



MEMORANDUM

To: SDOT Staff

From: Center City Connector Consultant Team (Thomas Brennan and Bonnie Nelson, N\N; Brad Tong, SOJ)

Date: December 5, 2012

Subject: Center City Connector Transit Study – Stakeholder Interviews – Draft Findings

Overview

Based on a recommendation from the City of Seattle Transit Master Plan, adopted in the Spring of 2012, SDOT is undertaking a transit alternatives analysis to identify a locally preferred alternative (LPA) for an urban circulator transit line that connects Uptown/South Lake Union with South Downtown and potentially the South Lake Union (SLU) Streetcar line with the First Hill Streetcar Line (now under construction). The study will consider transit modes including streetcar and enhanced bus, and will review several alternative alignments (i.e., 1st Ave, 4th Ave, 5th Ave). A decision making process will be conducted to identify the best transit solution to be developed as the LPA for adoption by the City and for inclusion in the Puget Sound Regional Council's long range transportation plan – Transportation 2040.

The appendix to this document includes a map of potential alignments under discussion in Seattle's center city, including potential connections to South Lake Union and First Hill Streetcar lines.

During a 14-month period, the study will:

- Identify a series of performance measures including mobility needs and land use/economic development goals to be supported by the preferred alternative.
- Use an agreed upon evaluation process to gradually screen alignment and design options that do not match the project Purpose and Need.
- Provide a transparent and inclusive public engagement process that will involve all stakeholders in the decision making process.
- Conduct technical studies and facilitate a local decision making process that identifies a locally preferred alternative that can attract federal transit funds.

An early step in the study process was to identify and conduct interviews with a range of individual stakeholders and stakeholder groups throughout the center city study area. The consultant team, SDOT staff and the Mayor's Office developed a list of potential stakeholders, who were contacted and invited to a 60 minute interview. Most invitees accepted and were interviewed on November 28 – 30, 2012. The stakeholder list was intended to represent a range of interests and cover key geographies that a new transit line could service or improve access to through transit connections. **It is important to note that these interviews were not intended to represent the sentiments of all center city stakeholders, only those that were interviewed. Findings reported are those that multiple stakeholders shared in common. No individual sentiments are reported. The summary findings are not reported as facts, but rather are key themes as reported to interviews by invited stakeholders.**

Stakeholders Interviewed

The following stakeholders were interviewed.

Ben Franz-Knight	Pike Place Market PDA, Seattle Streetcar Coalition
Michael Wells	Capitol Hill Chamber
Jim Miller	Belltown Business Association
Jerry Dinndorf	South Lake Union Community Council
Cara Egan	Seattle Art Museum
Bob Cundall	Seattle Art Museum
Lindy Gaylord	Seneca Group (for Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation)
Lisa Quinn	Feet First
Rob Johnson	Transportation Choices
Chuck Ayers	Cascade Bicycle Club
Jan Drago	Historic South Downtown
Rob Nellams	Seattle Center
Layne Cubell	Seattle Center
Maud Daudon	Seattle Chamber of Commerce
Charles Knutson	Seattle Chamber of Commerce
Don Blakeney	Chinatown/International District Business Improvement Area (CIDBIA)
Kate Joncas	Downtown Seattle Association
Tom Eanes	Seattle Housing Authority
Rita Ryder	Seattle YMCA
Joshua Hicks	Plymouth Housing
Steve Woo	Century Link Field / Public Stadium Authority (PSA)
Thomas Eli Backer	Safeco Field / Public Facilities District (PFD)
John Coney	Uptown Alliance
David Freiboth	King County Labor Council
Dan McGrady	Vulcan Inc.
Leslie Smith	Alliance for Pioneer Square
Ben Schiendelman	Seattle Subway
Maiko Winkler-Chin	SCIDpda (Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority)
Shelly DaRonche	Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Robbie Phillips	Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Jill Morelli	UW School Of Medicine
Miranda Leidich	UW School Of Medicine
Maggie Walker	Central Waterfront Committee
Ellen Monrad	Queen Anne Community Council
Kirk Robbins	Queen Anne Community Council
Martha Choe	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Lara Hirschfield	Amazon.com

Heidi Westling	Amazon.com
Jamie Cheney	Commute Seattle
David Perez	Queen Anne Chamber of Commerce
Tom Waithe	Kimpton Hotels

Stakeholder Interview Summary Findings

The interviews were designed to follow a general “script”, which is attached as an appendix to this memo. The findings described below represent common themes expressed over many interviews. Where there were clear dissenting viewpoints, these are also represented.

Perhaps the most dominant theme gathered from the stakeholder interviews is the substantial consensus for connecting the existing streetcar lines with a center city circulator streetcar on a 1st Avenue alignment. Most stakeholders see the 1st Avenue streetcar as operating primarily in mixed flow traffic to maintain capacity on that street. The findings included below document that consensus and provide many insights from more than two dozen interviews with stakeholders.

It is important to note that the opinions expressed in this memo simply restate the views expressed in stakeholder interviews. There has been no attempt to “fact check” or change the opinions expressed in these interviews.

Benefits/Purpose of a Center City Transit Improvement

1. Virtually every person interviewed agreed that a center city circulation improvement is necessary and will result in substantial benefits. Key purpose and benefits identified by respondents regardless of the alignment selected included:
 - a. Provides local connection services which will increase mobility and access in the center city, particularly between employment centers, retail, attractions and residential populations.
 - b. Ties together and leverages current and short-term investments in streetcars and rail service and to a great extent bus service as well. Nearly all stakeholders described the need to complete the connection between SLU Streetcar and First Hill Streetcar lines as the highest priority.
 - c. Provides added capacity in the center city necessary to meet increasing demand for local trips. This is seen as especially important as more people use light rail and other transit services to access the center city. Further, planned residential and job growth will necessitate most center city trips be made by walking and transit.
 - d. Provides better connections and thus greater accessibility for casual riders.
 - e. Will provide critical link between isolated portions of the system (SLU and First Hill streetcar lines).
2. Many stakeholders felt that a center city investment would improve current transit options which are commonly viewed as inadequate, confusing and uncoordinated across multiple modes. Stakeholders felt that the center city circulator was necessary or could go a long way to improve reliability, ease of use, legibility and certainty. This was particularly true if the circulator was a streetcar investment.
3. Additional benefits were identified by many respondents specifically for the 1st Avenue Corridor including:

- a. Ties together many important attractions in the western part of the city that are currently poorly served by transit including Pike Place Market, Seattle Art Museum, the Waterfront, Colman Dock (Ferry terminal), cruise ship terminal, newly developing stadium area, Pioneer Square, Belltown, Queen Anne and Seattle Center.
- b. Keeps key attractions from becoming isolated from the retail core of downtown. 1st Ave is the “bridge” that knits together the waterfront and the business core and retail district.
- c. Catalyzes and extends economic development anticipated for the waterfront after the removal of the Alaskan Way Viaduct.
- d. Helps to replace significant loss of bus service in the 1st Avenue corridor when buses were removed from 1st Avenue and shifted to 3rd Avenue.
- e. Enhances underperforming retail districts in Pioneer Square, Pike Place Market area, Chinatown ID and Belltown and supports the revitalization of a street that is “uniquely Seattle” and supports many local businesses.
- f. Encourages more in-fill development that is good for the City.

Preference for Specific Modes

1. Nearly everyone interviewed immediately gravitated to a streetcar solution. Many expressed hope that it would not be necessary to study a bus solution. Specific reasons for this preference included:
 - g. Overall preference for rail transit and for modern streetcar specifically. Respondents cited added comfort, route certainty, ease and simplicity of use, and legibility of a streetcar system.
 - h. Economic development potential is seen as greater with a fixed rail system. The potential for economic development is closely aligned to the potential for local funding for the line, which is also seen as being possible only with a rail investment.
 - i. Because this project is seen as a connector, many respondents emphasized the need for a streetcar investment that is through-routed to the existing lines, providing a seamless connection. Stakeholders voiced concern about the need to transfer from streetcar to a bus connector. Several stakeholders described the plan for a “crescent” of streetcars.
 - j. Stakeholders expressed a general lack of belief that buses can be fast or reliable or can be branded in a way that will attract core groups of center city riders or build transit patronage over time.
 - k. Stakeholders noted the high levels of tourism and visitor travel in Seattle, and anticipate dramatic increases in visitors to the Central Waterfront. Many stakeholders believe that visitors would be more likely to use a streetcar and believe that a streetcar would do more to spread economic benefit generated by visitors to other center city neighborhoods including the International District.
 - l. Several respondents expressed hope that the waterfront historic cars could be operated on the circulator route for special occasions, festivals or summer weekend service. Stakeholders did not believe that the historic trolley service would be likely to return to the waterfront, and that even if it did, the historic waterfront trolley would not substitute for a modern urban circulator line/system.
2. The only significant skepticism of streetcars came from human service providers and affordable housing representatives who felt their clients were knowledgeable about and comfortable with

bus services operating in the center city and were concerned a center city circulator would draw operating resources from the bus system.

In addition, several stakeholders questioned whether current single car streetcars vehicles would have enough capacity on a line that connected SLU and First Hill streetcars through downtown and served multiple visitor destinations along 1st Avenue.

Preference for a specific alignment

1. The vast majority of stakeholders interviewed had a strong preference for a 1st Avenue alignment. Reasons cited for this preference included:
 - a. There is a very strong feeling that the 4th/5th corridor is already well served by transit, with bus and light rail service operating in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel (DSTT) and bus service on the 3rd Ave Transit Mall. There is a gap in higher capacity attractive transit options on the west side of the center city.
 - b. 4th and 5th Avenues are seen as key auto and transit carrying streets and introduction of a streetcar could reduce valuable and very limited capacity for those modes. Many people's reaction was "it makes so much sense to put a streetcar on 1st Ave, why deal with the many challenges and conflicts on 4th and 5th Avenues?"
 - c. Many stakeholders noted that streetcars/circulators work best where they act as "pedestrian accelerators" serving routes where people are already inclined to walk and to make short trips or trips that represent a "long walk." They noted that 1st Avenue is more suited to this type of travel than 4th and 5th Avenues.
 - d. 1st Avenue was seen as having wider array of uses and markets which would create all day demand from both local travelers and visitors. Stakeholders cited the emergence of a revitalized waterfront and removal of the Alaskan Way Viaduct as creating new mobility demands.
 - e. Stakeholders noted that buses were removed from 1st Ave and businesses and stakeholders in this corridor feel the need for a new service.
 - f. Stakeholders believe the opportunity for economic development is much greater on 1st Avenue compared with 4th and 5th Avenues, which are already more fully and newly developed. Lack of north-south access and mobility is perceived as a current barrier to development 1st Avenue.
 - g. Several stakeholders noted that the 1st Avenue alignment is better suited for extension to the Stadium District and to other major employers like Starbucks.
 - h. Stakeholders believe there is an opportunity to support cultural and economic resources that are "uniquely Seattle" located in the 1st Avenue corridor, compared to a 4th and 5th Avenues alignment, which supports larger stores, chain retail, office uses and has a more modern development pattern.
 - i. Citing the need for local funding, stakeholders believe there is potential to tap into LID funding either through a planned Central Waterfront LID which could be extended to or beyond 1st Avenue, through a new Local Improvement District (LID) and/or through an LID in the stadium area, which could extend this line south. Stakeholders from the Stadium District were interested in examining a streetcar line that served the district, but also had concerns about where it would run. (Discussed further in the funding section of this memo).

- j. The 1st Avenue line is seen as having the best opportunity to tie together both local riders and tourists by touching many major tourist attractions (including many local recreators from throughout the region) encouraging either park once or leave the car at home travel. In particular, service to the Market and the Art Museum were cited as critical. The 1st Avenue line would also serve the growing cruise passenger market. In contrast, stakeholders felt a 4th and 5th Avenue alignment would be attractive primarily to commuters and would not have substantial all-day ridership.
 - k. The 1st Avenue line would presumably operate later than current bus routes providing service in the evening hours which is seen as exceptionally poor now.
 - l. Several stakeholders felt that connecting south downtown neighborhoods (Pioneer Square, Stadium District, and ID/Chinatown) to 1st Avenue attractors is a priority due to its potential to boost economic returns in these neighborhoods.
 - m. Connections to Washington State Ferries (WSF) via the Marion Street pedestrian bridge would be well served by a 1st Avenue line. There is a significant population of WSF commuters that work in SLU and Capitol Hill.
2. Of those who preferred 1st Ave, the majority of stakeholders expressed preference for Pike and/or Pine Streets as the connection to Westlake and the existing South Lake Union Streetcar alignment. The connections on Pike/Pine were cited for their opportunity to add “eyes to the street” and reduce negative social issues on those streets. Other specific reasons for preferring the Pike/Pine connection included revitalization of the corridor, connections from residential districts north and south of downtown to retail including Westlake Center and the new Target store, and the iconic potential of a streetcar operating on Pike Street between Westlake and the Pike Place market.
 3. Other stakeholders cited the direction connection to the front door of the Market and the opportunity to tie the market into the rest of downtown and the center city as crucial.
 4. Two stakeholders expressed preference for making the connection to Westlake as far north as possible, citing the directness of the route as important and having an interest in penetrating Belltown. Two stakeholders expressed preference for avoiding Pike and Pine because of the existing pedestrian hub at Pike and 1st Avenue.
 5. A small number of stakeholders expressed priority for an east-west connection between Uptown/Lower Queen Anne and South Lake Union, with the potential to extend an east-west connection directly to Capitol Hill as an equal priority to connecting at Westlake. This was seen as important to a number of employers and businesses with developing demand in those areas.

Potential Conflicts

1. Conflict with traffic congestion/flow was most often cited by the stakeholders as a concern. In particular, traffic congestion on 1st Avenue after Viaduct removal and also on 4th Avenue were cited as problematic. A majority of stakeholders believe that conflicts on 4th and 5th Avenues would be significantly worse than on 1st Avenue. Stakeholders recognized that outcomes of WSDOT discussions around SR99 tolling levels and resulting traffic diversion could have a significant impact on the viability and performance of streetcars on 1st Avenue.
2. Bike safety was often cited as an issue to contend with, particularly bikes traveling in parallel with streetcar tracks (there was no concern of bike travel perpendicular across tracks). This was of more significant concern on the 4th and 5th Avenue alignment where improved bicycle facilities are planned. Stakeholders felt that 1st Avenue is a much less important bikeway and would not require bike treatments since there are quality parallel routes either built or planned.

3. Loss of parking was cited as a potential problem, primarily for small merchants. There was mixed opinion about whether this would be a significant issue, as much of the existing parking is restricted to midday.
4. Historic London Plane median street trees in Pioneer Square and visual issues from streetcar wires were cited as potential issues in the historic Pioneer Square area. Additionally, stakeholders felt changing the “boulevard” feel of 1st Avenue in this district could be controversial.
5. Safety and security on Pike/Pine and crime in Belltown were cited as potential issues, primarily in the context of how streetcar could improve these situations.
6. Resistance or potential resistance from Belltown residents and businesses was expressed by several respondents, although the Belltown representative said that opinions were changing among residents and business owners in this neighborhood.
7. Stakeholders had broad agreement that 2nd Avenue should not be considered for streetcar/circulator operations due to importance for regional transit and for a next generation bicycle facility (i.e., cycle track).
8. A question (and potential concern) was raised as to where the car maintenance facility would be to house added streetcar vehicles.

Right of Way Management/Service Characteristics

1. There was general consensus that an exclusive right of way was not achievable on either corridor, because the conflict with auto traffic would make it impossible to take a lane or remove significant street parking in the corridor. Many stakeholders indicated a preference for anything that would make a streetcar more reliable including queue jumps or short segments of exclusive right of way where feasible, priority signals, and anything else that would assist the streetcar’s reliability.
2. Several stakeholders expressed concern at the slowness of the South Lake Union streetcar and hoped that anything developed through this study would be faster.
3. A number of stakeholders indicated that parking removal could be controversial, particularly in areas like Pioneer Square that are losing parking with the removal of the Alaskan Way Viaduct. However, there was general agreement that downtown businesses understood the value of higher-capacity transit in delivering customers and would be willing to these some reduction of on-street parking for a transit improvement.
4. Several stakeholders indicated that frequency is critical since people value their wait times more than the time spent moving on a rail vehicle. Several stakeholders indicated that people don’t expect to go fast through downtown but they do want to know that a streetcar is coming soon.
5. Most stakeholders who expressed a preference preferred close-spaced stops, especially on the 1st Avenue alignment from Pioneer Square to Westlake to serve as a people-mover and to promote lingering along the line, rather than serving as a rapid transit function. Several stakeholders indicated the need to examine block by block, and suggested wider stop spacing in some segments (2 or 3 stops in Belltown for example) and closer spacing in areas with many visitor attractions.

Market for a transit investment

1. Most stakeholders indicated that a transit investment should serve a combination of local and tourist/visitor markets, and should have a long service day where it would be useful to many different kinds of trips.

2. Several stakeholders emphasized that 1st Avenue would have the best opportunity to serve both local and visitor trips and would be viable as an all day/extended day service. The 4th and 5th Avenues alignment was cited several times as a commute market useful primarily during the work day.
3. Several stakeholders cited the advantage of a streetcar in capturing lunchtime work trips. One stakeholder noted that Chinatown/ID lunch business has dropped with the elimination of the Ride Free Area and that creating a highly legible service for workers to access Chinatown/ID could help to increase lunch time business.
4. Social service and affordable housing representatives felt that their clientele would use streetcars and would appreciate ride quality and access benefits; however, they stressed their concern about putting limited transit resources into a service that was structured for short downtown trips and that might be routed to serve tourist markets.
5. Waterfront, Pike Place, 1st Avenue, and Stadium District stakeholders were all interested in the role of a streetcar/circulator in enhancing “park once” opportunities in the center city. All felt that a 1st Avenue alignment would do a lot more to connect parking assets – particularly those underutilized at off-peak times – to major attractors. This is particularly important given recent parking reduction from the AWV project and other future street use demand that could reduce on-street parking further.

Priority Segments

1. Virtually all stakeholders said that a first phase that connects the First Hill and SLU Streetcars is critical. “Tie together the ends first and then extend from there” was a sentiment that was commonly expressed. One stakeholder’s comment echoes a common sentiment, “To not complete the connection between isolated segments of the streetcar system (SLU to First Hill streetcars) would be the biggest failure.”
2. Several stakeholders expressed concern that Belltown would resist a streetcar, although that could not be confirmed by the Belltown representative who thought there was a broader mix of opinions now. Stakeholders concerned about acceptance in Belltown felt that a first phase between Pioneer Square and Westlake could still be built, giving Belltown more time to prepare for a future extension.
3. Seattle Center representatives stressed the need to get the streetcar north to Seattle Center to connect the sculpture park and the Center with the rest of the City. They provided information about visitation, including many evening events and expressed a strong desire to market a transit connection. Current services are inadequate, not legible to occasional users and stop running before events typically end.
4. Belltown and Art Museum representatives stressed the value of the 1st Ave segment north of Virginia/Stewart (or Pike/Pine depending on the east-west connection) as a later phase as it connects key community assets but also provides connections to the Cruise Ship Terminal and significant existing and planned residential development. They stressed that for Seattle Center and SAM to thrive in a time when driving to the center city is increasingly unattractive, they need customers delivered from downtown housing and major transit hubs.
5. Both SLU and Seattle Center representatives expressed a desire to keep the east-west connection between Uptown/Lower Queen Anne and South Lake Union in study considerations, at least as a future phase. They agree that there is a need to get the streetcar network more fully planned so that other decisions can be made around future alignments.
6. Several stakeholders felt that alignment options through Westlake on 6th and 7th should be explored to provide service closer to the Convention Center, key hotels, and to a burgeoning office district in the Denny Triangle. Several stakeholders also thought there was opportunity to improve streetcar to light

rail connections (relative to the current Westlake terminus connection) by creating a new station with a more transparent and proximate connection to a Westlake Station tunnel entrance.

7. Six stakeholders mentioned the need to consider an extension south to the stadium area, proposed arena/entertainment district, and connecting to Starbucks HQ. At least one stakeholder felt that the property owners in this area were willing to consider an immediate local improvement district (LID) and would contribute to construction. While there was support for this alignment, stakeholders most familiar with the Stadium District and recent master planning efforts there, expressed concern that finding a suitable alignment could be challenging. In their planning efforts, Occidental has been taken off the table as a potential alignment and 1st Avenue has a number of competing demands on the right-of-way.

Funding

1. Several stakeholders expressed belief that the Central Waterfront group considering an LID would be interested in extending the LID to provide funding for the 1st Avenue line and would consider a 1st Avenue streetcar, as well as quality connections from the waterfront to 1st Avenue, priority investments. Stakeholders felt this was the best opportunity to generate local funding, since it seemed unlikely that a second and separate streetcar LID could be imposed in this area. They also felt that given the high demand for funding for Central Waterfront projects, a streetcar portion of the LID would be relatively modest and other funding sources would be needed to support the majority of the project.
2. Stakeholders expressed concern that the relatively limited development potential in the downtown area would make it difficult to raise local revenue from a LID, especially for a 4th and 5th Avenue alignment.
3. One stakeholder felt that downtown businesses and property owners along the alignment should not shoulder the cost of streetcar construction and that funding should come from a citywide source, particularly since all residents share the value of center city investments.
4. Stakeholders indicated that it would be necessary to look at a more diverse capital funding package than that the one developed for South Lake Union Streetcar.
5. Several stakeholder expressed concern that operating funds should be a priority so that frequency could be provided to attract riders. There was a desire for a frequent streetcar service that would not reduce bus service in other parts of the community.
6. Several stakeholders expressed belief that the stadium area property owners would consider an LID to extend the 1st Avenue line south of Jackson.
7. One stakeholder though that a new LID that would include properties on an east-west line from SLU to Seattle Center would be possible.
8. Many stakeholders said it would be much harder to get local funding for a line on 4th and 5th Avenues.
9. Many stakeholders expressed hope that the State would come up with a new transit funding source.

Current and Potential Development Projects

1. Several stakeholders mentioned the Lake to Bay trail and wayfinding effort which could extend the reach of the streetcar.
2. Many stakeholders mentioned parcels either planned or potential for development on the waterfront and between the waterfront and 1st Avenue. Economic development in this area was often cited as a reason to align a streetcar in the 1st Avenue corridor.

3. Most stakeholders indicated 1st Avenue and surrounding neighborhoods like Pioneer Square and West Edge to Waterfront are likely to see much more creative class development in employment and residential tenancy than 4th and 5th Avenues. This burgeoning class of users was seen as a significant potential market for a streetcar route on 1st Avenue.
4. It was broadly recognized that redevelopment potential in either corridor is much lower than the South Lake Union line. Both corridors present opportunity for infill development and some redevelopment, but not at the scale that streetcars in Portland's Pearl District or South Waterfront or Seattle's South Lake Union helped catalyze.
5. Multiple stakeholders with 1st Avenue interests noted that elimination of Metro bus service from 1st Avenue had hurt some retail businesses and reduced vitality on those streets. They believe a streetcar could be part of reversing these trends along with other mechanisms (such as expansion of the Metropolitan Improvement District (MID) to Belltown).
6. There is substantial growth still planned in SLU and west to Seattle Center. Gates Foundation is planning another building and will double their employment; the University of Washington School of Medicine has expansion plans and construction underway; Amazon continues to grow.
7. Several stakeholders mentioned the planned bike sharing program which could coordinate with streetcar implementation.
8. Planned residential development in Belltown was mentioned. The new arena and development of neighborhoods in the stadium area and south of the stadiums was cited by several as important enough to consider extending the streetcar south.
9. Numerous stakeholders were excited about the idea of running streetcars east-west in the Pike/Pine corridor to leverage redevelopment of a few strategic sites, strengthen the retail environment and reduce social problems.
10. Several stakeholders pointed to rapid growth in the Denny Triangle and residents' need access to services, retail and recreation.
11. Yesler Terrace project will increase housing and bring market rate housing to this area. Additional market rate housing is planned in Chinatown/ID, which will change the demographics and travel patterns in this area, which currently houses many senior citizens.
12. North stadium lot development will increase residential, hotel and commercial population south of Jackson.
13. Mid-rise commercial development is planned just south of Chinatown/ID to the immediate south of Dearborn Street.
14. Pioneer Square Historic District has seen \$1.7 billion in annual revenue reported in the last year.

Other Comments

1. Please come speak to the SLU Community Council which meets on the 2nd Tuesday of each month in the evening.
2. Extend the 1st Hill streetcar to Volunteer Park (several comments).
3. Uptown Plan is currently under development and should be considered.
4. 2008 Seattle Center Plan had a detailed access plan and will be sent electronically.
5. Key Arena attendance is nearly back to pre-Sonic departure levels. The need for transit continues to be a major concern for Seattle Center.

6. A parking and construction mitigation strategy will need to be a key part of any streetcar project development, particularly to garner business support.
7. City did some work on economic potential of streetcars in 2008? Could be useful.
8. One stakeholder said that waiting for transit in the middle of the street is problematic and creates a barrier effect. Put streetcar at the curb.
9. One stakeholder expressed concern about accessible pathways in the Pioneer Square Area.
10. See Trevor at SDOT for development maps.
11. NY Times reporter told stakeholder: “Seattle more than any other city reminds me of Manhattan as it is landlocked and linear – you have the opportunity to strangle yourself or become a very dense city.”
12. Streetcars to Stadium District would be more useful to stimulate off-event activities than for game day transportation. They would not provide enough capacity to make a significant contribution meeting game peak access demands.
13. City needs to be proactive in communicating with the business community about the benefits and tradeoffs of this project. Many will perceive it as a threat (i.e., lost parking and access) without an extensive conversation about the long-term benefits and construction impacts.
14. Project is an important step toward developing a much needed modern transit system. Believe incrementalism and missed opportunities are going to kill economic growth and this and other transit projects needed to be expedited.
15. Several major employers in the study area have offered to provide us with employee zip code data, transportation management plan reports, conduct employee and visitor streetcar user study, employee home-location maps.

Appendix: Draft Alignment Options Map

Center City Connector Transit Corridor Alignment Options



Appendix: Stakeholder Question Guide

Introduction

Background

Seattle's recently completed Transit Master Plan identified priority corridors throughout the city that would need to see improvements to meet projected ridership demands. In particular, the center city is expected to see significant growth in employment and residential density, which will result in a greater need for even better transit service downtown. The TMP identified options for improving center city transit circulation, including two specific corridors that could be served by a frequent bus or streetcar circulator. The Center City Connector Transit Alternatives Analysis will give us an opportunity to further examine potential alignments and develop a plan to move this idea closer to an on-the-ground reality.

[Provide map showing TMP Center City Alignments CC1 and CC2]

Study Overview

[Interviewer will provide 5 minute overview of study purpose, role of an Alternatives Analysis, study schedule, and study goals]

Primary goal of the study is to:

- Identify the best alignment and technology that connects Uptown or South Lake Union with South Downtown and potentially the South Lake Union Streetcar line with the First Hill Streetcar Line (now under construction on Jackson Street). The study will consider transit modes including **streetcar and enhanced bus service** [unique branding, service design focused on center city circulation, etc], and will review several alternative alignments (i.e., 1st Ave, 2nd Ave, 4th Ave, 5th Ave). A decision making process will be conducted to identify the best transit solution to be developed as the LPA for adoption by the City and for inclusion in PSRCs long range transportation plan – Transportation 2040.

[NOTE: Recommend we bring to each interview a simple map of corridors and possible alignments.]

During a 14-month period, the study will:

- Identify a series of performance measures including mobility needs and land use/economic development goals to be supported by the preferred alternative.
- Compare different transit modes (including streetcar, enhanced bus) and service alternatives/alignments to identify the best alternative or combination of alternatives for the corridor.
- Use a three-tiered evaluation process to gradually screen alignment and design options against a defined project Purpose and Need
- Provide a transparent and inclusive public engagement process that will involve all stakeholders in the decision making process.
- Facilitate a local decision making process that identifies a locally preferred alternative that can attract federal transit funds or other state grants.

Meeting Purpose

- To discuss stakeholder perceptions of transit in Seattle's center city and then opportunities, issues, and challenges associated with developing a new urban circulator transit line for this corridor. Information from this interview is intended to identify issues that will be addressed or considered in the subsequent analysis.

Confidentiality

Individuals may speak to us in confidence. Any quoting of outcomes will be done anonymously. Our main purpose is to allow stakeholders to speak freely.

Discussion Topics

[Note: not all topics or questions are relevant for all stakeholders]

Stakeholder Name:

Organization/Role:

Contact Information:

1. What do you think the benefits of an enhanced center city transit connection might be?
2. How do you think an enhanced transit service in this corridor will affect neighborhoods, land use, economics, urban form along the corridors? Are there specific neighborhoods or districts that could particularly benefit from enhanced service? Those that may experience unwanted consequences?
3. What are major challenges this study could face with regard to transportation in general? This could include traffic congestion, bicycle/pedestrian issues, transit, safety/security, etc. What other challenges are important?
4. What is your opinion of existing transit service (bus, light rail, streetcar) in these corridors today? Specifically, how do you feel about the effectiveness of the service, service quality, marketing, ease of use, etc., especially for trips that start and end in the Study Area?
5. What do you think should be the primary purpose of a new, higher quality transit connection in this corridor? Should it:
 - a. provide frequent access, travel in mixed traffic and operate less reliably at relatively slow speeds?
 - b. provide more limited stops, seek priority over traffic where feasible, and seek to achieve faster travel speeds and more reliable service (including streetcar only segments), at the potential expense of reduced street capacity for automobiles?
6. Are there segments of the corridors shown on the map that should be prioritized/deprioritized? And why?
7. While a future **system** could both connect the SLU and First Hill Streetcars and provide service to Seattle Center/Belltown/Lower Queen Anne, it may be difficult to achieve both in the near future. If given the choice between connecting the SLU and First Hill lines or connecting Seattle Center/Belltown/Lower Queen Anne with downtown, which do you think is a higher priority (and why)? [Note: we will provide a map and further explanation of options and challenges]
8. What impact do you think a streetcar operating in mixed traffic on 1st, 4th or 5th Avenues would have on street operations, business access, and pedestrian and bicyclist safety?
9. Competing priorities for downtown street space for various modes will require a number of hard discussions about allocating limited rights-of-way. In specific, there are stakeholders interested in maintaining on street parking, introducing new protected bicycle facilities, and/or adding transit. What is your position on the City's ability to accomplish all these things simultaneously? (why ask this – to do so is an impossibility) To what degree are you willing to see general purpose traffic lanes or parking lanes removed to allow these projects to be constructed?
10. We are collecting demographic, land use, and planning data for this study. Is there anything we should be aware of with respect to land use or employment changes in the two corridors? Any

data you have available? Any surveys you have conducted? Any development projects that we may not be familiar with?

11. What haven't we covered that's important to you?
12. Any other comments, questions or concerns?