Transportation

CIP-1
DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

DEPARTMENT			
	Tra	nsportation	
PROGRAM CATE	GORY		
		Port	

POLICY GOALS

Comprehensive Plan - Transportation Goal: To establish an efficient transportation system that accommodates public needs and serves both external and internal purposes.

Objective - Encourage development of intrastate and marine transportation to serve the people of Anchorage.

SIX-YEAR DEPARTMENT GOALS AND STRATEGY

The Port's 1978 - 1983 Capital Improvement Program will be primarily directed toward improving and refining existing terminal facilities and those currently under construction. Planned improvements should result in increased efficiency, safety and environmental protection.

PRIORITY CRITERIA

- 1. Need
- 2. Feasibility

CIP-2 DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

DEPARTMENT Transportation
PROGRAM CATEGORY Port

	EXISTING CAPITAL IM	PROVEMENT BUDGET
PROJECT TITLE	CURRENT STATUS	EXPLANATION
Dredging for Terminal No. 3 Extension	Proceeding Est. completion date 9/7	7
Construction of Terminal No. 3 Extension	Proceeding Est. completion date 11/7	7
Construct equipment storage shop	Proceeding Est. completion date 11/7	7
Pave Transit Area A	Proceeding Est. completion date 9/77	
Purchase industrial sweeper	Proceeding	
Purchase wash/dump truck	Proceeding	
Lot 12A Development	Engineering is to be accomplished in 1977	Earthwork is scheduled for 1978 as all work will need to be accomplished in one season due to tidal action on unprotected tidelands.
Buy-back, lease-back funding for permanent trestle at Term. No. 3	Bonds authorized - to be sold following trestle construction.	Trestles to be constructed during 1978 by RO/RO carrier.
Reimbursement for portion of 1975 RO/RO trestle construction.	n Bonds authorized - to be sold following move of RO/RO carrier to Terminal No. 3.	RO/RO carrier to move to Terminal No. 3 follow- ing construction of trestles.
Port office con- struction	Engineering & design scheduled for 1977.	Construction scheduled for 1978 if additional appropriation approved.

CIP-3 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT SUMMARY

1980

1979

400

700

1100

1100

1100

197 A

125

125

125

1.25

TOTAL

TOTAL

DEPARTMENT

approx.

PROJECT CATEGORY

Transportation

Port

PROJECT TITLE

Lot 12A Development, 7 acres

"Buy-back, Lease-back" funding for permanent trestle at Terminal No. 3

Reimbursement for portion of 1975

Alternate Petroleum header system

Construct rail loading facility

RO/RO trestle construction

Port Office Construction

Pave transit areas B & C

SOURCE OF FUNDS

REVENUE BONDS

FEDERAL -

STATE

OTHER

G. O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G. O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED

OPERATING REVENUES

FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS

Pave lot 12A

3 Page ACCT. CODE 571.3008.3405.3460 SERVICE AREA Areawide **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL 1981 1982 1983 **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** COST APPROP. COST IN THOUSANDS 1200 1200 1500 1500 400 400 125 75 200 400 400 700 700 500 500 500 475 475 475 975 2200 3175 5375 REIMBURSABLES 975

ACCECCMENTO.

975

CIP-3 A CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT SUMMARY

	5-1900s as a super-	Faye	4 -
DEPARTMENT:	ACCT, CODE:		
Transportation	571.3008.3405.3460		
PROJECT CATEGORY:	SERVICE AREA:		······································
- Port	Areawide		

Lot 12A/ Development

Project will involve survey, engineering, filling, grading, buttressing and drainage required to improve and reclaim waterfront parcel to approximately 7.6 acres. Present usable area is 2.4 acres.

Buy-back, Lease-back" funding for permanent trestle at Terminal No. 3

This will provide funding to "Buy-back" two 30' x 225' trestles constructed by, and for, primary use by "Roll-on, Roll-off" carrier. User will amortize investment on a "lease-back" method.

Reimbursement for portion of 1975 RO/RO trestle construction

Reimbursement for portion of causeways constructed by "Roll-on, Roll-off" carrier in 1975 which is determined to be useful and beneficial to overall Port operations.

Paga

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT:	4.00% 0.00%		
Transportation	ACCT. CODE: 571.3008.3405.3460		
'ROJECT CATEGORY:	SERVICE AREA:	······································	
Part	Areawide		

Port Office Construction

Construction of office space to provide additional office area and a meeting/conference room to accommodate Port Commission business meetings, negotiations, etc. Additional land acquisition will not be required.

Construct Alternate Petroleum Header System

Installation of addtional valving, piping, etc., approximately 200' northward of existing system to allow large tankers to berth further north thereby gaining additional protection against breakaway.

Pave Transit Areas B and C

Paving of approximately 13 acres of the staging and storage areas immediately adjacent to the Port facilities.

Construct RAil Loading Facility

Extension of railroad tracks and purchase of straddle equipment to facilitate loading to rail flat cars.

Pave Lot 12A

Paving of approximately 7 acres adjacent to, and southerly of Port facilities.

Page DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY Transportation 1 571.3008.3405.3460 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Port Areawide TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL Develop Lot 12-A 1979 1980 1983 **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** 1978 1981 1982 COST APPROP. COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION 1100 1100 PLANNING AND DESIGN 100 100 EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER 1200 1200 TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED **REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL** STATE **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER TOTAL 1978 19 78 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT ANNUAL REVENUE** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** Personnel 1.0 1.2 Revenue Equipment & Supply 2.0 2.0 anticipated to exceed expense PROJECT STATUS: Engineering in process **DESIGN FEES:** \$100,000 LOCATION: Port of Anchorage PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: 98 GROSS FLOOR AREA: Approx. 7 acres sa. ft. **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** 3 mos. (mos.) BUILDING COST PER SO. FT.: \$4.00 STARTING TIME: April, 1978 ASSET LIFE: **ASSESSMENTS:**

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

, M 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	11/12 3/7/1 11/	- w 171 1 3 1	11100201	COLIMA	*			Page	1
DEPARTMENT Transportat	ion		ACCT. C 571	ODE . 3008.34	405.3460		PRIORITY 2		
PROJECT CATEGORY Port			SERVICE	EAREA	Areawid	e		 	
funding for permanent trestles at Terminal No. 3	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST
ESTIMATED COST				li	N THOUSAN	DS			
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER	-		,		·			1500	1500
TOTAL								1500	1500
SOURCE OF FUNDS G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED							R	EIMBURSAB	<u> </u>
G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER									
TOTAL									
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	1978 PERSONNE		1978 OTHER COS		TURE ANNU		TURE ANNUAL	ANNUAL	REVENUE
PROJECT STATUS: Awaiting 1978 tr				GN EEEs.	1887				

LOCATION: Port of Anchorage by carrier. GROSS FLOOR AREA: sq. ft.

BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.:

ASSET LIFE:

PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS:

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: STARTING TIME: September, 1978

ASSESSMENTS:

(mos.)

CAPITAL	IMPROVEMENT	PROJECT	ESTIMATE

	CAPI	TAL IMPRO	OVEWEN.	T PRO	JECT E	STIMA	\TE					Page	8
DEPARTMENT	Transportation				асст. с 571		. 340	95.3460		PRI	ORITY	3	
PROJECT CATEGORY	Port	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		SERVICE	AREA		Areaw	ide				
of 1975 RO/RO	ement for portion O trestle con- neficial to Port	1978	19 79	1	980	198]	L	1982	198	3	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST
ESTIM.	ATED COST						IN	THOUSAN	os				
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DE EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARG OTHER					.*			•		,		400	400
	TOTAL			`								400	400
SOURCE OF FUN G.O. BONDS AUT G.O. BONDS UNA REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE OPERATING REV FUND BALANCE/ OTHER	HORIZED UTHORIZED S ENUES				er en						RE	IMBURSAB	LES
	TOTAL												
OPERATING	BUDGET IMPACT	19 7 PERSONNE	1		1978 IER COS			JRE ANNU.			RE ANNUAL IER COSTS	ANNUAL	REVENUE
:													
PROJECT STATUS: LOCATION: Port GROSS FLOOR ARE BUILDING COST PER		RO/RO ca Termina	l No.	to 3 sq. ft.	PERC ESTIN		BLD(G. COSTS: TRUCTION Septe			978		(mos

	CAP	HAL IMPRO	JVEMEN	PROJECT	ESTIMAT	E .			Page	9
	Transportation	n	ACCT. CODE PRIORITY 571, 3008, 3405, 3460							
CT CATEGORY	Port			SERVIC	E AREA	Areawi		· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4	
nstruct Port O	ffices	1978	1979	1980	\1981	1982	198	FUTUR PROJEC		TOTAL PROJEC COST
ESTIMATED	COST				I	IN THOUSAN	DS	- 0001	1 Air noi.	1 0031
ND AND R.O.W. NSTRUCTION NNING AND DESIGN JIPMENT ERFUND CHARGES HER	·	125		•				12	5 58 17	183
	TOTAL	125						12	75	200
JRCE OF FUNDS 5.0. BONDS AUTHORIZ 6.0. BONDS UNAUTHO BEVENUE BONDS EDERAL TATE PERATING REVENUE UND BALANCE/RET E	ORIZED S EARNINGS	125							REIMBURSAI	BLES
	TOTAL	125			<u> </u>					
OPERATING BUDG	ET IMPACT	19 7 PERSONNE		1978 OTHER CO		UTURE ANNU RSONNEL CO		OTHER COST		_ REVENU
None										
	roposed ort of Anchora	ıqe			GN FEES: CENT OF B	\$17,000 LDG. COSTS:	9%			

GROSS FLOOR AREA: 3,000

BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$66/sq. ASSETTIFF 30 MASKE

sq. ft.

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: 4 months

(mos.)

STARTING TIME:

DEPARTMENT: ACCT, CODE: PROJECT TITLE: Transportation Port Office Construction 571.3008.3405.3460 PROJECT CATEGORY: SERVICE AREA: Areawide Port **EXPLANATION** Engineering and design will be completed in 1977 **FEASIBILITY** with construction commencing in 1978. 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans? X Construction will provide additional office area NEED plus a sorely needed meeting/conference room to 1. How urgent is the need for this project? X accommodate Port Commission business meetings, 2. To what extent does this project alleviate negotiation meetings, etc. present inadequacies? X Project was approved in previous C.I.P. SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific X plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? X REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the No Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? No Estimated increase in utility costs expected to IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET be offset by rental of present offices. No 1. To what extent does this project reduce Х reduction in personnel costs is anticipated. the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? X

Page

11

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

EPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY Transportation 571.3008.3405.3460 5 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Port Areawide TLE Construct alternate POL Header **FUTURE PRIOR** TOTAL 1978 1979 1980 System **PROJECT** 1981 1982 1983 YEARS **PROJECT** COST APPROP. COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. 350 CONSTRUCTION 364 364 50 **PLANNING AND DESIGN** 36 36 **EQUIPMENT** INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER TOTAL 400 400 400 SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES **G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS** 400 **FEDERAL** STATE **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER TOTAL 400 1978 1978 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** PERSONNEL COSTS ANNUAL REVENUE OTHER COSTS PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** None **PROJECT STATUS:** Proposed **DESIGN FEES:** \$36,000 LOCATION: Port of Anchorage PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: 10% **GROSS FLOOR AREA:** ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: 2 months sq. ft. (mos.)

STARTING TIME:

ASSET LIFE

BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.:

	CAFITAL INFINO	2 171A1 E	1 V :	i NC	70 L.	CT ESTIMATE - JUSTIFICATION Page 12
DEPARTMENT:	Transportation			, 		ACCT. CODE: PROJECT TITLE: Alternate POL Header System
PROJECT CATEGORY:	Port "					SERVICE AREA: Areawide
			0	1	+	EXPLANATION
timing, c	asible is this project in terms of osts and resource availability?				х	Project can be completed under contract in one season.
the com	extent is this project essential to appletion of other projects in this existing plans?		х			
2. To what	ent is the need for this project? extent does this project alleviate nadequacies?			х		Project will allow tankers to berth further not during winter months so mooring lines can be secured at a lesser angle and consequently in safer manner. This will reduce the hazard of casualty and oil spill.
				х		
	es this project relate to specific opted by the Municipality?			x		This project will help maintain the environ- mental goal adopted by Municipality. Oil companies have supported either header syst
	extent has the public supported			х		construction or additional dolphin construction which will be exceedingly more costly.
Municipa	project been mandated by the lack that the Charter, the Assembly, or Court	No				
	oroject a requirement for either Federal funding?	No				
1. To what the cost	E OPERATING BUDGET extent does this project reduce of providing a Municipal service?		х			
2. Does the	s project reduce personnel costs?		х			

		2 4 crist crist	INCOLUI	COLIMA	L			Page	13
Transportation			ACCT.		.3405.346	^	PRIORITY		
ROJECT CATEGORY Port	-			E AREA	. <u>3405.346</u> Areawi		6	* ************************************	
Pave Transit Areas B & C	19 78	1979	1980	\1981	1982	198	FUTURE PROJECT	PRIOR YEARS	TOTAL PROJECT
ESTIMATED COST		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	I IN THOUSANI	DS	COST	APPROP.	COST
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER		675 25					675 25		675 25
TOTAL		700					700		700
G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER		700					RE	IMBURSAI	BLES
TOTAL		700					<u> </u>		
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	19 7 PERSONNE		1978 OTHER CO		JTURE ANNU RSONNEL CO:		UTURE ANNUAL OTHER COSTS	ANNUA	L REVENUE
None									
PROJECT STATUS: Proposed LOCATION: Port of Anchora GROSS FLOOR AREA: Approx. 13 acre BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$1.24	ige es	\$4	pero q. ft. ESTI STA		\$25,000 LDG. COSTS: NSTRUCTION E:	4%	o: 4 months		(mos

PROJECT TITLE: Pave Transit ACCT. CODE: 571,3008,3405,3460 DEPARTMENT: Transportation Areas B & C PROJECT CATEGORY: SERVICE AREA: Port Areawide **EXPLANATION** 0 Engineering and construction can be accomplished FEASIBILITY in one season. Project is unrelated to other Х 1. How feasible is this project in terms of C.I.P., projects. timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans? X Paving will facilitate forklift operations, help NEED prevent erosion from drainage and ease operational 1. How urgent is the need for this project? Х problems from dust, mud and rough terrain. 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? X Project approved in earlier C.I.P. SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific x plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the No Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? No Maintenance expense should be reduced. User IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET revenue will contribute toward project amor-1. To what extent does this project reduce X tization. No additional personnel will be the cost of providing a Municipal service? required. 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? X

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

UA:	PHAL IMPRO	A EMEM I	PROJECT	E211MA11	***			Page	15
EPARTMENT Transportation	ı		ACCT. 6	ODE 71,3008	PRIORITY	7			
PROJECT CATEGORY Port	•		SERVIC		Areawi				
Rail Loading Facility	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST
ESTIMATED COST			-		N THOUSANI	D\$		1 7.1.1.107.1	1 0001
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER					455 45		455 45		455 45
TOTAL					500		500	`	500
SOURCE OF FUNDS G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER	·				500			EIMBURSAI	
TOTAL			<u> </u>		500				
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	197 PERSONNE		1978 OTHER CO		ITURE ANNU RSONNEL CO		TURE ANNUAL	ANNUA	L REVENUI
None						Laborate de la companya de la compan			
PROJECT STATUS: Proposed			DESI	GN FEES:	\$45,000				

LOCATION:

Port of Anchorage

GROSS FLOOR AREA:

BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: ASSET LIFE:

sq. ft.

DESIGN FEES: \$45,000 PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS:

ACCECCMENITO.

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: STARTING TIME:

3 months

(mos.)

	TIME INTE			·				Page	17
DEPARTMENT Transportation	on		ACCT. 0		3405.346	n P	RIORITY	8	
PROJECT CATEGORY Port	<u>.</u>		SERVICE		Areawid			0	
TITLE	44						FUTURE	PRIOR	TOTAL
Pave Lot 12-A	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	PROJECT	YEARS APPROP.	PROJECT COST
ESTIMATED COST				ļ!	N THOUSAND)S		L	<u> </u>
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER			ė .		455 20		455 20		455 20
TOTAL					475		475		475
SOURCE OF FUNDS G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL					475		R	EIMBURSAE	ILES
STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER									
TOTAL					475			·	·····
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	19 7 PERSONNE		1978 OTHER CO		TURE ANNUA	1	TURE ANNUAL	ANNUAL	REVENU
None									
PROJECT STATUS: Proposed			b i	GN FEES:	\$15,000	<u> </u>			

LOCATION: Port of Anchorage GROSS FLOOR AREA: Approx. 7 acres BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$1.44

T ASSET LIFE:

PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: 4%

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: 3 months STARTING TIME:

ASSESSMENITS.

DEPARTMENT: Transportation					ACCT. CODE: PROJECT TITLE: PROJECT TITLE: PROJECT TITLE:
PROJECT CATEGORY: Port					SERVICE AREA: Areawide
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		o x	x	+	EXPLANATION Engineering and construction can be accomplished in one season. Project is a refinement of Priority 7 - Lot 12 Development - in the current C.I.P.
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?	х				Delay in paving will allow 1977 ground improve- ments to settle. When project is accomplished, dust, mud and erosion control will result.
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project?	X	x			
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	No No			·	
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?		x	х		Project will reduce maintenance costs. No additional personnel will be required.

CIP-1 DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

DEPARTMENT	Transport	ation	
PROGRAM CATE	OHYA1rpor	t	

POLICY GOALS

The Airport Division will concentrate on preserving and improving Merrill Field's existing facilities to maximize operational capacity. Through improvements which will increase efficiency we can reduce the impact of the growing general aviation demand in the Municipal Area. A study is presently underway to determine to what extent Merrill Field will be able to meet the areas capacity requirements. Should the study determine that Merrill will be unable to keep pace with demand, alternate site improvements will be reviewed.

Our program policy is to provide facilities that will safely and adequately meet the growing general aviation demand in the Anchorage area.

SIX-YEAR DEPARTMENT GOALS AND STRATEGY

During the next six (6) years our emphasis will be to complete Merrill Field's physical plant. Improvements will be made; to preserve existing facilities, to improve the airports operational efficiency, increase capacity if practical and improve the esthetic appearance.

It's reasonable that Merrill may not be able to absorb the growing general aviation demand in the Anchorage area over the next six years. Alternate airport locations will be examined to provide relief for Merrill should the need present itself.

The Federal Government has an ongoing liberal airport aid program. Funds from this program will be used to finance airport CIP projects. A minimum amount of Municipal matching funds are required though and we should develop a source to provide for these funds.

PRIORITY CRITERIA

- 1. Need
- 2. Support
- 3. Feasibility

CIP-2 DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

1	DEPARTMENT
1	Transportation
1	PROGRAM CATEGORY
1	Airnort

EXISTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET										
PROJECT TITLE	CURRENT STATUS	EXPLANATION								
East Taxiway Widening	Proceeding	Construction should be completed by late Fall								
East Taxiway Lights	11	of 1977. "								
East Taxiway Striping	n	H								
Runway 6/24 Storm Drain	H	n ·								
Widening of Runway 6/24 Exits	11	ii .								
Runway 6/24 Diagonal Exit Paving	11	. 11								
Runway 6/24 Diagonal Exit Lighting	11	ti.								
Reconstruction South Taxiway	ti	Ħ								
Reconstruction East Taxiway	II	**								
	•									

DEPARTMENT Thomasontation							····	Page	21
Transportation			ACCT. C		581-3009-	3501-3520)		
PROJECT CATEGORY Airport			SERVIC	E AREA	C1ty				
PROJECT TITLE	19 78	19 79	19 80	1981	19 82	19 83	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST
				IN	THOUSAND	S			
Mayor Runway Taxiway Improvements Runway & Taxiway Extensions	951.0	512.0					951.0 512.0	•	951.0 512.0
Misc. Airport Improvements			698.0				698.0		698.0
Improve Lease Lots				373.0	741.0		1114.0		1114.0
Landscaping						597.0	597.0		597.0
TOTAL	951.0	512.0	698.0	373.0	741.0	597.0	3872.0	4-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-	3872.0
SOURCE OF FUNDS						221-0		MBURSABL	
G. O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G. O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER	30.0 891.0 30.0	16.0 480.0 16.0	22.0 654.0 22.0	350.0 11.5	23.0 695.0 23.0	18.5 560.0 18.5	363		
TOTAL	951.0	512.0	698.0	373.0	741.0	597.0	375	1.0	······································
A		L.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	L	L	<u>i</u>		l		

DEPARTMENT:	Transportation	ACCT. CODE: 583	1-3009-3501-3520	Page	22
PROJECT CATE	GORY: Airport	SERVICE AREA:	City		
1978	Major Runway Taxiway Improvements			•	
	Overlay Runway 6/24 Overlay North & South Taxiways 6/24 Irrigation System		\$ 493.0 185.0 273.0		
1979	Runway and Taxiway Extensions		\$ 951.0 Total		
	Taxiways to South Lease Lots Extend North Taxiway 6/24 Tower Parking Pavement	·	\$ 356.0 142.0 14.0	·	ŧ
1980	Miscellaneous Airport Improvements		\$ 512.0 Total		
	Pave Transient Parking Area Lot 48 Diagonal Exits with Lights 6/24 and 15/33 Widen South Ramp 6/24		\$ 338.0 279.0 81.0		
1981-82	Improve Lease Lots		\$ 698.0 Total		
	1981 Improve Additional Lease Lots Landfill 1982 Improve Additional Lease Lots Landfill	Area Area	\$ 373.0 741.0		
			\$1,114.0 Total		
1983	Landscaping		\$ 597.0 Total		
	•				•

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

Page 2.3 DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY 581-3009-3501-3520 <u>Iransportation</u> PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Airport City TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR Major Runway/Taxiway Improvements TOTAL 19 80 19 81 1982 1978 1979 19 83 **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** COST APPROP. COST ESTIMATED COST IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. 836.0 836.0 836.0 CONSTRUCTION 115.0 115.0 115.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN **EQUIPMENT** INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER 951.0 TOTAL 951.0 951.0 SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES **G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED** 30.0 G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED **REVENUE BONDS** 891.0 891.0 **FEDERAL** 30.0 30.0 STATE **OPERATING BEVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER TOTAL 921.0 951.0 1978. PERSONNEL COSTS 1978 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT ANNUAL REVENUE** OTHER COSTS PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** -0--0--0--0--0-PROJECT STATUS: 115.0 Proposed **DESIGN FEES:** Merrill Field **LOCATION:** n/a PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: **GROSS FLOOR AREA:** n/a 5 sq. ft. **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** (mos.) BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: n/a STARTING TIME: June 1979 ASSET LIFE: 25 years ASSESSMENTS: n/a

Transportation					ACCT CODE: PROJECT TITLE: S81-3009-3501-3520 Major Runway Improvements
PROJECT CATEGORY: Airport					SERVICE AREA: City
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this		0	>	+ x	EXPLANATION Feasibility- Will improve already existing facilities and their efficiency. No projects are related to this one.
C.I.P. or existing plans? NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?		X		x	Need- Will eliminate standing water on runway and taxi- way and improve operational safety by providing proper surface drainage.
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project?		•	x		Support- Project has been presented to the Merrill Field Advisory Committee to solicit recommendations. The committee has approved this project.
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	x				Requirement- State and Federal funds will be a major source of funding.
 IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? 		x			Operating Budget- No additional maintenance will be required because the project is improving already existing asphalt surface area.

DEPARTMENT Transportation	ACCT.	ACCT. CODE PRIORITY 2										
PROJECT CATEGORY Airport			SERVIC	SERVICE AREA City								
Runway and Taxiway Extensions ESTIMATED COST	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	19	33	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST		
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER	•	451.0 61.0			IN THOUSA	NDS		451.0 61.0		451.0 61.0		
TOTAL		512.0	5					512.0		512.0		
SOURCE OF FUNDS G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER		16. 0						·······················.	480.0 16.0	LES		
TOTAL	19	512.0	19 78	<u> </u>	FUTURE ANN		HTUO	E ANNUAL	496.0			
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	PERSONNE		OTHER CO		PERSONNEL CO			R COSTS	ANNUAL	REVENUE		
Maintenance Operations	-0-		-0-		-0-		-0)-	-()-		
PROJECT STATUS: Proposed LOCATION: Merrill Field GROSS FLOOR AREA: n/a BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.:n/a ASSET LIFE: 25 years		\$	PERC sq. ft. ESTI STAF		BLDG. COSTS: CONSTRUCTIO ME:	N PERIO	61.0 n/a D: June n/a	1979	5	(mos.)		

DEPARTMENT: Transportation					ACCT. CODE: PROJECT TITLE: Runway & Taxiway Extension
PROJECT CATEGORY: Airport					SERVICE AREA: City
,]_	0	1	+	EXPLANATION
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability?				x	Feasibility-Will provide better access to south lease lots. Not related to other projects.
2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		х			
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				x	Need- Will eliminate dust problems and provide a better surface to taxi aircraft. Often aircraft are damaged by rocks and dust.
				x	
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality?			х		<u>Support-</u> Project has been reviwed and approved by the Airport Advisory Committee.
2. To what extent has the public supported this project?			х		-
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	x				Requirement- State and Federal funds will be a major source of funding.
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	×				• •
1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service?		X			Operating Budget- No impact on airport budget.
2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?		X			

DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY 581-3009-3501-3520 Transportation 3 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Airport City TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL Misc. Airport Improvements 1978 19 79 1982 **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** 1983 1980 1981 COST APPROP. COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION 614.0 614.0 614.0 84.0 84.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN 84.0 EQUIPMENT **INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER** 698.0 698.0 698.0 TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES 22.0 G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED **G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS** FEDERAL 654.0 654.0 STATE 22.0 22.0 **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER** 698.0 TOTAL 676.019 78 19 78 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** ANNUAL REVENUE PERSONNEL COSTS OTHER COSTS PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** Maintenance Operations -0--0--0--0--0-Proposed **PROJECT STATUS:** 84.0 **DESIGN FEES:** Merrill Field LOCATION: n/a PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: n/a **GROSS FLOOR AREA:** sa. ft. **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** (mos.) **BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.:** n/a STARTING TIME: June 1980 ASSET LIFE: 25 years ASSESSMENTS: n/a

DEPARTMENT: Transportation				•	ACCT. CODE: PROJECT TITLE: 1980 Mis. A/P Improvement
PROJECT CATEGORY: Airport				1	SERVICE AREA: City
	T-	0	1	+	EXPLANATION
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability?				x	<u>Feasibility</u> - Will improve operational safety and efficiency and provide a better and larger area for transients. Not related to other projects.
2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		х			
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				x	Need- Help meet the growing aviation demand. Eliminate dust and rock problems and provide better aircraft parking areas.
				х	·
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality?			x		<u>Support-</u> Presented to the Airport Advisory Committee for review and recommendations. Project was approved.
2. To what extent has the public supported this project?			x		
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	x				Requirement-State and Federal funds will be a major source of funding.
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	х		13 15 16		
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?		X			Operating Budget- Greater surface area will impact the maintenance budget, but will not require any additional personnel.
2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?		X			

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

Page 29 DEPARTMENT ACCT, CODE PRIORITY Transportation 581-3009-3501-3520 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Airport City TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL Improve Lease Lots 19 78 1979 19 81 19 82 19 83 **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** 19 80 COST APPROP. COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. 328.0 328.0 328.0 CONSTRUCTION 45.0 45.0 45.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN **EQUIPMENT** INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER 373.0 373.0 3/3.0 TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES **G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED** G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED **REVENUE BONDS** 350.0 350.0 **FEDERAL** 11.5 11.5 STATE **OPERATING REVENUES** 11.5 **FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER** TOTAL 373.0 361.5 19 78 1978 **FUTURE ANNUAL** FUTURE ANNUAL **OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** PERSONNEL COSTS ANNUAL REVENUE OTHER COSTS PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** Maintenance Operations -0--0--0-10.0 100.0 Proposed **PROJECT STATUS:** 45.0 **DESIGN FEES:** Merrill Field LOCATION: PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: n/a n/a **GROSS FLOOR AREA:** sq. ft. **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** (mos.) **BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.:** n/a June 1981 STARTING TIME: ASSET LIFE: 25 years ASSESSMENTS: n/a

DEPARTMENT: Transportation				ACCT. CODE: PROJECT TITLE: 1981 Improve Lease Lots				
PROJECT CATEGORY: Airport					SERVICE AREA: City			
	-	0	1	+	EXPLANATION			
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability?				х	Feasibility- Will increase the area for parking privately owned airplances. Cannot be constructed sooner because of landfill operations. Not related to other projects.			
To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		x						
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				X	Need- Aircraft parking is difficult to find in the Anchorage area. We should develope these areas as soon as practical.			
				х.				
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality?				x	Support-Strong public support for more parking areas. Project has been reviewed by the Airport Advisory Committee and approved.			
2. To what extent has the public supported this project?				x				
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	х				Requirement-State and Federal funds will be the major source of funding.			
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	x							
1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service?	X				Operating- Will increase maintenance cost and revenue. The cost will be easily covered by project revenue			
2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?	×							

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

Page 31 DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY **Transportation** 581-3009-3501-3520 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Airport City TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** Improve Lease Lots 19 78 19 79 1981 1983 1980 19 82 COST APPROP. COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION 652.0 652.0 652.0 **PLANNING AND DESIGN** 89.0 89.0 89.0 **EQUIPMENT** INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER 741.0 741.0 741.0 TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED **G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL** 695.0 695.0 STATE 23.0 23.0 **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** 23.0 OTHER TOTAL 718.0 741.0 19 78 PERSONNEL COSTS 19 78 OTHER COSTS **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** ANNUAL REVENUE PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** Maintenance -0--0-15.0 20.0 200.0 **PROJECT STATUS:** Proposed **DESIGN FEES:** 89.0 LOCATION: 12% Merrill Field PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: **GROSS FLOOR AREA:** sq. ft. **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** n/a (mos.) June 1982 **BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.:** STARTING TIME: n/a ASSET LIFE: n/a **ASSESSMENTS:** 25 years

DEPARTMENT: Transportation				Ī	ACCT. CODE: PROJECT TITLE: 1982 Improve Lease Lots
PROJECT CATEGORY: Airport					SERVICE AREA: City
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		O X	→	+ X	EXPLANATION Feasibility- Will increase the area for parking privately owned aircraft. Cannot be constructed sooner because of landfill operations. Not related to other projects.
NEED1. How urgent is the need for this project?2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				х	Need- Aircraft parking is difficult to find in the Anchorage area. We should develope these areas as soon as practical.
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project?				x x	Support-Strong public support for more parking. Has been reviewed by the Airport Advisory Committee and approved.
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	×				Requirement-State and Federal funds will be the major source of funding.
 IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? 	×				Operating Budget-Will increase maintenance cost and revenue. The cost will be easily covered by project revenue.

ASSESSMENTS:

n/a

ASSET LIFE:

20 years

Page

3.4

DEPARTMENT: Transportation					ACCT. CODE: PROJECT TITLE: Landscaping		
PROJECT CATEGORY: Airport					SERVICE AREA: City		
	_	0	1	+	EXPLANATION		
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability?				x	Feasibility-Will greatly improve the appearance of Merrill Field. Not related to other projects.		
2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		х					
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				X	Need-Merrill Field is located in the heart of Anchorage and should be improved esthetically.		
				Х			
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality?			x		Support-Project has been presented to the Merrill Field Advisory Committee for recommendations and has been approved.		
2. To what extent has the public supported this project?			x		•		
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	х				Requirement-State and Federal funds will be a major source of funding.		
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	x						
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service?	X				Operating Budget-Addition personnel and maintenance cost will result from this project. More grounds care will be required.		
2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?	X			,	wiii ne teduitea.		

		i ayo	33
	DEPARTMENT	Transportation	
i	PROGRAM CATEGORY	Public Transit	

Dago

7 5

POLICY GOALS

Comprehensive Plan - Transit Goal: To establish an efficient transportation system that accommodates public needs, has a variety of transportation modes, serves both external and internal purposes, has a minimum negative impact on the community and reduces dependency on the automobile.

- <u>Objectives</u> To provide for the citizens of the Anchorage Municipality the highest feasible level of transit service possible.
 - To develop transit service as an effective alternative to the use of the private automobile in order to help relieve air pollution and traffic congestion.
 - To operate as efficiently and economically as possible to provide a service for citizens with no other mode of travel.

SIX-YEAR DEPARTMENT GOALS AND STRATEGY

During this CIP period the program will emphasize the extension of service to reach the maximum population and further increase service to reduce headways during peak traffic periods.

To accomplish this objective, this CIP proposes the addition of sixty (60) additional operating units.

PRIORITY CRITERIA

- Feasibility
- 2. Support
- 3. Need

CIP-2 DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

DEPARTMENT Transportation
PROGRAM CATEGORY
Public Transit

	EXISTING CAPITAL IM	PROVEMENT BUDGET
PROJECT TITLE	CURRENT STATUS	EXPLANATION
Equipment, Transit Coaches (12)	Finalized	
Shelters	Dropped	To be reinstituted in 1978.
Bus Stop Signs/Route Information Signs	Delayed	To be completed latter part of current year
Bus Turnouts on Existing Streets	Dropped	To be reinstituted in 1978
Special Access Transit Vehicles	Dropped	May be proposed again in 1979
	·	

	CAPITAL	. IMPROVE	MENIPHO	DJECT SUN	MARY			Page	37
DEPARTMENT Transportation			ACCT. C	ODE 40	01-3006-3	201		······································	
PROJECT CATEGORY Public Transit			SERVIC	FARGA	reawide				
PROJECT TITLE	1978	19 79	19 80	19 81.	1982	19 83	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST
				IN	THOUSAND	S			
Transit Coaches (60) Park and Ride Lots (5) Accommodation Centers (5) Bus Stop Turnouts (100) Bus Stop Shelters (180) Bus Stop and Route Information Signs Downtown Terminal Coach Storage and Maint. Facility	740.0 344.0 60.0 200.0 120.0	790.0 688.0 120.0 216.0 130.0 14.5 270.0 2300.0	840.0 688.0 60.0 232.0 140.0	890.0 688.0 60.0 250.0 150.0	940.0 270.0 160.0 14.5	990.0 291.0 170.0 14.5	5190.0 2408.0 300.0 1459.0 870.0 270.0 2300.0		5190.0 2408.0 300.0 1459.0 870.0 270.0 2300.0
TOTAL	1478.5	4528.5	1974.5	2052.5	1384.5	1465.5	12884.0		12884.0
SOURCE OF FUNDS							RE	MBURSABL	ES
G. O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G. O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL (80%) STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER	295.7 1182.8	905.7 3622.8	394.9 1579.6	410.5 1642.0	276.9 1107.6	293.1 1172.4	10307.2		
TOTAL	1478.5	4528.5	1974.5	2052.5	1384.5	1465.5	10307.2		

DEPARTMENT:	Transportation	ACCT, CODE:		•	Page	38
222/201		A0011 00D2.	401-3006-3201	1		
PROJECT CATEGORY	Public Transit	SERVICE AREA:	Areawide			

Transit Coaches:

Current plans call for an increase of 60 buses commencing in 1978, and extending through 1983. The increase will consist of ten buses per year. The size of the buses will vary for future years according to need; however, the Municipality contemplates ordering ten (10) 35-passenger buses for FY 78.

Park and Ride Lots:

Plans call for the construction of five (5) park and ride lots. These lots will be approximately four (4) acres in size with accommodations for 500 cars each. One lot will be operational in 1978 and located in Eagle River. In 1979 two additional lots will be located in Sand Lake and the South Anchorage area. A lot will be added in Mt. View in 1980, and another in the Muldoon area by 1981. If operating experience indicates, lots will be paved.

Accommodation Centers:

Five (5) accommodation centers will be constructed at the park and ride lots. This added facility will give greater incentive to potential riders to avail themselves of park and ride express service. The buildings at each location will be Butler Buildings with a large waiting room filled with benches. Approximate size of the waiting room will be 40' x 60'.

Bus Turnouts on Existing Streets:

Bus turnouts, which are non-existent today, are a vital part of the future Anchorage transit plans. Increased car traffic dictates that planned turnouts be built where ridership is highest at an identified location. Turnouts would be approximately 12' x 60' in size.

Shelters:

Because of the severe winter conditions, the Anchorage Public has literally demanded heated bus shelters. The approximate size of bus shelters is rectangular shaped, lighted and heated enclosure measuring 5'x 6'. Benches are provided on the inside. The approximate cost for a bus shelter, including a concrete pad and electrical hookup is \$4,000.00. The total number of shelters planned for the next six (6) years is thirty (30) per year for a total of 180.

CIP-3 A CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT:		·		rage	39
	Transportation	ACCT, CODE:	401-3006-3201		······································
'ROJECT CATEGORY:	Public Transit	SERVICE AREA:	Areawide	····	
		L			

Bus Stop Signs/Route Information Signs:

Bus stop signs and route information signs, although for the use of the Transit Division, are printed, installed and maintained by the Traffic Engineering Division. They are of a standard design and cost approximately \$70.00 each for painting and installation. Location of signs is provided by the Transit Division.

Downtown Terminal:

There are approximately 15/20,000 potential patrons working or living in the central downtown area. The majority of bus routes will either originate or terminate in the downtown area. A centrally located terminal will provide heated indoor waiting facilities and will provide transit type riders with a common central transfer point. The building will be a Butler Building with a large waiting room approximately 40' x 80' filled with benches and an information booth where tokens will be sold.

Plant Expansion, Coach Storage and Maintenance Facility:

With a planned increase of 60 additional buses within the next six (6) years added to the present 1977 fleet of 30 buses, the current maintenance and storage area will be totally inadequate. UMTA regulations require UMTA financed buses to be stored overnight in indoor heated facilities. Original plans for the present facility included provisions for phased expansion to accommodate the increase of buses.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

Page 40 DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY Transportation 401-3006-3201 SERVICE AREA PROJECT CATEGORY Public Transit Area Wide TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL 1978 1979 1980 1982 1983 **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** 1981 Transit Coaches (60)APPROP. COST COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN 738.0 788.0 838.0 **EQUIPMENT** 888.0 938.0 988.0 5,168.0 5,168.0 2.0 INTERFUND CHARGES 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 12.0 12.0 OTHER 740.0 790.0 840.0 890.0 940.0 990.0 5,190.0 TOTAL 5.190.0 SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED 148.0 158.0 G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED 168.0 178.0 188.0 198.0 **REVENUE BONDS** (80%)592.0. 632.0 672.0 712.0 752.0 4,152.0 FEDERAL 792.0 STATE **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER 740.0 790.0 840.0 890.0 940.0 990.0 TOTAL 4,152.0 19 78 19 78 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** ANNUAL REVENUE PERSONNEL COSTS OTHER COSTS PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** Transit Operations 642.8 200.0 60.0 PROJECT STATUS: Proposed N/A **DESIGN FEES:** N/A N/A LOCATION: PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: N/A **GROSS FLOOR AREA:** sq. ft. **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** N/A (mos.) N/A BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: STARTING TIME: 08/01/78 15 years N/A ASSET LIFE: ASSESSMENTS:

DEPARTMENT: Transportation		· ************************************		7	ACCT. CODE: 401-3006-3201 PROJECT TITLE: Transit Coaches
PROJECT CATEGORY: Public Transit	············			┥	OFFINIOR AREA.
Tublic Italiste .	1 1			l	Area wide
	_	0	<u> </u>	+	EXPLANATION
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability?				Х	The feasibility of additional buses is contingent upon 80% UMTA funding subject to removal of an UMTA temporary freeze on new capital.
2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?				х	The accitional of buses are crucial to route expansion, plant expansion, addition of shelters and accomodation centers as well as implementing an expanded park-n-ride operation.
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				X	The mass transit service to the existing Anchorage area can not be increased without new buses.
				X	Allows for expansion of present service.
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported				Х	Relates to the Municipal Comprehensive Plan and the Transit Development Program.
this project?				X	By showing increased ridership.
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	Х				
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	Х				Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for - UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projected increase is in harmony with our 5 yr. Transit Plan (TIP)
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?	Х				It is impossible to forecast the availability of new buses because of the lead time required by all bus manufacturers. We do not expect delivery of these buses in 1978 thus no impact on the transit operating budget.
	Х				When and if the new buses arrive, personnel costs will increase.

CADITAL	IMPROVEMENT	DDOIECT	CCTIMANTO
CAPITAL	IMPROVEMENT	PROMECI	ESTIMATE

CAP	Page	42									
DEPARTMENT Transportation			ACCT.	ACCT. CODE 401-3006-3201 PRIORITY 2							
PROJECT CATEGORY Public Transit			SERVIC	E AREA	Areawide						
Park and Ride Lots (5)	19 78	19 79	1980	198	1 1982	1982 198		FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST	
ESTIMATED COST	ESTIMATED COST			1	IN THOUSAN	DS				1	
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN	343.0	686.0	686.0	686.0	0			2,401.0	12 *********************************	2,401.	
EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0				7.0	·	7.0	
TOTAL	344.0	688.0	688.0	688.	688.0			2,408.0		2,408.0	
SOURCE OF FUNDS G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED									IMBURSAB	LES	
G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL (80%) STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER	68.8 275.2	137.6 550.4		137. 550.				1,926.4			
TOTAL	344.0	688.0	688.0	688.	.0			1,926.4			
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	19 7 PERSONNEI		19 78 OTHER COS		FUTURE ANNU ERSONNEL CO		UTUF	RE ANNUAL ER COSTS	ANNUAL	REVENUE	
Public Works snow removal 5 times per year	8,000		2,000		16,000	16,000		000			
PROJECT STATUS: Planning LOCATION: Eagle River, Sand Lake, S. Anch. Mt. View GROSS AREA: 20 Acres PAVING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$.51 ASSET LIFE: 40 Years				DESIGN FEES: N/A PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: N/A ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: Construction Seaso STARTING TIME: May ASSESSMENTS: N/A					ı Season	- 3 (mos.	

A 7

DEPARTMENT: Transportation			······································		ACCT. CODE: 401-3006-3201 PROJECT TITLE: Park-n-Ride Lots
PROJECT CATEGORY: Public Transit		****			SERVICE AREA: Areawide
CEACIDII ITV		0 ·	V	+	EXPLANATION
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to			Х		On assumption that this may be shared on an UMTA 80 - 20 shared basis.
the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?				Х	It is an integral part of the Municipality's total transportation plan.
NEED1. How urgent is the need for this project?2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				Х	This project is a high priority item and is an integral part of President Carter's energy conservation plan.
,			χ		These projects allow for greater utilization of bus fleet.
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality?			Х	This project relates to Municipality of Anchorage Transportation Improvement Program submitted to UMTA.	
2. To what extent has the public supported this project?			Х		This project has been strongly endorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	Х				
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	х				
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service?	х			-11-	Should increase ridership reducing unit cost and increasing revenue per mile.
2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?	х				

			TRUJECT		_				Page	44	
DEPARTMENT Transportation	ACCT.	401	-3006-3201		PRIO	PRITY 3	<u> </u>				
PROJECT CATEGORY Public Transit			SERVIC	E AREA Ai	reawlde	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	····				
Accomodation Centers (5)	19 78	19 79	1980	1981	1982	198	33	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST	
ESTIMATED COST	1	·		<u> </u>	IN THOUSAN	DS				1	
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER	60.0	120.0	60.0	60.0				300.0		300:0	
TOTAL	60.0	120.0	60.0	60.0				300.0		300.0	
SOURCE OF FUNDS								RE	REIMBURSABLES		
G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS	12.0	24.0	12.0	12.0			-				
FEDERAL (80%) STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER	48.0	96.0	48.0	48.0				240.0 -			
TOTAL	60.0	120.0	60.0	60.0				240.0			
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	19 7	8	19 78 OTHER CO:	FU	TURE ANNU		UTURI	E ANNUAL R COSTS	ANNUAL	REVENUE	
Transit (cleaning contract)			.8				2.0				
PROJECT STATUS: Planning				IN EEEC.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

PROJECT STATUS: Planning

LOCATION: Eagle River, Sand Lake, Muldoon, Mt. View

GROSS FLOOR AREA: 3,200

BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$50.00 ASSET LIFE: 20 Years

S. Anch. sq. ft.

DESIGN FEES:

PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS:

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: Construction Season - 3 (mos.)

STARTING TIME: May

ASSESSMENTS:

DEPARTMENT: Transportation			·		ACCT. CODE: 401-3006-3201 PROJECT TITLE: ACCOMMOdation Center
PROJECT CATEGORY: Public Transit				\dashv	SERVICE AREA: Areawide Accommodation Center
rubiic mansic	<u> </u>	0	1		EXPLANATION Muldoon
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to			х		On assumption that this may be shared on an UMTA 80-20 basis.
the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?				Х	It is an integral part of the Municipality's total transportation plan.
NEED1. How urgent is the need for this project?2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				х	This project is directly related to the Park' N Ride lots.
CURRORY			Х		Accommodation centers presently do not exist. This will provide a new service that will help increase ridership.
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project?			Х		Accommodation centers are a part of the Muni- cipality's transportation improvement program.
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court	X		X		Endorsed by Transit Advisory Board
Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	X				Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for. UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projected
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service?	х	<u> </u>			increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (TIP Should increase ridership reducing unit cost and increasing revenue per mile.
2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?	Х				No increase in personnel planned for 1978.

Page

DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY Transportation 401-3006-3201 4 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Public Transit Area Wide TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** Bus Turnouts on Existing Streets 19 78 1979 1980 19 81 19 82 1983 COST APPROP. COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. 180.0 205.0 220.0 237.0 257.0 278.0 1,377.0 CONSTRUCTION 1,377.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES 10.0 11.0 12.0 13.0 13.0 13.0 72.0 72.0 OTHER 200.0 216.0 232.0 250.0 270.0 1459.0 291.0 1459.0 TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED 43.2 46.4 54.0 58.2 40.0 G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED 50.0 **REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL** (80%)160.0 172.8 185.6 200.0 216.0 232.8 1167.2 STATE **OPERATING REVENUES** FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS **OTHER** 232.0 250.0 200.0 216.0 270.0 291.0 1167.2 TOTAL 19 78 **FUTURE ANNUAL** 19 78 **FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT ANNUAL REVENUE** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** Public Works (sweeping and snow removal 5 times per year) 4.0 1.0 24.0 6.0 **PROJECT STATUS:** Planning N/A **DESIGN FEES:** LOCATION: Unknown at this time PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: N/A GROSS FLOOR AREA: 720 sq. ft, X 10 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: Construction Season - 3 (mos.) sq. ft. PAVING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$2,50 STARTING TIME: May ASSET LIFE: 25 Years ASSESSMENTS: N/A

		~			ACCT CODE: Page 47
ransportation			·		ACCT. CODE: 401-3006-3201 PROJECT TITLE: Bus Turnouts
PROJECT CATEGORY: Public Transit		·	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,	service anea: Area Wide
	_	0	1	+	EXPLANATION
1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans? NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate			X		Totally undertermined. It should be part of 5-year program. This project should be an integral part of the
					Municipality's total transit plan and will he increase efficiency of the transit operation. Bus turnouts will help reduce safety hazards patrons waiting for buses in congested traffi areas
present inadequacies?			X	As traffic congestion grows the need becomes greater for bus turnouts for patrons of the transit system.	
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported	,		х		Turnouts presently do not exist.
this project?			X		Should be part of Municipality's 5-year trans plan.
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	x				Current Canital Aggistance Court AV on once
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	X				Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for;UMI'A will pay for 80% funding. Projected increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (TI
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?	Х			•	No increase in personnel anticipated in operating budge as a result of bus turnout construction.
	х				

CAP	Page	48									
DEPARTMENT Transportation			ACCT	CODE	401-3	3006-3201		PRIORITY 5			
PROJECT CATEGORY Public Transit			SERV	CE AREA	Area	a Wide					
Shelters (180)	19 78	1979	19 80	19	81	1982	19 8	19 83 FUTURE PROJECT COST		TOTAL PROJECT COST	
ESTIMATED COST					IN	THOUSAND	os .		APPROP.	<u> </u>	
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER	120.0	130.0	140.0	15	0.0	160.0	170.	0 870.0		870.0	
TOTAL	120.0	130.0	140.0	150	0.0	160.0	170.	0 870.0		870.0	
SOURCE OF FUNDS				ŀ				R	REIMBURSABLES		
G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS	24.0	26.0	28.0	3	0.0 32.0		34.	0			
FEDERAL STATE	96.0	104.0	112.0	120	0.0	128.0	136.	0 696.0	v • •		
OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER						an approximately an approximately an approximately approxi					
TOTAL	120.0	130.0	140.0	15	0.0	160.0	170.	0 696.0			
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	19 7 PERSONNE		19 78 OTHER C			URE ANNUA		TURE ANNUAL OTHER COSTS	ANNUAL ANNUAL DEVELOP		
Transit (cleaning contract)	ing contract)		12.0					28.8			
PROJECT STATUS: Planning			DES	IGN FEE	ES:	Not deter	rmined	······································			

LOCATION: Various

GROSS FLOOR AREA: 990 sq. ft. for 30 shelters

BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$127.00 ASSET LIFE: 15 years

sq. ft.

PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: Not determined ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: 7 months

STARTING TIME: May ASSESSMENTS: N/A

(mos.)

DEPARTMENT:					ACCT, CODE: PROJECT TITLE:				
Transportation PROJECT CATEGORY: Public Transit			401-3006-3201 Shelters						
f f					service area: Area Wide				
FEASIBILITY		0	<u> </u>	+	EXPLANATION				
 How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? To what extent is this project essential to 			X		Because of severe winter conditions, the loca populace has demanded bus shelters located at strategic points in the route structure.				
the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?			χ		This project is an integral part of the Munici- pality's present and future route structure.				
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?			Х		Because of winter conditions, this project is needed.				
		Х			This project will supplement the on-going place- ment of shelters.				
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality?			Χ		This project is an integral part of the Munici- pality's total transit plan.				
To what extent has the public supported this project?			Х		Strongly endorsed by Transit Advisory Board.				
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?				-	Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being				
					phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for; UMTA will pay 80% funding. Projected increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (TIP)				
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?					No increase in personnel anticipated in operating budget as a result of purchase and placement of bus shelters.				
2. Does this project reduce personner costst	x				11 II II II 11 11				

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

Page 50 DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY Transportation 401-3006-3201 6 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Public Transit Area Wide TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR **TOTAL** Bus Stop Signs/Route Information 19 78 1987 **YEARS PROJECT** 19 79 1980 19 82 1983 **PROJECT** Signs APPROP. COST COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN **EQUIPMENT** 14.5 14.5 14.5 14.5 INTERFUND CHARGES Traffic Engineer-14.5 14.5 87.0 87.0 ing OTHER 14.5 14.5 14.5 14.5 87.0 14.5 14.5 87.0 TOTAL **SOURCE OF FUNDS** REIMBURSABLES **G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED** 2.9 **G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED** 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9 **REVENUE BONDS** (80%)11.6 11.6 11.6 11.6 11.6 FEDERAL 11.6 69.6 STATE **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER 14.5 14.5 14.5 14.5 14.5 14.5 69.6 TOTAL 1978 19 78 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** ANNUAL REVENUE PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** 5.8 8.7 5.8 Traffic Engineering (approximately 8.7 207 signs to be installed and maintained by Traffic Engineering) Planning **PROJECT STATUS: DESIGN FEES:** N/A LOCATION: Various PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: N/A 6 months GROSS FLOOR AREA: N/A **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** sq. ft. (mos.) BUILDING COST PER SIGN: \$70.00 May STARTING TIME: ASSET LIFE: 5 years ASSESSMENTS: N/A

FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project sesential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans? NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? X Project is essential for identifying bus stop our route structure would be rendered useles. X Project is in harmony with existing route structure and bus stops. SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? X Endorsed by the Transit Advisory Board. Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projection applied for 100 f	DEPARTMENT:				7	Page 51		
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans? NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? NEED 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? 3. Is this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce proper relate to specific plans adopted during a Municipal service? 2. Does this project a project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce provided a requirement for either state of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce projects and provide necessary in formation patrons. Painting of signs, placement and maintenance is done by Traffic Engineering. X			-w		ACCT. CODE 401-3006-3201 Sussest Type Information Sign			
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans? NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? X Project is essential for identifying bus stops our route structure would be rendered useles. X Project is essential for identifying bus stops our route structure and bus stops. An integral part of our total transit plan. SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? 2. Is this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce proper reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce provided reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 3. Does this project reduce provided reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce presented costs? 3. Does this project reduce provided project reduce provided reduce provided reduce provided for: 3. Does this project reduce providing a Municipal service? 4. Does this project reduce provided project reduce provided provided for providing a Municipal service? 3. Does this project reduce providing a Municipal service? 4. Does this project reduce providing a Municipal service? 4. Does this project reduce providing a Municipal service? 4. Does this project reduce providing a Municipal service? 5. Does this project reduce providing a Municipal service? 4. Does this project reduce providing a Municipal service? 5. Does this project reduce provided			Т	_	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans? NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? NEED 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? 2. It was the public supported this project? 3. To what extent has the public supported this project? 4. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 4. To what extent has the public supported this project? REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? No anticipated increase in personnel in operating budget. No anticipated increase in personnel in operating budget. No anticipated increase in personnel in operating budget. """""""""""""""""""""""""""""""""""	FFASIRII ITV	_	0	'	+ X	This project is necessary in order to identify		
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? X Project is essential for identifying bus stop to what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? X Project is in harmony with existing route structure and bus stops. X Project is in harmony with existing route structure and bus stops. An integral part of our total transit plan. X Endorsed by the Transit Advisory Board. X Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. Transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. Transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projects increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. Transit plan (not be applied for; UMTA will pay	 How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? To what extent is this project essential to 					bus stops and provide necessary information to patrons. Painting of signs, placement and maintenance is done by Traffic Engineering.		
1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies? X Project is in harmony with existing route structure and bus stops. X Project is in harmony with existing route structure and bus stops. An integral part of our total transit plan. An integral part of our total transit plan. X Endorsed by the Transit Advisory Board. REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? X Project is in harmony with existing route structure and bus stops. X Endorsed by the Transit Advisory Board. Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for; UMFA will pay for 80% funding. Projecte increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (1) the providing a Municipal service? W No anticipated increase in personnel in operating budget. In the project reduce personnel costs?					Х	Without bus stop signs identifying bus stops, our route structure would be rendered useless		
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? Structure and bus stops. An integral part of our total transit plan. Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projected increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (1) No anticipated increase in personnel in operating budget. """" No anticipated increase in personnel in operating budget. """" """ """ """ """ """ """	 How urgent is the need for this project? To what extent does this project alleviate 				X	Project is essential for identifying bus stops		
1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project? X					Х			
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? X Endorsed by the Transit Advisory Board. X Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projected increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (1) No anticipated increase in personnel in operating budget. **Y *** **Indorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** **Output** **Description** **X *** **Indorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** **Output** **Description** **Y *** **Indorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** **Output** **Description** **X *** **Indorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** **Output** **Description** **X *** **Indorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** **Output** **Description** **X *** **Indorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** **X *** **Description** **X *** **Indoorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** **Current Capital Assistance Grant AK-03-0003 is being phased out. New Capital Assistance Grant will be applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projected increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (1) **Indoorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** **X *** **Indoorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.** *	1. How does this project relate to specific			Х		An integral part of our total transit plan.		
1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?					Х	Endorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.		
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?	 Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? Is this project a requirement for either 							
1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? " " " " " "						applied for; UMTA will pay for 80% funding. Projected increase is in harmony with our 5-yr. transit plan (TIP).		
2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?	1. To what extent does this project reduce	Х				budget.		
						11 11 11 11 · ·		

52 Page DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY Transportation 401-3006-3201 7 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Public Transit Areawide TITLE **FUTURE PRIOR** TOTAL **YEARS PROJECT** 19 78 19 79 1980 1987 **PROJECT** Downtown Terminal (1) 19 82 1983 APPROP. COST COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION 259.0 259.0 259.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN 10.0 10.0 10.0 **EQUIPMENT** INTERFUND CHARGES 1.0 1.0 1.0 **OTHER** 270.0 270.0 270.0 TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES **G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED** 54.0 G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS (80%)**FEDERAL** 216.0 216.0 STATE **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER **TOTAL** 270.0 216.0 1978 1979 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT ANNUAL REVENUE** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** Transit (cleaning contract) 5.0 5.0 PROJECT STATUS: Planning **DESIGN FEES:** LOCATION: Downtown PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS:

GROSS FLOOR AREA: 3,200 BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$60

20 Years

ASSET LIFE:

sq. ft.

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: 3 months

STARTING TIME: Construction Season ASSESSMENTS: N/A

(mos.)

DEPARTMENT: Transportation PROJECT CATEGORY: Public Transit					ACCT. CODE: 401-3006-3201 PROJECT TITLE: Downtown Terminal		
					SERVICE AREA: Areawide		
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		O	X	* X	On assumption that this may be shared on an UMTA 80-20 basis		
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				х	A downtown terminal will he;p generate greater utilization of buses.		
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project?			X X		At present the central downtown core area has approximately 20,000 potential transit users who have no place to wait for a bus in a heated facility. This project was in the original GAAB transit plans. This project has been endorsed by the Transit Advisory Board.		
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	X						
 IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? 	Х	X			Should increase ridership reducing unit cost and increasing revenue per mile.		

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

Page 54 DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY Transportation 401-3006-3201 8 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA Public Transit Areawide TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL Coach Storage And 19 79 **PROJECT YEARS** 19 78 19 80 1981 19 82 1983 **PROJECT** Maintenance Facility COST APPROP. COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. 340.0 340.0 340.0 CONSTRUCTION 1,880.0 1,880.0 1,880.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN 80.0 80.0 80.0 **EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER** 2,300.0 2,300.0 TOTAL 2,300.0 SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES **G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED** 460.0 **REVENUE BONDS** (80%)FEDERAL 1.840.0 1,840 STATE **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER** 2,300.0 TOTAL 1,840 19 78 19 78 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** ANNUAL REVENUE PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** 185.2 346.6 346.6 185.2 Transit Planning PROJECT STATUS: **DESIGN FEES:** 80,000

LOCATION: 3500 Tudor Rd. GROSS FLOOR AREA: 38,658

BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: \$45.00

ASSET LIFE: 25 Years

sq. ft.

PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: 3,5% **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:**

12 months

(mos.)

STARTING TIME: May 1, 1977 ASSESSMENTS: N/A

	5

Page

DEPARTMENT

CIP-1
DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

TRANSPORTATION
PROGRAM CATEGORY
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

POLICY GOALS

Comprehensive Plan - Transportation Goal:

To establish an efficient transportation system that accommodates public needs:

Objectives

To improve the safety and capacity of the existing streets and highways system in areas non-developed.

To provide for the systematic extension of the present streets and highways system to serve newly developed areas.

To promote and develop multimodal transportation to reduce dependency on the automobile.

SIX-YEAR DEPARTMENT GOALS AND STRATEGY

This CIP Program reflects on-going traffic safety and efficiency projects involving new or improved traffic signal installations, traffic signs, and street channelization to regulate flow and increase arterial capacity.

To accomplish the above, this CIP proposes to install or remodel five (5) traffic signals yearly, construct two (2) major raised channelization projects yearly, and construct one (1) pedestrian overcrossing each year.

PRIORITY CRITERIA

- 1. Need
- 2. Feasibility
- 3. Support

CIP-2 DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

DEPARTMENT Transportation
PROGRAM CATEGORY
Traffic

		11 BITTO									
EXISTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET											
PROJECT TITLE	CURRENT STATUS	EXPLANATION									
Fireweed & Arctic Fireweed & C Fireweed & Seward	Delayed	Signalization modernization in conjunction with Public Works and State Projects delayed until 1978.									
Mt. View & Commercial	Delayed .	Public Works Bond Funds not available for widening projects.									
DeBarr at Pine & Turpin	Delayed	State Highway Department is installing base work with DeBarr Widening Project. Intersections will be signalized at a later date.									
School Signals	Proceeding as Planned	Hazardous Route Committee will recommend projects									
Channelization	Proceeding	36th & Lake Otls presently under contract									
Communications	Delayed	Approved in 1977 CIP, but not funded									
	,										

CIP-3

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT SUMMARY 58 Page DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE TRANSPORTATION 401-3007-3302 SERVICE AREA AREAWIDE PROJECT CATEGORY TRAFFIC ENGINEERING **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL 1978 1981 1979 1980 1982 1983 **YEARS PROJECT PROJECT** PROJECT TITLE COST APPROP. COST IN THOUSANDS Areawide Communications 50.0 300.0 50.0 400.0 400.0 Pedestrian Overcrossing 400.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 2,000.0 2,000. Signals and Channelization 250.0 250.0 1,700.0 1,598.7 400.0 400.0 400.0 3,298.7 TOTAL 700.0 800.0 300.0 700.0 800.0 800.0 4,100.0 1,598.7 5,698.7 SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES G. O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G. O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED 250.0 250.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 **REVENUE BONDS** 300.0 **FEDERAL** 300.0 STATE 450.0 450.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 2,100.0 **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER 300.0 TOTAL 700.0 700.0 800.0 800.0 2,400.0

800.0

ACCCCCSSCRITC.

1				rage	59	
1	DEPARTMENT: TRANSPORTATION	ACCT. CODE:	101 2007 2200			
- 1			401-3007-3302			
	PROJECT CATEGORY: TRAFFIC	SERVICE AREA:	Areawide			
		1				

AREAWIDE COMMUNICATIONS

Install transmitter/receiver repeater sites with multi-channel microwave frequencies to provide the Municipality with adequate areawide coverage.

SIGNALS AND CHANNELIZATION

Modernize traffic signals in conjunction with Public Works or State projects along Fireweed Lane; at Mountain View Drive and Bragaw Street; and at Fifth Avenue and Concrete Street.

Install school signals as warranted per recommendation at the Hazardous Route Committee.

Construct raised channelization at various intersections in conjunction with other roadway improvements.

PEDESTRIAN OVERCROSSING

Future locations have yet to be identified.

DEPARTMENT: TRANSPORTATION		ACCT, CODE:		Page 60
PROJECT CATEGORY: TRAFFIC		SERVICE AREA:	401-3007-3302 AREAWIDE	
	in the second of		AREAWIDE	***************************************
				THE THE STATE OF T
INTERSECTIONS TO BE SIGNALIZ	ED OR REMODELED	CT.	INTERSECTIONS REQU	URING CONTRACTOR
1978 PROJECTS - FUNDED	COST SHARE		NNELIZATION, WIDENING,	IMPROVEMENTS
Spenard & Fireweed Fireweed & Arctic Fireweed & C Fireweed & Seward Mountain View & Bragaw 5th & Concrete School Signals - Various Loc Channelization - Various Loc 1979 PROJECTS - FUNDED Maplewood & Northern Lights 15th & Gambell 4th & Ingra 4th & Gambell	ations	16th & Old Ser Northweeth & I Northweeth & I 36th & I9th & Norther 15th &	Spenard C ward & International cood & Spenard F cood & International F Minnesota C rn Lights & Turnagain Merrill Field rn Lights & Wisconsin	
UNFUNDED School Signals - Various Channelization - Various 1980 PROJECTS - FUNDED 15th & Ingra Turnagain & Northern Lights UNFUNDED School Signals - Various	50,000 150,000 50,000 200,000 50,000 25	50,000 1981 Inter	This list does not nece order of construction we by right-of-way acquist participation or change PROJECTS resection Improvements PROJECTS resection Improvements	which may be affected
Channelization - Various	<u>150,000</u> <u>50,000</u>	FA AAA	PROJECTS csection Improvements	400,000

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ESTIMATE

Page 61 DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY TRANSPORTATION 401-3307-3302 1 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA TRAFFIC ENGINEERING Areawide TITLE **FUTURE PRIOR** TOTAL Area-Wide Communications **YEARS PROJECT PROJECT** 1978 1979 1980 1982 1981 1983 APPROP. COST COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. 65.0 12.5 12.5 CONSTRUCTION 90.0 90.0 40.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN 40.0 40.0 195.0 **EQUIPMENT** 37.5 37.5 270.0 270.0 INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER 300.0 50.0 50.0 400.0 TOTAL 400.0 SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES **G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED** G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED 50.0 50.0 **REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL** 300.0 300.0 STATE **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER **TOTAL** 50.0 300.0 50.0 300.0 1978 1978 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** ANNUAL REVENUE PERSONNEL COSTS OTHER COSTS PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** Traffic (Electronics) 5.0 1.0 5.0 1.0 0 **PROJECT STATUS:** Planning **DESIGN FEES:** 40.0 Various LOCATION: PERCENT OF BLDG, COSTS: 10% **GROSS FLOOR AREA:** Eight (8) N/A sa. ft. **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** (mos.) **BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.:** N/A STARTING TIME: April 1, 1978 ASSET LIFE: Twenty five (25) years N/A

ASSESSMENTS:

					****		Page	0.2
DEPARTMENT: TRANSPORTATION				AC	сст, соре: 401-36	007-3302	PROJECT TITLE: Area-wid Communications	e
PROJECT CATEGORY: PROJECT CATE	-			SE	EDVICE ABEA.	Areawide		
 FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans? 		0 v	///	+	services by a but not funda	existing person	nistration of contrac nnel. Approved in 19 ect is in conjunction ilities.	77 C.I.P.
NEED1. How urgent is the need for this project?2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?					increase area Municipal rac	a. Fire, Polic dio users must s with less int	ons are inadequate du ce and EMS, as well a be able to communica terference to perform	s other te over
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project?		/	7		have been inv	volved in the p	efense and other majoroject planning to interest and improve se Girdwood.	ncrease
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	7						•	
 IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? 	1	V			cations incre Future mobile	easing the Muni e and portable	timely and efficient cipalities level of radio purchases will anel will be required	service. be at

CAPITAL.	IMPROVEMENT	PROJECT	FSTIMATE

DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY 401-3007-3302 TRANSPORTATION 2 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA TRAFFIC ENGINEERING AREAWIDE TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL 19 78 1980 1981 **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** 1979 1983 PEDESTRIAN OVERCROSSINGS 19 82 APPROP. COST COST **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 500.0 500.0 CONSTRUCTION 250.0 1,250.0 1,250.0 250.0 250.0 250.0 250.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN 250.0 250.0 50.0 50.0 50.0 50.0 50.0 **EQUIPMENT** INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER 400.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 2,000.0 2,000.0 TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES **G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE** (Hwy Safety) 400.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 2,000.0 **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS** OTHER 400.0 400.0 TOTAL 400.0 400.0 400.0 2.000.0 1978 1978 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** ANNUAL REVENUE PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** PERSONNEL COSTS **OTHER COSTS** PROJECT STATUS: Proposed **DESIGN FEES:** 250.0

LOCATION: .

GROSS FLOOR AHEA: N/A

ASSET LIFE: 25 years

BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: N/A

1979-83 undet.

sq. ft.

PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: 12%

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD: 6

STARTING TIME: April, 79 ASSESSMENTS: N/A

(mos.)

Page

DEPARTMENT:				T .	Page 64 ACCT, CODE: PROJECT TITLE:
TRANSPORTATION					401-3007-3302 Pedestrian Overcrossing
PROJECT CATEGORY AFFIC ENGINEERING				s	SERVICE AREA: AREAWIDE
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this		0	\ \ 	+	EXPLANATION This project would involve administration of a state safety contract.
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?		√	/		This project would result in reducing pedestrian/vehicle conflicts at locations used primarily by school children
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project?		/	∨ √		Safe pedestrian facilities are required by the multimode transportation concept of the Comprehensive Plan. The School District and P.T.A. groups support this project.
 REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding? 	 			/	
 IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? 		1	1		School crossing guards will be eliminated at locations where overpasses are constructed.

DEPARTMENT ACCT. CODE PRIORITY TRANSPORTATION 3 401-3007-3302 PROJECT CATEGORY SERVICE AREA TRAFFIC ENGINEERING Areawide TITLE **FUTURE** PRIOR TOTAL Traffic Signals/Channelization **PROJECT YEARS PROJECT** 19 78 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 COST COST APPROP. **ESTIMATED COST** IN THOUSANDS LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION 200.0 200.0 310.0 310.0 310.0 1330.0 1598.7 2928.7 25.0 PLANNING AND DESIGN 25.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 170.0 170.0 20.0 20.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 **EQUIPMENT** 160.0 160.0 **INTERFUND CHARGES** 5.0 5.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 40.0 40.0 OTHER 400.0 1700.0 1598.7 250.0 250.0 400.0 400.0 3298.7 TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS REIMBURSABLES G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED **G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED** 200.0 200.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE 50.0 50.0 100.0 **OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER** TOTAL 250.0 250.0 400.0 400.0 400.0 100.0 1978 1978 **FUTURE ANNUAL FUTURE ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT** ANNUAL REVENUE PERSONNEL COSTS OTHER COSTS PERSONNEL COSTS OTHER COSTS Traffic (Electronics) 5.0 1.0 5.0 1.0 0 PROJECT STATUS: Proposed DESIGN FEES: 170.0 LOCATION: Various - See attached listing PERCENT OF BLDG. COSTS: 10% **GROSS FLOOR AREA:** sa. ft. **ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:** On-going (mos.) **BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.:** STARTING TIME: ASSET LIFE: ASSESSMENTS: N/A Twenty (20) years

PARTMENT:				Т	ACCT. CODE: PROJECT TITLE:
TRANSPORTATION ROJECT CATEGORY:					ACCT. CODE: 401-3007-3302 PROJECT TITLE: Iraffic Signals/Channelizat
OJECT CATEGORY; TRAFFIC ENGINEERING					Areawide
		0	4	+	EXPLANATION
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability?				V	C.I.P. prior years funds available, project design is included in the operating budget.
To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?				V	Many state and Municipal Public Works projects are dependent upon traffic C.I.P. for completion.
NEED1. How urgent is the need for this project?2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				مرد	Major intersection travel delay and high accident rate warrent immediate action.
				/	This project will increase roadway capacity and reduce accident rate for Anchorage's 180,000 vehicles.
SUPPORT1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality?2. To what extent has the public supported this project?				_	The comprehensive plan calls for efficient use of existing roadways.
			_		Traffic Engineering receives on a daily basis requests for signals, left turn channelization, interconnected signal systems and school crossing protection.
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	V				
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	V				
 IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs? 	<u> </u>	4			Increased signalization requires maintenance, however, existing personnel will maintain this C.I.P. project.

CIP-1

DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

	1 494	
DEPARTMENT	Transportation	
PROGRAM CATEGORY	Parking	

POLICY GOALS

Comprehensive Plan

Circulation Element & Parking Plan

1974 Central Business District - Provide an adequate parking program to encourage new development in the CBD and insure increasing demands for parking are satisfied.

Objectives - Expand existing facilities vertically and develop additional sites to provide parking for areas outside the service area of existing facilities. To insure existing and future on-street parking is efficiently utilized. To encourage transit ridership and increase vehicle occupancy.

SIX-YEAR DEPARTMENT GOALS AND STRATEGY

During this CIP period additional off-street parking spaces are to be provided. Meter area expansion is to be continued with improved meter efficiency.

To accomplish the above, a parking garage at 5th Avenue & C Street is proposed and new meters are required.

PRIORITY CRITERIA

- 1. Need
- 2. Support
- 3. Feasibility

CIP-2 DEPARTMENT CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

		· ugo	
- 3	DEPARTMENT		
į		Transportation	
	PROGRAM CATEGORY	Parking	

II CAPITAL NEEDS ANALYSIS	Parking									
EXISTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET										
CURRENT STATUS	EXPLANATION									
Dropped	Meter monies provided in Parking Facilities 1977 Budget were transferred to the Police Department to provide meter maid services.									
	-									
	EXISTING CAPITAL IN									

CIP-3
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT SUMMARY

	UMITIM	L HAIL MOA	EMENI PH	OTEC! OU!	ANAIWU			Page	69
DEPARTMENT Transportation			ACCT. C	401.	.3007-3302	2			
PROJECT CATEGORY Parking			SERVIC	E AREA	Areawic				
PROJECT TITLE	1978	1979	1980	198 1	1982	1983	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST
Parking Meters		32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	160.0		160.0
Parking Garage 5th & C Street			7500.0				7500.0		7500.0
TOTAL	<u> </u>	32.0	7532.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	7660.0		7660.0
SOURCE OF FUNDS						7	1	MBURSABL	
G. O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G. O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE			7500.0				116-1	WID ON OABL	
OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER - Parking Revenue Fund		32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0			
TOTAL		32.0	7532.0	32,0	32.0	32.0			

ASSESSMENTS.

TRANSPORTATION

PROJECT CATEGORY:
Parking

ACCT. CODE: 401-3007-3302

SERVICE AREA: Areawide

PARKING METERS

The 1975 Parking Strategy as approved by the City Council calls for parking meters to be placed throughout the C.B.D. This project is about 80% complete. Monies will purchase meters to place on street and replace meters that are phased out due to age and worn out conditions. \$32,000 will purchase approximately 300 meters.

PARKING GARAGE

A parking facility at 5th & "G" Street is warranted due to the development in that area. The 1974 "Central Business District Circulation Element and Parking Plan" prepared by Wilbur Smith & Associates and incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan states..."Existing demand plus proposed development within the service area of the 5th & "C" Street site is adequate to warrant a net gain of approximately 300 spaces (commercial frontage is desirable). This same study notes a demand for 1900 more parking spaces in the CBD from 1974 to 1980 and an additional 1700 more by 1985.

The Parking & Traffic Commission has twice unanimously recommended the construction of a garage on this site.

The proposed structure will hold about 550 vehicles on five floors. The land is owned by the Parking and Revenue Fund. Anticipated payoff on the bonds of 20 years.

Page

71

									Page	71	
DEPARTMENT Transportation			ACCT.	CODE	1						
PROJECT CATEGORY Parking	SERVIC	service area Areawide									
Parking Meters	19 78	1979	1980	19		1982	198	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST	
ESTIMATED COST		.1		<u> </u>	11	V THOUSAND	S		AFFROR.	1 6031	
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER		32.0	32.0	2.0 32.		32.0	32.	160.0		160.0	
TOTAL		32.0	32.0	32	.0	32.0	32.	0 160.0		160.0	
SOURCE OF FUNDS G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER - PARKING REVENUE FUND		32.0	32.0	32.	.0	32.0	32.0		EIMBURSAE	LES	
TOTAL		32.0	32.0	32	.0	32.0	32.	0			
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	197 PERSONNE		1978 OTHER CO	STS		TURE ANNUA		UTURE ANNUAL OTHER COSTS	ANNUAL	REVENUE	
Parking Facilities						0		1.0		40.0	
PROJECT STATUS: Proposed LOCATION: Various GROSS FLOOR AREA: N/A BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: N/A			PERC sq. ft. ESTI	MATED	F BLD	N/A DG. COSTS: STRUCTION F		D: On-	-Going	(mos.	

STARTING TIME: March 1979

ASSESSMENTS: N/A

20 Years

ASSET LIFE:

DEPARTMENT: Transportation			Ī	ACCT. CODE: 401-3007-3302 PROJECT TITLE: Parking Meters							
PROJECT CATEGORY: Parking				SERVICE AREA: Areawide							
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability? 2. To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		0	x	+ X	EXPLANATION Meters can be installed and/or replaced with existing Meter Shop personnel. Meters must be installed before the Parking Garage at 5th Avenue and "C" Street is built.						
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?			х	,	Curbside parking spaces in the CBD proximate to the Federal Building and the Calista Hotel must be metered for efficient curb parking turnover. Meter posts presently exist in the CBD, while no meters						
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality? 2. To what extent has the public supported this project?			X X	Χ	are available for installation. The CBD Circulation and Parking Plan recommends expansion of parking meter areas. The Parking & Traffic Commission supports the expansion of parking meter areas.						
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order? 2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	X										
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service? 2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?		X	X		Costs of parking meters will be derived from the Parking Revenue Fund. More metered parking will increase income resulting in more parking facilities at no cost to the Municipality.						

DEPARTMENT Transportation				ACCT. C	ode 01-30	07-3	302		PRI	ORITY	Page 2	/3
PROJECT CATEGORY Parking			S	SERVICE AREA Areawide						4		
Parking Garage	1978	19 79	19	£0	198	1	1982	195	33	FUTURE PROJECT COST	PRIOR YEARS APPROP.	TOTAL PROJECT COST
ESTIMATED COST	IN THOUSANDS											
LAND AND R.O.W. CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN EQUIPMENT INTERFUND CHARGES OTHER		Andreas de la constanta de la		0.0			•			6750.0 750.0		6750.0 750.0
			===								·	
TOTAL	<u> </u>		750	0.0						7500.0		7500.0
SOURCE OF FUNDS G.O. BONDS AUTHORIZED G.O. BONDS UNAUTHORIZED REVENUE BONDS FEDERAL STATE OPERATING REVENUES FUND BALANCE/RET EARNINGS OTHER			750	0.0						RE	IMBURSAB	LES
TOTAL			750	0.0								
OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT	19 PERSONNE	L COSTS		19 ER COS	TS		URE ANNU. ONNEL COS			RE ANNUAL IER COSTS	ANNUAL	REVENUE
Parking Facilities	Ø			Ø			Ø		Ø		200).0
PROJECT STATUS: Proposed LOCATION: 5th Avenue & "C GROSS FLOOR AREA: BUILDING COST PER SQ. FT.: ASSET LIFE: 40 Years	" Street		sq. ft.	PERCI ESTIN STAR		BLD CONS	G. COSTS:	PERIO	D:	750.0 10% 12 01/01/81	<u> </u>	(mos.

DEPARTMENT: Transportation				ACCT, CODE: 401-3007-3302 PROJECT TITLE: Parking Garage					
PROJECT CATEGORY: Parking				SERVICE AREA: Areawide					
	_	0	1	+	EXPLANATION				
FEASIBILITY 1. How feasible is this project in terms of timing, costs and resource availability?			х		This project will be designed and constructed by contract. No additional personnel will be required in Traffic Engineering to administer the contracts.				
To what extent is this project essential to the completion of other projects in this C.I.P. or existing plans?		Х		•					
NEED 1. How urgent is the need for this project? 2. To what extent does this project alleviate present inadequacies?				X	The Federal Complex under construction in the CBD will have a deficiency of 555 spaces. Also, the demand for parking will be increased by the proposed Calisto Hotel.				
			X		Curbside parking proximate to 5th Avenue & C Street is 100% utilized.				
SUPPORT 1. How does this project relate to specific plans adopted by the Municipality?				X	The CBD Circulation Element & Parking Plan supports off- street parking facilities as an alternative to the con- tinual reduction of curbside spaces.				
2. To what extent has the public supported this project?			X	•	The Parking & Traffic Commission supports the 5th & C Street Parking Garage.				
REQUIREMENT 1. Has this project been mandated by the Municipal Charter, the Assembly, or Court Order?	х								
2. Is this project a requirement for either State or Federal funding?	х								
IMPACT ON THE OPERATING BUDGET 1. To what extent does this project reduce the cost of providing a Municipal service?			х		The Municipality cannot finance and construct wider roadways in the CBD in order to provide parking. Furthermore, the Parking Revenue Fund is self-sufficie				
2. Does this project reduce personnel costs?		Х			and will eventually pay for the parking garage.				