



Chapter 4. Implementation

A detailed implementation plan, which this is not, will begin with two important questions:

- Which actions belong logically to each of three categories?
 - **Short term.** These actions are not dependent on anything else being done first, and are simple and inexpensive enough to be done in a year or less.
 - **Medium term (DSTT Closure Mitigation Project).** This set of actions -- mostly transit preferences on various streets -- is already spelled out in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel (DSTT) Closure Mitigation Project plan. We recommend that these changes be made permanent, and in some cases expanded. If the changes are made with permanence in mind, they can be done to a higher level of amenity and clarity.
 - **Long term (Buildout of all major projects).** This is the outermost year of the study, 2015 or so, though many changes in this category are linked to the Monorail and or LRT completion, which is in the 2008-10 range. The major “if” hanging over certain long-term projects is the completion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement -- the only unfunded project that is assumed in this study due to its importance from a safety perspective.
- What current, future and recommended studies/plans/projects are interconnected with the recommendations of this study, so that implementation must be planned together?

Generally, modest pedestrian improvements such as adding planters and bollards can occur in the short term. While we recommend undertaking efforts such as a Bicycle Master Plan and Pedestrian Master Plan, the addition of some elements of the proposed bike network could be implemented quickly and prior to completion of a full plan. Of course, the policy recommendations form the foundation of future implementation items; therefore implementation of policy changes should begin as soon as possible. Finally, KC Metro and other transit providers can begin restructuring some routes to reflect the network as proposed herein.

Many of the bus priority treatments outlined in this study are already in the DSTT Closure Mitigation Project, and are therefore on-track or near-term implementation. Some frequency increases are also possible through service redesign and speed improvements in the relatively short term. More dramatic route alterations should be implemented as demand grows over the longer term, and as the Link LRT and Green Line Monorail projects free up further bus operating hours.

Sometimes, a current project, which may make sense in the short term, can preclude implementation of some long-term recommendations. Therefore, it is imperative that projects in planning continue to interface with one another and consult the long-term vision outlined herein. The following figure is provided to assist this process. It includes existing and proposed projects and studies on the left column and identifies related recommendations from this study in the right column. At the bottom are a series of new studies that are recommended by this report.

Figure 4-1 Summary of Plans and Recommendations

Project / Plan	Relevant Types of Recommendations
Major capital projects that determine the study context for Long Term	
Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project	Streetcar network Access/Egress to Colman Dock Pedestrian bridges Bus transit access to downtown core
Seattle Monorail Project Green Line & Related Planning Efforts such as City of Seattle station area planning	Hub area pedestrian needs/connections
Sound Transit Central Link Phase 1, including Joint Operations in Tunnel	Hub area pedestrian needs/connections
Projects that determine the study context for the Medium Term	
Downtown Transit Tunnel Closure Mitigation Project	Bus transit service and priority recommendations
South Lake Union Streetcar	Streetcar network and routing
Mercer Corridor Project	Bike/Pedestrian Network Bus transit facilities
South Lake Union Transportation Study	Bike/Pedestrian Network Bus transit service and priority recommendations Streetcar Network Policy support
Other complete or ongoing studies that interact with this study's recommendations	
Metro's Six-Year Transit Development Plans (ongoing)	Transit network, service, and priority Policy support
Seattle Wayfinding Project	Incorporate eventual transit network and physical changes into wayfinding recommendations.
Seattle's Comprehensive Plan & Transportation Strategic Plan	Policy support
Seattle's Transit Plan	Policy support and incorporation of specific Center City Circulation Report recommendations.
KC Metro Downtown Layover Study	Service level and routing
King Street Station Planning	Hub area and bike station recommendations
PSRC Regional Bike Stations Project	Hub area and bike station recommendations
Blue Ring Strategy Implementatiao	Urban design, pedestrian amenities for areas and streets, I-5 Crossings
Lake to Bay (Potlatch) Trail Plan	Bike/Pedestrian network
Seattle Parking Management Study	Parking policies Street level management guidance
Urban Forest Management Plan	Include recommendations that support desired pedestrian and sidewalk environment in the Center City.
Important Planned Studies	
Colman Dock Redesign (medium- term)	Colman Dock hub area Access/Egress to Colman Dock Pedestrian bridges
Terminal 46 Development Master Plan (long-term)	Bike network Streetcar network
I-5 Reconstruction (long-term)	I-5 Crossings, pedestrian enhancements
New studies recommended by this Report	
Seattle Bicycle Master Plan	Bike network and facilities Some facilities could be completed independently in the short-term.
Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan	Programs Street, Hub Areas, and I-5 Crossings Some enhancements could be completed independently in the short-term. Establish a pedestrian facilities maintenance program.
Downtown Streetcar Master Plan	Streetcar network
Urban Design Plans for Downtown Avenues	Pedestrian amenities needed given vehicle volumes

Impacts and Mitigations

The projects listed in Figure 4-1 will necessitate significant changes to Seattle's street network. While they will result in dramatic increases in the *person* capacity of Seattle's street network, many of the listed transit, bicycle, pedestrian and urban design improvements will result in a loss of on-street parking spaces and/or a loss of capacity for single-occupant motor vehicle traffic. In order to address concerns about such losses, Seattle should refine its existing street management guidelines. The guidelines should be coordinated with on-street parking management guidelines that consider factors related to traffic management objectives and the surrounding land use context when changing or removing on-street parking.

In order to determine when it is appropriate to convert a mixed flow travel lane into a bus-only lane, or reduce auto capacity in order to add a bicycle lane, it is important that Seattle have clear guidelines for how it allocates its street rights-of-way. While it is fairly straightforward to create performance measures for each individual mode of transportation, it is more challenging to identify performance measures for a street or corridor that must serve multiple functions. On a given corridor, how should the City balance competing accommodations for buses, streetcars, motor vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians and parking? What tools can the City use to make such difficult decisions on a quantifiable, defensible basis?

The first step is to refine its existing street typologies, building upon the work that the City has already done for important transit-serving streets. That is, each key street should be labeled according to its relative importance to each mode. Some streets will be of primary importance to cars but minor importance to transit, such as 6th Avenue. Others will be of primary importance to both transit and bicycles, such as Pine.

Typologies should also acknowledge adjacent land uses. In neighborhood commercial districts, for example, sidewalk width and the provision of on-street parking will be very important, regardless of the transportation function of the street.

Figure 4-2 shows a sample matrix of typologies that could form the framework of a system of multimodal performance measures for Seattle's entire street network. Detailing and assigning typologies to individual streets will be a large undertaking, but it will allow shifts in right-of-way allocation to be based upon clear, quantifiable objectives.