Streetcar Institutional Models

A Comparison of Experience with Transit Coordination

Chris Kopp Transportation Planning Practice Lead HNTB Corporation Chicago, IL





Contributors

- Ashley Booth, HNTB Milwaukee
- Sue Comis, Sound Transit
- Shellie Ginn, City of Tucson
- Chris Kopp, HNTB Chicago
- Benjamin Limmer, Atlanta BeltLine
- Terry Nash, HNTB Seattle
- Jeff Polenske, City of Milwaukee
- Matt Webb, HNTB Detroit





Hypothesis

- Different institutional approaches to streetcar development lead to different coordination outcomes
 - Physical
 - Service
 - Fare
 - Information
 - Construction





Institutional Models

- City-led Tucson SunLink, Milwaukee
- Agency-led Tacoma Link
- Privately-led Detroit M-1 RAIL
- Hybrid Atlanta Streetcar





Physical Coordination

Ideal Outcome:

Ability to board a connecting transit service at the same station, plaza, and/or platform where one alighted the streetcar, or vice versa.





Physical Coordination

Atlanta





Tacoma

Few shared platforms, connecting bus typically less than two street crossings away.







Service Coordination

Ideal Outcome:

Ability to have a connecting transit vehicle waiting when the streetcar arrives to facilitate a timed transfer from streetcar to the connecting transit service, or vice versa.





Service Coordination

Streetcar headways of 10-15 minutes were considered frequent enough not to require schedule coordination.



Tucson





Fare Coordination

Ideal Outcome:

Reciprocal transfers with full credit for previous fares paid between the streetcar and all connecting services using all valid fare media.





Fare Coordination

Best where streetcar implementer = operator.

Atlanta

Only Tucson offers full integration with regional transit fare system.

Atlanta, Tacoma accept regional smartcard media.

Tucson

Streetcars frequently introduce proof-of-payment to regions.







Information Coordination

Ideal Outcome:

Clear presentation of streetcar services and all connecting transit services on all maps, schedules, mobile apps, and other transit service information materials, as well as wayfinding signage showing the way from streetcar stops to boarding platforms of nearby transit services, and vice versa.





Information Coordination



Atlanta



Tacoma





Construction Coordination

Ideal Outcome:

Required utility relocations occur prior to active construction of rail and system elements.





Construction Coordination





Detroit

Atlanta





Findings

 Hypothesis: Different institutional approaches to streetcar development lead to different coordination outcomes

Rejected

A common goal of integrating a streetcar into the regional transit network overcomes institutional challenges



