

S

B

2

8

8

POSITION PAPER  
ON  
HOUSE BILL NO. 288

"An Act making a special appropriation to the Municipality of Anchorage to study modes of mass transportation in Anchorage; and providing for an effective date."

This bill would appropriate the sum of \$100,000 to the Municipality of Anchorage to study modes of mass transportation in Anchorage. It is generally an accepted fact that transportation is a major service needed for all age groups, including the elderly and handicapped, and present services are not meeting the demand.

The Municipality of Anchorage received a grant of \$10,000 for FY'81 from the Department of Health and Social Services to contract with a transportation consulting firm to plan better coordination of transportation services with existing agencies providing services to the elderly and handicapped. However, this legislation would extend beyond the scope of the coordination study and evaluation.

The Department of Health and Social Services supports the concept and need for improved mass transportation in Anchorage.

Recommended by: Elizabeth Muktarian  
Elizabeth Muktarian  
Director  
Div. of Adult and  
Aging Services

Date: 3/19/81

Approved by: Helen D. Beirne  
Helen D. Beirne  
Commissioner  
Dept. of Health and  
Social Services

Date: 3/24/81

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA  
TWELFTH LEGISLATURE

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. House Bill No. 289

Title "An Act making a special appropriation to the Municipality of Anchorage to study  
Requested by mass transportation in Anchorage; & providing for Date March 18, 1981  
an effective date."

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Department of Health and Social Services

Program Category Affected Social and Economic Assistance for the General Population

BRU, Program, or Subprogram(s) Affected Division of Adult and Aging Services-Adult Services

(Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC						
TOTAL		-0-				

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND		-0-				
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify Fund Source)						

POSITIONS

FULL TIME						
PART TIME						
TEMPORARY						

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

Zero Impact.

IV. DATE

3-18-81

PREPARED BY Dorothy Wall

AGENCY Division of Adult and Aging Services

Original: Legislative Finance

PHONE 465-3250

cc: Budget and Management

Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

M&B Approval

M. H. G. Gault

Date 3/20/81

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
For an analysis of Mass Transportation  
Modes Suitable for Primary  
Transit Corridors

Introduction

In order to provide personal mobility with minimal disruption to the urban environment, the Municipality of Anchorage is seeking qualified consultants to submit proposals for an analysis of the suitability of a range of modes for Primary Transit Corridors.

Anchorage has a unified government that encompasses an area of 2,000 square miles with a population near 200,000. Most of the population is located in an area covering 180 square miles which is expected to accommodate 350,000 people by 1993. The Municipality initiated transit service in 1974 and now has a daily ridership in excess of 10,000. The Long Range Element of the Transportation Plan forecasts approximately 140,000 daily transit trips for 1995.

Parameters of Alternatives

The objective is to evaluate a broad range of modal alternatives within the following parameters:

1. A wide range of anticipated levels of demand for transit service, within the population range predicted for the study area.
2. Availability of right-of-way.
3. Capital and operating costs.
4. Accessibility to the mobility-impaired.
5. Anticipated reliability of the technology.
6. Comfort, personal safety, and security of passengers and staff.

Modal-Evaluation Criteria

The final product will be a report assessing a variety of modes with respect to:

1. Potential to attract varying levels of ridership.
2. Construction cost, in light of local-financing capability.

3. Operating costs, in light of local-financing capability.
4. Average speed, including access time.
5. Lead time for implementation.
6. Frequency of service.
7. System capacity.
8. Right-of-way requirements and associated displacement.
9. Visual and noise impacts.
10. Energy impact.
11. Accessibility to the mobility-impaired.
12. Structural stability under prevailing soil and seismic conditions and the subarctic climate.
13. Maintenance requirements.

#### Modal Characteristics

The proposal should list a wide variety of modes to be examined in the initial phase of the project. The initial selection should cover numerous variations within--and combinations of--the following factors:

- Vehicle size--including articulation and the potential for multiple unit (MU) operation. Passenger-carrying capacity is a primary concern.
- Guideway--surface, mixed-traffic, elevated, subway, degree of grade separation, fixed guideway.
- Control--manual, automatic with on-board attendant or completely automated.
- Personnel Requirements--vehicle operator, vehicle attendant, station attendant, traffic controllers and supervisors, peaking characteristics of daily crew size.
- Power Supply--central Station: overhead wires, current rails, recharging stations. On-board: petroleum-based fuels, alcohol, propane, batteries, flywheels.

- Propulsion--electric, internal combustion, linear induction, flywheel, cable.
- Effect on Street Traffic Control--preferential signalization, restricted-use lanes, grade-crossing signals and gates.
- Pedestrian Access--including means of handicapped access.

Attached is an example list of modes.

#### Selection of Modes for Detailed Analysis

The consultant will present the results of the initial analysis of each mode to the AMATS Committees, the Transit Advisory Board, the Planning and Zoning Commission (in a public hearing), and the Municipal Assembly. In this presentation the consultant will provide brief descriptions, in lay terms, of the distinguishing characteristics of each mode, providing--where possible--photographs or drawings of the modes. The presentations should include a description of the land-use and population characteristics appropriate to each mode. Order-of-magnitude relative costs should also be discussed.

The Municipality will then select four modes for detailed analysis.

#### Final Report

The detailed analysis of the final four modes will describe the conditions under which each mode could be successfully operated on primary transit corridors in Anchorage.

#### Land Use

The final report should highlight the land-use characteristics that are typically associated with successful operation of each mode.

#### Reference to Previous Studies

Reference should be made to the "Anchorage Light Rail Feasibility Analysis" (Alan M. Voorhees & Associates, 1979) and the "Feasibility Analysis of Upgraded Passenger Rail Service in the Anchorage, Alaska Region" (A.M.V. & Assoc. 1979). The Municipality will loan copies of these reports

to interested consultants, upon request, and will provide a copy of each report to the party to whom the contract is awarded. The report should note where conclusions are similar to, or different from, those contained in the aforementioned Voorhees reports.

#### Corridors

The corridors for which these modes are to be studied include:

1. Northern Lights Boulevard, from "C" Street to Muldoon Road (designated as a primary transit corridor).
2. "C" Street from Downtown Anchorage to Dimond Boulevard (also a primary transit corridor).
3. Northern Lights Boulevard from "C" Street west to Earthquake Park, thence south to Anchorage International Airport.
4. The Seward Highway from Third Avenue to Potter Marsh.
5. The Alaska Railroad from Birchwood to Potter Marsh.
6. The Glenn Highway from Downtown Anchorage to Eklutna.

#### PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF SUPPORT

The contractor may avail itself of the following pieces of information from the Planning Department:

1. Map of the Adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
2. Existing population and employment, by traffic analysis zone.
3. Projected populations and employments, by traffic analysis zone.
4. The adopted Long Range Transportation Plan.
5. Existing and projected average daily traffic counts.
6. The adopted Transit Development Program.
7. Limited data on current transit ridership.
8. Copies of previous relevant studies.

The Planning Department will not furnish any other staff support except to coordinate with the AMATS Policy Committee and to help further define the scope of the project.

Qualifications Sought

In reviewing the proposals, the Municipality will consider the following items:

1. Previous experience in transit-mode feasibility studies.
2. Previous experience with small to medium-sized transit systems.
3. Qualifications of individuals who will work on the project, including any subcontractors.
4. Methodology and organization of study.
5. Proposals for group presentations of preliminary and final reports.

The review team will consist of representatives from the Municipal Planning and Transportation Departments. No more than \$100,000 is likely to be available for the transit data study. The terms of payment are negotiable.

Time Frame of Study

The approximate time schedule for the project is:

1. Pre-proposal session: 4 weeks from date of cover letter.
2. Proposals due: 6 weeks from date of cover letter.
3. Staff review: 2 weeks from proposals-due date.
4. Contract award: 2 weeks following staff review.
5. Status reports: Monthly during project.
6. Initial report: 4 months after contract award.
7. Selection of final modes: 2 months after initial report.
8. Project completion: 9 months after contract award.

The consultant must be prepared to make a preliminary presentation and a final presentation to the Municipal Assembly, the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Transit Advisory Board, and the AMATS Technical Advisory and Policy Committees, including production of 40 copies of the final report. A public hearing must also be conducted.

The requirements outlined in the project description are minimums and any additional information you can provide should be listed to allow a better evaluation of the proposal. Any questions before the opening date can be directed to Ken Markve or to Stanley Green at (907) 264-4251.

#### APPENDIX A

##### List of Modes

The modes to be examined initially should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following list. For all modes, the costs and access times for primary access modes should be included in the analysis.

1. Automated rapid transit, such as the new system in Lille, France.
2. Monorail, with under-carriage structural rail, such as in the systems in Disneyland and Seattle.
3. Monorail, with catenary-suspended rail, such as proposed for New Orleans.
4. Monorail, with over-carriage rail.
5. Personal rapid transit, such as the Morgantown system.
6. Electric bus with intermediate stations for recharging.
7. Express buses on HOV lanes.
8. Express buses on exclusive bus lanes.
9. Trolley buses on exclusive bus lanes.
10. Light rail transit.
11. Aerial tramways (telepherique) such as on Roosevelt Island, New York.
12. Rail cars on the Alaska Railroad.
13. Trolley bus with off-line capabilities, either by flywheel or internal-combustion engine.
14. Flywheel-powered vehicles.
15. Articulated buses.
16. Heavy rail rapid transit.