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Background

2014 - AC Transit awarded SR2T grant

2016 - Stantec & Toole Design Group contracted to support development of guideline

2017 - (Summer/Fall) TAC Meetings, Guide development
(Winter) Final adoption

Goals

1. Achieve **internal buy-in** from AC Transit staff
2. Achieve **external buy-in** from city staff and funding agencies
3. Create an **actionable** document that will streamline interagency coordination and design review process
Vision

Compelling narrative for improving transit
Clear, attractive illustrations
Planning-level cost estimates
Simple project checklists for developers and city staff
Sample policy language that can be adopted

Examples

SEPTA Bus Stop Design Guidelines
Rhode Island Bus Stop Design Guide
Transit Street Design Guide
SEPARATED BIKE LANE PLANNING & DESIGN GUIDE
Examples

Clear, attractive illustrations to communicate concepts
Identifying key elements and arrangement

Examples

¾ Perspective view
Examples

Plan view

Examples

Cross-section view
**Examples**

Context sensitive minimum and preferred dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Configuration</th>
<th>Roadway Characteristic</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Safety Buffer</th>
<th>Additional Standard Width</th>
<th>Additional Standard Space</th>
<th>Can Use Public Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder/bike stop (near side)</td>
<td>Urban street with on-street facilities; horizontal entry speed 20-30 mph; bike lane offset at 10 mph</td>
<td>10 ft. (2.7 m)</td>
<td>5 ft. (1.5 m)</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor road with no on-street facilities</td>
<td>10 ft. (2.7 m) safety buffer</td>
<td>10 ft. (2.7 m)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major road with no on-street facilities</td>
<td>10 ft. (2.7 m) safety buffer</td>
<td>10 ft. (2.7 m)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Typologies**

**Bike Lanes (Class II)**
1. Adjacent to Curb
2. Between Parking Lane and Travel Lane

**Separated Bike Lanes (Class IV)**
3. Between Curb and Travel Lane
4. Between Curb and Parking Lane
5. Two-Way Facility Between Curb and Parking
Typology 1: Draft Bike Lane
Adjacent to curb

Typology 1: Bike lane
Adjacent to curb

Current Standard

Potential?
Typology 2: Draft Bike Lane
Adjacent to parking

Typology 2: Bike Lane
Adjacent to parking
Typology 2: Bike Lane
Adjacent to parking

Typology 3: Draft Separated Bike Lane
Between curb & travel lane
Typology 3: Separated Bike Lane
Between curb & travel lane

Denver

Typology 3: Separated Bike Lane
Between curb & travel lane

Seattle
Typology 3: Separated Bike Lane
Between curb & travel lane

Typology 4: Draft Separated Bike Lane
Between curb and on-street parking
Typology 5: Draft Two-Way Separated Bike Lane Between curb and on-street parking

Vancouver, BC
Next Steps

First TAC meeting in Late Spring 2017

Outreach to local agencies in Spring/Early Summer 2017

Draft Guide Summer/Fall 2017

Discussion

• Clarifying questions or comments?
• How could this document help you?
• What are we missing?
  o Scenarios...
  o Policies/procedures...
  o Key stakeholders...