

Action Initiative: Enhance Downtown Transit Oriented Development

6/6/12

Initiative Champion(s):	Greg Fisk
Initiative Development Team:	Greg Fisk, Heather Marlowe, Fran Downey, Ben Lyman, Mark Ridgway, Nancy Waterman, Paul Thomas [John Kern, Capital Transit Director is not an active member but is included in all group outreach.]
<p>Description & Motivation: DOWNTOWN CIRCULATOR – The group’s focus is on creation of a Downtown Circulator transit system as an integral part of efforts to revitalize Downtown Juneau. The group recognizes that creating desired higher density mixed use development and attracting new residents to downtown is highly linked to effective transit options in the area. Motivations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving District interconnect between S. Franklin (tourist zone), the uptown Legislative / Governmental campus, and the Willoughby District; Encouraging the pedestrian / transit experience by using the “pedestrian extension” a circulator can provide; • Creating a convenient alternative to using private vehicles to move about in downtown; • Capitalizing on the existing infrastructure base by achieving higher density development by fostering Transit Oriented Development (TOD) throughout downtown. 	
<p>Objective: <i>Foster investment in mixed use development using TOD concepts. Create an alternative to typical motor vehicle use. Improve safety. Broaden visitor access and options while creating a new visitor venue. Expand the pedestrian environment. Support business and leisure activity in the downtown core.</i></p>	

ACTION PLAN– Provide a rough schedule of activity for each step

Describe the specific steps/tasks.	Key People: Who needs to be involved to accomplish step	Resources needed to accomplish step	Timeline to accomplish step
<p>1. <u>Revisit and move circulator plan forward</u> – a review of existing plans and of past history was completed. This included the CBJ’s Capital Transit Plan (Moore & Assoc., 2008) and subsequent DBA report on Circulator ideas. Previous circulator history was reviewed. Juneau’s 1982-83 experience with a “ride free zone” circulator was both very positive from a public “user’s” perspective and had Juneau at the forefront of innovative transit efforts. Its “Achilles’ heel” was dependence on a federal grant for operations. Once the grant ran out the bu-based system could not be maintained.</p>	<p>Fisk Interviewed John Kern, Capital Transit.</p>	<p>Volunteer time / No \$ resources needed.</p>	<p>Completed early April, 2012</p>

<p>2. <u>Define street car possibility</u> – Outline a true (rail in roadway) streetcar option. Memo outlined technical and operational issues, as well as capital and operational funding, the desirability of streetcars vs. buses; impacts on TOD development, etc. Potential for roughly 3 track mile route – S. Franklin to 4th, down Main to Transit Center, along Willoughby to Federal Bldg. and return. Pluses of streetcar: low operating cost, clean & quiet, higher ridership than buses, long system life, and highest multiples for private investment along route. And they are a visitor venue in their own right. Biggest concern is capital cost. System alternatives range from vintage restored cars to fully modern, low floor rolling stock; over head wire to wireless systems.</p>	<p>Fisk has already had discussions with experts in field – Keith Jones (URS), Tim Borchers (City Rail Solutions), Peter Mikos (HART – Tampa Streetcar System Mgr.)</p>		<p>Analysis memo completed early April, 2012. Work on details is ongoing</p>
<p>3. <u>Define bus alternatives</u> – General agreement that if a bus alternative is chosen it should be fixed guideway, (ie. not divertable to other service) in order to generate at least some development assurance along route. Alternatives being looked at include rapid recharge supercapacitor drives (also applicable for streetcars). Capital cost of buses much less than a streetcar but lower system life, lower ridership, and lower development generation. Any bus based system would need to be well branded.</p>	<p>Thus far web research only. Though super capacitor systems look very interesting, add. Work needed on other possible bus systems like vintage buses, Euro specialty buses, etc.</p>		<p>Analysis memo completed early April, 2012. Work on details is ongoing</p>
<p>4. <u>Identify alternative routes</u> – Suggested that a design charette be held to generate route ideas. Good way to generate interest</p>			
<p>5. <u>Fully analyze pros/cons for different alternatives</u> -</p>	<p>Keith Jones of URS estimated roughly \$500,000</p>	<p>Preliminary engineering analysis required.</p>	
<p>6. <u>Understand and quantify impact of transit (fixed and not) on development</u></p>			
<p>7. <u>Explore costs and funding options in greater detail-</u></p>		<p>Prelim. work done based on CBJ revenue projections</p>	
<p>8. Identify barriers and allies for preferred alternative</p>			
<p>9. Build community and institutional support</p>			<p>1 year</p>

Obstacles and Impediments Likely to Affect Implementation: *What are some of the most significant obstacles to implementing the action initiative? How can/will they be overcome? What resources will be needed?*

Step:	Help needed:
Capital Cost – what is the funding source(s)	Industry will object to use of cruise ship taxes (CBJ MPF and PDF, and State MPF) even though this source is more than adequate for either streetcar or bus-based circulator capital cost.
Operating Cost – how much will be fare box and how much other sources; can we create a ride free zone	Innovative market as in “city pass” for tourists, various possible “ride free” concepts – this will take creative thinking and a commitment to success.
Perceived Competition – taxis and tour bus operators will likely with other operators.	Even though the circulator <u>will not</u> offer tours per se, some compensation may be required / justified for existing “faux trolley” operators.
Local objection to extending effective tourism zone	Some people want to isolate tourists, not distribute them more widely through the downtown. Education and outreach about trade-offs and benefits will certainly be required.

Funding: *What is the estimated cost of this initiative, in phases beginning with design, the ‘ramping up’ phase, and then for ongoing annual costs? Note potential sources of funding for each phase if possible.*

Phase:	Budget:	Funding Source:
Streetcar	\$30-\$45 million	Marine Passenger Fees (MPF, PDF, S-MPF)
Supercapacitor Buses (fixed guideway system)	\$8-\$9 million	Marine Passenger Fees (MPF, PDF, S-MPF)
Operating budget	\$1-\$1.25 million / annum	Farebox, tourism promotions (city passes), Marine Passenger Fees, or combinations thereof

Outcome/Results:

How will we know we have achieved our objective? How will we evaluate whether or not we have been successful? Are there measurements? Objective will be reached when an effective, sustainable circulator is in place and meeting the Transit Oriented

Development goal of stimulating significant new mixed use private investment along the circulator route.