



AFFILIATED AGENCIES

*Orange County
Transit District*

*Local Transportation
Authority*

*Service Authority for
Freeway Emergencies*

*Consolidated Transportation
Service Agency*

*Congestion Management
Agency*

*Service Authority for
Abandoned Vehicles*

January 27, 2017

Mr. Paul Emery
City Manager
City of Anaheim
200 South Anaheim Boulevard
Anaheim, CA 92805

RE: City Resolution Related to a Streetcar System in Anaheim

Dear Mr. Emery:

This correspondence is in response to the recent City of Anaheim (City) Council resolution related to a streetcar system within the City. As you know, the Central Harbor Boulevard Transit Corridor Study is developing and analyzing strategies for improving transit service in this important corridor that serves Orange County residents, employees, and visitors.

A key Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) responsibility includes evaluation of all options and strategies for improving transit in core service corridors throughout Orange County as required and recommended by the Federal Transit Administration, environmental laws and regulations, data-driven planning practices, and public input. The study was initiated in 2015, consistent with these requirements and recommendations, and has been developed in close coordination with representatives from each of the corridor cities (Anaheim, Fullerton, Garden Grove, and Santa Ana) and stakeholders. As such, OCTA is committed to a rigorous planning process that includes public and local agencies' input, detailed technical assessments, and, of course, future policy direction from the OCTA Board of Directors (Board) on next steps.

To date, the project team has developed 12 draft conceptual alternatives for improving transit service in the Harbor Boulevard corridor. These conceptual alternatives include a variety of alignments (Anaheim Boulevard/Lemon Street, Harbor Boulevard, and Katella Avenue), modes (enhanced bus, bus rapid transit, and streetcar), and features (vehicle type, stop amenities, shared or dedicated lanes, etc.). Each alternative has been developed with input from the corridor cities, OCTA, and the public, and will ultimately be evaluated based on how well it meets a defined set of performance criteria.

Mr. Paul Emery
January 27, 2017
Page 2

OCTA acknowledges the City's resolution, which identifies related concerns with traffic impacts, affordable fares, operations, and safety. This input will be considered by the Board during the refinement of the draft alternatives for the study. Comments received from each of the corridor cities, stakeholders, and the public will be weighed and evaluated in order to refine the draft alternatives. The draft alternatives will be available for review and comment in the next few months, and the project team will be seeking input from all study participants regarding the transit options being proposed.

We look forward to continuing to work with the City to identify transit alternatives for the Harbor Boulevard corridor that best meet the needs identified through the study process.

Sincerely,



Darrell Johnson
Chief Executive Officer

DJ:kb
Attachment

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
ANAHEIM EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO A STREET CAR
SYSTEM IN ANAHEIM

WHEREAS, for nearly a decade, the City of Anaheim (City) and the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) have worked collaboratively on the proposed Anaheim Rapid Connection (ARC) Project which is intended to provide residents, employees, and visitors an east-west transit connection between the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC) and Anaheim's major neighborhoods, employment and activity centers in the Platinum Triangle and The Anaheim Resort; and

WHEREAS, on May 12, 2008 OCTA authorized funding Anaheim's Go Local application with an investment of \$5,900,000 from Measure M (Project S) and a \$100,000 local match from Anaheim to study and potentially develop a convenient "last mile" connection between the Study Area's activity centers and Metrolink, Amtrak, local fixed-route bus, Stationlink bus, and future California High Speed Rail (CHSR) at ARTIC; and

WHEREAS, the City has successfully received federal, Measure M and Measure M2 transportation funding from the OCTA Board and entered into cooperative agreements with the OCTA to study transit connections from Metrolink stations in Anaheim to major job, housing and activity centers; and

WHEREAS, the City has also contributed local funding to this analysis, including Anaheim Tourism Improvement District (ATID) restricted transportation funds; and

WHEREAS, on September 27, 2016, the City Council approved and authorized an Amendment to a Cooperative Agreement with OCTA for the ARC Fixed Guideway Project, requiring the City conclude all planning efforts for the ARC project and submit all work completed to date to OCTA; affirmed OCTA as the lead agency for any potential future phases of the ARC project; and

WHEREAS, in furtherance of this previous action, City staff has concluded all planning efforts for the street car project; and

WHEREAS, in light of the OCTA managing these significant transportation projects in corridors along and near the ARC corridor, the OCTA Board has determined there is a need for a more regional perspective for planning transit extensions to current or planned systems. As such, the OCTA Board has reevaluated the roles identified in the cooperative agreement with the City of Anaheim for the ARC Project; and

WHEREAS, it is the City Council's belief that a Street Car project is not a viable transit solution in Anaheim; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Street Car project, budgeted for more than \$300 million, would

have been one of the most expensive projects of its kind, on a per mile basis in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the ARTIC train facility has had significantly lower ridership numbers than projected; and

WHEREAS, having a fixed guide rail transit project connected to ARTIC would seem to be an unwise investment of taxpayer dollars; and

WHEREAS, a fixed guide rail system within the resort area would be ill conceived as it would severely disrupt street traffic lanes needed for car and buses; and

WHEREAS, municipalities such as Providence, Rhode Island and Arlington, Virginia have rejected previously approved rail transit programs due to the high costs associated with such transit solutions; and

WHEREAS, the City Council is hereby expressing concern that the proposed Street Car project is expensive and a drain on community resources; does not allow for flexibility; makes congestion worse and does not support ridership numbers; and

WHEREAS, Anaheim has a large population of transit-dependent people who rely on the OCTA bus system and the City of Anaheim has a need for more routes and frequency of service with lower fares for these residents; and

WHEREAS, the City Council does support more dynamic, fluid and accessible transportation system that does not create unintended consequences, such as an increase in traffic and supports alternatives which are a better fit for the unique needs of The Anaheim Resort and Platinum Triangle.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ANAHEIM AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Anaheim wishes to express its opposition to the Anaheim Rapid Connection (ARC) Street Car project as being a non-viable transit solution in the City of Anaheim.

Section 2. The City Council of the City of Anaheim also opposes any street car plans along Harbor Blvd. However, it supports the Orange County Transportation Authority's study of other transit modes to recommend the best options to alleviate traffic congestion and improve mobility for transit dependent riders in Anaheim and Orange County.

Section 3. The City Council of the City of Anaheim encourages the Orange County Transportation Authority to plan and develop a flexible transit solution that increases frequency of bus routes and provides this solution for a lower fare, so that more riders can use this system.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION is approved and adopted by the City Council of the City of Anaheim this _____ day of _____, 2017 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

CITY OF ANAHEIM

BY _____
MAYOR OF THE CITY OF ANAHEIM

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF ANAHEIM
119091