

Out of scope of request

Unique vs. Common Assets (1)

Some Advantages with Tailored Assets

As mentioned above, a mixed fleet does have advantages in some situations. Exactly tailoring an asset to its service may be more cost effective *at the local operational level* than a common asset which may not always be the perfect fit. Occasionally this may be significant and material.

Sometimes the operating cost benefits of tailored asset greatly outweighs the flexibility cost benefit of a common asset. For example, the physical characteristics of a route may be so special that a unique vessel will provide much larger operating and capital savings than a common vessel. This is the case with the cable ferry at Denman Island and the *Kwuna* in Haida Gwaii. In both situations the operating savings are of a scale which outweighs the benefits of commonality.

Assess Total Cost

The essential point here is that the *total cost* of unique vs common asset be considered, not just local route economics. Out of scope of request

BCF Requires Some Fleet Variability

It's clear that the BCF network is too diverse for a "one size fits all" approach. As we have seen in Part 1, a single model fleet imparts an undesirable rigidity which can increase operating costs. Therefore the future fleet must have both commonality and flexibility.

As the scattergrams show, for BCF this means using several families and models of ships. The results suggest a BCF fleet³⁰ comprising:

Table 7 – Suggested Families and Models for BCF Future Fleet

Old Name	Family	Model(s)	Route type	# of Routes
Major	Major	250, 370	Long/high volume routes	4
Intermediate	<i>Salish</i>	85, 100, 145	Moderate/long routes with moderate volumes	5
	<i>Century Mk2 Shuttle</i>	100, 115	Short routes with high volume	4
-	Cable	50	Short routes with moderate volumes (w/ cable characteristics)	1
Minor	Minor	35 & 50	All length routes with low volumes	8

We do not suggest that every model above is required. Exact sizes will be determined by business case and engineering analysis. Rather the scattergram results suggest those sizes which logically fit BCF route requirements.

Note that within each family there are several models to calibrate size more closely to requirements. For example, route 3 may be served in future by 1 x Major 370 or 2 x Major 250.

Out of scope of request

Out of scope of request