


September 18, 2025

SR 25-471 Item 2.A.

Telegraph Avenue Multimodal Corridor Study

**AC Transit – City of Berkeley Inter-
Agency Liaison Committee**



Goals & Objectives

- **Meeting Vision Zero Policy Goals**
 - Safety improvements and design to reduce traffic deaths and serious injuries.
- **Improve transit travel times and on-time reliability**
 - Using treatments such as bus bulbs, queue jumps, and transit lanes consistent with the Transit First Implementation Plan.
- **All Ages & Abilities biking facilities**
 - Provide safe, comfortable, connected bike facilities for bi-directional travel consistent with the goals of the City of Berkeley Bicycle Plan.
- **A state of good repair**
 - Spot pavement repair, ADA curb ramp upgrades, traffic signal upgrades, and other maintenance activities to enhance safety for all users.
- **Curb management strategy**
 - With input from residents, visitors, and the business community, develop a design that provides commercial and passenger loading zones adequate to support local businesses and destinations, more and better accessible parking spaces and paratransit access, and preserve on-street parking as much as possible.



Corridor Concepts

– Concept 1

- Two travel lanes in each direction
 - One General Purpose lane (“GP lane”)
 - One transit, right turn, and driveway access lane. Also known as Business Access and Transit lane (“BAT lane”)
 - Maximizes parking by limiting left turn pockets
 - Eliminates 13 of 15 left turns

– Concept 2

- Similar to Concept 1 – Two travel lanes in each direction
- More left turn pockets and opportunities (Stuart Street and Parker Street) by reducing curb space
- Eliminates 11 of 15 left turns

– New Concept 3B

- Same as prior Concept 3, but with transit priority elements such as BAT lanes and queue jumps in vicinity of Ashby to improve performance for all modes
- Continuation of the “Oakland” design on Telegraph
- Reduction of travel lanes to one in each direction
- Maximizes left turn pockets and opportunities and includes continuous center turn lane




Initial Concept Schematics

TELEGRAPH AVENUE


LEGEND

- School Zone
- Bus Lane
- Shared Bike Lane
- Conventional Bike Lane
- Protected Bike Lane
- Bicycle Boulevard
- On-Street Parking
- Existing Traffic Flow
- Vehicle Traffic Flow
- Restricted Traffic Flow
- Traffic Signal
- Stop Sign
- Bus Stop
- Bus Stop - Constrained Step Out
- Bus Stop - Transit Island
- Traffic Diverters
- Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB)
- School Crossing
- Pedestrian Crossing
- Queue Jump



EXISTING CONDITIONS



CONCEPT 1



CONCEPT 2

Initial Concept 3
(Oakland Concept)

BERKELEY CITY LIMIT


BERKELEY CITY LIMIT

Concept 3B


LEGEND

-  School Zone
-  Bus Lane
-  Shared Bike Lane
-  Conventional Bike Lane
-  Protected Bike Lane
-  Bicycle Boulevard
-  On-Street Parking
-  Existing Traffic Flow
-  Vehicle Traffic Flow
-  Restricted Traffic Flow
-  Traffic Signal
-  Stop Sign
-  Bus Stop
-  Bus Stop - Constrained Step Out
-  Bus Stop - Transit Island
-  Traffic Diverters
-  Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB)
-  School Crossing
-  Pedestrian Crossing
-  Queue Jump

Initial Concept 3 (Oakland Concept)



Recommended Concept 3B (Oakland Concept)



Why is Concept 3B the “Recommended Concept Design”?

- **Ashby:** Contributes to **57% to 71%** of the increased vehicle travel time, and **84%** of the increased transit travel time
- Concepts 1 and 2 lack diverters (except at bike boulevards) creating the potential for dangerous illegal left turns, per Vision Zero traffic safety analysis
- Concept 3B recommended because it:
 - **Prioritizes Vision Zero** by slowing vehicle speeds, shortening pedestrian crossing distances, and making left turns more predictable
 - **Prioritizes transit** where most transit delay is occurring
 - **Maintains most parking and loading**, consistent with Telegraph Business Improvement District input
 - **Aligns with Fire Dept. feedback**
 - **Public survey preference** – 54% of respondents chose Concept 3
 - **Consistent with Oakland design** leading up to the Berkeley border
 - Note:
 - Intersections not fully designed
 - Benefits from AC Transit’s in-progress Telegraph Rapid Corridors Project not modeled
 - Opportunities for further transit performance mitigation during detailed engineering

Traffic Analysis – Recap and Potential Mitigations

- **Ashby:** Contributes to **57% to 71%** of the increased vehicle travel time, and **84%** of the increased transit travel time
- Note:
 - Testing was of high-level schematics, not fully designed intersections
 - There are a number of approaches that we can take in design refinement to reduce the LOS and travel time implications at Ashby Ave
 - Permissive left turn signalization at Ashby Ave
 - Maintain 2nd lane to Ashby Ave intersection (BAT or general purpose)
 - Extend left turn lanes

Difference in *Vehicle* Travel Time vs. Existing

Concept 1	Concept 2	Concept 3	*NEW* Concept 3B
+42%	+70%	+100%	+65%

Difference in *Transit* Travel Time vs. Existing

Concept 1	Concept 2	Concept 3	*NEW* Concept 3B
-17%	-9%	+59%	+10%

Transit Travel Time – Detailed Analysis

- Synchro Arterial LOS tool plus right turn delay and bus stop information utilized to estimate transit travel time **through the entire study corridor**

Scenario	Bus Configuration	Stop Configuration
Existing	Buses in mixed flow 2 through travel lanes	Pull-off
Concept 1	Buses in bus/right turn only lane	In-lane
Concept 2	Buses in bus/right turn only lane	In-lane
Concept 3	Buses in mixed flow 1 through travel lane	In-lane
NEW Concept 3B	Buses in mixed flow except between Webster and Russel	In-lane

Transit Travel Time (Min)	Existing	Concept 1	Concept 2	Concept 3	*NEW* Concept 3B
AM NB	5.4	4.5 (-0.9)	4.6 (-0.8)	9.9 (+4.5)	5.6 (+0.2)
AM SB	4.8	4.6 (-0.2)	5.3 (+0.5)	6.9 (+2.1)	6.1 (+1.3)
PM NB	6.1	4.9 (-1.2)	5.6 (-0.6)	7.7 (+1.6)	5.9 (-0.2)
PM SB	5.7	4.2 (-1.5)	4.4 (-1.3)	10.6 (+4.9)	6.2 (+0.4)

Key Findings

- Transit travel time changes **-14% to +65%** depending on Concept
- Concepts 1 and 2:** Generally, up to a minute of travel time savings over current conditions
- Concept 3:** Lack of a BAT lane results in 1.6 to 4.9-min increase in travel time
- *NEW* Concept 3B:** -.2 to 1.3-min increase in travel time compared to existing, but significant reduction compared to Concept 3A

Note: Travel time savings do not reflect any potential transit signal priority improvements as part of in-progress AC Transit Telegraph Rapid Corridor Project

Average Change in Transit Travel Time vs. Existing			
Concept 1	Concept 2	Concept 3	*NEW* Concept 3B
-17%	-9%	+59%	+10%


Summary of Stakeholder Feedback

- Fire Department – **prefers Concept 3 or Existing Conditions**
 - Potential for center turn lane to be clear during emergencies
 - Simple and consistent design – reduces driver confusion
- AC Transit and UC Berkeley TDM Manager
 - **Favor Concepts 1 and 2** due to transit benefits
- Disability community favors blue zones on side streets so wheelchairs are not let out in a bike lane. Would like to see another concept without bike lanes
- Telegraph Business Improvement District – expressed support for studying a closure of the Dwight Triangle slip lane closing Dwight Triangle slip lane
- Public survey expressed strong preference for pedestrian and bike safety improvements
- Public Meeting
 - Questions around use of parallel bike boulevards
 - Concerns raised about access to neighborhoods if left turns largely eliminated under concepts 1 and 2

Public Survey Results

- Online public survey open from 6/11 – 7/3 (22 days)
- 505 responses
 - What is most important to you?
 - 51% said ped safety
 - 32% said bicyclist safety
 - 23% said disabled person access
 - 22% said on-street vehicle parking
 - 18% said transit speed and reliability
 - 9% said commercial loading zones
 - What is “very important” to you?
 - 82% said ped safety
 - 52% said accessibility
 - 48% said bike lanes
 - 32% said transit improvements
 - 22% said maintaining on-street parking
 - 15% said loading zones

Which concept do you prefer?



Evaluation Criteria

- Two Level Evaluation Weighting
- Level 1: Baseline Considerations (Pass/Fail)
- Level 2: Ability to Address Project Goals + Public Feedback
- **Concept 3B ranked highest among all concepts**

Level 1: Pass/Fail Criteria

Maintaining Emergency Response, Access, and Egress

Maintaining Traffic Circulation

Traffic Operations

Level 2 Criteria (Project Goals and Public Feedback)

Meeting Vision Zero

Transit Speed & Reliability

Providing All-Ages and All-Abilities Facilities

Providing a State of Good Repair

Managing Curbspace Usage


Public Feedback



Schedule and Next Steps

Future phases of this project (detailed engineering and construction) have *not* yet been funded or scheduled.

Concept Design: Project Status



Thank you!

