



RAPID TRANSIT PROGRESS

METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY

"MARTA REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE IT SERVES . . ."

SEPTEMBER 1967
VOL. 2 . NO. 9

FINANCIAL PLAN OFFERED

PROPOSES "HAMBURGER-A-WEEK" COST TO LOCAL CITIZEN

Rapid transit can be built at a maximum cost to the taxpayer of 3 mills in Fulton County and 1.6 mills in DeKalb County, according to economic consultants of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority. The figures are contained in the final draft of a report by Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates prepared as part of the revision of the 1962 plan for rapid transit for Metropolitan Atlanta. The 1967 revision of the plan is expected to be completed in the next few weeks.

The report shows that the basic 30-mile system, which will cost about \$332 million, can be built with local funds of \$199 million, state funds of \$33 million, and federal funds of \$100 million. The Fulton County share would be \$146,265,000 (73.5%) and the DeKalb County share \$52,735,000 (26.5%). Clayton and Gwinnett Counties would not contribute to the capital construction costs until work is begun on the extensions to complete the 52-mile system when additional federal funds are expected to become available. The Clayton and Gwinnett financial support would include a pro rata share of the costs of the basic system.

"This report shows that the maximum cost of rapid transit in Fulton County to the owner of a \$15,000 house would be \$12.00; the same person in DeKalb County would pay about \$6.40 maximum," MARTA General Manager said. "In Fulton County, this amounts to the price of a hamburger a week, or two or three cups of coffee a week," he told the MARTA Board of Directors at their regular meeting today. "And these amounts would be paid only for about 5 years; the rest of the time the costs would be even lower," he continued.


"When Clayton and Gwinnett counties assume their share of the costs, their rate would be a maximum of 1.5 mills, or about \$6.00 a year to the owner of a \$15,000 house," Stuart explained.

"The report of our financial consultants proposes what appears to be a practical and feasible approach to financing construction of the rapid transit system," he said. "Our final plans are taking shape and preliminary engineering is developing well. If a successful referendum can be held in November 1968, we would begin construction in Spring of 1969. If this program develops in this manner," he stated, "we would have the first line operating about the end of 1973 and the basic 30-mile system in service in 1975. The entire 52-mile system could well be in operation before 1980, or in about the same length of time it is taking to complete the perimeter expressway.


"We need to begin construction as early as possible," he concluded, "since every year's delay costs us \$18 to \$20 million thru inflation and increased construction costs.

The basic 30-mile system would have 24 stations and would run from Brookhaven to College Park and from Decatur to Lynhurst Drive near I-285 on the west, with a northwest stub to Northside Drive. The electrically-driven, air-conditioned cars would operate at maximum speeds of 70 miles per hour, averag-

(Continued on Page 2, Col. 1)



\$332 MILLION
(30 Miles)



\$479 MILLION
(52 Miles)

THIS MANY CARS PARKED HERE...



(Continued from Page 1)

ing about 40 miles per hour including station stops. Trains would run as often as every 90 seconds during rush hours. The commuter will ride to Transit Center, just a block from Five Points, in about 13 minutes from Brookhaven, 9 minutes from Decatur, and about 13 minutes from College Park.

... COULD REMOVE MANY CARS FROM HERE



An important factor in attracting commuters from their cars to rapid transit is the "Park-N-Ride Principle," according to a noted transportation expert.

George L. DeMent, Chairman of the Board of the Chicago Transit Authority, recently discussed the importance of parking facilities in connection with rapid transit stations. Referring to the new Skokie Swift extension to the Chicago rapid transit system, he said, "The 522 Park-N-Ride spaces provided at the outer Dempster Street terminal has proved to be a major factor in the success of Skokie Swift. This Park-N-Ride is used to 100 per cent capacity every weekday. It is obvious to the Chicago Transit Authority that the patronage of the highly successful Skokie Swift operation would be increased automatically if additional parking spaces could be provided at the Dempster Terminal. Similar examples could be cited for the Park-N-Ride lots along other Chicago lines."

DeMent noted that "the Cleveland Transit System has given emphasis to Park-N-Ride. Seven 'Rapid' stations have been provided with 5,218 free parking spaces...Additional parking spaces soon will be provided along the airport rapid transit extension now under construction." He quoted a survey which "indicated that parking spaces are being used at a rate of 1.3 cars per day, and that each car carries an average of 1.2 passengers.

He says further that "the Toronto Transit Commission will provide parking spaces for 3,000 cars at three stations along the Bloor Street subway extension now under construction, with

(Continued on Page 3, Col. 1)

CITY PLANNING AND RAPID TRANSIT

The American Institute of Planners has a strong interest in the development of a rapid transit system for the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The specific interest in MARTA and its proposed system is related to the "balance" and relationship of the transit network to the rest of the metropolitan area and to the total transportation system of the metropolitan area—as it exists and is planned.

The planner is concerned with the relationships that will be an outgrowth of the system. What impact will MARTA lines have on public and private property? Which areas will be likely to develop because of a MARTA installation—a station, for instance? Will the system be sensitively related to neighborhoods and business areas, or industrial areas? How? Will the system put stations in places where other planning and development activities provide an opportunity to "multiply" the effect of the investment in transit by an investment in urban renewal, or a college, or a new business area, or a special school? Can better relationships be established between elements of the transit system and the environment?

The planning profession is interested in the general and the comprehensive dimensions of the city and the metropolitan area. Therefore, the planning interest in the transit system will extend beyond the tracks and the stations, into a concern for nearby property—and, more important, property that is not so near. The planning concern for all of the Atlanta area is oriented to maximizing the livability of our "place," and deals equally with the areas impacted and not impacted. In the areas being served (giving the word "impact" a positive tone) the planner is likely to seek to make the favorable impact more favorable, more utilitarian, more significant to the area in terms of its present and future role in the city, whether this role is related to change, redevelopment, more intensive development, new uses or no change.



Richard M. Forbes

The planning attitude about any public or private investment is based on what the facility will mean to people in their environment. What will it mean to citizens as they travel to and from work, to recreation, to shopping? This is one level of concern. What it will mean to people at home, if they live near the transit line, is another concern. For example, will it cause an unpleasant industry to develop nearby?

The planning concern reduces itself to a concern for our city, our place, our environment. The planner wishes to make Greater Atlanta the best possible place in which to live and work. He consequently sees transit as a marvelous opportunity to use a large public investment as one of the elements that will help to do that. However, transit will make a positive contribution only if it is very carefully related to each part of the area and to other projects and plans so that the system is balanced. This relationship to the whole is of prime importance.

Richard M. Forbes, Assistant Professor of Real Estate and Urban Affairs at Georgia State College, is a member of the MARTA Advisory Committee, representing the planning profession. He is a member of the American Institute of Planners, and other professional groups.

(Continued from Page 2, Col. 2)

additional spaces planned for the Yonge Street Subway Extension just authorized. The new 10-mile extension in South Jersey will provide nearly 5,000 parking spaces at six locations with provision for future expansion. Over 16,000 parking spaces at 23 stations will be provided along the 75-mile rapid transit system being built in San Francisco.

Quoting DeMent, "There is no longer a question of the need for such facilities. It is only a question of how much parking should be provided for any given rapid transit installation."

The system being designed for the Atlanta area will include adequate parking facilities at suburban stations.

MARTA TALKS... AND LISTENS

The story of rapid transit plans for Metropolitan Atlanta is finding interested audiences throughout this area. Between the first of June and mid-September, the MARTA directors and staff talked to some 1700 members or more than 30 civic and other groups, illustrating the MARTA story with slides or motion picture films. In addition, many other discussions were held with city and county officials, planning departments, state legislators, and citizen groups such as Chambers of Commerce and Central Atlanta Progress. After the formal presentations, the meetings were generally opened for questions. In the picture below, Henry L. Stuart, MARTA General Manager, is listening to a question being asked by a member of the Atlanta Civitan Club.



A MARTA display depicting progress in the development of rapid transit was part of the fifth Annual Fall Sale at Jamestown Shopping Center in College Park recently. The event was sponsored by the College Park Jaycees in cooperation with merchants at the shopping center.

The MARTA display shows the location of Transit Center in downtown Atlanta, and the various lines considered for rapid transit routes.

The display back of College Park Jaycee President Paul Green shows in the upper left corner a cutaway view of how Transit Center might be designed, with escalators connecting the two levels of trains with the sidewalks above.

The lower left corner contains typical site development plans for the four levels of Transit Center while in the lower right corner is a map locating Transit Center in relation to downtown streets.

The map in the upper right corner shows the areas in which the routes and stations will be located. Routes as planned in 1961, 1962, and 1966-7 are variously indicated.

The display back of Joan Eschenbrenner, MARTA secretary, features a large aerial photo of downtown Atlanta and pictures of various major building developments now under way near rapid transit stations.

The MARTA exhibit aroused many enthusiastic comments from those who viewed it.



METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY

808 GLENN BLDG. • 120 MARIETTA ST., N. W.
ATLANTA, GA. 30303 • PHONE 524-5711

"DIRECTED BY THE GEORGIA STATE LEGISLATURE TO DEVELOP A RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM FOR THE 5-COUNTY METROPOLITAN ATLANTA AREA."

Edited by KING ELLIOTT



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS:

RICHARD H. RICH, Chairman ROY A. BLOUNT, Vice Chairman
HERBERT J. DICKSON, Treasurer GLENN E. BENNETT, Secretary

CITY OF ATLANTA:

ROBERT F. ADAMSON L. D. MILTON
RICHARD H. RICH RAWSON HAVERTY

CLAYTON COUNTY:

EDGAR BLALOCK

DEKALB COUNTY:

ROY A. BLOUNT DR. SANFORD ATWOOD

FULTON COUNTY:

W. A. PULVER MITCHELL C. BISHOP

GWINNETT COUNTY:

K. A. McMILLON

COBB COUNTY (Observer)

OTIS A. BRUMBY, JR.

MARTA STAFF:

HENRY L. STUART, General Manager
EARL W. NELSON, Chief Engineer
KING ELLIOTT, Director of Public Information
H. N. JOHNSON, Secretary to General Manager

MARTAanswers

QUESTION: Why is MARTA planning to use the old-type steel-wheel and steel-rail system instead of something new, like monorail?

ANSWER: In the first place, monorail is not new or modern. As shown in the picture below, monorail has been around a long time—70 years or so. A short monorail line has been operating across a river in Germany since 1906.

The major reason for not using monorail, however, is simply that no monorail system has ever been a commercially successful operation in moving numbers of commuters.

In recent years, short, relatively simple monorail systems have been built in Paris and Tokyo, and others have been used in World's Fairs in Seattle and New York, and at Disneyland. These small operations, however, do not meet MARTA's design requirements to transport commuters at 70 miles per hour in capacities approaching 30,000 passengers per hour.

There are other problems relating to cost, engineering, construction, and route location:

Both the top-supported (suspended) and bottom-supported monorail systems are more expensive to construct system-wide than the conventional steel-wheel steel rail system. The top-supported monorail requires the support structure throughout the system, whereas MARTA's plans call for only 3½ miles of aerial structure. The top-supported monorail requires a much larger tunnel for subway where subway is essential. Trying to eliminate the monorail subway brings us back to the problem MARTA faced all along—where to put the routes through downtown Atlanta without using subway. There is no feasible surface route for either system.

MARTA ACTION

The Board of Directors at its September 5 meeting heard a report on a financial study by Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates, Inc. No action was taken on the report.

No official action was taken by the Board since a quorum was not present.

The next meeting of the MARTA Board of Directors will be Tuesday, October 3, 1967, 3:30 p.m., Room 619, Glenn Building, 120 Marietta St., N.W.

The bottom-supported system would be somewhat more expensive for grade and aerial structure than the steel-wheel steel rail system, and considerably more expensive for subway because of the larger tunnel required.

If expense were not the major factor it is, the question then arises, "what would monorail give you that the conventional system would not provide?" The answer is "nothing." The monorail is slower, has higher operational costs, and does not provide as comfortable ride. During the past 70 years, engineering problems relating to monorail have not been satisfactorily resolved. These include switching, high speeds (70 to 80 MPH), sway, and other technical problems.

These and other disadvantages may eventually be resolved, but no solution is in sight. By contrast, the dual rail system solved these and many other engineering and operational problems years ago. The dual-rail system will definitely provide what is needed in this area: 70 MPH speeds, safety, comfort, and convenience at less cost than any type monorail. Using a known and proven technology means MARTA will be able to bring the system into operation at the earliest possible time. This is our goal.—Henry L. Stuart, MARTA General Manager



MEIGS COLLECTION, Yale University Library — MONORAIL, 1887 VERSION — Joe Vincent Meigs (second row, sixth from right) patented this early "monorail" in 1873. The running wheels were tilted at 45 degree angles; horizontally-mounted steam-driven wheels running on an up-

per set of rails provided propulsion. The Philadelphia City Council visited the 1,114-foot long test track in East Cambridge, Mass., in 1887. The revolutionary Meigs railway did not gain acceptance, however; and the company failed a few years later.



RAPID TRANSIT
PROGRESS

METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY



808 GLENN BLDG. • 120 MARIETTA ST., N.W. • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303
PHONE 524-5711 (AREA CODE 404)

SEPTEMBER 1967 . VOL. 2, NO. 9

Hon. Ivan Allen, Jr., Mayor
City of Atlanta
City Hall
Atlanta, Ga. 30303