

## Westlake Cycle Track Design Advisory Committee Meeting #4 Summary

Monday, June 9, 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	Present
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
- Mike Estey
- Barbara Lee
- Mary Rutherford

#### Office of Economic Development

- James Kelly

#### EnviroIssues

- Penny Mabie
- David Gitlin
- Sara Colling

#### Toole Design Group

- Kristen Lohse

### Observers

- Arden Wilken
- Vicki Workman
- Max Taran
- Tim Ratcliffe
- Emily Kathrein
- Robin Randels
- Paul Sittemes
- Deb Otto
- David Keller
- Wendy Wheller
- Natalie Dauch
- LeAnn Byrum
- Pamela Hale
- Mike Hendrix
- Haley Woods
- Bill Wiginton
- Jerry Dinndorf

- Jack Wilken
- Marilyn Perry
- Phil Bannon
- Brock Howell

**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 (DAC) members.*

## **Welcome and introductions**

Penny Mabie, facilitator, welcomed the Design Advisory Committee (DAC) and audience members and led a round of introductions. She reminded the committee of the DAC purpose to provide SDOT with input on bike facility design.

## **Review of meeting summary #3B**

Penny then called the members' attention to the meeting #3B summary and asked if they considered it final. 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.

- Thomas Goldstein, Cascade Bicycle Club, reported he attended the open house and found it informative. He spoke with people who care passionately about the corridor.
- Sarah McGray, Bicycle interests, reported she also attended the open house and had constructive conversations with community members around the small map tables. She saw people on both sides of the issue talking with each other. Outside of the open house, she has seen more and more bike commuters coming into her workplace at South Lake Union now that the weather has improved. Sarah has heard people express an interest in biking during the winter if they had a flat space to bike because Dexter Avenue feels risky in the rain.
- Martha Aldridge, Lake Union Park users, had nothing to report.
- John Meyer, Air/water transportation/tourism, reported his constituents want to know how the project will work for the Westlake community and people who bike.
- Martin Nelson, Westlake Stakeholders Group, said he agreed that the open house was an excellent public meeting. The biggest issue his constituents are concerned about is the development projects on the west side of Westlake that are both north and south of National Sign. The projects are large residential developments with fewer parking stalls than living units provided. He reported the Department of Planning and Development has no requirements with regard to residential units and parking.
- Cam Strong, Westlake Stakeholders Group, reported attending the open house and thought it

was well organized. He was impressed with the process both at the stations and during the question and answer session. He is hearing concerns with how SDOT will document all the comments and whether the comments will be available for review. He also reported there should be a list of considered designs and if something is taken off the table, it should be reflected within the public process.

- Dave Chappelle, Lake Union floating home and live-aboard residents, agreed that it was a great open house and a win all around. He said it is too bad that didn't happen months ago but it was positive nonetheless. He reported the neighborhood continues to be creative with suggesting potential solutions such as increasing the size of the Chesiahud Trail so that it serves as multiuse. Another idea is an elevated track that could include both cycling and pedestrians.
- Warren Aakervik, Freight interests, reported it is frustrating to hear concepts A and B aren't being used anymore. The main interest of freight is smooth flow of traffic. Westlake Ave N is going to be one of the only major arterials.
- Peter Schrappen, Lake Union marina operators and boat moorage tenants, reported he was also impressed with the open house. Peter heard Mayor Murray on the radio reiterate what he said on the campaign trail that he wants to get away from siloed planning and move toward a more integrated, comprehensive approach. He also attended the Mayor's maritime summit where the mayor expressed the importance of the maritime industry.
- Devor Barton, Pedestrian interests, reported he found the open house constructive. He had two takeaways. First, he heard from people who live and work in the corridor that they would be happy to turn the delivery access lane into a bike path. The lane isn't currently serving its purpose. Second, the main parking complaint was that many people park in the corridor but don't live and work in the corridor and the parking area can be managed more effectively.
- Karen Braitmayer, Westlake Avenue North business owners, reported she had a similar experience at the open house. She hears from people who need better ADA accessible parking. They are concerned that compliant accessible parking is included within the parking area changes in some proportion. There seems to be a general trend towards placing parking between cars and bikes where it's not safe to open a car door and unload on either side.
- Amalia Leighton, Transportation Engineer, reported she had a disappointing open house experience. As a volunteer, she didn't appreciate being yelled at. Some people in blue shirts were rude which was unfortunate because she was trying to solicit information to get a better understanding of the situation. What she heard is that parking is a huge concern and that if the parking can be better managed, people could be comfortable with the bike facility.
- Andrew Austin, Non-vehicular commuters, reported he heard a lot about safety at the open house. He recently had a conversation with a Metro bus driver who drives the Dexter and Westlake routes. The driver said the scariest part of driving is dealing with heavy bus and bike interactions, and she loves the idea of a separated bike facility for safety.

- Sam Woods, SDOT project manager, reported standing next to the boards at the open house that showed which options were considered but eliminated. She conversed with people in blue shirts and found everyone to be respectful.
- Martin asked Andrew to introduce himself.
  - o Andrew said he has missed a few DAC meetings but he was at the initial March 23 meeting.

## **SDOT introduces potential community roundtables**

Dawn Schellenberg, SDOT communications lead, noted SDOT is compiling the comments from the open house. A comment summary and the full compilation of comments will be available online and presented at the June 23 DAC meeting.

Dawn then referred to the handout on community roundtables. The idea for holding community roundtables resulted from Dawn and Sam attending a South Lake Union Community Council meeting. Jerry Dinndorf, who manages the AGC building, wanted to meet with stakeholders to discuss their particular area around the AGC building. SDOT thought two or three other areas around the corridor might be of interest for local neighbors and people who walk or bike the corridor together to give feedback on their particular segment. SDOT wouldn't bring designs to the roundtables; they would collect feedback on area-specific details and potential solutions to bring to the DAC for consideration.

Dawn said the AGC area and the north end of the corridor at Driveway 14 come to mind as potential roundtable locations. They would find a leader within each location who could host and invite recommended stakeholders. The DAC members would be invited to each as well, but they are not required to attend. In terms of timeline, the DAC schedule has an optional meeting on July 14, so these roundtables could take the place of that meeting and not change the overall DAC meeting timeline. Dawn asked the DAC what they think about the idea and whether to move forward.

- Sarah said she sees value in having smaller dialogues. She asked how SDOT would identify the people who move through the space. She bikes the corridor everyday but it could be challenging to identify others who really understand the area.
  - o Dawn said the roundtables would be small groups – about 20 people and they were hoping to ask DAC members for ideas on who to identify.
- Thomas said he finds the idea interesting but has heard this could sound like “sustained ambiguity.” He suggested the DAC do a full length walking tour with Toole and the City to assess problems and solutions first hand.
- Karen said she has a colleague who bikes regularly but chooses Dexter over Westlake because of safety. They could be someone to participate.

Penny asked the DAC if these roundtables would be of value as they move forward into design concepts.

- Martin said the more input, the better the design.
- Cam noted he has felt a burden to continue to speak up on behalf of his constituents. It would

help to have the DAC members walk through the area and talk with people. He agrees with the roundtable idea as well. It would help achieve a better understanding of nuances.

- The DAC members agreed that the roundtable idea is worth pursuing.
- Sarah noted it may be difficult to maintain proportionate representation from bike commuters and pedestrians. She agrees with the idea but would want participations from bike and pedestrian users.
- Andrew asked Dawn what the specific goals of the roundtable are.
  - o Dawn explained that they want to talk with people who know the area well either by commuting through or working/living nearby. They want to learn more about the details and challenges of particular segments.
    - Andrew said that makes sense and noted there are potential users that aren't using Westlake right now.
    - Devor suggested identifying potential participants by looking through comments received from the public so far. He would also be willing to flyer within the corridor.
  - o Thomas expressed concern that sometimes there is too much ambiguity. He would prefer to have design options so that they don't end up with endless possibilities.
  - o Amalia said she would prefer to do the field visit. People could potentially ride a bike or be in a wheelchair to see how it feels from a different perspective. 5 pm would be a good time when a lot of people are out. Doing both the walking tour and the roundtables seems like too much.
    - Dawn clarified that DAC members are invited but not required to attend the roundtables. She said a combination of a walk through and a roundtable is a possibility.
    - Amalia said she would prefer the walk through because talking at a table doesn't necessarily work.
- Penny asked the committee if they all had interest in a walking tour instead of meeting on July 14 starting at 5 PM.
  - o The DAC members agreed.
    - Thomas asked if Toole could propose solutions. A menu might be helpful for guidance.
      - Penny said the schedule is to bring potential solutions to the meeting on July 24.
    - Cam added that Argosy had offered to take the DAC along the waterfront in a boat. They could walk one way and take the boat back – rather than walking both ways.
      - Penny said they could consider that and confirmed the DAC members would meet at MOHAI at 5 PM and walk north.
- Penny then asked if anyone objected to the roundtable idea and the DAC members had no objections.

- Dawn summarized they would do a DAC tour and roundtables at a couple locations.

## **SDOT parking information presentation**

Sam introduced the parking presentation saying SDOT recognizes parking as a very important issue for this project. The project will have an impact on parking and there has been constructive dialogue to minimize those impacts. Regardless, there are parking needs that aren't being met currently in the corridor that the committee can discuss at today's meeting.

Mike Estey, SDOT Parking Operations & Traffic Permits manager, began the presentation by outlining a typical city block which includes transit, driveways, loading zones, bike lanes/sharrows, sight distance issues and access to nearby parking, with about 5-10 parking spaces per block face. He then listed Westlake's corridor characteristics which are similar to a typical city block but has more seasonal demand fluctuations, dumpsters in the right-of-way, limited access to off-street or nearby parking and about 33 parking spaces per block face. Westlake also has more parking density within the public right-of-way than a typical block.

Mike then outlined the parking history of the corridor starting in 2005 when the City collaborated with the Westlake Parking Advisory Group in revising the proposed Parking Management Plan. In 2006, SDOT held open houses on the revised plan and from December 2006 through July 2007, SDOT participated in 13 meetings with Westlake Parking Advisory Group. The plan was finalized in 2007 and implemented in 2008.

In November 2010, the Seattle City Council amended the Seattle Municipal Code to set rates to reach specific space availability objectives. SDOT began collecting more parking management data and made changes annually. Because the Westlake corridor wasn't reaching target occupancy in successive years, SDOT dropped the parking rates in 2011 from \$1.50/hour to \$1.00/hour and extended time limits in 2012 to all-day. The 2013 data reflected that Westlake occupancy is within the target range of 70-85%.

- Martin asked if the data is collected through money collected or physical counts.
  - Mike responded the data is collected through physical counts on an hourly basis on one day.
- Karen asked if they are using target percentages or number of spaces available.
  - Mike answered they use percentages with a 70-85% target occupancy in all paid areas of the city, including Westlake.
- Cam pointed out it is important to note that this parking survey is only looking at paid parking on the east side of the lot. It doesn't include all parking.
- Thomas asked about how many free spaces are one third of a mile from South Lake Union and 1.2 miles from downtown.
  - Mike responded there are 800 free in the corridor – hard to know how many more nearby, such as up Queen Anne.
    - Thomas noted there is probably no other place so close to downtown that has that many free spaces. They need to think about how to provide parking for key

stakeholders in the area. There is no parking scarcity beyond what is created.

- Andrew asked if the unpaid spaces were factored into the analysis.
  - o Mike responded they primarily analyze paid areas because they have trouble funding data collection beyond paid areas. They are looking at ways to incorporate unpaid spaces in future years of data collection.
- Amalia clarified that the Westlake paid parking signs say 9 AM – 4 PM, \$1/hour with no restrictions.
  - o Mike responded yes, it is 9 AM – 4 PM rather than the standard 8 AM – 6 PM.
- Martin asked if the parking is surveyed section by section or overall.
  - o Mike responded both; they count every space in the corridor and separate it by section. For average peak occupancy, they look at the three highest hours of occupancy throughout the paid spaces of the overall corridor.

Mike resumed the presentation, noting that in July they are planning to implement four-hour time limits south of AGC/Starbucks. He listed the curb space prioritization the City outlines in their Parking Comprehensive Plan:

1. Transit
  2. Loading: passenger and commercial
  3. Short-term visitor, customer parking
  4. Shared vehicles
  5. Vehicle capacity
- John asked if the four hour limits will apply to just paid parking and not free parking.
    - o Mike responded it just applies to paid parking but they could be open to discussion about restricting free parking.
      - John noted the parking problem will move further north. They need a comprehensive plan throughout the whole corridor.
  - Warren said transit stops should be included for people parking on Westlake and taking transit. He also noted that handicap spaces weren't included.
    - o Mike said ADA accessible spaces are a requirement rather than a priority.
      - Warren added that transit stops and signalization locations should be included in the analysis.
  - Dave asked for more explanation about Restricted Parking Zone (RPZ) permits.
    - o Mike said people with RPZ permits can park in any space along the corridor. SDOT has issued about 250 RPZ permits in the area. The 2014 data didn't show any RPZ parkers in the paid areas.
  - Dave asked if there are predicted modifications to parking, if SDOT could make parking changes proactively before the cycle track is built.
    - o Mike said the second part of the presentation should add clarity.
  - Penny asked that the members consider the priorities for parking in the corridor rather than solutions at this point in the meeting.

- Amalia verified that the 250 RPZ permits include guests and are typically for houseboats and liveaboards.
- Cam commented that the free parking came into the parking management plan as a solution for people who moor boats on Westlake and are gone for a day or more. Another group to consider is the repair shops with people coming in and out throughout the day. He spoke with the manager of Shilshole marina who said they do follow the City of Seattle ordinance that says there needs to be one parking space for every two slips. Shilshole enforces that with parking passes. (City of Seattle note: the Shilshole marina parking is owned and operated by the Port of Seattle and that parking is not regulated by the City of Seattle.)
- Thomas asked John if he would want an RPZ permit for his business.
  - o John responded that he doesn't think he would need that and he doesn't think it's possible for customers.
- Andrew said he is interested in the unpaid spaces. He would want to know what percentage are driving to Westlake, leaving their vehicle, and then busing downtown which doesn't seem to be the best use for the waterfront or community. From a planning perspective it's not great either. He asked what percentage of parking would open up if there were stricter time limits.
  - o Mike responded that in a couple years of analysis, the paid parking in Westlake was 40-50% full. They found that paid parking duration is longer in the south end, but toward the north end there is more turnover. To figure out when people arrive and where they go would require an intercept study.
- Amalia asked about boat moorage and how they could get an RPZ.
  - o Martin said they would use their mailing address on the corridor.
  - o Mike said moorage tenants aren't eligible for RPZs because they aren't residents. They have had discussions about businesses getting RPZs but that entails a strict criteria as defined by the City Council in the Seattle Municipal Code, and that Westlake would likely not qualify based upon those criteria.
  - o Martin said that liveaboards applying for RPZ permits would need certification by the marina.
- Martin commented that no one would park in paid parking if they could park in free parking, so the free parking must be 100% full. When calculating the parking occupancy, the free parking would change the occupancy rate to over 95%.
  - o Mike said the 70-85% target occupancy is an appropriate range to manage to for paid or free parking, but that it is the specific paid parking occupancy that is written into the Seattle Municipal Code as a goal to determine whether or not to change parking rates.
    - Amalia added that Westlake is a long corridor so while there might be open spots, someone could choose to look for paid parking in front of one business rather than choose the free parking out of convenience.
- Andrew asked how far would someone have to travel to find another 1,000 spots that are unpaid.
  - o Mike responded Queen Anne would likely be the closest.

Penny asked the group to list out who uses the parking on Westlake. She recorded responses on a whiteboard such as: Residents; boat owners; customers; deliveries; guests; employees (retail and marine); tourists; mobile marine and residential services; contractors; park and ride; construction workers; and construction projects on the corridor. Penny then asked whether the curb space priorities listed in the City's Comprehensive Plan make sense or are missing something.

- Mike said if residents were included in the Comprehensive Plan's on-street parking criteria they would probably fall between the third and fourth priority.
- Karen said it is a big picture list but it is not applicable because it assumes there is somewhere else to park.

Penny asked the committee whether the list changes depending on where you are in the corridor. The committee said yes. Penny asked them to think in the big picture about their top three priorities.

- Martin said boat owners would be one.
- Martha said deliveries should be added to the list.
- Cam said to add water dependent businesses.
  - o Penny asked for clarification on how that is different than customers.
    - Cam responded that water dependent businesses can only function in this corridor. It includes employees, customers and loading. It's a category of businesses unique to the area and can't go anywhere else.
- Dave added that an example of a service is a diver with flotation devices doing repairs. They generally come in by truck but one comes in by boat.
  - o Cam said businesses share those services as well.
- Dave said residents should be prioritized because floating homes can't move.
- Devor thought customers and boat owners could be combined. He didn't see any on the list that could be ignored.
  - o Penny clarified that the exercise is not to ignore but to prioritize.
  - o Karen said she agrees with Devor that these uses shouldn't be made to compete. Everyone coming to the corridor has a reason to be there, aside from those who use the corridor as a park and ride. She thinks shorter turnover spaces could be prioritized. They could look at how to get more people to use the spaces that are there.
    - Penny asked Karen to hold that idea for later in the meeting.
  - o Sarah said she agrees that all the users have reasons to be there. Another example of a unique use is the massage therapist who carries her table to her business.
    - Penny clarified this is just an informative conversation to set up the next discussion.
- Warren noted boat owners come with guests as well.
- Andrew commented that downtown-goers, South Lake Union-goers and construction commuters should not be prioritized.
- Peter said marinas are the lynchpin of the working waterfront.
- Devor agreed with Andrew that park and riders don't need to be prioritized.

- Thomas commented that the free parking needs to be studied as well. It is not serving anyone.
  - o Cam agreed with Thomas and said they need to see the data.

After a break, Penny introduced the next part of the meeting saying that much of the focus has been on parking supply but that parking demand can be managed as well to maximize parking use. She pointed out the two-page handout summarizing key parking results from the Business and Resident online survey conducted earlier in the year.

- Cam noted that survey does not include moorage tenants.
  - o Amalia verified that moorage tenants are short term tenants who are not eligible for RPZ permits.

Mike began the presentation outlining parking management tools that help maximize parking use including time limits, paid parking, loading zones (both passenger and commercial) and residential parking zones. He listed other concepts as well including, partnering with parking garages, smart phone parking apps and employee commute reduction programs. He then opened up the discussion to the DAC to consider potential solutions for Westlake.

- Amalia asked about parking enforcement in the load zones and in the paid parking.
  - o Mike responded that the Seattle Police Department tend to patrol areas with lower time limits more frequently. He doesn't know how often the SPD is actually on Westlake. Enforcing load zones is a challenge – they tend to be self-regulating.
- Dave commented that a lot of houseboat owners don't buy RPZ permits. They park on the east side and can go years without a ticket because it's not monitored. He said people generally respect the accessible parking and loading zones.
- Thomas said they had a radical parking rezone in Columbia City. He was dubious of the plan but has been impressed with how the parking management is working.
  - o Mike responded SDOT has RPZ close to the light rail stops and SPD can use cameras attached to vehicles to enforce those effectively.
    - Warren said the enforcement in Ballard is effective and profitable for the city.
- Karen said she has talked with immediate business neighbors and most of them have been there awhile and enjoyed the free parking. They do recognize that the free parking probably won't last long. They would rather be able to pay for parking spaces for themselves and their employees and know there's parking available than maintain the free parking. She would be in favor of business RPZs on the corridor.
- Penny asked Karen and Cam to share their suggestions from earlier in the meeting.
  - o Karen shared her suggestion to create more short-term turnover to get a greater number of cars in and out of the lot.
  - o Cam shared his suggestion to create a parking pass for moorage tenants who are gone for a few days or weeks at a time – similar to the Shilshole marina.
- Warren asked if businesses could get RPZ permits that they can transfer to customers.

- Mike said that City Council did establish criteria for business RPZ permits. To qualify, there has to be enough paid parking available and few competing needs for parking. Montlake Elementary School is an example. Westlake is highly occupied and has competing demands so it would probably not qualify. That doesn't mean they can't continue that conversation however.
  - Amalia asked if it were just marine businesses, would that classify as a special use.
    - Mike said they'd have to figure that out.
    - Amalia commented that parking is not being used to businesses' best interest – 800 unpaid stalls is not working.
  - Martin noted to keep Kenmore Air in mind. That could be a situation where a business RPZ is appropriate. Kenmore Air brings in revenue to the city.
- Karen asked if there is an exercise to see if all the parking were paid in some way with the opportunity to purchase longer term passes that are unique to neighborhood situations. She would consider helping her employees pay for parking and there are other businesses that might as well.

Penny noted the committee identified some of the groups they listed earlier in the meeting. Now the question is who is prioritized in the corridor to make sure needs are met.

- Thomas said he agrees with Karen. He doesn't want parking holding everything else hostage. If there has to be an ordinance, maybe the DAC could help leverage it together.
- Sarah said she is interested in seeing a map of hours of use, locations of use and days of use – recognizing there would be variation. It would be interesting to see how those patterns overlap. It could be they are making assumptions that aren't there.
- Amalia verified that the area is technically public right-of-way so even with RPZs, cars aren't allowed to stay more than 72 hours.

Penny summarized that the committee brainstormed various solutions including permits for moorage tenants, business guest passes, businesses helping employees pay for parking, partnering with private lots and identifying specific needs. She asked Mike what the next steps would be.

- Mike said depending on what the needs are, it may make sense to have four-hour time limits. That could free up enough space to accommodate parking needs. He recognizes this is a high-priority need and the current conditions aren't working well so they will evaluate how to use these tools.
- Amalia asked if it were possible to complete a pilot parking project without going through the Seattle City Council.
  - Mike said it would be hard to do that in the short term. However, he could go back to City Council and ask for permission to try.
    - Amalia added there are a lot of active people here who would support that ask.

- Martin commented that at the beginning of the DAC process, the committee agreed to listen to public comment. It was brought to his attention that the public comment time isn't long enough so people can't comment on what is important to them. He thought every person should have an opportunity to speak.
  - o Penny responded that the DAC had agreed to a public comment period at each meeting but didn't specify a time. There wouldn't be time to hear from everyone in the audience but she asked if the DAC would be willing to stay an extra 15 minutes to hear public comment.
    - The DAC members agreed.

## **Observer Comments to DAC**

- Comment 1 – Commenter appreciated Karen's idea for businesses to offer passes. University of Washington has a program with transit passes and bike amenities. It wouldn't work for everyone but a similar programs along the corridor could help.
- Comment 2 – Commenter noted where there are lots, businesses routinely validate parking. One possibility is designing a phone app where businesses could validate short-term parking. The new developments might have parking available. Shared parking concepts should be considered.
- Comment 3 – A bicyclist commented that he sees a number of people walking from South Lake Union to their cars. In retail they focus on getting inventory off the floor quickly. The current parking situation is inefficient.
- Comment 4 – Commenter asked if the walkthrough in July is open to the public.
  - o Penny responded they will need to discuss but it would be difficult for everyone to hear in a large group.
- Comment 5 – A bicyclist who bikes through the corridor thanked SDOT for making this a priority. The meeting was more meaningful, productive, informative and cordial than she expected. She didn't realize the corridor had free parking and thinks that should be regulated.
- Comment 6 – Commenter said she got up early on May 28 to see how full the parking lot was. By 7 AM, every space was gone into Zone G and by 8 AM, parking was full up to Zone J. She followed some parkers and saw they are walking to South Lake Union. Others are parking and busing/biking. 1505 is a new building that should have adequate parking but some park on the east side and cross to the west side of Westlake Avenue N.
- Comment 7 – A cyclist finds the corridor dangerous and confusing. He was excited to see the community here and was encouraged by what he saw.
- Comment 8 – Commenter noted that there are virtually no “park and riders” on the north end of the corridor.
- Comment 9 – Commenter asked the DAC to consider big picture questions such as what are the best uses of limited public resources and what allocations provide the most benefits for the most people as well as the city.

- Comment 10 – Commenter asked what the City thinks is an acceptable loss of parking noting that is important for the committee to know.
- Comment 11 – Commenter suggested that if Westlake is considered a street, he proposes a 35 mph speed limit in the parking lot.
- Comment 12 – Commenter was encouraged to hear other people’s thoughts regarding Westlake parking. As a business owner, he sees people every day parking and then walking or biking to destinations other than Westlake. He supports the concept of paid parking throughout the corridor as a fair compromise. Once they eradicate nuisance parking, they might not have as much of a problem as they think.

### **Next Steps**

- Devor commented that the public can comment outside meetings as well and Penny agreed.
- Cam recommended to Mike that they refer this discussion to the Westlake Parking Management Workgroup. That workgroup has already spent two years working to prepare the Westlake Parking Management Plan, is knowledgeable of the unique parking issues for this area, and could take the time to explore some creative solutions to address the current problems at hand.

Penny listed next steps noting the next DAC meeting on June 23 covering feedback about the open house. The project team will also send out details about the walking tour on July 14.