommodate multiple developers and users.
   - Make sure any parking garage structure can accommodate ADA vehicles/spaces.
   - Don't plan the site to park for all the events. Create a parking plan that uses a shuttle/satellite parking facility to take people to the event. The marina can't be designed for peak events; just make sure day-to-day uses are adequately addressed.
   - Keep boaters in mind. They don't use the marina on event weekend's, such as Fresh Paint, because of the parking difficulty.
   - Consider gated parking like 12th Street.

10. House boats
    - There could be a good market for house boats either at 12th Street or north marina.
    - Views would have to be evaluated and covenants to ensure aesthetics and that house boats don't obstruct other views.

11. Farmers/Fish Market
    - The market should be larger.
    - Fish market should be located near and help promote the fishing fleet area.

12. Maintenance Considerations
    - Future uses will require truck service, plan the road system accordingly. Right now the road about is difficult for semi-trucks to navigate.
    - Evaluate benefit of roundabouts. Not desirable, causes damage.
* Standardize all maintenance items: i.e. landscaping, lighting, water, electrical, infrastructure. It costs a lot of money, and takes up a lot of storage space to keep repair supplies for the various designs.
* Cost affordable features: benches, garbage cans, bollards, light poles should be affordable.

13. Management and Phasing
   * The property should be developed by multiple owners.
   * The Port should manage this growth.
   * The Port should have control over leasing. Existing pricing has forced uses out of area (South Marina village).

14. Environmental Features
   * Roof gardens (i.e. pea patches).
   * Electric car plug-in stations.
Attachment F:
Development Agreement Excerpt on Building Heights

Note: This exhibit was prepared by City of Everett Planning on 9/13/11 to clarify the Height Zone Map (Attachment C) of the 2005 City Port Agreement.
Attachment G
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APPENDIX I
Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan Website Survey Results (attached).
Boating Access & Public Facilities Plan

1. Are you a Port of Everett District resident?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 1
skipped question 0

2. Do you have a moorage slip at the Port of Everett Marina?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 1
skipped question 0

3. How many times per week (on average) do you use the boating facilities at the Port?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 1
skipped question 0
4. Are you aware the Port of Everett provides boating access and public facilities? Such as walking/bicycling trails, viewpoints and benches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 1
skipped question: 0

5. Have you used any of the following existing public facilities provided by the Port of Everett during the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marina Slips &amp; Guest Moorage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Street Marine Park</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty Island</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 10th Street Boat Launch</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Trails</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Concert Series</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront restaurants</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman's Tribute Plaza</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 1
skipped question: 0
6. Please describe your satisfaction with the facilities you have used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marina Slips &amp; Guest Moorage</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Street Marine Park</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty Island</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Street Boat Launch</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Trails</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Concert Series</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront restaurants</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman's Tribute Plaza</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In addition to the existing public facilities listed in question 5 are there other public facilities you would like to see?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Are there any improvements you would like to see to the existing public facilities listed in question 5?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Are there specific boating amenities you would like to see that are not provided at this time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Which of the following waterfront events and activities have you participated in the past 5 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/Activity</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moorage Holder</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Boater</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty Island Days</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Cruises/Tours</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudders &amp; Wheels</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Concert Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Cleanup Day</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday on the Bay</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th of July Festival</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Paint</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Derby</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty Jam Kiteboarding Festival</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answer</strong></td>
<td><strong>answer</strong></td>
<td><strong>answer</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The Port of Everett values your feedback. Do you have any comments or suggestions that you would like to offer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>answer</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answer</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answer</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3. How many times per week (on average) do you use the boating facilities at the Port?

1 3 times  

Q7. In addition to the existing public facilities listed in question 5 are there other public facilities you would like to see?

1 Why don't you allow for more boats to come to Waterfront Concert Series, by taking out the net dock you took out most of the moorage.  

Q8. Are there any improvements you would like to see to the existing public facilities listed in question 5?

1 Why don't you enlarge the docks at jetty Island.  

Q9. Are there specific boating amenities you would like to see that are not provided at this time?

1 More reasonably priced dinghy moorage rates if you are already a tenant paying for a regular slip.  

Q11. The Port of Everett values your feedback. Do you have any comments or suggestions that you would like to offer?

1 Over the last few years the Port has paid more attention to the upland development and not to the marina and the tenants. You need to change this, obviously your vacancy rate is reflecting this lack of attention to the boaters. Other marinas offer 50 and 100 amp electrical service (you do in the new marina) why don't you in the original marina? You also are planning on raising the moorage rates again this year which will make you the only landlord in Snohomish County to raise rents this year.
APPENDIX J

Port of Everett Commission Resolution adopting the Boating Access & Public Facilities Plan on February 14, 2012 (to be attached post-adoption).
RESOLUTION No. 968

A resolution adopting the Port of Everett’s Boating Access and Public Facilities’ Plan.

WHEREAS, the Port Commission of Everett desires that the Port of Everett be eligible for a variety of grant funding programs administered by the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), including those that fund boating and outdoor recreation facilities; and

WHEREAS, RCO policies set forth certain planning requirements for grant applicants, including the preparation and adoption of a plan containing specific elements per RCO guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Port of Everett prepared a draft Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan in a manner consistent with RCO guidelines and conducted public involvement in the forms of articles describing the plan in the Port Side and Marina Newsletter and on the Port’s website which included access to public survey questions, a SEPA environmental review with a public comment period, a public presentation before the Port Commission on February 7, 2012 where comments were solicited; and

WHEREAS, the Port of Everett Commission and Staff believe the Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan provides an appropriate framework for future boating access and other related public improvements.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

The Port Commission hereby officially adopts the Port of Everett Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan dated February 14, 2012, substantially in the form which is attached hereto and incorporated herein as though fully set forth herein. The Executive Director and his Staff are hereby authorized to make minor changes to the Boating Access and Public Facilities Plan as adopted.

ADOPTED by the Port Commission of the Port of Everett this 14th day of February, 2012

PORT OF EVERETT COMMISSION

Troy McClelland, President

Michael Hoffmann, Vice President

Tom Stogner, Secretary

Attest: Swan Braxton

Approved as to form:

COPY