

## WSG Comments on Existing Conditions & Design Criteria Memo from Toole Design – 2014-04-03

Page 1 – Paragraph 2 states “TDG has prepared 2 additional Memos” for the Traffic Circulation Study and Parking Utilization Study “with more in-depth documentation of existing conditions and analysis about vehicle, bicycle & pedestrian circulation and parking patterns that will influence the design of the cycle track.” Please provide the DAC with this source information.

Are the order of bulleted points in any specific order?

- If so, how was the order chosen?
- Is it correct to say that “safety” is the top concern?
  - Or are they all linear and that “parking and safe access to businesses” is as imp as the top bullet?
- Can you provide the DAC with data about the number of bicycle related injuries occurring in Westlake during each of the past 10 years?
  - We understand that that some go un-reported but we would like to know where are all starting from.

Page 2 – What is the source of the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) of 23,900 (per 2011 counts)? Is there more recent data? What is the projected traffic growth along Westlake Ave. N for the future?

This “Existing Conditions Section” should also include SDOT survey data showing the average daily usage of 124 bicycles per day and 150 pedestrians per day for this area.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence on page two states: “Improve a high use connector, meeting the City’s goal to build a network tht puts all residents within a quarter mile of a bike facility...” Does Dexter Ave N. meet that quarter-mile goal of the City?

Page 4 – The statement regarding 62% of the 1,271 parking spaces being unrestricted in terms of time limits and the hours of the spaces being metered from 9:00 am – 4:00 pm does not appear to have any relevance to the design of a cycle track. It should be noted that the current Westlake Parking Management Plan is the direct result of an 18 month engagement process in which SDOT partnered and jointly developed with the Westlake community.

Page 4 – The 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence description of the current land use is woefully inadequate and disregards the water based uses. We recommend the following information be incorporated into this section and the title broadened to say “Current Land and Water Uses” .....

Westlake Ave. N is a 1.2 mile long working waterfront and diverse water dependent community which is bordered by Lake Union to the east and a very steep hillside on west. The land use along this corridor supports the following:

**RESIDENTIAL USAGE**

- Approx. 65 Floating Homes
- Approx. 200 Live-a-board Vessels
- Condominiums & Apartments
- Visitors & Guests

**WATER DEPENDENT BUSINESSES USAGE**

- Approx. 20 Boat Dealerships & Brokerages
- Approx. 1200 Moorage slips
- Largest Float Plane Port in USA
- Large Charters & Tour Boats
- Large Kayak/ Paddle Board Center
- Approx. 45 Boat Repair Businesses
- Boat Lift-out Yards
- Marine Engine Repair
- Propeller Shop
- Shipwrights
- 300 Member Rowing club
- 19 Marinas
- Marine Electronics
- Marine Painting & Varnish Shops
- Fiberglass Repair
- Marine Custom Canvas
- Marine Surveyors
- Marine Financial/Insurance/Title
- Boat Signage
- Marine Fuel Dock
- Underwater Boat Repair & Maintenance Services
- 100 Member Dragon Boat Club

**NON-MARINE RELATED BUSINESS USAGE**

- 8 Restaurants & 2 Delicatessens
- Hotel
- Radio Station
- Fitness Centers
- Numerous Business Offices (wide variety)
- Sign Company
- 2 Banks
- Recycling Company
- Large Swimming Pool with Classes

Page 5 – The 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence under “Parking Lot Access” paragraph incorrectly states Galer Street as the only intersection providing western connectivity. This should state 8<sup>th</sup> Street, not Galer.

Page 6 - Figure 7 (labeled “Driveways, Street Ends and Crossings”) incorrectly shows 6 streets having a connection to Westlake. Since only one street 8<sup>th</sup> St. has a western connection to Westlake, this should be corrected.

Page 7 – The statement that “Peak Time is 4:30 – 5:30 pm weekday” does not appear to have any context or is supported. Copies of the “Traffic Circulation Study” should be provided to the DAC members.

Page 8 – The “one day” study of Local Ridership by TDG provides higher ridership data than the SDOT study. Please provide both the TDC & SDOT studies to the DAC membership so we can better understand these differences at a different meeting.

Page 9 – Please correct the following statement: “There are also raised crosswalks across the parking lot at these stops, to provide access to and from the east sidewalk”. There is actually only “one” raised crosswalk located at 8<sup>th</sup> street.

Page 9 – What is the relevance of the bus ridership for busses that transit through Westlake Ave. N to the design of the cycle track?

Page 11 – Please provide the DAC members copies of the following 2 documents which are referenced throughout this memo:

- American Association of Highway & Transportation Officials Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 2012
- Manual of Uniform Traffic Devices

Page 11 – The last paragraph states: “The City of Seattle has constructed a number of two way cycle tracks at 10 feet wide, the width of 2 bicycle lanes.” Please identify where these are located and provide images of the current structures.

What is the size of the Broadway Cycle Track? How long has the Broadway Cycle Track been in use? How successful was the design in achieving increased ridership? How has the local community responded to the Broadway Cycle Track now that it has been implemented?

Page 12 – “(Design Speed)” The 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph states “Research has documented that reductions in bicyclist design speeds and motorists’ turning speeds approaching intersections can improve safety” for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists.” Please provide the DAC with the research which is referenced in this statement.

Please provide the definitions of a “parallel buffered bike lanes” and a “trail-like facility” which are mentioned paragraph #4 on this page.

The list of other factors in paragraph # 5 on this page omits the following significant additional factors which should be included:

- Access to boats for 1200 moorage tenants and their guests
- Access of trucks and vans used by marine repair shop technicians
- Access of busses supporting cruise boats
- Access of fuel trucks for boats

The DAC needs to determine who this cycle track is intended to accommodate in order to be able to better consider which design features are relevant or not.

Page 15 – In the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph on this page, please provide a definition of a “major” vs. “minor street crossing” which are referenced here.

Page 19 – The “Parking Stall Size and Distribution Ratios” fail to discuss the specifications of space available to access the rear of a vehicle which abuts the side of

the cycle track. This is especially important for the 45 marine repair shops along the corridor (truck, van, and car). Also, please provide the specifications for how the marine repair shops will be accommodated with space to transport marine repair materials through the parking area to/from their shops and vehicles.

Page 20 – (Figure 13) Please discuss the space in the parking lot for transporting marine parts to/from a marine shop & vehicle (truck, van, car).

Page 22 – (Cycle Track Width Recommended Criteria). Why not consider an 8' width and have a few pull-over & passing locations in the corridor? Again, this raises the question “who is this cycle track being designed to accommodate”?

The last page does not have a number – (Attachment A Comparison of ULI, ITE and CPS Parking Space Standards and Westlake Cycle Track). Can someone explain this attachment?