



**Seattle
Design
Commission**

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

20 November 2003

Gregory J. Nickels,
Mayor

David Spiker
Chair

Charles Anderson

Pam Beyette

Frances Nelson

Iain M. Robertson

Nic Rossouw

Donald Royse

Sharon E. Sutton

Tory Laughlin Taylor

John Rahaim,
Executive Director

Layne Cubell,
Commission Coordinator

Projects Reviewed

DPD Planning Division
Southwest Library Addition
35th Anniversary Update
California Substation Site Plan
Southwest Community Center Expansion
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Project
Joint review by Design and Planning Commissions

Convened: 8:30am

Commissioners Present

David Spiker, Chair
Charles Anderson
Pam Beyette
Frances Nelson
Iain M. Robertson
Nic Rossouw
Donald Royse
Sharon E. Sutton
Tory Laughlin Taylor

Adjourned: 5:00pm

Staff Present

John Rahaim
Layne Cubell
Lisa Baker



Department of Planning and
Development

700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104-5070
phone 206/233-7911
fax 206/386-4039

printed on recycled paper

20 Nov 2003 Project: **DPD Planning Division**

Phase: Discussion

Previous Reviews: None

Presenter: John Rahaim

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00322)

Summary: The Commission discussed the changing organizational structure of the Planning Division at DPD and the future role of CityDesign and the Design Commission.

The Commission is primarily concerned in thinking about the future of CityDesign and the Design Commission that there continue to be a strong voice at DPD advocating for design. The Commission is open to a number of different solutions for the organization of the Planning Division, but believes that there should be a combination of autonomy and interaction between the different functions within the division. They feel that some level of autonomy of the different functions is important in order to bring private voices into the public sector process and to allow ideas to well up and be fostered within each function before they are integrated into the larger division. They would like to see a map or organizational chart, then give more thought to the Commission's relationship to CityDesign and the Department of Planning and Development. and also the Commission's role and how it works in parallel with or in contrast to the Planning Commission. The Commission would also like to look at the relationship between the Design Commission and its staff within DPD and how the Commission will continue to meet its mandate. The Commission agrees that the new director of CityDesign should also be the new director of the Design Commission and wants to participate in the recruitment process. The Commission will continue this discussion at future meetings.

20 Nov 2003 Project: Southwest Library Addition

Phase: Design Development

Previous Review: 19 June 2003 (Schematic Design), 16 January 2003 (Scope Briefing)

Presenters: Rick Sundberg, Olson Sundberg Kundig Allen

Barbara Swift, Swift and Company

Justine Kim, Seattle Public Library

Attendees: Matthew Stennard, Olson Sundberg Kundig Allen

Dennis Ross, Community Member

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00099)

Action: The Commission thanks the team for the presentation and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- **The Design Commission feels that the civic scale of the building and the entry canopy are appropriate as designed;**
- **notes that the modulation and scale of the interior spaces are working successfully;**
- **feels that the design has successfully integrated the building addition and the arcade into the existing structure;**
- **appreciates the more direct entry treatment on 35th which now includes stairs from the sidewalk;**
- **encourages the team to continue to study the integration of parking into the neighborhood and urges the team to protect the integrity of the landscape design along Henderson St if angled parking is added;**
- **encourages the team to continue work on the integration of the art with the building and the entry procession;**
- **feels it is important that there be adequate space given to the landscape in light of the large amount of impervious surface on this site;**
- **and recommends approval of design development.**

This project involves remodeling and adding on to the existing brick and steel library building which was built in 1961, or 1962. The addition will double the size of the library. The team has met with the community and with the Library Board to review this project. The primary concern raised at the community meetings has been parking.

A one story addition will wrap the existing building while a second story will also be added above. The back of house operations will be split between the two floors of the library. A multi-purpose room will be located on the 2nd floor and will be able to be used independently of the rest of the library.

An arcade structure will extend from the front of the library across the parking lot and over the parking lot entrance. The arcade will be a large steel framed structure that will be a dark color, but not black. The underside of the canopy will be finished with wood panels.

The existing library building steps down in scale to meet the adjacent residential buildings. The new addition and the arcade will step up the scale of the building along 35th Ave in order to create an appropriate civic presence.

A two story vestibule will wrap around the book drop. Visitors will pass from the vestibule under a bridge and into the main space. The circulation and reference desks will be located at the entrance to the main space. The designers are investigating the shape of the reference desks and are trying to develop a

form that receives visitors rather than thrusting them away.

To the left, when entering the library, will be the children's area which will be the most colorful area in the library and will include two-story bay windows. The designers would like to create a range of moods in the library not just a distinction between children's and adult's areas. A series of teen lounge spaces will be located along the back wall of the library. All of the lounge spaces except one will be able to be closed off from the rest of the library. This will allow teens in the lounges to have conversations without disturbing the rest of the library.

Currently windows in the Library are too high to see out of. The design team would like to lower as many of these windows as possible. They will use three foot high book cases under all lowered windows instead of full height stacks. Lowering the windows would make the library space more pleasant and would also reduce vandalism of cars in the adjacent parking lot.

The librarian's office and staff work room will be located on the 2nd floor of the building. The break room will be cantilevered out from the rest of the building. A multi-purpose auditorium will also be on the second floor of the building. Glazing in the staff work room and the multi-purpose room will allow staff to supervise the multi-purpose space if necessary.

As the design has been developed the volume of the buildings has increased and there have been more opportunities to bring daylight into the building. The team is treating the building as a LEED project, but will not actually get certification due to budget constraints.

The team is considering using panelized carbonized bamboo as an interior finish, they have not decided definitely on the material but want it to give the space a warm feeling. The team has been investigating using a translucent material on the roof overhangs. They found that the deep overhangs were compromising the daylighting strategies for the buildings. The main space will be day-lit by a series of baffled skylights. The design team is being extremely sensitive to potential glare issues on computer screens as they develop these skylights.

The roof plane of the existing building will be removed over the central area only in order to create a double height space. In all other areas the roof plane of the existing building will be maintained. A raised floor will accommodate mechanical systems as well as electrical and computer wiring.

The team is working with an engineer to develop opportunities for adding parking to the site. One possibility would be to add diagonal parking along Henderson St. This option would add a net of four more stalls, but would eliminate the landscape buffer along the street. Currently there is not money in the budget for this diagonal parking.

There will be many opportunities for visitors to see through the building and out into the surrounding landscape. Looking north across Henderson St from the library there is an unattractive commercial property. The proposed landscaping would create two layers of trees that would screen this view. This layering will create the illusion of depth in what is actually a very narrow landscaped area. The landscaping will also be used to help distinguish the library from the large homogeneous neighborhood in which it is located. New landscaping will supplement existing crabapple trees whose horizontal quality helps mark the building entrance. The design team would like to extend the existing low wall around the corner of the site.

The artist working on this project, Katherine Kerr, wants to enhance the open and welcoming quality of the library. She is working with hands cast in bronze, with open palms as a universal gesture of welcome. The hands will be life sized casts of community members hands and will be holding objects which are precious to the community. The hands will be integrated with the columns of the entrance canopy and will help enhance the processional nature of this space. The artist was interested in using a black patina

on the hands, but the Library Board has requested a natural bronze finish which would not be as somber. Granite pieces in the paving which will run from column to column will reinforce the hands with fragments of text.

Key Visitor Comments and Concerns

- Notes that the interior and exterior have been very well received by the community.
- States that the community has continued concerns about the number of parking spaces being provided. Would like the Design Commission to support the angled parking option on Henderson St.
- Notes that in the study of parking there was a flaw in the discussion of the existing bus routes. There is only one bus (route 21) that stops at the closest bus stop to the library. The other bus (route 54) stops 1-1/2 blocks away. The buses only serve the community along the 35th corridor. The rest of the community is not served by public transportation. In the current scheme 40 cars will need to park on the street.
 - Proponents explained that a drop off area on 35th will provide short term parking for four cars. They noted that people currently use the parking lot when they are dropping off books.

Key Visitor Comments and Concerns

- Questions if there is an existing parking spot for people who are dropping off books.
 - Proponents stated that currently there are not spaces dedicated for this purpose. They added that currently the on street parking is not timed. They explained that they are working to make the on street parking adjacent to the library timed at an interval that will suit library patrons. They noted that currently many on-street spaces are being used by people who park there and then ride the bus downtown.
- Questions if there will need to be additional columns added to the building.
 - Proponents stated that a new row of columns will need to be added to the building. They explained that these columns will be on the same spacing as the original columns.
- Questions what the width of the bridge connecting to the multi-purpose room will be.
 - Proponents stated that it will be five feet wide.
- Wonders if all of the hands in the art piece will be mounted at the same height.
 - Proponents stated that they want the piece to be accessible to children and disabled people. They explained that they will either mount the hands at varying heights, or mount all of the hands at a height that is accessible to everyone.
- Feels that the scale of the new building is very good. Notes that the tall canopy enhances the scale of the building.
- Wonders if the tree that is shown under the canopy will remain.
 - Proponents stated that this tree will remain. They noted that the community is very attached to this tree.
- Thanks the team for modulating the interior space of the building rather than creating one homogeneous space.
- Feels that the sectional transitions successfully blend the three components of the building (the existing building, new addition, and canopy) together.

- Doesn't feel that the Commission has enough information to weigh in on the parking issue. Notes that there are other forms of transportation than bus or car. Adds that it will be important to provide a bike rack in order to encourage people to bike to the library.
- Agrees with the community that there is not enough parking. Notes that from personal experience there is not enough parking in this area.
- Wonders what the sidewalk is like adjacent to the potential diagonal parking.
 - Proponents explained that the existing sidewalk is very wide, possibly too wide. They added that if the diagonal parking is pursued the sidewalk would become extremely narrow.
 - Proponents explained that they need to report back to the Library Board about the parking issue. They noted that this option would only gain a net of four spaces. They further explained that the Board will need to determine if this project is worthwhile given the gain of so few spaces.
- Feels that a lot could be accomplished through the proposed regulation of on-street parking.
- Is disappointed in the art. Notes that it seems un-integrated and just applied to the building. Adds that the paving component of the art seems to work well. Questions if a different column shape could be used to better accommodate the art.
 - Proponents explained that they have just started meeting with the artist about mounting options.
- Agrees that the paving component of the art is critical in marking the presence of the art. Notes that this ties together the whole section of the arcade as part of the art.
- Wonders if the columns can change somehow in response to the art.
- Likes the idea of combining civic scale and intimacy through the incorporation of art into the canopy. Notes that the arcade operates on the civic scale while the scale of the art is more intimate
- Notes that the materials being presented do not do the art justice. Has seen some pieces in person and feels they are much more effective. Explains that the eight hands are all casts of community member's hands and that people touching the hands will add to the patina.

20 Nov 2003 Project: **Design Commission 35th Anniversary Update**

Phase: Discussion with staff

Presenters: Layne Cubell, Design Commission Coordinator, CityDesign
Kathy Dockins, CityDesign

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00310)

Summary: **The Commission discussed with staff the upcoming Design Commission 35th Anniversary event. They reviewed the agenda and speakers as well as the invitation list. The Mayor will attend the event during the awarding of letters of recommendation. The Commission suggested a book be compiled with comments from past Commissioners and that printed materials uncovered by staff in the office archives be put on display at the event to help explain the work of previous Commissions.**

20 November 2003 Commission Business

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|--|
| ACTION ITEMS | A. | <u>TIMESHEETS</u> |
| | B. | <u>MINUTES FROM 6 NOVEMBER 2003</u> - APPROVED |
| DISCUSSION ITEMS | C. | <u>DC RETREAT 2004</u> - CUBELL |
| | D. | <u>PROJECT UPDATES</u> - CUBELL |
| | E. | <u>OUTSIDE COMMITMENTS UPDATE</u> - ALL |
| ANNOUNCEMENTS | F. | <u>“SUSTAINABLE CONNECTIONS” RECEPTION</u> - Nov 20 TH , 5-7PM, CITY SPACE |
| | G. | <u>DESIGN COMMISSION 35TH ANNIVERSARY</u> - DEC 4 TH , 2-4 PM, CITY HALL |
| | H. | <u>ARCADE RELEASE</u> – PETER MILLER BOOKS, DEC 4 TH 5:30-7:30 PM |

20 Nov 2003 Project: **California Substation Site Plan**

Phase: Concept Design

Previous Reviews: None

Presenters: Susanne Friedman, Parks and Recreation
 Matt Appleby, Koppe Wagoner Architects

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00296)

Action: **The Commission appreciates the presentation about the relationship between the park site plan and the building and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Design Commission will defer comments about the design of the building to the Landmarks Board;**
- **agrees with the community's selection of concept A as the preferred scheme rather than concept B since it does not separate out a play area;**
- **also agrees with the community that it would be unfortunate to pave more of the site for parking;**
- **is concerned about the idea of the art in the park being something that is also functional and asks the team to further consider the integration of art;**
- **agrees with the idea of paving the area at the SE which has PCB contamination underneath;**
- **agrees with the idea that the site should be made more visible from the street for security and safety reasons and feels that removing the hedge makes sense;**
- **acknowledges that there are few other choices for distributing the activities on the site, other than what the team is presenting;**
- **takes the layout presented as a diagrammatic concept, rather than as a defined or final shape for the paved and landscape areas;**
- **asks the team to look at vehicular access for service vehicles to the building;**
- **encourages the team to look at how the handicap access ramp could be integrated more fully to the mutual benefit of other park elements and to give a gracious entry to the site;**
- **Asks the team to consider screening as they develop the landscape to the north where there are adjacent houses and to the west along the alley where there are houses across the street;**
- **and recommends approval of concept design.**

This project is being seen concurrently by the Design Commission and the Landmarks Board. The team has already received feedback from the Landmarks Board on the building re-use design. The site of this project is three blocks north of the West Seattle Junction. The site is located on the corner of California Ave SW and SW Dakota St. This project is funded through the Pro Parks Levy. The idea for this park came from the neighborhood plan developed by Friends of the Junction. The Pro Parks Levy specified that the funding for this park was to acquire the site, develop the park site as public open space, and develop the building for community use.

The building was built in 1928 by Puget Sound and Power. The Department of Parks and Recreation is currently in the process of acquiring the site from Seattle City Light. The building has been out of use

since the 70's. The site is located within a neighborhood residential district, along a spine of neighborhood commercial development. The building was designed to fit in with the character of the adjacent neighborhood.

After studying the feasibility of upgrading the building to current seismic and other code requirements it was determined that the levy funding would cover either the park, or the building. The community has decided to pursue work on the building as it will be easier to seek other funding for the park. The park will be developed through schematic design in order to allow the community to seek additional grant funding, but construction documents and construction will not be completed.

The building will be programmed similar to the Parks' shelter houses. There will be some scheduled activities such as teen or senior classes, but most of the time, the building will be able to be rented by members of the community.

Currently there are very few access doors into the building. In order to make the building more usable it will need to be made ADA accessible and more light will need to be brought into the building. The wrought iron fence at the front of the building will be maintained. The loading dock will be adapted into an ADA accessible entrance. The two interior bays of the building will be gutted. The team is investigating whether they will refurbish or replace the existing windows. They would have liked to replace a pair of metal doors with a new vent, but the Landmarks Board wanted these doors to be preserved. The team had proposed replacing the doors with vents in order to avoid needing a roof top mechanical unit on this building. The Landmarks board did not feel that a rooftop unit would conflict with the building parapet. The changes to the building will be to the west façade only which is not visible from the street. The team would like to find new windows that match the existing windows. The Landmarks Board supports this approach.

The community had a long wish list of items for this park. Because of the size of this park it will need to be relatively simple. Both design schemes include hardscape outside of the main doors to the building, and some screening elements between the park and the alley. In addition to the paved area outside of the building scheme B includes a play area, an open space, and some parking. Scheme A includes a larger open space and some parking, but no dedicated play area. The community preferred scheme A because they felt that the play area in the other scheme cut the paved area off from the open space. Rather than a structured play area the community would like a sculptural element in the park that kids can also play on.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know if the interior space is needed by the parks department.
 - Proponents explained that the parks department would actually prefer not to have a building of this size, but the community feels strongly that they want this building.
- Wonders what elements outside of the building are included in the current funding.
 - Proponents stated that the ADA access and required egress will be funded. They also noted that money from the general fund will be used to develop the concept for the park.
- Questions if there is money for art in this project.
 - Proponents explained that this project will not get 1% funding for the arts.
- Wonders if parking will be included on the site.
 - Proponents explained that they are still trying to determine the zoning classification for this project. Depending on how the use is interpreted there would be different parking requirements. They noted that the community is not in favor of having parking on this

site.

- Questions if there will be eyes on the park.
 - Proponents stated that there is currently a 15 foot hedge to the east of the site which blocks visibility. They explained that they are planning on removing this hedge and a portion of the retaining wall to increase visibility. They noted that only a portion of the retaining wall is designated as an historic landmark, and that they will not be disturbing that portion of the wall.
- Is concerned that the site does not have an occupant because the building does not have a permanent use. Wonders how often there will be programmed activities in the building.
 - Proponents stated that they have been having conversations with an organization called Hyacinth, which is potentially interested in using this building for some of their activities.
- Wonders if the park will be maintained by the Parks Department.
 - Proponents stated that it would.
- Is concerned about art being used as play equipment.
 - Proponents explained that the community would like something like the whale tale or orcas at Seattle Center. They want to have art that kids don't need to stay off of.
- Questions if the existing landscaping will be maintained.
 - Proponents stated that it will be modified. They explained that a landscape architect is involved in this project and that they will be putting together a schematic design package that the community can use to find grant funding.
- Questions what the element being depicted on the west edge of the park along the alley is.
 - Proponents explained that it is some sort of arbor structure. They noted that they want to allow visibility into the park without being in the face of neighbors who are immediately adjacent to the park.
- Wonders if there is vehicular access to the building for service vehicles.
 - Proponents stated that they have not planned for service vehicle access.
- Suggests that at the location of the accessible ramp there could also be direct access with a stairs.
 - Proponents stated that building a stair in this area could involve disturbing an underground vault which would be very expensive.
 - Proponents noted that there was previously PCB contamination on this site which has been remediated. They noted that the hardscape is located over this area in accordance with park policy. They added that the ramp was carefully located to avoid disturbing any other contaminated areas.
- Questions how literal the shapes shown in the plan of the park are.
 - Proponents explained that the plan is very diagrammatic.
- Wonders if the bathrooms will be open when the park is closed.
 - Proponents stated that they are working to address this issue. They feel that it would be important to keep the bathrooms open.

20 Nov 2003 Project: Southwest Community Center Expansion

Phase: Design Development

Previous Reviews: 7 August 2003 (Schematic Design), 20 February 2003 (Scope Briefing)

Presenters: Debin Schliesman, Weinstein AU
Jon Mihkels, Weinstein AUAttendees: Toby Ressler, Parks and Recreation
Michael Dorcy, Department of Planning and Development

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00296)

Action: The Commission thanks the team for coming and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- **The Commission believes that the team has addressed the concerns that were raised at the last review about the link to the new gym and has not only created a gracious entry to the gym but also a better connection to the outside and the possibility of a concession stand in that area which is very well thought out;**
- **applauds the investigation of daylight versus glare in the gym, the addition of screened lightwells, and feels that it is going in the right direction;**
- **is concerned not with the design but with Parks' limited budget which is forcing the project team to pare the project back to the point where it may lose things that are essential to a quality building;**
- **agrees with the idea to maintain construction quality and daylighting as priorities in the face of budget restrictions and encourages the team to look at the structure they are creating for future improvements especially in terms of the circulation;**
- **encourages the Department of Parks and Recreation to continue to look at creative means of funding the essential elements of the project;**
- **is especially concerned that this project not be pared back to a sub-standard level of design in an area that is in need of public services, and also that what is being sacrificed not affect the accessibility of the building and the spirit of accessibility;**
- **and recommends approval of design development.**

This is the Design Commission's final review of this project. Design development has just been completed for this project and the team is in the process of reconciling the design with the cost estimate. Construction documents should be completed by early next year and construction should be complete by May 2005.

This project involves the expansion of the existing Southwest Community Center, which is located on Thistle St. Denny Middle School is immediately adjacent to the east of the community center and Sealth High School is immediately to the west. The existing building was built in 1974 as part of the Forward Thrust program and was designed by Ralph Anderson. The Parks department has acquired additional land from the school district to add to the community center site. This additional land alleviates zoning problems regarding the buildings setbacks as well as the amount of parking provided.

The Pro Parks levy is funding this project with the aim of adding the following:

- a computer center

- a teen center
- a gymnasium
- 1 family changing room
- a new sprinkler system.

The budget for this project is \$2.1 million. It has been very challenging to try and meet the program goals within the budget. Some money has been saved by displacing the pottery studio to accommodate the teen center rather than building a new structure, but the project is still facing budget problems.

The design team is using the following principles to guide the development of this project:

- locate the gym to allow future flexibility and maximize the use of the site – the gym will be located 10 feet off of the property line to the west.
- Use circulation to link the old to the new – the design is using the existing main axis of circulation through the building and is implying a continuation of this axis into the exterior space.
- Create a sense of cohesion with the existing building while respecting and honoring the existing architecture – the new addition will be differentiated from the old building, and will not copy the building details, but will use similar materials.

Very little will be changed to the second floor of the building. On the lower level of the building the pottery studio will be renovated and a new lobby and new gym will be added. At the previous meeting the Design Commission recommended that the team should improve the connection to the new gym. A changing room has been eliminated due to budget constraints which has allowed more space at the entry to the gym. The entry to the gym will now be a double height space which will have natural light from above.

Because the gym is partially buried in the slope on the west of the site, three of the gym walls will be



retaining walls. The concrete walls will double as structural elements as well as durable surfaces. The team has brought a model of the gym to the lighting lab to study the daylighting and make sure there isn't too much glare. Due to budget restrictions the wood slats that were intended to screen the slot window on the east side of the gym have been eliminated. Instead there will be a combination of an interior screen and operable blinds to shade this window.

Outside of the new lobby there will be a green area as well as a paved open space. There is also a play area which will be developed by parks and will include a relocated play structure which will be

displaced by the construction of the gym. A series of doors between the lobby and the outdoor area will be held open to provide access to a wide paved area. This area will be used in combination with concessions in the teen area as an outdoor café.

According to the latest cost estimate the project exceeded the budget by 4-1/2% and the team needed to remove \$90,000 dollars from the scope. The drawings being presented to the Design Commission represent the reconciled design development scope. Landscaping has been eliminated on the west side of

the gym. In addition to the wood slats which were removed from the slot window in the gym, other sun screens were eliminated. These changes will bring the cost back down to \$2.1 million.

Recently many Parks' projects have been coming in over budget so the Parks Department has requested that the design team include other deduct alternates as a contingency. One of these options would be to not include the new lobby and leave the gym as a separately accessible facility. Another option is to use a single wythe construction in the exterior wall of the gym instead of using a veneer block. A final cost cutting option is to remove some of the storefront between the lobby and the outdoor paved space.

The design also includes some add alternates in case the project comes in under budget. The first add alternate is to add an elevator to connect the two levels of the building. An elevator is not required by code because both of the levels are accessible on grade, but it would provide a more equitable accessible connection within the building. The second add alternate is to replace the existing dog leg stair with a more direct more public stair.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Questions what the play area being developed by parks will include.
 - Proponents explained that the play area will be a place holder for future development when more funds are available. At this time the project only consists of relocating the play structure.
- Wonders what material the ground surface will be.
 - Proponents stated that they will use wood chips.
- Would like to know more about the detailing of the slot window in the gym, now that the wood slats have been eliminated.
 - Proponents stated that the sill will be 6'-8" above the floor of the gym. The window will be a clear storefront with wood veneer. There will be an automated mecho-shade on the interior of the window.
- Would like to know what the artist is doing on this project.
 - Proponents stated that the artist working on this project is Ashley Thorner. She works with very bright colors of translucent plastic. She will be forming a shape in resin similar to a mushroom or umbrella. There will be four pieces on the approach to the building. They will be 10 feet high by 6 feet wide and will be supported by steel columns.
- Would like to know more about the narration of the art and the relationship between art and the community.
 - Proponents explained that the artist will be working with the community through a public charrette.
- Wonders if any changes will be made to the adjacent parking lot area that has been acquired from the school district.
 - Proponents stated that they did not initially anticipate the land swap so they have the land, but do not have any money to make improvements.
- Is concerned that the budget constraints are eliminating the sustainable aspects of the design. Notes that many sunscreens have been removed. Would like to know what the design team's philosophy is regarding the budget cuts and allowing for future development.
 - Proponents stated that the creation of the gym space is the primary goal. They added that

- maintaining quality construction is a high priority particularly in a public facility. They noted that the connection to the gym could be added later if necessary.
- Proponents remarked that they had looked into stormwater and natural reclamation systems early in the project but had been limited by budget constraints. They also explained that the mechanical system in the gym is a low velocity system which is the latest thinking in environmental controls. This will include an evaporative cooling system that will simulate air conditioning with no additional cost above the rooftop heater.
 - Notes that bids in the private sector are coming in lower not higher. Wonders if the City has looked at ways of addressing this.
 - Proponents explained that public projects have different requirements that make them more expensive than projects in the private sector. One example is the requirement to use a set percentage of apprentice labor which costs contractors money.
 - Remarks that the excavation to locate the gym will produce excess soil which will need to be removed from the site and will be a substantial expense.
 - Proponents explained that they are trying to use as much of this earth as possible on other parks projects if it is found to be suitable.
 - Notes that the building is being developed with two separate entrances. Wonders if it would be simpler to bring a stair in from the north.
 - Proponents explained that there is already an existing entrance from the south. They added that people who use the functions on the lower level and kids from the middle school enter this way.
 - Wonders what the Parks Department is doing to prioritize addition projects.
 - Proponents stated that there is major maintenance money that could partially fund the remainder of this project in the future. They added that they have also applied for a grant to supplement the project budget.
 - Questions if private funding could be applied to this project.
 - Proponents explained that private funding could be used if it came through the Parks Foundation.
 - Notes that Parks Department has gotten into a tight corner of over-extending expectations and then cutting back on the quality of the project. Cautions the agency that this goes back to the initial programming.
 - Proponents noted that the programming goes back to the original levy.
 - Feels that the levy created unrealistic expectations.
 - Suggests that if the building is being extended without providing the necessary circulation it would be better to put the project on hold.
 - Notes that the project ,as it is currently designed, is an elegant form of minimalism. Is concerned that budget cuts will turn it into a brutal minimalism.
 - Compliments the team on the improved link to the gym and the possibility of creating a wide hallway.
 - Feels that the design team should be lauded for doing a lot with a little.
 - Commends the team for doing the lighting investigation in the gym and balancing daylighting with the parks requirements against glare.

20 Nov 2003 Project: Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Project

Phase: Joint Review by Design and Planning Commissions

Previous Review: 17 October, 2003 (Subcommittee)

Presenters: Tom Madden, Washington Department of Transportation
Bob Chandler, Seattle Department of TransportationAttendees: Steve Pearce, Seattle Department of Transportation
Beverly Barnett, Seattle Department of Transportation
Paul Tomita, Seattle Planning Commission
Marty Curry, Planning Commission Director
Barbara Wilson, Planning Commission Staff
Ivan Miller, Puget Sound Regional Council

Time: 1.5 hours (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00242)

Summary: The Commission appreciates the presentation on the southern portion of this complex project and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- **The Commission feels that, from this initial presentation, having South Atlantic and Royal Brougham continue over the rail road tracks would be preferable to connecting below the tracks**
- **encourages the team to do whatever it takes to make the shortest acceptable tail track adjacent to Terminal 46;**
- **commends the team on continuing to consider the larger planning and design issues of this project and not just viewing this solely as a transportation study;**
- **appreciates seeing the consideration of east-west connections;**
- **would like to see continued study of these connections including Pike Place Hillclimb, Marion/Madison, Pike/Pine and other street pairs;**
- **emphasizes the importance of foot traffic coming from the ferries;**
- **suggests that transit lanes be consolidated to the extent possible in order to leave space for other uses;**
- **and looks forward to having another review of this project in late January after the summary project report with all surface options has been produced, prior to the issuance of the DEIS next March.**

Proponents for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Project updated the Design and Planning Commissions on the progress of this project. A critical issue in all of the schemes is how the viaduct and local streets will interact with the rail lines adjacent to terminal 46. Plans are to relocate the tail track, where trains wait for 10-15 minutes, by terminal 46. If the terminal is ever redeveloped it will be important that access is not blocked by the tail track. The team presented one option that would allow access to terminal 46 by bridging over the tracks, and one that would have Atlantic and Royal Brougham cross the tracks at grade. Currently neither of these schemes is completely reconciled with the current function of terminal 46 as a container facility.

As the Ferry redevelops its facilities there is the possibility that the viaduct project could inherit some land that is currently being used for off site holding by the Ferry. If the new dock is big enough the Ferry will not need a remote holding location. Washington State Ferries is exploring different alternatives for the new dock. The existing dock holds 650 cars. They are considering options for 1,000 or 1,200 car docks.

The Viaduct team has stopped working on the tunnel design under the sculpture park. Instead they are exploring other connections which could touch down at Elliot, or could skip over Elliot and touch down at Western. The surface street pieces of this project could include new pedestrian connections. There is also the opportunity to connect to the PC1 site, by Pike Place Market, by lidding over a tunnel. Proponents noted that the tunnel will need to daylight for a portion of its length in order to cross over the BNSF railroad tracks. The alternative, to tunnel under the tracks would add \$500 million to the project.

The team is exploring a variety of surface alternatives that could be used in combination with the different Viaduct proposals. One option would have 4 lanes of surface traffic until south of Madison or Seneca where it would expand to 6 lanes. Proponents noted that not all of the surface options are compatible with all of the viaduct alternatives. The team is also investigating ways to improve east-west connections to the waterfront.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Notes that these proposals are all on one end of the spectrum of options for how to use this area. All of these schemes include a huge amount of paving. At the other end of the spectrum; some of that area could be water.
- Agrees that there is an opportunity to rework the location of the seawall, as a lot of the fill will need to be removed in order to replace it.
- Wonders if there are utilities under Alaskan Way.
 - Proponents stated that there are utilities under Alaskan Way and that they will need to move some of them around during construction of the viaduct project. Proponents noted that it may not be a good idea to build new structures over the utility corridor.
- Notes that going over the railroad tracks near terminal 46 seems better than going under.
- Appreciates that this project is not being viewed solely as a transportation project.