

Westlake Cycle Track Design Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Summary

Monday, July 28, 2014 5:30-8:00 p.m.

MOHAI – Lakefront Pavilion

Design Advisory Committee member attendees

Member Name	Interest Represented	Attendance
Warren Aakervik	Freight interests	Present
Martha Aldridge	Lake Union Park users	Present
Andrew Austin	Non-vehicular commuters	Present
Devor Barton	Pedestrian interests	Present
Karen Braitmayer	Westlake Ave North business owners	Present
Dave Chappelle	Lake Union floating home and live-aboard residents	Present
Thomas Goldstein	Cascade Bicycle Club	Present
Amalia Leighton	Transportation Engineer	Present
Sarah McGray	Bicycle interests	Present
John Meyer	Air/water transportation/tourism	Present
Martin Nelson	Westlake Stakeholders Group*	Present
Peter Schrappen	Lake Union marina operators and boat moorage tenants	Absent
Cam Strong	Westlake Stakeholders Group*	Present

**Note: The Westlake Stakeholders Group represents a variety of businesses and residents within the Westlake corridor.*

Staff attendees

Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)

- Sam Woods
- Dawn Schellenberg
- Barbara Lee
- Mary Rutherford
- Mike Estey

Office of Economic Development

- James Kelly

EnviroIssues

- Penny Mabie
- David Gitlin
- Sara Colling

Toole Design Group

- Kenneth Loen
- Kristen Lohse

Observers

- Brock Gilman
- Raquel Gomez Nebot
- Cathy Graubert
- Pamela Hale
- Lars Halstrom
- Sierra Hansen
- Catherine Hennings
- Kate Hotler
- Brock Howell
- Jeff Hummel
- Taylor Kendall
- Michael Locatell
- Joseph Losi
- Millie Magner
- Dylan Meyer
- Jesse Nelson

- Owen Petersen
- Maureen Pirog
- Robin Randels
- Lynne Reister
- Gordon Ruh
- Bob Scheulen
- Dick Schwartz
- Susan Schwartz
- Jo Seel
- Paul Sittauer
- Ed Smith
- Malcolm Taran
- Bill Wehrenberg
- Bill Wiginton
- Alex Wilken
- Kathy Willhight
- Paul Wirsing
- Tim Zamberlin

Note: This document is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It is not intended to be a transcription of the meeting, but an overview of points raised and responses from SDOT and Design Advisory Committee members.

Welcome and introductions

Penny Mabie, facilitator, welcomed the Design Advisory Committee (DAC) and audience members and led a round of introductions. She reviewed the ground rules included on the agenda and reminded the committee that this meeting is dedicated to looking at concepts.

Adopt summaries from meeting #5 and tour

Penny called the members' attention to the meeting #5 summary. There were no proposed edits from DAC members and the committee approved the meeting #5 minutes as is. Penny noted proposed edits to a few numbers within the tour summary. She said the team would finalize the summary once those edits are incorporated as long as no DAC members had objections. The DAC members agreed.

DAC members share feedback from the interests they represent

Penny asked committee members to share the input they've been receiving from their constituents.

- Karen Braitmayer, Westlake Avenue North business owners, reported she thought the tour was a great opportunity for the DAC to see some of the access issues she experiences on a daily basis, particularly in crossing the mixed modes of transportation. She had nothing new to report from her constituents.
- Andrew Austin, Non-vehicular commuters, reported he was not able to make the tour but he read the notes and saw that parking and parking management continues to be a hot topic. He is generally hearing from people who are curious about the status of the project and want to see the end result. He also has had informal conversations with members of the South Lake Union ~~Community Council~~ Chamber of Commerce -who have a lot of interest in the project.
- Devor Barton, Pedestrian interests, reported he found the tour helpful to be able to experience the corridor. The DAC had already discussed a lot of the issues presented but he learned more about the history of the area. The constituents he hears from also want to know what this cycle track will look like and when it will be built.

- Dave Chappelle, Lake Union floating home and live-aboard residents, reported he thought the tour was a wonderful chance for the members to experience the dynamic and diverse corridor. He appreciated the people who volunteered their time to speak. A couple different constituents have asked him why the DAC hasn't discussed a multiuse track that uses the existing sidewalk. He has also heard input to make sure this is done well rather than just done quickly.
- John Meyer, Air/water transportation/tourism, reported he agrees with Dave. They have between 100 and 400 customers a day in their shop and no matter what time of day they hear about parking being hard to find. He thought the tour was a fun opportunity to talk with people who live and work in the area. It's a complicated corridor and right now he doesn't see a clear solution. He hears from people who have the same concerns about safety and loss of parking.
- Warren Aakervik, Freight interests, reported his constituents want predictability and safety particularly along Westlake Avenue North itself. They also need freight access for deliveries. They are waiting to see what comes out of this process.
- Cam Strong, Westlake Stakeholders Group, reported he was gone for awhile but he has done a couple of walkthroughs and there is a lot of interest in parking management, particularly whether or not the time range was adjusted for all day parking. There is also interest in the next design concept.
 - o Mike Estey, SDOT parking management, confirmed that the time-range adjustment is complete.
- Martin Nelson, Westlake Stakeholders Group, reported he rode his bike along the water in Portland and Vancouver so he could get a better understanding of what those communities have done with cycling. Portland is a good example of a city that has embraced bicycles but they do so along with the vehicles.
- Sarah McGray, Bicycle interests, reported she thought the tour was fun. She has heard from her community mostly what the DAC has been discussing, that safety is an issue and people don't know where to be on their bikes. She spoke with someone who works at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center who used to bike within the corridor until she was doored by a car. Sarah is hearing about increases in the number of bike commuters in the last couple years, which is probably due to growth in the area. People are excited that bike commuters are being accommodated as a growing community.
- Martha Aldridge, Lake Union Park users, reported she was intrigued by Karen's comment about the ratio of parking spaces to units within apartment buildings. She spoke with someone who confirmed that as the community is becoming more urban, apartment buildings do not need to offer as much parking as they used to. Developers are looking at six parking spaces for every ten units. Her colleagues at MOHAI and at the Center for Wooden Boats reported that driving to work is not very common. This is a busy, changing neighborhood and they need to prioritize parking for visitors.
- Amalia Leighton, Transportation Engineer, reported she appreciated hearing from business

owners on the tour. She asked them if they would be willing to put up signs and/or receive special permits for loading/unloading. They mostly thought that would be helpful, though some were concerned about the staff time required. There is opportunity looking beyond just engineering solutions, such as permits, that are not uncommon in industrial areas. She said that is an important piece of the conversation.

- Thomas Goldstein, Cascade Bicycle Club, reported he found the tour helpful to see the different spaces and hear about the impacts any changes would have to the corridor. He was on his bike the day a motorcyclist and car collided which adds urgency to their work. He has heard about a 30 mph bike speed but he finds that he can't even reach 30 mph traveling downhill. The general average is 11 mph to 14 mph where it's flat. He agrees with people that this area is complex, though other cities have handled equally complex challenges elegantly.

Bike facility concept presentation

Sam Woods, SDOT project manager, began the concept presentation by reviewing SDOT's mission, vision and values. She then outlined what they would cover in the presentation including what SDOT has heard from the public and the evolution of the concept development, noting there would be time for DAC discussions. She explained that a concept is the layout of an idea. The design phase follows where the concept is refined to best fit the corridor.

Sam reviewed how the project team has been collecting feedback from the public including a highly attended open house, meetings and discussions with the DAC, community briefings and ongoing conversations with community members. They have worked to incorporate that feedback into two concepts that they'll share with the DAC today: the Center Concept and the Sidewalk Concept.

Kenneth Loen, Toole Design Group, stepped in to explain the Center Concept. In general, the Center Concept would locate the bike facility within the parking area between the two drive lanes. There are sections where the bike facility would need to be located on the east side of the corridor. It is considered a "clean slate" concept because it assumes a complete reconstruction for the majority of the corridor. Any angled parking would be converted to back-in parking for safety reasons.

Sam explained the benefits of the Center Concept, including its predictability – placing the bike facility where bicyclists are already riding. The Center Concept improves safety by limiting mixing zones and it accommodates two-way circulation. It would accommodate approximately 75% of the current parking spaces. Regarding parking spaces, Sam reminded the DAC that the parking supply is just one side of the conversation and that they will continue to discuss how to manage parking so that it is better utilized by adjacent land uses.

Sam then explained the challenges with the Center Concept. The Center Concept puts bicyclists between two drive aisles which may not be appealing to families. Because of its placement, some bicyclists may still choose to ride on the sidewalk. There is also potential for misuse with vehicles making U-turns over the path. Also when delivery trucks stop, they would block the drive aisle. Additionally, the Center Concept would require complete reconstruction of the parking area, with long-term access challenges for businesses and residences. Finally, the Center Concept would create significant impacts to

landscaping.

After the Center Concept presentation, Penny opened up the discussion to the DAC for their questions and thoughts.

- Devor said he is not clear how bicyclists would be able to access businesses. He also wanted to know more about putting pedestrians in the center lane on the south end of the corridor.
 - o Kenneth explained that the south end proposal mimics how the corridor is now, for example by Kenmore Air and Argosy Cruises. He also explained that all driveways would have a thruway for bicyclists to easily exit the bike facility.
- Andrew asked for more detail on the interaction with cars crossing and turning left.
 - o Kenneth explained that the crossings would be raised relative to the drive aisle. There would also likely be green pavement to identify conflicts areas. This concept does simplify the driver's conflict experience giving them more space to react before moving across the facility. Drivers would also just need to look for one-way traffic rather than two-way.
 - Andrew asked if they would have a stop sign at the first driveway.
 - Kenneth responded they haven't gotten to that point in the design yet.
 - Andrew noted if someone is moving quickly off the road, they may not have enough visual awareness to slow down and look for bikes.
- Warren noted that with the cycle track being two inches higher, vehicles would make U-turns across it.
 - o Kenneth said one of the advantages of this concept is vehicles would be able to make U-turns within the parking lot at designated locations rather than having to go out to Westlake.
- Warren asked if there would be opportunity for blocked off loading zones where businesses could reserve the parking.
 - o Kenneth said some parking could be converted to loading rather than parking.
 - Warren added that they could designate certain hours for loading.
- Cam verified this design would entail about 25% parking loss. He asked about how the design would accommodate large vehicles.
 - o Kenneth agreed that they had concern about accommodating large vehicles with this concept. The proposed spaces accommodate up to a medium-sized delivery truck. Larger trucks would need to cross over multiple spaces at once.
 - Cam noted that would encroach into both the cycle track and driveways.
 - Kenneth said yes if they back-in, but they could parallel park as well.
- Warren asked if large vehicles could request a parking hood to restrict multiple parking spaces for load and unload use.
 - o Kenneth said that is a policy question.
- Cam asked the size of vehicles able to make a right-hand turn coming off of Westlake.
 - o Kenneth responded about 20 feet.
 - Cam asked if that the 20-foot size would be the same for vehicles exiting parking

spaces.

- Kenneth said they can deal with different-sized vehicles within design.
- Warren said all large trucks would have to go to the far side going northbound to make the corners.
- Devor noted he thought where buses go was a key concern for the designers.
 - Kenneth responded that where the buses would go would be worked out in design.
- Cam asked if all the parking would be diagonal.
 - Kenneth said the north section has other types of parking to accommodate the space. The generic concept is all 60 degree angle (diagonal) parking.
- Martin asked if the design team is proposing using the same posts shown in the example photo.
 - Kenneth said they wouldn't use that type of post but they haven't gotten that far.
- Martin asked what angle parking they're proposing.
 - Kenneth responded 60-degree angled parking.
- Martin asked, regarding the north end, how people will cross the cycle track to access businesses and residences.
 - Kenneth said the crossings would be clearly identified and pedestrians could cross at any point if they wanted to.
- Martin said SDOT indicated they don't know the number for the total loss of parking and asked when SDOT will provide an actual figure so the DAC can make an assessment.
 - Sam responded SDOT would be able to bring a tighter range to next month's meeting but there are a lot of tradeoffs to consider before they can reach a final count.
- Sarah asked if the cycle track would be delineated by height when it is adjacent to the sidewalk.
 - Kenneth responded yes. The cycle track would also be higher than the drive aisle.
- Sarah asked if the cycle track would have posts on both sides. She commented that bicyclists act similar to vehicles where they would have an intended destination and they'd stop and park. Bicyclists would likely exercise caution with pedestrians and pedestrians would be aware as they navigate a busy lane of traffic including bicyclists. U-turns would need clearer signage showing where they are and are not allowed.
 - Kenneth answered it would have some kind of protection.
- Amalia noted this concept would have better sightlines at intersections because there is not a lot of clutter. She raised the question whether this concept assumes the same number of driveways. She noted that slowing cars is a key piece, particularly in the north end where there's a 24-foot drive aisle. People will still need to traverse through the parking lots so something will need to be in place to slow cars.
- Thomas asked about the discrepancy in the concept illustrations between the track being 12 feet overall or 10 feet with a 2-foot buffer.
 - Kenneth explained that the cycle track has an overall minimum width of 12 feet. Where there is parallel parking a 3-foot buffer is preferable because of doors.
- Thomas noted there are many runners in the corridor and asked how they could avoid the conflict of runners using the cycle track.
 - Kenneth said that is a problem the designers would have to solve.
 - Sarah added that people run in the parking lot. They prefer an uninterrupted route with

no curves. She has observed maybe two or three runners in the parking lot during peak hours.

- Thomas commented that related water activity businesses want direct connectivity.
- John asked if runners use cycle tracks in other places.
 - o Thomas responded that Myrtle Edwards and the Burke Gilman Trail are good examples. The Westlake Cycle Track could bring additional tourists, so success will have challenges.
 - o Dave added that if bicyclists are pulled off the sidewalk, runners would have a clear space.
- Dave commented that he agrees with Amalia that currently it's dangerous to pull into the parking lot in a car. This concept would be much more predictable. He is a bit concerned, however, that once everyone from different interests submits input, less parking will be preserved. He also noted he has several neighbors who drive full-size pickups that are roughly 9 feet long. He asked whether that size vehicle would be accommodated.
 - o Kenneth responded that a 9-foot vehicle size would barely fit. A 13-foot drive aisle is very generous. The figures shown in the concept diagrams are a starting point.
- Dave asked how the railroad track park would fit into the Center Concept.
 - o Kenneth said that is the most constrained part of the corridor. As long as they keep the landscaping, they would likely need to use parallel parking. For any concept, it's safe to start talking about closing driveway #11 to free up some space in what is already a difficult area to maneuver.
- Cam asked if there would be a sidewalk for businesses on the south end where the sidewalk would be in the center as opposed to the east side.
 - o Kenneth responded that between driveways #2 and #4 would essentially operate the same as today.
- Cam asked if they can assume dumpster needs as well as bus parking were addressed.
 - o Kenneth said the concept addresses bus parking but they haven't gotten to dumpster needs.
 - o Cam added that the area by China Harbor has specific needs for bus parking.
- Sarah verified if the sidewalk by Starbucks would remain in the center.
 - o Kenneth responded yes.
- Sarah asked why the two-way drive aisle is 24 feet on the north end.
 - o Kenneth said that is to preserve as much parking as possible.
 - o Sarah commented in north Seattle they have two-way roads that only have space for one car and asked if there could be a similar situation here.
 - Kenneth responded that this is a beginning point so that could be something to consider.
 - o Sarah added she would also challenge 13-foot driveways as encouraging drivers to speed.
 - Kenneth responded they need that width for drivers to get safely in and out of parking spaces.
- Cam asked if it is necessary to have 14 feet of sidewalk.
 - o Kenneth said it is unlikely that would be all sidewalk. It would incorporate landscaping

and business needs as well.

- Amalia noted the City minimum sidewalk width is 6 feet. It's useful to think of that as space outside of parking that could include amenities such as benches.
 - o Kenneth added that sidewalks adjacent to businesses need space for doors that swing out.

After the discussion about the Center Concept, Sam returned to the presentation to describe a second concept the design team began to develop: the Sidewalk Concept. Sam noted that the Sidewalk Concept evolved from the open house and recent DAC meetings, when SDOT heard a preference to keep the bike facility on the east side of the corridor. Members of the Westlake community have also encouraged SDOT to make better use of the existing sidewalk/multi-use trail to accommodate bikes and pedestrians.

Kenneth walked through the concept in more detail. The Sidewalk Concept would narrow the existing sidewalk to minimum 8 feet and add a space for bicyclists that is delineated in some way such as elevated pavement. He showed a photo of the Burke Gilman Trail segment close to University of Washington as a comparable example. For the most part the Sidewalk Concept wouldn't need to impact circulation within the parking lot.

Sam explained what works well about the Sidewalk Concept, including: it provides a better experience for all users, has few vehicle/bike conflicts, provides a comfortable and relaxed experience, the route is predictable and intuitive and consistent through the corridor, it has fewer construction impacts, and it preserves approximately 80% of the current parking spaces.

The issues to consider regarding the Sidewalk Concept include: customers and residents must cross the bike facility, it has major landscaping impacts, loading/unloading must cross bike facility, there is potential use of the parking area by faster cyclists, and there is some loss of sidewalk space.

Penny explained that during the break the DAC and the audience members could look at roll plots of the two concepts. She noted that the concepts are changing daily as the design team works and makes revisions so there will probably be more tweaks to the concept before the roundtables. These roll plots are for the purposes of discussion.

Bike facility concept presentation

After the break, Penny opened up the discussion to the DAC.

- Dave asked about the discrepancy in loss of parking between Concept B and the Sidewalk Concept.
 - o Kenneth responded that because the Sidewalk Concept moves the curblineline and reduces the sidewalk width, the corridor can accommodate more parking.
- Karen noted she has a preference for the Center Concept. She thinks it seems easier to implement and would be more conducive to accessible parking. She sees it as being easier for people who drive modified vehicles though that could be possible in the Sidewalk Concept as well. Karen isn't concerned with crossing the track given there are routes to do so and she

- recommends including space to pause to see both sides of oncoming traffic.
- Warren said he is concerned with loading and unloading. Bikes might use the drive aisles with the Center Concept. The Sidewalk Concept doesn't seem bad except for loading and unloading. He sees more potential with the Center Concept.
 - Cam added he is concerned with everyone having to cross the cycle track.
 - Martin noted the team has done a great job of exploring different ideas. He agrees that the Sidewalk Concept has too much potential conflict with people having to cross it to get to and from businesses. The Sidewalk Concept showed no loss of parking within the middle section, though it looked like all the parallel parking was removed.
 - o Kenneth responded that he meant to say everything west of the center would be not be affected but everything to the east would be altered.
 - Martin commented that narrowing the sidewalk in the south section might be problematic because pedestrians would overflow into the cycle track.
 - o Amalia responded that the entire Sidewalk Concept is aligned next to the sidewalk.
 - o Kenneth clarified that the sidewalk would be minimum 8 feet wide all along the corridor.
 - o Amalia noted that where there are no building frontages, 8 feet is enough space.
 - Kenneth pointed out that this arrangement is the most common way a cycle track is built in other places around the world. An 8-foot sidewalk is generous.
 - o Amalia noted the existing landscaping would prevent people from crossing at all points.
 - o Kenneth added that one of the goals is to separate bicyclists from pedestrians. This concept could have some pedestrian spillover but it's an improvement on the current corridor where there is no indication of who goes where.
 - Martin commented that he doesn't know how trailers, crew shells or fuel trucks will be accommodated on the north end.
 - o Kenneth said the DAC spoke with the operators of the fuel trucks and the project team has been in conversation with Lake Union Crew. Kenneth felt that the cycle track could accommodate those trucks as they get into design detail.
 - Sarah commented that the 8-foot sidewalk seems pretty wide for pedestrians. She does see the Center Concept as having fewer interactions and as accommodating commuters but the Sidewalk Concept, provided there is clear demarcation, is feasible. She is curious to understand why the two-way drive aisle can't be narrowed to provide more buffer between the sidewalk and cycle track.
 - Amalia said she likes that the Sidewalk Concept has less conflict between vehicles and bicycles. The Sidewalk Concept would probably slow bikes down more. While she appreciates the sight distance, if they think about the concept in terms of a hierarchy it puts the slowest movement (pedestrians) on one end and the fastest movement (vehicles) on the other end.
 - Thomas reiterated what Sam said that whether the design is intuitive is important, which is where the Sidewalk Concept makes a lot of sense. If someone is riding with a child or going slow, they wouldn't want to be between cars. The Center Concept adds another level of complexity that begs some unknown issues. Having high volumes of bicyclists and pedestrian together works well because it makes everyone pay attention. Venice Beach is a good example. He

pointed out to John that this could be a big win for businesses. Thomas thinks that one-lane channelization is a smart solution.

- Karen said he had a meeting with folks from the fuel dock and how they bring in big boats and supplies. Karen said it's helpful to imagine the parking lot without cars – it's one big open space and when cars aren't in it, the lot is flexible and usable. It's important to think about flexible and creative use of the space.
- John said that the Center Concept has everyone crossing either by car or by foot. The Sidewalk Concept is safer plus cheaper and faster. He has been in the corridor a long time, before they had the parking lot. The Sidewalk Concept would create less conflict between vehicles and people.
- Cam asked about who yields to whom.
 - o Sam responded that, like a crosswalk, everyone yields to pedestrians. When pedestrians are not in a crosswalk, there is common sense law that they need to allow cars reaction time to let them cross.
 - o Cam asked when they will get more information about crosswalks.
 - Sam said they will look at building entrances that attract a lot of people and add crossings accordingly. The AGC building, for example, would probably have a defined crossing. It would be site specific.
 - Cam commented they would need to have more than 12 accessible locations.
 - Kenneth responded that in addition to crosswalks, there would be interim crossings.
- Cam noted he had encouraged SDOT to use a 10 mph speed for both bikes and vehicles and asked if that would still be applied.
 - o Kenneth said it is safe to say that a frequent number of crossings would control speed.
 - Cam reiterated that he encourages whatever it would take to reduce speeds for cars and bikes.
- Martin, in response to Thomas's Venice Beach example, commented that Venice Beach doesn't have the same maritime industry. It is good comparison regarding joggers and bicyclists but not for comparing crossings. He asked if there would be yield signs at all the pedestrian crossings.
 - o Kenneth said pavement markings are a well established treatment for crossings. Yield strips right on the pavement are more effective than signs.
 - Sam added that on the Burke Gilman Trail next to University of Washington, stripes and rumble strips are used to make bicyclists aware they're entering a crossing area.
 - o Martin verified that with the Sidewalk Concept, 100% of people trying to access businesses would cross the cycle track.
 - Devor said that people already on the sidewalk wouldn't be crossing the track.
- Sarah noted that that interaction is already happening in the corridor. In her experience, different users use the space at different times of day. During 5-6 PM there is a commuter rush, but outside of that there are different modes of use. She is not too concerned about runners or walkers using the cycle track during the morning or evening commute.
- Thomas noted, in regards to Martin's comment about Venice Beach, the most maritime

dependent countries have the highest bike rates in the world. Los Angeles is building bike paths through industrial areas. When he rides his bike on Harbor Island, he yields to any truck. People are respectful.

- Warren added that cyclists being aware of their surroundings adds predictability.
- Dave commented that the DAC has had good conversation about crossings and wanted to add that people who live on the corridor are carrying groceries and different items. Residents will need crossings that are accessible. To encourage predictability, the crossings will need to be close enough together.

Sam wrapped up the discussion by noting that while there are tradeoffs, where the facility is located is only a part of the discussion. The conversation was a little bit split but there seems to be more general leaning toward the Sidewalk Concept. Crossings still need to be addressed but the Sidewalk Concept leaves the parking area as more functional. The Center Concept would have greater impact to the parking lot functionality. The City is going to take the Sidewalk Concept forward to the roundtables and set the Center Concept aside.

Observer comments to DAC

- Comment 1 – Commenter asked if SDOT would consider snaking the path along the corridor and moving it over to the west side where there are issues with businesses.
- Comment 2 – Commenter said that as a bicyclist, the Sidewalk Concept seems far better. He noted that he has experience loading and unloading trucks and doesn't think vicinity matters that much. Crossing a bike path can be really compatible with a pedestrian area. Pedestrians will wander but it's not that dangerous.
- Comment 3 – Commenter thanked the DAC and project team for their efforts and noted that the details could end up making a big difference. She asked if it would be possible to put up signs, for example, and then reassess.
- Comment 4 – Commenter said she owns a floating home and cares a great deal about parking having reasonable access to her house. The narrow, one-way directionality with the Center Concept would create a problem with everyone who is unloading stopping the flow of traffic in either direction. She encourages more judicious use of one-ways. There needs to be space for cars to go around stopped cars.
- Comment 5 – Commenter noted she wouldn't walk where the railroad tracks are at night. Runners in the parking lot is a big issue especially where cars ingress off of Westlake Avenue North. She doesn't see a correlation between the biggest maritime countries and bike use.
- Comment 6 – Commenter would like to have "predictability" defined. It seems to mean that people who are inconsiderate don't have to be accountable.
- Comment 7 – Commenter noted that the Center Concept does not meet all ages and abilities. Riding between barriers is not accommodating to parents with children.
- Comment 8 – Commenter noted that Norway had bikes first and there are some instances where they removed parking to get bikes in. Twenty percent parking loss is better than 40% but he is not sure marinas can sustain that kind of parking loss.

- Comment 9 – Commenter said he is a commuter and has young kids. He agrees that the Center Concept is not somewhere he would take his kids. He would more likely ride on the sidewalk.
- Comment 10 – Commenter encouraged planning for connectivity between the cycle track and bike facilities on 7th Avenue, 2nd Avenue and 4th Avenue. He requested the DAC know more about those connections because it would impact where the cycle track should be located.

Martin requested that the City comes back to the DAC with some comments about how these concepts would impact businesses in terms of loss of parking and access to businesses and residences.

Next Steps

Penny outlined the next steps for the project team. They will refine specifics within the Sidewalk Concept, bring the concept to the community roundtables for feedback, and come to the DAC with revisions. They will also have time at the next DAC meeting on August 25 to discuss parking management strategies.