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About this Project

- **Project Team**
  - Leland Consulting Group
  - Fehr & Peers

- **Scope of Work: Cost benefit Analysis of Albuquerque Streetcar**
  - Review Cost and Ridership Estimates
  - Identify Development Potential
  - Market Strategy
  - Financing Strategy
  - Planning Context
Costs
- Capital
- Operations
- Opportunity Cost

Benefits
- Economic Development
  - Downtown Revitalization
  - Connect major destinations
  - Quality of life
- Transportation Benefits
  - Ridership
  - Improved environment for walking, biking
  - Transportation options
  - Congestion mitigation
- Environmental Impacts
  - Reduced pollution
  - Improved air quality
### The Transit Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Rail</th>
<th>Streetcar</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markets Served</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Local &quot;central city circulator&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>Commuters, shoppers, tourists, students, conventioneers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System characteristics</td>
<td>Emphasis: Speed, distance 1/2 mile+ between stations</td>
<td>Emphasis: Frequency, connectivity 1/4 mile between stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle characteristics</td>
<td>150 feet long, Wide turn radius, Low floor</td>
<td>65 feet long, Tight turn radius, Low floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>Dedicated lanes</td>
<td>Mixed traffic lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Impacts</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Portland

Why Portland?

- First modern model
- Connects the dots
  - Downtown: Employment and retail center
  - Urban neighborhoods: Historic and new
  - University
- High ridership
- Public-Private Partnership
- Development impacts
Portland: Visualizing the Impact

The Pearl District
Downtown/West End
Portland State University
South Waterfront

Albuquerque Streetcar Evaluation
Portland: Quantifying the Impact

- $2.3 billion investment within 3 blocks 1997 - 2005
- 7,200 residential units
- 4.6 million sf commercial
- Condos: Market now as high as $600+ per s.f.

Source: E.D. Hovee and Associates
Portland: Quantifying the Impact

Location of Central Portland Development

Before 1997

1997 - 2005

Source: E.D. Hovee and Associates
Portland: Quantifying the Impact

Development Potential Achieved

Source: E.D. Hovee and Associates
Portland: Keys to Success

- **Strong Anchors (Connecting the Dots)**
  - Downtown, Pearl District, Portland State

- **Political Leadership and Vision**
  - “Central City Circulator” suggested as early as 1970s
  - Leaders take the case to land owners, public, and media
  - Public responsibilities include freeway demolition, parking strategies, three parks
  - Back up vision with public dollars

- **Savvy Developers & Site Control**
  - Urban developer Hoyt St. Properties owns 40+ acres directly surrounding alignment
  - Other major developers control other key parcels
Portland: Keys to Success

- Private sector leadership
  - Local merchants lead assessment district
- Healthy residential, office, and retail markets; good demographics
  - Real estate soars in 1990s and 2000s
  - High density urban housing fulfills unmet demand for young singles, couples, and downsizing boomers
- Regional population and employment growth
- Appropriate regulation; quality urban design and architecture
  - Both public and private committed to quality
  - Several district-wide plans
  - Development agreements require: high density, active ground floors, high quality, parking location and quantity, affordable housing and more
Portland: Phasing

Phase 1
Phase 2
Phase 3
Phase 4
Portland: Funding

- Local lead
- A new model for transit funding
- Independent, non-profit management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Revenues</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Increment Financing</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Fund</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Contributions</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Capital Cost: $56.9
**Seattle**

- Opened December 2007
- 1.3 mile starter line
- 1,000 daily ridership
- Connects
  - Biotech: UW campus and private labs
  - South Lake Union area including lakefront park
  - Downtown
- Development Partner
  - Vulcan Real Estate
- Roaring real estate market
- Funding
  - Local improvement district
  - Federal/MPO grants
  - Joint development
Tacoma

- Opened 2003
- 1.6 miles
- 2,500 + daily ridership
- Connects
  - Cultural district
  - Convention center
  - Downtown employment
  - Regional transit links
- No master developer
- Middling residential and office markets compared to Portland and Seattle
- Constrained development sites
- Largely funded by regional transit agency
Tampa

- Moving tourists first, locals later
- Connecting the dots

“The streetcar was an exercise in place-making. Transportation is never just about moving people from A to B, it’s a tool for creating communities.”
—HART

“It’s like Riverwalk in San Antonio. It gives convention organizers a reason to choose Tampa.”
—Chamber of Commerce
Tampa

Ybor City
Historic landmark district; Retail and residential revitalization begins in ’90s.

Downtown
(Not served by streetcar)

Channelside
Cruise Terminal, new residential, South Florida College, Aquarium

Convention and Arena Area
St. Pete Times Forum, Hotels, Convention Ctr., waterfront park

Albuquerque Streetcar Evaluation
“We wanted this part of town to be like LoDo in Denver. These kinds of higher density residential projects didn’t exist outside of downtown until the streetcar was built”

—Michael English, former Planning Commissioner
Tampa: Visualizing the Impact

Net Housing Change

- Most of central city loses population with exception of Harbor Island
- Several central city areas gain residents, especially Ybor City
- Channelside expected to add residents next
Local leadership critical, despite large role of Federal funds,

- Improvement District
- Sponsorships
  - $2.5 M total, including TECO sponsorship
- Endowment Fund for Operations
- City owned; non-profit managed; transit agency operated.
How do the overall capital costs compare?

![Bar chart showing capital costs](image)
How do the capital cost per mile compare?
What Do We Know About the Capital Costs?

- Albuquerque’s system is consistent with modern streetcar capital costs per mile
  - Above average system length
  - Average costs for infrastructure
  - Average costs for system amenities
Are there cost sharing opportunities?

- Share cost with other capital improvements
- Secure costs or purchase material for later phases of the project. NOW
- Reallocate capital funds earmarked for future ABQ ride routes replaced by streetcar
- Share stops with Rapid Ride
- Use a “toolbox” of funding options
How do the overall operating costs compare?

![Annual Operating Cost Chart]

- **Vintage Systems**
  - Kenosha
  - Tampa
  - Little Rock
  - Memphis

- **Modern Systems**
  - Tacoma
  - Seattle
  - Portland
  - Albuquerque
How do the operating cost per passenger mile compare?
What Do We Know About the Operating Costs?

- Albuquerque’s system is lower than average to operate per passenger mile*
  - Above average operations plan
  - Track length at build out is long
  - Anticipated ridership is high

* Assumes most expensive operating scenario 1C (15 minute peak headway)
Are there cost sharing opportunities?

- Peer systems used a variety of operation configurations to maximize budget
  - Public transit authority
  - Non-profit organizations
  - Private contractors
- Special services to offset operations costs
  - Charters for special events during off-peak hours
- Shift operating costs from ABQ Ride
Are there cost sharing opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>TCSP</th>
<th>FTA5307/5309</th>
<th>Small Starts</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>TIF</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Parking Garage Bonds</th>
<th>Parking Revenue</th>
<th>Advertising and Sponsorship</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Farebox</th>
<th>Special Farebox</th>
<th>Development Impact Fees</th>
<th>Local Improvement Districts</th>
<th>Transportation Authority</th>
<th>State DOT</th>
<th>Private Contribution</th>
<th>Special Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer System Ridership

- Ridership projections do not define success!!!
  - Particularly if not using FTA funds
  - Future ridership projections should use 4D’s

- Phasing can serve specific travel needs
  - Planned and built as part of a larger systems
  - Built a ridership market and excitement
### Ridership Generators

#### Modern Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership Generators</th>
<th>Tacoma</th>
<th>Seattle</th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th>Albuquerque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center/Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Destinations</td>
<td></td>
<td>State museum</td>
<td>Seattle Center</td>
<td>Theater District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vintage Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership Generators</th>
<th>Kenosha</th>
<th>Tampa</th>
<th>Little Rock</th>
<th>Memphis</th>
<th>Albuquerque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center/Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Destinations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Park</td>
<td>Cruise Port</td>
<td>Clinton Library</td>
<td>Beal St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer System Ridership

Annual Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vintage Systems</th>
<th>Modern Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lessons Learned

Conventional wisdom versus complicated reality:

Economic Development

= Streetcar + time

+ Strong Anchors
+ Political leadership, vision
+ Private sector leadership
+ Healthy residential, office markets
+ Available sites
+ Appropriate regulation
+ Creative financing
+ Developer experience
+ Urban Design, architecture, and great plans
Lessons Learned

- Broad support base
- Public Private partnerships
- Connect the dots
- “Think development when thinking transit.”
- Phasing is key – bite sized pieces

- A streetcars is a tool to achieve other policy goals, not an end in itself
Measuring Economic Development

- New housing
- New jobs and business retention
- Tax revenue
  - Sales
  - Property
  - Business
- Place making
  - Downtown revitalization
  - Corridor revitalization
- Tourism
- Funding potential
Opportunity Sites

- Infill and redevelopment
- Where will the landscape change the most?
Conclusion and Discussion

- How can we best support you?
  - Questions
  - Discussion