

MINUTES

21st Century Transportation Task Force

July 8, 2008

3:00 – 5:00 PM

9th Floor Council Committee Room

Type of meeting:

Thirteenth Task Force Meeting

Attendees:

Councilor Isaac Benton, Claude Luisada, Claude Morelli, Moises Gonzalez, Jeffrey Peterson, Antonio Sandoval (absent), Terry Keene, Gary Bodman, Nevin Harwick, Alex Romero, Bert Thomas, Bob Murphy, Brent Wilson, Chris Blewett, Clovis Acosta, Dale Lockett, Joanne McEntire, Joel Wooldridge (absent), JW Madison, Martin Sandoval (absent), Ralph Cipriani (absent), Frank Burcham, Gus Grace

Resource Persons:

Michael Riordan, Mike Smith, Tony Sylvester, Robert Nelson (UNM), Jamie Welles, Chris Zahas (Leland Consulting), Brian Vanneman (Leland Consulting), Debbie Stover, Tom Menicucci, Donna Baca, Kara Shair-Rosenfield

Observers:

Roger Mickelson, Silvio Dell'Angela, John Perry, Greg Gurule, Jeff Maher, Dan McKay

AGENDA TOPICS

Welcome

Councilor Benton

Discussion: Councilor Benton called the meeting to order.

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Councilor Benton

Discussion: Councilor Benton moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Councilor Benton moved to approve the minutes from the 6-24-08 meeting with two small corrections submitted by Claude Morelli. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Presentation: Albuquerque Streetcar Presentation – Summary of Findings

Brian Vanneman and
Chris Zahas, Leland
Consulting Group

Discussion: Brian Vanneman and Chris Zahas from Leland Consulting Group made a presentation to the Task Force on the “Summary of Findings” of their completed cost-benefit analysis on the proposed modern streetcar system.

Chris Zahas began by reviewing the **Goals** of the cost-benefit analysis, which included:

1. Review and comment on HDR and City analysis from 2006;
2. Analyze the streetcar's redevelopment potential;
3. Prepare a cost-benefit analysis and matrix focusing on redevelopment and transportation benefits;
4. Make strategic recommendations on complementary policies;
5. Recommend financing strategies.

Background information they considered included:

1. **Planning Context:** Two Goals from the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan were cited as evidence that adopted City policy supports investing in this type of project as a way of achieving economic development and land use/growth management goals. Chris explained that streetcars are about more than just investment in transit; they provide a way to achieve better land use and redevelopment that other forms of transit don't.
2. **Project Context:** Chris provided information about the "Peer Review" they conducted as part of the cost-benefit analysis. The most comparable cities that served as peer cities for this study were Tampa, Little Rock, Portland, Seattle, and Tacoma. Chris said that, while streetcar systems tend to vary widely from one another on issues such as destinations, ridership, and operations, the peer cities' systems share the following characteristics: development-oriented transportation, local funding solutions, and central city circulators.
3. **Review of HDR analysis and reports:** Leland Consulting Group's analysis included a review of the projections and data provided to the City by HDR back in 2006. Leland reviewed HDR's ridership and land-use projections as well as their figures related to capital and operating costs. Leland's conclusion was that "HDR projections are accurate and reasonable." The one exception to this statement was regarding land uses along Yale Boulevard.
4. **Alignment Analysis Framework:** The final thing Chris explained as part of the context section of the presentation was the way they divided the length of the alignment into segments in order to conduct in-depth analysis of each segment. Segment "A" refers to the western portion of the alignment (Atrisco Dr. to 4th St. in downtown); Segment "B" refers to the central portion of the alignment (4th St. in downtown to Girard Blvd.); Segment "C" refers to the eastern portion of the alignment (Girard Blvd. to San Mateo).

* * *

Brian Vanneman then went over the "Benefits" part of the presentation. He explained that they considered two base scenarios to calculate potential net growth (land-use benefits) along Central Avenue (Atrisco to San Mateo): 1) no streetcar, 2) with streetcar. They found that successful implementation of a modern streetcar on Central Avenue could result in four times more residential development and ten times more commercial development between 2010 and 2030 than if the streetcar wasn't built. In other terms, there could be 6,000 more residents and \$1 billion in development value with the streetcar versus \$200 million without. In terms of employment, they estimated that 6,000 more jobs would be created in the area along the streetcar than if there were no streetcar.

Other information provided with regard to **Land-Use Benefits** included:

1. **Drivers for supporting land-use benefits assumptions:**
 - Demographics: strong regional growth, strong corridor indicators, good outlook nationally;
 - Demand for urban living: 1/3 of all new residents to Albuquerque will be considering and looking for the urban living environment;
 - Strong employment growth for central employers: 6 of the region's top 10 employers are in this area (UNM, healthcare, public sector, film industry, tourism, professional and cultural services);

- Built evidence: Albuquerque High redevelopment;
 - Peer cities: streetcars and high-growth downtowns.
2. **Streetcars Shape Development**: There exists consistent difference in perception of buses vs. rail. Literature and interviews indicate that there is a significant difference in perception of rail systems. Interviews with real estate professionals in Albuquerque revealed a real interest in pairing future developments with potential streetcar development.
 3. **Urban Indicators**: In all of the following categories, Albuquerque is comparable to peer cities (see Leland Presentation 7.8.08 for specific numbers):
 - Population
 - Income
 - Education
 - Household Size
 - Housing Type, 2000

The next part of Brian’s presentation dealt with the **Transportation Benefits** of the proposed streetcar. He provided the following numbers with regard to ridership, which is considered the primary transportation metric:

- Alignment “A” Daily: 1,351
- Alignment “B” Daily: 3,084
- Alignment “C” Daily: 1,858
- **Alignment “A,B,C” Daily: 6,293**
- Alignment “A” Annually: 493,228
- Alignment “B” Annually: 1,125,668
- Alignment “C” Annually: 678, 092
- **Alignment “A,B,C” Annually: 2,296,988**

Brian said that these ridership numbers represent a relatively conservative projection and do not account for: 1) rail ridership premium, and 2) tourist riders, both of which would be difficult to quantify.

In addition to the projected ridership numbers, other indicators of the transportation benefits of the streetcar as proposed are that it is located on one of the city’s three designated Major Transit Corridors and that the full alignment connects the three most active transit destinations in the city – Downtown/Alvarado Transportation Center, UNM, and San Mateo. Additionally, there is an excellent group of “major destinations” – Downtown, recreation, education, tourism, employment, residential – that would be connected by this alignment, which is arguably better than any other alignment according to Leland.

Brian also explained that the Central Avenue corridor has existing ridership characteristics that naturally lend themselves to support the transportation benefits of a streetcar. These characteristics include: 1) frequent boarding and alighting, which matches the function of a streetcar circulator, 2) 75% of Rt.66 ridership is located between Atrisco and San Mateo, 3) 60% of Rt.66 ridership is concentrated between 4th St. and San Mateo.

One final transportation benefit that Brian mentioned is that, by replacing the Rt.66 buses with streetcars, ABQ Ride will have additional buses that can be redeployed for service in other, bus-appropriate areas of the city.

In addition to land-use and transportation benefits, Brian presented a list of “Other Benefits” that were not a central focus of the cost-benefit analysis and, therefore, not quantified in any way, but that Leland felt warranted mention. The “Other Benefits” were:

- Livability
- Transit Evolution
- Costs
 - Lower Operating and Lifecycle Costs
 - Fiscal – reduced need for regional infrastructure
- Land-Use/Transportation Link (Growth Management and Sustainability)
- Affordability
- Safety
- Health
- Reduced Oil Dependence

* * *

The third part of Leland's presentation dealt with the **costs – capital and operating** – associated with building a modern streetcar.

Capital Cost: \$28.0 million per double-track mile (same as HDR estimate) – includes cost of construction, vehicles, and maintenance facility. (A detailed explanation of the methodology used to arrive at this figure will be provided in Leland's Final Report.)

Operations Costs:

- Projections done by operating scenarios and section
- Broken out by HIGH (10 min.-headways AM/PM peak – 7-9 AM, 4-6 PM, 15-min. off-peak, weekends 20-minutes), MEDIUM (15 min.), and LOW (20 min.) service levels
- For Full Alignment, operating costs as follows:
 - HIGH: \$4.5 million annually
 - MEDIUM: \$3.8 million
 - LOW: \$3.4 million

Cost-Benefit Comparison:

- **Capital Cost per mile:** \$28 million, regardless of which segment or if full alignment built.
- **Operations Cost per passenger:**
 - Alignment A: \$4.21
 - Alignment B: \$1.08
 - Alignment C: \$1.80
 - Alignments B&C: \$1.35
 - Full Alignment: \$1.97
- **Capital Cost per passenger:**
 - Alignment A: \$142
 - Alignment B: \$55
 - Alignment C: \$66
 - Alignments B&C: \$59
 - Full Alignment: \$77
- **New Residential Units Per Mile:**
 - Alignment A: 241
 - Alignment B: 751
 - Alignment C: 620
 - Alignments B&C: 696
 - Full Alignment: 515
- **Investment Leverage:** (Low for A section; considerably higher for other alignments)

- o Alignment A: 2.9
- o Alignment B: 8.4
- o Alignment C: 6.3
- o Alignments B&C: 7.5
- o Full Alignment: 5.7

All of the above data compared to peer cities (Tampa, Little Rock, Tacoma, Seattle Portland) – See Leland Presentation 7.8.08 for details.

Brian explained that the projected operating costs for Albuquerque are low compared to peer cities, in part because Albuquerque's ridership projection is high; a lot of other lines are shorter circulator lines and don't connect the number of destinations that ABQ would.

- **Claude Morelli:** Where did the operating cost numbers come from?
- **Brian Vanneman:** Carlos Hernandez of Fehr & Peers did a thorough analysis. The figures he came up with are consistent with HDR's projections (\$4.1 million for 8 miles).
- **Claude Morelli:** Does that include track-maintenance costs?
- **Brian Vanneman:** We will look into that and provide information in the final report.
- **Chris Zahas:** Operating costs themselves are not lower. It's the per passenger cost that's lower because of number of riders projected.
- **Brian Vanneman:** We'll also include specifics on anticipated hours of operation.

Cost-Benefit Conclusions:

- Alignment B has the highest benefit-to-cost ratio, followed closely by C.
- Alignment A has considerably lower benefit to cost ratio.
- B and C compare favorably to national peers.

Additional Findings:

- Destinations compare favorably to other cities;
- Ridership has strong potential from Opening Day;
- Strong potential for redevelopment;
- Catalyst for economic development;
- Benefit-to-cost metrics are high.

Alignment Recommendations:

- Build Alignments B and C first
- Evaluate future Phases – Atrisco, Sunport, Uptown, 4th St.
- Chris Zahas: Future phases don't need to be 10 years apart; could be 2-4 years; heavy costs (maintenance facilities) built into first phase.

The following conversation ensued at this point in the meeting:

- **Councilor Benton:** What are the lengths of the additional Portland phases?
- **Brian Vanneman:** 2.5 miles initially, then 0.6 miles, then another 0.6 miles – about 4 miles total. The next phase they're looking at would be a considerable extension – 3 miles.
- **Terry Keene:** What was Portland's initial rationale in building streetcar? Why did they do it?
- **Chris Zahas:** It was part of their downtown plan, going back to 1970s and driven, in large part, by property owners and developers in the Pearl District. TriMet was originally very skeptical.
- **Terry Keene:** And what is its resonance now?
- **Chris Zahas:** Very positive. Everyone likes it. It is now a defining part of the Pearl District brand.
- **Bert Thomas:** For the Downtown to San Mateo alignment, you estimated about 5,000 riders,

right? Have you factored in or calculated the reduction in number of cars?

- **Chris Zahas:** We didn't do a VMT analysis. That's part of the "rail ridership premium" unknown. You also have to factor in the "park once" idea.
- **Clovis Acosta:** Where will the maintenance facility be located?
- **Brian Vanneman:** Maybe near Alvarado Transportation Center.
- **Michael Riordan:** We actually looked at 5 options – best one was near Washington and Central.
- **Chris Zahas:** Maintenance facilities can be pretty small.
- **JW Madison:** What about expansion possibilities? Streetcars stop a great deal. How far do you think the system could expand and still be viable as a streetcar?
- **Chris Zahas:** As you get farther out, you can space stations farther apart, and they can go 50 mph. Streetcars could behave more like lightrail farther out with an increased number of stops the closer to downtown/center they get. As long as you're not exceeding the passenger capacity of the streetcar, they will function.
- **Claude Morelli:** 1) Maintenance facility: wouldn't it make sense to locate the maintenance facility more centrally, especially if there might be future expansions? 2) \$28 million/mile – scaling of system, cost isn't necessarily linear. Questioning \$28 million/mile. 3) TriMet doesn't actually pay for operations in Portland.
- **Chris Zahas:** TriMet does kick in 1/3 of operations. Re: Maintenance facility – the size of the facility is something to consider if you're looking at future expansions (e.g., needing more maintenance sheds, locating in a central location, etc). However, the maintenance facility isn't the main part of capital cost (only about \$4 million out of \$180 million).
- **Nevin Harwick:** I would like to clarify something. You said streetcars can go up to 50 mph. However, the posted speed limit on Central doesn't approach 50 mph. It could only go that fast where the speed limit was that high or in a dedicated ROW.
- **Jeffrey Peterson:** How long will it take to ride from downtown to San Mateo?
- **Brian Vanneman:** The average speed of the streetcar is 12.5 mph (includes stop times, red lights, etc.). We have the exact numbers and will provide them to the Task Force.
- **Tony Sylvester:** Design of alignment/track – HDR felt comfortable saying they could get 12.5 mph, on average. The 66 bus has an average speed of 12.5 mph.
- **Clovis Acosta:** How much more efficient is it to move people steel-on-steel vs. rubber-on-asphalt? Is that factored into the operating cost analysis?
- **Brian Vanneman:** We can't answer that question specifically. Operating includes labor, electricity, and maintenance.
- **Chris Zahas:** Rail is cheaper to operate on an hourly basis per rider and on lifecycle cost than buses. Carlos Hernandez has specific information about that issue that will be provided in an appendix.
- **Frank Burhcam:** Is that cost differential calculated based on diesel or natural gas buses?
- **Chris Zahas:** I don't know the answer to that.

* * *

The next part of Leland's presentation, made by Chris Zahas, addressed the issue of how to fund the proposed streetcar:

Funding Principles:

- Identify 2 to 4 primary funding sources;
- Balance sources;
- Partner with the private sector;
- Maintain flexibility, expect changes in grant awards and other sources.

Chris explained that they provided two funding packages for each of the following scenarios: B

Alignment only, B&C Alignments, and A,B&C Alignments. The reason for providing two options is that, in one scenario, they are recommending the use of TIDD to fund a large portion of the development of the streetcar. However, since there is uncertainty with TIDD and whether or not one or more could be put in place along Central, the second option provides that the ¼ Cent Transportation Tax would be the primary funding source for the streetcar.

Focusing on the B&C alignment, which is Leland's recommendation for the first phase, the total capital cost would be \$106 million total. Scenario 1 for Alignment B&C assumes TIDD would be used a financing tool, in which case the total percentage of ¼ tax that would be needed for this alignment would be 12%. In scenario 2, which assumes there would be no TIDD, the percentage of the ¼ tax needed to build and operate Alignment B&C would be 28%.

In addition to the ¼ cent tax and TIDD, Leland identified the following other tools available to fund the streetcar:

PID: Public Improvement Districts where property owners tax themselves. Leland estimated that a total bond potential of \$4.6 million for the full alignment exists. Broken out by segment, it would be \$800,000 for Alignment A, \$2.5 million for Alignment B, and \$1.4 million for Alignment C. A benefit to using a PID is that it forces engagement of the private sector as supporters and partners.

Other: (conservative estimates)

City's Capital Improvements Program: \$4-8 million
Federal Transportation Improvement Projects: \$0-10 million
Institutional Contribution: \$2 million
State Funds: \$2-5 million
Sponsorship/Advertising: \$1-3 million
Other: lodging hospitality, transit impact fees, parking revenues

* * *

The final part of Leland's presentation focused on explaining and elaborating on the **Conditions for Success**:

- **Leadership and Organization**
 - Identify and engage project "champions";
 - Broaden support base;
 - Unify voice of support;
 - Create umbrella organization/forum for all Central Ave. organizations;
 - Study streetcar ownership and management structure options (ABQ Ride, independent non-profit).
- **Public-Private Partnerships**
 - Give property owners and developers a seat at the streetcar table – meaningful roles and responsibilities;
 - Identify public-private partnership opportunities along the corridor.
- **Finance**
 - Get financing tools ready now (CIP, ¼ cent, TIDD);
 - Assign staff to apply for grants (regional, state, foundations).
- **Public Policy & Regulation**
 - Public plans define vision for central area and sectors;
 - Review zoning to ensure it maximizes streetcar leverage (heights, density, design guidelines);
 - Increase redevelopment and transit-oriented development staff capacity and funding;
 - Provide development incentives for supportive projects (density bonuses, expedited

permits, fee reductions, clear and objective standards).

- **Demographics & Economy**

- Focus on population growth and “urban housing” indicators;
- Strong growth in central areas/business sectors (service, government, healthcare, education);
- Build on livability to attract urban residents and employers.

- **Transportation**

- Multi-modal network, accessibility;
- Don’t separate the parts (implement other projects, including pedestrian and bicycle improvements);
- Refine preliminary streetcar engineering (speed up timetables, seek cost savings, confirm alignment, locate maintenance facility).

- **Destinations & Events**

- By policy, put activity generators near the streetcar (Civic Plaza, Arts Crawl, Events Center, museums, libraries);
- Refine your retail strategy (know your niches, provide local services, daily needs for residents);
- Build on tourism (conventions, partner with visitors bureau).

- **Public Realm & Design**

- Recent downtown streetscape improvements, infill, streetscape plans;
- Have plans for plazas, station areas, public art, landscaping, signage, lighting;
- Insist on quality (start with public investments, provide incentives for private investment, have uncompromising standards);
- Continue to address safety and security.

- **Project Success:** A vibrant central Albuquerque and streetcar that shapes neighborhoods and moves people.

Recap of Leland Consulting Group’s Cost-Benefit Analysis:

Goals:

1. Review and comment on HDR and City analysis.
2. Analyze the streetcar’s redevelopment potential.
3. Cost-benefit analysis and matrix focusing on redevelopment and transportation benefits.
4. Strategic recommendations on complementary policies.
5. Recommending financing strategies.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

1. Planning context supports streetcar.
2. Redevelopment potential is high (\$1 billion redevelopment, 6,400 new residents).
3. Solid transportation investment (6,300 daily riders, \$1.35 per passenger – works from Day One).
4. Build alignment sections B&C.
5. Combine transportation and land use funding sources.
6. Evaluate future phases pending Phase 1 success.

* * *

Following the conclusion of Leland’s presentation, the group had the following discussion:

- **Councilor Benton:** For the next meeting, everyone please be prepared to weigh in – not necessarily at length – about how you’re feeling with respect to the streetcar. The streetcar will probably be the most contentious piece other than allocation of tax. I would really like to hear from everyone at the next meeting. You don’t have to provide a whole lot of explanation or a final

answer, but some initial thoughts.

- **Mike Smith (facilitator):** It will be helpful to have an indication about that issue so we know how to move forward with majority/minority reports.
- **Claude Morelli:** I like the idea of streetcar, but not funding it with the ¼ cent tax. It's a subtle point, but it's something to consider.
- **Councilor Benton:** Absolutely, everyone should feel free to qualify their position.
- **Nevin Harwick:** When will we get Leland's final report with all of the supplemental information?
- **Chris Zahas:** Unfortunately, probably not until a day or so before your next meeting.
- **Mike Smith:** For next meeting, you don't have to have final decision – just an initial sense.

Questions on Leland's presentation:

- **Clovis Acosta:** What would happen to the 66 bus and Rapid Ride should the City move forward and build the streetcar – will they be moved and, if so, to where?
- **Chris Zahas:** The 66 bus would essentially go away.
- **Brian Vanneman:** The streetcar would operate in place of the 66; the 66 would continue to operate at the ends of streetcar alignment; Rapid Ride would continue to operate as it currently does.
- **Tony Sylvester:** I spoke with ABQ Ride about next steps. The system would need to evolve based on hours of service, corridor selected, other variables, but it's probably too soon to make final call.
- **Nevin Harwick:** Looking at peer cities – where they have streetcar lines, do you have information about employment and housing densities and how they compare to ABQ? ABQ believes a high-rise is a building that's 3 stories high, which is not the case in Seattle. Nothing there resembles anything here. We need a better handle on what things are like in peer cities compared to what Albuquerque has.
- **Brian Vanneman:** We tried not to make those kinds of direct comparisons with other cities, which are bigger and have different development patterns. Development intensity in Seattle and Portland is extremely intense. However, Tampa is an auto-oriented city with auto-oriented development. They've seen development adjacent to their streetcar between 7,000-8,000 new units in 5+ story buildings.
- **Chris Zahas:** Development projections for Albuquerque are calibrated to existing zoning and existing opportunity sites. The 6,400 new residents could be accommodated in 3-5-story developments.
- **Nevin Harwick:** What about the width of the corridor? You've assumed a 1-mile wide influence area.
- **Brian Vanneman:** Portland, in particular, has emphasized 1-3 blocks for development. It's not to say that no development took place a ½ mile away. In our analysis, we separated areas along corridor into low- (7-8 du/a), medium-, and high-capacity (12 du/a). We project that most development will take place very close to streetcar line, not ½ mile away.
- **Chris Zahas:** 6,400 residents are accommodated mostly within 1-2 blocks of the corridor. We will show this through maps in the final report. Tables can be cross-referenced to show intensity of development.
- **Joanne McEntire:** Are your TIDD assumptions based on the maximum amount allowed – 75%?
- **Brian Vanneman:** Yes, that's right.
- **Joanne McEntire:** So another possibility would be less than 75%. That might be a scenario B.1. – 60 or 65%.
- **Brian Vanneman:** To be clear, we did not assume that TIDD would capture County GRT. We provided information for capturing City and State GRT only.

- **Joanne McEntire:** Regarding the entire right-of-way of the street, the Pearl District had, before streetcar went in, extremely high-quality walkability. In your costs, are you just showing what is essential for conveyance of people onto the streetcar?
- **Chris Zahas:** The capital costs assume platforms and some bump-outs, but not street trees or anything like that.
- **Joanne McEntire:** I hope that in the Conditions for Success, existing or improved streetscape funding occurs when streetcar alignments go in. On VMT reduction questions, I'm interested in what COG will say about that issue. I heard a COG transportation planner say about the last streetcar proposal that he couldn't see how streetcar would reduce VMT.
- **Tony Sylvester:** From our RailRunner experience, you still see roads filling up and demand growing. But one thing we're looking at is where demand for residential is – new residents they're projecting are likely to not be car-dependent residents. Bringing potential new growth to this area has the potential to reduce VMT overall.
- **Councilor Benton:** For everyone's information, Tony and MRCOG will be providing an addendum/supplemental piece to Leland's report.

- **JW Madison:** You guys made a compelling case for streetcar/rail, but it's been oriented toward a rather small part of general public – developers, realtors. I'm thinking that, in order to use the transportation tax, we're going to have to sell this thing to the general public of Albuquerque. Have you done any work on other benefits of putting in streetcar/urban rail that are not related directly to benefits for developers/realtors?
- **Chris Zahas:** We made passing reference to those issues, but it's not part of our technical analysis. The benefits are more than just development and ridership. It's not fair to measure streetcar against the same metrics as you do other systems because it serves a different purpose than, say, buses.
- **Councilor Benton:** But you also cited the Comprehensive Plan – there are some public policy goals already in place that would be furthered by streetcar.
- **Chris Zahas:** You definitely can't downplay employment and economic development potential, too.

- **Claude Morelli:** I've been reviewing literature – VMT reduction related to density. The literature says that you can expect about a 30% reduction in VMT for every doubling of density. Something to consider is that every residential unit that we provide in this area is one fewer unit that has to be provided on the West Side, and a compelling argument is that that's at least 2 fewer trips across the river every day and helps with the issue of west side/river crossing congestion.

- **Nevin Harwick:** How do people get to the corridor? Park and ride? Also, how many current 66 riders will have to transfer back to-and-from the streetcar?
- **Chris Zahas:** That issue is addressed in Carlos' report. You're right – it just does not work to have to transfer in the way you described. The way people would get there is the same way they get there today. Ridership already exists within the alignment today.
- **Michael Riordan:** I'd like to point out, though, that if you're going all the way from Juan Tabo to Coors, you'd be taking the Rapid Ride, not the 66 or streetcar.
- **Nevin Harwick:** San Mateo to Wyoming sees a lot of boarding and alighting, though.
- **Michael Riordan:** But the transfers at Wyoming are mostly Rapid Ride riders.

- **Frank Burcham:** While you're, in a way, cannibalizing riders from 66, you're also projecting a good percentage of new riders. I would like to see something in the recommendations that ties streetcar into environmental benefits – noise reduction, greenhouse gas emissions, not just VMT.
- **Chris Zahas:** Don't think of it as "cannibalizing" but rather "evolving" ridership through

triggering land-use changes. It makes logical sense to go to the place that currently has the highest transit ridership in the city. Think of streetcar as part of the evolution of the city's transit system.

- **Councilor Benton:** You've made a recommendation of B&C for the first alignment. If you were looking at future phases, would that eastern extension be the more logical one versus the western extension? "A", I see, as being something really different that's hard to compare to the other two segments because of the tourism concentration. It might be a different consideration, too, with regard to funding (lodger's tax).
- **Chris Zahas:** If you want to pick up more riders, you'd want to go east. If you're more interested in "place-making" you'd go west. There is development potential to the west, but there doesn't appear to be market demand currently.

	Scheduling of Next Meeting; Adjourn	
--	--	--

Discussion: The next meeting of the Transportation Task Force will be on Tuesday, July 22, 3 PM in the Council Committee Room on the 9th floor of City Hall. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 PM.