THANK YOU FOR JOINING US AT THE SECOND OPEN HOUSE FOR THE MADISON CORRIDOR BUS RAPID TRANSIT STUDY!

AGENDA:

YOUR ROLE:
- LEARN ABOUT THE PROJECT
- ASK QUESTIONS
- HELP US DEVELOP DESIGN IDEAS
- FILL OUT A COMMENT CARD

PLEASE BE SURE TO FILL OUT A COMMENT CARD BEFORE YOU LEAVE!
**WHY DO WE NEED THIS PROJECT?**

**Transit service in the corridor needs improvement.** Bus service can be slow, unreliable and crowded during peak hours, and service could be more frequent.

**Population and employment density are high and growing.** The Madison Corridor connects Downtown Seattle with dense and growing mixed-use neighborhoods. Large-scale infill development is occurring and more is expected.

**Major transit hubs and lines are in need of an east-west connector.** Madison BRT would connect Colman Dock, Rapid Ride, Link, Downtown transit corridors, and the First Hill Streetcar, helping to form a network of frequent, high-capacity transit.

**Pedestrian and bicycle conditions could be made safer and more comfortable.** Although pedestrian and bicycle volumes are high and growing, there are limited facilities for cyclists and sidewalks and crosswalks are often substandard.

**The public realm could be made more attractive.** The corridor could be made a more pleasant place to spend time by adding more green space, places to sit, and more comfortable and attractive bus stops.

**Affordable access is needed to Center City jobs and the health, social services, and educational facilities on First Hill.** Higher-quality transit service could ensure that employees, patients, visitors, students, and staff have an affordable and convenient travel option.

**Greenhouse Gas (GhG) emissions are on the rise.** Seattle’s Climate Action Plan relies on high capacity transit in major corridors including Madison.
**Madison Corridor BRT Study**

**PROJECT TIMELINE**

- **Aug 2014**: Needs & Goals
  - Project Purpose & Needs Statement
  - Corridor Overview
  - Assessment of transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and auto conditions
  - Survey of parking and loading zones and usage

- **Oct**: Existing Conditions
  - Develop evaluation measures for comparing alternatives (e.g. ridership, cost, traffic impacts)

- **Dec**: Evaluation Process
  - Develop potential BRT design options including station locations and right-of-way configurations
  - Bicycle route planning for parallel bicycle facility

- **Feb 2015**: Alternatives
  - Analysis of alternatives
  - Initial evaluation screening
  - Early stage design for the preferred alternative (10%)
  - Bicycle corridor design (conceptual)
  - Cost estimates:
    - Capital cost estimates
    - Operating and maintenance cost estimates

- **June**: Technical Analysis
  - Design and Cost Estimates
  - Funding strategy
  - Implementation plan

**Outreach Phases**

- **Outreach Phase 1**: Needs & Goals
- **Outreach Phase 2**: Existing Conditions
- **Outreach Phase 3**: Evaluation Process
- **Outreach Phase 4**: Alternatives
- **Outreach Phase 5**: Technical Analysis

**Additional Activities**

- **November 19-20**: Design Workshops
TRANSIT AND BICYCLE NETWORKS, AND PRIORITY INTERSECTIONS FOR PEDESTRIANS
TRANSIT AND BICYCLE NETWORKS, AND PRIORITY INTERSECTIONS FOR PEDESTRIANS
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* 2014 BMP alignments subject to change

Madison Corridor BRT Study
POTENTIAL STATION LOCATIONS

TYPICAL BRT STOP SPACING

Existing

600-800 ft

“Hybrid”

1/3 mi

BRT

1/2—2/3 mi

FACTORS IN STATION LOCATIONS:

• Distances between stops
• Land use, including population and employment density as well as institutional trip generators
• Transit connectivity
• Pedestrian access
• Grades and American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements for level boarding areas for wheelchairs
• Neighborhood specific issues
PROS:

- Stations can be on the sidewalk, which may be more comfortable for waiting passengers.
- Fewer left-turn restrictions may be necessary.
- The lane can double as a right-turn lane at intersections.

CONS:

- Buses must share the lane with cars and trucks turning right, slowing buses down.
- Side-running bus lanes are often used by regular buses, so the public may be less aware of BRT.
- Sidewalk stations are less visible than stations in the street.
CENTER-RUNNING BRT

PROS:

• Traffic is never allowed in the bus lanes, and lanes may even be physically separated by curbs or medians.

• Both center lanes and stations on islands are highly visible, and there may be more room on platforms for shelters and other amenities.

• Stations can double as refuges for pedestrians crossing the street.

CONS:

• Island platforms require more space.

• Some left turns may be restricted.

• Passengers may not be comfortable waiting in the middle of the street.
Elements of BRT Stations may include:

- Large, custom shelters with plenty of seating
- Real-time arrival information
- Safety features such as lighting and platform-edge strips
- Bike parking
- Garbage and recycling bins
- Raised platforms for level or near-level boarding of buses
- Ticket machines for prepaid boarding
Madison BRT Study seeks to deliver a substantial improvement in transit service, while also addressing broader needs in the Madison Corridor. This evaluation framework will help us capture changes in transit performance, walking, biking, driving impacts, accessibility, and urban design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVE: Improve transit service performance in the corridor to address speed, reliability, and crowding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide reliable, frequent transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide comfortable, visible, accessible transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve east-west connections to major transit hubs and lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENHANCE: Promote active transportation through safer, more comfortable pedestrian and bicycle connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve the streetscape and pedestrian connections to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance and support public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve connections to active transportation modes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALANCE: Accommodate all users in a dense corridor expected to host substantial job and housing growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maximize transit service efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain or improve balance of modes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSTAIN: Develop an implementable project that supports Seattle’s Climate Action Plan goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Deliver cost-effective project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce greenhouse gas emissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPEN SPACE

Data Sources: King County, City of Seattle
DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Data Sources: King County, City of Seattle

Potential for Redevelopment

- Parking
- Vacant
- Planned redevelopment sites
- High Redevelopment Potential*
- Med-High Potential*
- Med-Low Potential*
- Lower Potential*

*Redevelopment potential was assessed based on size of parcel and ratio between the parcel improvement value (value of existing structures) and the parcel land value.
Streets are the ultimate, and original, public space. Throughout the history of cities, streets have provided space for movement, commerce, and even assembly; only in the 20th century did the function of streets become more rigidly focused on the movement of traffic. Today’s standards for great streets return us somewhat to this original notion, detailed below.

**PROVIDE SAFE MOBILITY FOR ALL USERS**
- Facilities for biking and walking
- Attention to integration of modes
- Architecture and lighting for visibility and safety

**ENHANCE THE CHARACTER OF THE PLACE**
- Expressive materials and color palette
- Public art
- Interesting street furnishings and lighting

**PERFORM ECOSYSTEM SERVICES**
- Permeable paving and cisterns for stormwater management
- Continuous planting systems
- Microclimate-enhancing planting strategies
The design of streets shapes the behavior of users, which in turn shapes the pattern of building and development. Where streets are designed as vital extensions of the public realm, with equal attention paid to all users, more efficient land uses follow. This justifies further investments in quality public spaces as well as efficient and sustainable infrastructure. Cleveland, Ohio’s Euclid Avenue offers strong precedent of these dynamics.